

# Public Document Pack



Aspirational for our people, our place and ourselves

To: MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE  
Councillors Sayer (Chair), C.Farr (Vice-Chair), Blackwell,  
Bloore, Booth, Botten, Gray, Jones, Lockwood, Prew and  
Steeds

for any enquiries, please contact:  
[customerservices@tandridge.gov.uk](mailto:customerservices@tandridge.gov.uk)  
01883 722000

Substitute Councillors: Crane, Flower and Robinson

C.C. All Other Members of the Council

16 November 2022

Dear Sir/Madam

## **PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE THURSDAY, 24TH NOVEMBER, 2022 AT 7.30 PM**

The agenda for this meeting of the Committee to be held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted is set out below. If a member of the Committee is unable to attend the meeting, please notify officers accordingly.

Should members require clarification about any item of business, they are urged to contact officers before the meeting. In this respect, reports contain authors' names and contact details.

If a Member of the Council, not being a member of the Committee, proposes to attend the meeting, please let the officers know by no later than noon on the day of the meeting.

Yours faithfully,

David Ford  
**Chief Executive**

### **AGENDA**

**1. Apologies for absence (if any)**

**2. 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.

**3. Minutes of the meeting held on the 22nd September 2022 (Pages 3 - 16)**

To confirm as a correct record

4. **To deal with any questions submitted under Standing Order 30**
5. **CIL Working Group - 14th November 2022** (Pages 17 - 22)  
To receive the minutes of this meeting and to consider the recommendations under items 3, 4 and 5.
6. **Quarter 2 2022/23 Budget Monitoring - Planning Policy Committee** (Pages 23 - 30)
7. **Local Plan update** (Pages 31 - 34)
8. **Site Allocations Development Plan Document** (Pages 35 - 38)
9. **Authority Monitoring Report - 1st April 2021 to 31st March 2022** (Pages 39 - 42)
10. **Pro-forma for Planning Performance Agreements** (To Follow)
11. **Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 16 consultation** (Pages 43 - 46)
12. **Lingfield Conservation Area Appraisal** (Pages 47 - 52)
13. **Any urgent business**  
To consider any other item(s) which, in the opinion of the Chair, should be considered as a matter of urgency – Local Government Act 1972, Section 100B(4)(b).

## 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 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2022 at 7.30pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Sayer (Chair), C.Farr (Vice-Chair), Bloore, Booth, Botten, Flower (substitute in place of Steeds), Gray, Jones, Lockwood and Prew.

**PRESENT (Virtually):** Councillor Blackwell

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillors S.Farr and Gillman

**ALSO PRESENT (Virtually):** Councillors Caulcott, Gaffney, Moore and Pursehouse

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:** Councillor Steeds

#### 103. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 23<sup>RD</sup> JUNE 2022

These minutes were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

#### 104. PLANNING PROTOCOL

A proposed replacement version of this protocol had been drafted by officers and shared with Members via a Zoom briefing on 5th September 2022. The subsequent version, updated in light of Members' input both during and following the briefing, was presented to the Committee for consideration. Various proposed amendments from Members were debated, some of which were supported.

The protocol formed part of the Council's constitution and, as such, required the approval of Full Council before the new version could take effect.

#### **COUNCIL DECISION**

*(subject to ratification by Council)*

**RECOMMENDED** – that the Planning Protocol attached to the report, amended by the 'track changes' attached at Appendix A to these minutes, be adopted.

## 105. HOUSING DELIVERY TEST ACTION PLAN SEPTEMBER 2022 AND INTERIM POLICY STATEMENT FOR HOUSING DELIVERY

Local planning authorities which had delivered less than 95% of their housing requirement over the previous three years, as prescribed by central government, were obliged to produce annual Housing Delivery Test Action Plans (HDTAPs) in line with Paragraph 76 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Tandridge had fallen into this category in previous years, although its HDTAPs had been published under powers delegated to officers. It was intended to change this approach in future, whereby HDTAPs would require Committee approval. (The same would apply to the authority's 'Annual Monitoring Report', a draft of which for 2022 was scheduled for submission to the Committee's next meeting).

The results of the Government's latest 'Housing Delivery Test' (published on 14th January 2022) showed that Tandridge had delivered 38% of its required level of new housing and, consequently, had to publish a further HDTAP and add a 20% buffer onto the 'Five-Year Housing Land Supply'. A proposed HDTAP for 2022 was therefore presented. This incorporated an 'Interim Policy Statement for Housing Delivery', intended to provide a consistent development management approach for considering relevant planning applications.

The covering report explained that the Council could not meet the Government's house building targets without:

- encroaching into highly constrained areas in planning policy terms; and
- creating severe difficulties in terms of infrastructure capacity.

The proposed HDTAP sought to update the 2021 version and identify what additional measures the Council will take to improve housing delivery. The report concluded that the HDTAP and its Interim Policy Statement would be a material planning consideration in the determination of future planning applications for housing development.

Discussion focused on the text for 'Appendix A' to the Interim Policy Statement regarding "*Examples of possible sites ...*", i.e.:

*"The emerging Local Plan process identified a number of large sites (75+ units) that could potentially be brought forward where the examiner did not raise concerns. These sites have been rigorously assessed via the HELAA process and Green Belt assessments. They have also been through two Regulation 18 consultations, one Regulation 19 consultation as well as site specific Examination hearings."*

It was suggested by some Members that, by implication, a significant proportion of the units concerned would be in Warlingham and that the list of sites as described above should be forthcoming. In response, it was explained that the sites had already been identified during the Local Plan examination process and could be distinguished from others about which the Inspector had raised concerns. In any event, the Interim Chief Planning Officer stated that, while development proposals would be invited in respect of potential sites, any consequent planning applications would have to be assessed against relevant development control criteria (including the need to demonstrate very special circumstances for any developments in the Green Belt) and the current national policy context (e.g. regarding Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty status). However, there would be no repeat of the Regulation 18 and 19 consultations referred to above.

**RESOLVED** – that:

- A. subject to the deletion of the word, “favourably” in the text of the HDTAP in section 4.2, i.e.

*“The Council will take the following actions to enable increased housing delivery and boost supply in the District. These are divided into short and medium-term solutions:*

**Short Term Measures**

- **Criteria Based Policy for Housing Site Delivery** – *the Council will prepare and adopt (for development management purposes) a criteria-based policy (known as the Interim Policy Statement for Housing Delivery) which will assist in bringing forward land for new housing development in the short term. Those draft allocations in the emerging plan that can be brought forward will be favourably considered as a matter of principle and development opportunities not previously identified will be encouraged that assist the Council in meeting its housing needs and that do not adversely impact on designated areas.”*

... the Housing Delivery Test Action Plan dated September 2022, attached at Appendix A to the report, be agreed for publication;

- B. the ‘Interim Policy Statement for Housing Delivery’, as contained within the HDTAP referred to in A above, be adopted for development management purposes; and
- C. future HDTAPs be presented to the Planning Policy Committee for approval and adoption as a material planning consideration in the determination of applications for housing development, prior to publication, to ensure elected Members have the final decision on behalf of the Council.

## **106. FUTURE WORK ON OUR LOCAL PLAN 2033 FOLLOWING THE FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE'S LETTER TO THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE REGARDING DECISIONS ON EMERGING LOCAL PLANS**

A report was presented in light of a letter dated 28<sup>th</sup> July 2022 from the former Secretary of State (for Levelling up, Housing and Communities) to the Chief Executive of the Planning Inspectorate (PINS). The letter advised that, until further notice, PINS should not determine that local plans are unsound and/or suggest that local plans should be withdrawn. This had introduced a significant degree of uncertainty regarding the plan making process. In particular, it raised the prospect of major policy changes regarding housing delivery targets and the scope for releasing land from the Green Belt. The situation was particularly relevant for Tandridge in view of:

- its 94% Green Belt coverage and the associated challenges of meeting the Government’s housing targets; and

- the significant amount of extra work required by the Inspector to enable the soundness of the emerging Local Plan to be further considered, with no guarantee of this resulting in the Plan being declared sound.

The report concluded that the Council should not proceed with commissioning or undertaking further work on the emerging Local Plan, pending clarification of future government policy. It was recommended that letters explaining the Council's position be sent to the Chief Planner at the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) and the Inspector examining the Local Plan. This would support the Council's efforts to manage the risk of continuing to prepare the Local Plan at considerable cost, amidst the financial constraints it was already seeking to address. However, the report also recommended that a robust policy be established for determining future planning applications for housing through the preparation and adoption of a Site Allocations Development Plan Document that would carry significant weight in decision making.

Regarding the proposed letter to DLUHC, the Committee requested an additional paragraph in respect of the Government's target of having adopted local plans in place by December 2023, i.e. that:

- the deadline was likely to be missed due to the uncertainties created by the former Secretary of State's letter of 28<sup>th</sup> July and was not something for which Councils should be held responsible; and
- an extension to the deadline should be considered.

The Chair confirmed that the cost of preparing the Site Allocations Development Plan Document would be accommodated within the overall Local Plan budget envelope. Nevertheless, a specific budget and project plan for the work would be presented to the Committee's next meeting.

**RESOLVED** – that:

- A. the letters at Appendices B (amended by the insertion of the penultimate paragraph in accordance with the Committee's instructions) and C be sent from the Chief Executive to the Chief Planner at DLUHC and the Inspector examining the Local Plan;
- B. the Council does not proceed with commissioning or undertaking further work for the time-being on the emerging Local Plan; and
- C. the Interim Chief Planning Officer be authorised to commence work on a Site Allocations Development Plan Document.

## 107. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT STAFFING

A proposed new Development Management staffing structure was presented which comprised:

- 4 x full-time Senior Planning Officers (compared to 3 in the existing structure)
- 2 x full-time Planning Officers (compared to 4 in the existing structure)

The Interim Chief Planning Officer was pleased to confirm that, with permanent staff now in place, the service no longer relied on having to engage temporary staff on more expensive contracts which had contributed to salary overspends in previous months. The cost of the additional Senior Planning Officer would be offset by the reduction in Planning Officers from 3 to 2 and by deleting an apprentice post which the Council had been unable to fill.

**RESOLVED** – that, subject to the deletion of the apprentice post as referred to above, the revised Development Management structure for the Planning Department at Appendix 2 to the report be approved and implemented to deliver ongoing resilience and improvement to the service.

## 108. QUARTER 1 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 June 2022 (Month 3) was presented. A £124k overspend was forecast due to greater than expected expenditure on:

- commissioning counsel, resulting from the decision to serve injunctions rather than enforcement notices
- salaries, due to a continuing heavy dependence on temporary contract staff in the first quarter of the financial year
- external consultancy advice and a late invoice from SCC for historic building fees due in 2021/22.

These overspends had been partly offset by greater than expected planning application fee income.

The capital position was under review and would be updated as part of the Quarter 2 budget monitoring report.

**RESOLVED** – that the Committee's forecast revenue and capital budget positions as at Quarter 1 / M3 (June) 2022 be noted.

Rising 9.49 pm

**Replacement Planning Protocol - amended sections incorporating additions / deletions agreed by the Planning Policy Committee**

## 6. Role of Members

### 6.1 Members sitting on the Planning Committee should:

- make planning decisions on applications presented to the Committee openly, impartially, with sound judgement and for sound planning reasons;
- consider only development plan policies, supplementary planning documents and material planning considerations (including the National Planning Policy Framework or NPPF) in determining applications
- exercise their responsibilities with regard to the interests of the District as a whole rather than with regard to their particular Ward's interest and issues;
- come to meetings with an open mind;
- not allow anyone (except Officers, other Committee Members and public speakers when they are addressing the Committee) to communicate with them during the meeting (orally or in writing) as this may give the appearance of bias. For the same reason, it is best to avoid such contact immediately before the meeting starts;
- consider the advice that planning, legal or other Officers give the Committee in respect of the recommendation or any proposed amendment to it. Members need to consider "significant" planning considerations in the determination of a planning application having regard to what the Planning Officer's report states is a significant consideration and be prepared to justify their view if different before the Committee;
- comply with section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which requires the Local Planning Authority to make decisions in accordance with the development plan unless there are good planning reasons to come to a different decision based on material planning considerations;
- have regard to material planning considerations which can be but are not limited to:
  - Overlooking/loss of privacy
  - Loss of light or overshadowing
  - Right to peaceful enjoyment of property
  - Government policy
  - Previous planning decisions (including appeal decisions)
  - Economic benefits of a proposed development nationally or for the local area
  - Community benefits
- come to their decision only after due consideration of all of the information available to them, including the local information that Members are uniquely placed to access, but always remembering to take decisions on planning grounds alone. If Members feel there is insufficient time to digest new information or that there is insufficient information before them, they should seek an adjournment to address these concerns;
- not vote on a proposal unless they have been present to hear the entire debate, including the Officer update and any public speaking;



- make sure that if they are proposing, seconding or supporting a decision contrary to the Officer's recommendation or the development plan, they clearly identify and understand the planning reasons leading to this conclusion and that they take into account any advice planning, legal or other Officers give them (they should seek such advice before the Committee meeting including resolutions contrary to the Officer's recommendation, reasons for refusal or draft planning conditions). Their reasons must be given prior to the vote and be recorded. Be aware that they may have to justify the resulting decision by giving evidence in the event of challenge;
- avoid requests for Officers to speed up or delay the determination or assessment of particular applications for their own personal or political convenience or following lobbying by applicants, agents/advisers, local residents or other interested parties;
- not allow anyone (except Officers and other Committee Members) to communicate with them during any site visit (orally or in writing).

6.2 Issues such as loss of view, or negative effect on the value of properties, are not material considerations. There is no set list defining material considerations and it is a matter for Members to decide upon in the context of determining a particular planning application having regard to a Planning Officers advice on the matter

### **13. Referring applications to the Planning Committee**

- 13.1 All Councillors will receive copies of the weekly list of planning applications validated and proceeding to determination, detailing the reference number, proposal, location, decision, number of objections, and a hyperlink to connect to the relevant part of the Planning Portal to enable Planning Committee Members to view more details about the application.
- 13.2 If a Councillor wishes an application to go before the Planning Committee (to be 'called-in') rather than to be determined through Officer delegation, they should make this request in writing (including by email) to the Planning Officer and copy in the Chief Planning Officer as soon as possible, The planning grounds on which the call-in is based should be stated as fully as possible.
- 13.3 The Planning Officer and/or Chief Planning Officer shall then mark the record of that application as "Referral to Committee".
- 13.4 "Call-ins" are of two types:
- i) when a Member would want to have Planning Committee consider the application in the event of an Officer recommendation of refusal because of their awareness of a material consideration that indicates planning permission should be granted; or
  - ii) when a Member would want to have Planning Committee consider the application in the event of an officer recommendation of permission because of their awareness of a material consideration that indicates planning permission should be refused.

In either case, if Members consider there may be circumstances in which an alternative Officer delegated decision may be acceptable (e.g. amendments to a scheme of development imposition of planning conditions), they should still make a "call-in" in writing but indicate to the Chief Planning Officer that they may be minded to change their view subject to further discussion once Officers had come to an initial opinion.

- 13.5 Councillors must have reasonable and material planning ground(s) upon which to make the request to reverse an Officer's indicated recommendation. All Call-ins will be reviewed. Should the Chief Planning Officer find the planning grounds to be insufficient for the reversal of an Officer's recommendation then the Chief Planning Officer will immediately consult with the Chair, Vice Chair and delegated Planning Officer before presenting in writing to, and subsequently discussing with, the member concerned their ~~reason(s)-recommendation(s)~~ to withdraw their Call-In. The decision for a Call-in rests with the Member but no reasonable and sound request for withdrawal shall be refused.
- 13.6 The agenda for the next appropriate meeting will be amended as soon as possible to reflect those applications that have been 'called-in'. The Planning Officer will also inform the Member of the date of the Committee when the application will be heard. The Member making the call-in request will be invited to;
- i) discuss the wording of an alternative resolution for permission/refusal with the Case Officer/another Senior Planning Officer to be forwarded to Democratic Services to ensure the smooth running of Planning Committee proceedings; and
  - ii) discuss the wording of an alternative set of planning conditions/ reasons for refusal with the Case Officer/another Senior Planning Officer to ensure these meet the test of reasonableness and to be forwarded to Democratic Services to ensure the smooth running of Planning Committee proceedings.
- 13.7 The Chief Planning Officer has absolute discretion to refer any otherwise delegated application to the Planning Committee for determination, for example, when such an application raises issues considered to be of District wide importance.
- 13.8 Members of the public and other third parties **cannot** request that an application be referred to the Planning Committee.
- 13.9 The number and nature of delegated applications referred to the Planning Committee will be reviewed on a regular basis.

## **17. Decision making**

### **17.1 Declaration of Interests**

- 17.1.1 The Council's Monitoring Officer has provided all Councillors with detailed guidance on the Member Code of Conduct and in particular, declaration of interests. This is regularly updated. Members of the Planning Committee must ensure they are familiar with the Code. The requirements must be followed scrupulously, and Members should review their situation regularly. It is the personal responsibility of individual Members to ensure they comply with the Code of Conduct and make all appropriate declarations at Planning Committee meetings. Members should take advice early, from the Monitoring Officer or the Deputy Monitoring Officer, and preferably well before any meeting takes place, if they are in any doubt as to their position.

- 17.1.2 The Member Code of Conduct sets out detailed requirements for the registration and disclosure of disclosable pecuniary interests. Members should not participate in any decision and should leave the meeting where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest unless they have first obtained a dispensation. In addition, unless they have obtained a dispensation, they should:-
- NOT participate or give the appearance of trying to participate in the making of any decision on the matter by the Council
  - NOT get involved in the processing of the application
  - NOT use their position to discuss the proposal with Officers or Members when other members of the public would not have the opportunity to do so or in any other way seek or accept any preferential treatment or give the appearance of so doing.
- 17.1.3 The Member Code of Conduct requires Members to consider whether they have a non-registrable interest or personal interest in any item. Such an interest will arise where the matter may reasonably be regarded as affecting the wellbeing or financial standing of the Member concerned, a member of their family or a person with whom they have a close association to a greater extent than many of the constituents of the ward affected by the application at Planning Committee. Such an interest will also arise where it would be a disclosable pecuniary interest but relates to a member of their family or to a close associate rather than to the Member themselves or to their spouse or partner.
- 17.1.4 In the event that a Member considers that they have a non-registrable pecuniary interest or personal interest in any matter they should disclose the existence and nature of the interest as requested by the Chair during the course of the meeting but, in any case, no later than the hearing of the specific item to which an interest relates.
- 17.1.5 A Member who has a personal interest in a planning application must also consider whether that interest also constitutes a prejudicial interest. The test of this is whether it would be reasonable for a member of the public with knowledge of all the relevant facts to consider that the nature of the Member's interest was likely to affect their judgement of the public interest - i.e. affect or influence their voting intentions.
- 17.1.6 If a Member only has a personal interest to declare, which they do not consider to be prejudicial, they are entitled to remain in the meeting and speak and vote.
- 17.1.7 If a Member decides that their personal interest is a prejudicial interest, they must declare that fact in the usual way. They should leave the meeting for the discussion regarding that item unless exercising their public speaking rights, after which they should then leave the meeting for the remainder of the consideration of the item.
- 17.1.8 A Member with a disclosable pecuniary interest should, subject to any dispensation, leave the meeting for the discussion regarding that item and not participate in the matter. If there is any doubt, further advice for Members is available in advance of the meeting from Legal Services.
- 17.1.9 The obligation to disclose the existence and nature of an interest applies to **all Councillors attending the Planning Committee meeting, whether sitting as a Member of the Planning Committee or as a Councillor addressing the Planning Committee or sitting in the public gallery**. The responsibility rests with individual Councillors to ensure they indicate to the Chair that they have an interest to declare.

17.1.10 Members should carefully consider whether they have a disclosable interest if they have participated in a Parish Council meeting or a County Council committee with respect to a particular planning application.

## 17.2 Predisposition, predetermination or bias

17.2.1 To preserve the integrity of Planning Committee decisions, it is vital that Members do not make up their minds before they have all relevant materials and arguments before them at the Committee meeting. Members must retain an open mind at the time the decision is made and not make up their minds or appear to have made up their minds, until they have heard the Officer's presentation and evidence at the Planning Committee when the matter is considered. This is particularly important if a Member is contacted by an external interest or lobby group. If a Member has made up their mind prior to the meeting and is not able to reconsider their previously held view, they will not be able to participate in the determination of the matter because if they did take part in the discussion or vote it would put the Council at risk in a number of ways. Firstly, it would probably, in the view of the Local Government Ombudsman, constitute maladministration. Secondly, the Council could be at risk of legal proceedings on a number of possible grounds, e.g.

- that there was a danger of bias on the part of the Member; and/or
- predetermination; and/or
- failure to take into account all of the factors which would enable the proposal to be considered on its merits

17.2.2 Members are entitled to feel predisposed towards a particular decision but must still be able to consider and weigh relevant factors before reaching their final decision. Predetermination arises when Members' minds are closed, or reasonably perceived to be closed, to the consideration and evaluation of the relevant factors. This risks making the whole decision vulnerable to legal challenge. Section 25 of the Localism Act 2011 provides that a Member should not be regarded as having a closed mind simply because they previously did or said something that, directly or indirectly, indicated what view they might take in relation to any particular matter. For example, a Member who states "*wind farms are blots on the landscape and I will oppose each and every wind farm application that comes before committee*" has a closed mind. A Member who states "*many people find wind farms ugly and noisy and I will need a lot of persuading that any more wind farms should be allowed in our area*" does not have a closed mind although they are predisposed towards opposing such applications.

17.2.3 Where a Member may have campaigned for or against a proposal, they need to be careful to consider and ensure it is apparent that they have considered all relevant considerations and made their decision in accordance with their statutory duty. Members must be prepared to change their view right up to the point of making the decision. Members can listen to applicants and objectors, and indicate their view, but must not be biased in their consideration of the issues. Members can support or oppose an application and represent the views of their constituents in their role as a Ward Councillor. To do so as a Planning Committee Member MIGHT compromise their role on the Committee and Members are advised to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer or Deputy Monitoring Officer.

- 17.2.4 The fact that Members may have campaigned for or against a proposal will not be taken as proof that they are not open-minded. However, a Member who has expressed particularly extreme views, it will be more difficult in practice to be able to get away from the impression that they would approach the decision with a closed mind. Members of the Planning Committee who have actively engaged with lobby groups on a live planning application will need to seek advice from the Monitoring Officer regarding any perceived pre-determination.
- 17.2.5 Pre-determination does not arise where Members have not expressed a concluded view on a planning application but consider they are still approaching the determination of that application with an open mind.
- 17.2.6 Members on the Planning Committee who also serve on bodies (such as Parish ~~or County~~ Councils) that are consulted about planning applications need to think carefully about their participation in that consultation process to avoid the impression that they have already made their minds up before the matter arrives at the Planning Committee. Members will be familiar with the fact that, when they receive the consultation on a particular matter, they only receive the proposal and not the full Officer report. It is at the point when the Officer report is submitted to Members that all material considerations are before them. A firm decision before that point is as stated above therefore premature in terms of planning law. This does not prevent a Member from listening to a debate at a Parish ~~or County~~ Council, so long as the Member does not take part in the debate or express a view during the debate or openly afterwards.
- 17.2.7 Where a Parish Council ~~or County Council~~ has a Planning Committee, District Planning Committee Members should avoid joining that Committee. Councillors may also well consider whether it would be preferable to leave the room or simply listen to debate in the Parish ~~or County~~ Council but express no view during the debate or openly afterwards until the matter comes before the District Planning Committee. Members should be aware of, and have regard to, guidance issued from time to time by the Planning Advisory Service in relation to this issue.
- 17.2.8 Planning Committee Members should confirm whether they have, in Parish or other formal planning situations, considered, evaluated or discussed any planning application that is before the Committee for consideration. In such circumstances, the Member should leave the room while that planning application is being heard.

## **18. Public Speaking on planning applications**

- 18.1 The Council operates a system of limited public speaking at Planning Committee, to allow Members to hear representations from several interested parties before the application is considered. Representations are limited to 3 minutes per speaker, with 3 speakers allowed, i.e. one in favour (e.g. an applicant, agent or supporter); one objector; and the Parish Council. They are taken in the order of objectors and then applicant and/or supporters. No individual will be allowed to speak in more than one capacity and as set out above; Members of the Committee should not assume one of these roles.
- 18.2 Each speaker must pre-register with Democratic Services no later than 16.30 on the day before the Planning Committee, with registration opening on the publication of the agenda. Details of how to register to speak will be provided to the applicant and third parties who have made representations on the proposal on the publication of the agenda, including within emails generated to affected parties in advance of the meeting. Speakers are registered on a 'first come first served' basis, that is to say the first speakers to register will be successful. Ward and Parish councillors are expected to adhere to the identified timeframes, and any exceptional circumstances that mean that this has not been possible may be considered by the Chair.

- 18.3 There shall be no transfer of time between registered individuals, or to others not registered, except in exceptional circumstances and with the prior approval of the Chair.
- 18.4 Speakers should arrive for the Planning Committee no later than 15 minutes before the start of the Committee. A speaker arriving after the start of the meeting will not be recorded as present and may not be eligible to speak. Changes to the order of the agenda may be made at the Planning Committee and at the discretion of the Chair.
- 18.5 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. In such cases the time will be increased equally for each of the groups.
- 18.6 Messages, in any form, should never be passed to individual Committee Members, either from other Councillors or from the public. This could be seen as seeking to influence that Member improperly and will create a perception of bias that will be difficult to overcome.

### **32. Ward Councillors addressing the Planning Committee**

- 32.1 If a Ward Councillor wishes to address the Planning Committee about a matter in their ward being considered at the Planning Committee, they should advise the Chair (or Vice Chair in his/her absence) and the Committee Clerk prior to the meeting itself and will be entitled to speak after the ~~objector and applicant public speakers~~ and partake in the debate as appropriate but not vote. Ward Councillors should comply with the procedure for declaration of interests if they speak at a Planning Committee meeting in the same way as Members of the Committee. Where the Ward Councillor has a prejudicial interest, they may only address the Planning Committee if they are the applicant or lead objector and must withdraw from the room (or virtual meeting where appropriate) once they have made their representations.

**Letter to the Chief Planner at the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities**  
(sent on the 27<sup>th</sup> September 2022)

Dear Ms Averley,

**GOVERNMENT ADVICE TO PINS ON LOCAL PLANS UNDER EXAMINATION**

I am writing to ask for clarification about the implications of the former Secretary of State, Greg Clark's, letter to Sarah Richards, the Chief Executive at the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) of 28th July, 2022. The letter requested that inspectors do not conclude that local plans under examination are unsound or recommend their withdrawal before a new prime minister is appointed, or "until the department advises you otherwise". This letter is quite unprecedented in the opinion of the Council's principal planning officers and has introduced a significant amount of uncertainty into this Council's local plan making process.

The pause in decision making on local plans currently at examination could last well into the autumn, taking into account the party-political conferences in October; and a newly appointed prime minister and cabinet needing time to assimilate their briefs and make their own decisions on the future direction of planning policy. There has to be a reason for the Secretary of State to take such unprecedented action. Both elected members and officers of this Council are concerned that the letter presages significant alterations in Government planning policy, particularly with respect to matters such as assessment of housing requirements, affordable housing and release of land from green belts.

Tandridge District Council has spent to date some £3.1M of council tax-payers money on preparing its emerging local plan. An additional £1.3M is estimated to be required for the further work the examining inspector has identified is required to move the local plan forward for consideration for adoption by December 2023.

Tandridge District Council like all local authorities is facing real challenges financially. Adding to these existing challenges are levels of inflation and rising energy costs not previously anticipated. The Council has to act in a financially prudent way and ensure value for money in all expenditure. The uncertainty raised by the Secretary of State's 28<sup>th</sup> July letter to PINS causes the Council real concern that if major central government planning policy changes are afoot there could be wasted expenditure. This could arise either because not all the work identified to complete the local plan may be needed or the work that is needed will have to be approached in different ways to before.

Furthermore, the Council is concerned about the implications of the former Secretary of State's letter for the Government's target of having adopted local plans in place by December 2023. The letter introduces uncertainty, and thereby delay, in progressing local plans already at examination, which is the position with the emerging Tandridge Local Plan. Local authorities are not responsible for that uncertainty and delay. This raises the question of whether the December 2023 date should now be extended.

The Council would be extremely grateful if you could provide clarity about the implications of the Secretary of State's 28th July letter and whether the Council is right to anticipate changes in central government planning policy that could have financial consequences for this Council in terms of incurring further significant expenditure in moving the local plan forward.

Yours sincerely,

**David Ford**  
**Chief Executive**

**Letter to the Planning Inspector examining the Local Plan (c/o the Programme Officer)**  
(sent on the 27<sup>th</sup> September 2022)

Dear Inspector,

**GOVERNMENT ADVICE TO PINS ON LOCAL PLANS UNDER EXAMINATION**

We write in respect of the letter dated 28th July 2022 from the Secretary of State, Greg Clark, to Sarah Richards, the Chief Executive at the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) giving Government advice to PINS regarding Local Plans under Examination.

As a result, we have sent the attached letter to the Chief Planner. As you will see, we are concerned that there may be significant alterations to Government planning policy and we are anxious to avoid spending money on work that may not be necessary or become outdated. There are growing pressures on the Council's limited financial resources and it is imperative for us to secure best value in all our expenditure.

We will therefore not be sending any further monthly updates for the time being but will resume as soon as there is further clarification of future Government policy.

Yours sincerely,

**David Ford**  
**Chief Executive**



## 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 14<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>TH</sup> 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 – 4<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup> 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

## Quarter 2 2022/23 Budget Monitoring - Planning Policy Committee

### Planning Policy Committee Thursday, 24 November 2022

Report of: Mark Hak-Sanders - Chief Finance Officer (Section 151)

---

Purpose: To note the 2022/23 Quarter 2 / Month 6 (September) financial position of the Committee and take associated decisions.

---

Publication status: Unrestricted

Wards affected: All

---

#### **Executive summary:**

This report presents the 2022/23 Quarter 2 / Month 6 (September) financial position of both Revenue and Capital for the Committee.

---

**This report supports the Council's priority of:** Building a better Council/ Creating the homes, infrastructure and environment we need / supporting economic recovery in Tandridge/ Becoming a greener, more sustainable District.

**Contact officer** Mark Hak-Sanders Chief Finance Officer (S151)  
mhaksanders@tandridge.gov.uk

---

#### **Recommendation to Committee:**

That the Committee's forecast Revenue and Capital budget positions as at Quarter 2 / M6 (September) 2022 be noted.

---

## **Reason for recommendation:**

The Council has a duty to ensure that its expenditure does not exceed resources available. The medium-term financial outlook remains uncertain and so the Council must continue to take steps towards growing its financial resilience, including building reserves to a sustainable level.

It is essential, as a matter of prudence that the financial position continues to be closely monitored. In particular, Members must satisfy themselves that sufficient mechanisms are in place to ensure both that the revenue budget is delivered, and that any new expenditure is contained within the available resources.

Finance have committed to bringing quarterly financial monitoring updates to each committee to ensure that all Members are aware of the financial position of the services within their remit, as context for decisions needed to mitigate any variance to budget and as background to the emerging budget for 2023/24.

The consolidated position for quarter 2 will be reported to Strategy & Resources Committee on the 1<sup>st</sup> December 2022.

## **Introduction and Background**

1. The 2022/23 Planning Policy Committee Revenue budget was approved at £1,204k on 10th March 2022, including the distribution of budget for staffing increments (known as the Tranche 2 budget).
2. The 2022/23 Planning Policy (Community Infrastructure Levy) Capital Budget was approved at £1.6m by Council on 10th February 2022 having been considered by Planning Policy Committee on the 20th January 2022.
3. This was increased to £2.1m by carry-forwards from 2021/22 approved by S&R committee on 30th June 2022.

## **Revenue Headlines**

4. Planning Policy Committee is forecasting an £86k full-year overspend, a £37k improvement from Q1 (M3), mainly due to:

£92k Planning Application and Advice Planning Application and Advice variance consisting of:

- £164k overspend on salaries. Previously, the service has been reliant on contract staff and has gone through an organisational change which will lead to some mitigation (net £15k improvement from Qtr1 comprising, £24k restructure improvement offset by £9k one-off costs)
- £32k overspend on specialist recruitment to obtain skilled permanent staff (£32k deterioration from Qtr1)



- £20k overspend - Greater than expected spend on counsel on resulting from the decision to serve injunctions rather than enforcement notice (£10k deterioration from Qtr1)
- £43k overspend - greater than anticipated on external consultant advice. (£4k deterioration from Qtr1)

Offset by

- £167k surplus on planning application fee income being better than expected in the first 3 months (£61k improvement from Qtr1)

£9k Enforcement underspend due to staff churn and third party expenditure (£7k favourable) and enforcement appeals income (£2k favourable) - (£5k improvement from Qtr1).

5. The service is endeavouring to take mitigating action by completing the transition to permanent staff; greater dependence on injunctions to deter planning breaches and reduce cost of appeals.
6. The Planning Policy position will continue to be monitored, including the impact of an increase in the use of permanent staff rather than interims, and consolidated with the overall Council position. A report to S&R committee on 1st December will set out the total Council position along with potential corporate mitigations.

### **Capital Programme Update**

7. At M6, the Planning Policy (CIL) capital allocation is forecasting £1,619k of slippage due to rephasing of expected contributions. Further details are set out in Appendix A. As this is CIL funded it has no General Fund impact.

### **Key implications**

#### **Comments of the Chief Finance Officer**

8. The Section 151 Officer confirms the financial information presented in this report has been based on reasonable working assumptions taking into account all material, financial and business issues and risks. The key financial implications at this stage are captured in the body of the report.

## **Comments of the Head of Legal Services**

9. It is essential, as a matter of prudence, that the financial position of services continues to be closely monitored. In particular, Members must satisfy themselves that sufficient mechanisms are in place to ensure both that savings are delivered and that new expenditure is contained within the available resources. Accordingly, any proposals put forward must identify the realistic measures and mechanisms to produce those savings. Under S28 of the Local Government Act 2003, a local authority must review its budget calculations from time to time during the financial year and take appropriate action if there is any deterioration in its budget. This report satisfies this statutory requirement.

## **Equality**

There are no equality implications associated with this report.

## **Climate change**

There are no significant environmental / sustainability implications associated with this report.

## **Appendices**

Appendix A – Committee’s M6 (September) 2022 Financial Report and supporting data

## **Background papers**

Planning Policy Committee 22/23 draft budget and Medium-Term Financial Strategy – 20<sup>th</sup> January 2022

2022/23 final budget and 2023/24 MTFS - Strategy and Resources Committee 1st February 2022

Planning Policy Committee - 2022/23 Budget – Tranche 2 Pressure and Savings Distribution – 10<sup>th</sup> March 2022

2021/22 Budget – Outturn Report – Strategy and Resources Committee 30<sup>th</sup> June 2022

----- end of report -----

# **Month 6 (September 22) Financial Report – Planning Policy Committee**

Page 27

**Mark Hak-Sanders**  
Chief Finance Officer (S151)

**24th November 2022**

# Revenue Commentary – Planning Policy

Note – the forecast assumes that the budgets for the local plan and other planning policy matters are spent in full in 2022/23 or remain ringfenced to the local plan if not.

This ensures that funding approved for such matters is retained to meet uncertain future costs and not used to offset overspends elsewhere in the budget.

2021/22 Outturn	Forecast at M06		Annual Budget		Outturn Variance from M03		Change		One-off events		Ongoing Pressures	
	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k	£k
816 Planning Applications & Advice	428	335	92	(30)	31	62						
294 Planning Strategy & Policy Guidance	316	316	0	0	0	0						
50 Enforcement	267	276	(9)	(5)	(9)	0						
(2) Tree Preservation & Advice	95	95	(0)	0	(0)	0						
0 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)	0	0	0	(0)	0	0						
174 Local Development Plan - Evidence	182	182	0	(0)	0	0						
0 Gatwick Airport DCO	2	0	2	(0)	2	0						
9 Transfer to/from Neighbourhood Plan Reserve	8	8	0	0	0	0						
(10) Land Charges and Street Naming	(6)	(8)	2	(3)	2	0						
<b>1,332 Planning</b>	<b>1,290</b>	<b>1,204</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>(37)</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>62</b>						

TOTAL

## Planning Policy – Forecast overspend : £86k (Change from Q1:£37k improvement)

The forecast variance mainly comprises of:

- **£92k Planning Application and Advice Planning Application and Advice** variance consisting of
  - £164k overspend on salaries. Previously, the service has been reliant on contract staff and has gone through an organisational change which will lead to some mitigation (net £15k improvement from Qtr1 comprising, £24k restructure improvement offset by £9k one-off costs) .
  - £32k overspend on specialist recruitment to obtain skilled permanent staff (£32k deterioration from Qtr1)
  - £20k overspend - Greater than expected spend on counsel on resulting from the decision to serve injunctions rather than enforcement notice (£10k deterioration from Qtr1).
  - £43k overspend-Greater than anticipated on external consultant advice. (£4k deterioration from Qtr1) Offset by
  - £167k surplus on planning application fee income being better than expected income in the first 3 months (£61k improvement from Qtr1)
- **£9k Enforcement underspend** due to staff churn and third party expenditure (£7k favourable) and enforcement appeals income (£2k favourable) - (£5k improvement from Qtr1)

The service is endeavouring to take mitigating action by greater dependence on injunctions to deter planning breaches and reduce cost of appeals

# Capital Budget – Planning Policy

Scheme Name	Original Budget		Carry Forward		Budget including Carry Forwards		Forecast Variance M6	
	2022/23	£k	2021/22	£k	2022/23	£k	2022/23	£k
Capital contributions to third parties from CIL	1,667		479		2,146		527	(1,619)
<b>Total Capital Programme</b>	<b>1,667</b>		<b>479</b>		<b>2,146</b>		<b>527</b>	<b>(1,619)</b>

Page 29

- The Capital Budget for Planning Policy consists of the Capital Contributions for Community Infrastructure Levy. When the budget was set, this consisted of £1.7m, with a further £950k as part of the Croydon Road scheme in S&R.
- Carry forwards agreed as part of the 30<sup>th</sup> June S&R committee have increased this to £2.1m, as set out above.
- The forecast against this has been reviewed with the Budget Holder and current expectation is for spend of £0.5m; £1.6m less than budget. As this is CIL funded, there is no General Fund impact. The variance relates to:
  - Forecast delays where the budget assumed earlier agreement on Grant letters/agreements for Waringham Green, Burstow Road Safety and Blanchmans in 2022/23.
- The budget also reflects some older CIL Grants which are subject to external fund raising, which has been slow due to Covid-19 or agencies needing to re-schedule works due to shifting programmes.

# Revenue Risks

These risks have not been included in the budget monitoring position unless otherwise stated

Committee	Outline of Risk	Mitigation	Range Max - Min £k	Likely Financial Risk £k
Planning	Local Plan business case roadmap unforeseen costs and alternatives required	Additional costs would be offset within the Local Plan reserve in the first instance		
Planning	The need for externalising legal work could increase as more complex planning matters arise and thereby causing a possible cost pressure within planning services	Monitor and report, taking commensurate actions where opportunities arise		
Planning	Unexpected fall of in planning application fee income, driven by the national economic situation	Monitor and report, taking commensurate actions where opportunities arise		
Planning	Although the Council's decision to serve injunctions, rather than enforcement notices, drives the need for external specialist Counsel costs, it does have a long term benefit for the Council.	Use of injunctions, results in a long term saving through deterrent effect on other individuals wanting to breach planning control and overall reduction in cost of planning appeals		
Planning	Gatwick Airport Development Consent Order. Gatwick Airport has set out its proposal to bring its existing northern runway into regular use, alongside its main runway, as set out in its masterplan. The Council will incur specialist consultant advice to respond to each stage of the consultation process.	Value for money will be achieved by working with other Councils to secure the most effective, efficient and economical services to deliver the Councils responses to the consultation.	£68k - £48k	£58k

## Local Plan Update

### Planning Policy Committee – 24 November 2022

Report of: Interim Chief Planning Officer  
Cliff Thurlow

Purpose: To note

Publication status: Open

Wards affected: All

---

#### Executive summary:

In September 2022, the Council decided not to proceed for the time being with commissioning further work on the emerging Local Plan, pending clarification of future government policy. It was agreed that letters be sent to the Chief Planner at the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) and to the Inspector examining the Council's Local Plan.

---

#### This report supports the Council's priority of:

Creating the homes, infrastructure and environment we need but prudently managing financial resources.

**Contact officer** Cliff Thurlow Email: [cthurlow@tandridge.gov.uk](mailto:cthurlow@tandridge.gov.uk)

---

#### Recommendation to Committee:

That the report be noted.

---

#### Introduction and background

1. In July 2022, a letter was sent by the former Secretary of State at the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities to the Chief Executive of the Planning Inspectorate ('PINS') advising that, until further notice, PINS should not determine that local plans are unsound and / or suggest that local plans should be withdrawn.
2. This letter introduced a significant degree of uncertainty regarding the plan making process. In particular, it raised the prospect of major policy changes regarding housing delivery targets and the scope for releasing land from the Green Belt.

3. The Local Plan Inspector requires a significant amount of further work to be carried out, costing an estimated £1.3m, to enable the soundness of the emerging Local Plan to be further considered, with no guarantee of this resulting in the Plan being declared sound.
4. Given the severe financial constraints the Council is under and the risk that changes to national planning policy would make the work redundant, it was considered fiscally prudent to await clarification from the Government on future policy. The Chief Executive wrote a letter to the Chief Planner at DHLUC asking for clarification whether changes to national planning policy were to be expected. That clarification has not yet been received by the Council.
5. Following this Committee of 22<sup>nd</sup> September, the Council also sent a letter to the Inspector examining the emerging Local Plan explaining its position and that it would not, for the time being, be sending monthly updates on progress on the Local Plan work.
6. The Inspector has not yet responded to the Council's letter and has said he is waiting for the Secretary of State's letter to PINS to be withdrawn before he can set out a substantive response.
7. The Council has also clarified to the Inspector that it has not halted all work on the emerging Local Plan but has decided that it would not be prudent to spend more money for the time being commissioning work which may become redundant owing to potential changes to National Planning Policy.
8. Although the Council is not sending regular monthly updates to the Inspector, Officers have continued to discuss with National Highways and Surrey County Council how necessary improvements to junction 6 of the M25 may be funded.
9. After further consideration by these bodies, the Council has been informed that the total cost of the required improvements is likely to be at least £54m.
10. Regarding the emerging Local Plan proposals for Gypsy and Traveller sites, the Council is aware of the recent Court of Appeal judgment on the 31<sup>st</sup> October 2022 (**Lisa Smith v SSLUHC [2022] EWHC**) regarding the interpretation of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites ('PPTS') and the application of that policy to gypsies and travellers who have ceased to pursue nomadic lifestyles because of age or infirmity. The Court of Appeal found the PPTS to be discriminatory.
11. The Court of Appeal was very clear in its judgment that it could not quash national planning policy. This will now be a matter for the Secretary of State for DHLUC who may decide instead to ask the Supreme Court to redetermine the Court of Appeal's judgment. Therefore, at the moment, Officers consider that it would be speculative to make any assumptions about what central government's response to the Court of Appeal judgment may be and the timescale for a clear direction of travel with respect to the provisions of the PPTS to emerge.



12. The Council has read and noted the judgment and will keep the matter under close review so that any previous assessment of gypsy / traveller site needs for our Local Plan can be updated to accommodate any forthcoming changes there may be in the PPTS.

## **Key implications**

### **Comments of the Chief Finance Officer**

The Chief Finance Officer's comments on the decision not to proceed for the time being with commissioning further work on the emerging Local Plan, pending clarification of future government policy, were set out in the report to Planning Policy Committee on 22<sup>nd</sup> September 2022. The comments remain unchanged - that the Council must take decisions based on what represents best value for money at this point and based on a clear understanding of future planning requirements. Without that clarity, avoiding any further financial commitment on activities that may no longer align with Government policy appears to be the most financially prudent course of action.

### **Comments of the Head of Legal Services**

There are no legal issues associated with this report. The report simply provides Members with an update on the work to support the delivery of the Local Plan.

### **Equality**

Duty under the Equalities Act 2010

In assessing this proposal, the following impacts have been identified upon those people with the following protected characteristics (age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation).

The proposal would have a neutral impact on the protected characteristics.

### **Climate change**

There are no significant environmental / sustainability implications associated with this report.

### **Background papers**

None

This page is intentionally left blank

## Site Allocations Development Plan Document Update

### Planning Policy Committee – 24 November 2022

Report of: Interim Chief Planning Officer - Cliff Thurlow  
Purpose: To note  
Publication status: Open  
Wards affected: All

---

#### Executive summary:

- In September 2022, the Council decided to commence feasibility work on a Housing Site Allocations Development Planning Document (DPD). It is currently liaising with consultants with a view to awarding a tender.
- 

#### This report supports the Council's priority of:

Creating the homes, infrastructure and environment we need but prudently managing financial resources.

**Contact officer** Cliff Thurlow Email: [cthurlow@tandridge.gov.uk](mailto:cthurlow@tandridge.gov.uk)

---

#### Recommendation to Committee:

That the report be noted.

---

#### Introduction and background

1. As agreed at the 22<sup>nd</sup> September meeting of this Committee, the Council is seeking to explore whether a Site Allocations Development Plan Document (SADPD) can be added to the adopted Development Plan under the umbrella of the existing Core Strategy. The primary purpose of the document would be to identify a five-year housing land supply which is defensible and would include both constraints and infrastructure requirements. Plan-led development is essential in a district almost entirely Green Belt and where new development risks creating even more severe difficulties in terms of infrastructure delivery.

2. The primacy of the protection of the District's two Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty ('AONB'), candidate areas for AONB status and the Green Belt, together with recognising the limitations of infrastructure and other constraints, will be key planning considerations in drawing up the SADPD.
3. Infrastructure and services necessary for the sites included in the SADPD will not rely on future ad hoc provision, but instead must be explicitly planned for in the site requirements contained in the SADPD.
4. The maximum site yields in the SADPD site policies will fully reflect the need for affordable housing provision, infrastructure and/ or services and any other site specific requirements such as flood mitigation, heritage, landscape and biodiversity. In addition, there must be sufficient infrastructure and service capacity and, if not, there will be sufficient land allocated for any additional services/ infrastructure / flood mitigation etc and a realistic prospect for its delivery. The cumulative impact of development will also be explicitly provided for.
5. There is considerable overlap between the work to be completed for the SADPD and the ongoing work for the emerging Local Plan to address the gaps in the infrastructure delivery plan and other constraints on the sites. This provides the Council with considerable flexibility as to how the detailed site work will be used when clarity on future government planning policy emerges in the future.
6. A tendering process has been carried out by the Council and discussions are currently being held with a number of firms of consultants about the best way forward and so it is not yet possible to bring a budget and project plan before the committee.
7. Once the work has been commissioned from the appointed consultants, together with legal advice, a budget and project plan will be agreed. In light of the overlap, the consultancy fees for the preparation of the SADPD will be funded from the Planning Policy budget for the emerging Local Plan.

## **Key implications**

### **Comments of the Chief Finance Officer**

Although significant progress has been made over the last twelve months to improve the Council's financial position, the medium-term financial outlook beyond 2023/24 remains uncertain.

With uncertainty about the ongoing impact of the economic environment and no clarity on the extent to which both central and local funding sources might be affected in the medium term, our working assumption is that financial resources will continue to be constrained, as they have been for the majority of the past decade.

This places an onus on the Council to continue to consider issues of financial sustainability as a priority in order to ensure stable provision of services in the medium term.

As reported in paragraph 7, S151 Officer notes the costs for the preparation of the SADPD will be contained within the existing Planning Policy and emerging Local Plan budget.

### **Comments of the Head of Legal Services**

The Head of Legal has reviewed this report and is satisfied that all legal requirements have been met to date.

### **Equality**

Duty under the Equalities Act 2010

In assessing this proposal, the following impacts have been identified upon those people with the following protected characteristics (age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation).

The proposal would have a neutral impact on the protected characteristics.

### **Climate change**

There are no significant environmental / sustainability implications associated with this report.

### **Background papers**

None

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021-31<sup>st</sup> March 2022**

### **Planning Policy Committee – 24 November 2022**

Report of: Interim Chief Planning Officer

Purpose: For decision

Publication status: Open

Wards affected: All

---

#### **Executive summary:**

The Council has prepared an Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) for 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022 in accordance with Section 113 of the Localism Act 2011.

---

#### **This report supports the Council's priority of:**

Monitoring the effectiveness of our planning policies and procedures.

**Contact officer** Cliff Thurlow, Email: [cthurlow@tandridge.gov.uk](mailto:cthurlow@tandridge.gov.uk)

---

#### **Recommendation to Committee:**

It is recommended that:-

- A. the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) 1<sup>st</sup> April 2021 – 31<sup>st</sup> March 2022 (Appendix A - provided as a separate document) be approved for inclusion in the emerging local plan evidence base and to 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.

#### **Reason for recommendation:**

The requirement for a local authority to produce an annual Authority Monitoring Report (an AMR) is set out in Section 113 of the Localism Act 2011.

---

## **Introduction and background**

1. The Localism Act 2011 requires every local planning authority to produce a series of reports containing information on the implementation of the Local Development Scheme, the progress and effectiveness of the Local Plan, and the extent to which the planning policies set out in the Local Plan documents are being achieved.
2. Monitoring and reporting on current planning policies tells communities and stakeholders how the Council's planning function is performing.
3. The Monitoring Report is a good way to gather evidence on the effectiveness of existing policies, for future policy making, and supporting development management decisions. It identifies areas where objectives aren't being met and where changes to policy or development management may be necessary.
4. Good monitoring and reporting will assist councillors in their scrutiny function. It will also be a useful tool for neighbourhood planning – encouraging communities to engage in future policy making and helping them understand where neighbourhood plans 'sit' in the whole context of the development plan in the District.
5. The last annual Authority Monitoring Report was for 2020/21 and this report now provides an update for 2021/22.
6. The preparation and publication of the AMR within the Council has for many years been delegated to Officers but going forward the report will be reported to this Committee for adoption prior to publication.

## **Key implications**

### **Comments of the Chief Finance Officer**

There are no direct financial implications of this report. As such, the Section 151 Officer supports the recommendations.

### **Comments of the Head of Legal Services**

Since the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the requirement to monitor has evolved with the Localism Act 2011 and subsequent Town and Country Planning Local Planning (England) Regulations 2012, setting out the current requirement. The requirement to prepare and publish an Authority Monitoring Report replaces the previous duty, in the Town and Country Planning Regulations 2004, for local authorities to produce an Annual Monitoring Report which had to be submitted directly to the Secretary of State. However, there is still a minimum requirement to annually produce an Authority Monitoring Report, which, in the interests of transparency, should be made publicly available and



updated as and when the information becomes available.

Regulation 34 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 therefore sets out the basic information that AMRs must contain, although local authorities have discretion to include any other useful information relating to planning policy preparation and performance. These are summarised as:

- Reporting progress in the preparation and adoption of local plans (development plan documents) and supplementary planning documents against the milestones set out in the Council's local development scheme (LDS)
- Identifying progress in the delivery, both in the reporting period and cumulatively, of local plan policies that set specific targets for the number of net additional dwellings (or affordable dwellings);
- Setting out monitoring information, where available, used to assess the effectiveness of other local plan policies;
- Reporting any local plan policies that are not being implemented along with the reasons for non-implementation;
- Providing details of neighbourhood plans and neighbourhood development orders that have been made;
- Detailing any activities or actions related to the statutory duty to cooperate; and
- Where a community infrastructure levy (CIL) has been introduced, information relating to the operation of the levy, as specified in separate CIL regulations.

The content of the Council's AMR fulfils this duty.

## **Equality**

Duty under the Equalities Act 2010

In assessing this proposal, the following impacts have been identified upon those people with the following protected characteristics (age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation).

The proposal would have a neutral impact on the protected characteristics.

## **Climate change**

There are no significant environmental / sustainability implications associated with this report.

## **Appendices**

Appendix A - Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) 1st April 2021 – 31st March 2022 (separate document provided)

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan – Regulation 16 consultation**

### **Planning Policy Committee - 24 November 2022**

Report of: Interim Chief Planning Officer  
Cliff Thurlow

---

Purpose: For decision

---

Publication status: Open

Wards affected: Tatsfield

---

#### **Executive summary:**

This report recommends that the Committee endorses the statutory public consultation (Regulation 16) on the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan by Officers at the Council.

**This report supports the Council's priority of:** Creating the homes, infrastructure and environment we need

**Contact officer** Michael Eastham, Email: mfeastham@tandridge.gov.uk

---

#### **Recommendation to Committee:**

It is recommended 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.
-

## **Reason for recommendation:**

The Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan has been submitted to the Council as required under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. The next step is to consult under Regulation 16. Regulation 16 sets out that this must be done 'as soon as possible after receiving a plan proposal which includes each of the documents referred to in Regulation 15(1)'.

---

### **1 Introduction and background**

- 1.1 Under the Localism Act, 2011 parish councils or neighbourhood forums were given power to prepare their own plan. Once adopted ('made') neighbourhood plans form a part of the wider development plan for the District and are considered in the consideration of all relevant planning application and planning policy matters.
- 1.2 Eleven areas across the District have been designated as a neighbouring planning area and are at varying stages of their plan making process:
  - Burstow
  - Caterham, Chaldon & Whyteleafe
  - Crowhurst
  - Dormansland
  - Godstone
  - Limpsfield
  - Lingfield
  - Tandridge
  - Tatsfield
  - Woldingham
- 1.3 Of these areas, Woldingham Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in April 2016, Limpsfield Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in June 2019 and Caterham, Chaldon & Whyteleafe Neighbourhood Plan was adopted in June 2021.
- 1.4 The Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan has been submitted to the Council under Regulation 15 to progress to the next stages and Officers are now carrying out the review of the suite of documents received. Further details are set out later in this report.

### **2 Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan**

- 2.1 A Neighbourhood Plan is a community-led framework for guiding the future development and growth of an area. It may contain vision, aims, planning policies, proposals for improving the area or providing new facilities, or allocation of key sites for specific kinds of development. It may deal with a wide range of issues (like housing, employment, heritage and transport) or

it may focus on one or two issues that are of particular importance in a local area.

- 2.2 The Neighbourhood Plan must meet the following Basic Conditions, it must:
- be appropriate having regard to national policy
  - contribute to the achievement of sustainable development
  - be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the local area
  - be compatible with human rights requirements
  - be compatible with EU obligations.
- 2.3 The Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan was submitted to the Council in late October 2022.
- 2.4 Whilst all previous stages of consultation on a neighbourhood plan are the responsibility of the plan-making group/forum, the Regulation 16 consultation is carried out by the Local Planning Authority and must be completed before the neighbourhood plan can be considered by an independent examiner. Consultation responses received will be passed to the independent examiner. Consultation on the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan will commence as soon as is practically possible following this Committee meeting and it is intended to run for six weeks in accordance with Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.
- 2.5 On the assumption that the Neighbourhood Plan passes examination the Parish Council is aiming to have the local referendum running alongside the elections in May 2023. However, in order to achieve this tight time-frame it will require the Council to run the Regulation 16 consultation for 6 weeks with a view to start the consultation on or around **Monday 28th November 2022 and ending on Friday 27<sup>th</sup> January 2023, taking account of the two-week Christmas break.**
- 2.6 Once the statutory consultation period has ended, the Planning Policy Team will need to send responses to the Examiner. The Examiner will then prepare a report, which will be fact checked by the Planning Policy Team and the Parish Council. A schedule of amendments will need to be presented to the Committee for approval and agreement sought to go to referendum. Following on from this, the Neighbourhood Plan has to be amended and made available so that the local residents know what they are voting on at the referendum. The Planning Policy Team will then prepare all of the documentation and arrange the accommodation for the referendum.

## **Key implications**

### **Comments of the Chief Finance Officer**

There are no significant financial implications associated with endorsing the statutory public consultation (Regulation 16) on the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan. As such, the Section 151 Officer supports the recommendations. Any costs of undertaking the consultation will be met from existing committee budgets.

### **Comments of the Head of Legal Services**

There are no significant legal implications arising from this report. There are also no alternative options that can be considered as the Council is required to progress the Plan in accordance with the Regulations.

### **Equality**

Duty under the Equalities Act 2010

In assessing this proposal, the following impacts have been identified upon those people with the following protected characteristics (age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation).

The proposed consultation on the Tatsfield Neighbourhood Plan would have a neutral impact on the protected characteristics.

### **Climate change**

There are no significant environmental / sustainability implications associated with this report.

### **Appendices**

None

### **Background papers**

None

## Lingfield Conservation Area Appraisal (Supplementary Planning Document)

### Planning Policy Committee - 24 November 2022

Report of: Interim Chief Planning Officer

---

Purpose: For decision

---

Publication status: Open

Wards affected: Lingfield

---

#### **Executive summary:**

This report recommends the delegation of production of a Conservation Area Appraisal for Lingfield to Lingfield Parish Council, working with Surrey County Council ('SCC') Historic Environment Planning Team and in partnership with the Council.

**This report supports the Council's priority of:** Creating the homes, infrastructure and environment we need

**Contact officer** Cliff Thurlow e-mail: [cthurlow@tandridge.gov.uk](mailto:cthurlow@tandridge.gov.uk)

---

#### **Recommendation to Committee:**

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 ('SPD') to be consulted upon and adopted by the Council.

---

## **Reason for recommendation:**

Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 establishes the duty of 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.

A request has been received from Lingfield Parish Council that they be enabled to carry out an appraisal of the Conservation Area, commissioning SCC Historic Environment Planning Team to carry out the work. (Appendix A includes a copy of the letter from the Parish Council). The appraisal will identify the special architectural and historic interest of the conservation area, set out its historic development and assess what contributes to its character and appearance. It is anticipated that the appraisal will also recommend boundary changes to the conservation area to ensure they are still relevant and in accordance with national legislation and guidance.

It is proposed that work be carried out in a way that, when complete, this Council can then carry out the necessary consultation and adopt it as a Supplementary Planning Document (an SPD) to support its statutory planning functions.

---

### **1 Introduction and background**

- 1.1 The purpose of a conservation area designated under Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is to identify "an area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance". The terms of reference for the Committee allow the Committee to confirm the boundaries of a conservation area.
- 1.2 Conservation area designation introduces controls over the way owners can alter or develop their properties and controls work to trees. The purpose of a conservation area is not to prevent new development but to manage change to maintain, reinforce and, where possible, enhance the special character and quality that justifies designation. Section 72 of the 1990 Act requires the Council, when considering planning applications, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
- 1.3 To meet the statutory obligations, Conservation Area Appraisals are prepared and periodically reviewed. These aim to identify those features that contribute to the special character and appearance of a conservation area and provide the basis for making informed and sustainable planning decisions that aim to preserve and make these areas worthy of protection. Supplementary Planning Documents provide additional detail and guidance to support development plan policies, in this case those in the Core Strategy Parts 1 and 2.



- 1.4 The most recent example of a Conservation Area Appraisal is the Limpsfield Village Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, prepared in partnership between the Parish Council and this Council, with the Parish Council sponsoring the work and the District Council carrying out the consultation and other formal steps required for adoption of the document as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

## **2 Process**

- 2.1 Lingfield Parish Council has resolved its intention to seek an appraisal of the Lingfield Conservation Area and to appoint Surrey County Council's Historic Environment Planning Team section to prepare the appraisal. SCC's Team, as professional heritage advisors to the District Council is considered to be appropriately qualified to carry out this work and indeed have prepared similar appraisals across the county. It is anticipated that, if approved, the work will commence in December 2022, with adoption by the District Council anticipated in late 2023. The Parish Council will provide information and financial resources to produce the draft Lingfield Conservation Area Appraisal (LCAA). Officers of this Council will give advice on content and process, reviewing the draft LCAA before public consultation, and carrying out the formal consultation stage necessary for adoption of an SPD. There will be a further report to this Committee prior to adoption. The project will thus be a partnership between Lingfield Parish Council and the District Council.
- 2.2 The model for this approach was successfully established locally in the Limpsfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan. In the Lingfield case it is not intended that a Management Plan will be produced. The Parish Council's intention is to include management policies in the Lingfield Neighbourhood Plan, which is in production.

## **3 Resourcing**

- 3.1 Lingfield Parish Council resources will be used for funding the work of the heritage consultants and local consultation.
- 3.2 Tandridge District Council will contribute officer time and expertise from within the Planning Policy team.

## **Key implications**

### **Comments of the Chief Finance Officer**

The S151 Officer confirms that there are no financial implications arising from the proposal to delegate the task of producing a conservation area appraisal for Lingfield to Lingfield Parish Council.

## **Comments of the Head of Legal Services**

As noted in the report there is a duty under section 69(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) ("the Act") for a local planning authority ("LPA") from time to time determine which parts of their area are areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance, and shall designate those areas as conservation areas. Under section 69(2) of the Act from time to time the LPA shall review the past exercise of the functions noted above. The recommendation put forward in this report form part of this review process.

No formal consultation requirements are imposed by the Act, however as the report states there will be public consultation and it is anticipated that this may last 6 weeks. All the consultation responses will need to be considered.

### **Equality**

Duty under the Equalities Act 2010

In assessing this proposal, the following impacts have been identified upon those people with the following protected characteristics (age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex or sexual orientation).

The proposed production of the LCAA would have a neutral impact on the protected characteristics.

### **Climate change**

There are no significant environmental / sustainability implications associated with this report.

### **Background papers**

None

**Appendix A** - Letter from Lingfield Parish Council dated 1<sup>st</sup> November 2022



1<sup>st</sup> November 2022

Tandridge District Council  
Council Offices  
Station Road East  
Oxted  
RH8 0BT

For the attention of the Planning Policy Committee

Dear Sirs

### **Conservation Area Appraisal – Lingfield**

We have been in discussion with Chris Reynolds, Heritage Officer, Surrey County Council about the possibility of engaging him to carry out an appraisal of our Conservation Area. We also held a preliminary meeting with Michael Eastham and Anna Cronin (Tandridge District Council) to talk about the scope of work and timescale.

The reason for writing is to ask for permission to carry out this work on the understanding that Lingfield Parish Council will pay for it and I would be grateful if you could put this request to the Planning Policy Committee at its next meeting.

Lingfield Parish Council approved expenditure of £7,800 at its meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> July 2022, for the Appraisal quote from Mr Reynolds. Further monies have been set aside in the budget to cover any additional costs involved with engagements and consultations, etc. The matter was discussed further at our meeting held on 26<sup>th</sup> October and in accordance with Section 11.1 (d) of our Financial Regulations members agreed to waive our Financial Regulations to remove the need to collect alternative quotes. This decision was taken because we believe Chris Reynolds is the best person to carry out this work, having recently carried out a similar appraisal for Limpsfield Parish Council of their Conservation Area.

If the Tandridge Planning Policy Committee is in agreement to delegate the authority to undertake the Conservation Area Appraisal, we will set up a small working party to represent Lingfield Parish Council on this project.

Yours faithfully

Mrs Fay Elwood  
Clerk

This page is intentionally left blank