

Public Document Pack



SUMMONS

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT A MEETING OF THE HART DISTRICT COUNCIL
WILL BE HELD IN COUNCIL CHAMBER ON THURSDAY, 29TH SEPTEMBER, 2022
AT 7.00 PM

Joint Chief Executive

CIVIC OFFICES, HARLINGTON WAY
FLEET, HAMPSHIRE GU51 4AE

AGENDA

This Agenda and associated appendices are provided in electronic form only and are published on the Hart District Council Website.

Please download all papers through the Modern.Gov app before the meeting.

- **At the start of the meeting, the Lead Officer will confirm the Fire Evacuation Procedure.**
- **The Chairman will announce that this meeting will be recorded and that anyone remaining at the meeting had provided their consent to any such recording.**

1 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Pages 5 - 17)

To confirm the Minutes of the Council Meeting held on 28TH July 2022.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive any apologies for absence from Members*.

***Note:** Members are asked to email Committee Services in advance of the meeting as soon as they become aware they will be absent.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To declare disposable pecuniary, and any other interests*.

***Note:** Members are asked to email Committee Services in advance of the meeting as soon as they become aware they may have an interest to declare.

4 YATELEY COMMUNITY SPORTS AND WELLNESS CENTRE (Pages 18 - 19)

Presentation by Colin Ive, Chairman of Yateley Sports Community Interest Company

5 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12 - QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

To receive any questions from members of the public submitted pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 12.

*Note: The text of any question under Council Procedure Rule 12 must be given to the **Chief Executive** (email committeeservices@hart.gov.uk) no later than **Noon on Friday, 23rd September 2022***

6 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14 - QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

To receive any questions from Members submitted pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 14.

*Note: The text of any question under the Council Procedure Rule 14.3 must be given to the **Chief Executive** (email committeeservices@hart.gov.uk) not later than **5.00pm on 26th September 2022***

The text of any question under Council Procedure Rule 14.4 must be submitted to the **Chief Executive before 10.00am on 29th September 2022**

7 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

8 CABINET MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

9 CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORTS

10 MINUTES OF COMMITTEES (Pages 20 - 72)

The Minutes of the following Committees, which met on the dates shown, are submitted.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 14.1, Members are allowed to put questions at Council without Notice in respect of any matters in the Minutes to the Leader of the Council or any Chairman of the relevant meeting at the time those Minutes are received by Council.

Meeting	Date	Page Numbers	For Decision
Cabinet	4 August 2022	20-34	Item 28, Item 29, Item 30, Item 31, Item 32,
Cabinet (draft)	1 September 2022	35-44	Item 41, Item 42, Item 43, Item 44, Item 46, Item 47
Overview and Scrutiny	9 August 2022	45-53	Item 26
Audit (draft)	26 July 2022	54-57	Item 16, Item 17. Item 18, Item 19, Item 20, Item 21
Licensing (draft)	2 August 2022	58-60	Item 11
Planning (draft)	20 July 2022	61-69	Item 18, Item 19, Item 20, Item 21, Item 22, Item 23
Staffing (draft)	2 September 2022	70-72	

11 SECTION 151 OFFICER APPOINTMENT

To agree the appointment of Graeme Clark as Section 151 Officer from 1st November 2022. Mr Clark is CIPFA qualified and has performed the role of S151 Officer at Waverley Borough Council since 2014

RECOMMENDATION

The council should appoint Graeme Clark as Section 151 Officer

12 MOVE TO A SINGLE CEO MODEL (Pages 73 - 75)

To recommend that the Council should adopt on an interim basis a single CEO model and to bring it into full effect at the earliest opportunity.

RECOMMENDATION

Full Council agrees that the Council should adopt a single CEO model and bring it into full effect at the earliest opportunity (and that some of the estimated annual revenue budget savings achieved potentially reinvested to create additional capacity in Tier 3 manager posts to increase operational capacity/Monitoring officer provision)

13 OUTSIDE BODIES - FEEDBACK FROM MEMBERS

To receive any feedback from Members who are representatives of the Council on an Outside Body.

Date of Publication: Wednesday, 21 September 2022

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 1

COUNCIL

Date and Time: Thursday 28 July 2022 at 7.00 pm

Place: Council Chamber

Present:

COUNCILLORS -

Worlock (Chairman)

Axam	Dorn	Oliver
Blewett	Engström	Quarterman
Butler	Farmer	Smith
Clarke	Forster	Southern
Coburn	Hale	Wildsmith
Cockarill	Kennett	Woods
Collins	Kinnell	Wright
Crampton	Makepeace-Browne	
Davies	Neighbour	

Officers Present:

Daryl Phillips	Joint Chief Executive
Sharon Black	Committee Services Officer
Claire Lord	Committee Services Officer

Cllr Worlock announced that, for the term of her office, she wished to be known as Madam Chairman.

11 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the AGM held on 19 May 2022 were unanimously agreed as a correct record and were duly signed.

12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllrs Bailey, Butcher, Crisp, Delaney, Harward, Lamb and Radley.

13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllrs Cockarill and Quarterman declared non pecuniary interests in Agenda Item 10, Yateley, Darby Green and Frogmore Neighbourhood Plan – “Making” the Plan and would abstain from any vote.

14 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12 - QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

No questions by members of the public had been received.

15 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14 - QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

Questions had been received from Councillors Dr Crampton and Farmer, as detailed in Appendix A.

16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman announced that she had attended a number of events as follows, assisted by Cllrs Dorn and Wildsmith.

- 20 May - Councillor Sharyn Wheale's funeral
- 20 May - Celebration of HM The Queen's Platinum Jubilee by young people of Hampshire at Winchester Cathedral
- 22 May - Mayor of Winchester Civic Sunday Service
- 29 May - Celebration of the Queen's Platinum Jubilee in Winchester Cathedral
- 2 June - Platinum Jubilee Beacon Lighting at Whitewater Meadow
- 4 June - Platinum Jubilee Big Picnic at Whitewater Meadow
- 4 June - Test Valley Civic Sunday Service
- 5 June - Visiting various Platinum Jubilee events in the district
- 6 June - HM Lord-Lieutenant of Hampshire Reception for new Mayors and Chairmen
- 10 June - Ground Breaking Ceremony - Sainsburys in Hook
- 16 June - Beating Retreat and Cocktail evening at Gibraltar Barracks
- 20 June - Basingtoke & Deane Armed Forces Day Flag Raising Ceremony
- 21 June - Hampshire & IOW Armed Forces Briefing (Cllr Dorn represented HDC)
- 25 June - Royal British Legion Poppy Appeal Garden Party (Vice Chairman, Cllr Wildsmith represented HDC)
- 26 June - Mayor of Waverley's Civic Service
- 26 June - Lions Funfest at Yateley Manor School (Vice Chairman, Cllr Wildsmith represented HDC)
- 1 July - Duke of Edinburgh's Award Reception in Winchester Great Hall
- 3 July - The Hook Village Show
- 3 July - Hampshire Scouts Annual Review & AGM (Vice Chairman, Cllr Wildsmith represented HDC)
- 9 July - Pelly Concert, Church on the Heath

Regular meetings were also held with the Vice Chair to review the past month and discuss forthcoming events.

Cllrs noted that it was planned that a Civic Service would be held in Autumn 2022 and a Civic Day in Spring 2023 with further details in due course.

It was also noted that Madam Chairman wished to establish a Chairman's Legacy project involving a DofE Award Scheme for Special Needs and Disabled Young People, together with other projects, further information for which would follow in due course.

17 CABINET MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader of the Council congratulated the Countryside team for retaining the Green Flag for Fleet Pond.

The Portfolio Holder for the Environment – gave an update on waste strategy and DEFRA. It was to be noted that work was ongoing with Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council to improve Hart's recycling collections. The Council had a green waste strategy but there were issues around funding required for additional services such as food waste recycling.

A Councillor expressed their frustration that many of the portfolio holders had nothing to report since the last Council meeting.

18 CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORTS

The Joint Chief Executive had nothing to report.

19 MINUTES OF COMMITTEES

The Minutes of the following Committees, which met on the dates shown, were received by Council.

Meeting	Date
Cabinet	9 Jun 2022
Cabinet (draft)	7 Jul 2022
Overview & Scrutiny	14 June 2022
Overview & Scrutiny (draft)	12 July 2022
Audit (draft)	24 May 2022
Licensing (draft)	7 Jun 2022
Planning (draft)	15 Jun 2022

There were no questions on the minutes.

20 YATELEY, DARBY GREEN AND FROGMORE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - 'MAKING' THE PLAN

Cllrs Cockarill and Quarterman restated their non-pecuniary interests in this Agenda Item.

Council was provided with the background to the referendum on the neighbourhood plan. Council was reminded that as the Plan had been approved by the referendum, there was a legal requirement for the Plan to be adopted and brought into force. There had been a 91% vote in approval of the Plan at the referendum.

Adoption of the plan was proposed by Cllr Neighbour and seconded by Cllr Clarke, and was agreed by Council.

21 OUTSIDE BODIES - FEEDBACK FROM MEMBERS

Cllr Dorn gave updates regarding his work on Military Governance and also the Farnborough Aerodrome Consultative Committee.

It was hoped that updates from members on other Outside Bodies would be available for the next meeting.

The meeting closed at 8.01 pm

Appendix A

Agenda Item 5 – Council Procedure Rule 14 – Questions by Members

Questions from Councillor Dr Anne Crampton

1. **The Shapley Heath external audit says; The governance arrangements were appropriate and adequate, but these were not actioned throughout the project. Specifically there was lack of any reports to Cabinet between March 2020 and November 2021, meetings not held at the required frequency even post pandemic, the lack of annual review of the Opportunity Board’s Terms of Reference and the lack of a review of objectives and priorities as required by the Terms of Reference. Who made these decisions and with whose authority and in the absence of governance arrangements, how was it expected that those who had the obligation to scrutinise the project, would be able to hold the project to account?**

Response from Cllr Neighbour

The Shapley Heath project was curtailed in November 2021, when government funding failed to meet the levels that MHCLG had advised HDC to expect. It has however delivered ten informed and evidenced baseline reports which can underpin any future Local Plan Review and help advise the council of the viable options for meeting future housing need. This evidence base has a real intrinsic value and will benefit the people of Hart should the government allocate the area a substantially increased housing target. The project delivered very real and positive outcomes.

The Audit report did identify a number of deficiencies in the way the project had been managed. These did not have a material influence on the outcome of contract tendering, nor in the quality of the material produced. However, the failure to meticulously follow Hart’s own internal processes is clearly recognised. We will learn from the mistakes made regarding the governance and procurement of this project. I welcome the work done by the Audit Committee and apologise to the people of Hart for these failings. We will provide appropriate training to ensure that this doesn't happen again.

Meanwhile the project's ten baseline reports are saved ready for the Local Plan Review, where they will join output from other housing option studies.

Supplementary Question

Are the 10 reports from developers not key milestones?

Response from Cllr Neighbour

I believe that the reports were part of at least one, if not more, of the key milestones. However, it was only a few, not many of them.

2. The management of the Shapley Heath project did not meet the Council's required standards and did not follow the Council's standardised project structure. As a result standard internal reporting processes were not used. How was this allowed to happen and will those responsible be held to account?

Response from Cllr Cockarill

The project referred to as 'Shapley Heath' was our bid to the Government's Garden Village Community Programme. The project management and reporting processes which we set up were those prescribed under the rules of the Garden Village Community Programme, which is run by Homes England. It required the use of standard project reporting template supplied by Home England. The issue of using the Homes England supplied reporting templates had no impact on the project outcome.

I believe both Cabinet & Full Council were aware that this was the case when we agreed to enter the Project, as was Overview & Scrutiny who discussed the membership of the Opportunity Board. The Internal Audit Report made no criticism of the project management and reporting processes themselves.

3. The interim Head of Corporate Services has set out a timetable for improvement in processes going forward. How will what has happened, as highlighted in the report, be investigated, by whom and how will it be demonstrated that those responsible for the project do not "mark their own homework" and dismiss this simply as a project management shortcoming?

Response from Cllr Neighbour

The Audit Committee has asked Cabinet to provide a response to the management recommendations contained within the report. It has also asked Cabinet to review the application of project governance and financial controls and reporting and to provide a response. In addition, Staffing Committee is also asked by Audit Committee to review the exercise of officer management control and financial reporting and oversight over the project. The outcome of these reviews will be shared with Members.

Supplementary Question;

As Cabinet were responsible for this, it seems that they will investigate their own messes.

Response from Cllr Neighbour

No that is not the case. Cabinet has been asked by the Audit Committee to look at an improvement plan. Staff issues will be investigated by the Staffing Committee. I don't believe that Cabinet will be "marking their own homework".

4. In cancelling the July and September Shapley Heath Opportunity Board meetings, what regard did either the officers who advised him or the Portfolio Holder for Place himself, take of the Board's obligation to meet as a minimum once a quarter, particularly as there was outstanding business arising from the March meeting as the 2021/2022 project plan and the costings had not been endorsed and none of the financial information against which to scrutinise the project had been provided?

Response from Cllr Cockarill

Quarterly meetings of the Opportunity Board should have taken place, but unfortunately, we were hit by a global pandemic which caused a nationwide lockdown. As the Council went into emergency mode, the planned schedule of meetings was put aside to allow officers to deal with the health emergency. The March 2021 Opportunity Board meeting did have a briefing on the impact of Covid upon the project. It was my view that the July 2021 meeting of the Opportunity Board would not have all the requested information to hand and therefore considered it better to wait until the next scheduled meeting to provide a full, post-Covid update. I had requested that the Board be supplied a budget by e-mail so that questions could be asked. I do not understand why the officers did not circulate the updated 2021/22 Project Plan and Costings Plan with the detailed budget information as promised to all Board members in the officer's email dated 2 July 2021. The project was halted in September, which meant the next scheduled meeting of course didn't happen. In hindsight, I should have sought to intervene and have the July meeting go ahead to provide the Board with at least the limited information available. It was not my intention to restrict the ability of Members to scrutinise the project and I apologise to Members if I inadvertently gave them that impression.

Supplementary Question

As portfolio holder for the project, would you resign?

Response from Cllr Cockarill

No. I was working on information made available to myself and the Opportunity Board at the time. No concerns were raised by any member of the Opportunity Board. Had a

concern been raised and I had failed to act upon it, then there may have been a different outcome.

5. The Shapley Heath Garden Community audit review outlines a series of significant failings by the Council. Does the leader of the Council agree with me that the issues raised in the review cannot simply be described as project management shortcomings but instead represent a far more deeply rooted example of mismanagement, questionable competency and accountability which must be investigated further? Who will carry out that investigation, when and how will it be fed back to members? Doesn't like Cabinet will do.

Response from Cllr Neighbour

I cannot agree to recognise all of the points raised in your question – they go well beyond the factual findings of the Audit review. We are nevertheless determined to abide by the highest standards of governance and unfortunately in this case I do agree the project governance exhibited in this case is not acceptable.

As I said earlier, Audit Committee has asked Cabinet to provide a response to the management recommendations contained within the report. That is our process. It has also asked Cabinet to review the application of project governance and financial controls and reporting and to provide a response. Will go to audit committee to review. In addition, Staffing Committee is also asked by Audit Committee to review the exercise of officer management and financial control and oversight over the project. The outcome of these reviews will be shared with all Members.

Supplementary Question

What will the timeline be?

Response from Cllr Neighbour

There will not be a response tonight as we will need to prepare information streams to put in place. The Staffing Committee will decide when they can make available their aspects of the response.

Questions from Councillor Spencer Farmer

1. Why was an audited 2021/22 budget never circulated to the Opportunities Board and, because the costings were never supplied, how was it expected that the budgeted spend for 2021/22 be scrutinised, particularly as the 2021/22 Project Plan was never endorsed. Who therefore approved the 2021/22 work stream?

Response from Cllr Cockarill

I believe that I gave a full answer to a similar point earlier, but for clarity: The intention was to bring budgets to the Opportunity Board (initially in July but deferred to September of 2021), but decisions taken regarding the future of the project meant that the September meeting was subsequently cancelled.

I had requested that the Board be supplied a budget by e-mail so that questions could be asked. I do not understand why the officers did not circulate the updated 2021/22 Project Plan and Costings Plan with the detailed budget information as promised to all Board members in the officer's email dated 2 July 2021. That update was never provided and that clearly hampered the ability of the Opportunity Board to properly scrutinise the project's finances albeit this was not an issue raised with me by any Board members at the time.

However, I believe the Opportunity Board did see a high-level project plan in March 2021 and raised no objections to the principle of the programme, albeit the Board did ask for a more detailed budget and costings to be provided before it received final sign off. In hindsight, I should have sought to intervene and have the July meeting go ahead to provide the Board with at least the limited information available.

Supplementary Question

Who therefore approved 21/22 workstream and project plan. Where in the Terms of Reference did it allow that these be approved without referral to the Opportunity Board.

Response from Cllr Cockarill

It didn't. This is an issue that I cannot explain as I do not know where the approval came from.

2. It was noted that since 2018/19 in excess of £650,000 has been spent on the Shapley Heath project up to March 2022. Taking into account the latest full year forecast for 2021/22, this may increase to in excess of £820,000 (£544,000 of Council money). Unrecorded staff costs such as officer resources used to support/lead workstreams need to be assessed, therefore what is the true cost of the project when these factors are taken into account?

Response from Cllr Cockarill

The Audit Committee has now received the final updated figures for the project income and expenditure over the last 4 years broken down in appropriate detail. The actual expenditure incurred is significantly less than that initial Audit forecast (more in the region of £752,000) without account having been taken of a miss coding. It also must be recognised that a substantial portion of the budget was also actually used by officers working on other projects and on the emergency response to COVID. It should be noted that of the £500k drawn down from reserves £298k of this has recently been put back.

Supplementary Question

The numbers were stated in the auditors' report and it was thought that any proof of other costs for staffing would have been presented to the auditors and if different from what they were originally advised, this should have been highlighted. Why was this not the case?

Response from Cllr Cockarill

That information is not detailed here but I will go back to the officers involved and ask them to supply the information requested. When I know how long it will take to get this information together, I will advise Council.

3. A fund of £500,000 was allocated to the Shapley Heath Project, approved by Cabinet and Full Council in February 2020. However, there were no details of the expected overall expenditure of the project, no breakdown of expenditure over the three-year period, or any indication of items that would be covered by such expenditure. 80% of the expenditure is attributable to staff costs or recharges and no key milestones had been achieved at the time of concluding the project. Day-to-day financial monitoring did not follow the standard template documentation and was found to be significantly inaccurate in recording actual expenditure, particularly staff costs and recharges, and calculating available resources, and did not correlate with the project plan document. There was also no evidence to support the project having been accurately and appropriately financially managed. How did this happen and who is responsible?

Response from Cllr Cockarill

As I have just said, Audit Committee has now received the final updated figures for the project income and expenditure over the last 4 years broken down to the appropriate level. Furthermore, a substantial portion of the SH budget was actually used by officers working on other projects and on the emergency response to Covid. It should

be noted that of the £500k drawn down from reserves £298k of this has recently been put back.

It is the nature of major projects such as Shapley Heath often start with outline budgets, as the exact scope of works and timescales needed to achieve the project's aims are themselves forecasts. Full Council agreed, prudently in my view, to allocate a reserve fund of £500k over three years, to provide some certainty over the Council's financial liability for the project. By the end of that 3-year period, the aim was to have collated enough information for Cabinet to decide whether a Garden Village was desirable and or feasible, be it at Shapley Heath or elsewhere.

Because the Government's financial commitment to the Project fell substantially below that which was expected, Cabinet realised that Hart's financial liability would increase to an unknown limit. Because the work undertaken during the project had given Council has the information it needs to be able to assess the new settlement option against other potential housing options in a future review of the Local Plan, Cabinet agreed to halt the Project. There are, as I have acknowledged, issues over how the finances of the project were managed and reported. These are the issues that the Staffing Committee and Cabinet will need to address and resolve.

Supplementary Question

The Governance process was agreed in principle in November 2019 and fully in February 2020. The Terms of Reference were agreed in February 2020. Why was it not ensured that these were followed?

Response by Cllr Cockarill

Failure to ensure that this happened is partly due to the fact that Covid threw a curve ball. There were no meetings at all held at Hart District Council, and during this period work was going on by officers under emergency protocols. I was not approached by the Opportunity Board or Members with any concerns. If any had been raised and we had deliberately failed to act, then things might have been different, but as that did not happen I am not going to take an underserved hit.

4. Despite spending all this taxpayer's money, not one milestone was achieved. Who will take responsibility for this failure by the administration?

Response from Cllr Cockarill

I respectfully disagree with my colleague that the project did not achieve any milestones. At the time the project was closed it was on track to deliver its programmed outcomes. As I explained in an earlier answer, the first phase of the project was to evaluate the potential

for a Garden Village as an option for future housing growth. We have enough information from that evaluation to enable an assessment to be made of the suitability of a new settlement, compared to other housing options when we come to review our Local Plan. The Project has, therefore, met its primary objective.

Supplementary Question

The audit report is clear that not one key milestone was achieved. The press release yesterday seeks to claim that 10 baseline reports have been published. However, the baseline studies are not an outcome of the spend as the studies were funded by developers. By claiming reports as a response to the funding, how can you say you are being transparent.

Response from Cllr Cockarill

It is clear that the funding came from 3 streams: government, the council and developers. Therefore it was right for us to ask developers to provide detailed reports: if we had commissioned them it would have cost more than the developers charged. Cllr Farmer was part of the Opportunity Board.

6. The Shapley Heath Audit Report found that procurement rules have not been fully followed as prescribed, with multiple documents not signed, lack of an audit trail for panel evaluation of contracts, an incorrect sending of a contract notification, and an approximate 9-month delay in publishing contract award results. Why was this allowed to happen and who is responsible?

Response from Cllr Cockarill

Public procurement rules, particularly concerning large and complex projects, are necessarily detailed, both to protect the public purse and ensure against impropriety. There is no excuse for officers not to have complied with Contract standing Orders albeit there is no suggestion anywhere in the Audit report that the failure to follow these rules to the letter amounted to improper decisions being taken. The failure to publish the results of the procurement process in the correct timeframe had no material impact upon the process, nor indeed to the Project. It is important, however, that procurement rules are followed to the letter and the Cabinet will ensure that officers are reminded of and trained in the proper procurement processes, as necessary.

Supplementary Question

When spending taxpayers' money, why does the portfolio holder believe rules are important?

Response from Cllr Cockarill

The first right of local government is to ensure that we are spending taxpayers' money in a prudent manner and correctly. However, in the case of Shapley Heath, procurement processes were not followed correctly, and this is clearly not acceptable. Officers will be reminded and will be retrained wherever appropriate.



Yateley United FC

Yateley Community Sports and Wellness Centre

The cumulative planned development of facilities by Yateley United FC at Sean Devereux Park is one which encompasses far more than just sport but importantly aids the health of our community. As a result this development is best described as a Community Sports and Wellness Centre.

Most people will be aware the Government and the NHS have been stressing the growing health challenges posed by obesity, dementia, diabetes, high blood pressure, mental health issues etc, with exercise being strongly promoted as one of the key solutions to these, which is of course what sports clubs provide. A simple example of this is the growing YUFC Walking Football group. Within this group we have members who are registered disabled, diabetic, recovering heart attack victims, a transplant donor, recovering cancer patient together with those who are overweight and playing to reduce this. Such health issues are not just restricted to this group but also afflict younger members of our teams.



The most significant part of the development is the new Yateley United Community Centre pictured above. This consists of changing rooms and showers with disabled access, medical rooms, kitchen, bar and a large room within which can be held referee, coaching, 1st aid, safety and other training courses for any sport, but importantly also as a location for a Vaccination Centre administering annual flu or Covid-19 jabs together with wellness seminars, health promotion, Sporting Memories Café (Dementia), slimming groups, cardiac and other health focused recovery groups etc as well as a refreshment and social area. New parking on site will provide total space for over 150 vehicles.

The current changing rooms building will be refurbished to include treatment rooms and an open area for Yoga, Pilates, Dance etc. In addition, there will be a new multi-use floodlit games area providing an evening football training space and facilities for Walking Football, Walking Netball and other sports.

Improvements to the heavily used existing pitches have already commenced on several youth pitches plus completely new drainage and relocation of the main pitch, plus plans for a new pitch barrier, hard standing around the pitch and floodlights etc to follow. This pitch upgrade will enable a higher standard of football to be played and youth floodlit games to take place during the week.

These facilities will be offered to all in our community providing sport and wellbeing for ages 4 to 80+ years. Importantly it not just about football. A local running group and Yateley Netball club have already agreed to use them and other clubs are welcome to talk to us.

We have a great deal of support for this development outside of the club from Hampshire County Council, Hart District and Yateley Town councillors, our MP, and the heads of the local comprehensive schools. All of whom were willing to support our application for a very significant grant from the Football Foundation. We are also delighted, following a meeting with the practice manager, for support from our local medical practice Oakley



Health <http://www.oakleyhealth.org/> who provide health services to our community with 28,000 registered patients. They appreciate the huge health benefits this development could bring to the community in terms not just of fitness but importantly social cohesion.

Raising funds to help pay for this development has not been achieved overnight but is a direct result, spread over the past 10 years, of the continued hard work from our great teams of volunteers, including organisation of the annual Gig on the Green community music festival <http://www.gigonthegreenyateley.co.uk/> and new for this year the Blackwater Valley Cask and Cork Festival <http://www.yateleysports.org/bvcaskcork.asp> . All arranged by our sister fundraising company Yateley Sports Community Interest Company, set up for this purpose. These funds, coupled with the generous grants from the Football Foundation, and Hampshire County Council enabled us in 2020 to commence construction of the Yateley United Community Centre.

However, the fund raising is not over, far from it. One of the important features of the building yet to be budgeted for is for it to be as 'Green' as possible with a very low carbon footprint. One plan we have to achieve this is to cover its roof with solar panels, which, together with an air source heat pump, will hugely reduce our reliance on externally supplied electricity. In addition we are looking longer term into the provision of a bore hole to again eliminate our need for an external supply.

We are developing a number of ways of raising further funds for the remainder of the development from straight donations, sponsorship, commercial loans, the provision of personal small interest free loans, grants, covenants and a significant 'Buy a Brick' campaign plus the provision of goods in kind. The hard work continues and all help on the journey to completion is gratefully received.

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 10

CABINET

Date and Time: Thursday 4 August 2022 at 7.00 pm

Place: Council Chamber

Present:

Neighbour (Leader), Bailey, Cockarill, Collins and Quarterman

In attendance: Axam, Farmer, Forster

Officers:

Patricia Hughes	Joint Chief Executive
Joane Rayne	Finance Manager
Mark Jaggard	Executive Director, Place
John Elson	Head of Technical and Environmental Services
Isabel Brittain	S151 Officer
Peter Summersell	Sustainability Officer
Adam Green	Countryside Manager
Daniel Hawes	Planning Policy and Economic Development Manager
Sharon Black	Committee Services Officer

23 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of 7 July were confirmed subject to the amendment below

It was noted that following the suggestion that an anonymous reporting system be included within the Whistleblowing Policy, it had been confirmed this would be possible and an update to the Policy document would be produced in due course.

The minutes with the amendment were signed as a correct record.

24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Cllrs Oliver and Radley.

25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Forster declared an interest in Agenda Item 9 – EV charging points as he worked for Osprey Charging Points who were involved in this area of work although they had not bid in the tender process.

Cllr Farmer declared an interest in Agenda Item 7 as voluntary Chairman of Hart Swimming Club.

26 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman had no announcements.

27 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE AGENDA)

There were none.

28 REQUEST FOR THE RELEASE OF S106 FUNDING TOWARDS HOOK COMMUNITY CENTRE AND SPORTS PAVILION

John Elson and Adam Green were welcomed for this item.

Cabinet considered the request made to release S106 funding towards the Hook Community Centre and Sports Pavilion, and discussed:

- How the funds would be utilised
- Funding already in place from other means
- That the process is that standard for release of Parish S106 funding

DECISION

Cabinet:

1. Approved the immediate release of £455,369 held in Parish S106 reserves for Hook Parish Council 4.
2. That subject to the receipt of a successful planning application and the letting of an appropriate contract of works, Cabinet approves that delegated authority is given to the Head of Place (in consultation with Local Ward Members) to release £250,000 of earmarked S106 reserves to be used for the provision of the Sports Pavilion

29 REVENUE AND CAPITAL OUTTURN 2021/22

Isabel Brittain and Jo Rayne were welcomed for this item.

Cabinet considered the Revenue and Capital Outturn for 2021/22, and discussed:

- That the outturn to the end of the financial year will be audited throughout September by Ernst & Young
- Questions raised by Overview and Scrutiny had been addressed in the updated report
- The inclusion of the Domestic Abuse Grant, which was passed through our accounts
- Costs for highways management against the additional income of £118k – JR would provide a full written answer to Cabinet on this
- The improvement in our financial position with a reduction in the year end draw down of reserves against budgeted draw down

Officers were praised for keeping expenditure as low as possible, particularly as the year in question was impacted by Covid restrictions.

DECISION

Cabinet unanimously

1. Noted the provisional revenue outturn position of an underspend of £57k (shown in Table 3).
2. Noted the capital outturn position on 31st March 2022.
3. Approved the unspent capital budget be carried forward into the Capital programme for 2022/2023.
4. Approved, following recommendation by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the contributions to and from earmarked reserves detailed in Tables 6 and 7 of the paper

30 CYCLE & CAR PARKING IN NEW DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL ADVICE NOTE

Mark Jaggard and Daniel Hawes were welcomed for this item.

Cabinet considered the proposed Technical Advice Note (TAN) for cycle and car parking in new developments, and discussed:

- That the TAN was an interim measure which updated the Council's current policy
- A full Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) would be produced in due course
- The TAN would increase the number of car parking spaces per development and help provide cycle parking and safe storage for bicycles, especially electric bicycles
- That updated building regulations required electric vehicle charging points
- Whether the recommendations from the Climate Change Working Group and Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been taken into consideration, and if so, how
- Greater flexibility regarding on-street parking
- The requirement for motorcycle parking
- Concerns around over-long vehicles (ie vans)
- The percentage of bays allocated for disabled drivers
- Parking for mobility scooters

It was agreed that the last 3 points would be considered further and reviewed to see whether these should be added before the SPD is produced.

In summary, it was also noted that planning policy often was required to follow national policies and that this was an area that regularly changed.

DECISION

Cabinet unanimously:

1. Endorsed the content of the Cycle and Car Parking in New Development Technical Advice Note (TAN);
2. Adopted the cycle and car parking standards set out at paragraphs 4.11 and 5.4 of the TAN as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications;
3. Revoked the [Parking Provision Interim Guidance](#) adopted in 2008; and
4. Authorised the Head of Place to make further edits and re-publish the TAN as and when required, except for the numerical cycle and car parking standards setting out quantum of parking to be provided with new development, which can only be amended with Cabinet approval

31 EV CHARGING POINTS TENDER PROCESS

John Elson and Peter Summersell were welcomed for this item.

Cabinet considered the report on the EV charging points tender process and discussed:

- The fact this was a “good news story” that would deliver a number of high specification charging points in Council car parks at no cost to the Council and which would generate a small income
- The list of car parks included as listed in section 9 of the report
- The fact that a full feasibility study would be undertaken by the preferred bidder before a final decision as to the numbers and types of EVCPs to be installed would be agreed
- What mitigation was in place to ensure that the preferred bidder did not decide to pull out of the process at any stage
- Whether there was a responsibility for the Council to provide EVCPs at Hart Leisure Centre, and whether any revenue would be passed to the Council
- The reasons as to why Church Road and Gurkha Square car parks were excluded
- The standard of chargers and whether these met current EV requirements
- Potential requirements for electricity sub-stations to run the charging points
- The cost per kW to residents – PS to provide a written response to Cabinet on this
- Emerging standards for disabled access

DECISION

Cabinet agreed:

1. That the tender submitted by Bidder B for the installation of EVCPs in Hart car parks at locations detailed in section 3.2 of the report, should be accepted.

2. That £5k would be ring fenced in the 2022/23 climate change budget to provide a working fund for the installation of EVCPs

32 CLIMATE CHANGE WORKING GROUP

Cabinet discussed various elements of the proposed draft budget, as outlined at Appendix A of the Climate Change Working Group minutes of 19 July 2022, including:

- The reason for including a £5k budget for EVCPs despite the previous report having said they would be at no charge
- The proposed budget for the Communications and Engagement Officer and any duplication with messages being sent out by national or other local organisations
- The budget allocation given to the cost of EVCP for Council owned vehicles and the cost of any feasibility study

DECISION

Cabinet:

1. Noted the minutes of the meetings of the Climate Change Working Group held on 27 June 2022 and 19 July 2022
2. Approved the budget allocation as set out in Appendix A to the Working Group Minutes of 19 July 2022

33 CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

Cabinet considered and agreed their Work Programme circulated with the Agenda Pack, and noted amendments as set out by the Joint Chief Executive. An updated copy would be circulated with the minutes.

Points noted included:

- 2 new reports in September and 1 in November
- Inclusion of all financial reports to Cabinet until end of Municipal Year 2022/23
- Odiham Common Management Plan to now go to September 2022 meeting

Appendix A - Cabinet Work Programme Updated August 2022

34 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

Members discussed whether the public interest in maintaining an exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

DECISION

Cabinet agreed that, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded during the discussion of the matters referred to, on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

35 PROVISION OF CORPORATE HEALTH AND SAFETY SERVICE

Discussion was held on the future provision of the Corporate Health and Safety Service (see Part II Exempt Minutes).

DECISION:

Cabinet unanimously agreed to:

1. Issue Notice to Terminate the provision of the Shared Corporate Health & Safety Service to Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council to terminate on the 31 December 2022;
2. Authorise the Head of Place to procure an alternative Corporate Health & Safety service for Hart District Council for an initial period of 18 months commencing 1 January 2023; and
3. Acknowledge the potential redundancy costs associated with the change, as detailed in the report

Exempt Minutes

The meeting closed at 8.28 pm

Cabinet Work Programme August 2022

Subject / Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Due Date	Consultation	Likely Exemption	Background documents	Member / Officer Contact
Termination of the Shared Corporate Health and Safety Service with Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council To seek Cabinet approval to terminate the shared Corporate Health and Safety Service	Cabinet	4 Aug 2022			Termination of the Shared Corporate Health and Safety Service with Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council	
Page 2/7 Cycle and Car Parking Standards To approve the Technical Advice Note on Cycle and Car Parking Standards	Cabinet	4 Aug 2022			Cycle and Car Parking Standards	Portfolio Holder for Environment <i>Adam Green, Ecology and Countryside Manager</i> adam.green@hart.gov.uk
Green Grid Signage and Wayfinding To agree signage and wayfinding for the Fleet Pond Corridor	Cabinet	4 Aug 2022			Fleet Pond Corridor Signage and Wayfinding	Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic Direction and Partnerships <i>Adam Green, Ecology and Countryside Manager</i> adam.green@hart.gov.uk
Request the release of S106 funding towards Hook Community Centre and Sports Pavilion Hook Town Council are seeking the release of S106	Cabinet	4 Aug 2022		Open	Request the release of S106 funding towards Hook Community Centre and	Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic Direction and Partnerships <i>Adam Green, Ecology and Countryside Manager</i> adam.green@hart.gov.uk

Subject / Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Due Date	Consultation	Likely Exemption	Background documents	Member / Officer Contact
funding held in earmarked reserves for improvements at Hook Community Centre and towards the provision of a Sports Pavilion and Changing Rooms at the Land at North East Hook					Sports Pavilion	
Revenue and Capital Outturn 2022/23 Post consideration by Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to consider the Annual report on outturn.	Cabinet	4 Aug 2022			Revenue and Capital Outturn 2022/23	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer</i> <i>isabel.brittain@hart.gov.uk</i>
Treasury Management 2021/22 (Half Year Report) to consider a Half Year review report on Treasury Management Strategy 2021/22 before it goes to cabinet	Cabinet	4 Aug 2022				<i>Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer</i> <i>isabel.brittain@hart.gov.uk</i>
EV Charging Points Tender Process	Cabinet	4 Aug 2022			EV Charging Points Tender Process	Portfolio Holder for Environment <i>John Elson, Head of Environment and Technical Services</i> <i>john.elson@hart.gov.uk</i>
To receive the request from Audit Committee to provide a response to the management recommendations contained within the Shapley Heath Audit Review report, and to review	Cabinet	1 Sept 22				Chair of Audit Committee

Subject / Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Due Date	Consultation	Likely Exemption	Background documents	Member / Officer Contact
the application of project governance, financial controls, and reporting for the Shapley Heath project and to provide a response to Audit Committee on lessons learnt.						
Climate Change Working Group To receive the minutes of the Climate Change Working Group and approve the budget expenditure as outlined in the minutes of 27 June 2022	Cabinet	1 Sep 2022			Climate Change Working Group	Portfolio Holder for Environment <i>John Elson, Head of Environment and Technical Services</i> john.elson@hart.gov.uk
Page 289 Councils Governance, Joint Committee and representation lease	Cabinet	1 Sept 2022				Portfolio Holder for Corporate <i>Patricia Hughes, Joint Chief Executive</i> patricia.hughes@hart.gov.uk
Medium Term Financial Strategy and Capital Strategy, Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Asset Management Plan Post consideration by Overview and Scrutiny Committee, to consider the Council's medium term financial strategy position and future capital strategy, treasury management strategy statement and asset management plan	Cabinet	1 Sep 2022			Medium Term Financial Strategy and Capital Strategy, Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Asset Management Plan	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer</i> isabel.brittain@hart.gov.uk
Odiham Common	Cabinet	1 Sept 2022			Odiham	Leader and Portfolio Holder for

Subject / Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Due Date	Consultation	Likely Exemption	Background documents	Member / Officer Contact
Management Plan To approve the Odiham Common Management Plan					Common Management Plan	Strategic Direction and Partnerships <i>Adam Green, Ecology and Countryside Manager</i> <i>adam.green@hart.gov.uk</i>
Quarterly Budget Monitoring Quarterly Update on budget position	Cabinet	1 Sept 2022			Quarterly Budget Monitoring	<i>Joanne Rayne, Finance Manager</i> <i>joanne.rayne@hart.gov.uk</i>
Annual SANGS Review The Annual SANGS Review to be noted by Cabinet	Cabinet	1 Sep 2022			Annual SANGS Review	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Ken Robinson, Finance Manager</i> <i>ken.robinson@hart.gov.uk</i>
Odiham and North Warnborough Conservation Area Appraisal to endorse the CA appraisal for planning/development management purposes	Cabinet	1 Sep 2022			Odiham and North Warnborough Conservation Area Appraisal	Portfolio Holder for Place <i>Daniel Hawes, Planning Policy and Economic Development Manager</i> <i>daniel.hawes@hart.gov.uk</i>
The Swan Inn, North Warnborough To seek Cabinet approval for cost projection and next steps	Cabinet	1 Sep 2022			The Swan Inn, North Warnborough	Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic Direction and Partnerships
Quarterly Performance Reports To seek Cabinet approval on reports on performance data	Cabinet	6 Oct 2022			Quarterly Performance Reports	Portfolio Holder for Commercialisation and Corporate Services <i>Ashley Grist, Contracts & Procurement Manager</i>

Subject / Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Due Date	Consultation	Likely Exemption	Background documents	Member / Officer Contact
						<i>ashley.grist@hart.gov.uk</i>
Risk Register Review To review the Risk Register and agree recommended amendments	Cabinet Cabinet	6 Oct 2022 6 Apr 2023			Risk Register Review	Portfolio Holder for Commercialisation and Corporate Services <i>David Harwood, Internal Auditor</i> <i>david.harwood@hart.gov.uk</i>
Review of Finance Regs and Contract Standing Orders Post consideration by Overview & Scrutiny	Cabinet	6 Oct 2022			Review of Finance Regs and Contract Standing Orders	Portfolio Holder for Finance
Revised Medium Term Financial Strategy and Emerging 2023/24 Budget Post consideration by Overview and Scrutiny	Cabinet	3 Nov 2022			Revised Medium Term Financial Strategy and Emerging 2023/24 Budget Revised Medium Term Financial Strategy and Emerging 2023/24 Budget	Portfolio Holder for Finance
Consideration of the Business Case for a Shared Chief Executive between Hart	Cabinet	3 Nov 22				Leader of the Council

Subject / Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Due Date	Consultation	Likely Exemption	Background documents	Member / Officer Contact
District Council and Rushmoor Borough Council						
Annual SANGS Review The Annual SANGS Review to be noted by Cabinet	Cabinet	3 Nov 2022			Annual SANGS Review	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Ken Robinson, Finance Manager</i> <i>ken.robinson@hart.gov.uk</i>
Waste Strategy and Contract Change To look at the efficiency of Serco	Cabinet	1 Dec 2022			Appendix 1 Local code of corporate governance Local code of corporate governance	
Q2 Review and Capital Outturn to September 2022 Post consideration by Overview and Scrutiny	Cabinet	5 Jan 2023			Q2 Review and Capital Outturn to September 2022	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer</i> <i>isabel.brittain@hart.gov.uk</i>
TM Strategy - Mid Year Review Post consideration by Overview and Scrutiny	Cabinet	5 Jan 2023			TM Strategy - Mid Year Review	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer</i> <i>isabel.brittain@hart.gov.uk</i>
Forecast 2022/23 Capital and Revenue Outturn Post consideration by Overview and Scrutiny	Cabinet	5 Jan 2023			Forecast 2022/23 Capital and Revenue Outturn	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer</i> <i>isabel.brittain@hart.gov.uk</i>

Subject / Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Due Date	Consultation	Likely Exemption	Background documents	Member / Officer Contact
Budget Report for 2023/24 Post consideration by Overview and Scrutiny	Cabinet	2 Feb 2023			Budget Report for 2023/24	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer</i> <i>isabel.brittain@hart.gov.uk</i>
Fees and Charges for 2023/24 Post consideration by Overview & Scrutiny	Cabinet	2 Feb 2023			Fees and Charges for 2023/24	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer</i> <i>isabel.brittain@hart.gov.uk</i>
Draft Budget Book Post consideration by Overview and Scrutiny	Cabinet	2 Feb 2023			Draft Budget Book	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer</i> <i>isabel.brittain@hart.gov.uk</i>
Draft Treasury Management Strategy Statement Post consideration by Overview and Scrutiny	Cabinet	2 Feb 2023			Draft Treasury Management Strategy Statement	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer</i> <i>isabel.brittain@hart.gov.uk</i>
Q3 Capital & Revenue Outturn to December 2022 Post consideration by Overview and Scrutiny	Cabinet	2 Mar 2023			Q3 Capital & Revenue Outturn to December 2022	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer</i> <i>isabel.brittain@hart.gov.uk</i>
Forecast 2022/23 Capital and Revenue Outturn Post consideration by Overview and Scrutiny	Cabinet	2 Mar 2023			Forecast 2022/23 Capital and Revenue Outturn	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer</i> <i>isabel.brittain@hart.gov.uk</i>

Subject / Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Due Date	Consultation	Likely Exemption	Background documents	Member / Officer Contact
Bad Debt Write Offs Post consideration by Overview and Scrutiny	Cabinet	2 Mar 2023			Bad Debt Write Offs	Portfolio Holder for Finance <i>Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer</i> <i>isabel.brittain@hart.gov.uk</i>
Draft Service Plans 2023/24 To consider the draft service plan for 2023/24	Cabinet	6 Apr 2023			Draft Service Plans 2023/24	Portfolio Holder for Finance

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Exempt from Publication

Public Document Pack

CABINET

Date and Time: Thursday 1 September 2022 at 7.00 pm

Place: Council Chamber

Present:

Neighbour (Leader), Radley (Deputy Leader), Bailey, Clarke, Cockarill, Collins, Oliver and Quarterman

In attendance:

Axam. Butcher, Crampton, Farmer, Forster, Smith

Officers:

Daryl Phillips,	Joint Chief Executive
Isabel Brittain,	Section 151 Officer
Adam Green	Countryside Manager
Steve Lyons	Countryside Operations Manager
John Elson	Head of Environmental and Technical Services
Christine Tetlow	Strategic and Corporate Projects Manager
Katy Sherman	Communications & Engagement Officer - Countryside
Sharon Black	Committee Services Officer
Claire Lord	Committee Services Officer

36 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of 4 August 2022, including the exempt minutes, were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

37 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies had been received.

38 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Quarterman declared an interest in Agenda Item 11 as a close family member was a Cabinet member of South Oxfordshire Council. Cllr Farmer declared an interest in Agenda Item 9 as he was voluntary Chairman of Hart Swimming Club. Both were non-pecuniary interests.

39 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements.

40 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE AGENDA)

Mr David Turver and Mr Stuart Royston were welcomed to the meeting to present statements at the beginning of Agenda Items 6 and 7 respectively.

41 SHAPLEY HEATH AUDIT REVIEW REPORT

Councillors received the background to the request from the Audit Committee, which had discussed at length the Audit report from tiaa on the Shapley Heath Garden Community project.

Mr Turver read a statement to Cabinet regarding the agenda item (attached at Appendix 1).

Discussion took place including:

- Recognising that the governance arrangements for the Shapley Heath project were in themselves appropriate but asking the LGA or another recognised organisation to independently carry out the review so that lessons could be learnt as to why the governance arrangements appear not to have succeeded in this instance and to make sure that similar situations do not arise in the future.
- Acknowledging that officer oversight questions were being dealt separately through Staffing Committee
- What better scrutiny arrangements could have supported the project? How could member oversight be improved to include making sure that clear and accurate update information is provided to Cabinet in future.
- The review would include gathering evidence from Cabinet members and also those members involved on the Opportunity Board
- Timescales for the production of the reports and action plan The S151 Officer to prepare the report outlined in recommendation A in time for the November Cabinet meeting

DECISION

Cabinet agreed

1. That the Interim Section 151 Officer prepared an action plan to comprise the response to the management recommendations contained within the Shapley Heath Audit Review report: and

2. Cabinet will ask the LGA or another recognised body to provide an independent investigation in response to the request from Audit Committee that

Cabinet carries out a review of the application of project governance, financial controls, and reporting for the Shapley Heath project.

Appendix 1 - Statement from Mr David Turver

42 ODIHAM COMMON MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Chairman declared an interest in this item as he was a member of the Butterfly Conservation Society.

Mr Royston read his note in relation to the item, and circulated some photos to those present. The note is attached at Appendix 2.

Discussion points included:

- The number of trees to be felled, where they would be, and what this would achieve
- The role of the Parish Council in the plan and whether they were supportive
- The fact that the O&S Committee had recommended that Cabinet not approve the plan and the reasons why.
- That O&S supported many areas of the proposed plan but had some concerns over others
- The balance between accessibility and biodiversity
- The difference between SANGS and SSSIs
- The importance of establishing strong links with the local communities and Parish Councils

An additional recommendation was agreed that a suitable engagement plan would be prepared to ensure that Parish Councils' and local residents' views are accommodated to help deliver the Odiham Common Management Plan. This engagement plan will be brought back to Cabinet for approval.

With this amendment Cabinet endorsed the recommendations.

DECISION

Cabinet

1. Approved the draft Odiham Common Management Plan
2. Approved and adopted a temporary Ash Dieback Strategy until a time where a more formal "Tree Strategy" will supplement this guidance.
3. Resolved that a suitable engagement plan should be prepared to ensure that Parish Councils' and local residents' views are accommodated to help deliver the Odiham Common Management Plan. This engagement plan will be brought back to Cabinet for approval.

Appendix 2 - Speaking Note from Mr Stuart Royston

43 GREEN GRID PILOT PROJECT – SIGNAGE AND WAYFINDING

It was explained that Cabinet was being asked to choose the style of branding options for wayfinding and signage.

Discussion included:

- The differences in the two concepts
- That the signage did not need to fit in with the corporate rebranding
- Consultation undertaken with various disability groups to ensure that accessibility requirements were met
- That QR codes and other tech could be incorporated once designs were finalised

DECISION

Cabinet:

1. Selected the final design for the Green Grid Pilot Signage and Wayfinding Strategy from the two shortlisted concept designs, this being Design B.
2. Agreed that approval of any minor variations to the final design could be delegated to the Leader

44 QUARTERLY BUDGET MONITORING

Cabinet discussed:

- Whether the £110k for the health and safety claim had yet been received
- That the report was looking at the whole year rather than just the quarterly. The presentation of the report to be discussed at the finance meeting with Cabinet on 5 September
- They would like to see variances against budget
- Potential consequences of increased costs for energy and inflation and opportunities for energy savings
- The balance of Earmarked Reserves
- Whether the current budget will be adhered to with the move from 4 HOS to 3

DECISION

Cabinet

1. Noted the Q1 revenue outturn position of an underspend of £126k
2. Noted the Q1 capital outturn position
3. Approved the transfer to reserves of £110k of costs received from health & safety court case

45 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT

Cabinet noted:

- The S151 Officer had no concerns over the statement
- The Council was carefully managing its money
- The Head of Service from Mendip would be joining Hart so there would be continuity with the moving away from the shared service

DECISION

Cabinet

1. Noted the Treasury Management Outturn statement

46 5 COUNCILS GOVERNANCE

Cabinet noted:

- There was a proposal to revise the governance approach
- That Cllrs Radley and Quarterman would represent the Council
- That Revs/Bens, customer service and IT were the only areas covered by the agreement for the Council

DECISION

Cabinet

1. Noted and endorsed the minor alteration to the proportion of the size of the Hart contribution to the 5 Councils contract and agreed the approach to the 'truing up' mechanisms, making payment as set out in paragraphs 15 and 16
2. Approved the streamlined governance approach, reflective of the size of the contract, to enable effective oversight and management which includes all the changes as set out in paragraph including Joint Committee to meet annually, providing budgetary and contractual oversight and continuing the spirit of partnership working, whilst keeping Members informed on the contract.
3. Delegated to the Joint Chief Executive, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Commercialisation and Corporate Services, to complete the updated Inter Authority Agreement based on the principles set out in this paper.
4. Confirmed Cllr Quarterman and Cllr Radley as replacement representatives to the 5 Councils Joint Committee

47 MOVE TO A SINGLE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Joint Chief Executive left the meeting at 9:03pm at the start of this item

Councillors were reminded that this proposal was part of the plan put into place by the Staffing Committee last year, and that any final decision would need to be made by full Council, likely at their September meeting. Cabinet discussed the following:

- What the saving for moving to one Chief Executive would be per annum
- How the skill gaps would be addressed and that backfilling of resource would be undertaken if necessary
- Senior management capacity and any impact on the ability to deliver services if the proposal is agreed
- How this proposal fitted in with the work being undertaken on a potential move to a shared Chief Executive with Rushmoor Borough Council
- That if agreed, the recommendations would be put to full Council on 29 September, and debate in the public forum

DECISION

Cabinet

1. Recommended to Full Council that the Council should adopt on an interim basis a single CEO model and bring it into full effect at the earliest opportunity (and that some of the estimated annual revenue budget savings achieved potentially reinvested to create additional capacity in Tier 3 manager posts to increase operational capacity/Monitoring officer provision)

48 CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

Cabinet considered the Work Programme as circulated prior to the meeting.

A number of amendments would be made in the next iteration:

- The Review of Financial Regulations will move to November or December
- Quarterly Plans to be added to November
- Consideration of the LGA Report regarding Shapley Heath to be added to November

The meeting closed at 9.39 pm

Statement to Cabinet 1 September 2022

As you decide whether to throw more good money at a “facilitated reflection” after squandering over £800K of bad money on the Shapley Heath debacle, may I humbly offer some points for you to reflect upon:

- 1) You might consider whether it was appropriate to even start the project at all after the Inspector had rejected it, and your own bid documents for Government funding said the Garden Village was not necessary to meet our housing needs.
- 2) You might ponder why you ignored my warnings prior to and during the 21/22 budget meeting that the “bloated cost structure is completely indefensible” and that you were set up to fail because you had not secured enough funding to be successful.
- 3) You might contemplate why concerns about Governance raised by Hartley Wintney Parish Council and others were ignored by the project sponsor.
- 4) You might think about why you rebuffed questions about obvious budgeting and spending irregularities in July 2021.
- 5) You might consider whether your credibility is damaged or enhanced by claiming the project met its core objectives when the fact-checked audit report clearly states you didn’t meet a single milestone.
- 6) You might also review whether it is entirely appropriate to simply throw the officers under a bus, when it is clear that there were also significant Cabinet member failings.
- 7) Finally, you might contemplate whether it is appropriate for those involved to remain in office when despite repeated and accurate warnings, they have continued to squander our money on a totally unnecessary project that has delivered nothing of substance.

Speaking note for Cabinet on 1 September 2022

I speak on behalf of the people who live on or adjacent to Odiham Common. These are people who love and cherish the common; enjoy it for quiet informal recreation; and in the commercial world would be key customers.

Potbridge lies between two noisy roads – the M3 and B3016 - and the rural lane through the hamlet leads directly to Shapley Heath. At a site visit in June 2020 the noise problem was appreciated and Hart agreed in an e-mail on 1 July 2020 that in the East compartment ‘just 2 Willow trees are to be removed in the Potbridge triangle to minimise the traffic noise effect that further felling would cause’ i.e. felling is not critical.

However, when we saw the Woodland Plan in spring 2021 it included 30% felling in Potbridge East and 10% in Potbridge West. We asked for the 2020 agreement to be honoured. In response Hart divided the East compartment into two halves with felling avoided in one and 10% in the other i.e. felling is not critical. At a Zoom meeting on 20 August 2021 Hart said there was no felling in Potbridge.

In September 2021 when we saw the Woodland plan that had been submitted we were astonished to see felling of some 40% of the trees in the East compartment ie over 1700 trees had been silently inserted and in the West compartment a 20 -25% felling: 370 trees.

When we questioned the Potbridge felling Hart said it was included because Forestry Commission insisted. We took this up. The Forestry Commission told us the land was gifted to the public to enjoy for leisure purposes; it is therefore classed as open space and is exempt from forestry regulations. They confirmed activities in the Woodland Management Plan were not legally binding; that they do not insist the work is carried out and no action would be taken if it was not carried out. They also wrote that in their negotiations with Hart over the management plan they advised the council to identify areas of ash that were suffering from ash dieback as work within these areas would increase the biodiversity and resilience of the woodland by replacing these trees with a more diverse mix of tree species. In their following e-mail of 7 December 2021 they went on to say ‘The Forestry Commission whilst reviewing the works stated that felling could be carried out within the areas other than those that were originally stated. There are areas of Ash trees within the common that are suffering from chalara and unfortunately a significant amount of those will die’ i.e. felling in Potbridge is not critical or biodiversity optimal. The truth of the matter is that the Forestry Commission did not insist felling takes place in Potbridge and were positively encouraging Hart instead to fell diseased trees in the ash dieback areas for good biodiversity reasons.

Hart officials can muster only 9 words about the felling: ‘there is no uncritical and unfunded tree felling proposed’. The Forestry Commission does not regard felling in Potbridge as critical or providing the optimal biodiversity approach. The various

proposals from Hart since July 2020 hardly suggest felling is critical or based on sound scientific evidence.

The plan lists 42 habitat operations. Only 9 are funded by the much reduced Stewardship Grant and over 40% of the grant is earmarked for simply haloing on average 6.5 veteran trees per year and haymaking. As long ago as June 2021 we questioned whether the aspirations were realistic. There have been no changes as a result of our inputs and officials were not able to advise O&S that the Potbridge felling was funded. The Hart budget is mainly for a ranger who will have to cope, inter alia, with the listed 29 unfunded habitat activities; the 2000 tree Potbridge felling, ash dieback that is likely to result in the felling of 4000 diseased trees at average mortality rates, and the development of the Tree Strategy; unfunded activity in the Woodland plan; plus all the non-habitat activity such as path maintenance on the 300 acre site.

The most waterlogged paths are adjacent to areas of felling and, after felling, bracken and bramble invade. In Potbridge the wayleave is now impassable with 5 foot high bracken and bramble. The other path already has standing water: easy to anticipate the consequences of felling.

When resources are reduced or restricted it is imperative to concentrate on and prioritise the essentials. If it's not broken don't fix it. We ask you to delete the felling of the 1700 healthy Potbridge trees that during the period of this plan is not essential, critical, welcomed, or a biodiversity optimum.

We were interested to see that the Forestry Commission use Lord Charrington's Gift as the basis of their consideration of the common. The residents believe that Hart officials have betrayed Lord Charrington's wish that the public should enjoy the common for leisure purposes and as a result the balance in the plan is flawed. We would like to see biodiversity and humans embraced for the benefit of both. Frankly we do not believe all the aspirations in the plan are achievable within the available resource. The plan would benefit from more realistic aspirations with sharper objectives and performance indicators - it would not be difficult to make these improvements. We urge you to accept the unanimous O&S recommendation to decline to approve the plan in its current form.

Bill Esdaile; Peter Ingram; Stuart Royston
Representatives on the Consultative Committee

Gordon McLean
Chairman of the Potbridge residents association

Public Document Pack

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Date and Time: Tuesday 9 August 2022 at 7.00 pm

Place: Council Chamber

Present:

Dorn (Chairman), Butcher, Butler, Coburn, Engström, Farmer, Smith (Vice-Chairman), Woods and Crisp

In attendance:

Councillor Axam
Councillor Neighbour

Officers:

John Elson, Head of Environment and Technical Services
Joanne Rayne, Finance Manager
Adam Green, Countryside Manager
Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer
Mike Barry, Biodiversity Officer
Jenny Murton, Committee Services Officer

21 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting of 12 July 2022 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Councillors Davies and Wildsmith. Councillor Crisp was a substitute for Councillor Wildsmith.

Councillor Axam attended virtually.

23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Farmer declared a non-pecuniary interest as Chairman of Hart Swimming Club, a voluntary position.

The Chairman reminded officers he was a Ward Member for Odiham in respect of Item 6.

Councillor Butcher declared during Item 8 that he had a non-pecuniary interest due to his involvement with Fleet Market.

24 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman had three announcements:

- The public participation would take place in Item 6.
- Councillor Butler was proposed to replace Councillor Davies on the Place Service Panel on a permanent basis and the Committee unanimously agreed this.
- The Chairman reminded the Committee the role and purpose of the Service Panel Reviews and to report back and summarise to Overview and Scrutiny Committee what had been discussed.

25 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE AGENDA)

Stuart Royston had previously submitted a statement, which will be read out during Item 6.

26 ODIHAM COMMON MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Leader of the Council, who is also Portfolio Holder for the project highlighted that this item is a pre decision scrutiny of the Odiham Common Management Plan, ahead of going to Cabinet to seek approval.

The Countryside Manager and Biodiversity Officer gave a presentation summarising the Plan and its purpose.

Members questions included:

- How climate change is considered within the Plan and how the Common had feared in the last few weeks due to the extreme heat.
- The possibility of a dedicated Ranger for the site who is familiar with this specific type of environment.
- How this Plan differs from the previous one and what officers have learnt from it.
- The funding sources for the Plan and how it could deliver all the desired objectives.
- Biodiversity offsetting and the stages that may be required.
- The possibility of setting up a designated group for the Common, like Fleet Pond Society.

The Countryside Manager to seek further evidence on the differences between this most recent Plan and the previous one and send this to the Committee and Cabinet.

Stuart Royston read out a statement on behalf of a group of Odiham residents. This is attached as Appendix A of the Minutes.

Members questions following this information included:

- The possibilities that may have caused visitor numbers to the Common to decrease over the last 12 years.
- Managing the species effectively that are already on the Common.

- The definition of Hayloing.

Members debated:

- The cost of the Plan and balancing its requirements and resident's expectations.
- Making additional links, 'a contact group' between residents and Parish Councils regarding the Common.
- Balancing biodiversity and moderate access to this Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).
- The current standard of the existing pathways and whether additional work is needed to make them more accessible.
- The possibility of applying for additional Government funding schemes appropriate to local groups for climate change activities.

The Countryside Manager to provide answers to the questions submitted in the appendix by Mr Royston to Cabinet.

DECISION

Members unanimously agreed that Cabinet:

I) Should not approve the draft Odiham Common Management Plan in its current form and ask it to take note of the issues and discussions raised by Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

II) Approves and adopts a temporary Ash Dieback Strategy until a time where a more formal "Tree Strategy" will supplement this guidance.

27 OMBUDSMAN ANNUAL REVIEW LETTER 2021/2022

The Committee noted the report and Annual Review letter 2022.

28 QUARTERLY BUDGET MONITORING

The Interim Section 151 Officer gave a quarterly update on the Budget position up to 30 June 2022.

Members questions included:

- The amount spent on climate change and if these spends should be defined as Capital or Revenue items.
- The possibly that the largest contribution from Earmarked Reserves (EMR) to replace the Leisure Centre shortfall could decrease.
- Clarification on savings made since the loss of the dog warden.
- Clarification on the Place Services costs regarding a Health & Safety case.

- The amount of Parking income and how it had differed over the years due to the covid-19 pandemic.

Members praised the report's format and the work from the Finance team.

A Member also requested that more detail on variances and justifications between Budget and Forecast could possibly be included in future reports.

The Committee noted the report.

29 TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2021/22 (HALF YEAR REPORT)

The Interim Section 151 Officer summarised the council's Treasury Management activities during the year ending 31 March 2022.

Members questions included:

- The Barclays extension of £5 million to £10 million.
- Centenary House payments.
- What graphs will be presented to the next Overview and Scrutiny Committee in this type of report.

The Committee noted the report.

30 CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

Members questioned the items due to go to Cabinet on the Shapley Heath Audit Review Report in September and the Consideration of the Business Case for a Shared Chief Executive between Hart District Council and Rushmoor Borough Council in November.

The Leader of the Council confirmed that more detail would be known soon.

The Chairman said he would have liked the report that went to Cabinet in August on the Termination of the Shared Corporate Health and Safety Service with Basingstoke & Deane Council, to have come to Overview and Scrutiny beforehand.

The Leader of the Council confirmed it was a Part 2 paper and apologised it had not come to this Committee first.

31 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PLAN

The Overview and Scrutiny Work Plan was noted.

The Chairman highlighted that he wanted to see less repetition in the Plan regarding the Service Panel Reviews and that the Committee Services Team was working on this.

The meeting closed at 8.20 pm

Speaking note for the O&S Committee Odiham Common Management Plan

I speak on behalf of the local people who live on or near the common.

The common is much valued public space used by the local community to enjoy informal recreation. The people we speak for use the common regularly and it is a key part of their daily lives. They are Hart's key customers, stakeholders, and are most affected by changes and activities on the common.

The difficulty of successfully managing Odiham common lies in its dual purpose – it is a SSSI but it also provides public enjoyment to the community – and a successful plan will balance ecological diversity with human use for the benefit of both. The current plan is a biodiversity plan and of course that is essential. The 2010 Plan was also a biodiversity plan but it also embraced human use. It saw the common contributing to quality of life; establishing strong agreement between the various stakeholders; including local people in the management of the common; encouraging enjoyment of the common; and the need for sensitive management to maintain the character with gradual, incremental changes to improve biodiversity. Some of those values and vision have been lost. Biodiversity, enjoyment, engagement should all mix seamlessly into the plan but the list of key performance indicators illustrates the lack of balance. Over the last 12 years public enjoyment and visitor numbers have reduced. One reason has been that the pace of change has outstripped the ability to maintain the changes created.

Potbridge lies between two noisy roads – the M3 and B3016. After a site visit in June 2020 it was agreed no felling would take place in the larger Potbridge compartment and Hart suggested a 10% thinning in the smaller compartment. However when the Woodland Management Plan was submitted felling in the larger compartment had been included to the extent that almost 40% - over 1700 - of the trees would be felled. The smaller compartment we now know has 15% ash. Hart explained that the felling was included because Forestry Commission insisted the entire site was included.

However when we explained to the Forestry Commission the detriment that would be caused they suggested a solution to the problem by the substitution of trees in Potbridge by trees that will have to be felled across the common as

a result of ash dieback. The Forestry Commission e-mail is included in the Appendix.

The Plan proposes replacing the consultative committee by liaison with the parish councils in order to bring a balanced engagement with the entire community. But Odiham Parish Council supports the residents request for continued representation on the Consultative Committee. Winchfield Parish Council has not been consulted. The local residents with their intimate knowledge and use of the common bring a unique perspective to the committee. Given the turbulent history of the common engagement is important. There is nothing to suggest the liaison proposal will achieve the Hart objective or how it would work. We do however agree the present committee does not work well. A revised consultative committee of local stakeholders genuinely sharing ownership of the problems, options for solutions, priorities, and importantly outcomes (with of course the executive authority remaining with Hart) could act as a catalyst.

There is an annual grant of £5,800 but much of this is earmarked for haloing 66 trees and haymaking. Pages 50 and 51 of the plan list 41 habitat operations but only 11 have funding and for example there is no funding for other operations such as path repairs. There is a Hart allocation of £32k but much of this is for a ranger and some of the activities will require contractors.

We attach in the Appendix requests to improve the plan that the Chairman and committee might use.



APPENDIX

1. Invite Cabinet to re-assure itself of the financial viability of the plan

2. In the light of the response from Odiham Parish Council, the residents, and the lack of consultation with Winchfield Parish Council all of which throw doubt on the wisdom of the proposed 'liaison' arrangements: **invite Cabinet to consider alternative, more effective consultation arrangements that would bring together and unite the key stakeholders at a local level**

3. **Ask Cabinet to appreciate that for a common such as Odiham Common – a SSSI site that offers potential to provide many benefits for people in the community – a successful plan should embrace biodiversity and wider public benefit objectives in a mutually supporting way and that the plan is weak on 'public enjoyment' objectives**

4. Paths and rides provide the essential infrastructure for public enjoyment and poor paths are one of the major factors preventing enjoyment of the common: **invite Cabinet to prioritise repair and maintenance of waterlogged and muddy paths and earmark any unused resource from the £32,227 budget allocation for this purpose**

5. **Invite Cabinet to ensure biodiversity objectives, targets, and performance indicators that particularly enhance public enjoyment are afforded priority and with this in mind:**

a) **Make reduction of bracken a priority with achievement targets at 2 year intervals rather than simply at the end of the plan**

b) **Review the much reduced mowing regime after 2 years to ensure it is adequate for ensuring Odiham Common is an attractive place for visitors**

c) **Prioritise ditch and water management to keep the common free of unnecessary excess water and its ponds attractive**

6. **Invite Cabinet to remove from the plan the non-critical, unfunded tree felling in the small compartments in Potbridge that would be detrimental to the people**

The Forestry Commission e-mail

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your letter regarding Odiham common . The Forestry Commission appreciate and welcome your views on the work within the common .The work in the Woodland Management also is not legally binding and the Forestry Commission do not insist that the work is carried out, we have no legal power to enforce the felling that is in the plan . The Forestry Commission whilst reviewing the works stated that felling could be carried out within the areas other than those that were originally stated . There are areas of Ash trees within the common that are suffering from chalara and unfortunately a significant amount of these will die. As this area is heavily used by the local community the Local authority have a duty of care to monitor the trees following health and safety regulations and best practice . I suggest you contact the local authority directly with any concerns you have regarding the felling of the Ash trees.

The woodland Management plan was approved on the 19th November 2021 and is valid until 2031. AS the plan is approved I suggest that you contact the Local authority to remove the mention of Holly clearance in the Plan. The Holly Clearance does not fall under the Forestry regulations act of 1967 so therefore out of our remit . It is our understanding that there is a capital grant that has been awarded by Natural England for the removal of the Holly . For further information regarding this I suggest that you contact Natural England . The contact details for this are enquiries@naturalengland.org.uk

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] | Field Manager | Mid Home counties

South East & London | Forestry Commission England

Public Document Pack

AUDIT COMMITTEE

Date and Time: Tuesday 26 July 2022 at 7.00 pm

Place: Council Chamber

Present:

Axam (Chairman), Blewett, Davies, Engström, Hale, Smith and Southern

In attendance: Councillors Butcher, Butler, Farmer
Christopher Harris, TIAA

Officers: Daryl Phillips, Joint Chief Executive
Isabel Brittain, Section 151 Officer
David Harwood, Internal Auditor
Joanne Rayne, Finance Manager
Rebecca Borrett, Committee Services and Members Officer

12 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2022 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies received.

14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations made.

15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements.

16 LOCAL CODE OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE 2022

Officers presented a revised local code of corporate governance and explained more narrative that had been provided, the seven principals contained within, and the relevant policies and procedures the Council have in place.

DECISION

The Committee accepted the local code of corporate governance.

17 DRAFT ANNUAL GOVERNANCE STATEMENT 2021/22

Officers presented the draft annual governance statement 2021/22 and drew members attention to a number of Items contained within the report relating to controls, terms of reference and the summary of actions.

DECISION

The Committee accepted the draft annual governance statement 2021/22.

18 INTERNAL AUDIT CHARTER

Officers sought approval to a revised internal audit charter. The Council will have a fully outsourced audit function from April 2023.

Members discussed

- moving to one provider as opposed to two current providers
- how the two current organisations are split, and work reviewed by internal audit manager
- concern the internal audit manager would not be employed directly and if the appointment requires someone to be resident on site in the future
- the specification could be discussed individually with any members as required
- the standards required being national standards and evidence of achievement via an independent external audit every five years
- the potential to take this to Overview & Scrutiny for the specification of the governance procedure, the KPI's etc to examine the specification as business function
- implications for current structure and staffing against employing a permanent member of staff
- the concerns and benefits regarding the function being outsourced

DECISION

The Committee reviewed and approved the internal audit charter.

19 INTERNAL AUDIT PROGRESS REPORT Q1 2022/23

The Committee were presented with an updated report on the work undertaken by Internal Audit covering the month of June 2022, together with the position of the audits currently being undertaken.

Members discussed

- The recommendations for Items 1-3. Officers confirmed this would be available for the October committee
- Cyber security guidance to service managers and system administrators
- The reliance on software suppliers to manage firewalls
- The award of a government grant to address cyber security

- The auto deletion of emails after 12 months against the need to follow GDPR. Officers confirmed retention periods are currently being reviewed
- Need for clarity of any SLA in place with software providers and bought services. It was agreed the Audit Manager would speak to the IT Manager regarding expertise Councillor Butcher could provide on this subject

DECISION

The Committee noted the report

20 EXCLUSION TO THE PUBLIC

The following item contained exempt information.

DECISION

Members decided that the public interest in maintaining an exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

In accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded during the discussion of the matters referred to, on the grounds that they involved the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

21 SHAPLEY HEATH GARDEN COMMUNITY PROJECT REVIEW AUDIT

Members had received the independent TIAA review of the Shapley Heath Garden Community Project and were asked to agree the Management response contained therein.

Members discussed

- Governance elements not being carried out in a number of cases
- Mitigating circumstances around Covid
- Staff work not exclusively on Shapley Heath and comparing time spent against outcomes achieved
- Audit committee not receiving reports when requested
- The responsibility of cabinet
- The need for safeguards and flag when processes not followed
- Spend controls
- Opportunities Board update requests
- Achievements
- The robustness of the report presented by TIAA
- The management response presented

DECISION

Cabinet be asked to provide a response to the management recommendations contained within the Shapley Heath Audit Review report, and to review the application of project governance, financial controls, and reporting for the Shapley Heath project and to provide a response to Audit Committee on lessons learnt.

Staffing Committee be asked, for the period from March 2021 to the closure of the Shapley Heath project, to review the exercise of officer management oversight over the Shapley Heath project, including a review of officers' application of financial controls, risk management, monitoring, and reporting. The findings to be shared with Audit Committee.

The meeting closed at 9.17 pm

Public Document Pack

LICENSING COMMITTEE

Date and Time: Tuesday 2 August 2022 at 7.00 pm

Place: Council Chamber

Present:

Wildsmith (Chairman), Butler, Collins, Farmer, Forster, Harward, Smith, Blewett and Engström

In attendance:

Officers: Mark Jaggard, Executive Director Place
Emma Coles, Licensing Team Leader, Shared Licensing Services
Rebecca Borrett, Committee Services and Members Officer

7 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Members noted part of the previous Decision was to review the Hackney Carriage Tariffs in no more than 12 months.

The minutes of 7 June 2022 were agreed and confirmed and signed as a correct record.

8 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from:

Councillor Crisp (substituted by Councillor Blewett)
Councillor Coburn
Councillor Delaney
Councillor Lamb (substituted by Councillor Engström)

9 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared.

10 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman announced:

- Following previous discussions of members wanting to be able to shadow officers on enforcement visits, the Chairman had requested this. The Shared Services Team would shortly send dates for anyone who wished to attend.
- The September meeting will be cancelled as the Business Charity Policy is out for consultation and this will finish the date of that meeting. The November meeting will also be cancelled and brought forward to October to discuss the Business Charity Policy at an early date.

Members asked why the consultation was issued late so the scheduled timeframe could not be met. Officers clarified it was not issued later, there is a 12-week statutory consultation period which meant it clashed with the next meeting.

Members noted the logic of reviewing that policy at the earliest opportunity after consultation.

Members requested it be noted as it is not known what will come up between now and November, it appears premature to cancel the November at this time.

The Chairman reserved the right to reinstate the November meeting if necessary.

11 CONSIDERATION OF HACKNEY CARRIAGE FARE REVIEW FOLLOWING PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Officers explained it was only the objections be reviewed as representations are not part of the Act. There had been support shown by a number of the drivers, but they are not part of this consideration.

The objections were all from drivers apart from one public body. The responses in the main support the discussion at the last meeting about the balance between supporting the drivers and supporting the public. The public body commented this would go against the new Taxi and Private Hire Disability and Persons Act Section 167(a).

Members are requested to either uphold the decision made at the previous meeting and agree the proposed tariffs or members could modify the table of fares.

Members discussed:

- If officers were confident all representation marked as from drivers were. Officers confirmed they were.
- In reference to the parish council's discrimination comments, if provision of a taxi share scheme existed within Hart that would enable a discounted rate. Officers confirmed there was, and the figures are the maximum amount in the tariff. Drivers can agree lower charges with the customer.
- As no objections had been received from residents, was it thought a fair assumption the previous consideration the committee gave to keeping value for money and cost low had been well received. Officers had ensured the consultation had been widely received over social media, consulted with parishes in the Borough and had ensured it was published, so was widely out there for everybody to review.
- The effective date for implementation. Officers advised a date of 10 August 2022 would be confirmed with the people responsible for updating the meters, if agreed this evening.

DECISION

- 1) That no changes are necessary to the advertised fares with the published fare update becoming effective as soon as the meters can be updated.
- 2) Ongoing reviews of no more than 12 months. Reviews to be undertaken by both Shared Services and Licensing Committee.

The meeting closed at 7.13 pm

Public Document Pack

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date and Time: Wednesday 20 July 2022 at 7.00 pm

Place: Council Chamber

Present:

Quarterman (Chairman), Blewett, Butler, Cockarill, Dorn, Kennett, Makepeace-Browne, Southern, Worlock, Wildsmith

In attendance:

Councillor Smith

Officers:

Mark Jaggard, Head of Place

Stephanie Baker, Development Management & Building Control Manager

Tola Otudeko, Shared Legal Services

Miguel Martinez, Principal Planner

Kathryn Pearson, Principal Planner

Amy Harris, Senior Planner

Jenny Murton, Committee Services and Members Officer

Craig Harman, Planning Assistant

13 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Nine out of the 10 Committee Members voted to approve the Minutes of the previous meeting. Councillor Dorn voted against.

Members highlighted that the Minutes in the Agenda pack did not mention Members by name for the recorded vote.

The Committee Services Officer apologised for the administrative error and ensured that going forward Minutes would reflect this.

The Minutes of the Committee Meeting on 15 June 2022 should have contained for planning application 21/02782/OUT:

Members undertook a recorded vote and Grant was carried. The vote was:

For – Blewett; Cockarill; Kennett; Quarterman; Southern; Worlock; Wildsmith

Against – Forster; Makepeace-Browne; Oliver; Radley

Abstention – none

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 June 2022 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

It was also agreed that Committee Services would look at version control for documents published in relation to all Committee meetings.

14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Councillors Forster, Oliver and Radley.

Councillor Dorn was a substitute for Councillor Forster and Councillor Butler was a substitute for Councillor Oliver.

15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

16 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman had two announcements.

1. An email poll would be set up to determine the most suitable September date to hold the tour of completed developments with an Urban Designer, which had to be postponed from February 2022.
2. His second announcement was that the Hares Hill meeting (relating to the sole agenda item from 15 June Planning Committee) had taken place between Members and Officers and there would be a follow-up meeting.

The Chairman also announced later in the meeting that he would move Item 9 to the end of the Agenda, after Item 11.

17 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

The planning reports from the Head of Place were considered and the updates via the Addendum paper were accepted.

18 21/01800/FUL - BUILDING 260, 270 AND 280 BARTLEY WOOD BUSINESS PARK, BARTLEY WAY, HOOK, HAMPSHIRE

The Principal Planner summarised the application as follows:

Redevelopment of the site to provide 10 industrial units (14,122 sqm of floorspace for Flexible Use Class B2/B8/E(g)(i)-(iii)), together with associated parking, a new vehicular access off Griffin Way South, landscaping, and other associated works (following demolition of existing buildings)

Members considered the application and asked the following questions:

- The possibility of removing Use Class B2 from the application.
- The description on the amended plan consultation letter that was sent to the Parish Council in April was discussed.
- Why the number of industrial units had changed from nine to 10 and noting the removal of the retail unit (food store) from the scheme to bring the proposal in line with policy

- How noise impact assessments and suitability for siting in residential areas differed between Use Classes B1 and B2.
- The time of year that the noise assessment for this application was undertaken as leaves on trees can change noise levels.
- The sort of activity that could be happening on the site late at night.
- Whether there were delivery restriction conditions on the lease and if any could be issued by the landowner.

Members debated:

- How B2 class is not specifically mentioned in the description on the response from Highways England
- More detailed discussion was needed relating to the Use classes.
- Hours of operation and usage would need careful control via condition
- Impact on the current residential area and residential occupiers in the future.
- The merits in taking the application away for further discussion
- Possible noise and air pollution that could occur because of the application being granted.
- Night-time activities at the site need to be properly defined and considered.
- Possible local employment opportunities the application may bring.
- The possibility of removing permitted development conditions.
- The lack of Section 106 contributions for this application.

A Member highlighted the importance of documentation and several typos in reports, and this was asked to be noted.

Councillor Smith addressed Members in his capacity as Ward Councillor for Hook and reiterated points of concern including neighbouring amenity, use class and consultation document descriptions.

Members undertook a recorded vote to Grant, subject to the conditions specified in the agenda which was not carried. The results were:

For: none

Against: Councillors Butler, Cockarill, Dorn, Kennett, Makepeace-Browne, Quarterman, Southern, Wildsmith and Worlock.

Abstention: Councillor Blewett.

Members undertook a second recorded vote for the recommendation to Grant, subject to conditions, and a referral to the Chairman and the relevant Hook Ward Councillor on Planning Committee, to review and agree the specific conditions. Delegated authority granted to the Head of Place to issue the permission once the conditions were agreed with the Chairman and relevant Ward Councillor.

Members voted unanimously for this second recommendation and the motion to Grant was carried.

DECISION – GRANT, subject to conditions, and in consultation with the Chairman and relevant Hook Ward Councillor on Planning Committee in respect of conditions, the Head of Place was delegated the authority to grant planning permission.

Notes:

No site visit took place.

Councillor John Orchard, from Hook Parish Council and Selena Coburn spoke against the application. Paul Newton, from Barton Willmore spoke for the application.

Selena Coburn was not speaking in her capacity as a Ward Councillor for Hook.

19 21/02749/FUL - LAND LYING TO THE NORTH OF VICARAGE LANE, HOUND GREEN, HOOK, HAMPSHIRE

The Principal Planner summarised the application as follows:

Construction of a temporary 17.87 MW Solar Farm, to include the installation of Solar Panels with LV switch/transformer, customer switchgear/T Boot enclosure, a DNO substation enclosure, security fencing, landscaping, and other associated infrastructure

Members considered the application and discussed:

- How the quality of the agricultural land could be monitored.
- Restrictions on working hours for construction vehicles.
- Potential noise pollution.
- The reason for the Planning Committee referral by the Head of Place Service

Members debated:

- The previous applications for solar development.
- Whether the location was appropriate.
- What would happen at the end of the 40-year temporary period
- Does solar farmland automatically mean it is previously developed land/ suitable for residential development

Members undertook a recorded vote on the recommendation set out in the agenda, which was unanimous, and the motion to Grant was carried.

DECISION – GRANT, subject to planning conditions.

Notes:

No site visit took place.

Mark Harding, from Barton Willmore spoke for the application.

20 22/00197/HOU - 87 ROSEMARY GARDENS, BLACKWATER, CAMBERLEY, GU17 0NJ

The Development Management & Building Control Manager summarised the application as follows:

Erection of a first-floor front, part single part two storey rear extension, replacement of garage flat roof with pitched roof, insertion of skylight into main roof and insertion of doors and windows into side elevation.

Members considered the application and debated:

- The difference between the current scheme and the previous refusal
- Clarification on how the parking spaces were shown on the site plan
- The length of construction and working hours and whether any restrictions could be placed on them.
- The number of parking spaces the property has.
- The minimum dimensions for a residential garage.
- Potential for condition to ensure garage retention, to ensure a garage would be used for parking only and not converted.
- Whether the proposal involved the removal of any trees.
- How the proposal could impact the existing street scene.
- Permitted development rights and householder rights under the General Permitted Development Order.
- Whether parking areas were permeable

A Member requested that the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be carried out. The Development Management & Building Control Manager reminded Members that a specific reason needed to be stated to request a site visit.

Members undertook a recorded vote on the recommendation, subject to conditions discussed and Grant was carried. The results were:

For: Councillors Butler, Dorn, Kennett, Makepeace-Browne, Quarterman, Southern, Wildsmith and Worlock.

Against: Councillors Blewett and Cockarill.

Abstention: none.

DECISION – GRANT, subject to the imposition of additional conditions discussed relating to garage conversion restriction; hours of construction works and permeable parking areas.

Notes:

No site visit took place.

There were no public speakers.

21 21/02743/FUL - THE ELVETHAM HOTEL, FLEET ROAD, HARTLEY WINTNEY, HOOK, HAMPSHIRE, RG27 8AR

The Principal Planner summarised the application as follows:

Alterations to and extension of The Elvetham Hotel (to include the provision of 46 guest accommodation units) including:

- Repair and restoration of chapel within Elvetham Hall
- Demolition of 1970s extension to Elvetham Hall and erection of a single storey extension to accommodate new rooms
- Partial demolition of existing extension and reinstatement of internal courtyard to Elvetham Hall
- Various other minor internal and external alterations to Elvetham Hall
- Demolition of underground air raid shelter
- Erection of an events centre featuring basement, ground floor and mezzanine floor and a subterranean access from service wing
- Demolition of glasshouses
- Erection of new building attached to existing garden wall and small buildings for use as a spa
- Renovation and conversion of St Mary's Church to provide function facility
- Refurbishment of water tower to include installation of platform lift and conversion to guest accommodation units
- Demolition of Bluebell Cottages and the erection of 2 two storey buildings to provide guest accommodation units
- Demolition of Heather Cottages and the erection of 3 two storey buildings to provide guest accommodation units
- Conversion of garden store and erection of a part single part two storey building to be known as Journeyman Cottages to provide guest accommodation units
- Erection of refuse storage building
- Erection of fuel tanks, generators
- Replacement of one and creation of one sewerage treatment plant and associated utilities
- Resurfacing, rearrangement, and extension to car parking
- Hard and soft landscaping works
- Replacement entrance gates
- Formation of gardener's yard
- Lighting Scheme.

Councillor Blewett left the room at 21:28 and returned at 21:31.

Members questions included:

- Whether any climate change elements had been explored for the development and PV cells on roofs etc.

- What could be done to reduce climate change implications during the construction phases and potential recycling opportunities during this construction.
- The potential impact of glazing and heat retention in the proposed spa area, potentially requiring air conditioning and how it could relate to Hart's climate change targets.

Members debated:

- The employment opportunities and benefits the application could bring to the local area as a destination.
- The positive impacts of the proposal to the heritage asset
- The Environment Agency's technical objection on flood risk was also discussed and the need for a referral to the Secretary of State to allow a 28-day period for call-in of the decision.

Members praised the application for balancing a modern design with conserving the building and site's heritage.

Members undertook a recorded vote on the revised recommendation, set out in the Addendum paper and subject to the required referral of the application to the Secretary of State, permission be GRANTED subject to the conditions and informatives set out on the Agenda.

The results of the vote were:

For: Councillors Blewett, Butler, Cockarill, Dorn, Kennett, Makepeace-Browne, Quarterman, Wildsmith and Worlock.

Against: none.

Abstention: Councillor Southern.

DECISION – GRANT, subject to referral of the application to the Secretary of State, subject to the conditions and informatives as set out on the Agenda.

The Principal Solicitor and Principal Planner reminded the Committee that if the Secretary of State does not call-in the application, the Head of Place be delegated authority to issue the decision. Members confirmed they understood this to be the situation when voting.

Notes:

A site visit was carried out on 19 July 2022 as set out in the Addendum paper.

Rebekah Jubb, on behalf of Bell Cornwell LLP, spoke for the application.

22 21/02744/LBC - THE ELVETHAM HOTEL, FLEET ROAD, HARTLEY WINTNEY, HOOK, HAMPSHIRE, RG27 8AR

The Principal Planner summarised the application as follows:

Alterations to and extension of The Elvetham Hotel (to include the provision of 46 guest accommodation units) including:

- Repair and restoration of chapel within Elvetham Hall
- Demolition of 1970s extension to Elvetham Hall and erection of a single storey extension to accommodate new rooms
- Partial demolition of existing extension and reinstatement of internal courtyard to Elvetham Hall
- Various other minor internal and external alterations to Elvetham Hall
- Demolition of underground air raid shelter
- Erection of an events centre featuring basement, ground floor and mezzanine floor and a subterranean access from service wing
- Demolition of glasshouses
- Erection of new building attached to existing garden wall and small buildings for use as a spa
- Renovation and conversion of St Mary's Church to provide function facility
- Refurbishment of water tower to include installation of platform lift and conversion to guest accommodation units
- Demolition of Bluebell Cottages and the erection of 2 two storey buildings to provide guest accommodation units
- Demolition of Heather Cottages and the erection of 3 two storey buildings to provide guest accommodation units
- Conversion of garden store and erection of a part single part two storey building to be known as Journeyman Cottages to provide guest accommodation units
- Erection of refuse storage building
- Erection of fuel tanks, generators Replacement of one and creation of one sewerage treatment plant and associated utilities
- Resurfacing, rearrangement, and extension to car parking
- Hard and soft landscaping works
- Replacement entrance gates
- Formation of gardener's yard
- Lighting Scheme

Members discussion and debate is listed in the Minutes for the previous item.

Members undertook a recorded vote on the recommendation set out in the agenda and subject to the revised condition wording for conditions 2 and 3 and additional condition 20 as set out in the Addendum paper together with all other conditions and informatives set out on the agenda, Listed Building Consent was granted.

The results of the vote were unanimous.

DECISION – GRANT, Listed Building Consent, subject to the revised conditions 2 and 3, additional condition 20, and all other conditions and informatives as set out on the agenda report.

Notes:

A site visit was carried out on 19 July 2022.

Rebekah Jubb, on behalf of Bell Cornwell LLP, spoke for the application.

23 22/01164/HOU - 79 WESTOVER ROAD, FLEET, HAMPSHIRE, GU51 3DE

The Senior Planner reminded Members of the update on the Addendum paper and summarised the application as follows:

Erection of a single storey side and rear extension and new front door and windows.

There were no questions from Members.

A Member commented that they believed the extension's wood cladding was not a material which was typical or in-keeping with the area. The Ward Councillor for the area advised that there is a mixture of designs and materials on Westover Road.

Members undertook a recorded vote, which was unanimous, and the motion to Grant was carried.

DECISION – GRANT, as per the officer's report and Addendum paper.

Notes:

There was no site visit.

There were no public speakers.

The meeting closed at 10.00 pm

Public Document Pack

STAFFING COMMITTEE

Date and Time: Friday 2 September 2022 at 9.00 am

Place: Council Chamber

Present:

Bailey, Butler, Crampton, Farmer, Makepeace-Browne, Radley and Worlock

In attendance:

Officers:

Daryl Phillips, Joint Chief Executive

Sharon Black Committee Services Officer

1 ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIRMAN

Cllr Worlock was elected as Vice-Chairman of the Staffing Committee for the 2022/23 Municipal Year.

2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 10th February, including Exempt minutes, were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Neighbour. The absence of Cllr Wildsmith was noted.

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

5 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

It was agreed that the following item(s) contain exempt information.

DECISION

Members decided the public interest in maintaining an exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

It was agreed that, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded during the discussion of the matters referred to, on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

6 SHAPLEY HEATH AUDIT REVIEW REPORT

This item was held in Exempt Session, see Part II Minutes.

Exempt Minute - Shapley Heath Audit Review Report

The meeting closed at 10.03 am

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1, 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Exempt from Publication

COUNCIL

DATE OF MEETING: 29 SEPTEMBER 2022

TITLE OF REPORT: EFFICIENCY SAVING: RECOMMENDATION TO MOVE TO A SINGLE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OPERATING MODEL

Cabinet Portfolio: Leader of the Council

PURPOSE OF REPORT

1. To recommend to Full Council that the Council should adopt a single CEO model and to bring it into full effect at the earliest opportunity.

RECOMMENDATION

2. Cabinet recommends to Full Council that the Council should adopt on a single CEO model and bring it into full effect at the earliest opportunity (and that some of the estimated annual revenue budget savings achieved potentially reinvested to create additional capacity in Tier 3 manager posts to increase operational capacity/Monitoring officer provision)

CONTEXT

3. The ongoing challenges on the Council's revenue budget, compounded by growing inflationary pressure, means it is essential that the Council brings forward efficiency measures. It needs to be proactive in bringing forward cost savings if the Council is to minimise the impact on Council Tax payers arising from the growing cost of Council services.

BACKGROUND

4. In January 2022 Staffing Committee received from Solace Enterprise a report recommending options for a possible appropriate Senior Management Structure for the future (a confidential report which is available to all Members via Mod.gov).
5. Staffing Committee recommended to Cabinet that Council should:
 - Move to a three Heads of Service model by the end of June 2022 following consideration of the practicalities of remodelling the service areas and management capacity.
 - To progress to a shared CEO in the timeframe being the end of the Municipal year 2022/2023 subject to finding a suitable partner authority.
 - To move to a single CEO model if a suitable partner authority isn't a viable or sustainable option, in the timeframe of the Municipal year 2022/2023.
6. The recommendations made by Staffing Committee were accepted by Cabinet.
7. More recently in July Cabinet received a further report on the potential for Hart District Council and Rushmoor Borough Council to working more closely together. In summary Cabinet agreed to
 - Approve a *Joint Working Together Statement*
 - note the report of the independent consultant on sharing a Chief Executive and agreed to proceed with further work to produce a business case to consider a shared Chief Executive, including obtaining relevant HR and Legal advice.

- to undertake work to assess services which may be suitable to be delivered as shared services.
 - agree a budget of £27,500 (50% of the overall cost) to undertake the work identified.
8. The decision to move to a three Heads of Service (now Executive Director) model has been implemented. The Council is also already exploring the potential of a shared Chief Executive with Rushmoor, and the findings of the latest independent consultant's work are awaited.

PROPOSAL

9. In parallel with the independent consultant's work, it is intended to bring forward the move to a single Chief Executive Officer (CEO) model even if only as an interim measure pending the conclusion of the exploration work with Rushmoor.
10. This is consistent with the preferred option that was recommended by an independent January 2022 Solace Enterprise review of the Senior Management Structure. The Solace Enterprise recommendation was:

The Council should adopt a single CEO and 3 Heads of Service model (option 3) (but with some of the £254k* savings reinvested to create additional capacity in Tier 3 manager posts to increase operational capacity/Monitoring officer provision) based upon a requirement to deliver a business case and transformation plan for the Council to progress to a shared CEO model (option 4) in a 2 year timescale.

*£113k of this projected saving has already been captured with the recent reduction for 4 to 3 Heads of Services (now Executive Directors)

11. This approach would better position the Council to react to the Rushmoor exploration work as envisaged by the independent Solace Enterprise recommendation should the shared CEO option offer a beneficial outcome. More importantly, it would give greater certainty for staff, councillors and the public, including stakeholders, about the future senior officer leadership direction of the Council. It would also assist us in our 2023/24 budget formulation processes.
12. Due to the need for consistency and stability in the face of on-going restructuring it is the intention to seek to fill the single CEO position internally with the opportunity ring fenced to one of the two current Joint Chief executives.
13. In the event that the exploration of the shared Chief Executive opportunity with Rushmoor is not successful, the intention is that potentially some of the savings that would arise from the move to a single Chief Executive would be reinvested back into maintaining the operational capacity of the Council. In this regard the new single Chief Executive, in their capacity as Head of Paid Service, should review the resultant officer management structure and within 6 months bring forward proposals to address any potential operational capacity issue arising directly from the move to a single Chief Executive model.

EQUALITIES

14. No issues of equality are anticipated arising from any operational decision to move to a single Chief Executive model.

CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

15. No climate change implications will arise from operational decision to move to a single Chief Executive model.

ACTION

16. Should Council accept the proposal the intention is to follow the Council's own employment practices and to bring the interim single CEO element of the model into effect at the earliest opportunity.

Background paper

Staffing Committee reports January and February 2022.

Cabinet reports February 2022 and July 2022, and September 2022.

Contact: Leader of the Council david.neighbour@hart.gov.uk