



## TO THE CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

You are hereby summoned to attend a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be held on Monday, 11 July 2022 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Offices, Gloucester Square, Woking, Surrey GU21 6YL.

The agenda for the meeting is set out below.

JULIE FISHER  
Chief Executive

NOTE: Filming Council Meetings

Please note the meeting will be filmed and will be broadcast live and subsequently as an archive on the Council's website ([www.woking.gov.uk](http://www.woking.gov.uk)). The images and sound recording will also be used for training purposes within the Council. Generally the public seating areas are not filmed. However by entering the meeting room and using the public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed.

## **AGENDA**

### **PART I - PRESS AND PUBLIC PRESENT**

- 1 Apologies for Absence.  
To receive any apologies for absence.
- 2 Minutes.  
To approve the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 6 June 2022 as published.
- 3 Matters Arising from the Previous Minutes. (Pages 5 - 8)  
To review any outstanding items from the previous minutes.
- 4 Urgent Business.  
To consider any business that the Chairman rules may be dealt with under Section 100B(4) of the Local Government Act 1972.
- 5 Declarations of Interest.  
To receive declarations of disclosable pecuniary and other interests from Members in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting.

## **Pre-Decision Scrutiny.**

- 6 Company Governance OSC22-031 - report to follow.

Reporting Person – Joanne McIntosh

- 7 Scrutiny Topic Proposal - Arrangements for Grants - Councillor Davis OSC22-035. (Pages 9 - 20)

Reporting Person – Councillor Kevin Davis

Rebecca Bowden and Peter Cluff from the Community Foundation for Surrey will be attending the meeting for this item.

## **Matters for Determination.**

- 8 Work Programme OSC22-036. (Pages 21 - 36)

- To receive the updated Work Programme for the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- To consider the Topic Review Selection Form submitted on a Constitutional Review by Councillor Andy Caulfield on 1 June 2022 and acknowledged by the Committee at its meeting on 6 June 2022
- To consider the Topic Review Selection Form on Insulation and Energy Efficiency submitted by Councillor Kevin Davis on 17 June 2022

It should be noted that if any Task Groups are set up, Members should be appointed to them by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and request that officers prepare draft Terms of Reference for consideration at their first meeting, which would need to be approved by the Committee at its next meeting.

Reporting person: Councillor Ayesha Azad

- 8a Scrutiny Topic Proposal - Review of the Constitution - Councillor Caulfield. (Pages 37 - 40)

- 8b Scrutiny Topic Proposal - Insulation and Energy Efficiency - Councillor Davis. (Pages 41 - 44)

- 9 Interim Performance and Financial Monitoring Review OSC22-032. (Pages 45 - 50)

Reporting Person – Adam Walther

- 10 Quarterly Noise Complaints Update OSC22-033. (Pages 51 - 60)

At its previous meeting, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee noted that a variety of reports were received during the year looking at complaints and it was suggested that the current arrangements should be reviewed to rationalise the approach adopted. The report on noise complaints now before the Committee includes a recommendation that the report should be prepared at six month intervals rather than quarterly. However, the review of the financial and performance monitoring (the 'Green Book') offers an opportunity to consider whether the key performance indicators for complaints, including those areas currently monitored through the Committee, could be reported as part of the financial and performance monitoring information. The details of Freedom of Information requests could also be considered under

the review.

Members are invited to consider this approach as a means of recording key information on complaints in the future.

Reporting Person – Giorgio Framaliccio

- 11 Report from the Housing Infrastructure Fund Housing Outputs Task Group OSC22-034.  
(Pages 61 - 68)

To receive a report from the Task Group, following its meeting on 15 June 2022.

Reporting Person – Councillor Adam Kirby, Chairman of the Task Group

- 12 Overview and Scrutiny Training.

Reporting Person – Councillor Ayesha Azad

Training on the roles and responsibilities of the Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee has been arranged for the evening of 20 July 2022, with Mark Palmer, Development Director at South East Employers. Whilst the training is aimed at the Members of the Committee, an invitation to attend has been sent to all Elected Members.

In the meantime, guides to scrutiny have been sent to all Members of the Committee, including the Government's Statutory Guide to Overview and Scrutiny, the LGA's Scrutiny for Councillors' Guide and the Good Scrutiny Guide drawn up by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny. In light of the discussions at the previous meeting of the Committee, details of the Council's responsibility for Councillor Call for Action requests has been circulated to all Elected Members of Woking Borough Council.

### **Performance Management.**

- 13 Performance and Financial Monitoring Information.

To consider the most recent publication of the Performance & Financial Monitoring Information.

Reporting Person – Councillor Ayesha Azad

### **Task Group Updates.**

- 14 Finance Task Group Update.

To receive a verbal update following the meeting of the Task Group on 6 July 2022.

Reporting person – Chairman of the Finance Task Group or representative of the Task Group (elected at meeting on 6 July)

AGENDA ENDS

Date Published – 1 July 2022

For further information regarding this agenda and arrangements for the meeting, please contact Frank Jeffrey, Head of Democratic Services, Ext 3012, Email [frank.jeffrey@woking.gov.uk](mailto:frank.jeffrey@woking.gov.uk)



**Mixed Sources**

Product group from well-managed forests and other controlled sources  
[www.fsc.org](http://www.fsc.org) Cert no. SA-COC-001794  
© 1996 Forest Stewardship Council

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 11 JULY 2022

### MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

#### Executive Summary

This report provides an update on matters arising from the previous meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The details summarise the progress made on achieving the desired outcomes from decisions taken by the Committee and requests from individual Elected Members. Once an action has been closed and the outcome reported to the Committee it will be removed from future reports.

Actions arising from the Committee are managed through the Council's Action Management system which was developed to capture and monitor the actions arising from (i) meetings of the Council and (ii) Internal Audit Reviews.

This is the a regular report that is brought the Committee and covers the actions identified at the previous meetings. The next version of this report, listing any actions previously identified together with the progress achieved shall be brought to the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 12 September 2022.

#### Recommendations

The Committee is requested to:

**RESOLVE That** the report be noted.

The Committee has the authority to determine the recommendation set out above.

<b>Background Papers:</b>	None.
<b>Reporting Person:</b>	Councillor Ayesha Azad cllrayesha.azad@woking.gov.uk
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Councillor Ann-Marie Barker cllrann-marie.barker@woking.gov.uk
<b>Shadow Portfolio Holder:</b>	Councillor Ayesha Azad cllrayesha.azad@woking.gov.uk
<b>Date Published:</b>	1 July 2022

## Update on Actions Arising from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

6 June 2022

1.0		Matters Arising from the Previous Minutes
1.1	<b>Action</b>	It was proposed that, as the responsibilities of NVH were taken in-house, the monitoring of complaints should continue be undertaken in a comparable approach. Furthermore, it was suggested that the Committee should at a future stage review the overall scrutiny of complaints to rationalise the reporting.
	<b>Progress</b>	Members will note that, later on the agenda, there is a proposal to explore the possibility of including the reporting of complaints in the review of the Performance and Financial Monitoring Information.
	<b>Responsible Person</b>	Adam Walther
	<b>Status</b>	Ongoing
2.0		Introduction to Overview and Scrutiny
2.1	<b>Action</b>	It was proposed that details of the Call for Action process should be circulated to all Councillors for information.
	<b>Progress</b>	Details emailed to all Members on 9 June 2022
	<b>Responsible Person</b>	Frank Jeffrey
	<b>Status</b>	Closed
2.2	<b>Action</b>	It was noted that the position of Scrutiny and Democratic Services Officer was currently being recruited.
	<b>Progress</b>	Interviews were successfully held in June and the new Scrutiny and Democratic Services Officer will be starting with the Team on 25 July 2022.
	<b>Responsible Person</b>	Frank Jeffrey
	<b>Status</b>	Closed

<b>3.0</b>		<b>Performance and Financial Monitoring Information</b>
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Action</b>	The Members were advised that a report reviewing the Performance & Financial Monitoring Information would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee.
	<b>Progress</b>	A report is included later on the agenda.
	<b>Responsible Person</b>	Adam Walther
	<b>Status</b>	Closed
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Action</b>	It was agreed that that the latest performance and financial monitoring information would be considered at the next meeting.
	<b>Progress</b>	The latest performance and financial monitoring information is due to be published shortly.
	<b>Responsible Person</b>	Adam Walther
	<b>Status</b>	Open



OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 11 JULY 2022

## **SCRUTINY TOPIC PROPOSAL - ARRANGEMENTS FOR GRANTS - COUNCILLOR DAVIS**

### **Executive Summary**

Attached are the Topic for Scrutiny Review Form (Appendix 1) and the report of the Executive (Appendix 2) held on 16 June 2022. Below is the draft minute extract for the meeting of the Executive.

#### **“9. REVIEW OF COMMUNITY GRANTS EXE22-046**

Councillor Forster, Deputy Leader of the Council, introduced the report which recommended to Council a proposed new partnership between the Council and the Community Foundation for Surrey whereby the Community Foundation would administer community grants on behalf of the Council. Councillor Forster explained that the proposed new approach would enable community beneficiaries to apply for funding from a range of sources through one single expression of interest to the Community Foundation, creating a ‘one stop shop’. It was noted that the Woking-based Community Foundation already administered the Woking Community Fund, as well as funds on behalf of Surrey County Council, Guildford Borough Council, Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, and Spelthorne Borough Council. The administrative burden of the current grants process was raised, and it was highlighted that the new approach would allow Officer time to be used more productively by working directly with groups to advise and support.

Councillor Forster proposed an amendment to recommendation (ii) to include consultation with the Portfolio Holder. The Executive agreed the amendment to recommendation (ii).

Councillor Kemp, Shadow Portfolio Holder for Voluntary Sector, raised a number of questions regarding the proposal, including the decision making process, governance arrangements and Member oversight, and the proposed recipients of a Service Level Agreement (SLA) which would provide secure funding. The Portfolio Holder confirmed that the Council would continue to retain full control of the grants in setting the annual budget for the fund and agreeing the criteria as per the strategic priorities of the Council. It was noted that the Portfolio Holder and Senior Manager would sit on the decision-making panel and an annual report would be received by Council. Regarding SLAs, the Executive heard that it was proposed that community groups considered essential by the Council, such as the York Road Project, would be offered an SLA in order to provide financial security. Discussions would be held with regular beneficiaries regarding the new approach.

Following a question, it was explained that it was proposed to combine the Council’s community grant budget to the existing Woking Community Fund.

The Executive welcomed the proposed new approach to community grants, which included the opportunity for the Council to incentivise increased investment into the endowment of the Woking Community Fund by match-funding private sector donations.

### **RECOMMENDED to Council**

**That (i) the proposed new partnership between Woking Borough Council and the Community Foundation for Surrey be endorsed and take effect for grants in 2023/24; and**

**(ii) delegated authority to be given to the Strategic Director – Communities, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, to oversee**

**Scrutiny Topic Proposal - Arrangements for Grants - Councillor Davis**  
**the new partnership between Woking Borough Council and the**  
**Community Foundation for Surrey.**

Reason: To improve the process for administering community grants.”

**Background Papers:** None.

**Reporting Person:** Councillor Kevin Davis  
Email: [cllr.kevin.davis@woking.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.kevin.davis@woking.gov.uk)

**Contact Person:** Councillor Kevin Davis  
Email: [cllr.kevin.davis@woking.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.kevin.davis@woking.gov.uk)

**Portfolio Holder:** Councillor Will Forster  
Email: [cllrwill.forster@woking.gov.uk](mailto:cllrwill.forster@woking.gov.uk)

**Shadow Portfolio Holder:** Councillor Colin Kemp  
Email: [cllrcolin.kemp@woking.gov.uk](mailto:cllrcolin.kemp@woking.gov.uk)

**Date Published:** 1 July 2022

### Scrutiny Review Topic Selection

Set out below is a copy of the online form set up for Councillors to submit a Scrutiny Review Topic Selection for consideration at a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**This form must be completed in full with as much detail as possible.**

Your name:	Kevin Davis
------------	-------------

Date Drafted:	17/06/2022
---------------	------------

Proposed Scrutiny Topic:	Pre-decision scrutiny regarding proposed arrangements for grants.
--------------------------	---

<b>Selection criteria</b>	
If your proposed Scrutiny Review Topic falls under any of these rejection criteria, it may not be a suitable topic to progress	
<b>Criteria for Scrutiny Review:</b>	
Scrutiny Review likely to result in improvements for local people.	X
Topic falls within a Community or Corporate priority.	X
Topic represents a key issue for the public.	X
A service is performing poorly.	
High level of dissatisfaction with a service.	
<b>Criteria for rejecting a Scrutiny Review Topic:</b>	
Topic already being addressed.	
Matter is subjudice or prejudicial to the Council's interests.	
Specific case falls within the Council's complaints procedure.	
Topic involves individual disciplinary or grievance matter.	
Proposed topic is unlikely to result in improvements for local people.	

## Outcomes of the Review

Why should the Scrutiny Review be undertaken?

At the Executive on 16/06/2022 the Review of Community Grants paper (EXE22-046) seeks to change the way community grants are administered by the Council. The proposals will likely lead to far less transparency and possibly no democratic oversight of the grants process from 2023/24.

As the budget for community grants is in excess of 10% of Council Tax receipts, residents should be sufficiently happy that their Council Tax is being well spent with Councillors maintaining a full understanding and scrutiny of the budget.

What benefits could result from the Scrutiny Review?

By scrutinising this paper and the proposed new grants arrangements, it will enable the O&S to come to an informed decision, and advise Council of the benefits or otherwise of outsourcing grant decisions.

What level of impact will the Scrutiny Review have?

Substantial benefits community wide or for a significant proportion or section of the Community.	X
Moderate benefits for two or more client groups or substantial benefits for only one client group.	X
Minor benefits for two or more client groups or substantial benefits for only one client group.	
Minor benefits for only one client groups.	
No benefits likely to result.	

## Topic Review Process

**Resources to be included in the Scrutiny Review:**

WBC Officer Time Committee.	Finance team
Report and/or presentation.	
Councillor time.	
Portfolio Holder Involvement.	Yes – to answer questions
Expert or External Representatives participation.	Community Foundation for Surrey
Establishment of a Task Group.	No

Site visits.	No
Research and Evidence.	Evidence to be presented that shows who has been consulted and their responses as outlined in 6.1 of the Executive report.
Consultation Exercise.	No
Other	
<p>Please add explanatory note for any resource selected above.</p> <p>The Community Foundation for Surrey must be invited so that Councillors can question how the grants will be administered and exactly what the democratic oversight will be.</p>	
<p>Please add any further information that you think would be useful in the consideration of this Scrutiny Review Topic.</p>	

Once submitted, if your Scrutiny Review Topic meets the selection criteria and enough information has been provided, it will be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at their next meeting, where they will decide whether to add the topic to their Work Programme.



EXECUTIVE – 16 JUNE 2022

## REVIEW OF COMMUNITY GRANTS

### Executive Summary

The Council provides a high level of support to the Woking voluntary sector. Each year community grants, and wider financial benefits are given to a range of services to enable them to support vulnerable residents. In 2022/23, over £1.7m worth of investment is being provided to the voluntary sector which is significant.

The Community Foundation for Surrey administers over 80 community funds and are well placed to administer community grants on behalf of the Council. This partnership approach would enable community beneficiaries to apply for funding from a range of sources through one single expression of interest to the Community Foundation, accessing wider funds that are not restricted solely to the Council's grant.

The Community Foundation for Surrey already administers the Woking Community Fund, which provides grants to the voluntary sector in Woking through private sector donations. Applications are received to the Woking Community Fund and the foundation then process these for the quarterly decision-making panel. The Council would set the annual budget for the fund, agree the criteria, join the panel and report annually on outcomes. The Council could also incentivise increased investment into the endowment of the Woking Community Fund by match-funding donations made to it from the private sector.

This approach incentivises wider investment into the community, growing long-term, sustainable contributions. It creates an improved and streamlined application system for community groups whilst enabling the Council to retain full control of the budget and the criteria for its grants. Further, it enables Council Officers to focus less time on administering a grants process and more time developing innovative and sustainable partnerships in its work with community groups.

### Recommendations

The Executive is requested to:

#### **RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL That**

- (i) the proposed new partnership between Woking Borough Council and the Community Foundation for Surrey be endorsed and take effect for grants in 2023/24; and**
- (ii) delegated authority to be given to the Strategic Director - Communities to oversee the new partnership between Woking Borough Council and the Community Foundation for Surrey.**

### Reasons for Decision

Reason: To improve the process for administering community grants.

The item(s) above will need to be dealt with by way of a recommendation to Council.

## Review of Community Grants

**Background Papers:** None.

**Reporting Person:** Louise Strongitharm, Strategic Director - Communities  
Email: louise.strongitharm@woking.gov.uk, Extn: 3599

**Contact Person:** Adam Thomas, Head of Family and Community Services  
Email: adam.thomas@woking.gov.uk, Extn: 3811

**Portfolio Holder:** Councillor Will Forster  
Email: cllrwill.forster@woking.gov.uk

**Shadow Portfolio Holder:** Councillor Colin Kemp  
Email: cllrcolin.kemp@woking.gov.uk

**Date Published:** 8 June 2022

### 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Woking Borough Council provides a significant level of discretionary support for the voluntary sector each year, including financial support, accommodation, rate relief and Officer advice. In 2022/23, the Council is investing £1,738,043 for these purposes.
- 1.2 Community grants are administered annually by the Council and form 40% of the investment figure above. This report evaluates the processes and operations surrounding the administration of community grants, to improve the opportunities for applicants through a partnership with the Community Foundation for Surrey.

### 2.0 Current Framework for Administering Community Grants

- 2.1 The annual community grants process is administered by Woking Council Officers in Democratic Services, supported by Senior Managers across the Council, Executive Members and Corporate Leaders. It commences each April, and the administrative tasks span the entire year. Officers engage in communication with beneficiaries, they advertise the scheme with the relevant dates and information, process applications, conduct consultations, attend planning meetings including a special meeting of the Executive with c.60 individual Executive Reports, then process the administration of the funds themselves in quarterly instalments.
- 2.2 The cost of Officer time to administer the grants process equates to at least £25,000 per year, based on a fair proportion of time from Democratic Services, Senior Managers and the Corporate Leadership Team. This time could be used more productively, instead spent working directly with community groups to advise and support, rather than processing annual applications.

### 3.0 Proposal for Change

- 3.1 If a trusted partner was used to administer the community grants this would enable the Council to focus on the strategic priorities, governance and wider opportunities for supporting local community groups. It would reduce the administration operations that are currently required and release a significant amount of Officer and Member time to focus on community development. The new approach would enable the Council to continue to retain full control of the grants in setting the annual budgets and the criteria as per the strategic priorities, whilst increasing the transparency of the process and broadening the financial scope of support to communities.
- 3.2 The Community Foundation for Surrey (CFS), based in Woking, is well established and a trusted expert in grant administration. It currently administers 89 funds including endowment and flow through funds, working closely with local businesses, Surrey County Council, and Borough and District Councils. A detailed overview of their work can be found on the CFS website which includes the Annual Report and Accounts. All grant giving is published in the public domain and is transparent in accordance with legal regulations and stipulations of the Charity Commission.

#### Woking Community Fund

- 3.3 CFS manage the Woking Community Fund, which is an existing endowment fund. Full details of the fund including case studies can be found on the CFS website. The endowment is currently £143,000 and yields an annual return, following investment, of 4% for community grants. The fund is well established and is overseen by a dedicated panel, chaired by an independent Woking resident with expertise in this work.

- 3.4 Over coming years, with the support of the Council, it would be possible to increase the endowment to £250,000 which is not unrealistic when compared to similar funds in neighbouring areas. Other District and Borough Councils match-fund corporate donations in similar schemes to incentivise new income, and it is recommended that Woking Council match-fund contributions by 50%. Therefore, a corporate donation of £1000 to the Woking Community Fund increases to £1,750, following the Council's contribution (50%) and the addition of Gift Aid (25%). This is a positive and innovative approach to stimulating wider, sustainable investment into the community across sectors.
- 3.5 CFS would receive and process all expressions of interest from applicants, then process these ready for the quarterly decision-making panel. The Council would set the annual budget for the fund, agree the criteria and support the panel in its decisions. It is recommended that the Head of Family and Community Services and Portfolio Holder for Community Grants attends the panel meetings. The Council would receive outcome reports on the use of the grants, and this would be collated and shared annually to promote the benefits of this scheme for residents.
- 3.6 The benefits of this new approach are far reaching. Partnering with CFS enables community groups to apply for funding locally in one place, reducing the need for multiple applications. It provides a wider breadth of funding for beneficiaries and gives Volunteer Woking greater capacity to work alongside groups to develop sustainable fundraising strategies.

### Small Grants

- 3.7 The Council provides small grants to youth providers and sports and arts providers through its small grants scheme, with an annual budget of £15,000. It is proposed to keep this budget for small grants to help local groups needing just in time support, in line with the Council's priorities. The framework for these grants is to be agreed with the Portfolio Holder and outputs reported annually with the wider community grants.

## **4.0 Corporate Strategy**

- 4.1 The Corporate Strategy: Healthier Communities theme focusses on the need to support safe, thriving and sustainable communities, high quality homes for all and health and wellbeing for all. It is acknowledged that the voluntary and charity sector plays an important role in supporting these priorities and therefore the community grants scheme should focus on these outcome areas, along with the five priorities from the Health and Wellbeing Strategy.

## **5.0 Implications**

### Finance and Risk

- 5.1 The Council will ensure that services providing essential support for residents, and those that exist to support community cohesion, receive the funds they need to continue their work in the borough. This can be achieved through a Service Level Agreement (SLA) that formally secures their funding, rather than through an annual grants process which creates uncertainty. This will enable these groups to maintain core funds and for the Council to work closely with them to monitor the service outcomes for residents and value for money.
- 5.2 The existing recipients of the annual community grant that should receive secured funding are Woking Community Transport, Citizen's Advice Woking, York Road Project, Woking Asian Business Forum and Woking People of Faith. These services are necessary for supporting the ongoing needs of some of the most vulnerable residents and/or continuing to strengthen

the connectivity and relationships across the diverse communities of Woking. For 2022/23, these groups have been awarded £499,357.

- 5.3 The Community Foundation for Surrey would administer the grants to community groups through its existing processes. The cost associated with this is c.£17,664 which is considerably less than the costs to the Council currently through Officer time, estimated to be at least £25,000 per year.

### Equalities and Human Resources

- 5.4 The Community Foundation process grant applications throughout the year through a single expression of interest. Applications are invited from potential beneficiaries based on three broad themes. The themes enable a wide breadth of applications and support the funding for the Council's priority groups.
- 5.5 The themes are Wellbeing (advance the wellbeing, physical, and mental health and safety of people of all ages), Equity and Inclusion (reduce disadvantage and increase access to services, strengthen community cohesion and build social capacity), and Young People (supporting the range of challenges faced by young people).
- 5.6 The benefit of having a themed schedule for applications is that the priority areas can be funded collectively, providing a strategic overview of local funding and avoiding duplication and piecemeal grants.

### Legal

- 5.7 A Service Level Agreement would be created to formalise the partnership with the Community Foundation for Surrey. This will confirm the expectations of the Council regarding the priorities and criteria for grant giving, budgets and reporting.
- 5.8 Service Level Agreements would be produced for the main regular beneficiaries, as discussed above.

## **6.0 Engagement and Consultation**

- 6.1 In preparation for this report, the Portfolio Holder and Council Officers in Democratic Services, Volunteer Woking and Woking Works have been consulted. Feedback has been sought from regular beneficiaries regarding the current process and this has supported the proposal to change the annual application process as it currently stands.
- 6.2 The Council will communicate with regular beneficiaries to discuss the new approach and ensure that support is given to adjust to the new processes, led through Volunteer Woking and CFS staff.

REPORT ENDS





## Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme

This Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme is published with the purpose of assisting the Council in its overview and scrutiny role. The Work Programme covers the following areas:

- Items for consideration at future meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- Any Scrutiny Review Topics proposed by Members of the Council for inclusion on the Work Programme.
- Any topics identified for pre-decision scrutiny.
- The draft forward programme of work for the Executive.
- Details of the current Task Groups under the Committee's remit.

The Work Programme is designed to assist the Council with its overview and scrutiny role by providing Members with an indication of the current workload, subjects to be considered for review and items which the Executive expects to consider at its future meetings, so that matters can be raised beforehand and/or consultations undertaken with a Member of the Executive prior to the relevant meeting.

*Any changes to the Work Programme since it was last published have been highlighted in green.*

<b>The Committee</b>	
<b>Chairman:</b> Councillor A Azad	
<b>Vice-Chairman:</b> Councillor J Sanderson	
Councillor H Akberali	Councillor C Kemp
Councillor A Caulfield	Councillor A Kirby
Councillor K Davis	Councillor J Morley
Councillor P Graves	Councillor M I Raja
<b>2022/23 Committee Dates</b>	
6 June 2022	21 November 2022
11 July 2022	23 January 2023
12 September 2022	20 February 2023
17 October 2022	20 March 2023

**Recommendations**

The Committee is requested to:

**RESOLVE That** the report be noted.

The Committee has the authority to determine the recommendation set out above.
--

**Background Papers:** None.

**Reporting Person:** Councillor Ayesha Azad  
Email: cllrayesha.azad@woking.gov.uk

**Contact Person:** Frank Jeffrey, Head of Democratic Services  
Email: frank.jeffrey@woking.gov.uk, Extn: 3012

**Portfolio Holder:** Councillor Ann-Marie Barker  
Email: cllrann-marie.barker@woking.gov.uk

**Shadow Portfolio Holder:** Councillor Ayesha Azad  
Email: cllrayesha.azad@woking.gov.uk

**Date Published:** 1 July 2022

REPORT ENDS

**Suggested Additions to the Work Programme**

Following the last meeting of the Committee, the Chairman and Vice-Chairman provided Officers with a list of items for consideration over the coming year. Where possible, these have been added to the Work Programme. Set out below are any ideas which have been requested but are yet to be included against a specific meeting of the Committee.

Decision to be Taken	Proposed by	Officer Comment
Biannual Overview of Complaints Report	Chairman and Vice-Chairman	Following the meeting of the Committee on 21 February it was expressed by Members that the possibility of having this report appear at the Committee twice a year, as opposed to once a year would be beneficial.
Overview and Scrutiny Committee Communications Plan	Chairman and Vice-Chairman	Following the work that was undertaken to develop a communications plan for the Committee it was advised to the Chairman that it would be beneficial for the 2022/2023 Committee to receive a report on the Communications Plan.

**The Work Programme 2022/23**

Set out over the coming pages are the items programmed for consideration over the 2022/23 Municipal Year.

**Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting – 12 September 2022**

**1 – Performance Management**

**1.1 Performance & Financial Monitoring Information.** For the Committee to consider the current publication of the Performance & Financial Monitoring Information (Green Book)

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Democratic Services

**2 – Matters for Consideration**

**2.1 Work Programme.** For the Committee to receive the updated Work Programme.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Democratic Services

**2.2 Guide to Scrutiny of Risk and Commercialisation.** The guide to scrutiny of risk and commercialisation, published by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny, will be received by the committee.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Giorgio Framalitto Leigh Clarke

**2.3 Freedom Leisure Performance Review.** For the Committee to receive the latest review of Freedom Leisure.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Steve May

**2.4 Survey of Leisure Facility Users.** For the Committee to receive the survey results from the Leisure Services Manager.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Steve May

**The Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme**

**2.5 Performance and Financial Monitoring Review.** For the Committee to receive an update on the review of performance and financial monitoring.

<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Background Documents</b>	<b>Contact Person/Team</b>
Officers and Members	None	Adam Walther

**2.6 Pre-Decision Scrutiny – Risk Management Update.** For the Committee to receive an update on risk management.

<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Background Documents</b>	<b>Contact Person/Team</b>
None	None	Pino Mastromarco

**3 – Task Group Updates**

**3.1 Task Group Update.** To receive an update from any meetings of the three Task Groups under the remit of the Committee.

<b>Consultation</b>	<b>Background Documents</b>	<b>Contact Person/Team</b>
None	None	Chairman of each Task Group

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting – 17 October 2022

### 1 – Performance Management

**1.1 Performance & Financial Monitoring Information.** For the Committee to consider the current publication of the Performance & Financial Monitoring Information (Green Book)

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Democratic Services

### 2 – Matters for Consideration

**2.1 Work Programme.** For the Committee to receive the updated Work Programme.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Democratic Services

**2.2 Centres for the Community.** To receive an update from the Family and Community Services Manager.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Adam Thomas

**2.3 Quarterly Noise Complaints Update.** The Committee to receive the Quarterly Noise Complaints Update.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Emma Bourne

### 3 – Task Group Updates

**3.1 Task Group Update.** To receive an update from any meetings of the three Task Groups under the remit of the Committee.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Chairman of each Task Group

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting – 21 November 2022

### 1 – Performance Management

**1.1 Performance & Financial Monitoring Information.** For the Committee to consider the current publication of the Performance & Financial Monitoring Information (Green Book)

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Democratic Services

### 2 – Matters for Consideration

**2.1 Work Programme.** For the Committee to receive the updated Work Programme.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Democratic Services

**2.2 Celebrate Woking 2022/2023 Review and Forward Plan.** For the Committee to receive the latest review of Celebrate Woking and the Forward Plan

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Riette Thomas

**2.3 Play Areas Provision.** For the Committee to receive the latest review of the Play Areas Provision.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Neighbourhood Services

**2.4 Treasury Management Mid-Year Review.** For the Committee to receive the Mid-Year Treasury Management Review

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Leigh Clarke

### 3 – Task Group Updates

**3.1 Task Group Update.** To receive an update from any meetings of the three Task Groups under the remit of the Committee.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Chairman of each Task Group

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting – 23 January 2023

### 1 – Performance Management

**1.1 Performance & Financial Monitoring Information.** For the Committee to consider the current publication of the Performance & Financial Monitoring Information (Green Book)

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Democratic Services

### 2 – Matters for Consideration

**2.1 Work Programme.** For the Committee to receive the updated Work Programme.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Democratic Services

**2.2 Joint Waste Management Performance Review.** For the Committee to receive the latest Performance Review of Joint Waste Management.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Neighbourhood Services

**2.3 Quarterly Noise Complaints Update.** The Committee to receive the Quarterly Noise Complaints Update.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Emma Bourne

### 3 – Task Group Updates

**3.1 Task Group Update.** To receive an update from any meetings of the three Task Groups under the remit of the Committee.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Chairman of each Task Group

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting – 20 February 2023

### 1 – Performance Management

**1.1 Performance & Financial Monitoring Information.** For the Committee to consider the current publication of the Performance & Financial Monitoring Information (Green Book)

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Democratic Services

### 2 – Matters for Consideration

**2.1 Work Programme.** For the Committee to receive the updated Work Programme.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Democratic Services

**2.2 Freedom of Information Requests Annual Report.** To review the statistics and requests that proceed to the Information Commissioners Office.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Natalie Khan Frank Jeffrey

**2.3 Overview of Complaints Received and Contract Review Annual Report.** A review of the complaints received over the past year and identify any trends.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Joanne McIntosh Adam Browne

**2.4 Enterprise M3.** The receive a presentation on the work carried out by Enterprise M3.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Stephen Martin Giorgio Framallicco

### 3 – Task Group Updates

**3.1 Task Group Update.** To receive an update from any meetings of the three Task Groups under the remit of the Committee.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Chairman of each Task Group

## Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting – 20 March 2023

### 1 – Performance Management

**1.1 Performance & Financial Monitoring Information.** For the Committee to consider the current publication of the Performance & Financial Monitoring Information (Green Book)

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Democratic Services

### 2 – Matters for Consideration

**2.1 Work Programme.** For the Committee to receive the updated Work Programme.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Democratic Services

**2.2 Safer Working Partnership – Community Safety Plan.** The Police and Justice Act 2006 gave local authorities responsibility for considering crime and disorder matters. In 2010 the Committee agreed that the Safer Working Partnership Plan would be brought forward annually for scrutiny.

Consultation	Consultation	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Camilla Edmiston

**2.3 Annual Report of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.**

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Chairman

**2.4 Annual Update on Climate Change.**

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Lara Beattie

### 3 – Task Group Updates

**3.1 Task Group Update.** To receive an update from any meetings of the three Task Groups under the remit of the Committee.

Consultation	Background Documents	Contact Person/Team
None	None	Chairman of each Task Group

**The Draft Executive Work Programme**

The following list sets out the draft forward programme of work for the Executive over the coming year. The programme is subject to additions and alterations and will be updated for future meetings of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The purpose of the list is to enable the Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to identify those items they would like to scrutinise under the Committee’s function of pre-decision scrutiny. The list includes those items for recommendation to Council as well as those for determination by the Executive.

**Executive – 14 July 2022**

**Matters for Consideration**

- 1) Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS)
- 2) Company Governance
- 3) Draft Town Centre Masterplan
- 4) Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) - Update
- 5) Equalities Annual Report - 2022
- 6) Performance and Financial Monitoring Information

**Executive – 8 September 2022**

**Matters for Consideration**

- 1) Animal Welfare Policy
- 2) Victoria Place – Six Months On
- 3) Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
- 4) Performance and Financial Monitoring Information

**Executive – 6 October 2022**

**Matters for Consideration**

- 1) Empty Homes Plan
- 2) Risk Management Update
- 3) Performance and Financial Monitoring Review
- 4) Confidentiality Protocol Annual Report
- 5) Performance and Financial Monitoring Information
- 6) Monitoring Reports - Projects

**Executive – 17 November 2022**

**Matters for Consideration**

- 1) Review of the Constitution
- 2) Thamesway Business Plans
- 3) Review of Fees and Charges 2023-24
- 4) Calendar of Meetings 2023-24
- 5) Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and General Fund Budget 2023-24
- 6) Draft Housing Revenue Account Budget Update 2023-24
- 7) Draft Investment Programme 2022-23 to 2026-27
- 8) Performance and Financial Monitoring Information

**Executive – 8 December 2022 (Special Meeting)**

**Matters for Consideration**

- 1) Grants for Voluntary and Community Organisations 2023/24

**Executive – 19 January 2023**

**Matters for Consideration**

- 1) Town Centre Masterplan
- 2) Performance and Financial Monitoring Information

**Executive – 2 February 2023**

**Matters for Consideration**

- 1) Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), General Fund, Service Plans, Budgets and Prudential Indicators 2023-24
- 2) Housing Revenue Account Budgets 2023-24
- 3) Investment Programme 2022-23 to 2026-27
- 4) Capital, Investment and Treasury Management Strategies
- 5) Performance and Financial Monitoring Information
- 6) Monitoring Reports - Projects

**Executive – 23 March 2023**

**Matters for Consideration**

- 1) Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
- 2) Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 – Annual Monitoring Report
- 3) Write off of Irrecoverable Debt
- 4) Performance and Financial Monitoring Information

**Current Task Groups Responsible to the Committee**

The table below provides a list of current Task Groups established by the Committee, including an indication of the resource requirements and the anticipated completion date. Updates on the progress of individual Task Groups are included elsewhere on the Committee's agenda.

<b>Economic Development Task Group</b>	
<b>Remit:</b>	<p>The Economic Development Task Group shall comprise seven Members of the Council representing all Groups on the Council based on proportionality. The Elected Members to be appointed annually by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in May. The Portfolio Holder for Promoting the Local Economy shall be an ex-officio member.</p> <p>Members of the Task Group will be expected to gain the views of Councillors/ Officers/ other representatives with a view to reporting those views to the Task Group.</p> <p>Members of the Task Group may also be charged with specific areas to research and report back on to the Task Group.</p> <p>Members of the Task Group may be expected to present proposals to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and, where necessary, prepare written reports.</p> <p>Substitutes may be appointed when necessary.</p>
<b>Membership:</b>	Councillors Akberali, Aziz, Davis, Elson, Morley, Oades, Roberts.
<b>Resources:</b>	Officer and Councillor time.
<b>Date Established:</b>	11.03.09
<b>Completion Date:</b>	Ongoing

<b>Finance Task Group</b>	
<b>Remit:</b>	<p>The Task Group has been established as a Standing Task Group to review financial issues as identified either by itself or the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Task Group will receive financial information, including reports to the Executive, to enable it to undertake effective scrutiny of the financial performance of the Council.</p> <p>The Task Group will receive reports on areas such as Treasury Management, Budget Process and Financial Forecast, Statement of Accounts, Investment Programme, Review of Fees and Charges, General Fund Budget, Update on Commercial Rents, Update on Irrecoverable Debt, and matters arising from the Green Book. Its Work Programme will be received at each Task Group meeting.</p>
<b>Membership:</b>	Councillors Akberali, Azad, Aziz, Davis, Kirby, Oades and Sanderson
<b>Resources:</b>	Officer and Councillor time.
<b>Date Established:</b>	25.05.06
<b>Completion Date:</b>	Ongoing

<b>HIF Task Group</b>	
<b>Remit:</b>	<p>The HIF Task Group has been established following the decision on 23 May 2022 to taking on the responsibilities of the Aggregates Site Working Group and the HIF Oversight Panel.</p> <p>The Task Group shall comprise seven Members of the Council representing all Groups on the Council based on proportionality. The Elected Members to be appointed annually by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in May.</p> <p>Members of the Task Group will be expected to gain the views of Councillors/ Officers/ Portfolio Holder / External Advisors and other representatives with a view to reporting those views to the Task Group.</p> <p>Members of the Task Group may also be charged with specific areas to research and report back on to the Task Group. Any investigation requiring funding would normally be expected to be part of the existing housing budget. Offsite visits will be ad hoc. Requests for additional funds for the purpose would be submitted to the Portfolio Holder.</p> <p>Task Group Members may be expected to present proposals to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and, where necessary, prepare written reports.</p>
<b>Membership:</b>	Councillors Akberali, Ali, Azad, Johnson, Kemp, Lyons and Nicholson.
<b>Resources:</b>	Officer and Councillor time.
<b>Date Established:</b>	23.05.22
<b>Completion Date:</b>	Ongoing

<b>HIF Housing Output Task Group</b>	
<b>Remit:</b>	<p>The HIF Housing Outputs Task Group has been established following the decision on 22 November 2022 to set-up a task group to look at the housing element of the Housing Infrastructure Fund. The Task group shall comprise seven Members of the Council representing all Groups on the Council based on proportionality.</p> <p>Members of the Task Group will be expected to gain the views of Councillors/ Officers/ Portfolio Holder / External Advisors and other representatives with a view to reporting those views to the Task Group.</p> <p>Members of the Task Group may also be charged with specific areas to research and report back on to the Task Group. Any investigation requiring funding would normally be expected to be part of the existing Overview and Scrutiny Budget. Offsite visits will be ad hoc.</p> <p>Task Group Members may be expected to present proposals to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and, where necessary, prepare written reports.</p>
<b>Membership:</b>	Councillors Akberali, Ali, Azad, Forster, Johnson, Kemp and Kirby.
<b>Resources:</b>	Officer and Councillor time.
<b>Date Established:</b>	24.01.22
<b>Completion Date:</b>	To be confirmed.

<b>Housing Task Group</b>	
<b>Remit:</b>	<p>The Housing Task Group shall comprise seven Members of the Council representing all Groups on the Council based on proportionality. The Elected Members to be appointed annually by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in May.</p> <p>Members of the Task Group will be expected to gain the views of Councillors/ Officers/ Portfolio Holder / External Advisors and other representatives with a view to reporting those views to the Task Group.</p> <p>Members of the Task Group may also be charged with specific areas to research and report back on to the Task Group. Any investigation requiring funding would normally be expected to be part of the existing housing budget. Offsite visits will be ad hoc. Requests for additional funds for the purpose would be submitted to the Portfolio Holder.</p> <p>Task Group Members may be expected to present proposals to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and, where necessary, prepare written reports.</p>
<b>Membership:</b>	Councillors Akberali, Aziz, Cosnahan, Dorsett, Johnson, Lyons and Whitehand.
<b>Resources:</b>	Officer and Councillor time.
<b>Date Established:</b>	25.05.06
<b>Completion Date:</b>	Ongoing

## Scrutiny Review Topic Selection

Set out below is a copy of the online form set up for Councillors to submit a Scrutiny Review Topic Selection for consideration at a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**This form must be completed in full with as much detail as possible.**

Your name:	Cllr Andy Caulfield	
Your email:	<a href="mailto:Cllrandy.caulfeld@woking.gov.uk">Cllrandy.caulfeld@woking.gov.uk</a>	
<b>Selection criteria</b>		
<b>Criteria for Scrutiny Review:</b>		
Scrutiny Review likely to result in improvements for local people.		X
Topic falls within a Community or Corporate priority.		X
Topic represents a key issue for the public.		X
A service is performing poorly.		
High level of dissatisfaction with a service.		
<b>Criteria for rejecting a Scrutiny Review Topic:</b>		
Topic already being addressed.		
Matter is subjudice or prejudicial to the Council's interests.		
Specific case falls within the Council's complaints procedure.		
Topic involves individual disciplinary or grievance matter.		
Proposed topic is unlikely to result in improvements for local people.		

If your proposed Scrutiny Review Topic falls under any of these rejection criteria, it may not be a suitable topic to progress.

<b>Outcomes of the Review</b>
<p>Why should the Scrutiny Review be undertaken?</p> <p>It is important that governance arrangements continue to be in line with current best practice. It is proposed to review the Council's Constitution and the practices and procedures contained within it. The Council's constitution provides that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, together with the Standards and Audit Committee, CLT, the Leader and Executive may be involved in any substantial review of the Constitution. In consultation with the Leader, a review has been scheduled to be undertaken and reported to Council in the Autumn. It is important that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is involved in this process to ensure cross party consideration</p>

and support for the review and any proposed amendments. A report and presentation to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee outlining the timetable for a review, detailing how the review is to be undertaken and providing an opportunity for feedback from the Committee should be forthcoming.	
What benefits could result from the Scrutiny Review?	
This review will support the Council's aim to deliver best value for the communities of the borough and to be a high performing council that you trust to make the right decisions for you and the borough in an open and transparent manner.	
What level of impact will the Scrutiny Review have?	
Substantial benefits community wide or for a significant proportion or section of the Community.	X
Moderate benefits for two or more client groups or substantial benefits for only one client group.	
Minor benefits for two or more client groups or substantial benefits for only one client group.	
Minor benefits for only one client groups.	
No benefits likely to result.	
<b>Topic Review Process</b>	
<b>Resources to be included in the Scrutiny Review:</b>	
WBC Officer Time Committee.	X
Report and/or presentation.	X
Councillor time.	X
Portfolio Holder Involvement.	X
Expert or External Representatives participation.	
Establishment of a Task Group.	
Site visits.	
Research and Evidence.	
Consultation Exercise.	X

Other  As discussed at O&S, and by Leader with CLT
Please add explanatory note for any resource selected above.
Please add any further information that you think would be useful in the consideration of this Scrutiny Review Topic.

Once submitted, if your Scrutiny Review Topic meets the selection criteria and enough information has been provided, it will be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at their next meeting, where they will decide whether to add the topic to their Work Programme.



## Scrutiny Review Topic Selection

Set out below is a copy of the online form set up for Councillors to submit a Scrutiny Review Topic Selection for consideration at a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**This form must be completed in full with as much detail as possible.**

Your name:	Kevin Davis
------------	-------------

Date Drafted:	14/06/2022
---------------	------------

Proposed Scrutiny Topic:	<p>A progress report on what the Council, including ThamesWey, has been, is doing and plans to do to ensure domestic properties meet modern energy efficiency standards, for the benefit of tenants and the environment. For example, through insulation. The report also to consider the contribution private development makes to the stock of energy efficient homes in the borough. In both respects, to understand any further steps that could be taken (and the associated costs, where these are known).</p>
--------------------------	--

<b>Selection criteria</b>	
If your proposed Scrutiny Review Topic falls under any of these rejection criteria, it may not be a suitable topic to progress	
<b>Criteria for Scrutiny Review:</b>	
Scrutiny Review likely to result in improvements for local people.	X
Topic falls within a Community or Corporate priority.	X
Topic represents a key issue for the public.	X
A service is performing poorly.	
High level of dissatisfaction with a service.	
<b>Criteria for rejecting a Scrutiny Review Topic:</b>	
Topic already being addressed.	
Matter is subjudice or prejudicial to the Council's interests.	
Specific case falls within the Council's complaints procedure.	
Topic involves individual disciplinary or grievance matter.	
Proposed topic is unlikely to result in improvements for local people.	

## Outcomes of the Review

### Why should the Scrutiny Review be undertaken?

The cost of living is increasing faster than wage growth currently. Many Council residents would benefit from well insulated and high energy efficiency performing housing. Understanding how far we've come would be important.

Developers building in Woking should be building to the highest standards possible in the context of current national planning and building requirements. The cost of property in Woking is high and the dwellings should benefit from the latest technologies to lower both the carbon footprint and the bills of residents.

Any further practical opportunities that the report can identify could assist these aims and be considered in more detail by the Greener Woking Working Group and, where appropriate, in conjunction with relevant partner organisations.

### What benefits could result from the Scrutiny Review?

Performing this scrutiny would ensure that helping tenants with the challenges of the costs of living and addressing climate change are kept at the highest priority level for the Council.

It will highlight existing good practice and potentially opportunities to consider in the future.

### What level of impact will the Scrutiny Review have?

Substantial benefits community wide or for a significant proportion or section of the Community.	X
Moderate benefits for two or more client groups or substantial benefits for only one client group.	
Minor benefits for two or more client groups or substantial benefits for only one client group.	
Minor benefits for only one client groups.	
No benefits likely to result.	

## Topic Review Process

### Resources to be included in the Scrutiny Review:

WBC Officer Time Committee.	Green Infrastructure, Housing, Planning and Property officers of the Borough Council and officers of ThamesWey.
Report and/or presentation.	Report on what's been achieved so far and what is planned.
Councillor time.	
Portfolio Holder Involvement.	

Expert or External Representatives participation.	Officers to consider how the views of the private sector on this topic can best be sought and reflected in the report, alongside those of the public sector.
Establishment of a Task Group.	Any further practical steps that the report can identify could be considered in more detail by and monitored through the Greener Working Working Group.
Site visits.	
Research and Evidence.	
Consultation Exercise.	
Other	
Please add explanatory note for any resource selected above.	
<p>Please add any further information that you think would be useful in the consideration of this Scrutiny Review Topic.</p> <p>Consideration of this item is suggested for the November meeting, as this would follow on naturally from the national energy price cap change announcement expected in October 2022.</p>	

Once submitted, if your Scrutiny Review Topic meets the selection criteria and enough information has been provided, it will be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at their next meeting, where they will decide whether to add the topic to their Work Programme.



## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 11 JULY 2022

### INTERIM PERFORMANCE AND FINANCIAL MONITORING REVIEW

#### Executive Summary

In March 2022 a report was submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) Committee which outlined the scope of a review of performance and financial monitoring. It was agreed that an interim report would go back to the O&S Committee in July to outline initial findings, with a final report scheduled for submission in September.

Over the last several weeks, work has been underway to map performance management best practice elsewhere across Surrey. The project team has also begun the process of engaging internal stakeholders, both Councillors and officers, to gather ideas as to how performance and financial management can be enhanced.

There are a number of early highlights based on initial consultation with stakeholders and known best practice elsewhere. Initial highlights include: restructuring performance management to better reflect the Council, making sure the right KPI's are used and ensuring that information goes to the right committee, reassessing the frequency of monitoring reports, making sure the information is user friendly, and revisiting the use of the 'Green Book' name.

Good progress has been made but there is still much to do. The purpose of this report is to provide a detailed update on current activity, and to seek the views of the O&S Committee in relation initial findings and proposed next steps, which will help to inform the next stage of the review.

#### Recommendations

The Committee is requested to:

**RESOLVE That** the report be noted.

The Committee has the authority to determine the recommendation set out above.

**Background Papers:** None.

**Reporting Person:** Adam Walther, Head of Transformation and Digital  
Email: adam.walther@woking.gov.uk, Extn: 3335

**Contact Person:** Adam Walther, Head of Transformation and Digital  
Email: adam.walther@woking.gov.uk, Extn: 3335  
Pino Mastromarco, Corporate Strategy Manager  
Email: pino.mastromarco@woking.gov.uk, Extn: 3464

**Portfolio Holder:** Councillor Ann-Marie Barker  
Email: cllrann-marie.barker@woking.gov.uk

## Interim Financial and Performance Monitoring Review

**Shadow Portfolio Holder:** Councillor Ayesha Azad  
Email: [cilrayesha.azad@woking.gov.uk](mailto:cilrayesha.azad@woking.gov.uk)

**Date Published:** 1 July 2022

### 1.0 Background

- 1.1 Dr Gifty Edila's Report and Local Government Association Corporate Peer Challenge Action Plan was agreed at Full Council on 10 February 2022. A key recommendation was to undertake a review of the Green Book, as well as wider performance management across the Council, to ensure that the correct mechanisms are in place to properly measure performance in relation to the key priorities of the Council as stated in the Woking For All Strategy.
- 1.2 A report was submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny (O&S) Committee in March 2022, which outlined the objectives and scope of the review. This included:
  - A review of the Green Book and performance monitoring overall, including governance, decision making and the use of technology to improve usability and transparency.
  - Exploration of the 'what?' of performance and financial monitoring. Are current measures fit for purpose? Are we measuring the right things to inform decision making? Is there a clear, evidence-based link between our intended outcomes and our measures? What works well, what is missing?
  - Exploration of the 'how?' of performance and financial monitoring. How is reporting currently done? What works well, and what methods and tools could be used to improve the process, and how information is presented?
- 1.3 It was agreed that an interim report would go back to the O&S Committee in July to outline initial findings and key lines of enquiry, with the final report scheduled for submission in September. Final decision making on any proposed changes will be determined by the Executive.

### 2.0 Current situation

- 2.1 The Green Book in its current form has been used within the Council for well over a decade. During this time little has changed in relation to the gathering and reporting of Key Performance Indicators (KPI's), other than the occasional addition/removal of a KPI. In recent times there have been additions to the Financial Management section of the Green Book at the request of Councillors, specific examples being the inclusion of the Strategic Property Investments and Sheerwater sections.
- 2.2 The Green Book is monitored by a number of different groups and Committees. This includes submission to the O&S Committee, Financial Task Group, and the Executive. CLT monitor the Green Book at Officer level. The Green Book is published monthly on the Woking Borough Council website.
- 2.3 The Green Book is comprised of four distinct sections which are 'owned' and provided separately by different teams/colleagues both in and outside the Council. Each section is managed and produced in a different way. A breakdown of each section is as follows:
  - Section 1 (Performance Indicators) is managed by the Business Improvement Team. On the last Friday of every month Business Improvement will remind all KPI owners within the Council to update a central spreadsheet with the previous months outturn. The deadline for completion is the first Tuesday of every month.
  - Section 2 (Financial Management Information) is managed and produced by Finance. There are 11 different reports in this section that are managed by various Business Support Managers. The Major Variations section is jointly updated across the team depending on where the variation falls. Business Support Managers work with functional leads across the Council each month to provide an explanation for variances. Finance will send an excel spreadsheet on completion to Business Improvement for inclusion.

## Interim Financial and Performance Monitoring Review

- Section 3 (Treasury Management) is owned and managed by Finance colleagues who produce the reports in a combination of excel and pdf formats and send it to Business Improvement for inclusion.
  - Section 4 (Thamesway Group) is owned and managed by external Thamesway colleagues who produce the reports in excel and send to Business Improvement for inclusion.
- 2.4 Business Improvement collates the four sections once received, using a combination of word, excel and OneNote applications and then produces a pdf copy. This draft is submitted to CLT for comment. Business Improvement will adjust the draft to reflect all comments and queries and a final version of the Green Book is created and published to CLT and the relevant committees/groups.
- 2.5 The Green Book is produced every month other than April and May, which is combined within the June publication. The process to compile each section is manual for all contributors, and a great deal of Officer time around the Council is expended in both the gathering/insertion of data, as well as the compilation and publishing of the document itself by Business Improvement.

### 3.0 Research to date

- 3.1 Work is underway to map performance management best practice elsewhere across Surrey. This assessment includes:
- What approach other authorities take in relation to performance management i.e., the nature, content, and frequency of their Green Book equivalent.
  - Who is the information shared with and what governance is in place?
  - What information does WBC capture and report that other authorities do not? Equally, what information do other authorities capture that WBC might benefit from?
  - Full findings of the desktop research will be appended to the final report.
- 3.2 To inform the direction and content of the review, the project team has/will consult with the following stakeholders:
- All councillors will be engaged via email to contribute if they wish. Cllr Ann-Marie Barker (Leader), Cllr Azad (Chairman of the O&S Committee), and Cllr Sanderson (Vice-Chairman of the O&S Committee) will be directly engaged.
  - Members of the O&S Committee will have additional opportunity to engage via the O&S meetings in July and September.
  - CLT – discussed at its meeting on 20 June.
  - Finance colleagues (Leigh Clarke and Neil Haskell) have been consulted and an email will be sent to senior managers and those involved in the Green Book process.
  - Performance Management leads at other Surrey Borough and Districts.

## Interim Financial and Performance Monitoring Review

### 4.0 Initial highlights for O&S to consider:

- 4.1 There are a number of early highlights based on initial consultation with stakeholders and known best practice elsewhere. The view of the O&S Committee on the points below would be very welcome and would help to inform the next stage of the review. Highlights include:
- 4.2 **Structuring collation/reporting around Directorates:** Restructuring performance and financial information around the Council's three Directorates would reinforce the relevance of Directorate Service Plans and provide a clearer link to the Woking For All Strategy. This approach would move towards a merging of KPI and financial information to provide a service-by-service narrative. This directorate-based approach has been applied to corporate risk and project management, and would provide clearer accountability at Strategic Director level.
- 4.3 **Having the right KPI's:** Ensuring that the right performance management data is collected and reported included in any publication and that these are strategic in nature and linked to the priorities in the Woking For All Strategy.
- 4.4 **In year financial monitoring:** The Green Book currently monitors budgets by variation or exception, which is a good way to focus on areas of concern or anomaly. A way to build on this approach might be to also monitor budgets on actual spend vs. planned or profiled spend – this will allow officers and Councillors to identify overspends or issues in advance of end of year reconciliation. Reporting 'actuals' against budgets throughout the year is not something that can easily/accurately be provided currently, but further investigation as to how we can work towards this ambition can be undertaken if deemed worthwhile.
- 4.5 **Separating out financial monitoring:** Do all financial elements need to be included and published as part of the performance management regime, or could some financial elements be submitted separately to the Financial Task Group or other committee as required?
- 4.6 **Frequency:** Woking Borough Council is the only authority in Surrey to produce and publish performance management reports on a monthly-basis – the majority of authorities do this on a quarterly or 6 monthly basis, with formal published reports often being compiled annually. A quarterly report, but with a more focused narrative may provide greater insight to Councillors and officers, whilst reducing the monthly burden on all contributors.
- 4.7 **Accessible Information:** The Green Book in its current form is very technical in nature which can often mean that it is not perceived as 'user friendly'. The document should be a tool for Councillors and officers to quickly see how the Council is performing, and equip them with the necessary information to answer queries from residents.
- 4.8 **Change the name:** The current title of 'Green Book' is not very clear for stakeholders, so the adoption of a clearer, more relevant name should be considered.

### 5.0 Next steps/lines of enquiry

- 5.1 The review will continue throughout July and August, and it is planned to investigate a number of additional areas which will feed into the final report to the O&S Committee in September. The proposed lines of enquiry include:
- 5.2 **Centralising:** KPI's are collected around the Council in a devolved way i.e., Housing capture KPI's and produce a monitoring report as does Health & Wellbeing. It is likely that other sections within the Council do the same, but this has not been mapped. It will be useful to investigate the extent of de-centralised performance management across the Council and whether this leads to duplication or missed opportunities in relation to the consolidation of information.

## Interim Financial and Performance Monitoring Review

- 5.3 **Centre of excellence:** Depending on the findings of 6.2, we will explore whether there is merit in providing a central hub or centre of excellence to support teams across the Council. Would it be useful to have all KPI's created and managed on the same system? Will this produce efficiencies and facilitate better corporate awareness and management information?
- 5.4 **Group Company monitoring:** We will work with Legal as part of the Group Company Governance Review to ensure that recommendations align with any newly adopted corporate performance monitoring framework.
- 5.5 **Tools:** Explore the use of systems that could be used to more efficiently compile performance management data. Options to consider include (1) continue as is i.e., excel, OneNote (2) bespoke performance management systems used by other authorities (3) utilising new internal technology from Microsoft such as 'Power BI' (4) hybrid/combination of the above options. An assessment of all options will be undertaken with the emphasis being on using currently licenced tools wherever possible to achieve value for money.
- 5.6 **Resources:** Any additional up-front work or longer-term resources (from both the Business Improvement and Finance teams), required to set-up or maintain any enhanced performance management arrangements will also be mapped and included with any final recommendations.

### 6.0 Conclusion

- 6.1 Good progress has been made but there is still much to do. The additional lines of enquiry will be undertaken throughout July and August and full recommendations will be made to the O&S Committee in September.
- 6.2 The views of all stakeholders, especially the O&S Committee and all Councillors whose role it is to monitor the performance of the Council, will be key in ensuring that the outcomes from this work delivers tangible enhancements to current processes.

### 7.0 Corporate Strategy

- 7.1 Robust performance and financial monitoring underpins the effective delivery of the functions that the Council provides, which in turn supports the objectives listed in the Woking for all Strategy. A cross cutting theme in the Woking for all strategy is a 'High Performing Council', and this review will help to achieve one of the stated priorities which is to 'develop and strengthen strategic and financial planning and performance'.

### 8.0 Implications

#### Finance and Risk

- 8.1 No additional implications arise specifically from this report.

#### Equalities and Human Resources

- 8.2 None arising from this report.

#### Legal

- 8.3 None arising from this report.

### 9.0 Engagement and Consultation

- 9.1 Engagement and consultation with both Councillors and Officers are a key requirement of this review. The extent and nature of engagement is outlined in more detail at section 3.2 above.

REPORT ENDS

## OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 11 JULY 2022

### QUARTERLY NOISE COMPLAINTS UPDATE

#### Executive Summary

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a Notice of Motion at its meeting on 7 June 2021, whereby a decision was made to adopt changes to Environmental Health's reporting procedures with regards to construction noise complaints and applications for Prior Consent Notices.

It was agreed that Ward Councillors would be consulted on applications for Prior Consent Notice for noisy works outside of the permitted hours and that a quarterly report be prepared and submitted to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee providing details of noise complaints received.

This report sets out the number of noise and dust complaints that the Council's Environmental Health service received per quarter since June 2021. It also summarises the number of applications for Prior Consent Notices received and total consultations to have taken place with Ward Councillors within this time.

It is proposed that this report is submitted every 6 months, rather than quarterly, going forward, to provide a better overview of trends and complaint numbers.

#### Recommendations

The Committee is requested to:

##### **RESOLVE That**

- (i) the report be received; and
- (ii) the information presented in this report be considered as part of the wider Performance and Financial Monitoring Review and until agreed otherwise be submitted every 6 months rather than quarterly.

The Committee has the authority to determine the recommendation(s) set out above.

<b>Background Papers:</b>	OSC21-016 Pre-scrutiny on EXE21-050 – Councillor L Lyons – Construction Site Noise Limits, received by O&S Committee on 7 July 2021.
<b>Reporting Person:</b>	Giorgio Framalico, Strategic Director - Place Email: giorgio.framalico@woking.gov.uk, Extn: 3440
<b>Contact Person:</b>	Emma Bourne, Environmental Health Manager Email: emma.bourne@woking.gov.uk, Extn: 3654
<b>Portfolio Holder:</b>	Councillor Liam Lyons Email: cllrliam.lyons@woking.gov.uk
<b>Shadow Portfolio Holder:</b>	Councillor Gary Elson Email: cllrgary.elson@woking.gov.uk

**Date Published:** 1 July 2022

### 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 At its meeting on 11 February 2021, the Council referred a Notice of Motion submitted by Councillor Lyons, which dealt with the limitation on noise from construction sites, to the Executive.
- 1.2 The Executive considered the Motion at its meeting on 25 March 2021 and recommended to Council that the Motion be not supported.
- 1.3 At Council on 8 April 2021, it was resolved that the Motion be deferred to enable it to be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 7 June 2021, and the Executive at its meeting on 17 June 2021, with a view to the matter being brought back to Council in July 2021.
- 1.4 The Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the Motion at its meeting again on 7 June 2021. The views of the Committee were of such that the existing process is fit for purpose, but that additional steps could be taken by Environmental Health to consolidate existing arrangements; including consulting with Ward Councillors on applications for Prior Consent, improving communication with residents and presenting a quarterly report to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee providing details of noise complaints received.
- 1.5 These recommendations were reported to the Executive on 17 June 2021 and approved.

### 2.0 Complaints Data

- 2.1 Since the implementation of the new reporting requirements, Environmental Health have provided The Committee with a detailed overview and analysis of complaints data relating to construction and plant noise, backdated to 1 January 2020.
- 2.2 The data provided contains all noise and dust pollution complaints made to Environmental Health, broken down by quarter and complaint type. The data captured is a record of every complaint made under the category of construction noise / plant & machinery noise. It is therefore worth noting that one-off complaints that have either not been substantiated, or have not required any further investigation, will also be captured in these figures.
- 2.3 A record of all noise and dust complaints received, along with a log of Section 60 and 61 Notices issued, is maintained by the Environmental Health Service, and updated on a regular basis. A breakdown of the figures can be found attached in [Appendix 1 and 2].
- 2.4 In summary, 102 complaints were made in 2021, 19 Prior Consent Notices were issued to contractors for out of hours working and 4 Section 60 Notices were issued, imposing noise control requirements on contractors found to be working out of hours, without a Section 61 Agreement in place. 31 of the complaints made in 2021 were domestic noise complaints (primarily neighbours complaining about noise from house renovations), 25 were complaints about noise from Town Centre construction, 3 related to other Council developments (namely Wells Court and Hale End) and 10 were about the Sheerwater development. There were 7 dust complaints in total, 3 of which related to the Days Aggregates yard.
- 2.5 37 noise complaints have been received between 1 January and 24 June 2022. 20 of those were residential/ domestic noise complaints about building works to properties and 12 were about noise from the Town Centre. At least 2 of the Town Centre complaints were new retail units being put in, another 2 were emergency works, and one complaint was made prior to any works commencing. The remaining 5 noise complaints were one-off complaints about Total Concrete, SCC Emergency works, the Sheerwater Development site, Days Aggregates and Worplesdon Golf Club, all of which were rectified by an approach from an Officer from Environmental Health.

### 3.0 Prior Consent Notices

- 3.1 The total number of Prior Consent Notices (PCNs) that Environmental Health have issued for out of hours noisy works, granted to take place outside of the permitted hours of 8am – 6pm Mon to Fri and 8am – 1pm on Saturdays, are listed in Appendix 1.
- 3.2 In 2020, 18 Prior Consent Notices were issued and a total of 2 section 60 Notices were served for breaches to these regulations.
- 3.3 In 2021, 19 Prior Consent Notices were issued and 4 section 60 Notices were served.
- 3.4 Since the start of the year, and up to 24 June 2022, 10 Prior Consent Notices have been issued and 2 Section 60 Notices have been served so far.
- 3.5 Ward Councillors have now been consulted on 19 applications for prior consent, in addition to being notified of other statutory/ emergency works when Environmental Health are made aware of them. Only 1 representation has been made in this time, regarding an application for Town Centre works.
- 3.6 Delegated Authority Forms are completed for all Notices issued to ensure the information is readily available for the public to view on the Woking Borough Council website.
- 3.7 It would also be appropriate to consider how best to present numbers of noise and dust complaints, and PCNs served, to members as part of the Performance and Financial Monitoring Review.

### 4.0 Corporate Strategy

- 4.1 The additional measures arising from this report will support delivery of the corporate plan objectives for sustainable development and a strong economy whilst increasing transparency for residents.
- 4.2 Other corporate priorities, as outlined in the Corporate Strategy, have been met through engagement and consultation improvements by subsequently improving communication, rapport and the health and wellbeing of Borough residents.

### 5.0 Implications

#### Finance and Risk

- 5.1 There are no financial or risk management issues arising from this report.

#### Equalities and Human Resources

- 5.2 No human resource or training and development issues are arising from this paper.

#### Legal

- 5.3 Environmental Health have undertaken the necessary statutory, procedural and policy steps available to the Council and there are no legal implications which arise from this report.

### 6.0 Engagement and Consultation

- 6.1 The Council's Portfolio Holder, Councillor Lyons, and professional environmental health bodies have been engaged in the preparation of this report.

6.2 The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was consulted in the preparation of this report.

REPORT ENDS



Quarterly Reporting  
Construction site **NOISE**- Notices Served

Q u a r t e r	Month/ Year	Total Complaints	S.60 Notices Served	S.61 PCNs Served	Total emails to Cllrs
2020					
Q1	Jan - Mar 20	21	2	18	N/A
Q2	April - June 20	49			
Q3	July - Sept 20	35			
Q4	Oct - Dec 20	21			
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>126</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18</b>	
2021					
Q1	Jan - Mar 21	29	1	3	n/a
Q2	April - June 21	26	1	5	n/a
Q3	Jul - Sept 21	31	2	4	3
Q4	Oct - Dec 21	16	0	7	7
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>102</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>19</b>	
2022					
Q1	Jan - Mar 22	10	2	4	7 (3 of which were informatives for emergency works)
Q2	April - June 22	27	0	6	5 (Cllrs were consulted on the other S.61 in Q1)
Q3	July - Sept 22				
Q4	Oct - Dec 22				
2023					
Q1	Jan - Mar 23				
Q2	April - June 23				
Q3	July - Sept 23				
Q4	Oct - Dec 23				

Quarterly Reporting  
Construction site **DUST** Notices Served

Q u a r t e r	Month/ Year	Total Complaints	S.60 Notices Served	S.61 PCNs Served
2020				
Q1	Jan - Mar 20	2	0	0
Q2	April - June 20	4		
Q3	July - Sept 20	4		
Q4	Oct - Dec 20	2		
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>12</b>		
2021				
Q1	Jan - Mar 21	1	0	0
Q2	April - June 21	4	0	0
Q3	Jul - Sept 21	1	0	0
Q4	Oct - Dec 21	1	0	0
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>7</b>		
2022				
Q1	Jan - Mar 22	1	0	0
Q2	April - June 22	2	0	0
Q3	July - Sept 22			
Q4	Oct - Dec 22			
2023				
Q1	Jan - Mar 23			
Q2	April - June 23			
Q3	July - Sept 23			
Q4	Oct - Dec 23			







OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 11 JULY 2022

## HIF HOUSING OUTPUTS TASK GROUP INTERIM REPORT

### Executive Summary

The Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) is a Government capital grant programme which seeks to support the delivery of new and 'additional' housing development above that set out in the Local Plan. The Council entered into an agreement in 2020 which secured a £95m grant to support the delivery of a replacement to the Victoria Arch over the A320 Guildford Road. The improvement would provide additional pedestrian, cycle and road capacity which would 'unlock' further housing development in the town centre. A potential 4,555 homes would be constructed across thirteen sites. Of the total above, 1,251 homes corresponds to dwellings in sites currently allocated for development in the adopted Site Allocations Development Plan Document. This leaves a further 3,304 additional dwellings to be built in the Town Centre over-and-above what has been committed to in terms of planning in the Core Strategy. It should be noted that 620 homes within this total would be developed on Council owned sites and because of this there is a requirement to deliver these housing outputs from a contractual perspective.

A prominent risk to the future delivery of these housing outputs is that the sites are proposed to deliver above that set out in the Local Plan. It should be noted that all nationwide HIF projects were awarded on the basis that they would support the delivery of additional housing above that set out in the relevant local plans and /or housing need targets.

The task group identified other key risks including:

- The agreement of the Executive to consult on the number of homes proposed for the town centre as part of the Town Centre Masterplan and the uncertainty that this presents; and
- the potential for changed housing requirements in the time that has elapsed since the agreement.

The agreement between Homes England and Woking Borough Council (WBC) distinguishes between types of non-delivery of housing outputs. This can be summarised by the difference between WBC failing to deliver housing outputs on sites owned by third parties, despite its 'best endeavours' versus WBC failing to deliver housing outputs on sites owned by WBC-itself or its companies.

As with any significant contractual arrangement there are risks associated with non-delivery. There is also an additional financial risk of non-delivery of housing outputs due to current assumptions budgeting for around £10 million in developer contributions to the project. Other impacts of non-delivery include the potential opportunity costs of officer time and other resources, given the ongoing extension of the delivery timeline.

To date, partial mitigations of these risks include the beginning of work towards a Masterplan for Woking town centre, alongside ongoing improvements to the project management of the broader HIF project – including additional oversight of infrastructure changes that could impact on housing outputs.

The Task Group's research identified mitigations which reduce these risks and include building on the relationship with Homes England, the progression of the masterplan and improved project management of the wider HIF project.

At this stage the task group could either continue or pause to allow the town centre masterplan to be published and, if necessary the group could recommence later in the year as set out in this report.

## Recommendations

The Task Group is requested to consider the following interim outputs:

1. To note the work to date of the group including the detailed and informed observations to date;
2. The Housing Task Group recognise the gap between the housing level proposed in the local plan and that set out by the HIF project and support the delivery of the town centre masterplan and its adoption as supplementary planning guidance in order to influence and support high quality sustainable development;
3. To endorse the Executive's position to undertake a full detailed consultation and engagement process on the town centre masterplan including the potential scale of housing development proposed;
4. To note the current mitigation in place and to recommend to the HIF Task Group that measures be continued.
5. The group may wish to further consider affordable housing outputs of the HIF project or ask the Housing Task Group to consider what actions could be taken to secure the maximum level of affordable housing from the new development taking place given the overall need for significant new affordable homes.
6. That the task group could be reinstated later in the year, if needed, or the HIF Task Group be asked to review the site specific information coming forward as part of the masterplan proposals and expand on specific site-by-site assessment of HIF housing outputs ahead of a potential renegotiation of the contract with Homes England.

**Background Papers:**None

**Reporting Person:** Councillor Adam Kirby  
Email: [cllradam.kirby@woking.gov.uk](mailto:cllradam.kirby@woking.gov.uk)

**Contact Person:** Councillor Adam Kirby  
Email: [cllradam.kirby@woking.gov.uk](mailto:cllradam.kirby@woking.gov.uk)

**Portfolio Holder:** Councillor Ian Johnson  
Email: [cllrian.johnson@woking.gov.uk](mailto:cllrian.johnson@woking.gov.uk)

**Shadow Portfolio Holder:** Councillor Steve Dorsett  
Email: [cllrsteve.dorsett@woking.gov.uk](mailto:cllrsteve.dorsett@woking.gov.uk)

**Date Published:** 1 July 2022

## **1.0 Additional housing outputs required by HIF**

Woking Borough Council has accepted a Housing and Infrastructure Fund (HIF) award of £95M to replace Victoria Arch and associated infrastructure. The award is based on additional housing coming forward above that set out in the Local Plan. The HIF award requires Woking Borough Council (WBC) to deliver housing on three of its own sites and use its best endeavours to deliver housing on ten further sites owned by third parties.

WBC has also taken on the financial responsibility for the project.

Across all thirteen agreed sites, these agreed housing outputs amount to an additional 3,304 homes above the Local Plan proposals of 1,251 new dwellings.

WBC-owned sites represent 620 dwellings within this target (The Triangle (300) + Concorde / Griffin House) 200 and Poole Road (120)) of which 123 have so far been committed to in the WBC core strategy (90+0+33). The difference of 497 dwellings on WBC-owned sites has a particular importance in terms of potential impacts of non-delivery, outlined below.

All these additional homes were originally agreed to be completed by an initial target date of 2030, however some mitigations on timeframe have since been discussed as the partnership with Homes England has developed. No project is currently at the stage of delivering housing.

## **2.0 Risks to successful delivery of HIF housing outputs**

Officers have provided the task group with a helpful summary of some initial Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis of the HIF housing outputs (see Appendix I). This report builds on a few of the most considerable elements in terms of risks, alongside mitigations further below.

### 2.1 Planning Guidance

WBC officers and officers at Homes England have confirmed that the HIF agreement has no formal planning status unlike a supplementary planning document or development plan document and therefore carries limited weight in the determination of a planning application. The determination of a planning application is based on its accordance with the local plan and other material considerations. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does list infrastructure as a factor contributing to sustainable development. However, the same NPPF's "presumption in favour of sustainable development" would only apply were WBC to be lacking a plan to meet future housing needs – rather than enabling planning permission for any applications beyond this requirement.

In the Task Group's discussion on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2022, WBC planning officer advice further clarified that whilst HIF could be "a material consideration" in the determination of a planning application it should not override Local Plan policies and adopted planning guidance. Therefore there is a risk that development proposals seeking a significantly higher housing number above that in the Local Plan may not necessarily be as certain as proposals that seek the same or similar levels of housing. However, the Local Plan does not prohibit development above that set out in the Local Plan and the key issue would be whether the proposed development represented sustainable development taking into account the benefits of delivering new homes and the overall design of the proposal.

The Housing Task Group recognise the gap between the housing level proposed in the local plan and that set out by the HIF project and support the delivery of the town centre masterplan and its adoption as supplementary planning guidance in order to influence and support high quality sustainable development.

## 2.2 HIF and the town centre masterplan:

In the 'SWOT' analysis provided for the Task Group, officers have identified a degree of political uncertainty and in particular a perception that major developments in Woking town centre have been "done to" residents as a relative weakness of the HIF housing outputs. It is also notable that a 'key risk' identified by WBC's separate (infrastructure-focused) HIF Oversight Panel is the "political acceptance of the project for housing delivery". Members are aware of a broad discontent among some (note: not all) residents, evident online and in local media, with the existing development of the town centre.

A Motion recommended by Full Council in April 2021 to the Executive, called for better consultation around the HIF project. Subsequently, the Executive recommended on 17<sup>th</sup> June 2021 that the HIF housing requirement become part of the upcoming Masterplan consultation. This is both a helpful potential mitigation (see below) and in the meantime also presents some risks.

On 21<sup>st</sup> July 2021 the original motion submitted by Cllr T Aziz was passed by means of a named vote and became a resolution of Woking Borough Council. Importantly this motion – and hence resolved policy of WBC since this date – stipulates that:

1. The HIF scheme housing to be put to public consultation with full honest disclosures.
2. The Council cease to make any further promises on HIF to any bodies until such consultation is complete.
3. The council re-assess the scheme's housing targets under new market conditions, (especially post COVID) public opinion and if needed is open to renegotiations with central government.

The Housing Output Task Group noted that the future masterplan will be a key document in shaping the town and the overall scale of development coming forward including the scale of housing development. The Executive have agreed that the masterplan will consider the scale of housing development proposed and once adopted as a supplementary planning document will be a 'material consideration' in future planning decisions giving a vision and an agreed plan to residents, businesses and investors about the future of the town centre and at the same time providing strong planning guidance to inform future investment. Homes England have made it clear that they fully support the delivery of the masterplan and that the outcome may in fact lead to fewer homes coming forward, accept that without a clear and certain plan in place there is likely to be less investment into the town.

In order to give certainty to the HIF project and inform any future renegotiation on housing delivery with Homes England it is essential that there is a detailed engagement and consultation exercise undertaken on the plan with residents.

## 2.3 Unclear premise of housing 'unlocked' by HIF involvement:

Broader approval of housing outputs will require a clear explanation of the project's purpose and mechanisms for success. In the official description of HIF funding, the purpose is to unlock "housing that would not otherwise be built" were the associated infrastructure not also constructed. This premise is mirrored in various WBC documents shared with the Local Development Framework Working Group, such as the report by the Planning Inspector to WBC on the Examination of the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (dated August 2021). Such a purpose to unlock housing that would not be otherwise possible without extra infrastructure is also mentioned in the HIF bid documents submitted by WBC.

Officers clarified to members of this group that housing 'unlocked' by HIF should be considered housing enabled in terms of its infrastructure (transport) provision, but not enabled in any complete sense of overcoming other planning matters that may exist for that particular development.

## 2.4 Uniqueness of Woking HIF scheme

Homes England have described the WBC project as rather unique – in that there are not many direct comparators for Woking given that it is based in the town centre and housing delivery is from multiple sites. Quoting directly, it was explained to the group that “Woking is almost unique as a HIF scheme, in a town centre, across multiple sites and with a majority of un-owned sites.”

This uniqueness can be seen both as a sign of ambition but may also be a potential risk given the lack of analogies for mitigations of any unforeseen risks. Its uniqueness makes a comparative study with other HIF projects difficult to complete and to draw beneficial conclusions.

## 2.5 Incorporation of targets for affordable housing outputs

Members of the task group have been interested in exploring the affordable housing outputs specifically. Officers have made clear that the HIF agreement itself does not require any specified Affordable Housing outputs. This means that this is not an additional area of risk for WBC.

The group may wish to further consider affordable housing outputs of the HIF project or ask the Housing Task Group to consider what actions could be taken to secure the maximum level of affordable housing from the new development taking place given the overall need for significant new affordable homes. This needs to be seen in the context that some key developments to date have not secured the full level of affordable housing given development viability issues.

## 2.6 Changing housing needs since original HIF proposal

So far, this group has not been able to dedicate sufficient time to this aspect of its Terms of Reference, though this element has been agreed upon by members as a potential additional risk to HIF housing outputs. In particular, broader economic changes and post-pandemic social changes may further impact any one of: demand for different types of tenure, size and design of dwelling; appetite among developers to invest locally; viability and construction costs; or any other as-yet-unknown factor.

It is however, noted that a detailed study has been produced as evidence to support the town centre masterplan and it is understood that the outcome of the study confirms that there is a need for flatted accommodation in the town centre. This study will influence the masterplan.

## **3.0 Potential impacts of non-delivery**

### 3.1 Financial risks

As with most contractual agreement there is a procedure in place to manage and monitor the outputs and a process to take action to mitigate where those outputs are unlikely to be delivered. Officers from WBC and Homes England explained that there was very close working between the partners in respect of both the infrastructure and housing outputs. In relation to housing, while the council cannot directly insist on housing sites coming forward for development it can manage development on its own land and is required to bring three sites forward for housing.

Ultimately there is a risk of a default on the agreement and where this is likely to be the case officers from across the organisation will work collaboratively to find solutions. As pointed out by Homes England, the HIF agreement preceded covid, a significant and unparalleled event. It is evident that the Council's action to remedy housing delivery are fundamentally linked to the masterplan – the delivery of the masterplan itself being recognised as a key tool to secure future sustainable development. Nonetheless there is a risk that if the Council were to act unreasonably the full grant could have to be paid back.

### 3.2 Additional financial impact of non-delivery – due to uncertainty of developer contributions

A further £10m Council contribution to the HIF project budget is expected to be met through developer contributions, otherwise it would need to be funded by the Council through borrowing or other means.

In line with this approximate amount, the Investment Programme recently referenced £9.2 million of “temporary borrowing” at an annual cost of over £400,000 by the end of the term of the Medium-Term Financial Strategy. It was described in this document that “this would be reduced if developer contributions were secured”. An example of this is the development approved for Goldsworth Road (Ecoworld) which has secured over £1.8m towards HIF.

## **4.0 Mitigations of risks to date**

The Task Group enquired as the current arrangements in place to mitigate risks and noted the following key elements. These activities are important and will remain so going forward.

### 4.1 Building of pragmatic working relationship with Homes England

The group heard from Jon Medlin representing Homes England (HE) about how WBC and HE had developed a better and more flexible relationship since the earlier stages of the project. Discussions are now much more flexible and pragmatic, which is a positive development and testament to the skills of WBC officers.

This is an important mitigation in terms of creating more time to solve potential risks to the delivery of housing outputs.

### 4.2 Initial work towards a unified Town Centre Masterplan

Woking’s development and subsequent approval by Full Council in late-2021 of a renewed Site Allocations Development Plan Document can itself – to some extent – be considered a mitigation of the uncertainty around the status of HIF housing output sites.

While this does not resolve the differences between housing outputs specific by the HIF and the site allocations, its presence at least crystallises the status of these sites and provides a foundation for further work to reduce these potential differences in dwelling numbers.

### 4.3 Improved project management for other aspects of the HIF project

Since January 2021 and as recommended by consultants Mazars, WBC is now running a “formal change request and approval process and change log” for the broader HIF project. This should help better record and consider any future renegotiations of housing outputs, and of changes to infrastructure elements with impacts on housing outputs.

While this does not directly mitigate all the risks mentioned above, it does increase the chances of any areas of concern being identified at a high level in WBC at an earlier stage.

## **5.0 Way forward:**

Following the findings of the group, a number of recommendations are made for including a recommendation to the Executive and or the Housing Task Group (in relation to affordable housing).

This Task Group originally wanted to the completion of a comparative study of HIF housing outputs in other authorities using the time of the Scrutiny Officer and/or budget for such external work allocated to Overview & Scrutiny. This could help identify both additional risks to housing outputs

and potential mitigations. However, the lack of any directly related HIF projects makes this a challenging task and one that may have limited benefit to the Group's understanding of the housing outputs arising from the project.

The task group could be reinstated later in the year, if needed to review the site specific information coming forward as part of the masterplan proposals and expand on specific site-by-site assessment of HIF housing outputs, including but not limited to density, site design etc. Should this be required the table of sites previously developed could be updated with up to date information at that point in time.

Six detailed outputs are set out for consideration by the Task Group. If approved these outputs would be reported to the next Overview and Scrutiny meeting on 11 July 2022.

1. To note the work to date of the group including the detailed and informed observations to date;
2. The Housing Task Group recognise the gap between the housing level proposed in the local plan and that set out by the HIF project and support the delivery of the town centre masterplan and its adoption as supplementary planning guidance in order to influence and support high quality sustainable development;
3. To endorse the Executive's position to undertake a full detailed consultation and engagement process on the town centre masterplan including the potential scale of housing development proposed;
4. To note the current mitigation in place and to recommend to the HIF Task Group that measures be continued.
5. The group may wish to further consider affordable housing outputs of the HIF project or ask the Housing Task Group to consider what actions could be taken to secure the maximum level of affordable housing from the new development taking place given the overall need for significant new affordable homes.
6. That the task group could be reinstated later in the year, if needed, or the HIF Task Group be asked to review the site specific information coming forward as part of the masterplan proposals and expand on specific site-by-site assessment of HIF housing outputs ahead of a potential renegotiation of the contract with Homes England.

## **REPORT ENDS**

Appendix I: HIF Housing Outputs SWOT Analysis

**APPENDIX I: HIF Housing Outputs SWOT Analysis**

As prepared by officers to support the meeting of the HIFHOTG on 17/03/2022

<b>Strengths (advantages)</b>	<b>Weaknesses (area for improvement)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current housing market position and build out rate is positive</li> <li>• Completion of The Marches and strong market signals for PRS</li> <li>• Supports housing in the 'right place' – supporting regeneration and re-use of land and property on predeveloped sites (not greenfield)</li> <li>• Population of the town centre supports vision for a mixed use, vibrant town centre</li> <li>• Physical infrastructure will unlock housing sites (improved rail, road, cycle and pedestrian connectivity).</li> <li>• Sustainable, well-connected development with lower dependency on the car usage</li> <li>• Benefits of locating housing in sustainable town centre location to support the climate change agenda</li> <li>• Strong Local Planning Authority – decisions made based on local plan and relevant material considerations.</li> <li>• Recently adopted Housing Strategy</li> <li>• Recognition and understanding that the Council can only use its best endeavours to deliver the non-owned housing sites.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uncertainty about the urban capacity of the town centre to deliver homes in design terms (height). No overall masterplan.</li> <li>• No agreed plan for The Triangle site (owned site)</li> <li>• Poole Road (owned site) development refused and dismissed on appeal.</li> <li>• Uncertainty about the Concorde House (owned site) – currently held in abeyance with planning pending outcome of masterplan</li> <li>• Higher housing numbers indicated by HIF are not part of the Statutory Local Plan</li> <li>• That the Victoria Place development and Goldsworth Road appeal decision is being 'done to' residents with no engagement.</li> <li>• Uncertainty about the current landowner position on town centre development sites.</li> </ul>
<b>Opportunities (situations to apply advantages)</b>	<b>Threats (risks)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Masterplan's intention to deliver a vision to the centre – creating certainty for investors and planning.</li> <li>• Adoption of Masterplan as planning Supplementary planning document would give additional weight to the delivery of housing in decision making.</li> <li>• Completion of Victoria Place – catalyst for change and further investment in the town centre</li> <li>• Appeal decision for Goldsworth Road development – bring 900+ new homes and significant investment.</li> <li>• Homes England partnership working – confirmation that there can be a dialogue around the delivery of owned housing site. That housing sites referred to could be amended in terms of their housing delivery, sites deleted and new sites added to. The agreement has mechanism to review outputs</li> <li>• £95m investment from Homes England to improve Victoria Arch bridge and regenerate the southern gateway entrance to the town centre and encourage investment</li> <li>• Victoria Arch bridge improvements and potential Network Rail WACE project offers improved capacity for rail travel which supports further housing growth in the town.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private investment in new homes does not come forward</li> <li>• Three Council owned sites are not delivered in accordance with the Homes England agreement</li> <li>• Delivery of affordable housing – may be weaker given development viability issues</li> <li>• A need to complete and articulate that the housing need and demand for type and tenure of homes in the centre remain.</li> <li>• Failure to comply with the conditions of the Homes England agreement</li> <li>• Failure to secure private investment in the town centre impacting on regeneration and vision</li> <li>• Refused schemes and risk that housing figures quoted under “housing unlocked by HIF” may be too optimistic and will not be realised. (9 “BHS”; 11 “Planets/Rat and Parrot” which includes Crown Place; and 13 “Church Gate”)</li> <li>• A different number of new homes coming forward for the centre – lower than that highlighted by HIF.</li> </ul>