

## THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF TANDRIDGE

### STRATEGY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Minutes and Report to Council of a meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 11<sup>th</sup> December 2018 at 7.30pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Fisher (Chair), Elias (Vice-Chair), Black, Botten, Bourne, Cannon, Childs, Davies, Harwood, Jecks, Jones, Lee and Pursehouse.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillors Dunbar, Farr, Lockwood, Sayer and White.

#### 194. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 1<sup>st</sup> November 2018 were confirmed and signed by the Chair.

#### **COMMITTEE DECISIONS** (Under powers delegated to the Committee)

#### 195. WHOLE COUNCIL BUDGET MONITORING

A 'whole Council' budget monitoring report was presented, which detailed the cumulative position up to the end of September 2018. Year-end variances for the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account and capital programme budgets were forecast as per the summary at **Appendices 'A' and 'B'**.

**RESOLVED** – that the financial reporting data relating to budgetary control for the Council be noted.

#### 196. STRATEGY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE DELIVERY PLAN 2018/19 – QUARTER 2 PROGRESS REPORT

The delivery plan comprised various performance indicators for monitoring the effectiveness of the activities falling under the Committee's remit, together with an analysis of major risks and how they could be mitigated. It also included key projects, namely 'Customer First'; 'RegenOxted'; the Caterham & North Tandridge regeneration initiative; development of a property portfolio; and the economic proposition delivery programme. Progress against the plan for the second quarter of 2018/19 was presented.

**RESOLVED** – that performance against the agreed Strategy & Resources Committee Delivery Plan for the second quarter of 2018/19, as attached at **Appendix 'C'**, be noted.

## 197. RESPONSE TO GATWICK AIRPORT DRAFT MASTERPLAN CONSULTATION

A report outlining the following growth scenarios presented in Gatwick Airport's draft masterplan was presented:

1. remaining as a single runway operation using the existing main runway;
2. routinely using the existing standby runway together with the main runway;
3. continuing to safeguard for an additional runway for the south.

The deadline for the consultation was 10<sup>th</sup> January 2019. Members were presented with a draft response which acknowledged the opposing views among the different stakeholders regarding the airport's potential expansion under any scenario. It was considered that the limited information and evidence (within the draft masterplan) regarding the potential impacts of the above scenarios made it difficult for the Council to identify a favoured position.

During the debate Members expressed a range of views including:

- the need for improvement to existing infrastructure in the event of any of the three scenarios;
- disappointment that the consultation process did not involve a public exhibition within Tandridge whereas venues further afield had been selected for that purpose;
- acknowledgement that some residents living under the flight path did not seem to mind about the aircraft noise and that some of the beneficial impacts of the airport upon the surrounding communities were significant (e.g. employment);
- concerns about the apparent increase in night flights and additional noise pollution.

The Chief Executive agreed to augment the proposed consultation response to reflect the concerns referred to above.

**RESOLVED** – that, subject to such amendments as the Chief Executive considers necessary to reflect the concerns expressed by Members, the consultation response at Appendix 'A' to the agenda report be submitted.

Note – the response subsequently submitted is attached at **Appendix 'D'** to these minutes.

## 198. RESPONSE TO SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL'S FINANCIAL STRATEGY & TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME CONSULTATION

A report outlining the above consultation, launched by Surrey County Council (SCC) on 30<sup>th</sup> October, was presented along with the Council's draft response. The programme focused on the following five areas:

- family resilience: children's centres
- concessionary bus travel
- special educational needs and disabilities (send)
- libraries and cultural services
- community recycling centres

Members discussed the proposed service changes for each of these areas with in-depth debates about children's centres and community recycling centres.

Concern was expressed that the proposals to close 4 of the 5 children's centres within the District had emerged with no assessment of the effectiveness and the benefits that children's centres provide for residents. Members questioned the apparent savings to be achieved by the closures given that the costs of early intervention were likely to be far less than those required to deal with familial problems later in life.

During the debate, Councillor Davies, moved that:

*If Surrey County Council proceeds with its proposal to close 4 of the 5 Sure Start Children's Centres in Tandridge, this Council will provide emergency stop-gap funding to save the Hurst Green and Holland Sure Start Children's Centre from closure and will also investigate providing a mobile service for the rest of the South of Tandridge, while a permanent solution is explored. This is vital to prevent the south of the District from being left without any provision of this crucial family support service.'*

This was seconded by Councillor Bourne. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was not carried.

Members agreed that Councillor Sayer's suggested additional wording should be added to the draft consultation response to SCC:

*This Council strongly opposes Surrey County Council's proposal to close 4 of the 5 children's centres in Tandridge leaving the south of the District without any centres at all. This is wholly unacceptable. Parts of the south of the District have areas with high levels of deprivation and the children's centres provide a vital service to support the most vulnerable families. Apart from the human cost, this is a false economy because these centres pre-empt problems that may end up costing the community much more later on.*

Members then discussed the proposals for community recycling centres in the District. Councillors were surprised that the proposal to close the Bond Road facility had been included as SCC had previously stated that this would not be the case until a suitable alternative had been identified. Discussion centred around the short-sighted nature of the proposals due to the correlation between the increase in fly-tipping and the closure of community recycling centres and the increased costs this would present for both TDC and landowners.

**RESOLVED** – that:

- A. the content of the transformation programme consultation issued by Surrey County Council be noted;
- B. the consultation response at **Appendix 'E'** be agreed (including the additional wording regarding children's centres); and
- C. a report on this matter be brought back to the Committee's meeting on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2019.

## **199. OXTED BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT – UPDATE ON PROGRESS**

On the 26<sup>th</sup> July 2018, the Committee had considered the merits of the Council providing support to the Oxted Business Improvement District (BID) and resolved that that the Chief Executive be appointed to the BID board for an interim period. A further report was submitted to update the Committee about the current position. It was explained that Tracey Shrimpton had recently been appointed as the BID manager and that 6 expressions of interest had been received for the vacant position of the BID director. It was also confirmed that, once the outcome of the director recruitment process is known, the appointment of the Chief Executive should come to an end.

**RESOLVED** – that progress by the board on the LoveOxted Business Improvement District be noted and a further report be brought to the Committee on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2019 to update Members on the number of new directors appointed to the Board, with a view to the Chief Executive standing down if appropriate.

## **200. ELLICE ROAD CAR PARK, OXTED – POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

This matter had previously been addressed on the 22<sup>nd</sup> November by the Finance Committee which requested that revised financial modelling be undertaken and submitted to this Committee for it determine the way forward. A report with the latest financial analysis was submitted accordingly. This invited the Committee to:

- (i) note the revised financial modelling;
- (ii) consider whether to proceed with the scheme to enlarge the car park with two additional decks; and
- (iii) give in principle agreement to an increase in charges for parking permits.

The Chair proposed an amendment whereby the report's recommendations regarding (ii) and (iii) above would be replaced with B and C below. This was seconded by Councillor Elias. Members discussed the reasons for the amendment. The Chair commented that, due to the delay caused by the judicial review of the intended residential scheme for the gasholder / Johnsdale site, concurrent development with the Ellis Road project was deemed to be too disruptive given the impact upon parking availability during construction. Members also discussed the need to re-evaluate the potential long term parking solutions for the town and to undertake further analysis of the ANPR (automatic number plate recognition) statistics for the car park to help determine future need. Upon being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

**RESOLVED** – that:

- A. the current financial appraisal and expenditure level in connection with the addition of two car parking decks on the Ellice Road car park be noted;
- B. to reduce the impact on businesses and residents, works to enlarge the Ellice Road car park be deferred for one year while the gasholder site is redeveloped and pending the outcome of a review of alternative options for increasing parking capacity in the town; and
- C. Officers be requested to bring back a report to this Committee on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2019 setting out those options for consideration.

Rising: 9:42pm

REVENUE BUDGET NARRATIVE FOR KEY VARIANCES	Annual Budget 2018/19	Forecast Variance at year end (July)	Forecast Variance at year end (Sept)	Narrative
<b>Resources and Support Services</b>				
Salaries	4,031,280	22,691	(34,480)	Review of salary identified staff required to be charged to projects. Updated Temporary staff end dates as per contracts
Additional New Homes Bonus	(999,200)	(26,000)	(26,000)	Additional NHB Allocated above budget
Regeneration of Caterham - Consultancy Fees	0	35,000	35,000	Required costs for Regen Caterham consultancy
HR Advertising Costs	8,500	26,500	26,500	Recruitment for lead specialists and over customer first posts
Legal Expenses	500	16,000	16,000	Leisure partnership agreement legal costs, will be offset by interest on loan
Council Tax Empty Home Review	4,700	0	26,000	Costs incurred on review of empty properties, Should result in additional council tax income in future years
Other net items	(965,100)	144,600	(9,800)	
<b>Resources and Support Services Total</b>	<b>2,080,680</b>	<b>218,791</b>	<b>33,220</b>	
<b>Corporate Items/ Reserves</b>				
Investment income	(847,600)	(123,100)	(116,800)	Investment income is greater than budget, this is primarily due to loans to the leisure partnership
Use of Reserves	218,800	-	-	
Depreciation reversal	(1,163,900)	-	-	
Pensions adjustments	920,500	-	-	
<b>Corporate Items / Reserves Total</b>	<b>(872,200)</b>	<b>(123,100)</b>	<b>(116,800)</b>	
<b>Community Services</b>				
Salaries	2,138,700	(22,300)	(23,000)	
De Staffords Lease	(33,000)	0	33,000	Due to the Freedom Leisure / TDC deal being completed in April'18, part of the agreement was that TDC would no longer receive any lease income from De Staffords School
Other net items	3,634,300	19,100	13,200	
<b>Community Services Total</b>	<b>5,740,000</b>	<b>(3,200)</b>	<b>23,200</b>	
<b>Housing General Fund</b>				
Salaries	1,003,400	48,800	47,600	Staff vacancies in Housing GF filled by agency staff.
Other Government Grants	(123,500)	0	(12,500)	Additional grant received for Homelessness Reduction Act work
Use of Reserves	(14,000)	0	(15,000)	Additional post funded from homelessness reserve
Other net items	101,700	(28,250)	39,700	
<b>Housing General Fund Total</b>	<b>967,600</b>	<b>20,550</b>	<b>59,800</b>	
<b>Planning Policy</b>				
Salaries	1,455,120	(13,386)	203,530	Staff vacancies in Planning & Enforcement filled by agency staff until customer first is completed.
Counsel Fees	26,100	23,900	23,900	QC Fees for Judicial Review on Gas Holder Site
Legal Expenses	100	12,900	12,900	Costs awarded against the Council for 10 Granville Rd plus fees for initial part of work down on the JR on the gas
Consultancy Fees	2,800	0	57,200	Cost of Traveller Site consultation and Terraquest outsourcing for validation
Pre App Fees	(63,800)	0	15,800	Income target unlikely to be achieved
CIL Receipts	(829,700)	0	5,000	Staff Sickness impacted collection and processing of Income
Formal Member Presentations	(12,500)	0	12,500	Unlikely to achieve income target due to lack of developer requests
Other net items	1,472,600	6,168	(10,423)	
<b>Planning Policy Total</b>	<b>2,050,720</b>	<b>29,582</b>	<b>320,407</b>	
Local Plan Funding from Reserves	15,000	0	347,350 (347,350)	Local Plan temp staff and advertising costs
<b>General Fund Total</b>	<b>9,981,800</b>	<b>142,623</b>	<b>319,827</b>	<b>Forecast Overspend / (Underspend)</b>

REVENUE BUDGET NARRATIVE FOR KEY VARIANCES	Annual Budget 2018/19	Forecast Variance at year end (July)	Forecast Variance at year end (Sept)	Narrative
<b>Housing Revenue Account</b>				
Salaries	1,665,900	(52,228)	92,200	Salaries overspend arising from temporary staff.
Electricity and Gas Expenditure	119,400	30,600	30,600	Budget increased to reflect 18/19 outturn and increase in supply costs - Brokerage service
Interest Payable	1,699,000	(33,000)	(33,000)	Less interest payable due to loan paid back in 17/18
Legal Expenses	3,200		31,800	3 X ASB cases and costs awarded against TDC
Elderly Persons Dwellings	0	0	(18,362)	Supporting People Subsidy
Other net items	(3,487,500)	(42,243)	(42,612)	
<b>Housing Revenue Account Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(96,871)</b>	<b>60,626</b>	



**Strategy and Resources Committee**  
**2018/2019 Delivery Plan - Quarter 2 Progress Report**



# Contents

About this Committee	3
-----	
Priorities	4
-----	
Projects	5
-----	
Performance	8
-----	
Risks	9
-----	

## About this Committee

---

The Strategy & Resources Committee plays an important role in setting the Council's overall strategic and financial direction.

Each year, the Committee sets the Council's overall corporate objectives and priorities. It also sets the Council's annual budget, oversees Committee budgets and sets Council Tax levels.

In addition, the Committee is responsible for developing and agreeing a range of strategies including those relating to:

- Economic Development and Regeneration
- Community Safety
- Health and Wellbeing
- Assets and Property
- Emergency Planning
- Performance & Risk Management
- Data protection
- IT

The Committee also oversees a range of Council functions including:

- Reviewing the Council's constitution
- Councillor representation on local groups and organisations
- Councillors allowances
- Appointment of senior Council staff
- Complaints procedure

Each year, the Strategy and Resources Committee agrees a Delivery Plan. The Delivery Plan sets out how the Committee will deliver the Council's corporate objectives and priorities for that year. It also sets performance indicators and risks so the Committee can monitor how the Council is delivering its services.

Progress against the Delivery Plan is reported to the Strategy and Resources Committee quarterly. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee also monitors the work of this Committee and receives regular updates about the progress of the Delivery Plan.

The Committee has proportional representation from each of the political groups. For 2018/19, the Committee will be made up of will be 7 Conservatives, 3 Liberal Democrats, 2 OLRG Independents Alliance representatives and 1 Independent Group representative.

## Priorities

---

### Vision

The Council's vision is to be "*aspirational for our people, our place and ourselves*". This will be fulfilled by the following corporate objectives and priorities for 2018/19:

### Objectives

- A. Providing high quality, customer focused services.
- B. Making a difference in our community by supporting those who need it most.
- C. Creating a thriving economy while protecting the local environment.
- D. Working in partnership with the community and other public services to create opportunities for all.
- E. Improving the quality of our residents' lives, including by enabling access to decent and affordable homes.
- F. Being a proactive, flexible learning environment.

### Priorities

The top five priorities for achieving this in 2018/2019 are to:

1. Implement the Customer First Strategy.
2. Implement a strategy for investing in land and property in order for the Council to remain financially viable and to create more affordable housing.
3. Progress the Local Plan process to Regulation 22 submission stage (i.e. to the Secretary of State for Examination).
4. Enhance the vitality and viability of our town centres, including the adoption and implementation of regeneration schemes in Caterham and Oxted.
5. Engage with multi-agency partners to facilitate flood prevention measures in Caterham, Smallfield and Whyteleafe.

# Projects

---

The programmes and projects below set out how the Strategy and Resources Committee will deliver the corporate objectives and priorities for 2018/19.

Each programme and project has a detailed plan and is overseen by a Board and Committee. This section provides a summary of each project. More detailed reports will be considered by this Committee during the year.

## 1. CUSTOMER FIRST

**WHAT:** The Customer First Initiative is a transformation programme to provide a new operating model for the Council, based on design principles which put the customer first and drive efficiency.

**WHAT WE WILL DELIVER:** Customer-focussed services and reduced costs of £1.2m of savings per year from 2019/20.

**KEY DATES:**

- Selection of IT/digital business partner (May/June 2018)
- Phase 1 'Go Live' (2 July 2018)
- Phase 2 staff consultation (July/August 2018)
- Phase 2 applications, assessment and selection (Sept/Nov 2018)
- Phase 2 'Go Live' (Feb 2019)



**QUARTER 2 UPDATE:**

Outcomes	Timescale	Budget	Risks
Green	Green	Green	Green

The Council has now selected its IT partner to help implement the new customer management software and although slightly behind schedule, good progress is now being made. Key processes are expected to be tested and operating by Phase 2 'Go Live' in February 2019.

The overall programme remains on time, on budget and is set to deliver the required savings and improved customer-focused services by 2019/20. Interviews for new roles have just been completed and are in the process of being assessed. Risks are documented and managed through regular reporting to the Programme Board.



## 2. REGENOXTED

**WHAT:** RegenOxted is an ambitious plan to revitalise the town-centre through a multi-million pound programme of strategically important projects. Comprising 4 key projects, the programme will deliver redevelopment of the Gasholder, an urban redesign project for Station Road East & West; additional parking capacity and creation of a business hub.

**WHAT WE WILL DELIVER:** In 2018/19, we will commence redevelopment of Ellice Road car park, commence feasibility work for the urban redesign project and work will commence on the redevelopment of the Gasholder site. We will also complete an options appraisal of public sector sites for the business hub.

### KEY DATES:

- Procurement of contractors to develop car park (Summer 2018)
- Commencement of work on car park (Winter 2018/19)
- Commencement of work on Gasholder site (Autumn 2018)
- Commencement of feasibility work on Urban Redesign (Summer 2018)
- Commencement of work on business hub options appraisal (Autumn 2018)

### QUARTER 2 UPDATE:

Outcomes	Timescale	Budget	Risks
Green	Amber	Green	Amber

#### Ellice Road Car Park

In October 2018, the Council received planning permission for a revised scheme which allows for a larger area of landscaping between the car park and properties on Ellice Road, giving them better screening. As a result of the changes, the car park will now have 297 spaces, three fewer than in the original design.

The other key amendment to the proposal is that a one-way system around Amy, Ellice and Beatrice Roads is not now included as part of the application. Having listened to residents' concerns and subsequent discussions with transport consultants and Surrey Highways, the Council has agreed to keep the two-way access on these roads for a 12 month trial basis. If, after this period, there is too much traffic on these residential roads, a one-way system will be reconsidered.

At this stage, work on the site is due to commence in early 2019 with all construction complete in Autumn 2019, weather permitting. We are now in the process of developing plans to mitigate against the impact of the construction period on the town centre, particularly in respect of the development on the Gasholder site.

#### Gasholder Redevelopment

In June 2018, St William received planning permission for a revised scheme across both the Gasholder and Johnsdale car park sites, following the purchase of the Johnsdale car park from the Council. The revised scheme is for 111 homes. St William now intend to start demolishing the gasholder and remediating the land in early 2019 (rather than Autumn 2018) as a result of delays to the timescale following an unsuccessful bid for a judicial review. The development is due to be complete in 2021.

#### Business Hub

Options appraisal underway and due to be completed in Winter 2019.

#### Urban Redesign Project

Scoping work underway for the feasibility stage. This is now due to be completed in mid-November 2018.

### 3. CATERHAM & NORTH TANDRIDGE REGENERATION

**WHAT:** Support delivery of aspirations set out in Caterham Masterplan to regenerate Caterham Valley and Caterham on the Hill. Deliver Phase 1 of the North Tandrige One Public Estate Programme, we will develop a Public Service Plan setting out options for how better public services can be delivered across public sector assets in North Tandrige

**WHAT WE WILL DELIVER:**

- Work with landowners to bring forward proposals for redevelopment of the Church Walk shopping centre and the William Hill site in line with Caterham Masterplan principles.
- Commence pre-feasibility work on enhancements to Station Avenue and Croydon Road.
- Develop Public Service Plan setting out options for better public services in North Tandrige.



**KEY DATES:**

- Commencement of pre-feasibility work on Station Avenue (Spring 2018)
- Public consultation for Church Walk shopping centre redevelopment proposals (Summer/Autumn 2018)
- Planning application submitted for redevelopment of William Hill site (Autumn 2018)
- Commencement of Rose & Young site redevelopment (Winter 2018/19)
- Planning application submitted for Church Walk redevelopment (Winter/Spring 2018/19)
- North Tandrige One Public Estate Public Service Plan completed (Spring 2019)

**QUARTER 2 UPDATE:**

Outcomes	Timescale	Budget	Risks
Amber	Amber	Amber	Amber

North Tandrige One Public Estate Programme

Asset specialists Currie and Brown are currently developing a Public Service Plan which will set out options for how better, more joined-up public services can be configured across public sector assets in North Tandrige. It will also identify whether there are opportunities for sites to be released for alternative uses. The completed Plan will be informed by the Douglas Brunton Centre Review and Surrey County Council Transformation Plan. It will be considered by this Committee in by March 2019.

Caterham Masterplan

Since the Masterplan was adopted the Council has been working with the owners of Church Walk shopping centre as they bring forward proposals for its redevelopment. These proposals include plans for additional housing, a cinema and improved parking provision. At this stage, a planning application for the centre is due in January 2019 which is later than originally intended to allow time for changes to be made to proposals following public consultation.

Officers have also commissioned pre-feasibility work for Station Avenue, Godstone Road and Croydon Road to better understand the physical constraints in these areas. This work is necessary to inform options which will be developed as part of the feasibility and detailed design stages. The pre-feasibility work is due to be completed in April 2019. The first stage of demolition work has now also commenced on the Rose and Young site. The Council has been actively involved in achieving development of this site. The new owners, Clarion Housing, will deliver 48 affordable homes and a supermarket on the site which are expected to be ready by Winter 2020.

## 4. DEVELOPMENT OF PROPERTY PORTFOLIO



**WHAT:** Support delivery of corporate priorities through development of our property portfolio. This will include properties acquired by Gryllus Property Investment Ltd, the Council-owned arms-length company set up to enable the purchase of investment properties outside the District. It will also include those sites already owned by the Council and sites acquired within the district.

**WHAT WE WILL DELIVER:** The Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) projects £300,000 per year new revenue income through property investment activity.

**KEY DATES:** Ongoing throughout 2018/19 in relation to specific projects.

### QUARTER 2 UPDATE:

Outcomes	Timescale	Budget	Risks
Amber	Amber	Green	Amber

Following the agreement of the expansion of the Investment and Development Fund to £200m at the Strategy & Resources Committee in June 2018, the budget will be sufficient to cover potential investment purchases and development opportunities. A property introduction database has been set up to record investments as they are introduced by agents and to track their pricing. Attractive opportunities are being progressed.

The purchase of Linden House, a three storey modern office building in Caterham completed on 18 September 2018.

The outcomes and timescale risks remain amber to reflect that the availability of potential investments in the district and the length of time it has taken to complete due diligence on some sites. In light of this, we are also investigating opportunities within the wider economic area.

The Medium Term Financial Strategy which includes £300,000 of new revenue per annum through our property investment strategy remains on track.

One commercial property in the north of the district, which has previously been considered at the Strategy & Resources Committee is still not being progressed at this time as there are issues which make it too high a risk at the level of premium the Council was being asked to pay. There are signs that there may be movement on price.



## 5. ECONOMIC PROPOSITION DELIVERY PLAN 2018/19

**WHAT:** Our Economic Proposition provides a framework for us to strengthen and grow our economy so that we can stay competitive and ensure our future prosperity. The aims of the Proposition are delivered through a Delivery Plan which is agreed annually and monitored by this Committee.

**WHAT WE WILL DELIVER:** Projects in the 2018/19 Delivery Plan include:

- World Class Data Centre – Lambs Business Park:
- Intensification – Hobbs Industrial Estate
- Business Support Offer: Roll out a business support offer to support businesses as they grow and develop. This will be a blended approach using local authority, private sector and peer-to-peer support.
- Skills: Working with HE and FE providers, Surrey County Council, East Surrey local authorities and Coast to Capital, review our skills offer in the district, including work experience and access to apprenticeships.
- Business Improvement District Support

**KEY DATES:** Ongoing throughout 2018/19 in relation to specific projects.



### QUARTER 2 UPDATE:

Outcomes	Timescale	Budget	Risks
Amber	Green	Green	Green

Economic Development Officers from the East Surrey district and boroughs along with colleagues from Surrey County Council have been working on a shared skills, business support and business retention programme for the region. This is due to be completed in early 2019 and rolled out from April 2019.

Officers have also facilitated meetings between East Surrey College and St William, the developers of the Gasholder site, to look at apprenticeship opportunities.

In July 2018, the Strategy & Resources Committee agreed for the Chief Executive of to be appointed to the Oxted BID Board for an interim period whilst a new BID manager and board directors are appointed. A new BID manager has now been appointed and a recruitment process is underway for new directors. The Council is also providing officer support to the BID to ensure the annual Christmas evening event can be delivered.

Unfortunately, Surrey County Council decided not to pursue a share of £30 million Rural Development Programme for England (RDPE) grant fund for broadband infrastructure to extend superfast infrastructure in to the remaining white areas where there is a business/ economic growth need. It was felt there was not sufficient demand for this infrastructure from rural businesses.



## Performance

The performance indicators below enable the Committee to monitor how the Council is delivering the services for which it is responsible. Where performance varies from the target, action is taken to address any issues.

Code	Indicator	Q2 2018/2019			Direction of travel (compared to same period last year)	2017-18 Outturn	Higher / lower is better	Performance against annual target
		Actual	Period target	End of year target				
SR1	Percentage of Council Tax collected	63.7%	58.0%	98.7%	Stable (64.2%)	98.6%	Higher	On Target
SR2	The percentage of non-domestic rates due for the financial year which were received by the Council	61.5%	57.8%	98.6%	Stable (62.1%)	99.0%	Higher	On Target
SR3	Days taken to process Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit new claims and change events	7.8	10.2	10.2	Improved (11)	7.7	Lower	On Target
SR4	The number of working days/shifts lost due to sickness absence <i>This figure reflects performance over the previous 12 months.</i>	6.1	7.1	7.1	Improved (8.2)	7.1	Lower	On Target
SR5	Staff turnover <i>This figure reflects performance over the previous 12 months.</i>	19.2%	10-15%	10-15%	Declined (18.0%)	14.6%	Lower	Off Target
SR6	The percentage of calls abandoned by Customer Services	5.1%	<10.0%	<10.0%	Improved (6.9%)	8.2%	Lower	On Target

### Commentary on indicators with performance below same period last year and/or off target

#### SR5 Staff Turnover

The higher figure is as a result of redundancies from Phase 1 of the Customer First Programme. Without the redundancies the figure would be 14.8% which is within the industry standard.

## Risks

The risks below enable the Committee to monitor and manage service performance. All risks are assessed according to the Likelihood (or probability) that the risk will occur. This ranges from 1 (Rare) to 5 (Almost Certain). We also assess the Impact (or severity) on the Council that the risk will have if it were to occur. This ranges from 1 (Negligible) to 5 (Extreme). Combining both scores together establishes a risk rating and, if the risk is high-scoring, enables us to decide how we wish to manage it.

Risk		Likelihood	Impact	Score	Controls/Mitigation
SR1	<b>Failure to remain financially sustainable</b>	2	5	<b>10 (Amber)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mechanisms in place to acquire and develop assets and drive new sources of income (eg Council owned companies, Property Investment Fund, Development Fund).</li> <li>• Regimes to monitor the effectiveness of investment strategies, including oversight by company directors and reports to Finance and Strategy &amp; Resources Committees.</li> <li>• Medium Term Financial Strategy identifying new sources of income and areas of efficiency.</li> </ul>
SR2	<b>Failure to achieve effective organisational change</b>	3	3	<b>9 (Amber)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruitment / selection criteria to seek staff with required skills, attitudes and approaches.</li> <li>• Fit for purpose job evaluation process and staff grading structure.</li> <li>• Open and honest communication with staff (newsletters, CE briefings, team meetings, drop-in sessions, Staff Conference).</li> <li>• Cost effective redundancy policy.</li> <li>• Measures to support staff throughout the change process.</li> <li>• Dedicated Customer First staff in place to manage change programme.</li> </ul>
SR3	<b>IT systems not fit for purpose</b>	2	4	<b>8 (Amber)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate investment in IT infrastructure needed to deliver Customer First service redesign.</li> <li>• Sufficient staffing resources, including in-house professionals and specialist external support when required.</li> <li>• Customer First Initiative overseen by CMT and reported to / scrutinised by Strategy &amp; Resources Committee.</li> <li>• IT Partner engaged to facilitate changes.</li> </ul>
SR4	<b>Failure to deliver regeneration schemes</b>	2	3	<b>6 (Green)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed risk management for each project or programme.</li> <li>• Effective community and stakeholder engagement mechanisms.</li> <li>• Resource commissioned to support delivery.</li> <li>• External funding secured to support delivery.</li> </ul>

Risk		Likelihood	Impact	Score	Controls/Mitigation
SR5	Failure to deliver an Election	1	4	4 (Green)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project plans and risk registers required to be in place and reviewed by Government.</li> </ul>
SR6	Providing negligent or flawed legal advice	2	4	8 (Amber)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access to legal database, ongoing training and CPD.</li> <li>Lexcel accreditation provides assurance.</li> </ul>
SR7	Failure to comply with court procedures	2	3	6 (Green)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lexcel accreditation provides assurance.</li> </ul>
SR8	Failure by Members to comply with Code of Conduct	3	3	9 (Amber)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Non-compulsory training offered to Members.</li> <li>Advice provided by trained Officers.</li> </ul>
SR9	Failure to deliver Family Support Programme	2	3	6 (Green)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>External reporting to SCC and MHCLG (including risk management).</li> <li>Local governance carried out by Community Safety Partnership (CSP).</li> <li>Memorandum of Understanding between East Surrey authorities.</li> </ul>
SR10	Non delivery of service due to posts being single person	3	3	9 (Amber)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Procedure notes produced.</li> <li>Business continuity plans reviewed.</li> <li>Resilience to be achieved through Customer First.</li> </ul>
SR11	Governance of wholly owned companies is inadequate.	3	3	9 (Amber)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training and external advice.</li> <li>Companies limited by guarantee or £1 share capital.</li> </ul>
SR12	Failure to conduct a DHR (Domestic Homicide Review).	3	3	9 (Amber)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DHR Policy in place with East Surrey CSP oversight.</li> </ul>
SR13	Website failure	3	3	9 (Amber)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local copy in place.</li> <li>Contract in place with supplier.</li> <li>Regular website testing.</li> </ul>

## Risk matrix

Impact	5	5 (Green)	10 (Amber)	15 (Red)	20 (Red)	25 (Red)
	4	4 (Green)	8 (Amber)	12 (Red)	16 (Red)	20 (Red)
	3	3 (Green)	6 (Green)	9 (Amber)	12 (Red)	15 (Red)
	2	2 (Green)	4 (Green)	6 (Green)	8 (Amber)	10 (Amber)
	1	1 (Green)	2 (Green)	3 (Green)	4 (Green)	5 (Green)
		1	2	3	4	5
		Likelihood				



Council Offices, 8 Station Road East,  
Oxted, Surrey RH8 0BT  
customerservices@tandridge.gov.uk  
Tel: 01883 722000, Dx: 39359 OXTED

Report, apply or pay for it online  
**[www.tandridge.gov.uk](http://www.tandridge.gov.uk)**

If calling, please ask for *Policy Team*  
on 01883 722000

E-mail: [customerservices@tandridge.gov.uk](mailto:customerservices@tandridge.gov.uk)

Monday 7 January 2019

Dear Sir / Madam,

**RE: Tandridge District Council's response to the Gatwick Airport draft Masterplan consultation**

Thank you for consulting Tandridge District Council on the Gatwick Airport draft Masterplan. We welcome Gatwick Airport Limited (GAL) sharing their early thinking regarding the future of the airport's operations with interested stakeholders.

**Tandridge District**

Tandridge District is located in farthest east Surrey and borders Kent to the east, Croydon and Bromley to the north, and West Sussex to the south. Gatwick Airport, the busiest single-runway airport in the world and the UK's second busiest airport, is located just a few miles across the south-western border of Tandridge district in the neighbouring borough of Crawley. Strategic routes including the M23, M25, A22 and A25 flow through the district, which is home to approximately 87,000 residents residing in towns and villages including Caterham, Oxted, Lingfield and Smallfield.

Like much of the South East, Tandridge faces a significant challenge in meeting the housing needs of the area as well as accommodating the necessary infrastructure requirements. The rural nature of our district, and being 94% Green Belt, means that meeting these needs is becoming increasingly difficult. Any proposals developed by Gatwick Airport will need to consider pressures on housing, and congestion on the A22, A25 and rural roads which all form part of the local network. Proposals will also need to consider issues with the Brighton Mainline railway and impacts on other local train lines and stations.

Airport-related parking is a concern to many residents in the district; the Council has received many applications and dealt with unauthorised developments of off-airport car parking, many of which increase issues on the road network and can be located in unsustainable locations. The Council would highlight policy TLP51 of Our Local Plan: 2033 (due to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in January 2019) which will not permit proposals for additional or replacement parking.

## The Masterplan

The draft Masterplan is a direct response to the Government's recent policy statement on the future of UK aviation, 'making best use of their existing runways'. Published in June 2018, this policy statement confirms that the Government has a clear issue to address regarding capacity at airports in the South East and is "supportive of airports beyond Heathrow making best use of their existing runways". This also follows the Government's decision to back a third runway at Heathrow airport, and not to support a second runway at Gatwick.

The draft Masterplan outlines three growth scenarios. It is confirmed that these growth scenarios are not exclusive, and that they could be used in combination at any time during the Masterplan's 15-year period. These scenarios are:

1. One where it remains a single runway operation using the existing main runway;
2. One where the existing standby runway is routinely used together with the main runway;
3. One where it continues to safeguard for an additional runway to the south.

### *Scenario 1*

Under Scenario 1, the airport would continue to operate with a single runway and two terminals. New air traffic management technologies and processes would make it possible for passenger numbers and aircraft movements to increase significantly. Limited work would be required to reconfigure the airport for this scenario, yet there would be a need to increase on-site parking.

The Council acknowledges that with advances in technology, the number of passengers and aircraft movements will increase at Gatwick Airport over the period of the Masterplan. Never-the-less any increase in noise would be intolerable to residents currently under or in proximity to the existing flightpaths and the Council will seek absolute assurances about the draft Masterplan's assertion that Gatwick's noise footprint will continue to reduce, despite the increase in aircraft movements. We would also not support any increase in night flights.

The Council would welcome sight of any detailed assessments undertaken with regards to the highways, economic, environmental and social impacts of this scenario.

### *Scenario 2*

Under Scenario 2, the airport would use the existing standby runway simultaneously with the main runway, although for departing smaller aircraft only. The existing standby runway is currently only used in emergencies and when the main runway is temporarily closed. One of the conditions of the planning permission for this runway (granted in 1979) was that it could not be used simultaneously with the main runway. The simultaneous use of both runways is also ruled out in a Section 52 Agreement with West Sussex County Council – however, this agreement expires in 2019.

Through this scenario there would be no change to arrival flight paths, but some departing flights would take-off slightly further (approximately 200m) north. For eastbound departing flights, this may have a negative impact on communities in Smallfield, Burstow and Lingfield. Preliminary results from initial analysis by Gatwick highlight that with advances in technology, noise from aircraft under this scenario would be broadly similar to today's levels. However, the Council is concerned that a northward shift in noise contours and an

increase in frequency of flights over those most directly impacted may negate such advances.

The Masterplan concedes that the technical studies required to implement or progress this scenario have not been completed, and that much of the information presented is preliminary analysis (in relation to the potential improvements to noise pollution for example). As such it is difficult for the Council to take a view as to the potential impact on Tandridge's residents and businesses, until such time as detailed highways, environmental and economic analyses are complete.

Should a decision be taken to progress this scenario, it would be subject to a Development Consent Order process. At that time, a more complete understanding of the implications of this scenario would be available for the Council to comment upon and the Council will actively engage with Gatwick to ensure benefits are maximised for the communities in Tandridge and the wider region and that any negative impacts are minimised or eliminated altogether.

### *Scenario 3*

With regard to Scenario 3, the Council acknowledges central government's decision to back a third runway at Heathrow Airport and not support a second at Gatwick. We will continue to monitor government policy statements with regard to aviation and the potential for a second runway at Gatwick.

### **Concluding Remarks**

The Council remains clear that until such a time as detailed evidence is available with regards to the potential positive or negative economic, environmental, highways and social impacts of any scenario, it cannot take a view on any of the questions prescribed through this consultation.

We would expect that any future public consultations include local drop-in sessions to enable those Tandridge residents most directly impacted or concerned with the operations of the Airport, and those with limited means to travel to destinations such as Brighton and Croydon, have an opportunity to attend and view the material in person.

The Council looks forward to working closely together with Gatwick Airport in the future for the long-term benefit of all residents and businesses in Tandridge District.

Kind regards,



Louise Round  
Chief Executive



Council Offices, 8 Station Road East,  
Oxted, Surrey RH8 0BT  
customerservices@tandridge.gov.uk  
Tel: 01883 722000, Dx: 39359 OXTED

Report, apply or pay for it online  
**www.tandridge.gov.uk**

If calling, please ask for Louise  
Round on 01883 732999

E-mail: lround@tandridge.gov.uk

Wednesday 12 December 2018

Dear Joanna,

### **Financial Strategy & Transformation Programme Consultation Response**

Many thanks for the opportunity to comment on Surrey County Council's Transformation Programme.

We fully appreciate the financial challenges facing the County and acknowledge that difficult decisions must be made to secure the Council's sustainability. Whilst we agree in principle with the need to make a number of the changes proposed, we cannot support any changes until appropriate alternative solutions are offered.

Specifically, we would like to make the following comments and recommendations:

#### Family Resilience: Children's Centres

Tandridge District Council (TDC) agrees with the proposal to support families to become more resilient and that earlier intervention is vital. The Council is mindful, however, that by removing the universal offer from the Children's Centres some families may not be identified at an early stage and that it will be harder for those seeking support themselves.

The Council strongly opposes Surrey County Council's proposal to close 4 of the 5 children's centres in Tandridge leaving the south of the District without any centres at all. This is wholly unacceptable. Parts of the south of the District have areas with high levels of deprivation and the children's centres provide a vital service to support the most vulnerable families. Apart from the human cost, this is a false economy because these centres pre-empt problems that may end up costing the community much more later on.

Many families will find it very difficult, if not impossible, to access the single remaining centre in Caterham. One of the hidden benefits of children's centres as currently configured is that the premises themselves offer a refuge- from post-natal depression, domestic violence and family conflict. We believe an outreach service could never achieve this and given the rural nature of our district makes outreach itself costly.

It would appear that no assessment of any kind has been undertaken on the effectiveness of the Children's Centres in the district or the real benefit they bring. The closure of the mobile centre run from Lingfield, which links to traveller families, could leave them without health visitor input which is of significant concern. The programme mentions some services continuing to be provided for families in Godstone using existing venues and we would request additional information.

Should the number of Centres be reduced to the proposed level we urge the Council to reconsider the proposal to stop using the mobile units. Although it is accepted that they are an expensive resource they would enable SCC to provide an element of equality of access to service for the more (but not most) deprived areas on a regular basis.

Chief Executive – Louise Round

The Council would also like clarification on what SCC anticipates would be provided from the other current Children Centre sites, which are generally coupled with, or located at schools? Will there be any available SCC resource to ensure that the sites remain viable venues for children's services or would the future of the site be solely determined by the landlords?

TDC agrees with the concept of having many services co-located however the Council is aware that the services listed may not be able to deploy staff to the Centres and are unlikely to have the resources to cover any additional venue costs. We would seek assurances that where those services are able to work from the Centre they would be accommodated at no cost.

The Council agrees with the expansion of the age range for the support and suggests that it be extended further to include support for families expecting a child. The Council believes the proposal will impact on the other services currently provided in the area including the Family Support Programme and the 0 -19 Service (which includes health visiting and school nursing) provided by First Community Health Care. There would need to be very close working between the teams and there must be clear criteria for support via the different teams.

The Council is aware that the SCC is considering asking for contributions to the cost of the services within the Children's Centres. The Council would suggest that if there are no universal services on offer and the support provided is targeted at families most in need, charges should not be made. However, if there are universal services provided within the centre open to all families then, provided those who need the services but cannot pay are protected, the Council would not disagree with the proposal.

Finally, whilst the Council is fully supportive of promoting volunteering through the Centres, we would seek assurances that no substantive posts be replaced by voluntary ones.

#### Concessionary bus travel

TDC express concern that by removing the companion's allowance, the most vulnerable people within our district may become isolated and unable to reach services they need. We are particularly concerned about the effect removing the companion's allowance will have on carers.

If the cuts are to be introduced, Tandridge District would want a guarantee that the most vulnerable individuals are provided with alternative transport options and assistance through the Community Transport programme.

#### Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND)

The Council is fully supportive of early identification of children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities and agrees SEND children should be educated in a place which best meets their needs as close to home as possible. It is important that children and families get the help and support they need in a timely manner and that they are kept fully informed of decisions and any changes to services that affect them.

The Council accepts that the cost of SEND families is very high and that there are a significant number of children accessing education at high cost to SCC. Although the Council wishes to see the increased number of placements within mainstream schools, the needs of the individual children are of the highest importance and must continue to be the priority not the location or cost of the education.

The Council support early identification of issues and action to prevent escalation of issues and reduction in the cost of intervention. The Council is supportive of the graduated pathway ensuring that support is available when and where it is needed. Emotional / mental health support for young people is inadequate in Surrey and the behaviour and emotional wellbeing pathway and the joint commissioning approach for CAHMS proposed is very much welcomed.

The Council supports the improvement of SEND provision within mainstream schools and would welcome any proposed additional funding but is concerned about the proposal to transfer 0.5% of budget from mainstream to SEND provision which could have a significant impact on the overwhelming financial pressures already faced by our local schools.



Support for post 16 and post 19 educational and training opportunities is welcomed as is the focus on reduction of exclusions.

Partnership working, training and support for all organisations supporting children with SEND would be welcomed to ensure that children in Surrey have the best opportunities to succeed.

### Libraries and Cultural Services

Access to information and knowledge is very important for our residents, as is learning new skills. TDC accepts that the way residents are accessing these services is changing and physical buildings may not be the only solution in the future. However, we believe they should be part of the solution and would encourage Surrey CC to look at co-locating other services within the library locations to make them more cost effective, rather than losing them entirely.

It should be noted that the libraries in Caterham Hill and Caterham Valley are also currently being reviewed as part of the Caterham Masterplan and the North Tandridge One Public Estate programmes. The Library in Caterham on the Hill is a stand-alone building protected by a covenant in the green belt, so has no other useable purpose. We would strongly encourage Surrey CC to speak with local Parish Councils to understand how local libraries are utilised.

### Community Recycling Centres

TDC would not support the closure of the CRC at Warlingham under any circumstances until an adequate alternative provision is provided, **as previously promised by the County**. We would question whether the current CRC site at Caterham has the necessary infrastructure to cope with any additional demand.

**The Council also has serious concerns regarding the impact additional demand at the Caterham Depot will have on Chaldon Road. Between 2012 and 2015 there were 9 reported accidents on Chaldon Road of which 1 was classed as serious. 10 people were injured with 1 seriously injured. The road is currently 30 mph, however the risk of accidents would be increase significantly if the visits at Bond Road transfer directly to Chaldon Road. We strongly believe that no decision should be made without a comprehensive road safety assessment being carried out at the Chaldon Road site. The assessment should review the capacity of the road to handle more traffic in light of the number of accidents that have taken place.**

**The Council also feels that the proximity of Hillcroft School to the Chaldon Road site should be taken into consideration in the road safety assessment and that the County Council applies their Guidance for Road Safety Outside Schools policy. As set out in the policy "The Community Engagement Team will arrange a site meeting with key colleagues including the council's local highways engineers, road safety engineering team and Surrey Police Road Safety and Traffic Management Team. A risk assessment will be carried out for the area immediately outside the school. Other nearby points of concern on the journey to school may be assessed too if necessary. The assessment will include analysis of collisions, speeds, and may include the views of the school and comments from road users. The existing road conditions, signing and highway infrastructure will also be checked and noted". We would seek assurance that such a road safety assessment is carried out before any decision is made.**

It should be noted that as part of the North Tandridge Public Estate programme of work, Tandridge District Council and Surrey CC are working together to look at options for a new CRC hub in Tandridge.

TDC would also strongly object to any additional or increased charges which could discourage people from using the Recycling Centres. We strongly feel that this could lead to an increased level of fly-tipping which is already a problem within the district. Whilst we understand the need to maximise income, the cost of clearing any fly-tipping could negate any benefit.

I am sure that we share the same aspiration to best serve our residents and I hope that we will be able to work together constructively on the Transformation Programme.

Kind regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Louise Round". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Louise" written in a larger, more prominent script than the surname "Round".

Louise Round  
Chief Executive