

COUNCIL

Date and Time: Thursday 25 February 2021 at 7.00 pm

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fleet

Present:

COUNCILLORS –

Kennett - (Chairman)

Ambler	Delaney	Quarterman
Axam	Dorn	Radley
Bailey	Drage	Smith
Blewett	Farmer	Southern
Butler	Forster	Tomlinson
Clarke	Kennett	Wheale (7.17pm)
Cockarill	Kinnell	Wildsmith
Crampton	Lamb	Worlock
Crisp	Makepeace-Browne	Wright
Crookes	Neighbour	
Davies	Oliver	

Officers Present:

Daryl Phillips	Joint Chief Executive
Emma Foy	Head of Corporate Services
Celia Wood	Committee Services

75 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

It was unanimously agreed to suspend Standing Orders 9.3 (Show of Hands for Voting, 22.1 (Standing to Speak) and 22.2 (Chairman Standing).

76 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 28 January 2021 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

77 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies for absence had been received.

78 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Crampton asked for it to be noted that she is now working as a clinical supervisor overseeing vaccinations at the Harlington Centre.

79 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12 – QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

Questions had been received from Mr Simon Brown, Mr Tristram Cary and Mr David Turver, details of which are set out in Appendix A attached to these Minutes.

80 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 14 – QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS

None.

81 CHAIRMANS ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

82 CABINET MEMBERS ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services, **Councillor Radley** announced:

Contacts received by the Community Safety Team are steadily increasing (39 received in November 2020 – 66 in January 2021) - which means the message that support with Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) issues and vulnerability concerns is getting out to Hart residents.

A flyer has been designed to go out to all households with the Council Tax Bills advising correct reporting of ASB to Police as well sharing contacts for the team and detailing other crisis support numbers.

This will utilise the back of the existing Landlord promotion leaflet, so it is not a further paper resource.

Efforts are being concentrated on building connections with Neighbourhood Watch networks across the district as key partners in sharing of information and provision of reporting and intelligence – webinars are being offered to encourage engagement and hopefully drum up interest in these very valuable community resources.

A Hart Community Newsletter will be produced by the end of March to share with members and key partners - initially introducing the team and their scope of work and then monthly to spotlight ongoing issues, celebrate successes and share useful contacts, information and opportunities.

The Cabinet Member for Community, **Councillor Bailey**, reported

I am pleased to confirm that yesterday we started our lateral flow testing at the Council Offices, and it is currently fully staffed by teams pulled from different areas of the Council. I'm very grateful for the huge effort that has been taken to make this happen. The plan is over next couple of weeks the facility will be more staffed by volunteers that are currently being vetted and we hope they will be in place by mid-March.

Hart Response Hub – with the increase in the shielded patient lists over recent weeks we haven't seen a significant increase in referrals through the Hub for support however a second tranche of additions to the shielded list is going to take place this week and as it is for many over 70 this may lead to additional support requests in the coming days. I can confirm that the Hub is well staffed and additional back up in place if necessary.

Community pantry for the District is being developed and continuing to progress well and I would like to put on record my thanks to St Edwards the developers who have donated a container due to arrive at Yateley Industries in the next week or so. This will be used to store the food and other donations and I will sending an email to all members in the coming weeks with details on how they can point residents to the Community Pantry who may want to take benefit to it.

The budget to be considered tonight is maintaining ongoing support for Homelessness an area we do extremely well as a Council. You will be aware the Government announced the eviction ban that has been in place for tenants during the Covid crisis has been extended for a further month to end of March. This does mean the types of cases our teams are dealing with are usually more complicated often people who are often classed as 'sofa surfers' and so we are mediating with landlords and tenants where there is sometimes friction for people in those situations. I can confirm currently we have 2 people in bed and breakfast in the district through our commitment to no 'First Night Out' so that we look for people to stay whenever they are threatened with homelessness.

The Cabinet Member for Environment, **Councillor Oliver**, reported:

The Harlington Covid-19 Vaccination Centre opened last week and is currently delivering over 1000 jabs a week for Hart residents. As a volunteer myself I can confirm that all the medics, volunteers and residents who use the service are very happy with the parking arrangements HDC have organised and that these are on a Free to use basis. Fleet Town Council, Hart Voluntary Action (HVA) and Fleet Lions also need to be congratulated on helping set the centre up with the NHS.

The centre is an 'invitation only' facility so, if you don't have an invite from your GP, do not attend. There are no spare vaccine doses left at the end of a day.

83 JOINT CHIEF EXECUTIVES' REPORT

There was no report from the Joint Chief Executives.

84 MINUTES OF COMMITTEES

Meeting

Date

Overview & Scrutiny

19 January 2021

No questions asked.

Cabinet (draft)

4 February 2021

No questions asked.

Minute 102 – Draft Budget 2021/2022 (see Minute 85 below)

Minute 103 – Capital Strategy Management Plan

Councillor Radley put the recommendation, seconded by Councillor Neighbour.

RESOLVED

That the Capital Strategy Management Plan be approved.

Staffing (draft)

11 February 2021

No questions asked.

Minute 13 - Pay Policy Statement Financial Year 2021-22

Councillor Wildsmith put the recommendation, seconded by Councillor Neighbour.

A recorded vote was requested against the recommendation as follows:

FOR the recommendation: Councillors Ambler, Axam, Bailey, Blewett, Butler, Clarke, Cockarill, Crisp, Davies, Delaney, Drage, Harward, Lamb, Makepeace-Browne, Neighbour, Oliver, Quarterman, Radley, Wildsmith.

AGAINST the recommendation: None

ABSTENTIONS: Councillors Crampton, Crookes, Dorn, Farmer, Forster, Kennett, Kinnell, Smith, Southern, Tomlinson, Wheale, Worlock, Wright

RESOLVED

That the Pay Policy Statement Financial Year 2021-22 be approved.

Planning (draft)

10 February 2021

No questions asked.

85 DRAFT BUDGET 2021/22

Cabinet Minute 102 – Draft Budget 2021/22.

Council considered the summary of Cabinet's revenue and capital budget recommendations for 2021/2022, enabling Council to calculate and approve the Council Tax requirement for 2021/22. The report also included the Head

of Corporate Services' (Section 151) statutory statement to Council on the robustness of the estimates and adequacy of reserves.

Councillor Radley provided a budget speech summarising the key elements of the budget and highlighting that the budget was balanced due to a contribution of £381K from reserves. Cllr Radley proposed the recommendation, seconded by Councillor Neighbour.

Members considered whether to deal with the recommendations on block or individually and were advised that the Budget is should be debated as a single package.

Members debated:

- The difficulty budgeting for Local Government especially in the current climate of unusual circumstances brought on by the effect of the Covid-19 pandemic.
- The loss of recycling revenues from Hampshire County Council and the effect on the budget of losing that revenue.
- 5Cs Contract and the effect on the budget this may have made.
- Re-instating the Overview and Scrutiny Service Boards for guidance and input to give Councillors greater insight in the budgeting process.

After the debate, a Recorded Vote was taken:

FOR the recommendation: Councillors Ambler, Axam, Bailey, Blewett, Butler, Clarke, Cockarill, Crisp, Davies, Delaney, Drage, Harward, Kinnell, Lamb, Makepeace-Browne, Neighbour, Oliver, Quarterman, Radley, Smith, Wildsmith.

AGAINST the recommendation: Councillors Crampton, Crookes, Dorn, Farmer, Forster, Southern, Tomlinson, Wheale, Worlock, Wright.

ABSTENTIONS: Councillor Kennett.

The Recommendation was agreed.

DECISION

1. That the Council Tax Base for 2021/22 be noted
 - (a) for the whole Council area as 41,055.21 [Item T in the formula in Section 31B(1) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")]; and
 - (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as in the attached Appendix 1A.
2. The Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2021/22 (excluding Parish precepts) is £7,465,479.68

3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2021/22 in accordance with Sections 31 and 34 to 36 of the Act:
- (a) £46,854,119 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.
 - (b) £35,924,871 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
 - (c) £10,929,248 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B(1) of the Act).
 - (d) £266.21 being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts).
 - (e) £3,463,769 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (as per Column 2 of Appendix 1A).
 - (f) £181.84 being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.
 - (g) The amounts set out in column 6 of Appendix 1A for each part of the Council's area being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 3(f) above the amounts of the special items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned in Appendix 1A divided in each case by the amount at 1(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 34 of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.
 - (h) The amounts set out in columns 1 to 9 of Appendix 1B for each part of the Council's area being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 3(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the

amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

4. That it be noted that for the year 2021/22 Hampshire Country Council's precept figures are subject to approval on the 25th February and are listed below. If any changes are required as a result of Hampshire County Council approval provision for delegation to change is provided in 2.6 of this report. The Police & Crime Commissioner for Hampshire and the Hampshire Fire and Rescue Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings below:

Valuation Band	Hampshire County Council	HCC Adult Social Care	Police & Crime Commissioner for Hampshire	Hampshire Fire & Rescue
	(£)	(£)	(£)	(£)
A(R)	666.69	83.56	125.81	39.13
A	800.03	100.27	150.97	46.95
B	933.36	116.99	176.14	54.78
C	1066.70	133.70	201.30	62.60
D	1200.04	150.41	226.46	70.43
E	1466.72	183.83	276.78	86.08
F	1733.39	217.26	327.11	101.73
G	2000.07	250.68	377.43	117.38
H	2400.08	300.82	452.92	140.86

- 4.1 That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3(h) and 2.2 above, the Council, in accordance with section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the amounts shown in Appendix 1D as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2021/22 for each of the categories of dwellings in each of the Parishes.
- 4.2 That for the purposes of section 35 (2) (d) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, any expenses incurred by the District Council in the financial year 2021/22 in performing functions in a part of the district which elsewhere in the district are performed by a Parish Council, shall not be special expenses of the District Council.
- 4.3 That the Council concluded the £5 increase in Council Tax for Hart District Council for 2021/22 is not excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB Local Government Finance Act 1992
- 4.4 That the Head of Corporate Services in consultation with the Cabinet member for Finance be given delegated authority to amend the final council tax calculations in the event of approved changes from the other precepting authorities.
- 4.5 That the fees and charges for 2021/22 as set out in Appendix 2 be approved.

- 4.6 That the budget set out in Paragraph 13 of the report attached to the 25 February 2021 Council Agenda be approved.
- 4.7 That the revised Capital Programme for 2020/21 to 2021/22 as detailed in Appendix 4 of the report attached to the 25 February 2021 Council Agenda be approved.
- 4.8 That the Section 151 officer's statutory report regarding the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of reserves detailed in paragraph 14 of the report attached to the 25 February 2021 Council Agenda be noted.

86 OUTSIDE BODIES - FEEDBACK FROM MEMBERS

None.

The meeting closed at 8:59pm

DRAFT

Response to Cllr. Radley

In response to Cllr. Radley's entreaty to the Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny at last night's Hart District Council meeting to reinstate the Service Boards, he is certainly aware of the decision (under the previous Chairman) to change the format for service reporting to that of a rolling Quarterly Review presented by Heads of Service to the Overview & Scrutiny committee.

The reason for this change was based solely on the fact that Council Members frequently failed to turn up for Service Boards, despite signifying their previous intention to attend, and thus no rigorous examination of individual service performance or spend took place. At a mid-year review of Overview & Scrutiny progress and performance held by O&S committee members in January this year, it was decided that the Quarterly Service Review format still had merit but should be refined to include a quantitative presentation of quarterly performance and spend, similar to that presented at the Service Board meetings. Work is already underway to revise the current format of service review reporting to accommodate a more data-driven presentation for the 2021/22 municipal year.

Cllr. Dr Jane Worlock Chairman, Overview & Scrutiny

COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 12

QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC

Mr Simon Brown asked:

In regard to recreational access to the military lands next to Fleet and across a wider area being under threat:

- 1 What assistance and support can Hart Council offer to our recreational users?
- 2 Will the Council formally support Ash Parish Council in this matter and lobby for the access to be retained unless the specific area is actively being utilised for training?

Councillor Radley responded:

Mr Brown, thank you for your questions. I am Hart's representative on the Thames Basin Heaths Joint Strategic Partnership Board, hence why I am assigned to answer your question. I am very familiar with the situation having been a keen and regular user of these lands for the past 30 years. Whether it is walking or cycling on my mountain bike I know the area well.

Like you and so many others I do find it frustrating when I find the fenced in area closed, when it is obvious that the land is not being used for training. Although that does indeed happen in my experience, I have also found the lands to be open more often in the past year especially at weekends and on bank holidays. So, I would like to recognise that the Army do make efforts in this regard, especially during the Covid lockdowns. In fact the Army lands along Bourley Road were open once again this weekend and being enjoyed by very many people.

It is not my job to speak on behalf of the army and I have no intention to do so. In response to your asking what support Hart gives to recreational users I will point out the range of SANGS (Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space) which we have set up at numerous locations around the district. These mini country parks are funded by developers for the explicit intention of drawing would be walkers away from the Special Protection Areas. Hart manage and maintain sites at Edenbrook Country Park and Bramshot Park. A privately funded SANG is located very close to the Bourley & Long Valley SPA on Ewshot Marsh. Hart would encourage walkers to explore and discover these facilities.

Hart have also recently opened a highly praised BMX track off Pale Lane north of Fleet. Which when we are not in lockdown attracts visitors from a very wide area.

I personally have engaged directly with the Army and was party to the negotiations to have access gates put in and to have them opened when the training lands are not in use. While I agree that they could be opened more often, I still believe the current regime is better than the total lockout which we would have faced without community intervention.

Thank you for bringing the initiative of Ash Parish Council to my attention, I have read the statement made by Cllr Nigel Manning, Chairman of Ash Parish Council and note that they are primarily concerned with restrictions to the area known as the Ash Firing Range. The situation there would seem to be different in nature to that which we have locally at Bourley. I wish Ash Parish Council well in their endeavours and will watch their progress with keen interest.

Meanwhile I shall continue to use whatever contact I have with the Army to lobby for them to maintain a more permissive access policy on the Bourley Road site. I would encourage my council colleague who is responsible for the Military Covenant, Cllr. Chris Dorn to use his extensive connections to do the same.

Mr Brown asked a supplementary question:

Will the council write to DIO raising the issue of a lack of access at Long Valley and request additional gates are provided, and that they remain unlocked when the area is not in active use?

Councillor Radley responded:

I was made aware earlier today by a member of the public of the legal advice that the Trail Action Group (TAG) had received about the interpretation of the byelaws and I would like to take time to study that press release. Certainly I am very happy to write to the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) and to engage them once again in a discussion about increasing the access to the permitted lands and also I will make reference to the interpretation of the byelaws if unable to fully comprehend what the legal judgement is telling us and if TAG are willing to send me the full legal advice received I would happy to analyse it and write to the DIO on behalf of not just TAG but everybody who enjoys using that land.

Mr Tristram Cary asked:

At the GC Stakeholder Forum both you and Patricia Hughes stressed that the Garden Village project might not be sited in the Shapley Heath area after all. Can you please confirm that in the light of this change of heart, the Shapley Heath project plan will be renamed, and the project plan amended so that the most suitable site for any Garden Village is established early in the project and if not, please could you explain why?

Councillor Cockarill responded:

Thank you for your question. The name Shapley Heath is a working title to identify the project rather than a site specific name. There has been no change of heart either in terms of the area of search or in the ambition of the Council to deliver a new striving community for Hart but in order to properly assess the viability of creating a new garden Community we need to have a potential site to study. The area of search we are currently reviewing, has been before this Council for a number of years but until now has not been properly considered in the context of providing a new community. Other options may come before us in the future and if they do, we will need to assess them fully as well.

Mr Cary asked a supplementary question:

On 26 February 2019, the Inspector wrote to Hart Council to say that SHGV could only be introduced in Local Plan after it had first undertaken detailed evaluation of alternative options which included other sites and other strategies such as urban extensions to show the SHGV was the best strategy. I wonder how the Stakeholders Forum can be adapted to develop a vision for Hart based on this wider range of options and now having attended some of these meetings it is clear SHVG does seriously limit the Stakeholders' idea of what might be possible so if you are trying to develop a vision for Hart it seems very limiting not to explain this is just one possible option.

Councillor Cockarill responded:

Without going into detail, you need to divorce the garden village plan project from the local planning process what we are doing at this stage is evaluating the options for what we might produce as a Garden Community and that is what the Stakeholders Forum is for, to assess what sort of things we think a new Community in Hart should have, there is an option of doing something in the Shapley Heath area and that is what we are benchmarking against, there will come a point where we will either decide to move ahead with the garden village project or decide not to. At another point in time we will need to revisit our local plan at that stage if we have decided to move forward with the Garden Village then the Shapley Heath site and any other site that comes forward will have to be assessed as to whether it is the most suitable site. However, we are several years from making that determination.

Mr David Turver asked:

- 1 The Shapley Heath Stakeholder Forum presentations show a myriad of Technical and Viability studies need to be completed by October 2021 to maintain your schedule. For instance, the Homes and Heritage Thematic Group needs to produce reports on Housing Type and Tenure, Urban Design, Heritage and Landscape/Gaps. Can you explain what proportion of all of these studies is going to be produced by internal staff and what proportion by external consultants?

Councillor Cockarill responded:

Thank you for your questions Mr Turver and for your input into the Stakeholders Forum. The example you have provided is the Strategic Report which will be commissioned by Councils and there are various ways of delivering that. We could utilise our own resources, we could look to see what support other organisations in the Thematic groups can provide, such as Hampshire County Council, Enterprise M3 LEP, Natural England etc and once we've got those conversations done and we know what the scope is, then we would look to external consultants.

Mr Turver asked a supplementary question:

You submitted a funding proposal to the Government where the vast proportion of the £406k you asked for was to produce these various studies that we discussed before therefore it seems odd you can't answer the first

question of how much is going to be provided internally and how much from external consultants.

Councillor Cockarill responded:

As I was trying to explain, there are a number of ways this can be done. The developers can do some of it, we can get consultants working in the stakeholders forum to do it, we can do some of it ourselves and through external consultants but until we know exactly who is going to put their hand up to do what, we don't know which external consultants we are going to get to do it and it may be that external consultants will be very good at some of it and it might be better for us to other part – that is what is part of the conversations we will be having within the Stakeholders Forum, Landowners Forum and the Opportunity Board.

Mr David Turver asked:

- 2 What is the anticipated level of spend on external consultants to deliver all of the required studies across all of the Thematic Groups?

Councillor Cockarill responded:

I refer to the answer I gave to your first question, at present on this basis we cannot confirm the level of use of internal workforce resources versus support from other stakeholders as opposed to external commissioning. All I can say is as things become clearer on this it will all be monitored and recorded through the Shapley Heath Opportunity Board to Cabinet and ultimately to Full Council.

Mr Turver asked a supplementary question:

What level of support do you expect to see from the developers in both workday effort and cash spend.

Councillor Cockarill responded:

That is an ongoing conversation with the developers so I can't give you an answer right now. All of these details need to be worked out and the costs will be available publicly as we get to them. It is in the nature of projects that you start with an estimate of what you think things will cost and then as you progress the project you find costs might change up or down and sometimes you find that different sources of funding become available. This project is no different to that.

Mr David Turver asked:

- 3 The budget before you this evening for the new settlement shows that you are assuming no further grants from the Government. Could you give an update on the status of the application for additional grant funding please?

Councillor Radley responded:

The budget being presented tonight is completely open and transparent. It is careful to ensure that all potential liabilities are called out, both in the revenue and the capital budgets. As you will be aware Mr Turver, the Council previously received a grant of

£150k in 2019-20 from Central Government towards funding the garden village project.

The council sees no reason why when the next round of funding is announced in March that the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government will not continue to help fund this important initiative, one which they themselves have highlighted as being a worthy scheme.

Should for any reason funding not be forthcoming, or in light of the Covid crisis reduced, then the cabinet will consider how it should continue with the Garden Village project. This administration is acutely aware of the funding pressure we are under and will respond accordingly to unexpected events as they occur throughout the municipal year.

Mr Turver asked a supplementary question:

What is the status on the application for the additional grant funding you made in September?

Councillor Radley responded:

We are awaiting The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to make the announcement in March and then we will know what the status of our application is and for them to tell us the answer.

Mr Turver asked:

- 4 The budget pack shows that the budget for the New Settlement has fallen from the £406K you indicated at the Council in January to £279K. However, the staff costs are £128K of this and recharge overheads a further £122K. The recharge overheads include almost £26K on "Financial Services Recharges" and the best part of £24K on "Corporate Admin Support". How is it possible for such a small project team to incur such large overhead charges?

Councillor Radley responded:

The figure of £406k previously mentioned by my colleagues in his reply of January reflects the amount that we have applied for from the MHCLG.

The organisation has significant fixed costs in terms of buildings, back office functions and overheads yet outsourcing decisions have meant that there are only 130 staff where this overhead can be charged against in accordance with CIPFA regulations. The recharge reflects 2.9 out of 130 for overheads to be recharged. Larger Authorities have economies of scale and higher FTEs which mean that overheads per person may be lower. The bulk of these overheads would still be present even if we did not have 2.9 staff allocated to the Garden Village project and most of the overhead charge of £122k would still be present in Hart's structural revenue budget.

Mr Turver asked a supplementary question:

The budget also includes £25k for external consultants, less than you spent on Shellgate PR year to date according to the project transparency report, can

you please explain the sense in spending less than 10% of the overall budget on the main deliverables and over a quarter of a million in managed expenditure.

Councillor Radley responded:

A number of things have been going on in the past year one of which is the Covid crisis and when we get to the end of the year we are currently in, we will be able to reconcile how much time officers have spent dealing with the Covid crisis as opposed to working on things that are previously allocated to and when we do that exercise, it will be clearer to everybody concerned, how the sums of money and officer time have been utilised over the course of the year. That will get balanced in due course.

Mr Turver asked:

- 5 Given that you are still forecasting a deficit of £381K for 2021/22 and no doubt a further large deficit for 2022/23. How can you justify spending £279K overall on the unnecessary Garden Community when the homelessness budget (GL Code: 44069) is being cut by more than £100K next year, and grants to voluntary services (GL Code: 47010) are being cut by more than £600K from their pre-Covid level?

Councillor Radley responded:

The £279k is being funded from earmarked reserves and does not impact base budget. The allocation to earmarked reserves was approved in the previous budget in February 2020. The £381K is an ongoing deficit which increases over time. Structural deficits need to be met by reducing ongoing expenditure or increasing ongoing income.

You will no doubt have seen in paragraph 7.2 of the budget paper that overall Hart will receive £319k less in government funding this coming financial year. We are also having to absorb £250k in reduced income due to Hampshire County Council withholding recycling credits from us. We are also prudently factoring in a cushion of £220k in anticipated income loss due to reduced demand arising from the Covid crisis. This along with the cost of having to exit more aspects of the ill-fated Five Councils contract which the previous Conservative administration saddled us with has given us a total of £610k in significant pressures to weigh into the budget.

I therefore assert that Hart's financial management team have done an excellent job in bringing forth a budget which we can balance with a one-off draw down on reserves of £381k. In doing this I can assure you that we are not cutting the homelessness budget nor the grants which we pay to the voluntary services. These budgets are themselves funded by specific government initiatives and the money is effectively 'pass through' funding – which gets balanced in the budget when the money is received or offset elsewhere in joint ventures with neighbouring authorities.

To reassure you Mr Turver, there are no cuts to services in this budget. Indeed, the Council is proud that when other local authorities have had to reduce payments to voluntary services, ours have been protected in the face of our budgetary challenges.

So to answer your question, given there are in reality none of the cuts which concern you, and neither the full time employees nor consultants allocated to the Shapley Heath project are being funded from 2021-22 council tax then therefore there is

nothing for me to justify in regards to the way this potential expenditure is being ringfenced.

Mr Turver asked a supplementary question:

You don't know whether you've got the support of the Government or not, you don't know what level of support you are going to get from the developers and despite an eye-watering budget, there's clearly not enough of the £25k to meet all of the requirements you set out yourselves and your time scale so essentially you are set up to fail. So wouldn't it be better just to cancel Shapley Heath and use the money to help those most in need or balance the budget?

Councillor Radley responded:

We are balancing the budget, we are legally obliged to balance the budget and today I am presenting to this Council a balanced budget. When we hear from the MHCLG if we have a grant and what extent that is, Cabinet can make decisions and reassess the programme that we have in place but I would point out to you, that the budget that we are balancing is a revenue budget and this is a budget in which we look at our cost base and our likely assured income and we make it balance. As I have explained before, the FTEs and the consultants are funded out of a ringfenced budget and no matter what we did to adapt today the £381k needed to draw off reserves will still be there, similar to moving money between savings accounts when you are trying to reduce an overdraft – you move money from savings into current account in order to do that, and that is why changing the way we ringfence the money for Shapley Heath would make no difference to the £381k we need to draw out of reserves this evening.

LICENSING COMMITTEE

Date and Time: Tuesday, 02 March 2021 at 7pm

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fleet

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Butler (Chairman), Clarke, Delaney, Drage (7.10pm), Farmer, Kennett, Lamb, Tomlinson, Wildsmith, Wright.

In attendance: Councillor Kinnell

Officers:

Mark Jaggard	Head of Place
Dymphna Sanders	Environmental Health Team Leader
Robert Draper	Shared Licensing Manager
Sophy Brough	Interim Licensing Team Leader
Louise Misselbrook	Basingstoke Shared Legal Services
Celia Wood	Committee Services

1 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2020 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies received from Councillor Davies.

3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None declared.

4 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman reiterated thanks to all Officers who have been working hard and now with the 'road map' out of Lockdown there will be more legislation and changes ahead.

5 APPROVAL OF UPDATED TAXI AND PRIVATE HIRE POLICY

The Committee considered the Council's updated Taxi and Private Hire Policy which sets out the approach to the administration of the Taxi and Private Hire licensing functions under the Town Centre Police Clauses Act 1847 and the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976.

Members discussed:

- Card payments in vehicles and the benefits to both customers and drivers.
- If agreed, a 12-week consultation will be required with drivers and vehicle proprietors to submit their comments on the proposed change to licensing vehicle conditions.
- Technology fails; Committee sought assurances drivers would still be offering to take cash payments.
- The cost for joining the National Anti-Fraud Network (NAFN) and possible rises in that cost in the future.
- Potential for passing on the NAFN cost and how much that could be for each driver with the possibility of other services making use of the NR3 system thereby reducing that cost overall.
- Keeping a record of how many times the NR3 system is used, if agreed.

DECISION

- 1 That the Taxi and Private Hire Policy be adopted.
- 2 To consult the relevant organisations on the proposal to make the ability to make card payment in vehicles mandatory.
- 3 That the Council joins the National Anti-Fraud Network (NAFN) and uses the NR3 system for Licensing Purposes.
- 4 That the Head of Place in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Regulatory be authorised to make minor alterations and typographical corrections to the document before it is published.

6 APPROVAL OF GAMBLING POLICY

To adopt the Council's Gambling Policy.

Members asked for clarification that nothing has changed since the Consultation and were advised there have been no changes in the gambling policy since 2019.

DECISION

- 1 That the Council's Gambling Policy (Statement of Principles Gambling Act 2005 Joint Statement of Licensing Policy) be adopted.
- 2 That the Head of Place in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Regulation be authorised to make minor alternations and typographical corrections to the document before it is published.

The meeting closed at 7.27 pm.

CABINET

Date and Time: Thursday, 4 March 2021 at 7pm

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fleet

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Ambler, Bailey, Cockarill, Kinnell, Neighbour (Chairman), Oliver, Quarterman, Radley

In attendance: Axam, Smith

Officers:

Patricia Hughes	Joint Chief Executive
Emma Foy	Head of Corporate Services and Section 151 Officer
Helen Vincent	Committee Services

105 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of 4 February 2021 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

106 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

107 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

108 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman asked Joint Chief Executive to update Cabinet on any recent emergency decisions taken to respond to the Covid-19 pandemic.

The Joint Chief Executive announced recent emergency decisions made: 1. In consultation with the Leader, Deputy Leader and Leader of the Opposition Cabinet, that an amendment to the local discretionary business grant scheme had been made which would increase funding for businesses facing challenge as part of the continued lockdown, which would change the proportionality of funds distributed and those held for Covid-19 Recovery purposes, as previously agreed, based on the immediacy of need by our local businesses.

109 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE AGENDA)

None.

110 MINUTES FROM CIVIC REGENERATION WORKING GROUP

Minutes of the meeting held on 2 February were noted.

Following the meeting held in March the decision was made to postpone activity associated with a public consultation until after the May elections.

111 MINUTES FROM CLIMATE CHANGE WORKING GROUP

Members were informed that Service Plans will include climate change impacts and the Working Group will engage with transport and building control to influence the move to net zero.

Minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2021 were noted.

112 CORPORATE VEHICLE FOR PROPERTY HOLDING PURPOSES: DRAFT BUSINESS CASE

The Council had agreed to establish a corporate vehicle for property holding purposes. The company will take the form of a company wholly owned by the Council limited by shares. The purpose of this report is to set out the draft business case and to ask Cabinet to recommend to Council that the Business Plan is approved.

Members discussed:

- Any rent increases proposed will abide to the rent increase legislation.
- The Business Case will be presented to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in April followed by Cabinet in May with recommendation to full Council.
- Future business plans will be approved by full Council.
- The Council and the programme will focus on affordable housing.

DECISION

Cabinet recommends to Council that the Business Case is approved.

113 2020-21 BUDGET MONITORING – TO END OF DECEMBER

Cabinet was advised of the position on revenue and capital expenditure at the end of December 2020. Overview & Scrutiny Committee had considered this report at its meeting on Tuesday 16th February 2021.

The forecast overspend on controllable budgets is £612k for 2020/21 before accounting adjustments; any deficit required will be transferred from Reserves at the end of the year after all year-end adjustments have taken place. Accounting adjustments can significantly affect the year end position as it is only then that we can fully account for key areas of spend such as Housing Benefits and Business Rates payments to cover policy decisions made by Central Government during the year.

This overspend should reduce due to support from the Government of lost income and cost savings from IT restructuring.

Members considered:

- Initiatives and opportunities for financial support not missed due to subscriptions to LGP (Local Government Platform) and Grant Finders who provide information of support available to Councils.
- Invoices to Basingstoke & Deane for the Joint Waste Contract delayed due to additional pressures and timing differences.
- The available resourcing for the annual audit of accounts to accommodate all extra schemes is on target for the deadlines of 31st July and end of September 2021.

DECISION

1. The revised projections and reasons for the main revenue variations highlighted in Paragraph 4 and analysed in Appendix 1 be noted.
2. The current spending position for Capital shown in Paragraph 5 and Appendix 2 which includes project details be noted.

114 CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

The Cabinet Work Programme was considered and amended.

1. Car Boot Sales to be postponed.
2. The Corporate Vehicle Business Plan to be included in June.

The meeting closed at 7.44pm

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date and Time: Wednesday, 10 March 2021 at 7pm

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fleet

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Ambler, Blewett, Cockarill, Delaney, Kennett, Oliver (Chairman), Quarterman, Southern, Worlock.

In attendance as observer: Councillors Davies, Makepeace-Browne, Smith.

Officers

Emma Whittaker	Planning Manager
Miguel Martinez	Principal Planner Officer
Peter Lee	Planning Team Leader
Tola Otudeko	Shared Legal Services
Celia Wood	Committee Services Officer
Sabrina Cranny	Committee Services Officer

51 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2021 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

52 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies received.

53 CHAIRMANS ANNOUNCEMENTS

There was no announcement from the Chairman.

54 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Delaney declared a personal interest in Item 102 (Connaught Road) due to parents living nearby and that this would not have any influence on her decision.

55 QUARTERLY UPDATE ON PLANNING ENFORCEMENT

The Planning Committee were updated with an overview of the Planning Enforcement function in the period April to December 2020 (Quarters 1-3).

The Chairman requested that if Members had any specific questions on individual enforcement cases to take those up with the Enforcement Team or Mrs Whittaker outside of the meeting.

The members were informed that there is currently a review of the Enforcement Team and function and that will come forward as a separate paper to say how we are going to drive this in the future.

DECISION

That the Planning Committee note the overview of the Enforcement function.

56 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

Members accepted updates via the Addendum and considered the planning report from the Head of Place, decisions/recommendations below:

57 Item No 1 - 20/00580/FUL - Farnham Lodge, Farnham Road, Odiham, Hook RG29 1HS

58 Item No 2 - 20/02513/FUL - 84 Connaught Road Fleet Hampshire GU51 3LP

59 Item No 3 - 20/01838/FUL - Redfields Plant Centre Bowling Ally Crondall Farnham

60 Item No 4 - 20/03004/FUL - Countryside Services Workshop Old Pump House Close Fleet GU51 3DN

The meeting closed at 9.39 pm

HART DISTRICT COUNCIL DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS

Decisions/Recommendations – 10 March 2021

Item number 101 - 20/00580/FUL - Farnham Lodge, Farnham Road, Odiham, Hook RG29 1HS

Change of use of land for residential purposes for 2 no. gypsy pitches, comprising of a mobile home (caravan), a touring caravan and a utility/day room each together with the formation of hardstanding.

Members discussed:

- This will not be a transit site and will have permanent pitches within it. Any additional pitches would require Planning permission as is the case with other sites in the area.
- That the site will help meet the need for providing sites under the Gypsy and Traveller Assessment (GTA) and will only be occupied by people of that ethnicity and background.
- Any potential breaches of the use of the accommodation for occupants who do not come from that background will be enforced in the same way as any other planning condition and should there be a reason to suspect anything, Planning would investigate accordingly.
- Compliance with the Neighbourhood Transport Policy and if the lack of public transport and shopping facilities would cause a problem for the occupiers.

DECISION

A: The Committee resolved to **Grant** planning permission subject to no new issues being raised by the Garden Trust and/or the Hampshire Gardens Trust and that the Head of Place be authorised delegated authority to issue the planning permission after the expiry date of the statutory consultation period. Subject to the following Planning Conditions:

OR

B: That, should the Gardens Trust and/or the Hampshire Gardens Trust raise any issues in respect of the proposed development, the application be brought back to the Planning Committee for further consideration.

Subject to the following Planning Conditions:

CONDITIONS

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

2. The development hereby permitted shall be fully implemented in accordance with the following plans/documents (including any mitigation/enhancement recommended therein):

16_818_003A Rev. A (Proposed Site - Block Plan) and 16_818_005; (Utility /Day Room – Indicative Layout, Elevation) and Heritage Impact Assessment produced by Green Planning Studio (August 2020).

REASON: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interest of proper planning.

3. The development hereby approved shall only be occupied by gypsies/travellers meeting the definition in Annex 1, paragraph 2 of Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (August 2015) (or any subsequent Planning Policy Document of this nature).

REASON: To comply with the submitted application, to help meeting an identified need for gypsy and traveller pitches in the District, in compliance with policy H5 of the adopted Hart Local Plan – Strategy and Sites 2016-2032 and the NPPF.

4. Prior to the construction of the day rooms hereby approved, samples of the external materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the buildings shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The details shall be fully implemented and completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development.

REASON: To ensure a high-quality external appearance of the buildings and to satisfy policy NBE9 of the adopted Hart Local Plan and Sites 2016-2032, saved local policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006 and the NPPF 2019.

5. Prior to the construction of the day rooms hereby approved, a detailed wastewater drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The details shall be fully implemented and completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development.

REASON: In the interest of providing the development with adequate infrastructure and to satisfy policy H5 of the adopted Hart Local Plan - Strategy and Sites 2016-2032, saved policies GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006, policy DNP16 of the Dogmersfield Neighbourhood Plan 2016- 2032 and the NPPF 2019.

6. Prior to the construction of the hardstanding area hereby approved, a detailed surface water management scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The surface water drainage scheme shall be based on sustainable drainage principles.

The details shall be fully implemented and completed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development.

REASON: In the interest of preventing on-site and off-site flood risk and to satisfy policy NBE5 of the adopted Hart Local Plan - Strategy and Sites 2016-2032, saved policies GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006, policy DNP15 of the Dogmersfield Neighbourhood Plan 2016- 2032 and the NPPF 2019.

7. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of any external lighting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting shall only be installed, operated and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON: In the interest of natural character of the surrounding countryside and to satisfy policy NBE2 of the adopted Hart Local Plan and Sites 2016-2032, saved local policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan 1996-2006 and the NPPF 2019.

8. Notwithstanding any information submitted with this application, details of a soft landscape strategy along the perimeter of the application site and a long-term landscape management plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until such strategy is fully implemented as approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Soft landscape details shall include planting plans, written specifications with details of species, sizes, quantities of plants, management plans, boundaries and implementation schedule of landscape proposals.

Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years after approved completion, are removed, die or become, in the opinion of the local planning authority, seriously damaged or defective, shall be replaced as soon as is reasonably practicable with others of similar species, size and number as originally approved.

The long -term landscape management plan shall be implemented for the lifetime of the development.

REASON: To ensure the development is adequately landscaped in the interest of visual amenity and the character of the area as a whole in accordance with policies NBE2 and NBE9 of the adopted Hart Local Plan - Strategy and Sites 2016-2032, saved policies GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006, policy DNP6 of the Dogmersfield Neighbourhood Plan 2016- 2032_and the NPPF 2019.

9. Details of hardstanding and boundary treatments shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved. The hardstanding and boundary treatment for the development shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In the interest of visual amenity and the character of the area as a whole in accordance with policies NBE2 and NBE9 of the adopted Hart Local Plan - Strategy and Sites 2016-2032, saved policies GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006, policy DNP6 of the Dogmersfield Neighbourhood Plan 2016- 2032_and the NPPF 2019.

10.No work of construction shall take place until and unless a Tree Protection Plan detailing proposed tree protection details has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The existing trees adjacent/close to the boundaries of the site, shall not be lopped, felled and the ground within root protection areas shall not be altered or otherwise affected in any way. Trees, hedgerows and groups of mature shrubs adjacent/close to the site shall be retained and protected only in accordance with British Standard 5837:2012 'Trees In Relation To Construction Recommendations' (or any subsequent revision) and shall be maintained fully intact and (in the case of the fencing) at all times, until the completion of all building operations on the site. All work shall take place in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure existing trees adjoining the site are not damaged, in the interest of the visual amenity and natural setting of the area in accordance with policy NBE2 of the adopted Hart Local Plan - Strategy and Sites 2016-2032, saved policies GEN1 and CON8 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006, policy DNP6 of the Dogmersfield Neighbourhood Plan 2016- 2032 and the NPPF 2019.

INFORMATIVES

The Council works positively and proactively on development proposals to deliver sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF. In this instance:

The applicant was advised of the necessary information needed to process the application and once received, the application was acceptable and no further engagement with the applicant was required.

Details to address condition no. 8 should contain native species rather than non-native species. New hedgerow and tree planting should follow that native species that are seen locally to the site.

Notes: Mr Nat Green spoke in favour of the application.
Graham Chisnall (Dogmersfield Parish Council) and Mr Andrew Fraser-Urquhart QC spoke against the application.

**Item number 2 - 20/02513/FUL - 84 Connaught Road Fleet Hampshire
GU51 3LP**

Construction of 2x two-bedroom dwelling houses with associated garages, parking and landscaping (following demolition of existing garage block).

Members discussed;

- Whether the development is too large for this site.
- Safety concerns for children and adults using the pavement with cars exiting and potential safety issues caused by lack of visibility.
- Acknowledging the need for smaller houses for affordability reasons.
- The potential to make car parking in the area worse.
- Mitigation against possible development into the roof.

After a vote, Members refused the application.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

The proposed dwellings, by reason of their height, massing and overbearingness in conjunction with the cramped layout and parking arrangements, would result in a backland residential development out of keeping with the spacious nature of the pattern of development in the locality, contrary to adopted policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy & Sites) 2016-2032, saved policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan - Replacement (1996-2006), policy 10 of the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan (2018-2032) and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019).

Note: Mr Bruce Horrocks spoke against the application.

Meeting adjourned at 8.33pm and restarted at 8.39pm.

**Item number 3 – 20/01838/FUL - Redfields Plant Centre Bowling Alley Crondall
Farnham**

Retention of 2no. landscape bunds and associated proposed landscaping (part retrospective)

Members discussed:

- If there was a need for a bund and whether other methods of security could be used.
- The benefits of having a natural screen that blends in with the area.

DECISION – GRANT subject to planning conditions.

CONDITIONS

1. The development hereby permitted shall be fully implemented in accordance with the following plans and documents (including any mitigation/enhancement contained therein):

- 103-270720 (Proposed Landscape Plan)

REASON: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interest of proper planning.

2. Notwithstanding any information submitted with this application, details of a soft landscape strategy for the bunds, including a broad 3m wide native hedgerow and tree planting area adjacent to the existing bund to the western side for its entire length, wrapping around the northern end to meet the unmade access road, and a long-term landscape management plan, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority within two months of this approval.

The soft landscape details shall include native hedgerow species with whips 0.60-0.90m in height and trees size with 10-12cm in girth, quantity of trees and species mix of rich native wildflowers seeding for bunds. Landscape plans to include detailed schedule of plants/hedgerows/trees (scientific names), details of species, sizes, quantities/density of plants and implementation schedule of landscape proposals.

The landscape strategy as approved shall be implemented on and adjacent to the existing bund in the next planting season following the approval of the details and the long-term landscape management plan shall be implemented for the lifetime of the development.

REASON: To ensure the development is adequately landscaped in the interest of visual amenity and the character of the area as a whole in accordance with policies NBE2 and NBE9 of the adopted Hart Local Plan - Strategy and Sites 2016-2032, saved policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006, policy DNP6 of the Dogmersfield Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2032 and the NPPF 2019.

3. Following the implementation of the soft landscaping works hereby approved, any vegetation which dies or becomes damaged or otherwise defective within the five-year period, following the completion of the development, shall be replaced not later than the end of the following planting season, with planting of similar size, species, number and positions.

REASON: To ensure the development is adequately landscaped in the interest of visual landscape and the character of the surrounding countryside, in accordance with policy NBE2 of the adopted Hart Local Plan - Strategy and Sites 2016-2032, policy GEN1 of the saved Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 and section 15 of the NPPF.

4. No work shall take place in relation to the construction of the bund in the south-eastern corner of the site, until and unless detailed plans of the existing and proposed surface water drainage proposals for this part of the site have been first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

The bund shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and shall have no impact on surface water drainage in this area of the site.

REASON: To minimise the risk of surface water flooding on the site and adjoining land in accordance with policy NBE5 of the adopted Hart Local Plan - Strategy and Sites 2016-2032 and the section 14 of the NPPF.

INFORMATIVE

The Council works positively and proactively on development proposals to deliver sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF. In this instance: The applicant was advised of the necessary information needed to process the application and once received, the application was acceptable and no further engagement with the applicant was required.

Item number 4 – 20/03004/FUL - Countryside Services Workshop Old Pump House Close Fleet GU51 3DN

Widening of the northern footway and the provision of a slipway from Boathouse Corner

Members discussed:

- Why this has not been deferred until the final opinion from the Environmental Agency and when to expect that review.
- Whether the loss of trees could be replaced elsewhere and if there is scope to do this and were advised that a detailed tree assessment was considered by the Tree Officer and raised no objection.
- The reason why the LEP funding is time limited and were advised that this is allocated within the financial year.
- How many people are using this natural and well-loved asset and would benefit from the Green Grid project and the building new paths and cycleways.

A recorded vote was requested:

FOR the recommendation: Ambler, Blewett, Cockarill, Kennett, Quarterman, Southern, Worlock.

AGAINST the recommendation: Delaney, Radley.

ABSTENTIONS: none.

DECISION

That, subject to the Environment Agency withdrawing their objection, the Head of Place Services delegate to **GRANT** approval subject to the following planning conditions:

CONDITIONS

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the following plan nos. and documents:

Plans:

2019_41 0001 Location Plan
2019_41 0002- Location Plan (Fleet Pond SSSI Boundary)
2019_41 0005 Planning area boundary
2019_41 0006 Widened Footpath Extents
2019_41 0007 Works Area Extent
2019_41 0008 The Flash Bund & Culvert
2019_41 0010 Raised Footpath & New Bridge
2019_41 0011 Location of Dwell Points and Staggered Timber Gateways
2019_41 0012 Footpath Construction Option A & B

Documents:

Construction Phase Plan (CPP) & Construction Environmental Management Plan
(CEMP)V1.0 8/12/2020
Fleet Pond Supporting Statement December 2020 V1.2
Northern Path Mitigation Overview
Tabulated DAS discussion results
Causal Flood Area Proforma dated 10.12.2020
Flood Risk Assessment December 2020
BS5837:2012 Arboricultural Survey Implications Assessment & Arboricultural Method Statement (Ref: RMT574) January 2021

REASON: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and particulars.

- 3 Prior to the commencement of construction activity including site clearance, demolition or groundworks, an updated Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval. The Plan shall detail the significant risks posed to amenity from the emission of noise, vibration and dust and set out the mitigation measures to be employed to control such emissions and mitigate the effects of such emissions on neighbouring land uses. The Plan shall include the following detail:

1. Arrangements for the parking of vehicles for site operatives and visitors.
2. Arrangements and locations used for loading, unloading of plant and materials to and from site.
3. The arrangements for the erection and maintenance of hoarding to the site boundary.
4. Mitigation measures to be used for the control of dust emission.
5. Arrangements for the control of noise and vibration emission. This shall include a specific method of work including noise mitigation to be employed for the carrying out of piling operations.
6. Arrangements for keeping public roads and access routes free from dirt and dust.
7. A scheme for the storage and disposal of waste, providing maximum recycling opportunity.
8. Monitoring arrangements for assessing the emission of noise, vibration and dust and assessing the adequacy of any mitigation measures.
9. Arrangements for community liaison, notification and complaint handling.

Unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, construction activity shall only take place in accordance with the approved CEMP.

REASON: In the interest of amenity of neighbouring occupiers or uses during the construction phase and to satisfy policies NBE9 and INF3 of the Hart Local Plan - Strategy and Sites 2016-2032 and saved policy GEN1 of the Hart Local Plan 2006.

- 4 The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the RMT Tree Consultancy Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan ref: RMT574.

REASON: To ensure appropriate tree retention and tree protection and to satisfy saved policy CON8 of the Hart Local Plan 2006.

- 5 All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner, and any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

REASON: To ensure the continuity of amenity afforded by existing vegetation and to satisfy policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan - Strategy and Sites 2016-2032 and saved policy GEN1 of the Hart Local Plan 2006.

- 6 The Development hereby permitted shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the mitigation strategies set out in the submitted Pre-App DAS Call summary letter 23.04.20, Northern Path Mitigation Overview and tabulated

DAS discussion results unless otherwise approved in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: To avoid impact on protected species and/or interest features of the Fleet Pond Site of Special Scientific Interest in accordance with policy NBE4 of the Hart Local Plan - Strategy and Sites 2016-2032 and saved policy CON8 of the Hart Local Plan 2006.

- 7 Unless otherwise agreed, no construction or demolition activity shall be carried out and no construction related deliveries shall occur, taken at or dispatched from the site except between the hours of 7:30 hours and 18:00 hours on Monday to Friday and 08:00 hours and 13:00 hours on Saturday except in the case of Bank or Public Holidays when no such activities or deliveries shall take place. Unless otherwise agreed, no such activities or deliveries shall take place on Sundays.

REASON: In the interests of amenity and of the environment of the development in the accordance with policy NBE9 the Hart Local Plan - Strategy and Sites 2016-2032 and saved policy GEN1 of the Hart Local Plan 2006.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 The applicant is advised to make sure that the works hereby approved are carried out with due care and consideration to the amenities of adjacent properties and users of any nearby public highway or other rights of way. It is good practice to ensure that works audible at the boundary of the site are limited to be carried out between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday, 8am and 12 noon on Saturdays with no working on Sunday and Bank Holidays. The storage of materials and parking of operative's vehicles should be normally arranged on site.
- 2 The Council works positively and proactively on development proposals to deliver sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF. In this instance: The applicant was advised of the necessary information needed to process the application and once received, the application was acceptable and no further engagement with the applicant was required.

Note: Mr John Elson, Head of Environmental and Technical Services, Hart District Council, spoke for the application.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MEETING

Date and Time: Tuesday, 16 March 2021 at 7pm

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fleet

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Axam, Davies, Delaney (substitute for Makepeace-Browne), Dorn, Drage, Farmer, Lamb, Smith, Worlock (Chairman), Wildsmith, Wright

In attendance: Ambler, Bailey, Cockarill (left at 9.22pm), Crookes, Forster, Kinnell, Oliver, Radley

Officers:

Daryl Phillips	Joint Chief Executive
John Elson	Head of Environment & Technical
Mark Jaggard	Head of Place
Ashley Grist	Contracts and Procurement Manager
Neil Carpenter	Internal Audit Manager
Liz Glenn	Health & Wellbeing Project Officer
Helen Vincent	Committee Services Officer
Jeremy May	Census Engagement Manager, Office of National Statistics
Peter Dewbery	Census Engagement Manager, Office of National Statistics

112 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the meeting of 16 February 2021 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

113 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies received from Councillor Makepeace-Browne who was substituted by Councillor Delaney.

114 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Forster declared a non-prejudicial interest on item 9 on the Agenda, as a Hampshire County Councillor.

115 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE AGENDA)

None.

116 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman had no announcements.

117 PRESENTATION BY THE 2021 CENSUS TEAM

Jeremy May the Census Engagement Manager from the Office of National Statistics attended to present the implementation of the 2021 Census. The presentation explained how the Census is a snapshot of a time in society covering housing, healthcare, education, and transport and 2021 being the first year that the Census is done digitally. Members were advised how The Office of National Statistics has been raising awareness of the Census using local news, radio and local authorities covering deadlines, support centres and field staff help that is available.

Members were informed that the Census media has expressed that invitations are by letter only and that if any Hart residents had not received an invitation letter, they should get in touch with the Census Contact Centre. The Committee had concerns with Census scams and were rest assured that all Field Officers will carry a unique ID number when making door to door contact. All data collected would be checked and validated over the following year for accuracy and kept anonymous for 100 years.

118 TO NOTE SECTION 4 OF THE MINUTES OF 2ND MARCH CLIMATE CHANGE WORKING GROUP MEETING – UPDATE ON CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLA

The Committee were updated on the action plan from the Climate Change Working Group and the Council's corporate objective to build pathways to net zero omissions. As there is no budget at present for funding the actions it was suggested that the action plan is incorporated as a consideration into service plans.

The Working Group is working on making conscious decisions on how best to achieve carbon efficiencies and its long term plan.

Members asked for clarification on:

- Energy efficient waste vehicles being trialled by Serco in urban areas.
- Working closely with Everyone Active to minimise emissions.
- Specific targets with firm dates.

119 SERVICE PERFORMANCE – HEADS OF SERVICE ATTENDANCE

The Head of Environment and Technical Services, John Elson, attended to discuss service performance and highlighted the resilience of staff working through three lockdowns, and how Hart has continued to delivery all services in accordance with agreed Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). New areas being focused on are supporting the COVID-19 response team with lateral flow testing and the Climate Change Working Group.

Focus was made on the success of the Edenbrook bike track, continued work on the potential transfer of the Joint Waste Client Team arrangement, and CCTV service. After requests, Mr Elson agreed to circulate links to the joint waste client team report on our website.

Councillors thanked Mr Elson for his comprehensive summary update and thanked him for the hard work and support of his team.

ACTION

The Head of Environment and Technical Services to circulate to Members the link to the draft FUTURE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE JOINT WASTE CLIENT TEAM AND INTER AUTHORITY AGREEMENT report.

https://www.hart.gov.uk/sites/default/files/4_The_Council/Council_meetings/Joint_Waste_Contract_Cabinet_Report_-_April_21v2_0.pdf

120 FLEET ROAD PEDESTRIANISATION: COSTS

Members noted the costs incurred by the Council in implementing and then securing the removal of the Fleet Road pedestrianisation scheme. The Chief Executive explained that the report is a factual statement of costs incurred. The report was not intended to be a commentary on the merits of the scheme or how it was implemented and then removed. The report was for noting only.

Members discussed:

- Officer's time to be included in the costs with assistance from the Section 151 Officer.
- Funding from the Reopening High Street Grant of £86K from the MHCLG used for bay closures and social distancing.
- Further clarification of the provisional costs was requested, and these will be sent out by the Joint Chief Executive.
- The EM3 LEP withdrawal of its funding as the scheme was withdrawn early (but Officers renegotiated £24K which has been agreed).
- The M3LEP funding for the Fleet Town Centre to Fleet Station cycle scheme was also lost when the Fleet Road pedestrianisation was withdrawn.
- Traffic monitoring and management costs were made by HCC and paid directly by County Council and these are going towards the department of transport project costs.
- Confirmation was given that Fleet Town Council and Fleet Bid both contributed £10K but that these contributions would not now be pursued.
- Competitive process selection was carried out for suppliers and local companies were used where possible within timescales available.
- The large planters have been given to Fleet Town Council for a contribution of £5K.
- The Chairman requested that the original motion to the September 2020 Council be appended to these minutes.
- HCC incurred the costs of the Traffic Management for the scheme which are not included.

ACTION

- (i) The Joint Chief Executive to circulate a note to the Committee reconcile the detailed costs with previous transparency reports.

- (ii) The original motion to the September 2020 Council be append to these minutes

121 DRAFT SERVICE PLANS 2021/2022

Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the draft Service Plans for 2021/22 as set out in Appendix 1, having regard to the agreed Budget for 2021/22 and made the following recommendations to Cabinet as appropriate.

Members asked for clarification on:

- The Uniform Project, which is a database run by the data team as a background system for planning, licensing, and environmental health to ensure work is done in the most effective way.
- Winchfield updating their Neighbourhood Plan.

DECISION – Recommendation to Cabinet

That, subject to more detailed information being provided in the resourcing charts for both Place and Environmental & Technical Services, the draft Service Plans 2021/2022 be adopted by Cabinet.

122 DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH & LICENSING ENFORCEMENT PLAN

The Committee considered and reviewed the draft Environmental Health & Licensing Enforcement Plan.

RECOMMENDATION

That the draft Environmental Health & Licensing Enforcement Plan was endorsed for adoption by Cabinet.

123 EQUALITY OBJECTIVES 2021 - 2023

Members were presented with highlights of the progress made against the Council's Equality Objectives 2017-2021 and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's comments were requested on the proposed Equality Objectives for 2021-23.

RECOMMENDATION

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee supported and endorsed the objectives to be recommended to Cabinet to adopt the Equality Objectives for the period 2021-2023.

124 QUARTER 3 PERFORMANCE REPORT - 2020/21

Members were updated on the Council's performance indicator results for the third quarter of 2020/2021 (1 October 2020 – 31 December 2020). The report was for noting only.

Members asked for clarification on:

- Trend indicators to be consistent with a requirement for benchmarks and targets across KPIs.
- Confirmation was given that we will meet legal requirements for audit purposes for 2021.
- H02 and H04 increase noted.
- ET04 rise in complaints for littering.
- KPIs and measurable outcomes to be scrutinised. Request to set up a cross party working group for KPI targets.

ACTION

A small informal cross party working group of Committee be set up to review the number and purpose of KPIs.

125 CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

As part of the Council's governance framework, it is essential that it identifies and manages risk that it is exposed to. Members were asked to review the Corporate Risk Register which is reviewed by management on a regular basis and reported to members to provide assurance that appropriate arrangements are in place to mitigate identified risks. The report was for noting only.

126 CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

The Cabinet Work Programme was considered and the draft Environmental Health & Licensing Enforcement Plan to be added to April.

127 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

The Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme was considered and noted, and Members were advised that there will be a presentation on employment and skills work by St. Edwards, Hartland Park at next months' meeting and all Councillors were encouraged to attend.

ACTION

Subject to any final report to Cabinet in April on possible changes to the Joint Waste Contract, Members of the Committee will be asked to provide written comments to the Chairman so that the Chairman can convey the views of Committee to Cabinet.

The meeting closed at 9.56pm

AUDIT COMMITTEE

Date and Time: Tuesday 23 March 2021 at 7.00 pm

Place: Council Chamber

Present:

Delaney, Makepeace-Browne (Chairman), Smith, Southern and Wildsmith

In attendance: Axam
Kevin Suter – Ernst & Young

Officers: Carpenter, Chapman and Foy

20 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting held on 27 October 2020 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

21 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Councillor Crookes.

22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations made.

23 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

No announcements.

24 INTERNAL AUDIT PROGRESS REPORT 2020/21

The Committee was updated on Internal Audit work carried out between November 2020 and March 2021. The Audit Manager updated on current progress in Quarter 4, giving an idea of progress on the revised plan to take into account the Covid response and the impact in-house, the position on high risk issues and any outstanding issues, and where further work was needed.

Members considered:

- External contractors
- Target dates to be updated
- Capita contract – the service would be back in house as from 1 April.
- Plans for the Audit team in view of the retirement of the Audit Manager
- Additional support and mentoring for new staff

Members queried the cost of outside resources, and were reassured that this would be funded by the New Burdens fund from the government.

DECISION

That the Internal Audit work completed between November 2020 and March 2021 be noted.

25 ACCOUNTING POLICIES

The Committee considered the Accounting Policies to be followed and complied with during the production of the 2020/21 Statement of Accounts.

Members discussed the outsourcing, its effectiveness and evaluation. The S151 Officer confirmed that the procurement regulations and contract standing orders had been recently updated, and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee were tasked with considered KPIs and monitoring the performance of outside contracts. The Audit Manager added from an internal audit perspective the working relationship with Basingstoke was very positive.

DECISION

That the Accounting Policies be approved.

26 INTERNAL AUDIT PLAN 2021/22

Members were asked to approve the Internal Audit Plan for 2021/22.

Members considered the plan, and the need to be flexible, especially in any response to issues around Covid, the work around business grants and ARG grants coming forward.

Members were informed that since the writing of the report joint working with Wokingham had been confirmed.

DECISION

That the Internal Audit Plan 2021/22 be approved.

27 ANNUAL AUDIT LETTER FOR YEAR ENDED 31 MARCH 2020

The Committee considered the 2019/20 Audit letter.

Kevin Suter, E&Y, summarised the findings after relative procedures were concluded. Issues highlighted included that the majority of the final fees had been agreed, and that this year's accounts timetable was being delivered by the deadlines.

Members queried property valuation, and were informed that this was revalued annually in March. It was suggested that, in view of the volatile markets and Covid issues, a review in six months may be needed because the market was so volatile and it was not known how Covid would affect these valuations.

The Chairman and Committee extended their thanks to the E&Y audit team, their support had been appreciated in a difficult year. The hard work of the audit and finance teams was also acknowledged, and good wishes were extended to the Audit Manager for his retirement.

DECISION

That the Annual Audit Letter for year ended 31 March 2020 be noted.

The meeting closed at 7.42 pm

CABINET

Date and Time: Thursday, 1 April 2021 at 7pm

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Fleet

Present:

COUNCILLORS

Ambler, Bailey, Kinnell, Neighbour (Chairman), Oliver, Quarterman, Radley

In attendance: Axam, Smith, Worlock

Officers:

Patricia Hughes	Joint Chief Executive
Daryl Phillips	Joint Chief Executive
John Elson	Head of Environment & Technical
Emma Foy	Head of Corporate Services and S 151 Officer
Liz Glenn	Health & Wellbeing Project Officer
Guy Clayton	Housing Projects Officer
Helen Vincent	Committee Services Officer

115 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Minutes of the meeting of 4 March 2021 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

116 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Councillor Cockarill.

117 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

118 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman had no announcements.

119 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION (ITEMS PERTAINING TO THE AGENDA)

None.

120 CLIMATE CHANGE WORKING GROUP UPDATE

Overview & Scrutiny discussed the progress of the Climate Change Working Group at its March meeting and raised concerns over the speed of execution. Cllr Oliver expressed to Cabinet Members that good progress was being

made in the background and Members were advised that a planning workshop would be used at the next meeting to incorporate the planning department in order to assist the climate change working group.

Minutes of the meeting held on 2 March were noted.

121 EQUALITY OBJECTIVES 2021 - 2023

Cabinet were informed of the Council's Equality Objectives 2021-2023, which were considered by Overview and Scrutiny Committee in March 2021.

Members asked about the publication of workforce equality information and asked why certain groups with lower representation had not been identified. It was explained that this is due to protecting individual Officer's right for confidentiality and ensures the ability to publish a more general overview.

DECISION

That the Equality Objectives 2021-2023 attached at Appendix 1 were approved.

122 DRAFT SERVICE PLANS FOR 2021/2022

Members considered the draft Service Plans for 2021/22 as set out in Appendix 1.

Members discussed different topics from all service areas, including:

- The new ways of working and ensuring better communication and engagement between Members working with Officers.
- Officers will split their time between working from home and the office and the office layout will keep evolving to find the best productive way to engage changing working patterns.
- Community Services have surveyed residents at risk of becoming homeless on how they have found engaging with the Council and accessing our Services during lockdown periods and found that the response has been very positive.
- Key performance targets currently available and how to develop further key indicators to create KPIs for the commercialisation strategy.
- Ground maintenance and street cleaning complaints data will be updated and provided by Mr Elson on the Environmental & Technical Service Plan.

DECISION

Cabinet considered and adopted the draft Service Plans for 2021/22, as set out in Appendix 1, having regard to the agreed Budget for 2021/22.

123 FUTURE ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE JOINT WASTE CLIENT TEAM AND INTER AUTHORITY AGREEMENT

Approval was sought to transfer the Administration Authority function for the Joint Waste Service and employment of the Joint Waste Client Team from Hart District Council to Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.

Members were reassured that the transfer of the Joint Waste Client Team was not as a result of how the team had performed but how the contractor had executed the contract. It was decided not to split the contract but to transfer instead to ensure no increased costs would be incurred from the contractor. Transfer of the client team would improve resilience and enable us to maintain a high standard of service.

Appendix G of this report is Exempt.

Members asked questions on:

- Additional services for our residents.
- Extra resources to implement initiatives and tasks.
- The possibility of deterioration in the service due to no longer managing the service but Members were assured that greater checks and balances in governance and oversight in the contract management would be put in place to protect our position.
- The reference to performance board will be amended to reference Overview & Scrutiny. Feedback and amendments suggested by Hart had been agreed by Basingstoke and Deane.
- The additional costs to Basingstoke & Deane for the higher level of workload to provide more resources. This figure to be confirmed by Mr Elson.
- Ensuring that Hart residents would not lose sovereignty on how the service would be delivered and the inter-authority agreement will strengthen and maintain clarity.

The Chairman thanked the joint waste client team for their hard work and the decision made by Cabinet was no reflection on their ability to deliver the service.

DECISION

That Cabinet:

1. Agreed to the transfer of the Joint Waste Client team, and to delegate authority to the Joint Chief Executive, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environment, to seek any minor changes to the client team arrangements as necessary.
2. Authorised the Joint Chief Executive in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environment, to finalise and enter into an amended contract that transfers the Administrating Authority function for the Joint Waste Service from Hart District Council to Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.

3. Agreed to enter into an updated Inter Authority Agreement (IAA) and new Service Level Agreement (SLA) with Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council, substantially in the form attached at Appendices A and B, and delegates to the Joint Chief Executive, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environment, authority to finalise the terms and complete both agreements on behalf of the Council.

124 HOUSING RE-PROCUREMENT

Cabinet were updated on the outcome of the procurement process undertaken to implement a new integrated housing advice software solution, and to grant approval to appoint the preferred supplier.

Cabinet agreed to request authority to draw down from housing earmarked reserves to fund the procurement of the new housing IT system.

Appendix 2 of this report is Exempt.

DECISION

1. That Cabinet approved the award of the contract to the highest scoring supplier (Supplier A), following the detailed evaluation process that has taken place between December 2020 and February 2021 by the project evaluation team as set out in paragraph 4.5.
2. That Cabinet endorsed the proposed initial contract term of 24 months for the new system, with the option to extend annually for a further 24 months, as laid out within the Crown Commercial Services G- Cloud 12 framework as set out in paragraph 3.4.
3. That Cabinet approved the use of earmarked reserves for the procurement of new housing IT system as set out in paragraph 5.2 & 5.3.
4. That Cabinet approved the officer recommendation to proceed with implementation as set out in paragraph 5.4.

125 FROGMORE DAY CARE CENTRE

Members were informed of an urgent decision taken to seek surrender of the existing lease for Frogmore Day Care Centre.

Members discussed how valuable the facility is for the district and were saddened to learn that the existing charity could not continue to fund the facility and agreed that the intention of this building will always be kept and retained for community use. Cabinet were happy to be informed that there is another charitable organisation was in a good position to take on the facility in the near future as there is a big demand for day care centres for community use.

Members asked what the next stage is and were advised that if the lease of the building passed exemptions to procurement around provisions for social and health care, then the Council can seek expressions of interest. If such exemptions cannot be established, a full tendering process will be required. Cabinet expressed an urgency for community services to be delivered from the centre but recognised, this should not risk services not being of sufficient safety and quality in doing so.

DECISION

Cabinet noted the urgent decision taken to seek surrender of the existing lease for Frogmore Day Care Centre.

126 COVID 19 PANDEMIC - MOVING FROM EMERGENCY RESPONSE TO RECOVERY

The Monitoring Officer confirmed the decision-making implications under the adopted scheme of delegation arising from the impending move in status from Emergency response to Recovery.

The Monitoring Officer commented on the Joint Chief Executives great work documenting urgent emergency decisions made in the emergency response phase and that further urgent decisions would still need to be made as the Council moves into the recovery stage. Cabinet were informed that the recovery stage would be a longer process and there would still be occasions for rapid decisions to be made for some considerable time. In this regard Members noted that Officers would now rely upon conventional delegated Urgent Powers already in the constitution (Delegated Powers 263 and 264). These would be exercised in consultation with the Leader of the Council (and in consultation with Ward Councillors if the decision raised significant Ward related matters) with a full report on any decisions taken subsequently made.

The Joint Chief Executive, Patricia Hughes added that additional activities were still ongoing under COVID services including the Lateral Flow Testing Centre, a further tranche of business grants and the Hart Hub still supporting Hart residents.

127 CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

The Cabinet Work Programme was considered and amended.

1. Car boot sales postpone to July.
2. Regulatory Services Enforcement Policy postpone to July after the Licensing Committee Meeting in June.
3. Housing Company Business Case in June.
4. An updated on Emergency COVID-19 Decisions taken for noting by Cabinet in July.

128 EXCLUSION OF 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.

129 HART DISTRICT COUNCIL LEISURE CONTRACT – COVID 19

In January 2021, Cabinet agreed that management fee relief would be to Everyone Active to the 31st of March 2021 and a claim be made to the National Leisure Recovery Fund which would be passed over to Everyone Active to mitigate against further losses. The amount received from the National Leisure Recovery Fund does not fully mitigate the losses anticipated by Everyone Active and they have made a further request for both additional funding to the 31st of March and that the management fee relief is granted until the 30th June 2021 due to the further period of enforced closure.

Members discussed:

- The reduced client base of members using the leisure facility during the pandemic.
- How the capacity of facilities will be limited due to social distancing being introduced when the leisure centre reopens.
- Encouraging residents back to use the facilities.
- Ways to safeguard our management fee.
- Possibility for an extension of the studio facilities.

DECISION

- (A) That Cabinet agreed to extend the grant of management fee relief to Everyone Active to the 30 June 2021 to allow for lost revenue as a result of additional costs, limited activities, and reduced membership subscriptions due to the impact of Covid-19 on the basis that COVID-19 compensation payments remain payable from Central Government.
- (B) Agreed that one further subsidy of no greater than £369K to cover the period from 1st January to 30th June to allow a break-even position.
- (C) With reference to Recommendation B, Cabinet agreed the break-even position should only be calculated before staff bonuses, extraordinary expenditure, and dividend payments.

- (D) That S.151 Officer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance be authorised to carry out the open book audit and agree any subsidy payable with Everyone Active.
- (E) That S.151 Officer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance be authorised to negotiate with Everyone Active a monetary mechanism to return to a position of full management fee receipts as early as is possible.

The meeting closed at 8.57pm

DRAFT