



To: **Members of the Council**

Contact: Ms. M. Bailey
direct line: 01372 474179
e-mail: mbailey@elmbridge.gov.uk

30 November 2018

Dear Councillor,

Council - Wednesday, 5 December 2018

I write with regard to the above meeting of the Council, and enclose the following information:

		Page Nos.
• Agenda Item	7. 2019/20 Council Tax Base	3 - 10
	The legislation requires that the Council Tax base calculations made must be based on the position as at 30 November each year (30 November 2018 for setting the 2019/20 Council Tax).	
• Agenda Item	8. Community Governance Review – Hersham	11 - 14
	As referenced in Page 19 (paragraph 2.7) of the Council Agenda, please find attached the consultation response from the Hersham Community Council Steering Group, which was omitted from the original agenda despatch.	
• Agenda Item	9(m) Planning Committee - 27 November 2018	15 - 18
• Agenda Item	9(n) Individual Cabinet Member Decision Making – Leisure and Culture - 28 November 2018	19 - 20
• Agenda Item	9(o) Individual Cabinet Member Decision Making - Planning Services - 29 November 2018	21 - 26

I shall be grateful if you will kindly arrange to access these documents in time for the meeting.

Yours sincerely

Marianne Bailey

Ms. M. Bailey
Democratic Services
Enc.

Chief Executive: Robert Moran

Strategic Director and Deputy Chief Executive
Sarah Selvanathan

Strategic Director
Ray Lee

This page is intentionally left blank

Committee: COUNCIL

Date of meeting: 5 December 2018

Subject:	2019/20 Council Tax Base
Lead Officer:	Head of Finance
Portfolio Holder:	Resources – Councillor Ruth Mitchell
Link to Council Priorities:	All
Exempt information:	None
Delegated status:	For Resolution

Executive Summary:

To provide the statutory details of the 2019/20 Council Tax Base for approval.

Recommended:

That the Council Tax bases (showing band ‘D’ equivalent dwellings for tax setting purposes) for the Elmbridge area in respect of the year 2019/20 be approved as follows:

For the whole borough	64,720
For the area of the borough covered by Claygate Parish Council	3,474

Report:

1. The Council is required to undertake a formal calculation of the 2019/20 council tax base, in accordance with the requirements of the Local Government Finance Act 1992. Tax base details must be determined and relevant information passed to precepting authorities by the required date of 31 January 2019.
2. Legislation requires that the calculations made must be based on the position as at 30 November 2018. These tax bases will then be used by each precepting authority early next year in setting their individual elements of the 2019/20 council tax.
3. Claygate Parish requires a specific council tax base calculation for its area; there is an additional and separate council tax levied on each of the domestic properties in the Claygate Parish area.
4. Two separate calculations for both recommendations A and B are attached as appendices to this report:
 - Appendix A - overall tax base for the Elmbridge Borough area (including the Claygate Parish area).
 - Appendix B - tax base for the Claygate Parish area.

5. The tax base is calculated by taking the actual number of properties in each property band then making allowances for anticipated changes to the end of the next financial year. These changes include the number of physical properties, statutory exemptions, discounts and the cost of awards under the Local Council Tax Support Scheme (LCTSS). The adjusted totals are then multiplied by a band specific ratio to produce the number of band D equivalents. Working out to band D equivalents is a legal requirement.

This year's tax base calculation include changes recommended by cabinet on 19 September 2018 and approved by Council on 3 October 2018 to remove a one month 100% discount for vacant properties and increase a premium on properties that have been vacant for over two years from 50% to 100%.

6. Given the tax base is estimating events up to 16 months ahead, an allowance is built in to protect against adverse movements such as successful appeals against banding, increases in the number of discounts, exemptions, and Local Council Tax Scheme (LCTS) discounts granted etc. as well as non-payment and bad debt. Last year an allowance of 1.0% was deducted from the tax base. Although there is a shortfall in the number of new properties (the significant reduction in the Council Tax Surplus for 2018/19) it is still considered prudent that an allowance of 1.0% is used for the calculation for 2019/20. This gives an estimated collection rate of 99.0% and has been used in the calculation of the council tax base for 2019/20. When next year's council tax base is calculated the 1.0% allowance will be reviewed in the light of experience at that time.

Financial implications:

The removal of the one month 100% discount increases the total tax base by 204 band D equivalents which, based on the current council tax, is worth approximately £43,500 based on Elmbridge's 11.5% share of the tax.

The increase in the empty premium charge increases the total tax base by 87 band D equivalents which is worth approximately £18,500 based on Elmbridge's 11.5% share of the tax. This additional income is likely to diminish over time as this change encourages bringing empty homes back into use more quickly.

The changes to empty discount and premium represent 50% of the total 0.9% increase in tax base from last year. For comparison the total tax base increase from 2017/18 to 2018/19 was 1.1%.

The Council Tax Base stated in this report will be used to work out the council tax funding in the 2019/20 budget to be approved by Council in February 2019.

Environmental/Sustainability implications:

None identified.

Legal implications:

Approval of the tax base by the Council, and notification to precepting authorities by no later than 31 January 2019, is a statutory requirement.

Equality Implications:

None for the purpose of this report.

Risk Implications:

None, other than the legal implications above and the estimated nature of the tax base calculation.

The collection rate of 99% may not be realised causing a deficit in the collection fund, however, this is considered an acceptable risk.

Community Safety Implications:

None for the purpose of this report.

Principal Consultees:

None for the purpose of this report.

Background papers:

None for the purpose of this report.

Enclosures/Appendices:

Appendix A - Overall tax base for the Elmbridge Borough area (including the Claygate Parish area).

Appendix B - Tax base for the Claygate Parish area.

Contact details:

Head of Finance – 01372 474123 acooper@elmbridge.gov.uk

Revenues Officer – 01372 474230 cmckay@elmbridge.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Whole Borough

Date: 30 November 2018	Disabled Band A	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H	Total	
Properties on Valuation List at 30/11/18	-	425	1,736	7,746	13,484	10,917	7,805	11,271	4,257	57,641	
Add expected new properties to 31/3/2020 (adjusted)	-	2	-	43	49	55	23	23	30	225	
Less:											
Exempt properties	-	36	51	123	128	128	82	85	21	654	
Demolished properties	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	2	
Chargeable dwellings	-	391	1,685	7,666	13,405	10,844	7,745	11,208	4,266	57,210	
Disabled relief properties - actual	-	1	3	15	49	45	51	57	32	253	
Disabled relief properties - effective	1	3	15	49	45	51	57	32	-	253	
Chargeable dwellings	1	393	1,697	7,700	13,401	10,850	7,751	11,183	4,234	57,210.0	
Discounted properties at 25%	1	110	1,163	3,789	4,385	3,052	1,697	1,739	336	16,272	
Discounted properties at 50%	-	35	2	5	5	5	9	22	9	92	
Premium properties at 200%	-	7	8	32	27	21	13	13	21	142	
Non discounted properties	-	241	524	3,874	8,984	7,772	6,032	9,409	3,868	40,704	
Less local council tax support cost (band D equivalents)	-	35	492	1,370	1,250	376	90	30	2	3,645	
Chargeable dwellings adjusted for discount	0.75	320.00	921.25	5,412.25	11,079.25	9,729.50	7,245.25	10,720.25	4,164.50	49,593.00	
Ratio to Band "D"	5:9	6:9	7:9	8:9	9:9	11:9	13:9	15:9	18:9		
Band "D" equivalents	0.42	213.33	716.53	4,810.89	11,079.25	11,891.61	10,465.36	17,867.08	8,329.00	65,373.47	
										Estimated collection rate %	99.0
										Band "D" equivalents x collection rate	64,719.74
										Band "D" Equivalents for tax setting	64,720

This page is intentionally left blank

This page is intentionally left blank

ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL
COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW 2018
PROPOSED HERSHAM COMMUNITY COUNCIL

SUBMISSION BY THE HERSHAM COMMUNITY COUNCIL STEERING GROUP

We enclose a summary of our views on the value of a community council to Hersham

OUR VISION OF WHAT THE COMMUNITY COUNCIL WILL DO FOR HERSHAM

The Hersham Community Council Steering Group is a body which was established to ascertain whether the residents wish to have an organization which will have authority to direct financial resources where they best benefit this community

The COMMUNITY COUNCIL once established would:

- set up a website for Hersham to act as a forum for sharing village and HCC initiatives and enable the residents to propose other initiatives. It would be a platform for publicising all local activities, clubs and businesses and could act as a conduit to other established associations – enabling the community to act with one voice – and to help strengthen the relationship between the community and its elected councillors
- investigate the possibility of publishing a free newspaper in conjunction with the website – to enable the inclusion of those residents without access to the internet
- help increase community participation by supporting a local business forum, arts and culture exhibitions and initiatives
- support the Day Centre, Village Hall and Youth Club
- use its funding resources to improve the quality of local clubs and associations by help in paying for new / replacing old equipment where needed where self-funding is not possible.
- be able to provide seed-funding for new initiatives being set up in Hersham, especially for the young and disabled
- by encouraging active use of the community facilities, help to assist in the viability and success of local businesses as well as improving those community facilities themselves
- have the power to respond and engage with to planning applications to preserve the character of Hersham while being supportive of developments which are sympathetically created. Care would be taken to ensure that the involvement of the HCC would not hold up the planning process.
- Supporting such initiatives as the Food Bank and School uniform recycling initiatives.

PROPOSED BOUNDARY for the Community Council area of responsibility:

- The proposed boundary uses the River Mole, the railway line, Seven Hills Road and A3 as the limits. It therefore includes Longmore Estate, Whiteley Village, Burwood Park and Painshill Park.
- The proposed boundary makes sense because it is also the one used by: the current Parliamentary Elections for Esher and Walton (eastern boundary); the previous Elmbridge Borough Council Hersham North and South wards; much of the Church of England Parish boundary and the Surrey County Council Hersham Division (except part of Netherby Park)

- We acknowledge that there will always be different opinions as to where the boundary should be, especially from those who live close to the perimeter.
- We hope that all those within the boundary would want to be associated with Hersham, and as such be included within the HCC boundary. However, we acknowledge that there will always be different opinions especially close to the boundaries and are happy to negotiate alterations and adjustments, particularly in the southern part, where the A3 has sectioned off a part of the old parish.
- Whiteley Village is strongly in favour of being part of Hersham and we would anticipate that it be included.

ECONOMICS

Our understanding of the financing of the community council:

- The steering committee anticipates that a precept be levied similar to that of Claygate
- Increases in the levy once it has been determined at the outset are not anticipated (as has been the case in Claygate)
- At band D, we understand the precept will be approximately £2 per household per month.
- All the money will be spent within Hersham only.
- The total levy received will be significant and impactful to the quality of community life in Hersham and will enable the provision of services in addition to those provided by Elmbridge Borough Council and/or Surrey County Council

RELATIONSHIP WITH ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCIL

A positive relationship with Elmbridge Borough Council will be fundamental to the success of the community council.

- Elmbridge Borough Council would be strongly supported, and a strong rapport is envisaged
- The need for Elmbridge Borough Council to be neutral at this stage is understood to ensure that the proposals come from a grass roots level and are not felt to be imposed by other layers of administration.
- It is not envisaged that Hersham Community Council would take any roles from Elmbridge Borough Council unless requested by it and fully funded.
- There is no expectation that the Hersham Community Council will be in competition with Elmbridge Borough Council in any way but will be there to help foster community growth and self sufficiency
- Hersham Village itself is a special place, centred around a green with churches, a doctor's surgery, schools, shops and a library all in close proximity. There are few places like this in Elmbridge and this is something which should be treasured
- Hersham is a large community and the residents are proud to live here and really care about their village
- The Village Hall is central to all of this and is the heartbeat of Hersham and community life. Both the Village Hall and Day Centre are positive for local businesses as they increase visitors and footfall – both young and old - to the commercial centre of Hersham
- The exceptionally strong turnout at the My Elmbridge meeting in Hersham on October 1st clearly showed that many residents do not feel that they currently have a voice.

- It is clear that many Hersham residents currently feel they are under-represented at Borough level. This is not a reflection of lack of care from its councillors, but an inevitable result of the current ward boundaries.
- Hersham Community Council will help all residents have a voice and to channel that voice in an efficient way to the Borough Council and in that way help to bridge the gap between the higher levels of administration and the local level
- Hersham Community Council would be able to support funding for youth events and community gatherings, fostering a stronger community spirit, and thus the well-being of the community and its residents
- Hersham Community Council can provide a useful forum for local businesses; a locally produced newspaper (online plus some print) would assist them

RELATIONSHIP WITH ELMBRIDGE BOROUGH COUNCILLORS

It is the belief of the steering group that a non-partisan community council, staffed primarily by volunteers, will be able to represent all the residents of Hersham, whether or not they have political interests.

- Approximately 1000 signatories were obtained for the petition, and even though not all of these were accepted under the electoral register criteria, the petition was easily able to reach the legally required 7.5%. This is a similar number to that achieved by successful candidates in borough elections, and this was without any financial backing, being funded from donations by the members of steering group only
- The Hersham Community Council would want to have and would strive towards a good working relationship with Elmbridge Borough councillors, providing feedback on Hersham issues
- The aim is to represent everyone, including those who are unable to vote for whatever reason but who live within the boundary, listening especially to those who feel unsettled by political stand points and who want only to concentrate on the environment where they live
- The community council will aim to give a high profile to the centre of the village, its clubs and its businesses
- The belief is that Hersham residents will prefer to take decisions with long term payback
- Many residents – evidenced by the high turn-out for the My Elmbridge meeting - do not currently feel that they have a voice in many decisions being made in their name, but in collaboration with local borough councillors, this situation can be improved

EXAMPLE: DAY CENTRE AND VILLAGE HALL

The Steering Group has not been set up to be a campaigning body but it does have concerns about the closure of the village hall and the rumours of redevelopment. A future HCC would provide a great forum for discussing issues such as the Village Hall and developing local policies with the support and engagement of Hersham residents.

This approach could have taken much of the heat out of the MyElmbridge meeting on 1st October, allowing other topics to be discussed.

As an example of this, it is felt that the existence of HCC would have helped to mitigate these points raised at the MyElmbridge meeting:

- As mentioned above, the My Elmbridge meeting clearly showed that many Hersham residents do not feel that they are being heard or consulted about the closure of the Village Hall
- It was felt that a feasibility study could have been initiated soon after the closure of the Village Hall – over 16 months have elapsed and this has still not been started
- The decision-making process surrounding this issue has been opaque and slow
- A refurbishment costing for both the Day Centre and the Village Hall should always have been included
- As highlighted earlier both the Village Hall and Day Centre are positive for local businesses as they increase visitors and footfall of all ages to the commercial centre of Hersham
- Another concern is that any redevelopment could mean that Hersham would be without a Village Hall AND Day Centre facilities for elderly for many years which residents felt was unacceptable.

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

Elmbridge Borough Council

Planning Committee

Report of a meeting held on 27 November 2018

Members of the Committee:

- * B.J.F. Cheyne (Chairman)
- * Mrs. K. Randolph (Vice-Chairman)

- | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|
| * | * |
| A.P. Burley | P.M. Harman |
| * | * |
| A. Coomes | C. James |
| * | * |
| Mrs. C.J. Cross | Rachael I. Lake |
| A. Davis | Mrs. D.M. Mitchell |
| * | * |
| Mrs. C. Elmer | Mrs. M.C. Sheldon |
| * | * |
| M.J. Freeman | Mrs. J.R. Turner |
| * | * |
| C.R. Green | S.J. Waugh |

* Denotes attendance

Substitutes:

D.J. Lewis (Substituting for Mrs. D.M. Mitchell)
Mrs. M. Marshall (Substituting for A. Davis)

Also present:

N. Haig-Brown and Mrs. V. Macleod

21/18 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Matters of Report

22/18 Planning Applications

The Committee considered the reports of meetings of the East, North and South Area Planning Sub-Committees.

Resolved that the reports of the East, North and South Area Planning Sub-Committees held on 5 November 2018 be received and, except where already determined under delegated powers, the planning matter set out below be determined as follows:

(a) 2017/1681 - Locke King House, 2 Balfour Road, Weybridge

Seven additional letters of objection were received. The Committee also noted that the planning agent had provided some points of clarification / amendments to the report.

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

Further to the promotion to the Planning Committee of application number 2017/1681 – Locke King House, 2 Balfour Road, Weybridge by two Members of the South Area Planning Sub-Committee at its meeting held on 5 November 2018, the Committee considered the recommendation from the South Area Planning Sub-Committee that permission should be granted in respect of this application.

The Committee discussed the application in detail and Members were of the view that the bulk and mass of the proposed development would be out of character with the locality and that this would be emphasised as the development would be set above ground level on a podium. Concern was expressed at the potential precedent that this could also set within a Conservation Area and at the impact that the development would have on the setting of the nearby Grade II Church due to bulk and height. The Committee therefore concluded that the proposal would indeed be out of character and would harm the streetscene.

Accordingly, the Committee

Resolved that permission be refused contrary to the recommendations of the officers and of the South Area Planning Sub-Committee, for the following reason:

01 The proposal by virtue of its bulk and mass, emphasised by the fact it would be raised from ground level on a podium, would be out of character and would harm the streetscene. The proposal would therefore have an adverse impact on the conservation area and not preserve its character. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies CS4 and CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy 2011, policies DM2 and DM12 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework 2018.

23/18 Minutes of the Local Plan Working Group - 15 November 2018

The Committee received the report of the meeting of the Local Plan Working Group held on 15 November 2018.

Arising from consideration of the report, the Head of Planning Services took the opportunity to provide an update on the minute in respect of the Government's consultation on changes to planning policy and guidance on the standard methodology used for assessing local housing need. In view of the timescales involved, it was noted that the proposed response to the consultation would be considered by the Portfolio Holder for Planning Services by way of an Individual Cabinet Member Decision Making meeting being held on 29 November 2018. Members were advised that they were welcome to attend this meeting, or alternatively they could submit any comments they may have on the consultation, to the Head of Planning Services before the meeting.

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

Resolved that the report of the meeting of the Local Plan Working Group held on 15 November 2018 be received and noted.

- - - - -

The meeting commenced at 7.00 pm and concluded at 7.57 pm

B.J.F. Cheyne
Chairman

Democratic Services Officer

Ms. B. Greenstein Head of Democratic Services

Other Officers in attendance

A. Harrison - Head of Legal Services
Mrs. K. Tagliarini - Head of Planning Services
P. Brooks - South Area Team Leader

This page is intentionally left blank

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

Elmbridge Borough Council

Individual Cabinet Member Decision Making - Leisure and Culture

Report of decisions taken on 28 November 2018

Present:

M.F. Howard (Portfolio Holder for Leisure & Culture)

1/18 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Matters of Report

2/18 Leisure Facility Strategy

(Link to Council Priorities: P1, P2, P3, P4)

A new Leisure Facility Strategy for Elmbridge had been approved by Cabinet on 19 September 2018 and ratified at Council on 3 October 2018.

However, Sport England had subsequently supplied further feedback on the Strategy and in this regard, the Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture considered an updated Strategy that included the proposed changes.

The Portfolio Holder was advised that the changes provided by Sport England did not affect the key recommendations of the Strategy and were therefore relatively minor in nature.

The Portfolio Holder acknowledged that it was important that the Council supported the proposed changes provided by Sport England given that they were a statutory consultee for all planning applications relating to leisure facility development within Elmbridge. Furthermore, Sport England required reassurance that the Council's forward planning and identified strategic needs were based on thorough and accurate data analysis.

On consideration of the report, the Portfolio Holder

Resolved that the minor amendments to the Leisure Facility Strategy provided by Sport England, as set out at Appendix A of the report, be agreed.

The meeting commenced at 3.00 pm and concluded at 3.02 pm

M.F. Howard
Portfolio Holder for Leisure & Culture

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

Democratic Services Officer

Mrs. T. Hulse

Principal Committee and Member Services Officer

Other Officers in attendance

A. Harrison

Head of Legal Services

Mrs. L. Taylor

Leisure Facilities Manager

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

Elmbridge Borough Council

Individual Cabinet Member Decision Making - Planning Services

Report of decisions taken on 29 November 2018

Present:

J.W. Browne (Portfolio Holder for Planning Services)

9/18 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

Matters of Report

10/18 The Draft Response to the Government's Technical Consultation on Updates to National Planning Policy and Guidance

(Link to Council Priorities: P1)

Through the Technical consultation on updates to national planning policy and guidance, the Government was seeking views on changes to the standard method for assessing local housing need. The consultation also proposed minor clarifications to national planning policy on housing land supply; the definition of deliverable sites; and appropriate assessment for habitats sites. In this regard, the Portfolio Holder for Planning Services considered a report that set out the Council's draft response.

In 2017, the Government had announced that it would enable the housing market to deliver 300,000 homes a year on average by the mid-2020s. This included a proposal for a standard method of assessing local housing need which had then been introduced through the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018 update.

The Portfolio Holder noted that when the standard method had been applied to Elmbridge, it had resulted in a local housing need of 612 homes per annum, which the Council had considered could not realistically be achieved given the local constraints. In this regard, the Council had submitted a response that had been agreed by the previous Portfolio Holder for Planning Services in November 2017. The response had outlined that the standardised method was fundamentally flawed, over simplistic and relied upon a limited range of datasets, that by themselves, did not provide a complete assessment of housing need within an individual local authority area or across Housing Market Areas (HMAs).

Whilst the Government had formally adopted the standard method for calculating local housing need, the Office for National Statistics (ONS), in September 2018, had published the latest household projections. The Portfolio

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

Holder noted that when applied to the standard method for Elmbridge, the need of 612 had dropped to 503 dwellings per year.

In response, the Government had considered whether it needed to change its aspirations for housing supply in light of the new household projections. Having considered this, the Government had decided that it was not right to change its aspirations and instead proposed that the original 2014 ONS projections be used rather than the latest figures. In this regard, the original delivery of 612 homes per year for Elmbridge was still required.

Given the decision by Government to use the original 2014 ONS projections in respect of the level of housing provision, officers had prepared a response to the consultation that reiterated the comments that had been made in the Council's 'Planning for the right homes in the right places' consultation response agreed in November 2017. In addition, the response also stressed that it was vital that the local constraints on new development were also considered as part of the Government's method, particularly as Elmbridge was heavily constrained by the Green Belt and other nationally important designations.

The Portfolio Holder acknowledged that a verbal update in respect of this consultation had been provided to the Local Plan Working Group at its meeting on 15 November 2018. The Interim Planning Policy and Strategy Manager advised that a copy of the draft response had also been circulated to Members of the Working Group and this item had also been considered by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 27 November 2018. He further advised that no comments in this regard had been received to date.

On consideration of the draft response, the Portfolio Holder requested that the comments under Question 2 (Do you agree with the proposed approach to not allowing 2016-based household projections to be used as a reason to justify lower housing need) be strengthened. In this regard the Portfolio Holder agreed that the following additional paragraph be included within the response under Question 2 prior to its submission to the Government:

'The Council is supportive of the governments intentions to tackle the housing problems. However it is difficult to explain to residents that the Government is proposing to amend the inputs into the previously agreed method, because the updated housing figures conflict with the Governments aspirations to build 300,000 new homes per year.'

The Portfolio Holder reported that he had discussed this issue with the Member of Parliament for the Esher and Walton Constituency and he had understood the Council's position.

The Portfolio Holder, in his opinion, considered that an Objectively Assessed Housing Need was being abandoned and a more politically directed housing prescription was in place. Whilst finding this disappointing, the Portfolio Holder acknowledged that the Government had an overriding policy of ensuring that more houses were built across the country. However, as there was a 'one size

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

fits all' planning system in operation, he did not feel that this took into account the particular constraints under which Elmbridge were operating.

Resolved that subject to the above additional wording under Question 2, the Council's response to the Government's Technical consultation on updates to national planning policy and guidance be submitted by 7 December 2018 and published on the Council's website.

11/18 Statement of Community Involvement 2018 - Adoption

(Link to Council Priorities: P1)

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Services considered a report that sought approval for the adoption of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

The SCI explained how the local authority would involve the community in local plan preparation and development management decisions. It was reviewed on a regular basis to ensure it was up to date with regard to changes in legislation / regulation and good practice.

The Portfolio Holder noted that after undertaking the most recent review of the SCI, it had been considered that the document should be written to be clearer and more concise. In addition, new regulations also required authorities to set out in their SCIs policies for giving advice or assistance to neighbourhood planning groups.

The draft SCI 2018 had been presented to the Cabinet on 19 September 2018 where Members had resolved to publish the draft SCI for public consultation for four weeks from 5 October to 2 November 2018 inclusive.

Following the conclusion of the consultation, the comments received together with how the Council had responded to these in the final document, had been discussed at the Local Plan Working Group meeting on 15 November 2018.

On consideration of the SCI, the Portfolio Holder noted that some public response had been generated as part of the consultation process. He commented that whilst some of the responses had been directed at how the Council would be engaging the public, unsurprisingly a number of the members of the public had also taken the opportunity to ask the Council not to release any of the Green Belt. Furthermore, the Portfolio Holder was pleased to note that amongst the regular consultees, all the local registered Residents' Associations, Heritage Bodies etc. had also been consulted.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Services also took the opportunity to thank the Interim Planning Policy & Strategy Manager and his Team for all the work undertaken in preparing the comprehensive document.

Resolved that the Statement of Community Involvement 2018, as attached at Appendix 1 of the report, be adopted.

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

12/18 Draft Authority Monitoring Report 2017/18

(Link to Council Priorities: P1)

As set out in Section 34 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, there was a requirement to formally produce an Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) and in this regard, the Portfolio Holder for Planning Services considered a report that sought approval to formally publish the AMR for 2017/18.

The Portfolio Holder noted that the AMR was a key element of the Government's 'plan, monitor and manage' approach to the planning system and an important tool for local authorities in communicating their performance locally. The AMR provided information on performance and impact of planning policy; identified outputs and trends; and assisted Local Planning Authorities to build a comprehensive evidence base.

In response to concerns raised by stakeholders and officers, a new concise format had been introduced for 2017/18 and it was considered that the new format was more accessible to the reader and the analysis provided more focus. The key themes remained the same with the relevant targets and indicators outlined at the beginning of each chapter.

The Portfolio Holder noted the key findings from 2017/18 which included details in respect of the monitoring of the Council's plan-making progress; the quality of decision-making; housing delivery; housing land supply; and infrastructure delivery.

With regard to housing delivery and specifically the mix of houses delivered, the Portfolio Holder reiterated the need for smaller units given that the trend for four or more bedrooms continued to be delivered. He referred to the Development Advice Notes that he had approved at a recent Individual Cabinet Member Decision Making meeting which were aimed at making it very clear that this Council intended to be robust on developers when it came to the efficient use of sites.

The Portfolio Holder was pleased to note that the figures in respect of the delivery of new affordable homes had increased. He commented that the previous two years had been poor in respect of the delivery of affordable homes which he considered was largely due to the fact that it was difficult to acquire affordable housing from developers because of viability issues.

With regard to the number of social housing units, the Portfolio Holder was again pleased to note that in 2017/18, the Council had managed to acquire 8 units which was a considerable improvement on previous years.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Services welcomed the interesting and comprehensive Council's Authority Monitoring Report for 2017/18 and thanked the officers for all the work undertaken in collecting the required data. He also

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

recommended that all Members of the Council and the public read the document given that it contained a wealth of useful facts and figures.

Resolved that the Authority Monitoring Report 2017/18, as set out at Appendix A of the report, be approved for publication on the Council's website.

The meeting commenced at 9.00 am and concluded at 9.13 am

J.W. Browne
Portfolio Holder for Planning Services

Democratic Services Officer

Mrs. T. Hulse

Principal Committee and Member Services Officer

Other Officers in attendance

A. Harrison

Head of Legal Services

T. Ridley

Interim Planning Policy and Strategy Manager

Mrs. R. Thorold

Deputy Strategy & Planning Policy Manager

This page is intentionally left blank