

Public Document Pack

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL



Council Agenda

MINUTES AND REPORTS
SUBMITTED TO THE COUNCIL MEETING ON
Thursday, 10th February, 2022

DAVID FORD
Chief Executive

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices,
Station Road East,
Oxted,
Surrey RH8 0BT

2 February 2022

Dear Councillor,

You are summoned to attend the meeting of the Council on Thursday, 10th February, 2022 at 7.30 pm to be held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted.

David Ford
Chief Executive

To: All Members of the Tandridge District Council

A G E N D A

1. **Minutes of the Council meeting held on the 16th December 2021** (Pages 5 - 10)
2. **Chair's Announcements**
3. **Declarations of Interest**

All Members present are required to declare, at this point in the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter:

- (i) any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs); and / or
- (ii) other interests arising under the Code of Conduct in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at the meeting.

Anyone with a DPI must, unless a dispensation has been granted, withdraw from the meeting during consideration of the relevant item of business. If in doubt, advice should be sought from the Monitoring Officer or her staff prior to the meeting.

4. **Questions submitted under Standing Order 30**
 - (i) questions from residents and others working or studying in the District; and
 - (ii) questions from Councillors

5. Reports of committees

- 5.1 Planning Committee - 9th December 2021 (Pages 11 - 12)
- 5.2 Planning Policy Committee - 5th January 2022 (Pages 13 - 24)
- 5.3 Strategy & Resources Committee - 11th January 2022 (Pages 25 - 30)
- 5.4 Planning Committee - 13th January 2022 (Pages 31 - 32)
- 5.5 Community Services Committee - 18th January 2022 (Pages 33 - 40)
- 5.6 Planning Policy Committee - 20th January 2022 (Pages 41 - 52)
- 5.7 Housing Committee - 25th January 2022 (Pages 53 - 64)
- 5.8 Audit & Scrutiny Committee - 27th January 2022 (Pages 65 - 74)
- 5.9 Strategy & Resources Committee - 1st February 2022 (minutes to follow, together with additional recommendations incorporating the Surrey County Council and Surrey Police & Crime Commissioner Council Tax precepts to comply with statutory requirements for approving the Council Tax for 2022/23)

6. Any other business which, in the opinion of the Chair, should be considered as a matter of urgency

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Council held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 16th December 2021 at 7.30 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Morrow (Chair), Wren (Vice-Chair), Allen, Blackwell*, Bloore*, Botten, Caulcott, Connolly*, Cooper*, Crane, Davies*, Dennis*, Duck, Elias*, Farr, Gaffney*, Gillman, Gray, Hammond, Langton, Lee, Jones, Lockwood, Mansfield*, Mills, Moore, North*, O'Driscoll, Prew, Pursehouse, Ridge, Shiner, Steeds, Stamp, Swann*, C.White and N.White*

** participated via Zoom and could not vote*

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillors Black, Bourne, Flower, Groves and Sayer

209. MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON THE 21ST OCTOBER 2021

Councillor Morrow advised that a correction needed to be made to Minute 166 regarding the voting on the Planning Committee's recommendations of the 29th July 2021, i.e. that Councillor O'Driscoll abstained from voting on the recommendation to grant planning permission for the proposed Council house development at Windmill Close, Caterham as opposed to Auckland Road.

Councillor Cooper, seconded by Councillor Ridge, also proposed an amendment regarding Minute 165 (questions submitted under Standing Order 30). This concerned the format of the text in connection with his second supplementary question to Question 2 in Appendix A to the minutes, namely that the last two sentences be shown in italics. The reason for this was to make the presentation consistent with that for the other questions and answers within the appendix. Upon being put to the vote, the proposal was lost.

Subject to the above-mentioned correction regarding Councillor O'Driscoll's abstention from the vote to grant planning permission for the proposed Council house development at Windmill Close, Caterham, the minutes were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

210. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Former colleagues

The Chair was sorry to announce that a former long serving Councillor and two ex-officer colleagues had passed away since the previous Council meeting, namely:

Tony Dalrymple, who served as a District Councillor for the Lingfield & Crowhurst Ward between 1986 and 2007. He was Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group (and 'de-facto Leader of the Council') for a period in the early 1990's and became Chairman of the Council in 1995/96. He was also Chairman of the former Policy & Finance and Planning & Environment Committees at different times and was made an Honorary Alderman in July 2007. Tony passed away on the 22nd October 2021.

Philip Thomas, who was the Council's longest serving Chief Executive, having been in post from the end of 1991 until his retirement in December 2003. Philip continued to live in the District until his untimely death on the 31st October 2021.

David Homewood, who served as a Committee Administrator and Committee Services Manager between 1989 and 2011. He died on the 6th December 2021 after a long period of ill health.

Members stood for a minute's silence as a mark of respect.

Civic events

The Chair confirmed that, subject to the implications of possible Covid restrictions, the following civic fundraising events were planned:

- Saturday, 22nd January 2022 - Caterham Food Bank meal and quiz at the Westway Centre
- Friday, 11th February 2022 – St. Valentine's dinner dance at Bletchingley Golf Club
- Saturday, 19th March 2022 – concert at the Oxted United Reformed Church performed by members of the Robert Bouffler Music Trust.

211. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chair, together with Councillors Bloore, Prew and Pursehouse, declared non-pecuniary interests in Minute 204 (CIL Working Group – 8th November 2021), the nature of their interests being that they were members of Warlingham Parish Council which had submitted the successful CIL application for financial assistance towards the Warlingham Green improvement project.

Councillor Botten declared a non-pecuniary interest regarding the fact that he was a founder trustee of the Westway Centre in Caterham, the Council's financial support for which was being considered as part of the budget setting process for 2022/23.

212. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER STANDING ORDER 30

Three questions were submitted by Councillor O'Driscoll, the contents of which are set out at **Appendix A**, together with responses from the relevant committee Chairs.

213. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

RESOLVED – that the reports of the following meetings be received, and the recommendations therein be adopted:

Audit & Scrutiny Committee - 2nd November 2021 (subject to Councillor Botten being added to the list of those present as a substitute member of the Committee)

Licensing Committee - 16th November 2021

Community Services Committee - 23rd November 2021

Planning Policy Committee - 25th November 2021 (subject to Councillor O'Driscoll being added to the list of those 'also present')

Housing Committee - 30th November 2021

Strategy & Resources Committee - 2nd December 2021

Rising 8.57 pm

Full Council 16th December 2021 – Standing Order 30 questions from Councillor O’Driscoll and responses from relevant Committee Chairs

1. Concerns have been raised about the construction materials shortage and its potential impact on construction of new homes in the District. Indeed, in the Housing Committee reports pack, there was talk of forecast delays of the construction of new Council homes at both Uplands and Bronzeoak House. Is there a possibility that further construction delays could be caused by this shortage in the short and medium term and is there a possibility of increased costs for the Council as a result of this?

Response from Councillor Pursehouse:

The shortage of materials and consequent rising costs in the construction industry has been well-publicised in the sector, and officers have reported previously on delays to handovers at Uplands and Bronzeoak as a direct result of this.

In Tandridge, contractors are doing all they can to keep delays to a minimum, including reprogramming the order of works, where possible, and stock-piling materials where it is practical to do so. The Council uses ‘design and build’ contracts for the council house building programme, and these involve fixed contract sums where, in the main, any cost increases during construction are absorbed by the contractor rather than the Council. Therefore, the contractor carries the risk.

However, we are expecting the uncertainty around supplies and pricing to continue well into 2022; with steel, cement, blocks, glass and ceramics impacted the most, especially where these products involve import from outside the UK.

We can anticipate contractors building this uncertainty into their tenders and, as a result, we expect construction costs to increase and officers will be carefully monitoring existing budgets and increasing contingencies on new schemes in response.

2. Residents are concerned about the reduction of service by Southern Rail on the Caterham Branch Line serving Caterham and Whyteleafe that took effect earlier this week, reducing the number of trains an hour from 4 to 2. While I’m hopeful this is only temporary during the pandemic, residents are also concerned about the removal by stealth of the direct Caterham to London Victoria services, which is requiring residents to change at East Croydon to get to Victoria. I share these concerns residents have. Will the Leader of the Council join us in expressing concern at these service reductions and take steps to address these concerns with Southern Rail?

Response from Councillor Wren (on behalf of the Leader of the Council)

Myself and other Members have become very aware of the adverse impact of Southern Rail’s service reductions upon Tandridge commuters. This is a District wide issue and the Leader will make representations to Southern Rail to express the Council’s concerns on behalf of its residents. We will also seek the support of Claire Coutinho MP in submitting these representations and would encourage residents to write to Claire to demonstrate the depth of feeling within our communities.

3. Many in our District, myself included, enjoy watching and playing football. In recognition that next year is a FIFA World Cup year, what can this Council do to arrange an event in Tandridge to celebrate the World Cup next year?

Response from Councillor Wren

There are no plans at the moment to celebrate the World Cup but I would be happy to work with you, as Chair of the Community Services Committee, to pursue ideas ... officers are busy with key council priorities so it would be good to make this a Member led initiative, possibly including an in-house sweep stake(s) with proceeds being allocated to the Chair of the Council's chosen charities for 2022/23. Members are welcome to approach me with ideas and we could work together to raise some money and make it something to remember.

This page is intentionally left blank

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 9th December 2021 at 7.30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Blackwell (Chair), C.White (Vice-Chair), Duck, Farr, Gray, Lockwood, Moore, Prew and Shiner

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Caulcott

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillors Connolly, Mansfield, Morrow and Ridge

214. MINUTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 7 OCTOBER 2021

The minutes of the meeting were confirmed and signed by the Chair.

215. 2021/1251 - ALLINGHAM FARM, COPTHORNE BANK, COPTHORNE, RH10 3JD

The Committee considered an application for the partial demolition of outbuildings and the conversion of the remaining outbuildings into four single storey dwelling houses with associated alterations, garden areas and parking.

The Officer recommendation was to refuse.

Mr Alex Moseley, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Lockwood put forward the following motion for approval:

The proposal is the redevelopment of a previously developed site within the green belt and by reason of the design, landscaping and reduction in built form, there is an improvement to the openness of the green belt and a reduction in harm caused by the previous business use to the setting of the adjacent Listed heritage asset, Allingham Farmhouse. The proposal re-uses traditional farm buildings, for which there is no further economic commercial use, for 4 dwellings, each with their own outdoor amenity space, thereby enabling the preservation of locally listed heritage assets and in providing smaller dwellings, adds to the mix of dwelling types in the area. This outweighs any harm the loss of a poorly located potential business use the site could provide for the locality. As such the proposal accords with Section 149 of the NPPF (2021), Policies DP7 and DP13 of the Tandridge Local Plan Detailed Policies (2014) and Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge Core Strategy (2008).

Councillor Duck seconded the motion. Before being put to the vote, conditions that would apply to the application (in the event of it being granted) were circulated to the Committee for consideration. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was carried.

RESOLVED – that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

216. 2021/1539 - UPLANDS, EDEN WAY, WARLINGHAM, CR6 9DP

The Committee considered an application for the variation of condition 2 (plans) for planning permission reference 2018/649. The original planning permission related to the demolition of existing sheltered accommodation and the erection of replacement accommodation comprising of a terrace of 4 houses, 4 semi-detached houses, and a 2-storey building with 13 bed flats and ancillary open space, car parking and landscaping. The variation would allow for 5 additional car parking spaces to be included on site.

The Officer recommendation was to permit subject to conditions.

Discussion also took place in relation to condition 3 which relates to hard and soft landscaping at the site. It was agreed that, if the variation to condition 2 was granted, that delegated authority be given to Officers to review condition 3 in an attempt to improve screening for the existing properties of 9 to 16 Uplands.

RESOLVED – that planning permission be granted and that authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer to review and, if necessary amend, condition 3.

Rising 8.20 pm

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 20th January 2022 at 7.45 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Sayer (Chair), Farr (Vice-Chair), Blackwell, Botten, Caulcott (substitute in place of Dennis), Duck, Elias (substitute in place of Black), Jones, Lockwood, Prew and Steeds

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Bloore*, Bourne*, Crane, Davies*, Dennis*, Gillman, Mills*, Moore*, Pursehouse*, Stamp*, Swann, N.White and Wren

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor Black

*These Councillors joined the meeting via Zoom. Councillor Dennis, while a member of the Committee, therefore participated in a non-voting capacity

235. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 5TH JANUARY 2022

These were approved as a correct record.

236. PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE - 22/23 DRAFT BUDGET AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

A proposed draft 2022/23 revenue budget and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) capital programme was presented. This explained that, due to current capacity constraints, a pragmatic approach had been taken regarding the distribution of pressures and savings to achieve a balanced budget position for 2022/23, namely:

Tranche 1 – savings and pressures which were straightforward to allocate (no Tranche 1 savings had been allocated to the Planning Policy Committee – Appendix A refers).

Tranche 2 – those requiring more time to allocate correctly to each committee, including £367k of pressures (£193k of staffing increments and £174k of contract inflation). These were being held as 'corporate items' pending consideration during the next cycle of committee meetings.

Tranche 3 – the more complex cross-cutting savings not currently allocated would be distributed following the June cycle of committee meetings, although none applied to the Planning Policy Committee.

It was also recommended that responsibility for CIL matters be transferred to this Committee from Strategy & Resources. At present, while the Strategy & Resources Committee was responsible for the CIL allocation process, the CIL budget remained with Planning Policy. The recommendation was intended to streamline arrangements more effectively. It was confirmed that the role of the CIL Working Group would not be affected by this change of committee ownership.

In response to Members' questions, officers advised that:

- the digital transformation of the land charges function was nearing completion and clarification would be sought about whether the process had been fully funded by a government grant;
- the £40,000 budget for planning appeals was intended to provide for the cost of both:
 - engaging barristers to represent the Council at public inquiries; and
 - any costs awarded against the Council (the application for costs arising from the successful appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the development at Coulsdon Road, Caterham – TA/2019/1538 – had not been submitted to date);
- the charges for pre-application fees, relative to those levied by other authorities, would be reviewed (the question was raised in the context of the charge for small businesses);
- the Government's funding settlement for local authorities would only be for one year and the outlook thereafter was uncertain, given that significant reforms of local government finance (i.e. the 'fair funding review' and a business rates reset) were anticipated for 2023/24;
- the only element of Tranche 2 savings applicable to this Committee would be staffing increments (including the 1.25% increase in National Insurance costs) directly relating to planning staff.

RESOLVED – that

- A. the Committee's draft revenue budget for 2022/23 in the sum of £1.19m (as shown at Appendix A) be agreed, taking account of pressures allocated as part of Tranche 1;
- B. the Committee's Community Infrastructure Levy Final Capital Programme for 2022/23 in the sum of £1.7m (as shown in Appendix B) be agreed;
- C. it be noted that, due to timing and capacity constraints across the Council, c£0.4m of pressures could not be allocated in time for January and February committee cycle and, as such, will be allocated in three tranches as follows:
 - Tranche 1, which are directly attributable to this Committee, have been allocated as per Appendix A (for Planning Policy, there are only directly attributable pressures, no savings have been applied);
 - Tranche 2 will be brought to the March committee cycle for approval (the only element of Tranche 2 savings applicable to Planning Policy will be increments directly relating to planning staff, adjusted for any share of planning staff terms and conditions / pay review savings);
 - Tranche 3, which are savings, to be applied as part of the June committee cycle (however, this will not be attributed to Planning Policy)
- D. the subjective revenue budgets in Appendix C, including movements from 2020/21 to 2022/23 and an estimated movement to 2023/24, be noted.

COUNCIL DECISION
(subject to ratification by Council)

RECOMMENDED – that, subject to the additional underlined wording, the following clauses regarding CIL be transferred from the Strategy & Resources to the Planning Policy Committee’s terms of reference and powers ‘to resolve’:

- the determination of CIL allocation criteria and applications for CIL funding
- the setting of CIL budgets and the monitoring of CIL income, expenditure and disbursements to Parish Councils
- the power to resolve:
 - revisions to CIL allocation criteria; and
 - CIL allocations upon consideration of applications and associated representations.

237. LOCAL PLAN PROGRESS OPTIONS: INSPECTOR RESPONSE - ID16 AND ID19

A report was considered with options regarding the Local Plan. This was in light of the Inspector’s correspondence ID16 and ID19 and the fact that key information arising from DHA’s Junction 6 (M25) capacity study and mitigation opportunities was now available. As agreed at the previous meeting on the 5th January 2022, DHA’s traffic modelling analysis had been sent to the Inspector.

Regarding the paragraph in the report titled “Consultation”, Councillor Duck requested that the second sentence be removed or qualified. It was qualified to state that the meeting referred to had taken place on the 7th December 2021 and had concentrated on DHA Transport’s report on junction 6 (M25).

The options presented within the report were:

1. Withdraw the draft Local Plan and prepare a new plan

This option would result in the withdrawal of the Plan and commence the preparation of a new Plan as per current national planning policy. This option was raised by the Inspector in paragraph 63 of ID16 and at paragraph 22 of ID19. For the benefit of context, the same details and workplan etc applicable to this option would also apply if the Plan were found unsound.

2. Continue with the current plan and modifications process

The examination would be paused, and the Council would be required to undertake further work on matters to an agreed timescale, including the provision of strategic infrastructure, Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAN); housing requirement and supply (including the Garden Village proposal); and provision for gypsies and travellers. The Inspector had identified several tasks in ID16 requiring completion before he could continue with the examination.

3. Continue with the current Local Plan and modifications process securing a 5-year Plan

As per Option 2, except that the Council would focus on a shorter adoption period in the knowledge that the Local Plan would need to be substantively reviewed after 5 years. It would continue to be prepared with the Local Plan period being 2013 to 2033 unless, at the point of review, it was determined the Plan should change.

4. Continue with a plan as set out in TED48

This option was originally presented to the Inspector as a “without prejudice”, alternative approach to progressing the Plan as set out in TED48. The intention of the option is different to Option 3 in that it changes the Plan period to fifteen years from 2013-2028 in accordance with paragraph 157 of the NPPF 2012, under which this Local Plan is being prepared. As with Option 3, it includes a 5-year review policy. However, where Option 3 would still consider the Garden Community as part of the Plan, Option 4 places no reliance on the Garden Community and would potentially require a new spatial strategy to be determined. The Local Plan would be focused on the allocated sites and would make best use of the remaining capacity of Junction 6 of M25.

For each option, the report contained indicative timescales and an analysis of risks, opportunities and caveats.

The report recommended that a response be issued to the Inspector attaching the options analysis referred to above and seeking a decision about how the Council should proceed.

Councillor Lockwood proposed that, regarding Annex 1 to the options analysis (table of work required by the inspector) the explanatory notes in the row for ‘Heritage Assessments for HSG06 and HSG12’ be amended (in the version to accompany the letter of response) to more closely reflect the wording of the Inspector’s comments in ID-16 (i.e. requesting assessments of the significance of the heritage assets for which there is potential for proposed housing allocations to cause harm etc). This was agreed.

Members discussed whether all four options should be identified as viable alternatives.

Councillor Prew, seconded by Councillor Elias, proposed that the response should identify Option 2 as the only option deemed viable by the Council. Upon being put to the vote, this amendment was lost.

It was agreed that the letter should be amended to express the Council’s view that the Inspector should discount Option 1 (the information would still be retained in the accompanying options analysis) because it would:

- not be financially viable for the Council due to the substantial costs involved and the significant strain it would impose on the Council’s limited resources;
- significantly increase the risk of speculative planning applications and appeals; and
- present extensive risks and challenges to residents and businesses throughout the District.

RESOLVED – that authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee, to issue a response to the Planning Inspector in accordance with the agreed amendments referred to above.

238. REVISED RESPONSE TO MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL'S CONSULTATION ON MODIFICATIONS TO ITS SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

A suggested response to this consultation was proposed to the Committee on the 5th January 2022. At that meeting, it was agreed that an alternative response be prepared by local Members and Officers for consideration on the 20th January 2022. A revised response had been drafted accordingly and was presented to the Committee for consideration. This was agreed, together with a proposal from Councillor Dennis that a copy be sent to the Planning Inspector examining the Tandridge Local Plan.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. the Council's response to Mid Sussex District Council's consultation be as per Appendix D; and
- B. a copy of the response be sent to the Planning Inspector examining the Tandridge Local Plan.

Rising 8.54 pm

Appendix A – 2022/23 Revenue Budget Movements, including pressures allocated as part of Tranche 1

PLANNING POLICY

		2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	Total £000
Brought forward budget		1,185	1,190	
Pressures				
Theme	Description	Pressure		
		2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	Total £000
Service Demands	Allowance for planning appeals	40	40	80
Service Demands - subtotal		40	40	80
Fees and Charges	Risk to pre-application income budget	15	0	15
Fees and Charges	Additional planning fee income	(50)	0	(50)
Fees and Charges - subtotal		(35)	0	(35)
Total Pressures		5	40	45
Net movement for committee budget		5	40	45
Indicative Budget Requirement		1,190	1,230	

Note: for 2023/24 Pressures are indicative only at this stage. These will be reviewed as part of the annual budget setting cycle for 2023/24

Appendix B – Community Infrastructure Levy Capital Schemes

CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2021/22 TO 2024/25 - Planning Policy

COMMITTEE SCHEMES	Current Programme 2021/22 £	Estimated Programme 2022/23 £	Estimated Programme 2023/24 £	Estimated Programme 2024/25 £	Total Programme 2021-25 £
-------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------

Planning Policy

Current Continuing Programme					
Capital Contributions from CIL	1,017,000	330,000	0		1,347,000
Total Current Continuing Programme	1,017,000	330,000	0	0	1,347,000

Revisions and New Bids					
Capital Contributions from CIL		1,337,400	500,000		1,837,400
Total Revisions and New Bids	0	1,337,400	500,000	0	1,837,400

Proposed Programme					
Capital Contributions from CIL*	1,017,000	1,667,400	500,000	0	3,184,400
Total Proposed Programme	1,017,000	1,667,400	500,000	0	3,184,400

* The full amount of CIL funding for 2022/23 is £2,617,400, however £950,00 is funding the Croydon Road Regeneration project which is shown as a separate scheme in Strategy & Resources Committee.

Appendix C - Subjective Revenue Budgets from 2020/21 to 2023/24

	2020/21		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	Annual Budget	Outturn	Annual Budget	Annual Budget ¹	Estimate ²
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Planning Applications & Advice	167	428	661	361	361
Planning Strategy & Policy Guidance	368	330	294	294	294
Appeals	0	0	0	40	80
Enforcement	173	101	50	224	224
Tree Preservation & Advice	1	1	0	92	92
Local Development Plan - Evidence	621	(82)	174	174	174
Transfer to/from Neighbourhood Plan Reserve	8	28	8	8	8
Covid-19 - Sales, Fees and Charges Reimbursement		(97)			
Land Charges and Street Naming ³			(3)	(3)	(3)
Planning Policy - General Fund	1,338	709	1,185	1,190	1,230
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) ⁴	0	0	0	0	0
Planning Policy	1,338	709	1,185	1,190	1,230

Note 1: The Annual budget will be represented, to the committee in March 2022, when the Corporate Items Pressures have been distributed

Note 2: These include the indicative pressures the committee

Note 3: Land Charges and Street Naming has been transferred to Planning Policy from Strategy and Resources

Note 4: Community Infrastructure Levy – The mechanism is to collect all of the levies through revenue (Est £1.8m) and transfer the levy to reserves less the administrative costs.

Revised draft Tandridge District Council response to proposed modifications to Mid Sussex District Council's Site Allocation Development Plan Document

We continue to have significant concerns about the traffic impacts that the proposed site allocations in East Grinstead, specifically SA19 and SA20, will have on the A22 Star Junction, and Felbridge roads more generally and do not feel that the main modifications process has responded to these known issues, sufficiently. The Star Junction has existing issues which are known to be severe and bringing sites forward in that immediate area can only add to the severity of the transport issues. Accordingly, significant improvements to the Star Junction are needed. This must also be considered in the context of the Garden Community proposed through our emerging Local Plan, which would be located at South Godstone and the general growth set out in our Plan which will increase traffic levels at the junctions referenced throughout this response.

We would like to remind MSDC of the work TDC/MSDC/WSCC and SCC jointly undertook regarding our unsuccessful HIF bid. This included a bid for monies to upgrade the Felbridge junction and MSDC are very aware of the significant obstacle this junction presents for both districts. As such, we are unsure why the profile and significance of the matter does not appear to have been suitably acknowledged.

Policy SA35 relates to the Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Housing Requirements. We refer to our comments made at Reg 19 in relation to policy SA35 and continue to support the thrust of the policy on joint working over the future identification of safeguarded land for improvements at junctions in the A22 and A264 corridors, and that development should not prejudice the delivery of these proposals. The TDC position is that the significance of issues at the junctions mentioned, must be more clearly borne out in the policies of the MSDC Site Allocations Plan. Policies should provide necessary assurances to both residents of Tandridge, and the local areas affected in Mid Sussex, that these junctions will either be mitigated, or sites considered to be undeliverable in the absence of necessary mitigation. We note that in the proposed Modifications no mention is made of our request in our Reg 19 response that:

'We would expect a mitigation option to have been agreed by all parties before the commencement of any development in the vicinity, so that we can be ensured that the impact will be mitigated and contributions towards the highways improvements are sought. As such, that wording to this effect is included within the policies (SA19 and SA20) as a main modification.'

We regard this as extremely important and without it our concerns remain as these sites could come forward with no overall solution to the pre-existing severe Star Junction issues. We recognise that, as the Inspector dealing with the Hill Place Farm appeal made clear, developer funding can only be used to mitigate the impact of their development and not to remedy pre-existing issues with the junction. Thus, if the sites come forward, the developers have the legal high-ground in only implementing mitigation for the incremental vehicle movements. Due to the already overloaded Star Junction this is likely to lead to re-routing, thereby adding significant burden to unsuitable rural roads. Our district acutely understands the impacts of rerouting on the highway network and the A22 and other rural roads are frequently used as alternative routes for high levels of traffic in the event of issues on the M25 and M23. Yet, no regard appears to have been taken to the impacts of this on the struggling Star and Felbridge junctions.

West Sussex County Council, in their response to the DPD at the Regulation 18 stage (page 999 https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/4704/req18_summaryreport.pdf) and as reiterated in their Regulation 19 response (page 215 https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/5860/evidence-base_redacted.pdf), noted that no scheme has been identified and also the possibility that the necessary significant junction improvements required at the Star Junction will not be delivered. Accordingly, they suggested an alteration but this has also not been incorporated.

We have included the relevant paragraph from their Regulation 18 response below.

“There is currently no scheme identified to improve the Felbridge junction that achieves all objectives and that all parties consider to be deliverable. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the County Council consider that the Site Allocations DPD should also acknowledge the possibility that improvements may not be deliverable at the Felbridge junction. If improvements are not deliverable, the Mid Sussex Transport Study indicates that the likely impacts of development are increasing delays and/or traffic re-routing via less suitable routes which may require mitigation measures such as traffic calming. Therefore, the County Council request that **para 3.16 is amended** to acknowledge that if highway improvements are not deliverable, then alternative transport strategy approaches, such as demand management or a major scheme, may need to be introduced to address pre-existing congestion and mitigate the cumulative impacts of development on the highway network.”

We also question whether the delivery of these sites is justified as the Plan seeks to over allocate against the established needs for the area. The DPD's residual need has been updated (effective from 21 April 21) and has been reduced from 1280 to 797 homes. So the plan is required to provide 797 homes but is allocating 1704. Such constraints to the sites referenced provide sufficient justification for their removal. We consider that the removal of both SA19 and SA20 would also lessen the cumulative impact upon the already severe highways network and upon infrastructure within our district. While we accept that this is not a simple matter, if removal is not possible, then properly robust policies on the commitment to mitigation and improvements, should be implemented.

SA 19 Land South of Crawley Down Road, Felbridge

We reiterate our previous Reg 19 comments regarding the identification of this site as part of East Grinstead settlement but its description as an extension to Felbridge.

“Tandridge notes that site SA19 has been identified as being within the proposed built-up boundary of East Grinstead and as such has the same settlement category (Category 1). However, it is also being described as an extension to Felbridge, with its vehicular access off Crawley Down Road and policy requirements setting out that the any proposals maximise connectivity with Felbridge. It is also noted that, at present, the built-up boundary narrows to a thin line between the main built up area of East Grinstead and development to the south of Crawley Down Road but this boundary is being amended to include an area of land located between this site allocation and the main built-up area of East Grinstead. Notwithstanding this it is noted that policy DP13 of the Mid Sussex Development Plan 2014-2031 seeks to prevent the coalescence of settlements which harms the separate identity and amenity of settlements and the maintenance of this undeveloped gap reinforces the fact that they are separate settlements.”

Our Settlement Hierarchy (2015 and 2018 Addendum) identifies Felbridge as a Tier 3 Rural Settlement which demonstrates a basic level of provision. However, it also recognises the relationship with out-of-district settlements, noting that residents rely on East Grinstead for services such as healthcare facilities, secondary schools and a train station. In arriving at our Preferred Strategy we considered a number of different approaches, including an approach with development focused on our Tier 3 settlements. Our Sustainability Appraisal concluded that such an approach would be unsustainable, with limited gains when compared to the impact on the environment and the settlements themselves. Tandridge’s approach therefore does not include directing development towards this settlement.”

Highways and Access – see comment above regarding the inclusion of wording that a mitigation scheme should be agreed before the commencement of any development on the site. We regard this as extremely important and its current omission as deeply regrettable in terms of impact on communities within Tandridge District.

We welcome the inclusion of the Minor Modification which makes it clear that development impacts should be mitigated “to the satisfaction of both” Surrey and West Sussex County Council Highway Authorities.

SA20 Land south and west of Imberhorne Upper School. Imberhorne Lane, East Grinstead

We continue to support proposals for health and education provision related to this site as set out in our Reg 19 representations.

We also support the proposed Minor Modification regarding monitoring of the use and management of the proposed SANG.

Highways and Access – see comment above regarding the inclusion of wording that a mitigation scheme should be agreed before the commencement of any development on the site. We regard this as extremely important and its current omission as deeply regrettable in terms of impact on communities within Tandridge District

We welcome the inclusion of the proposed Minor Modification which makes it clear that development impacts should be mitigated “to the satisfaction of both” Surrey and West Sussex County Council Highway Authorities.

This page is intentionally left blank

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

STRATEGY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 11th January 2022 at 7.30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Bourne (Chair), Langton (Vice-Chair), Black, Bloore, Botten, Caulcott, Cooper, Davies, Elias, Gillman, Pursehouse and Stamp

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Allen*, Connolly*, Crane*, Farr, Gaffney, * Groves*, Mills*, Ridge, Steeds, Swann and N.White

* These Councillors joined the meeting via Zoom.

220. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 2ND DECEMBER 2021

These minutes were approved and signed as a correct record.

221. FINANCE TRANSFORMATION

A report was presented which sought approval for a revised staffing structure for the finance function. The report explained that, following a selection process for posts in the previously agreed structure, it had not been possible to recruit suitable candidates to the posts of Senior Finance Business Partner (Deputy s151) and Finance Business Partner (corporate finance). These vacancies had been covered by additional support from Surrey County Council and other external sources when required.

In the circumstances, alternative staffing structures had been considered and the following revised changes were proposed (as per the organisation chart at Appendix 1 to the report):

- (i) appointment to a full time s151 / Chief Finance Officer (CFO) leadership role; the current CFO (Anna D'Alessandro) would continue to provide support and mentoring to this role both during transition to the new model and then provide ongoing support for 10-20% of her time - the costs of this will be included in the Joint Working Agreement;
- (ii) remove the Deputy s151 role from the structure (HOS 2) - the CFO post would absorb more of the operational leadership responsibilities that would otherwise have been vested in the Deputy role, the remaining responsibilities of which will be shared between the posts referred to in (iii) and (iv) below;
- (iii) create a new Senior Finance Business Partner (SFBP) role to oversee all the service facing functions (HOS 1) - the two service facing FBPs and the Assistant FBP would all report to this role;
- (iv) create a new Exchequer Manager role (M3) to oversee the exchequer team – the role would report directly to the CFO post;
- (v) the corporate finance structure to remain unchanged.

The Committee was advised that the changes would have a neutral financial impact as the increased costs arising from (i), (iii) and (iv) above would be offset by the removal of the Deputy s151 role. In response to Members' comments about this, the Chair agreed to liaise with the Chief Executive after the meeting about whether a cost comparison analysis of the old and new finance staffing structures to could be provided for Members.

The report also clarified the status of the Joint Working Agreement (JWA) with Surrey County Council. As opposed to a 'contract for services' it was confirmed that this is a partnership agreement for the creation of a shared finance team to work with staff directly employed by TDC to achieve agreed key aims and objectives. A draft JWA had been circulated to Committee members the day before the meeting. The report proposed that authority be delegated to the Chief Executive to vary the JWA in light of the new staffing structure. However, following a proposal from Councillor Pursehouse, it was agreed that the revised JWA should be brought to the Committee's meeting on the 1st February 2022 for approval.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. the new finance structure as set out in Appendix 1 to the report be agreed; and
- B. the revised Joint Working Agreement, reflecting A above, be submitted to the Committee's meeting on the 1st February 2022 for approval.

ACTION:

	Officer responsible for ensuring completion	Deadline
Chair to liaise with the Chief Executive about whether a cost comparison analysis of the old and new finance staffing structures to could be provided for Members.	Chief Executive / Ricky Fuller	24.01.22

222. STRATEGY & RESOURCES QUARTER 2 PERFORMANCE REPORT

The Committee considered an analysis of progress against its key performance indicators, together with updated risk registers, for the second quarter of 2021/22. Members discussed some of the five 'red risks' in the corporate risk register and the associated mitigations. The Chief Executive advised that the emerging Tandridge transformation programme would seek to address the long-standing risks as well as the scope for redesigning the delivery of services. The need for more work to be done to progress the climate change action plan was acknowledged, including opportunities for engaging with Surrey County Council via its climate change strategy partnership initiatives.

RESOLVED – that that the Quarter 2 (2021/22) performance and risks for the Strategy & Resources Committee be accepted.

223. WELLBEING PRESCRIPTION SERVICE CONTRACT EXTENSION

A report was presented to update the Committee about the Wellbeing Prescription Service (WPS) which had been operated by TDC, in partnership with Reigate & Banstead Borough Council, since 2015. The service was provided under the terms of a contract with the NHS East Surrey Integrated Care Provider and allowed GPs and other agencies to refer residents to a trained wellbeing advisor, e.g. to improve lifestyles and maintain independent living. The duration of the current contract was for three years to March 2021, with an option to extend to March 2023. The Committee was invited to endorse the contract extension which was being observed in practice by the parties, although the variation agreement had not been signed due to delays arising from the Covid pandemic.

The report also informed Members about:

- an independent evaluation in April 2021 which concluded that the service was supporting the aims of the Surrey Health and Wellbeing Strategy and delivering demonstrable benefits
- performance metrics and client feedback
- current resourcing and funding arrangements
- the need to review future contractual arrangements, including costing and pricing elements.

The Committee praised the WPS team for its work in delivering this valued service and noted that there was sufficient capacity (within the resources provided by the current contract) for dealing with increased levels of demand. Officers undertook to provide information about the number of face to face well-being appointments arranged for clients at two GP surgeries in the Lingfield area.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. the current two-year extension of the existing contract with the NHS East Surrey Integrated Care Provider until the 31st March 2023 be endorsed;
- B. the future work of the Wellbeing Prescription Service be supported and proposals be developed for a new contract in 2023, including cost implications, risks, funding options, and a memorandum of understanding to be agreed between partners; and
- C. a report on the outcome of B above be submitted to a future meeting of this Committee.

ACTION:

	Officer responsible for ensuring completion	Deadline
Information to be provided to Councillor Steeds about the number of face to face well-being appointments arranged for clients at two GP surgeries in the Lingfield and surrounding area.	Nicola Boreham	18.01.22

224. RENTAL GRANT SUBSIDY APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered applications (and officer recommendations) for rental subsidies from three tenant organisations, namely the East Surrey Museum, Caterham Community Association and Warlingham Sports Association. The applications had been submitted in accordance with the Council's policy which sought to provide transparency regarding the extent to which it subsidised community organisations which utilised Council owned land and buildings.

Rod Stead, a trustee of the East Surrey Museum, addressed the Committee (as permitted by Standing Order 31). He welcomed the prospect of a 15-year lease and confirmed that the museum should be able to take responsibility for the central heating system within the premises (1 Stafford Road, Caterham) as proposed within the report. However, he expressed concern at the requirement for the museum to contribute towards rental costs after the first three years of the new lease, especially as grants from other sources were unlikely to be available for running costs. He also questioned the recommended condition that the museum should '*take steps to improve the energy performance of the building*' given that it only occupied the ground floor. Regarding this latter point, officers clarified that the intention of the 'energy performance' condition was for the museum to install more energy efficient light fittings etc as opposed to having to insulate the building.

During the debate, it was suggested that future consideration of the museum's lease renewal be deferred, pending the establishment of a Working Group to offer strategic support to the trustees in developing a sustainable business plan to reflect the requirements of the new lease. The Committee concluded that the proposed lease and associated conditions should be agreed forthwith, but that the Working Group initiative, as proposed by Councillor Botten, should still be progressed.

The proposed leases and conditions for the Caterham Community Association and Warlingham Sports Association were agreed.

RESOLVED – that:

A. regarding the East Surrey Museum:

- (i) a 15-year lease be granted, with a stepped rent of £1,500 from the 3rd anniversary, £3,000 from the 4th anniversary and rent reviews in year 5 and year 10, and a tenant option to break the lease on or after each review date;
- (ii) the lease continues to be excluded from the security of tenure provisions of the 1954 Landlord & Tenant Act to give the Council the flexibility it needs, should circumstances be different at the end of the lease;
- (iii) the museum prepares a detailed business case setting out its vision for improving and modernising the museum and providing detailed plans showing how it intends to deliver its vision;
- (iv) a rental grant subsidy of 100% be granted in years 1 to 3, approximately 90% in year 4 and approximately 80% in year 5 be awarded (as per (i) above) subject to the museum:
 - taking responsibility for replacing the boiler and heating controls, and ensuing compliance with Part L of the building regulations

- taking steps to improve the energy performance of the building, thus achieving greater alignment with the Council's key objective of '*becoming a greener and more sustainable District*'
 - seeking grant funding from non-Council sources and/or fundraising to achieve the above two conditions;
- (v) a Working Group of Members and Officers be formed to offer strategic support to the trustees in developing a sustainable business plan to reflect the requirements of the new lease;
- B. regarding the Caterham Community Association:
- (i) a 15-year lease be granted, with a rent reviews in year 5 and year 10
- (ii) the lease continues to be excluded from the security of tenure provisions of the 1954 Landlord & Tenant Act to give the Council the flexibility it needs, should circumstances be different at the end of the lease;
- (iii) the Association submits a detailed business case setting out its vision and delivery plan;
- (iv) a rental grant subsidy of 95% be awarded, subject to the Association:
- continuing to be responsible for the repair and maintenance of the building and grounds in full;
 - taking steps to improve the energy performance of the building, thus achieving greater alignment with the Council's key objective of '*becoming a greener and more sustainable District*'
 - seeking grant funding from non-Council sources and/or undertaking fundraising to achieve the above two conditions;
- C. regarding the Warlingham Sports Association, a new five-year lease be granted, with a 30% rental grant subsidy, subject to the Association taking responsibility for all internal repairs and maintenance and statutory compliance at the Hamsey Green pavilion.

ACTIONS:

		Officer responsible for ensuring completion	Deadline
1	Formation of a Member & Officer Working Group to offer strategic support to the trustees of the East Surrey Museum in developing a sustainable business plan to reflect the requirements of the new lease	Alison Boote	04.02.22
2	First meeting of the Group with trustees	Kate Haacke	25.03.22

Rising 8.57 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 13th January 2022 at 7.30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Blackwell (Chair), C.White (Vice-Chair), Connolly, Duck, Farr, Gray, Lockwood, Mansfield**, Moore, Morrow, Prew, Ridge and Shiner

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Mills*, Black*, Caulcott*, Crane*, Groves*, N.White, Pursehouse*, Stamp*, Steeds* and Swann*

* Councillors participated joined the meeting remotely via Zoom

** Councillor Mansfield participated by Zoom in a non-voting capacity.

225. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Moore declared an interest in agenda item 5.2 (minute 228) as she had responded to the online consultation following a conversation with a member of the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Community regarding an unrelated planning matter.

Councillor Gray declared an interest in agenda item 5.2 (minute 228) as he was a member of the Surrey County Council Regulatory Committee, which would consider Tandridge District Council's response to the consultation. It was noted that this would not preclude him from taking part in the debate, but he may be unable to take part in any discussions on the item in future meetings of the Surrey County Council Regulatory Committee.

226. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 9TH DECEMBER 2021

The minutes of the meeting were confirmed and signed by the Chair.

227. 2021/1534 - SANDIFORD HOUSE 40 STANSTEAD ROAD CATERHAM

The Committee considered an application for the erection of four, 3-bedroom, terraced dwellings to the rear of Sandiford House, together with associated car parking and amenity space.

The Officer recommendation was to permit, subject to conditions.

Mr Russell Dixon-Box, an objector, spoke against the application.

Pre-recorded representations against the application from Councillor Maria Grasso of Caterham Hill Parish Council were shown to the Committee.

Mr Nigel Bennett, the applicant's agent, spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Duck put forward the following motion for refusal:

The proposal, by reason of the form, massing and detailing of the dwellings would fail to respect or reflect the character and appearance of the surrounding area or contribute positively to local distinctiveness. As such, significant harm would be caused contrary to Policy CSP18 of the Tandridge District Core Strategy (2008), Policy DP7 of the Tandridge District Local Plan: Part 2 - Detailed Policies (2014) and Policies CCW4 and CCW5 of the Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan (2021).

Councillor Prew seconded the motion. Upon being put to the vote, the motion was lost.

RESOLVED – that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

228. 2021/1983 - PENDELL CAMP, LAND OFF MERSTHAM ROAD, MERSTHAM, SURREY

The applicant, Surrey County Council, sought permission to use land at Pendall Camp as a ten-pitch transit site for the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) community, including the erection of amenity blocks, site manager's office, creation of a vehicular access, landscaping and parking. The formal decision on the application will be made by Surrey County Council. Tandridge District Council were a consultee in the application process and the report before the Committee provided a summary of the matters to be considered locally.

The Officer recommendation was to object to the consultation.

Following publication of the report and officer recommendation, Surrey County Council had contacted Tandridge District Council to request that the item be deferred to allow them time to address the Council's objections relating to the use of the site. Accordingly, the Interim Chief Planning Officer recommended to the Committee that the item be deferred.

RESOLVED – that the item be deferred to the Planning Committee on 3 March 2022

229. RECENT APPEAL DECISIONS RECEIVED

The Interim Chief Planning Officer advised that the following application had been allowed by the Planning Inspectorate on appeal:

TA/2019/1538 - Coulsdon Lodge, Coulsdon Road, Caterham, Surrey, CR3 5YA – the application has been refused by the Planning Committee on 2 July 2020. Costs had also been awarded against the Council in respect of the appeal. The total amount of the costs had yet to be determined.

The Interim Chief Planning Officer advised that an update relating to 2 Comforts Place Cottages, Lingfield, RH7 6LW would be discussed at a future committee.

Rising 9.08 pm

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 18th January 2022 at 7.30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Wren (Chair), Swann (Vice-Chair), Allen, Caulcott, Connolly, Crane, Gaffney (substitute in place of Mansfield), Hammond, Lee, North, O'Driscoll and Stamp

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Bourne*, Farr, Lockwood* and Mansfield*

*These Councillors joined the meeting via Zoom. Councillor Mansfield, while a member of the Committee, therefore participated in a non-voting capacity

230. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 23RD NOVEMBER 2021

These minutes were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

231. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Farr, Lee and Mansfield declared non-pecuniary interests in agenda item 6 (public conveniences) on the basis that they were members of Godstone Parish, Whyteleafe Village and Caterham on the Hill Parish Councils respectively and that they would be speaking about sites within those parish areas as referred to in the report.

232. COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE 22/23 DRAFT BUDGET AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

A proposed draft 2022/23 revenue budget and capital programme was presented. This explained that, due to current capacity constraints, a pragmatic approach had been taken regarding the distribution of pressures and savings to achieve a balanced budget position for 2022/23, namely:

Tranche 1 – savings and pressures which were straightforward to allocate (those for this Committee are shown in Appendix A).

Tranche 2 – those requiring more time to allocate correctly to each committee, including £367k of pressures (£193k of staffing increments and £174k of contract inflation) plus savings of £200k regarding staff vacancies. These were being held as 'corporate items' pending consideration during the next cycle of committee meetings.

Tranche 3 – the more complex cross-cutting savings totalling £450k, which would require service reviews and business cases to ensure accurate distribution to committees. The recently established Benefits Board would oversee this process to ensure that the benefits were being defined, owned and delivered. These budgeted savings were being held as 'corporate items' pending consideration during the June cycle of committee meetings.

In response to questions regarding budgeted savings, Officers explained that:

- the 'mechanical sweeper utilisation' saving involved the replacement of just one of the two present vehicles (an additional vehicle would be hired during the leafing season) and that proposals to revise the street sweeping schedule would be discussed with Members in due course;
- 'consolidating the lot structure' referred to the intended consolidation of current parks / grounds maintenance / playground contracts into ten lots (defined areas of work for which potential suppliers could bid, i.e. for one, some or all ten).

It was also suggested that parish and village councils should be able to procure additional street sweeping services from TDC to supplement its standard service and that a 'price list' should be made available (to parishes) accordingly.

The Chief Finance Officer advised that progress against budgeted savings would be reported to Members on a monthly basis.

Member suggestions for potential savings in 2023/24 were also discussed.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. the Committee's draft revenue budget for 2022/23 in the sum of £3.975m (as shown at Appendix A) be agreed, taking account of pressures and savings allocated as part of Tranche 1, and it be noted that a further two tranches of pressures and savings currently held in corporate items on behalf of other Committees will be distributed over the coming months;
- B. the Committee's final capital programme for 2022/23 in the sum of £522,000 (as shown at Appendix B) be agreed;
- C. the subjective revenue budgets in Appendix C, including movements from 2020/21 to 2022/23 and an estimated movement to 2023/24, be noted;
- D. it be noted that due to timing and capacity constraints across the Council, c£0.7m of savings (as part of a £1.1m savings programme) and c£0.4m of pressures could not be allocated in time for the January and February committee cycle and, as such, will be allocated in three tranches as follows:
 - Tranche 1 which are directly attributable to this Committee have been allocated as per Appendix A;
 - Tranche 2 will be brought to the March committee cycle for approval; and
 - Tranche 3 will be overseen and monitored by the Benefits Board and will be brought to the June committee cycle for approval.

In accordance with Standing Order 25(3), Councillor Allen wished it to be recorded that he abstained from voting on resolutions A to D above

233. REVIEW OF PROVISION AND FUNDING FOR PUBLIC TOILETS

A report was presented regarding options for the future provision of public conveniences throughout the District. This explained that the Council operated facilities at twelve sites but that the equipment (e.g. lavatories, sinks, hand driers) was approximately twenty years old and no longer serviced by manufacturers. The 2021/22 capital and revenue budgets were £550,000 and £94,030 respectively.

The report confirmed that the provision of public conveniences was not a statutory service and concluded that current maintenance costs were unsustainable. The Asset Management Team had therefore been asked to lead a review of the facilities with assistance from Operational Services. An initial desktop review was attached to the report with a commentary about the suitability of the twelve sites. This suggested that facilities at several locations were, for various reasons, no longer viable and that further discussions were required with local communities and businesses regarding longer term options. However, the two facilities on the A25 at Nags Hall, Oxted and the A22 at Godstone Hill (both on land owned by Surrey County Council) were recommended for immediate removal. The Nags Hall facility had remained closed since the 21st October 2021 for safety reasons arising from disrepair and both sites were known to attract anti-social activities / behaviour.

Upon debating the matter, the Committee accepted the recommendation to close the A25 (Nags Hall) facilities but argued that those on the A22 (Godstone Hill) should remain open until the need for any repairs made it financially unviable for the Council to maintain them. The need to provide adequate WC's for lorry drivers was cited as a key reason for this, notwithstanding the proximity of the Clacket Lane service station on the M25. It was also suggested that, in view of the income received by Surrey County Council (SCC) from mobile catering vendors on the A22 site, SCC should pay for the provision and maintenance of any replacement toilet facilities at that location.

Members also argued for the retention of toilet facilities at other locations, including where sites were adjacent to bus stops / termini. It was agreed that a more comprehensive review of the sites should be undertaken, including the scope for:

- design features seeking user safety and disabled access
- pay per use options
- partnership options involving alternative funding sources (although some Members doubted whether Parish Councils would be willing / able to take responsibility for WC facilities)
- seeking Community Infrastructure Levy funding (although Officers advised that CIL could not be used to offset revenue costs)
- reassessing the demand for facilities at the respective sites with a view to providing a more robust evidence base for any proposed closures.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. the toilet facilities at the A25 layby in Oxted be closed and removed;
- B. the A22 Godstone Hill facilities remain open until such time as the need for any repairs will make it financially unviable for TDC to continue to do so and that, in the meantime, dialogue be established with Surrey County Council regarding the possibility of them (SCC) providing replacement WC facilities on the site and taking responsibility for their ongoing maintenance and repair at no cost to TDC;
- C. refurbishment works at the toilet facilities at Ellice Road, Oxted be procured and that improvements to facilities at Queens Park and Whyteleafe Recreation Ground be taken forward in conjunction with the Open Space Strategy Action Plan;
- D. regarding toilet facilities at other sites:
 - (i) consideration be given to a reduction in the provision of facilities, while exploring opportunities for alternative methods of service delivery in consultation with Surrey County Council, Parish Councils and local businesses; and
 - (ii) no decision to change the management arrangements or to close any facilities be taken without the approval of this Committee following consideration of a report to a future meeting.

234. SHARED ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICE - PERFORMANCE REPORTING FOR FOOD HYGIENE STANDARDS

The Quarter 2 (2021/22) performance report for the Committee's meeting on the 23rd November 2021 recommended that KPI CS5 (% of establishments with a score of 3 or better under the food hygiene rating scheme) be removed from future performance reports. This was on the basis that the KPI reflected the performance of businesses rather than the joint (Tandridge / Mole Valley) environmental health team. However, Members concluded that food hygiene standards should continue to be reported to the Committee, and it was resolved that:

“a decision on the future of performance indicator CS5 (food establishment ratings) be deferred until the next meeting on the 18th January 2022, pending consideration of potential alternative means of measuring both the food hygiene standards of businesses and the performance of the food safety team”

Since the previous meeting, officers had assessed the quarterly performance information submitted to the Tandridge & Mole Valley environmental health / licensing partnership board and suggested that two of the KPI's concerned be included in the future quarterly performance reports to this Committee. This proposal was agreed.

RESOLVED – that future quarterly performance reports to this Committee include:

- (i) continued reporting against the current KPI CS5 (percentage of establishments with a rating of 3 (generally satisfactory) or better under the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme); and

- (ii) the performance information most recently submitted to the Tandridge & Mole Valley environmental health / licensing partnership board in respect of:
- the percentage of category A and B (food hygiene) risk premises inspected within 28 days of the inspection becoming due; and
 - the percentage of unrated food premises inspected, including registered premises not yet trading.

Rising 8.56 pm

Appendix A - 2022/23 Revenue Budget Movements, including pressures and savings allocated as part of Tranche 1

COMMUNITY SERVICES

	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	Total £000
Brought forward budget	3,993	3,975	

Pressures

Theme	Description	Pressure		
		2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	Total £000
Service Demands	Trees – Increase in provision for Ash die back	20	20	40
Service Demands	Playground inspection and maintenance contract (Jul	8	0	8
Service Demands	Increased net costs of Handy Man service	20	0	20
Service Demands - subtotal		48	20	68
Fees and Charges	Bulky waste collection charges are below initial estimates	39	0	39
Fees and Charges	Parking and Penalty Charge Notice revenue is down in 2021-22 and expected to continue into 2022-23	125	0	125
Fees and Charges	Additional recycling credits	(93)	50	(43)
Fees and Charges - subtotal		71	50	121
Total Pressures		119	70	189

Savings

Theme	Description	Saving		
		2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	Total £000
Service Efficiency	Mechanical Sweeper Utilisation	(20)	0	(20)
Service Efficiency	Move to fully cashless at Car Parks	0	(8)	(8)
Service Efficiency	Alteration to Specifications (Frequencies) and task approach for Parks activities	0	(10)	(10)
Service Efficiency	Through consolidating the lot structure, drive economies of scale	0	(25)	(25)
Service Efficiency	Route Mapping Exercise for Street Cleansing Service	0	(38)	(38)
Service Efficiency	Efficiency and income improvement on various regulatory services	(16)	(16)	(32)
Service Efficiency - subtotal		(36)	(97)	(133)
Fees and Charges	Increase Garden Waste charges	(64)	0	(64)
Fees and Charges	Charge schools for recycling collections	(25)	0	(25)
Fees and Charges	Tandridge Commercial Services works to Housing - Full cost recovery	(9)	0	(9)
Fees and Charges	Charge for contaminated Bin Clearances	(2)	0	(2)
Fees and Charges	General Maintenance Works to Housing - Full cost	0	(6)	(6)
Fees and Charges	Review of lease at Parks Cafes	0	(2)	(2)
Fees and Charges	Increase Garden Waste charges	0	(23)	(23)
Fees and Charges - subtotal		(100)	(31)	(131)
Total Savings		(136)	(127)	(263)

Net movement for committee budget	(17)	(57)	(74)
--	-------------	-------------	-------------

Indicative Budget Requirement	3,975	3,918	
--------------------------------------	--------------	--------------	--

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

COMMITTEE SCHEMES	Current Programme 2021/22	Estimated Programme 2022/23	Estimated Programme 2023/24	Estimated Programme 2024/25	Total Programme 2021-25
	£	£	£	£	£
Community Services					
Current Continuing Programme					
Children's Playground Improvements	432,500	179,200	99,500		711,200
Parks, Pavilions & Open Spaces	252,800	114,200	114,500		481,500
Grange Meadow Access Works	250,000	0	0		250,000
Vehicle Fleet Renewals	625,600	167,900	5,000		798,500
Car Park Equipment/Maintenance	34,800	34,900	35,000		104,700
Public Conveniences	550,000	0	0		550,000
Litter Bins	8,200	8,300	8,400		24,900
Roads&Paths at St.Mary's Church Cemetery	7,600	0	0		7,600
Land Drainage	13,700	10,000	10,000		33,700
Plant & Machinery Replacement Programme	8,000	8,000	10,000		26,000
Waste Vehicles	668,900	0	0		668,900
Garden Waste Bins	123,200	25,000	25,000		173,200
Recycling, food waste and refuse bins	111,000	90,000	90,000		291,000
Playground Improvements (Match Funding Pot)	50,000	0	0		50,000
Total Current Continuing Programme	3,136,300	637,500	397,400	0	4,171,200
Revisions and New Bids					
Children's Playground Improvements		(152,000)	75,000	131,800	54,800
Parks, Pavilions & Open Spaces				114,500	114,500
Grange Meadow Access Works					0
Vehicle Fleet Renewals		36,400	117,500	115,100	269,000
Car Park Equipment/Maintenance				35,100	35,100
Public Conveniences					0
Litter Bins				8,500	8,500
Roads&Paths at St.Mary's Church Cemetery				7,600	7,600
Land Drainage				10,000	10,000
Plant & Machinery Replacement Programme					0
Waste Vehicles					0
Garden Waste Bins				25,000	25,000
Recycling, food waste and refuse bins				90,000	90,000
Playground Improvements (Match Funding Pot)					0
Total Revisions and New Bids	0	(115,600)	192,500	537,600	614,500
Proposed Programme					
Children's Playground Improvements	432,500	27,200	174,500	131,800	766,000
Parks, Pavilions & Open Spaces	252,800	114,200	114,500	114,500	596,000
Grange Meadow Access Works	250,000	0	0	0	250,000
Vehicle Fleet Renewals	625,600	204,300	122,500	115,100	1,067,500
Car Park Equipment/Maintenance	34,800	34,900	35,000	35,100	139,800
Public Conveniences	550,000	0	0	0	550,000
Litter Bins	8,200	8,300	8,400	8,500	33,400
Roads&Paths at St.Mary's Church Cemetery	7,600	0	0	7,600	15,200
Land Drainage	13,700	10,000	10,000	10,000	43,700
Plant & Machinery Replacement Programme	8,000	8,000	10,000	0	26,000
Waste Vehicles	668,900	0	0	0	668,900
Garden Waste Bins	123,200	25,000	25,000	25,000	198,200
Recycling, food waste and refuse bins	111,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	381,000
Playground Improvements (Match Funding Pot)	50,000	0	0	0	50,000
Total Proposed Programme	3,136,300	521,900	589,900	537,600	4,785,700

Appendix C - Subjective Revenue Budgets from 2020/21 to 2023/24

	2020/21		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	Annual Budget £k	Outturn £k	Annual Budget £k	Annual Budget ¹ £k	Estimate ² £k
Salaries	2,235	2,087	1,363	1,363	1,363
Car Parking-On Street	0	52	(100)	(25)	(25)
Car Parking-Off Street	(58)	98	(64)	(14)	(22)
Hackney Carriage/Private Hire	(18)	(0)	(18)	(18)	(18)
Leisure & Community Grants	230	212	260	260	260
Waste Services	3,077	3,094	2,023	1,877	1,904
Environmental Services	298	304	294	278	263
Cesspool Services	(107)	(114)	(109)	(109)	(109)
All Operational Services	(1,109)	(865)	(172)	(152)	(152)
Parks and Open Spaces	566	590	500	519	521
Streets & Public Conveniences	10	29	16	(4)	(67)
Covid-19 - Sales, Fees and Charges Reimbursement		(159)			
Community Services	5,125	5,328	3,993	3,975	3,918

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 20th January 2022 at 7.45 pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Sayer (Chair), Farr (Vice-Chair), Blackwell, Botten, Caulcott (substitute in place of Dennis), Duck, Elias (substitute in place of Black), Jones, Lockwood, Prew and Steeds

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Bloore*, Bourne*, Crane, Davies*, Dennis*, Gillman, Mills*, Moore*, Pursehouse*, Stamp*, Swann, N.White and Wren

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor Black

*These Councillors joined the meeting via Zoom. Councillor Dennis, while a member of the Committee, therefore participated in a non-voting capacity

235. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 5TH JANUARY 2022

These were approved as a correct record.

236. PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE - 22/23 DRAFT BUDGET AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

A proposed draft 2022/23 revenue budget and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) capital programme was presented. This explained that, due to current capacity constraints, a pragmatic approach had been taken regarding the distribution of pressures and savings to achieve a balanced budget position for 2022/23, namely:

Tranche 1 – savings and pressures which were straightforward to allocate (no Tranche 1 savings had been allocated to the Planning Policy Committee – Appendix A refers).

Tranche 2 – those requiring more time to allocate correctly to each committee, including £367k of pressures (£193k of staffing increments and £174k of contract inflation). These were being held as 'corporate items' pending consideration during the next cycle of committee meetings.

Tranche 3 – the more complex cross-cutting savings not currently allocated would be distributed following the June cycle of committee meetings, although none applied to the Planning Policy Committee.

It was also recommended that responsibility for CIL matters be transferred to this Committee from Strategy & Resources. At present, while the Strategy & Resources Committee was responsible for the CIL allocation process, the CIL budget remained with Planning Policy. The recommendation was intended to streamline arrangements more effectively. It was confirmed that the role of the CIL Working Group would not be affected by this change of committee ownership.

In response to Members' questions, officers advised that:

- the digital transformation of the land charges function was nearing completion and clarification would be sought about whether the process had been fully funded by a government grant;
- the £40,000 budget for planning appeals was intended to provide for the cost of both:
 - engaging barristers to represent the Council at public inquiries; and
 - any costs awarded against the Council (the application for costs arising from the successful appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the development at Coulsdon Road, Caterham – TA/2019/1538 – had not been submitted to date);
- the charges for pre-application fees, relative to those levied by other authorities, would be reviewed (the question was raised in the context of the charge for small businesses);
- the Government's funding settlement for local authorities would only be for one year and the outlook thereafter was uncertain, given that significant reforms of local government finance (i.e. the 'fair funding review' and a business rates reset) were anticipated for 2023/24;
- the only element of Tranche 2 savings applicable to this Committee would be staffing increments (including the 1.25% increase in National Insurance costs) directly relating to planning staff.

RESOLVED – that

- A. the Committee's draft revenue budget for 2022/23 in the sum of £1.19m (as shown at Appendix A) be agreed, taking account of pressures allocated as part of Tranche 1;
- B. the Committee's Community Infrastructure Levy Final Capital Programme for 2022/23 in the sum of £1.7m (as shown in Appendix B) be agreed;
- C. it be noted that, due to timing and capacity constraints across the Council, c£0.4m of pressures could not be allocated in time for January and February committee cycle and, as such, will be allocated in three tranches as follows:
 - Tranche 1, which are directly attributable to this Committee, have been allocated as per Appendix A (for Planning Policy, there are only directly attributable pressures, no savings have been applied);
 - Tranche 2 will be brought to the March committee cycle for approval (the only element of Tranche 2 savings applicable to Planning Policy will be increments directly relating to planning staff, adjusted for any share of planning staff terms and conditions / pay review savings);
 - Tranche 3, which are savings, to be applied as part of the June committee cycle (however, this will not be attributed to Planning Policy)
- D. the subjective revenue budgets in Appendix C, including movements from 2020/21 to 2022/23 and an estimated movement to 2023/24, be noted.

COUNCIL DECISION
(subject to ratification by Council)

RECOMMENDED – that, subject to the additional underlined wording, the following clauses regarding CIL be transferred from the Strategy & Resources to the Planning Policy Committee’s terms of reference and powers ‘to resolve’:

- the determination of CIL allocation criteria and applications for CIL funding
- the setting of CIL budgets and the monitoring of CIL income, expenditure and disbursements to Parish Councils
- the power to resolve:
 - revisions to CIL allocation criteria; and
 - CIL allocations upon consideration of applications and associated representations.

237. LOCAL PLAN PROGRESS OPTIONS: INSPECTOR RESPONSE - ID16 AND ID19

A report was considered with options regarding the Local Plan. This was in light of the Inspector’s correspondence ID16 and ID19 and the fact that key information arising from DHA’s Junction 6 (M25) capacity study and mitigation opportunities was now available. As agreed at the previous meeting on the 5th January 2022, DHA’s traffic modelling analysis had been sent to the Inspector.

Regarding the paragraph in the report titled “Consultation”, Councillor Duck requested that the second sentence be removed or qualified. It was qualified to state that the meeting referred to had taken place on the 7th December 2021 and had concentrated on DHA Transport’s report on junction 6 (M25).

The options presented within the report were:

1. Withdraw the draft Local Plan and prepare a new plan

This option would result in the withdrawal of the Plan and commence the preparation of a new Plan as per current national planning policy. This option was raised by the Inspector in paragraph 63 of ID16 and at paragraph 22 of ID19. For the benefit of context, the same details and workplan etc applicable to this option would also apply if the Plan were found unsound.

2. Continue with the current plan and modifications process

The examination would be paused, and the Council would be required to undertake further work on matters to an agreed timescale, including the provision of strategic infrastructure, Objectively Assessed Housing Need (OAN); housing requirement and supply (including the Garden Village proposal); and provision for gypsies and travellers. The Inspector had identified several tasks in ID16 requiring completion before he could continue with the examination.

3. Continue with the current Local Plan and modifications process securing a 5-year Plan

As per Option 2, except that the Council would focus on a shorter adoption period in the knowledge that the Local Plan would need to be substantively reviewed after 5 years. It would continue to be prepared with the Local Plan period being 2013 to 2033 unless, at the point of review, it was determined the Plan should change.

4. Continue with a plan as set out in TED48

This option was originally presented to the Inspector as a “without prejudice”, alternative approach to progressing the Plan as set out in TED48. The intention of the option is different to Option 3 in that it changes the Plan period to fifteen years from 2013-2028 in accordance with paragraph 157 of the NPPF 2012, under which this Local Plan is being prepared. As with Option 3, it includes a 5-year review policy. However, where Option 3 would still consider the Garden Community as part of the Plan, Option 4 places no reliance on the Garden Community and would potentially require a new spatial strategy to be determined. The Local Plan would be focused on the allocated sites and would make best use of the remaining capacity of Junction 6 of M25.

For each option, the report contained indicative timescales and an analysis of risks, opportunities and caveats.

The report recommended that a response be issued to the Inspector attaching the options analysis referred to above and seeking a decision about how the Council should proceed.

Councillor Lockwood proposed that, regarding Annex 1 to the options analysis (table of work required by the inspector) the explanatory notes in the row for ‘Heritage Assessments for HSG06 and HSG12’ be amended (in the version to accompany the letter of response) to more closely reflect the wording of the Inspector’s comments in ID-16 (i.e. requesting assessments of the significance of the heritage assets for which there is potential for proposed housing allocations to cause harm etc). This was agreed.

Members discussed whether all four options should be identified as viable alternatives.

Councillor Prew, seconded by Councillor Elias, proposed that the response should identify Option 2 as the only option deemed viable by the Council. Upon being put to the vote, this amendment was lost.

It was agreed that the letter should be amended to express the Council’s view that the Inspector should discount Option 1 (the information would still be retained in the accompanying options analysis) because it would:

- not be financially viable for the Council due to the substantial costs involved and the significant strain it would impose on the Council’s limited resources;
- significantly increase the risk of speculative planning applications and appeals; and
- present extensive risks and challenges to residents and businesses throughout the District.

RESOLVED – that authority be delegated to the Chief Planning Officer, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee, to issue a response to the Planning Inspector in accordance with the agreed amendments referred to above.

238. REVISED RESPONSE TO MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL'S CONSULTATION ON MODIFICATIONS TO ITS SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

A suggested response to this consultation was proposed to the Committee on the 5th January 2022. At that meeting, it was agreed that an alternative response be prepared by local Members and Officers for consideration on the 20th January 2022. A revised response had been drafted accordingly and was presented to the Committee for consideration. This was agreed, together with a proposal from Councillor Dennis that a copy be sent to the Planning Inspector examining the Tandridge Local Plan.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. the Council's response to Mid Sussex District Council's consultation be as per Appendix D; and
- B. a copy of the response be sent to the Planning Inspector examining the Tandridge Local Plan.

Rising 8.54 pm

Appendix A – 2022/23 Revenue Budget Movements, including pressures allocated as part of Tranche 1

PLANNING POLICY

		2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	Total £000
Brought forward budget		1,185	1,190	
Pressures				
Theme	Description	Pressure		
		2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	Total £000
Service Demands	Allowance for planning appeals	40	40	80
Service Demands - subtotal		40	40	80
Fees and Charges	Risk to pre-application income budget	15	0	15
Fees and Charges	Additional planning fee income	(50)	0	(50)
Fees and Charges - subtotal		(35)	0	(35)
Total Pressures		5	40	45
Net movement for committee budget		5	40	45
Indicative Budget Requirement		1,190	1,230	

Note: for 2023/24 Pressures are indicative only at this stage. These will be reviewed as part of the annual budget setting cycle for 2023/24

Appendix B – Community Infrastructure Levy Capital Schemes

CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2021/22 TO 2024/25 - Planning Policy

COMMITTEE SCHEMES	Current Programme 2021/22 £	Estimated Programme 2022/23 £	Estimated Programme 2023/24 £	Estimated Programme 2024/25 £	Total Programme 2021-25 £
-------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------

Planning Policy

Current Continuing Programme					
Capital Contributions from CIL	1,017,000	330,000	0		1,347,000
Total Current Continuing Programme	1,017,000	330,000	0	0	1,347,000

Revisions and New Bids					
Capital Contributions from CIL		1,337,400	500,000		1,837,400
Total Revisions and New Bids	0	1,337,400	500,000	0	1,837,400

Proposed Programme					
Capital Contributions from CIL*	1,017,000	1,667,400	500,000	0	3,184,400
Total Proposed Programme	1,017,000	1,667,400	500,000	0	3,184,400

* The full amount of CIL funding for 2022/23 is £2,617,400, however £950,00 is funding the Croydon Road Regeneration project which is shown as a separate scheme in Strategy & Resources Committee.

Appendix C - Subjective Revenue Budgets from 2020/21 to 2023/24

	2020/21		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	Annual Budget	Outturn	Annual Budget	Annual Budget ¹	Estimate ²
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Planning Applications & Advice	167	428	661	361	361
Planning Strategy & Policy Guidance	368	330	294	294	294
Appeals	0	0	0	40	80
Enforcement	173	101	50	224	224
Tree Preservation & Advice	1	1	0	92	92
Local Development Plan - Evidence	621	(82)	174	174	174
Transfer to/from Neighbourhood Plan Reserve	8	28	8	8	8
Covid-19 - Sales, Fees and Charges Reimbursement		(97)			
Land Charges and Street Naming ³			(3)	(3)	(3)
Planning Policy - General Fund	1,338	709	1,185	1,190	1,230
Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) ⁴	0	0	0	0	0
Planning Policy	1,338	709	1,185	1,190	1,230

Note 1: The Annual budget will be represented, to the committee in March 2022, when the Corporate Items Pressures have been distributed

Note 2: These include the indicative pressures the committee

Note 3: Land Charges and Street Naming has been transferred to Planning Policy from Strategy and Resources

Note 4: Community Infrastructure Levy – The mechanism is to collect all of the levies through revenue (Est £1.8m) and transfer the levy to reserves less the administrative costs.

Revised draft Tandridge District Council response to proposed modifications to Mid Sussex District Council's Site Allocation Development Plan Document

We continue to have significant concerns about the traffic impacts that the proposed site allocations in East Grinstead, specifically SA19 and SA20, will have on the A22 Star Junction, and Felbridge roads more generally and do not feel that the main modifications process has responded to these known issues, sufficiently. The Star Junction has existing issues which are known to be severe and bringing sites forward in that immediate area can only add to the severity of the transport issues. Accordingly, significant improvements to the Star Junction are needed. This must also be considered in the context of the Garden Community proposed through our emerging Local Plan, which would be located at South Godstone and the general growth set out in our Plan which will increase traffic levels at the junctions referenced throughout this response.

We would like to remind MSDC of the work TDC/MSDC/WSCC and SCC jointly undertook regarding our unsuccessful HIF bid. This included a bid for monies to upgrade the Felbridge junction and MSDC are very aware of the significant obstacle this junction presents for both districts. As such, we are unsure why the profile and significance of the matter does not appear to have been suitably acknowledged.

Policy SA35 relates to the Safeguarding of Land for Strategic Housing Requirements. We refer to our comments made at Reg 19 in relation to policy SA35 and continue to support the thrust of the policy on joint working over the future identification of safeguarded land for improvements at junctions in the A22 and A264 corridors, and that development should not prejudice the delivery of these proposals. The TDC position is that the significance of issues at the junctions mentioned, must be more clearly borne out in the policies of the MSDC Site Allocations Plan. Policies should provide necessary assurances to both residents of Tandridge, and the local areas affected in Mid Sussex, that these junctions will either be mitigated, or sites considered to be undeliverable in the absence of necessary mitigation. We note that in the proposed Modifications no mention is made of our request in our Reg 19 response that:

'We would expect a mitigation option to have been agreed by all parties before the commencement of any development in the vicinity, so that we can be ensured that the impact will be mitigated and contributions towards the highways improvements are sought. As such, that wording to this effect is included within the policies (SA19 and SA20) as a main modification.'

We regard this as extremely important and without it our concerns remain as these sites could come forward with no overall solution to the pre-existing severe Star Junction issues. We recognise that, as the Inspector dealing with the Hill Place Farm appeal made clear, developer funding can only be used to mitigate the impact of their development and not to remedy pre-existing issues with the junction. Thus, if the sites come forward, the developers have the legal high-ground in only implementing mitigation for the incremental vehicle movements. Due to the already overloaded Star Junction this is likely to lead to re-routing, thereby adding significant burden to unsuitable rural roads. Our district acutely understands the impacts of rerouting on the highway network and the A22 and other rural roads are frequently used as alternative routes for high levels of traffic in the event of issues on the M25 and M23. Yet, no regard appears to have been taken to the impacts of this on the struggling Star and Felbridge junctions.

West Sussex County Council, in their response to the DPD at the Regulation 18 stage (page 999 https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/4704/req18_summaryreport.pdf) and as reiterated in their Regulation 19 response (page 215 https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/5860/evidence-base_redacted.pdf), noted that no scheme has been identified and also the possibility that the necessary significant junction improvements required at the Star Junction will not be delivered. Accordingly, they suggested an alteration but this has also not been incorporated.

We have included the relevant paragraph from their Regulation 18 response below.

“There is currently no scheme identified to improve the Felbridge junction that achieves all objectives and that all parties consider to be deliverable. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the County Council consider that the Site Allocations DPD should also acknowledge the possibility that improvements may not be deliverable at the Felbridge junction. If improvements are not deliverable, the Mid Sussex Transport Study indicates that the likely impacts of development are increasing delays and/or traffic re-routing via less suitable routes which may require mitigation measures such as traffic calming. Therefore, the County Council request that **para 3.16 is amended** to acknowledge that if highway improvements are not deliverable, then alternative transport strategy approaches, such as demand management or a major scheme, may need to be introduced to address pre-existing congestion and mitigate the cumulative impacts of development on the highway network.”

We also question whether the delivery of these sites is justified as the Plan seeks to over allocate against the established needs for the area. The DPD’s residual need has been updated (effective from 21 April 21) and has been reduced from 1280 to 797 homes. So the plan is required to provide 797 homes but is allocating 1704. Such constraints to the sites referenced provide sufficient justification for their removal. We consider that the removal of both SA19 and SA20 would also lessen the cumulative impact upon the already severe highways network and upon infrastructure within our district. While we accept that this is not a simple matter, if removal is not possible, then properly robust policies on the commitment to mitigation and improvements, should be implemented.

SA 19 Land South of Crawley Down Road, Felbridge

We reiterate our previous Reg 19 comments regarding the identification of this site as part of East Grinstead settlement but its description as an extension to Felbridge.

“Tandridge notes that site SA19 has been identified as being within the proposed built-up boundary of East Grinstead and as such has the same settlement category (Category 1). However, it is also being described as an extension to Felbridge, with its vehicular access off Crawley Down Road and policy requirements setting out that the any proposals maximise connectivity with Felbridge. It is also noted that, at present, the built-up boundary narrows to a thin line between the main built up area of East Grinstead and development to the south of Crawley Down Road but this boundary is being amended to include an area of land located between this site allocation and the main built-up area of East Grinstead. Notwithstanding this it is noted that policy DP13 of the Mid Sussex Development Plan 2014-2031 seeks to prevent the coalescence of settlements which harms the separate identity and amenity of settlements and the maintenance of this undeveloped gap reinforces the fact that they are separate settlements.

Our Settlement Hierarchy (2015 and 2018 Addendum) identifies Felbridge as a Tier 3 Rural Settlement which demonstrates a basic level of provision. However, it also recognises the relationship with out-of-district settlements, noting that residents rely on East Grinstead for services such as healthcare facilities, secondary schools and a train station. In arriving at our Preferred Strategy we considered a number of different approaches, including an approach with development focused on our Tier 3 settlements. Our Sustainability Appraisal concluded that such an approach would be unsustainable, with limited gains when compared to the impact on the environment and the settlements themselves. Tandridge’s approach therefore does not include directing development towards this settlement.”

Highways and Access – see comment above regarding the inclusion of wording that a mitigation scheme should be agreed before the commencement of any development on the site. We regard this as extremely important and its current omission as deeply regrettable in terms of impact on communities within Tandridge District.

We welcome the inclusion of the Minor Modification which makes it clear that development impacts should be mitigated “to the satisfaction of both” Surrey and West Sussex County Council Highway Authorities.

SA20 Land south and west of Imberhorne Upper School. Imberhorne Lane, East Grinstead

We continue to support proposals for health and education provision related to this site as set out in our Reg 19 representations.

We also support the proposed Minor Modification regarding monitoring of the use and management of the proposed SANG.

Highways and Access – see comment above regarding the inclusion of wording that a mitigation scheme should be agreed before the commencement of any development on the site. We regard this as extremely important and its current omission as deeply regrettable in terms of impact on communities within Tandridge District

We welcome the inclusion of the proposed Minor Modification which makes it clear that development impacts should be mitigated “to the satisfaction of both” Surrey and West Sussex County Council Highway Authorities.

This page is intentionally left blank

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

HOUSING COMMITTEE

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 25th January 2022 at 7.30 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Pursehouse (Chair), Lockwood (Vice-Chair), Connolly (substitute in place of Ridge), Gaffney, Gillman, Groves, Hammond, Mills, Morrow, Shiner, Steeds and Swann

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Bourne*, Davies*, Farr,* O'Driscoll and Sayer*

* participated via Zoom

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor Ridge

239. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 30TH NOVEMBER 2021

These minutes were approved and signed as a correct record.

240. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chair declared a pecuniary interest in agenda item 7 (HRA budget - Minute 243 below) on the basis that he rents Council garages on behalf of three community organisations in Warlingham. During that item, he left the Chamber for the discussion and voting on the setting of garage rents for 2022/23.

241. ENFORCEMENT POLICY FOR PRIVATE SECTOR HOUSING

A proposed enforcement policy for private sector housing was presented. It explained how the environmental health team (operating within the Tandridge / Mole Valley environmental health and licensing partnership) would regulate housing standards. The policy provided an overview of relevant legislation and the range of enforcement powers available. The intention was to raise standards in private sector housing throughout the District in collaboration with landlords, letting agents and tenants.

Section 11 of the policy dealt with civil penalties for offences under the Housing Act and is reproduced at Appendix A. Paragraph 4.1 of the covering report referred to the power to charge for serving notices under the Housing Act and stated that:

"The Council has the power, under the Housing Act 2004, to make a charge as a means of recovering certain administrative and other expenses incurred in serving certain Housing Act notices. The charge for each notice will be based on time spent by the officer in gaining entry to a property, visiting and inspecting the property to determine appropriate action and the administration costs for the production of a Notice or Order. The charge is determined in accordance with the Fees and Charges Principles ... it is proposed that charges are introduced in the next financial year 2022/23."

In response to Members' questions, it was confirmed that:

- The statutory framework of the policy did not extend to addressing Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) the legal powers for which were provided by the ASB Crime & Policing Act 2014. Housing Associations were able to adopt the provisions of that Act although many chose not to do so and, in Tandridge, ASB enforcement was led by the police in partnership with other agencies, including the Council via the Community Safety Partnership. It was also confirmed that officers attend the Tandridge Private Landlords Forum as means of engaging with the private rented sector.
- A paragraph could be added to the policy regarding gas safety standards (i.e. in addition to electrical safety standards which had been included to draw attention to recent statutory provisions, namely the 'Private Rented Sector (England) Regulations 2020').
- The term 'Temporary Exemption Notice' for houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) was a statutory definition which could not be altered in the policy. The environmental health team continued to monitor situations where such notices were served (e.g. where a landlord was taking steps to cease the operation of an HMO and to make the property non-licensable).
- Within the team, one full time Environmental Health Officer was dedicated to private sector housing standards within Tandridge (such officers are professionally qualified).
- The proposal to delegate authority to the Executive Head of Communities to make 'minor amendments' to the policy would involve incidental updates and would not amount to material changes.
- While the power to impose civil penalties is intended to make landlords more inclined to fulfill their statutory duties, the imposition of such penalties would be a matter of last resort and the associated income is unlikely to present a meaningful contribution for investment in the service.
- If non-compliance with an enforcement notice continued after the payment of a civil penalty, a further enforcement notice could be served (the Council could then choose to prosecute for non-compliance with second or subsequent notice rather than apply a fixed penalty).
- The policy would be publicised by way of a news release, communicated to the local landlord forum and published on the council's website

RESOLVED – that:

- A. subject to the addition of a paragraph regarding gas safety standards, the Private Sector Housing Enforcement Policy and the associated policy documents, including the approach to agreeing Civil Penalties (Appendix A refers) be approved and adopted;
- B. authority be delegated to the Executive Head of Communities, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Housing Committee, to make any minor amendments to the policy that may be necessary when it is reviewed annually; and
- C. the introduction of a charge for the service of Housing Act notices, which has been set in accordance with the current principles for fees and charges, be agreed and adopted.

242. HOUSING COMMITTEE 2022/23 DRAFT GENERAL FUND BUDGET AND MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

A proposed draft 2022/23 revenue budget and capital programme was presented. This explained that, due to current capacity constraints, a pragmatic approach had been taken regarding the distribution of pressures and savings to achieve a balanced budget position for 2022/23, namely:

Tranche 1 – savings and pressures which were straightforward to allocate (Appendix B).

Tranche 2 – those requiring more time to allocate correctly to each committee, including £367k of pressures (£193k of staffing increments and £174k of contract inflation) plus savings of £200k regarding staff vacancies. These were being held as ‘corporate items’ pending consideration during the next cycle of committee meetings.

Tranche 3 – the more complex cross-cutting savings totalling £450k, which would require service reviews and business cases to ensure accurate distribution to committees. The recently established Benefits Board would oversee this process to ensure that the benefits were being defined, owned and delivered. These budgeted savings were being held as ‘corporate items’ pending consideration during the June cycle of committee meetings.

In response to questions during the debate, Officers explained that:

- reference in the covering report to a loss of rental income from Redstone House should be read in light of the fact that:
 - the property is being marketed for sale and already vacant;
 - retention of the property would entail costly maintenance liabilities
- the cessation of funding for the Westway Centre was in accordance with the terms of the lease to the CIO (Charitable Incorporated Organisation) and officers were working proactively with trustees to enable them to access grant funding from other sources and generate rental income by sub-letting parts of the premises.

Regarding the recommendation to increase rentals for plots and garages at the Meadowside mobile homes park by 4.1% (in line with HRA rents for Council tenants) Councillor Morrow, seconded by Councillor Steeds, moved an amendment that the increase be capped at 2%, with the £468k revenue budget for the Housing General Fund being increased accordingly. Arguments for and against this amendment were discussed. Upon being put to the vote, the amendment was lost on the Chair’s casting vote.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. the Committee’s draft General Fund revenue budget for 2022/23 of £468k, as shown in Appendix B, taking account of pressures and savings allocated as part of Tranche 1 be agreed, and it be noted that that a further two tranches of pressures and savings currently held in corporate items on behalf of other Committees will be distributed over the coming months;
- B. the Housing Committee’s General Fund draft capital programme for 2022/23 in the sum of £460k for 2022/23, as shown in Appendix C, be agreed;
- C. the subjective revenue budgets in Appendix D, including movements from 2020/21 to 2022/23 and an estimated movement to 2023/24, be noted;

- D. it be noted that, due to timing and capacity constraints across the Council, c£0.7m of savings (as part of a £1.1m savings programme) and c£0.4m of pressures could not be allocated in time for the January and February committee cycle and, as such, will be allocated in three tranches as follows:
- Tranche 1 which are directly attributable to the committee have been allocated as per Appendix B;
 - Tranche 2 will be brought to the March committee cycle for approval; and
 - Tranche 3 will be overseen and monitored by the Benefits Board and will be brought to the June committee cycle for approval.

243. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT - 22/23 DRAFT BUDGET

A report was submitted to enable the Committee to consider a draft HRA revenue budget and capital programme for 2022/23. This explained that the HRA is a separate, ring-fenced account, paid from tenants' rents and service charges and governed by a regime based on a national system of self-financing. The report highlighted:

- new rules for the Right to Buy (RTB) although these would not provide additional resources for Tandridge given the relatively low number of RTB's in the District per annum;
- the ceiling for annual 'social' and 'affordable' rent increases of 4.1% (i.e. CPI at September 2021 + 1%)

The report explained that the current HRA business plan was based on a scheduled £2.85m loan repayment for 2022/23 being refinanced to allow sufficient resources for funding the Council house building programme. It also confirmed that the opening revenue balances for 2022/23 were approximately £6.5m, £1.7m of which was earmarked to support new build schemes. Any surplus generated by the HRA in the year would be apportioned between the 'new build' and 'repairs' reserves on a two-thirds / one-third basis as previously agreed. The permitted 4.1% increase for 'social' and 'affordable' rents was recommended. It was also proposed that rents for garages and service charges be increased by the same percentage.

The Committee received a presentation from Jeremy Cookson, the Council's HRA Consultant, which illustrated:

- the budget changes for 2022/23 in terms of the variations in costs and savings relative to the current year – this would reduce the transfer to reserves by £124,000 (although the HRA would still generate a surplus)
- the HRA capital programme, with provision for £16.5m of new build expenditure between 2022/23 and 2024/25
- base projections to 2050/51 of HRA debt / balances and sources of funding for the capital programme
- the impact of alternative new development scenarios on the HRA business plan from 2024/25 to 2031/32 (i.e. 9 units per annum to replace those sold via the Right to Buy; an accelerated programme of 35 units per annum; and the same accelerated programme but with rent increases limited to CPI).

The presentation concluded that, while there was a scope for sustaining a Council house building programme in future years, longer term grant funding should be sought to offset limitations in the availability of finite Right to Buy receipts. The potential advantage of borrowing now for investment in future years was also highlighted. Jeremy Cookson responded to Members' questions following the presentation.

During the following debate on the report, the intention to install new gas boilers in housing properties (as part of the energy efficiency scheme within the capital programme) was discussed, including a suggestion that this was at odds with the statement that there were no significant climate change implications. Officers also undertook to explain to Members (after the meeting) how the summary budget table in paragraph 3.9 of the report reconciles with Appendix F to these minutes (the main difference being that the latter includes the allocation of staffing costs).

The Executive Head of Communities confirmed that the proposed increases in service charges (including those for sheltered and older persons services) were necessary to absorb increased costs and were not intended to generate profits.

In accordance with Minute 240, the Chair left the meeting for the discussion and voting on the setting of garage rents for 2022/23. Councillor Lockwood took the Chair and presided over that matter before closing the meeting.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. social rents (excluding service charges) and affordable rents (including service charges) for 2022/23 be increased by 4.1% in accordance with government social rent policy guidance;
- B. the draft capital programme for 2022/23 in the sum of £11,585,700 and the subsequent years, as shown at Appendix E, be agreed;
- C. the draft revenue budget for 2022/23 with a net operating surplus of £2,401,800, before allowing for revenue contributions to capital expenditure and interest charges, as shown at Appendix F, be agreed;
- D. rents for garages be increased by 4.1% for 2022/23 to produce a standard weekly rent of £13.53 to tenants, or £16.25 (including VAT) for let to private tenants;
- E. service charges be increased by 4.1% for 2022/23 to produce an average weekly charge of £7.12;
- F. sheltered and older persons service charges be increased by 4.1% for 2022/23 to £14.33 and £3.13 respectively.
- G. the PWLB HRA Loan of £2.85m, due for repayment in 2022/23, be re-financed and programmed funding of £5.1m (£1.3m in 2022/23 and £3.8m in 2023/24) to finance the capital programme be financed by PWLB borrowing.

Rising 9.51 pm

Extract from section 11 of the private sector housing enforcement policy**Civil penalties for offences under the Housing Act 2004**

The Housing and Planning Act 2016 introduced a range of measures to crack down on rogue landlords, including the power for Councils to issue civil penalties. Penalties of up to £30,000 may be issued as an alternative to prosecution for certain specified offences.

Income received from a civil penalty can be retained by the Council, provided that it is used to further its statutory functions in relation to enforcement activities covering the private rented sector.

A civil penalty may be imposed as an alternative to prosecution for the following offences under the Housing Act 2004:

- Failure to comply with an Improvement Notice (section 30)
- Offences in relation to licensing of Houses in Multiple Occupation (section 72)
- Offences in relation to licensing of houses under Part 3 of the Act (section 95)
- Contravention of an overcrowding notice (section 139)
- Failure to comply with management regulations in respect of Houses in Multiple Occupation (section 234)

The amount of penalty is to be determined by the Council in each case. The actual amount levied in any particular case should reflect the severity of the offence as well as taking account of the landlord's previous record of offending. In determining an appropriate level of penalty, the Council will have regard to the publication 'Civil Penalties under the Housing and Planning Act 2016' in which the Government's Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) provides statutory guidance.

A civil penalty can only be imposed as an alternative to prosecution. However, unlike prosecution action, where there are offences under Houses in Multiple Occupation Management Regulations, the Council may issue a civil penalty for each separate offence.

The same criminal standard of proof is required for a civil penalty as for prosecution. This means that before taking formal action, the Council must satisfy itself that if the case were to be prosecuted in a magistrates' court, there would be a realistic prospect of conviction. The Residential and Environment Team will consult with the Council's legal team in this respect.

Determining the Sanction

The following principles will apply to each case to be considered in relation to a civil penalty;

- Each case will be considered on its own merits
- There must be sufficient, reliable evidence to justify the action taken
- The action taken must be in the public interest
- Any mitigating circumstances will be considered
- The decision to prosecute an individual is a serious step and has serious implications for all involved. Decisions to prosecute should always be fair and consistent.

Factors to be taken into consideration when determining the Penalty

In accordance with the statutory guidance, the Council will consider the following factors to help ensure that the civil penalty is set at an appropriate level:

- **Severity of the offence.** The more serious the offence, the higher the penalty should be.
- **Culpability and track record of the offender.** A higher penalty will be appropriate where the offender has a history of failing to comply with their obligations and/or their actions were deliberate and/or they knew, or ought to have known, that they were in breach of their legal responsibilities. Landlords are running a business and should be expected to be aware of their legal obligations.
- **The harm caused to the tenant.** This is a very important factor when determining the level of penalty. The greater the harm or the potential for harm (this may be as perceived by the tenant), the higher the amount should be when imposing a civil penalty.
- **Punishment of the offender.** A civil penalty should not be regarded as an easy or lesser option compared to prosecution. While the penalty should be proportionate and reflect both the severity of the offence and whether there is a pattern of previous offending, it is important that it is set at a high enough level to help ensure that it has a real economic impact on the offender and demonstrates the consequences of not complying with their responsibilities.
- **Deter the offender from repeating the offence.** The ultimate goal is to prevent any further offending and help ensure that the landlord fully complies with all of their legal responsibilities in future. The level of the penalty should therefore be set at a high enough level such that it is likely to deter the offender from repeating the offence.
- **Deter others from committing similar offences.** While the fact that someone has received, a civil penalty will not be in the public domain, it is possible that other landlords in the local area will become aware through informal channels when someone has received a civil penalty. An important part of deterrence is the realisation that (a) the local housing authority is proactive in levying civil penalties where the need to do so exists and (b) that the level of civil penalty will be set at a high enough level to both punish the offender and deter repeat offending.
- **Remove any financial benefit the offender may have obtained as a result of committing the offence.** The guiding principle here should be to ensure that the offender does not benefit as a result of committing an offence, i.e. it should not be cheaper to offend than to ensure a property is well maintained and properly managed.

Determining the Penalty

Tandridge District Council's 'Policy on determining the level of Civil Penalty as an alternative to prosecution under the Housing Act 2004' (pages 55 to 63 of the agenda pack) sets out how the Council will determine the level of financial penalty in individual cases, once the decision to impose a financial penalty has been made. It also provides further information about how the penalties are imposed, the procedure for issuing them and the process for appealing a penalty.

**2022/23 Revenue Budget Movements, including pressures and savings
allocated as part of Tranche 1**

HOUSING GENERAL FUND

		2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	Total £000
Brought forward budget		469	468	
Pressures				
		Pressure		
Theme	Description	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	Total £000
Service Demands	Afghan refugees – Net funding pressure	10	0	10
Service Demands	Redstone – sale of the property / affordable housing – loss of rent	49	0	49
Total Pressures		59	0	59
Savings				
		Saving		
Theme	Description	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	Total £000
Fees and Charges	Reduce funding for Westway Centre (Douglas/Broughton) as per the lease	(50)	(50)	(100)
Fees and Charges	Increase Meadowside Mobile Home Sales	(10)	10	0
Total Savings		(60)	(40)	(100)
Net movement for committee budget		(1)	(40)	(41)
Indicative Budget Requirement		468	428	

Note: for 2023/24 Pressures are indicative only at this stage and savings are those which are a continuation of those identified for delivery in 2022/23. These will be reviewed as part of the annual budget setting cycle for 2023/24.

CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2021/22 TO 2024/25 - Housing General Fund

COMMITTEE SCHEMES	Current Programme 2021/22 £	Estimated Programme 2022/23 £	Estimated Programme 2023/24 £	Estimated Programme 2024/25 £	Total Programme 2021-25 £
-------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------

Housing General Fund

Current Continuing Programme					
Disabled Facilities Grant	460,000	460,000	460,000		1,380,000
Total Current Continuing Programme	460,000	460,000	460,000	0	1,380,000

Revisions and New Bids					
Disabled Facilities Grant				460,000	460,000
Total Revisions and New Bids	0	0	0	460,000	460,000

Proposed Programme					
Disabled Facilities Grant	460,000	460,000	460,000	460,000	1,840,000
Total Proposed Programme	460,000	460,000	460,000	460,000	1,840,000

Subjective Revenue Budgets from 2020/21 to 2022/24

	2020/21		2021/22	2022/23	2023/24
	Annual Budget	Outturn	Annual Budget	Annual Budget ¹	Estimate ²
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
Salaries	776	661	524	524	524
Meadowside Mobile Homes	(116)	(137)	(120)	(130)	(120)
Westway	100	123	100	50	0
Private Sector Enabling	64	53	71	71	71
Housing of the Homeless	(60)	(75)	(61)	(61)	(61)
Other Housing Renewal Functions	60	55	55	55	55
Syrian Refugees	15	(0)	15	15	15
Afghan Refugees	0	0	0	10	10
Redstone House	(49)	(48)	(49)	0	0
Housing Benefits	(193)	(132)	(69)	(69)	(69)
Care In The Community	1	1	1	1	1
Other Variances less than £10k	0	(51)			
Alarm Systems	(163)	(160)			
Housing General Fund	435	291	469	468	428

Note 1: The Annual budget will be represented, to the committee in March 2022, when the Corporate Items Pressures and Savings have been distributed

Note 2: These include the indicative pressures and savings for the committee

CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2021/22 TO 2024/25 – HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT

COMMITTEE SCHEMES	Current Programme 2021/22 £	Estimated Programme 2022/23 £	Estimated Programme 2023/24 £	Estimated Programme 2024/25 £	Total Programme 2021-25 £
Housing Revenue Account					
Current Continuing Programme					
Structural Works	925,000	855,000	830,000		2,610,000
Modernisation & Improvements	439,000	732,000	511,000		1,682,000
Energy Efficiency Works	550,500	559,500	546,000		1,656,000
Service Renewals	758,000	712,500	695,000		2,165,500
Void Works	425,000	425,000	425,000		1,275,000
Health & Safety	190,000	190,000	180,000		560,000
Adaptations for the Disabled	250,000	250,000	250,000		750,000
Essential Structural Works	185,000	185,000	185,000		555,000
Communal Services	30,000	30,000	30,000		90,000
Council House Building	12,700,000	5,463,600	301,200		18,464,800
HRA IT - Hardware/infrastructure/Projects	351,500	60,600	72,200		484,300
Total Current Continuing Programme	16,804,000	9,463,200	4,025,400	0	30,292,600
Revisions and New Bids					
Structural Works				838,300	838,300
Modernisation & Improvements				516,100	516,100
Energy Efficiency Works				551,500	551,500
Service Renewals				702,000	702,000
Void Works				429,300	429,300
Health & Safety				181,800	181,800
Adaptations for the Disabled				252,500	252,500
Essential Structural Works				186,900	186,900
Communal Services				30,300	30,300
Council House Building		2,122,500	7,522,900	1,109,400	10,754,800
HRA IT - Hardware/infrastructure/Projects			(30,900)	68,300	37,400
Total Revisions and New Bids	0	2,122,500	7,492,000	4,866,400	14,480,900
Proposed Programme					
Structural Works	925,000	855,000	830,000	838,300	3,448,300
Modernisation & Improvements	439,000	732,000	511,000	516,100	2,198,100
Energy Efficiency Works	550,500	559,500	546,000	551,500	2,207,500
Service Renewals	758,000	712,500	695,000	702,000	2,867,500
Void Works	425,000	425,000	425,000	429,300	1,704,300
Health & Safety	190,000	190,000	180,000	181,800	741,800
Adaptations for the Disabled	250,000	250,000	250,000	252,500	1,002,500
Essential Structural Works	185,000	185,000	185,000	186,900	741,900
Communal Services	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,300	120,300
Council House Building	12,700,000	7,586,100	7,824,100	1,109,400	29,219,600
HRA IT - Hardware/infrastructure/Projects	351,500	60,600	41,300	68,300	521,700
Total Proposed Programme	16,804,000	11,585,700	11,517,400	4,866,400	44,773,500

APPENDIX F

APPENDIX F

Housing Revenue Account draft revenue budget for 2022/23

Actual 2019/20	Budget 2022/23	Programme Areas	Employee Costs	Other Running Expenses	Total Gross Expenditure	Income	Net Direct Budget	Support Service Recharge	Charges for Capital	Budget 2022/23	Changes from 2021/22 to 2022/23
5,826	27,900	Right to Buy	24,700	2,400	27,100	(9,600)	17,500	11,200	0	28,700	800
237,456	206,000	Allocations Administration	121,100	15,400	136,500	(31,600)	104,900	106,100	0	211,000	5,000
82,812	58,200	Void Properties Management	6,000	26,100	32,100	0	32,100	27,000	0	59,100	900
326,094	292,100	PROVIDING PEOPLE WITH HOMES	151,800	43,900	195,700	(41,200)	154,500	144,300	0	298,800	6,700
2,564,418	3,339,000	Housing Repairs - Dwellings	676,000	3,173,000	3,849,000	(279,400)	3,569,600	0	0	3,569,600	230,600
578,579	646,000	Housing Repairs - Administration	239,300	14,500	253,800	0	253,800	408,300	0	662,100	16,100
3,142,997	3,985,000	IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF HOUSING	915,300	3,187,500	4,102,800	(279,400)	3,823,400	408,300	0	4,231,700	246,700
6,213,663	6,525,100	Housing Administration	726,800	1,107,900	1,834,700	(60,300)	1,774,400	153,700	5,075,000	7,003,100	478,000
337,224	54,800	Hostel Management	5,700	5,800	11,500	0	11,500	49,900	0	61,400	6,600
334,644	326,200	Rent Collection & Accounting	171,800	32,700	204,500	(5,900)	198,600	134,200	0	332,800	6,600
333,366	280,400	Estate Management	157,600	30,500	188,100	0	188,100	97,600	0	285,700	5,300
660	3,400	Tenant Participation	0	3,400	3,400	0	3,400	0	0	3,400	0
74,410	75,300	Other Expenses	0	58,600	58,600	0	58,600	18,300	0	76,900	1,600
39,784	42,700	Estate Regeneration Schemes	0	42,700	42,700	0	42,700	0	0	42,700	0
61,189	67,700	Debt Management Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0	67,700	67,700	0
7,394,940	7,375,600	MANAGING THE SERVICES EFFECTIVELY	1,061,900	1,281,600	2,343,500	(61,558)	2,277,300	453,700	5,142,700	7,873,700	498,100
388,300	436,000	Elderly Persons Dwellings	323,400	8,900	332,300	(149,300)	183,000	259,800	0	442,800	6,800
39,810	89,600	Alarm Systems	43,900	39,900	83,800	0	83,800	7,600	0	91,400	1,800
(1,685)	(23,100)	Leasehold Properties	43,300	88,700	132,000	(193,400)	(61,400)	40,100	0	(21,300)	1,800
426,425	502,500	COMMUNITY SERVICES	410,600	137,500	548,100	(192,630)	205,400	307,500	0	512,900	10,400
(13,081,593)	(13,938,600)	Dwelling Rent Income	0	0	0	(14,509,800)	(14,509,800)	0	0	(14,509,800)	(571,200)
(471,677)	(482,100)	Garage Rents	0	0	0	(501,900)	(501,900)	0	0	(501,900)	(19,800)
(663,399)	(659,100)	Service Charges	0	0	0	(683,100)	(683,100)	0	0	(683,100)	(24,000)
474,313	375,900	Rent Loss from Voids and Bad Debts	0	0	0	375,900	375,900	0	0	375,900	0
(13,742,356)	(14,703,900)	RENT INCOME	0	0	0	(15,318,900)	(15,318,900)	0	0	(15,318,900)	(615,000)
(2,451,900)	(2,548,700)	NET COST OF SERVICES	2,539,600	4,650,500	7,190,100	(15,893,689)	(8,858,300)	1,313,800	5,142,700	(2,401,800)	146,900
1,688,757	1,662,500	Interest Payable on outstanding loans	0	1,639,600	1,639,600	0	1,639,600	0	0	1,639,600	(22,900)
(32,177)	(7,100)	Interest and Investment Income	0	0	0	(7,100)	(7,100)	0	0	(7,100)	0
795,320	893,300	Revenue Contributions to support HRA Capital Ex	0	0	0	(1,150,900)	(1,150,900)	0	1,920,200	769,300	(124,000)
2,451,900	2,548,700	Capital Charges and HRA support for capital	0	1,639,600	1,639,600	(1,158,000)	481,600	0	1,920,200	2,401,800	(146,900)
0	0	SURPLUS / DEFICIT FOR THE YEAR	2,539,600	6,290,100	8,829,700	(17,051,689)	(8,376,700)	1,313,800	7,062,900	0	0
0	0	Transfer to HRA Working Balance	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	HRA Budget	2,539,600	6,290,100	8,829,700	(17,051,689)	(8,376,700)	1,313,800	7,062,900	0	0

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

AUDIT & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 27th January 2022 at 7.30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Langton (Chair), Allen (Vice-Chair), Bloore, Crane, Davies, Dennis**, Flower, Gray**, O'Driscoll and C.White

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Sayer, Farr*, Gillman*, Jones*, Lockwood*, Mills*, Moore and N.White

* Councillors joined the meeting remotely via Zoom.

** Councillors Dennis and Gray participated via Zoom in a non-voting capacity.

244. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 2ND NOVEMBER 2021

The minutes were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

The actions arising from the meeting on 2 November 2021 were reviewed and it was noted that:

- SIAP had provided a paper outlining the standards that they had to comply with in respect of internal audit planning and the role of the Committee in that process. This action had been resolved and the paper circulated to the Committee.
- Information relating to payments made to staff in employment cases was still outstanding and must be allocated to the relevant member of staff to complete.
- It was noted that there may be a requirement to revisit the underlying reasons for the late closure of internal audit actions. This was dependant on the outcome of agenda item 9 (minute 248).
- It was noted that the actions arising from the Grant Thornton Review were now included within the Finance Transformation Programme.
- The action relating to the provision of cost and statistical information relating to the PSAA agenda item had been resolved.
- Both outstanding actions contained in minute 171 (External Audit update) had been resolved.
- In respect of minute 172, it was noted that the external auditors can only confirm that the audit was completed in line with the Annual Governance Statement ("AGS"). They are unable to comment on the standard of the AGS itself. However, if there were shortfalls with the AGS, this would be apparent from the contents of their final report.

- In respect of minute 173, it was noted that the action to provide further information on recorded complaints and any compensation details would be included in the next report to the Committee.
- The Chair will circulate an update to the Committee in respect of minute 174 (Resident's Survey 2021).
- Changes to the method for reviewing the performance exception report had been made and would be dealt with under agenda item 12 (minute 251).

ACTIONS:

	Action	Responsible Person	Deadline
1.	To allocate the task of providing information (subject to possible confidentiality issues) relating to payments made to staff in employment cases.	David Ford	TBC
2.	To circulate an update on the Resident's Survey received from Giuseppina Valenza	Councillor Langton	TBC

245. COMMUNITY SAFETY REVIEW

The Community Safety and Partnerships Specialist presented a report which updated Members about community safety activities in the District. The report focused on the work of the Tandridge Community Safety Partnership Board ("TCSPB"), their priorities for 2021/22 and the outcomes from the 2021 Action Plan. A summary of other notable achievements from the last year was also provided.

A presentation was also given by Inspector Karen Hughes (Surrey Police - Borough Commander) which included:

- an overview of the current Tandridge Borough policing team
- a summary of the 2021 highlights, which included:
 - successfully obtaining Safer Streets funding
 - enhanced response to Rural Crime
 - improving response to Anti-Social Behaviour
 - a review of the work of the Serious Organised Crime Joint Action Group
- a presentation of Tandridge Crime Data for 2020/2021

- A summary of the Tandridge Borough Priorities for 2022, which included:
 - protecting those most vulnerable in the community;
 - reducing Anti-Social Behaviour
 - reducing burglaries
 - reducing rural crime
 - increasing work in respect of violence against women and girls

A concern was raised that the report did not include any statistical information on how the TCSPB priorities were agreed and that it did not appear to reflect the concerns felt by residents within the District. It was explained that priorities were set using data from TCSPB partner agencies and that data is not always available to evidence the presence of Serious Organised Crime. Inspector Hughes offered to meet outside of the meeting to discuss the type of data that the Committee would find useful. It was noted that the level of resourcing in the Communities Team was significantly less than in other authorities across the County.

The discussion also commented on the creation of the Frauds and Scams Working Group which was an area of concern in the District following an increase of this offence during Covid. It was noted that this was a challenging area to police and resource. There was a need to increase awareness of the issue, particularly in areas where door knocking scams were taking place. It was noted that the Working Group would review whether any funding routes were available to the Council to enable further work in the area.

In response to a question about improved collation of community intelligence, it was noted that the Police had started engaging Communities in problem solving incidents in their area, the aim of which was to increase engagement from the public. The Police were keen to increase public confidence so incidents are reported when they happen. It was noted that Inspector Hughes would welcome more regular meetings with Councillors to try and make sure the correct messages about crime reporting is being circulated to residents.

It was noted that Officers had received training on Community Protection Warnings and Notices, which could be used by Council Officers to tackle low level Anti-Social Behaviour within the District.

The issue of CCTV was raised and a question was asked as to the Police's views on CCTV and whether there was any funding available to help with its installation. Inspector Hughes could raise this with the PCC but it was understood that there appeared to be a move away from funding the installation of CCTV. However, there may be the possibility to obtain funding via the Safer Streets initiative in order to improve safety for women and girls in the District.

In response to a question about the best method for contacting the Police locally, it was noted that information could be shared both on social media and in the next Tandridge District Magazine.

It was noted that, in relation to knife crime, an 'intensification week' was planned during which there would be dedicated publicity campaign and amnesty bins in the District. Inspector Hughes would confirm the date of this campaign after the meeting.

Due to some concerns raised about the contents of the reports to the Committee and the flow of information from the Community Safety Partnerships Board and the Police and Crime Panel, the Chairman proposed a future meeting with relevant Officers and Councillors to discuss further. It was noted that Councillor Gillman sits on the Community Safety Partnerships Board and the Police and Crime Panel for the Police and Crime Commissioner and should be the liaison for Councillors as to the contents of the briefings.

ACTIONS:

	Action	Responsible Person	Deadline
1.	To arrange a meeting to discuss the provision of data that evidences the TCSPB priorities and targets for 2021/22.	Councillor Langton / Inspector Hughes / Amanda Bird	TBC
2.	To explore possible funding opportunities to assist in the preventing of fraud and scams in the District.	Fraud and Scams Working Group	TBC

246. EXTERNAL AUDIT UPDATE - 20/21 ACCOUNTS UPDATE

Michelle Hopton from the Council's external auditor Deloitte provided a verbal update on the current position of the Council's external audits.

It was confirmed that the 2019/20 accounts had been signed and the audit opinion was ready to be sent. It was acknowledged that this had taken a long time but this was a positive step in terms of the current position of the Council's external audit.

Progress was now being made on the 2020/21 accounts. A clear plan for the audit process was being prepared from the current position of the audit up to a signing date. The plan and sign off date would be shared with Councillors once it had been agreed with the Finance Team. No provisional date for sign off would be provided now in order to avoid missed deadlines and to rebuild credibility with the Council. It was noted that Tandridge District Council was a priority audit and the intention was to sign off the 2020/21 accounts as soon as possible.

RESOLVED – to note the update from Deloitte and that authority be delegated to the Council's Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Chair of the Audit & Scrutiny Committee to give final approval to those accounts.

247. APPOINTMENT OF EXTERNAL AUDITORS

A report was presented which sought approval for appointing Public Sector Audit Appointments ("PSAA") to undertake the appointment of the Council's external auditor for 2023/24 to 2027/28. The report had been deferred from the 2 November 2021 committee meeting so further statistical and cost information could be provided to the Committee to assist with making the decision.

A briefing note annexed to the report confirmed that:

- during the last appointment process in 2018/19, only ten authorities had made local arrangements and opted out of the PSAA process;
- only limited comparable information was available as only two of these authorities were similar to the Council;

- the information showed that the audit base fee for the Council had reduced during the last external audit contract whilst one of the comparators had increased and the other marginally decreased.

During the debate, Members reiterated concerns that the information provided did not overcome concerns about the performance of the current external auditors and that the information did not assist with making the decision to opt in. The Committee was advised that the appointment process was complicated and resource intensive and if the Committee decided to opt out, it would be more expensive in the long term. Therefore, the Committee was advised that opting into the PSAA scheme was the correct decision.

In response to Member’s questions, the Committee was advised that once auditors had been appointed under the PSAA process Local Authorities would have a chance to discuss the appointment, although it was unclear at present how this would take place.

It was also noted that the 2019/20 audit was complicated by both issues on the part of the Council and Deloitte which were further enhanced by the Covid pandemic. However, the Council was confident that the 2020/21 process will be greatly improved. The Committee noted that it had not received a written response to their recent letter of complaint. The Chair confirmed that he would raise this point with the relevant Partner at Deloitte.

Upon being put to the vote, the recommendation was carried.

In accordance with Standing Order 25(3), Councillor O’Driscoll wished it to be recorded that he abstained from voting on this item.

COUNCIL DECISION
(subject to ratification by Council)

RECOMMENDED – that the Committee accepts PSAA’s invitation to opt into the sector-led option for the appointment of external auditors for five financial years from 1 April 2023.

ACTION:

	Action	Responsible Person	Deadline
1.	To speak to the Partner in Charge at Deloitte regarding a written response to the Committee’s complaint.	Councillor Langton	TBC

248. INTERNAL AUDIT PROGRESS REPORT - JANUARY 2022

Natalie Jerams presented a report which provided an overview of:

- the current status of live internal audit reports;
- an update on progress against the annual audit plan;
- a summary of internal audit performance, planning and resourcing issues; and
- a summary of significant issues that impact on the Chief Internal Auditor’s annual opinion.

The subsequent discussion on these reports included reference to the following issues:

- It was noted that some overdue internal actions were now included within the wider transformation programmes currently ongoing at the Council and have therefore been superseded.
- A comparison of overdue items from August 2021 to January 2022 appears to indicate that the closure of internal audit actions had worsened. However, as the audit continues, new actions had been added and closed which may have distorted the position.
- The underlying reasons for the delay in closing internal audit actions had been built into both the Finance Transformation Programme and the Future Tandridge Programme. Consequently, the root causes for delays in the closure of internal audit items should be addressed.
- An update on the 2020/21 Annual Governance Statement and Code of Governance, which has received a limited assurance opinion, would be brought to the next committee meeting on 22 March 2022 for discussion.
- An update was given on the outstanding Health and Safety management actions. It was confirmed that the current action plan to address these issues was nearing completion.
- Due to its technical nature, a third party partner would be assisting with the production of the Disaster Recovery Plan. Work on this would continue once the data site had been completed and signed off.
- It was strongly recommended that Agresso be maintained as the Council's general ledger system.
- Any current 'No Assurance' reports would be included in the 2022/23 internal audit plan.

It was also noted that Internal Audit's Annual Report would come to the July 2022 Audit & Scrutiny committee meeting.

RESOLVED – that the Internal Audit Progress Report be noted.

ACTIONS:

	Action	Responsible Person	Deadline
1.	To update the Internal Audit Actions spreadsheet to reflect the same order as SIAP's and include forecast completion dates and task owners.	Melanie Thompson	TBC

249. FINANCE TRANSFORMATION PROJECT

The Committee received a verbal update on the progress of the Finance Transformation Project (“FTP”). It was noted that the outstanding internal audit actions, such as Accounts Receivable and Exchequer Services, referred to in agenda item 9 (minute 248) were now part of the FTP.

It was confirmed that the Grant Thornton (“GT”) recommendations previously reported to the Committee were also included in the FTP. In addition, the recent 2021/22 line by line accounts review that had been sent to Members provided reassurance that the issues highlighted by GT had not been repeated. An independent review of Tandridge District Council’s financial management and reporting arrangements had also been completed by Laura Rowley. Her report had been included in the papers for the Strategy and Resources agenda for 1 February 2022. The Committee was assured that the Council felt that a stable financial foundation was now in place upon which the FTP would be built on.

It was agreed that a short report would be brought to the next committee meeting which would include a summary of the details that would be discussed at the Strategy and Resources Committee.

250. PROJECT MANAGEMENT REVIEW

The Committee considered a report which provided an overview of project management at the Council through recent governance change and what steps were being taken to improve the running of future projects.

Improvements introduced in the last 12 months included:

- the introduction of a Project Management Group;
- the reintroduction of Committee Project Boards;
- a review of governance arrangements; and
- the updating of a project management handbook for Officers.

It was noted that work was ongoing in order to achieve a consistent approach across all Council projects.

The Committee asked for information to be provided on the level of project management training within the Council. It was agreed that the information would be provided after the meeting. It was noted by the Chief Executive that a skills audit needed to be undertaken as part of the Tandridge Future Programme to make sure staff are properly equipped to undertake their roles.

In response to the Committee’s concern that the excerpts from the Internal Action Tracker and Corporate Improvement Plan set out in Appendix A to the report did not contain dates for completion, it was confirmed that the documents were now part of the Future Tandridge Programme and would be reviewed as part of this project. It was noted that end dates were required in order to be able to allocate resources effectively and to allow Members to monitor progress.

In response to a request from the Committee, Officers agreed to circulate a list of current ongoing projects and to provide a copy of the completed Project Management Handbook to Committee once it had been signed off by the Project Management Group.

Councillor Langton requested an addition to the recommendation which asked for a project management plan be provided by the next committee meeting. The addition was seconded by Councillor O'Driscoll.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. the Committee notes and agrees the report and that updates be brought to all future Audit & Scrutiny meetings, either written or verbal, until such time that the Committee is satisfied that project management has improved at the Council; and
- B. a project management plan, with a list of priority actions, to be provided at the next Audit & Scrutiny Committee, with each item specified with project owners and dates.

ACTIONS:

	Action	Responsible Person	Deadline
1.	To provide details of how many Officers are trained in, or hold qualifications in Project Management.	Alison Boote	TBC
2.	To provide the Committee with a copy of the Project Management handbook once it had been signed off and approved.	Yvonne Morland	TBC
3.	To provide the Committee with a list of all current ongoing projects.	Yvonne Morland	TBC
4.	A project management plan to be produced as per the recommendation above.	To be confirmed	08.03.22

251. PERFORMANCE EXCEPTIONS REPORT

The Committee received an exceptions report which set out the performance and risk headlines from the performance and risk reports which had already been reported to the four main policy committees earlier in the committee cycle.

The report presentation made reference to the following issues:

- KPI CS 5 had been discussed by the Community Services Committee as it no longer reflected the performance of the Joint Environmental Health Team. It was noted that the KPI would be reported annually in the future.
- The Planning Policy Committee had discussed the challenges associated with producing quality and timely performance data. It was noted that the current regime and some of the key risks identified on the Planning Policy Risk Register were being addressed as part of the Planning Transformation Project.
- The number of people in urgent need on the housing register continues to be high despite the council house building programme that is in place.
- The time taken to re-let Local Authority sheltered housing property was delayed over the past year due to issues related to Covid.
- Customer Services were continuing to be impacted by the number of calls received from residents. Ongoing efforts are being made to direct residents to the website where possible.
- Responding to Freedom of Information requests was still a concern however ongoing work on policy training and systems was in place to improve the Council's performance in this area. A review was being undertaken of FOI requests to minimise spurious, repeated and dubious requests.
- It was noted that the Future Tandridge Programme would seek to address long standing resource and capacity issues and redesigning the delivery of services.

Three key risk areas from the report were highlighted by the Chair for further scrutiny by the Committee:

Planning Transformation and Capacity (4.11 in the report)

This is a title to represent several risks under the Planning Policy Committee. The Committee felt the suggested actions put in place by the Planning Policy Committee to deal with ongoing issues in the Planning Department were adequate but a concern remained regarding the defending of planning appeals and associated applications for costs. It was suggested that the Council, in partnership with other Local Authorities, could recruit expertise to counter advice from statutory consultees where it is felt that the advice received is not complete or satisfactory. It was noted that there were insufficient costs in the budget to defend such cases and this should be reviewed.

The Chair was of the view that because the current budget may be insufficient to address an eventuality, as soon as should one arise, the likely cost implications must immediately be flagged up giving time to identify a possible funding source.

Inability to make savings as identified in the Medium Term Financial Strategy and to balance the Council budget (4.9 in the report)

It was noted that all policy committees were in the process of agreeing their separate budgets for the next year.

The Chair felt that actions were in place to make sure that the Council makes the required savings and no further action needed to be taken by the Committee. This was subject to the proviso that if any proposed savings were rejected, the relevant Committee would have to find a replacement saving from within its own budget.

A concern was raised about a recent suggestion to use reserves rather than finding budget savings. It was suggested that this practice should not be considered in the future.

Inability to maintain high standards for delivery of statutory services (4.13 of the report)

It was assessed that the Future Tandridge Programme comprised elements that were addressing this risk and no further action could be taken at this time. It was noted that staff sickness levels should be reviewed at a future committee meeting as they constituted to over 1750 lost working days and the matter was long overdue to be resolved.

Following a request by the Committee, an update had been provided on the Council's current debt management position. It was noted that the Council could consider selling its debt to a third party in order to release an immediate fund of money. However, this would require careful consideration. It was confirmed that debt collection agencies are already used by the Council for Council Tax and Business Rates recovery. A question was asked about repeat debt offenders and whether steps are being taken to prevent such situations occurring. It was agreed that this could be happening and this was likely to be discussed in the debt report that was on the Strategy & Resources Committee agenda for 1 February 2022.

RESOLVED – that the Committee accepts the report.

252. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH, IN THE OPINION OF THE CHAIR, SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS A MATTER OF URGENCY

The Chair asked the Committee to consider how it should review the progress of the Future Tandridge Programme at the next meeting.

Rising 10.38 pm