

Minutes of the meeting of the  
**Woking JOINT COMMITTEE**  
held at 6.00 pm on 22 June 2022  
at The Council Chamber, Woking Borough Council Civic Offices, Gloucester  
Square, Woking GU21 6YL.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its next meeting.

**Surrey County Council Members:**

- \* Ayesha Azad
- Liz Bowes (Vice-Chairman)
- Amanda Boote
- \* Saj Hussain
- \* Will Forster
- \* Riasat Khan
- \* Lance Spencer
- Matt Furniss

**Borough / District Members:**

- Borough Councillor Mohammad Ali
- \* Borough Councillor Ann-Marie Barker
- \* Borough Councillor Josh Brown
- \* Borough Councillor Andrew Caulfield
- \* Borough Councillor Daryl Jordan
- \* Borough Councillor Colin Kemp (Chairman)
- \* Borough Councillor Louise Morales
- \* Borough Councillor Ellen Nicholson

\* In attendance

---

**Open Forum**

Questions and responses from the informal open forum session are attached as an Annex to the minutes.

**1/22 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Cllr Ali, Cllr Boote, Cllr Bowes and Cllr Furniss.

**2/22 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING [Item 2]**

Cllr Nicholson stated that she had not received any further information on the streetlight opposite Quadrant Court that she had asked about at the last meeting; the Committee Officer undertook to follow this up.  
Cllr Barker pointed out in paragraph 34/21 'Shaw Road' should be 'Shore's Road'.

The minutes were agreed as an accurate record.

**3/22 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were no declarations of interest.

**4/22 PETITIONS [Item 4]**

There were no petitions.

**5/22 WRITTEN PUBLIC QUESTIONS [Item 5]**

There were no public questions.

**6/22 WRITTEN MEMBER QUESTIONS [Item 6]**

There were no member questions.

**7/22 CIL - APPLICATION FOR FUNDING: UNITED REFORMED CHURCH (FOR DECISION) [Item 7]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** None

**Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:** None

**Member Discussion – key points:**

The chairman gave apologies from Ernest Amoako, Planning Policy Manager at Woking Borough Council.

The local Ward Councillor drew members' attention to the important role played by the church in the local community, providing a service as a venue for clubs and as a vaccination centre, for example. This support was echoed by other members.

There was a concern that providing CIL funding for a church may set a precedent but the Chairman emphasised the paragraph in the officer's report which stressed the need for all applications to be considered on their own merits, and in this particular case for the benefits to the wider community that the church offers to continue.

It was felt that this application sat in the category of Ward-based low-level infrastructure that Neighbourhood CIL applied to.

**Resolved:**

Woking Joint Committee agreed that:

- (i) The application submitted by Ward Councillors for Mount Hermon Ward to secure £8,000 to install automated doors at the United Reformed Church in Mount Hermon be approved.
- (ii) The Strategic Director of Place be authorised to approve payment for the cost of replacing the automated doors when the works have been undertaken and the invoices have been submitted to the Council. The total cost of procuring and installing the automated doors is estimated at £8,000 plus VAT and will be drawn from the total CIL income

earmarked and available for Mount Hermon Ward, this currently stands at £173,262.75; and

- (iii) The Ward Councillors for Mount Hermon Ward be asked to oversee all works relating to the procurement and installation of the automated doors in accordance with their project plan, project specification, costs and quality control.

Reasons for decisions:  
The application satisfies CIL requirements.

**8/22 CIL - APPLICATION FOR FUNDING: ALL SAINTS, WOODHAM (FOR DECISION) [Item 8]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** None

**Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:** None

**Member Discussion – key points:**

The chairman gave apologies from Ernest Amoako, Planning Policy Manager at Woking Borough Council.

In the absence of Cllr Ali, the Chairman invited Cllr Aziz to comment on the application. He described how the church was the only community hub in its area, offering itself as a venue for a range of activities, music classes, a polling station, some sport etc. The building is old and in need of some renovation. This application is for part-funding as a contribution to add to funding the church has secured through other routes.

Members supported the application.

**Resolved:**

Woking Joint Committee agreed that:

- (i) The application submitted by Ward Councillors for Canalside Ward to secure £40,000 to install underfloor heating at the All Saints Church, Woodham in Canalside Ward be approved.
- (ii) The Strategic Director of Place be authorised to approve payment for the cost of installing the underfloor heating when the works have been undertaken and the invoices have been submitted to the Council. The total cost of procuring and installing the underfloor heating is estimated at £40,000 and will be drawn from the total CIL income earmarked and available for Canalside Ward, this currently stands at £272,548; and
- (iii) The Ward Councillors for Canalside Ward be asked to oversee all works relating to the procurement and installation of the underfloor heating in accordance with their project plan, project specification, costs and quality control.

Reasons for decisions:  
The application satisfies CIL requirements.

**9/22 CIL - APPLICATION FOR FUNDING: WOODHAM HALL (FOR DECISION)  
[Item 9]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** None

**Petitions, Public Questions and Statements:** None

**Member Discussion – key points:**

The chairman gave apologies from Ernest Amoako, Planning Policy Manager at Woking Borough Council.

The Chairman invited Cllr Aziz to comment on the application. He acknowledged that the requested CCTV cameras would be installed on a private road but stated the wider area would benefit from the added security they would provide.

Overall, the members were unsupportive. Their concerns included:

- the lack of evidence of the need for the cameras,
- the fact they would be used on private land thereby setting a precedent,
- the relative need of other areas nearby that experienced anti-social behaviour
- questions over who would own and review the data collected
- the alternative approach of the local householders simply installing their own CCTV on their property
- an absence of support from the local police

**Resolved:**

The Woking Joint Committee agreed that:

- (i) The application submitted by Ward Councillors for Canalside Ward to install an ANPR/CCTV at Woodham Way Estate does not meet the requirements to approve it agreed by the Joint Committee for the reason given in the report;
- (ii) If Members are minded to support the application contrary to recommendation (i) above, the Strategic Director of Place be authorised to approve payment for the total cost of the project when the works have been undertaken and the invoices have been submitted to the Council. The total cost of the project is estimated at £24,580 and will be drawn from the total CIL income available for community infrastructure project in Canalside Ward, this currently stands at £232,548.

Reasons for decisions:

The application does not meet CIL requirements.

**10/22 TASK GROUPS AND MEMBERSHIP (FOR DECISION) [Item 10]**

**Declarations of Interest:** None

**Officers Attending:** Gregory Yeoman, Partnership Committee Officer

**Petitions, Public Questions and Statements: None**

**Member Discussion – key points:**

The Chairman stated that the Parking task group and the Infrastructure task group were being taken on by Woking Borough Council.

It was pointed out that the list of CIL Task Group members was wrong, and that Cllr Azad should be replaced by Cllr Aziz. Cllr Khan asked for committee members who are SCC members only to be notified of CIL applications that are below the £10,000 threshold for them to come to the full committee.

The membership list for the Health & Wellbeing Group was agreed. There were two vacancies on the Community Safety Task; Cllr Barker agreed to liaise with Group Leaders at Woking Borough Council to provide new members.

**Resolved:**

Woking Joint Committee :

- (i) Agreed the terms of reference for the following (as set out in Annex 1):
  - a. Health and Wellbeing Task Group
  - b. Community Safety Task Group
  - c. CIL Task Group
  
- (ii) Agreed the County Councillor and Borough Councillor appointments to the following:
  - a. Health and Wellbeing Task Group (up to 2 County and 2 Borough)
  - b. Community Safety Task Group (up to 2 County and 2 Borough) **with Borough Group Leaders agreeing nominations for two vacancies.**
  - c. CIL Task Group (a minimum of three and a maximum of six councillors, with representation from the County Council and the Borough Council) **with the replacement of Cllr Azad by Cllr Aziz.**
  
- (iii) Agreed the discontinuation of the Parking Task Group and the Infrastructure Working Group.

Reasons for recommendations:

The Task Groups will enable the Joint Committee to carry out its functions in an efficient and expedient manner.

In February 2022 the Surrey County Council Cabinet agreed to remove the Highways and Parking functions from local and joint committees; any discussions the Parking Task Group might have would be outside the committee's remit, and the committee would be unable to act on the Group's recommendations. The Parking and Infrastructure Groups will become functions of Woking Borough Council.

**11/22 ACTION TRACKER (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 11]**

The action tracker was noted.

**12/22 FORWARD PROGRAMME (FOR INFORMATION) [Item 12]**

The forward programme was noted.

Meeting ended at: 6.52 pm

---

**Chairman**

**WOKING JOINT COMMITTEE**  
**22 JUNE 2022**



**OPEN FORUM IN ADVANCE OF FORMAL MEETING**  
**VERBAL PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

**Question 1: Mr Robert Shatwell (Chairman, Hoe Valley Neighbourhood Forum)**

Mr Shatwell raised the issue of the applications he had made for three areas to be designated as Village Greens. The first at Elmbridge Lane recreation ground had been objected to by Woking Borough Council as there was a statutory right for residents to use the land, although no evidence of this had been offered. The other two, at Luke Road and St Peter's Road, were the subject of trigger events. Mr Shatwell asked if Woking BC had a particular reason for not voluntarily agree to overturn the trigger events or designate the land at Elmbridge Lane recreation ground. He explained that the community would like to plant a jubilee orchard at the St Peter's Road site, at a cost of approximately £2,000, and would be reluctant to do this if it turned out that the area was going to be developed in the near future.

**Response:**

The Divisional member Cllr Forster explained that there are no plans to develop any of the three sites. The application for the Elmbridge site would be going to the County Council's Planning and Regulatory Committee in the week following this meeting, and the other two sites are making their way through the appropriate process. The land at Elmbridge Lane is held under Section 15 of the Housing Act, therefore access is open to everyone not just adjacent residents, and there is no precedent for S15 land being designated as a Village Green. Cllr Forster stated that he will attend the Planning and Regulatory Committee meeting to request a designation.

**Question 2: Mr Robert Shatwell**

Mr Shatwell raised the issue of the dangerous condition of the river Wey bridge at Fisher Farm that carries the footpath. The footpath is subject to a diversion meaning pedestrians have to travel up to two miles on the detour. Mr Shatwell felt that as the body responsible for the footpath the County Council ought to replace the bridge; negotiations with the owner had been going on for too long without any action being taken, and in the meantime individuals still used the bridge putting themselves at risk.

**Response:**

Cllr Forster replied. The Fisher Farm bridge is privately owned. The County Council is continuing its talks with the owner, and while it would consider making a contribution to work to repair or replace the bridge it will not pay for a private asset nor can the Council demolish it. The option of a separate narrow footbridge has been looked at, but there are access issues because of the private land at the site. Cllr Forster asked that individuals observe the closure of the path at this site because the condition of the bridge does put them at some risk and also they would be trespassing on private land. He hoped that negotiations would bring about an acceptable solution.

The Chairman asked Cllr Forster to keep Mr Shatwell informed of the outcomes of meetings and discussions on both the above issues as appropriate.

This page is intentionally left blank