

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 24th November 2022 at 7:30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Sayer (Chair), C.Farr (Vice-Chair), Blackwell, Bloore, Booth, Gray, Jones, Lockwood, Prew and Steeds

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Allen, Crane, S.Farr, Gillman, Moore and N.White

ALSO PRESENT (Virtually): Councillor Pursehouse

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor Botten

166. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 22ND SEPTEMBER 2022

While these minutes were confirmed and signed as a correct record, Councillor Steeds raised an issue concerning the planning protocol covered by Minute 104. She considered that paragraphs 18.1 and 18.5 of the protocol (since adopted by Council on the 20th October 2022) appeared contradictory, i.e.

- Paragraph 18.1 stated that public speaking at Planning Committee meetings was limited to three speakers per application, i.e. one in favour; one objector; and the relevant Parish Council.
- Paragraph 18.5 suggested that, in exceptional circumstances, more than three speakers might be allowed to speak per application, i.e. *“Exceptionally, the Chair may decide during the meeting to increase the time available, for example if an application straddles a parish boundary or if a large number of people wish to speak...”*

The Chair advised that these two paragraphs of the planning protocol would be reviewed after the meeting with a view to amendments being made if considered necessary.

167. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Allen declared a non-pecuniary interest on the basis that he would be speaking to the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan item (Minute 175).

Councillor Lockwood declared a non-pecuniary interest in the Lingfield Conservation Area Appraisal item (Minute 176) as she was a member of both Lingfield Parish Council and the Lingfield Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group.

168. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER STANDING ORDER 30

Two questions were submitted by Councillor Lockwood. Copies of both questions, together with the responses given by the Interim Chief Planning Officer and Councillor Sayer, are attached at Appendix A.

169. CIL WORKING GROUP - 14TH NOVEMBER 2022

The minutes of this meeting of the CIL Working Group were considered. Upon moving the reception of the minutes and the adoption of the Working Group's recommendations, Councillor Blackwell, seconded by Councillor Steeds, proposed an additional recommendation in connection with Item 3, which concerned three prospective CIL bids from GP practice managers later in 2022/23. Councillor Blackwell's motion sought to enable the Council to determine those bids within a short timeframe by delegating the necessary authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the CIL Working Group Members. It was confirmed that such consultation would be based on the same type and detail of bid documentation as previously provided for CIL Working Group meetings. Upon being put to the vote, this motion was agreed.

Regarding Item 6 of the minutes (UK Prosperity Funds) Members questioned whether "*bids aimed at combatting rural crime*" could include CCTV projects. Councillor Blackwell, as Chair of the CIL Working Group, would seek to clarify this with the Executive Head of Communities. This matter prompted a wider discussion about CCTV initiatives being pursued by Parish Councils.

RESOLVED – that, regarding the minutes of the CIL Working Group's meeting on the 14th November 2022, attached at Appendix B:

- A. the minutes be received and the recommendations in items 3, 4 and 5 be adopted; and
- B. authority be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with members of the CIL Working Group, to determine any bids brought forward in connection with Recommendation A of Item 3, namely:
 - internal re-modelling of the Oxted Health Centre
 - solar and power bank for the Smallfield surgery
 - extension of the Caterham Valley surgery.

170. QUARTER 2 2022/23 BUDGET MONITORING - PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

An analysis of expenditure against the Committee's £1,204k revenue budget for 2022/23, as at the end of September 2022 (Month 6) was presented. An £86k overspend was forecast (a £37k improvement from Q1) mainly due to:

- a greater than expected expenditure on salaries, specialist recruitment, counsel's legal advice and external consultancy;
- offset by a surplus on planning application fee income and a net planning enforcement underspend.

Slippage of £1,619k in the Committee's capital programme was forecast due to the re-phasing of expected CIL contributions.

Discussions took place regarding:

- the use of injunctions to deter planning breaches, including the need to publicise successful outcomes to deter future breaches and the fact that the Council had been awarded costs in respect of the High Court action to stop land at the School Plantation, Oxted being used for a Gatwick Airport car parking service (the Chief Finance Officer undertook to provide further information regarding the budgetary arrangements for pursuing injunctions);
- specialist staff recruitment costs and the approach to seeking to fill vacancies in the Planning Policy team.

RESOLVED – that the Committee’s forecast revenue and capital budget positions as at Quarter 2 / M6 (September) 2022 be noted.

171. LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

A report was presented which confirmed that, since the previous meeting, the Chief Executive had not received responses to his letters of 27th September 2022 to:

- (i) the Chief Planner at the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (seeking clarification regarding the former Secretary of State’s letter dated 28th July 2022 to the Planning Inspectorate which, in the opinion of officers, had imposed significant uncertainty on the Council’s local plan making process)
- (ii) the Planning Inspector (explaining that, in light of possible substantive alterations to Government planning policy, the Council was anxious to avoid incurring further unnecessary expenditure on the Local Plan examination process and would not, for the time being, be sending monthly updates on the progress of its Local Plan work). However, the Inspector had stated that he was waiting for the former Secretary of State’s letter to be withdrawn before issuing a response.

The Council had since clarified to the Inspector that it had not halted all work on the emerging Local Plan, but considered it imprudent to commission work which may become redundant owing to National Planning Policy changes.

The report referred to the recent Court of Appeal judgement (Lisa Smith v SSLUHC [2022] EWHC) which found the national planning policy for traveller sites (PPTS) to be discriminatory. The Council would therefore keep the matter under review, pending the Secretary of State’s response to the judgment, whereby any previous assessment of gypsy / traveller site needs for the Local Plan could be revised to accommodate any possible changes to the PPTS.

The latest position regarding necessary improvements to Junction 6 of the M25 was discussed. Members were advised that National Highways and Surrey County Council were now contemplating a more comprehensive scheme totalling at least £54 million, together with improvement works to the whole of the A22 corridor within Tandridge. It was agreed that a progress report regarding Junction 6 mitigations, including latest available data, be submitted to the Committee’s 23rd March 2023 meeting. The debate on this matter extended to highways implications of developments adjacent to the Mid-Sussex border and previous transportation studies of the A264 / A22 Star Junction.

The potential risk of not having a new Local Plan in place by the end of 2023 (and consequent exposure to the latest iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework) was also discussed.

RESOLVED – that the report be noted.

172. SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (SADPD)

A report was presented which advised that, following a tendering process, discussions were taking place with several consultancy firms about the best way to proceed with the production of a SADPD (to be added to the adopted Development Plan under the umbrella of the existing Core Strategy.) As discussed at the previous meeting, the primary purpose of the document would be to identify a defensible five-year housing land supply, reflecting constraints and infrastructure requirements.

The Chair commented that different ideas had been suggested by consultants and that potential terms of engagement were awaited from the most recent firm to be interviewed. However, she clarified that, in light of the outcome of the previous Committee meeting and subsequent consultation with the Planning Policy Working Group, officers had issued an initial brief as part of the tendering process. That brief was based on the objective of securing something close to a five-year housing land supply and retaining control over the location of new housing developments while protecting the Green Belt. She agreed to circulate the brief to the rest of the Committee and encouraged members of the Working Group to keep their political group colleagues informed of its deliberations so that the Committee was fully sighted about actions taken in between meetings.

The Interim Chief Planning Officer advised that, once consultants had been commissioned and any necessary legal advice considered, a budget and project plan would be prepared. He explained that, while the 'Interim Policy Statement for Housing Delivery' (agreed at the previous meeting) would be a material consideration in the determination of future planning applications, the proposed SADPD would carry additional weight by acquiring formal status as part of the Development Plan. It was also confirmed that, as stated within the report, the cost of preparing the SADPD would be contained within the existing Planning Policy and emerging Local Plan budget.

In response to the debate, the Chair clarified that another Green Belt assessment would not be carried out. The Local Plan Inspector had stated in his Preliminary Conclusions and Advice letter to the Council that the Green Belt assessment already undertaken was adequate.

The Interim Chief Planning Officer confirmed the intention to proceed with a further 'call for brownfield sites' which should assist the Council with its housing land supply obligations. This would be posted on the Council's website, the draft content for which would be shared with Members prior to publication.

RESOLVED – that the report be noted.

173. PRO-FORMA FOR PLANNING PERFORMANCE AGREEMENTS

The Chair advised that this matter stood deferred until the Committee's next scheduled meeting on 19th January 2023. She confirmed that a substantial amount of preparatory work had already been done and looked forward to PPAs (providing bespoke frameworks for dealing with major development proposals) being introduced in the new year.

174. AUTHORITY MONITORING REPORT (AMR) - 1ST APRIL 2021 TO 31ST MARCH 2022

The Localism Act 2011 and subsequent regulations required each local planning authority to produce an AMR regarding the implementation of its Local Development Scheme and other key planning policy matters. A proposed AMR for Tandridge, for the year ending 31st March 2022, was presented.

In recent years, the Council's AMRs had been published under powers delegated to officers without formal consideration by Members. However, in the opinion of the Interim Chief Planning Officer, this and future AMRs should be submitted to the Committee for approval, given their importance within the planning process. As far as the document before the Committee was concerned, the following aspects were debated:

- Policy CSP 8 regarding the provision of Extra Care Housing (for which the Council relied upon the private sector) and the complexities associated with distinguishing Use Class C3 (dwellinghouses) from Use Class C2 (residential care homes)
- the use of The Plantation (West Park Road, Newchapel) in the context of Policy CSP 10 regarding the provision for sites for Travelling Showmen.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) 1st April 2021 to 31st March 2022 (Appendix A to the report) be approved for inclusion in the emerging Local Plan evidence base and be made available for public and stakeholder scrutiny on the Council's website; and
- B. future AMRs be reported to the Planning Policy Committee prior to publication.

175. TATSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION

This Plan had been submitted to the Council towards the end of October 2022 in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The Committee was invited to endorse the next stage of the process whereby the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, would undertake a 'Regulation 16' consultation prior to consideration by an independent examiner.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. the Council publicise for consultation, for a period of 6 weeks during November / December 2022 and January 2023, the submission draft of the Neighbourhood Plan and any supporting documentation in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Plan Regulations 2012; and
- B. the content of the report be noted.

176. LINGFIELD CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL

Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 required local authorities to review, from time to time, the boundaries of conservation areas to ensure they are still relevant. Old Town and Plaistow Street in Lingfield were designated Conservation Areas by Surrey County Council in 1972. These were merged through the designation of the High Street in 1990 by the District Council to form one Lingfield Conservation Area.

Lingfield Parish Council now sought the District Council's permission to appoint Surrey County Council's Historic Environment Planning Team to undertake an appraisal of the Conservation Area (to be funded by the Parish Council) including possible boundary changes.

It was proposed that, once the appraisal had been completed, this Council would undertake the necessary steps for it to be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document to support its statutory planning functions. The Interim Chief Planning Officer advised that the final sentence of paragraph 1.2 of the report to the Committee should be corrected as follows:

*"Section 72 of the 1990 Act requires the Council, when considering planning applications, to pay special attention **regard** to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area."*

RESOLVED – that the Committee agrees to the production of a conservation area appraisal for Lingfield, by Lingfield Parish Council, which can then be used as the basis of a Supplementary Planning Document to be consulted upon and adopted by the Council.

Rising 9.33 pm

Planning Policy Committee – 24th November 2022

Standing Order 30 Questions from Councillor Lockwood

1. Given the current position of Tandridge Council in the Government's Live Tables on Planning Statistics, which puts this council into the equal 5th worst position in the country's 353 district and boroughs and a mere 0.7 percentage point away from the cut-off of 10% that the Government considers to be unacceptable performance of overturned appeals, and a inspection of the of the 56 Tandridge appeals determined in the last 12 months show that a staggering 39.2% have been overturned by the planning inspectorate, what steps are being undertaken by the council to prevent it being placed into special measures and what financial considerations are being made for the costs of resourcing an increasing number of appeals and the expected proportionate number of awards of costs against the council for unreasonableness to reflect the inability of this council to determine major applications within the prescribed timeframes?

Response from the Interim Chief Planning Officer

Nationally, about one-third (33%) of planning appeals are allowed, so overturning the Local Planning Authority's decision.

The last published Planning Inspectorate (PINS) "Quarterly and Annual Volume Statistics" for April 2021 to March 2022 do not reflect the statistics Cllr Lockwood has presented.

These show for Tandridge that:

- *for Section 78 appeals, 63 of the 218 shire districts in England had more appeals overturned than Tandridge*
- *Tandridge had 31% of Section 78 appeals overturned, slightly less than the national average*
- *for householder appeals, 64 of the 218 shire districts in England had more appeals overturned than Tandridge*
- *Tandridge had 34% of householder appeals overturned, slightly higher than the national average.*

Furthermore, Cllr Lockwood's suggested cut-off of 10% of what the Government considers to be unacceptable performance on overturned appeals cannot be correct, or a criterion for placing local authorities in special measures if, nationally, an average of 33% of appeals are overturned year on year.

Every applicant for planning permission has a statutory right of appeal. What the Council does to minimise the risks of being found unreasonable in refusing planning applications that then go on to appeal is:

- *provide a pre-application advice service to provide early guidance on whether planning permission is likely to be granted and what key planning considerations need to be addressed in any application that might come forward*

- *seek extensions of time agreements with applicants when applications cannot be determined within statutory timeframes*
- *ensure all reports and decision notices are peer reviewed for robustness (including those of the Chief Planning Officer)*
- *seek legal advice on matters of planning procedure and law, including employing barristers to advise and to represent the Council at more complicated planning hearings and appeals (e.g. Oxted Crematorium and Farleigh Crematorium appeals).*

Nobody, councillor or officer, can be sanguine about the possibility of cost awards against the Council if it is found to have acted unreasonably in determining a particular planning application. The key consideration here is that councillors and officers have to ensure that they can substantiate the reasons for refusal on solid planning grounds.

In the last 15 months, there have been two cost award claims made against the Council resulting from planning appeals. One was withdrawn. The inspector determining the other appeal, which was allowed, nevertheless found that the Council had adequately justified its reason for refusal and had not acted unreasonably and declined the cost claim.

Could I add that the Council is looking to introduce Planning Performance Agreements (PPA's) for major applications which will provide, from the outset, agreed extended timeframes for determination of these types of more complicated applications and an agreed series of steps for a decision to be made without fettering the Council's discretion as to how an application is determined. PPA's will assist in managing the expectations of the applicant and the Council as to timeframe and procedure. It is intended to make a recommendation on PPA's at the January 2023 meeting of this Committee.

- 2 The Leader of this Council has historically recognised that Lingfield Surgery is one of the most oversubscribed GP surgeries in this district, with a ratio of 1 full time equivalent GP to 2,643 patients, when she herself identified this surgery as being the most overcrowded in terms of floorspace per patient at the Local Plan hearings in 2019. How can she therefore, justify supporting the proposed recommendation to authorise the allocation of CIL funding through delegated authority for the surgeries listed which, whilst I acknowledge that medical practices need to be supported with funding to cope with increasing patient numbers, are very clearly able to provide a significantly better service for their patients, where the Oxted Health Centre and the Caterham Valley Surgery have GP patient ratios of 1:2,194 and 1:1,684 respectively, and that both these surgeries have suitable parking for their disabled patients which is grossly inadequate at Lingfield?**

Response from Councillor Sayer

First of all, I would like to agree that I am well aware that Lingfield Surgery is very oversubscribed and I have, on every possible opportunity, flagged up that wholly unsatisfactory position to whoever might listen, including to the Local Plan Inspector.

I am not a member of the CIL Working Group. However, I understand that the bids relating to Oxted, Smallfield and Caterham Valley were presented and discussed during the 14th November presentation given on behalf of the NHS Surrey Heartlands Integrated Care Board as projects that needed CIL funding to improve services for Tandridge residents.

I further understand that yourself Councillor Lockwood, as the Lingfield Ward Councillor, in conjunction with other Councillors on the CIL Working Group, raised concerns about Lingfield Surgery, agreeing that the Care Board would take discussions further with the appropriate bodies with the intention of putting in a CIL Bid for improvements. I would, of course, be more than happy to support these improvements to Lingfield Surgery.

Caroline Upton who gave the presentation to the CIL Working Group on behalf of the NHS Surrey Heartlands Integrated Care, has since explained the position with funding for Lingfield. She said:

“The Lead GP at Lingfield left, there are now new partners at the practice, the Practice received improvements last year for a clinical room and pod room. Lingfield received NHS funding in 22/23 and it is therefore earmarked for CIL funding in 23/24”.

This page is intentionally left blank

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL**CIL WORKING GROUP**

Minutes of the meeting of the Working Group held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 14th November 2022 at 6.30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Blackwell, Bloore, Botten, Farr, Gaffney, Hammond, Langton, Lockwood and Moore.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor Flower.

1. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 8TH JUNE 2022

These were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Botten declared an interest in item 4 below on the basis that he was Chairman of Governors at St Peter & St Paul School, Chaldon.

3. PRESENTATION ON BEHALF OF THE NHS SURREY HEARTLANDS INTEGRATED CARE BOARD

Caroline Upton (Head of Primary Care) and Jules Wilmshurst-Smith (Head of Estates) attended the meeting on behalf of the NHS Surrey Heartlands to give a presentation about the provision of primary care services in East Surrey. The presentation covered:

- (i) a summary of '*The future of General Practice – 4th report of the Health & Social Care [Parliamentary Select] Committee*' which acknowledged:
 - the need to improve integrated care systems; and
 - the challenges facing the GP profession, including the fact that the recruitment of new entrants was not keeping pace with the rate of resignations / retirements
- (ii) the phase 5 Covid-19 enhanced service vaccination programme and the use of Operations Pressure Escalation Level (OPEL) alerts
- (iii) NHS England's 'stocktake' report (undertaken by the Surrey Heartlands Chief Executive) '*Next steps for integrating primary care*' and the key actions and delivery programmes in place
- (iv) an analysis of primary care appointments in Surrey in September 2022

- (v) an analysis of roles claimed under the 'Additional Roles Reimbursement Scheme'
- (vi) the approach to public engagement and means of 'anchoring transformation around neighbourhoods'
- (vii) an analysis of GP premises throughout the three Primary Care Networks in the District, i.e., 'North Tandridge', 'South Tandridge' and 'Healthy Horley' (serving Smallfield);
- (viii) initiatives for
 - developing estate plans for each Primary Care Network by June 2023
 - co-ordinating responses to local plans and planning applications
- (ix) confirmation that the following three CIL bids (to be submitted by the respective practice managers) had been endorsed by Surrey Heartlands and were earmarked for bids during 2022/23:
 - internal re-modelling of the Oxted Health Centre (up to £100,000)
 - solar and power bank for the Smallfield surgery (£25,000)
 - extension of the Caterham Valley surgery (£250,000).

The presentation was followed by a question & answer session, which included discussions about the following matters:

- the proportion of total costs practice managers could be expected to seek via CIL applications – *capped at 66% of capital costs if GPs owned their premises, otherwise CIL bids could seek 100% of capital costs*
- guarantees of ongoing GP tenure in premises enhanced with the use of CIL funds – *there would be a contractual obligation to continue to provide care services for future periods appropriate to the level of investments made*
- maintenance of GP premises - *this was the responsibility of both the landlord and tenant ... Surrey Heartlands offers some financial support to enable doctors' premises to be maintained*
- the pressing need for physical access improvements to the Lingfield surgery, especially in view of Surrey residents being displaced from the East Grinstead practice
- the need to enhance primary healthcare services for Hurst Green residents, especially in view of the greater volume of housing growth compared with Oxted ... *this would need to be balanced against the policy of consolidating services into a smaller number of locations – discussions would continue about the possibility of a satellite clinic in Hurst Green*
- the number of patients GPs were expected to serve – *information would be shared with Jeremy Fisher, although other health professionals based in relevant surgeries were factored into calculations for 'doctor : patient' ratios*
- ongoing efforts to streamline and improve primary healthcare services.

RECOMMENDED – that:

- A. prospective bids from GP practice managers referred to in (ix) above be brought forward in 2022/23, i.e.:
 - internal re-modelling of the Oxted Health Centre (up to £100,000)
 - solar and power bank for the Smallfield surgery (£25,000)
 - extension of the Caterham Valley surgery (£250,000)

- B. regarding potential CIL bids for enhanced primary health care infrastructure beyond 2022/23 (i.e. in addition to the three schemes referred to in A above) priority be given to improving the accessibility of the Lingfield surgery.

4. CIL BID FOR EXPANSION OF ST PETER & ST PAUL SCHOOL, CHALDON

At its previous meeting on 8th June 2022, the Group received a presentation from Surrey County Council regarding its £1,252,000 CIL bid towards the cost of the school's expansion project. The project reflected the change in the school's status from 'infant' to 'primary', with an increase in capacity from 90 to 210 places. The estimated cost comprised £3 million for the building programme and £830,000 for highway improvements. At the time, the required highway / road safety measures were still being worked up by SCC's travel consultants, and a planning application (to SCC's Planning & Regulatory Committee) was anticipated before the end of the summer. As stated within the minutes of the 8th June meeting, the Group supported a CIL allocation but considered that SCC should make a greater contribution and recommended that *"an award of £1 million be agreed in principle subject to:*

- (i) *the award being utilised to cover the highways improvement scheme in the first instance, with any balance being allocated against the extended school building costs;*

- (ii) *the Working Group being satisfied with the proposed highway / road safety mitigation measures, including an implementation timeline, the details of which will be requested for consideration at a meeting (of the Working Group) to be arranged for November 2022".*

The Group received an update on the current situation which confirmed that a planning application had not yet been submitted and that no information had been received regarding the required highway / road safety mitigation measures.

RECOMMENDED – that authority be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Working Group members, to determine the CIL request once the proposed highway / road safety mitigation measures have been provided by Surrey Highways and subject to planning permission being granted (by SCC's Planning & Regulatory Committee) for the school's expansion project.

5. GRANT MONITORING AND CIL PROGRAMME FOR 2023

A report was presented which advised Members about:

- annual CIL receipts to date, including the requisite transfers to Parish Councils for developments in their areas; and
- 'expressions of interest in' and formal 'applications for' CIL funding to date.

It was confirmed that, subject to the provisional £1 million award for St Peter & St Paul School, Chaldon Primary School (Item 3 above) being granted, £2 million was available for CIL allocations in 2022/23.

In response to an officer request for clarification about the status of certain CIL projects, relevant Ward Members provided the following information:

Ref IA-00239 – Wolf's Hill, Hurst Green – road widening and pavement improvements

To be put on hold, pending further discussions with SCC Highways regarding the possibility of them providing the services of an engineer to scope the project.

Ref IA-00263 – Lingfield skate-ramp

The facility was currently closed, pending repairs. The possibility of the necessary works being funded by a specific TDC revenue budget was being pursued.

Ref IA-00264 – Lingfield Sports Association grounds and clubhouse

The bid would be re-presented in two phases, beginning with an application to enable a grounds drainage project.

Ref IA-00266 – tennis courts at Mill Lane, Hurst Green

Clarification would be sought about whether the project had already been completed without the need for CIL funding.

Ref IA-00268 – Caterham Valley medical practice

Officers would send a full application form for the practice manager to complete (Recommendation A in Item 3 refers).

A discussion took place on the merits of the CIL team liaising with Parish Councils (on an advisory basis) about options for using their CIL allocations for more co-ordinated, strategic purposes.

RECOMMENDED – that

- A. the updates regarding the five schemes listed above be noted; and
- B. the chart illustrating the types of infrastructure funded to date (page 13 of the agenda pack) be noted.

6. UK PROSPERITY FUNDS - UPDATE

The Executive Head of Communities gave a presentation which advised that:

- the Council's proposed investment plan for the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (which aligned with the Open Space Strategy) was submitted to the Government at the end of July 2022;
- the £1 million UKSPF awarded to Tandridge would be distributed over three years:
 - £69,268 in 22/23
 - £138,534 in 23/24
 - £792,198 in 24/25
- discussions were to take place with Parish Councils about utilising the UKSP funding for possible projects identified in the Open Space Strategy, with prospective projects to be reported back to the Working Group (funding would also be allocated for climate change education sessions for small business);
- Tandridge, Guildford and Waverley had also been allocated £400,000 each from the Rural England Prosperity Fund to be spent on capital projects (aligned to business and community-based themes) in 23/24 and 24/25 ... UKSPF revenue funding could be used to support such projects; and
- a Rural England Prosperity Fund addendum to the UKSP Fund investment plan would be submitted by the end of November 2022 (with the assistance of Mott MacDonald).

It was intended to utilise the Rural England Prosperity Fund to establish a small grants scheme in partnership with Guildford Borough Council, Waverley Borough Council and Surrey County Council, based on the principles of the Rural Surrey 'LEADER' programme. The Working Group supported this approach. It was also suggested that bids aimed at combatting rural crime should be encouraged.

The meeting closed at 8.23 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank