

Public Document Pack

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL



Council Agenda

MINUTES AND REPORTS
SUBMITTED TO THE COUNCIL MEETING ON
Thursday, 15th December, 2022

David Ford
Chief Executive

7 December 2022

Dear Councillor,

You are summoned to attend the meeting of the Council on **Thursday, 15th December, 2022 at 7:30pm.**

Yours faithfully,

David Ford
Chief Executive

To: All Members of the Tandridge District Council

AGENDA

- 1. To confirm the minutes of the special Council meeting on the 20th October 2022**
(Pages 5 - 6)
- 2. To confirm the minutes of the ordinary Council meeting on the 20th October 2022**
(Pages 7 - 12)
- 3. Chair's announcements**
- 4. 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.

- 5. To deal with any questions submitted under Standing Order 30**
 - i) questions from residents and others working or studying in the District; and
 - ii) questions from Councillors

6. To receive and consider the reports of committees

6.1 Community Services Committee - 10 November 2022 (Pages 13 - 16)

6.2 Housing Committee - 17 November 2022 (Pages 17 - 24)

6.3 Planning Policy - 24 November 2022 (Pages 25 - 40)

6.4 Strategy & Resources Committee - 1 December 2022 (Pages 41 - 62)

6.5 Audit & Scrutiny Committee - 6 December 2022 (To Follow)

6.6 Planning Committee - 8 December 2022 (To Follow)

7. To consider a motion submitted by Councillor O'Driscoll under Standing Order 7

"This Council recognises that accessibility to playground equipment for everyone in our communities should be a right and not a luxury.

Furthermore, this Council recognises that an inequality exists where not everybody in our community is able to access playground equipment and will take steps to make sure this inequality no longer exists.

Therefore, this Council commits to providing playground equipment for those in our District with disabilities and long-term health conditions in locations agreed by members of the Community Services Committee at their next meeting and funding shall be made available to provide these facilities before March 2024."

8. Any urgent business

To deal with any other item(s) which, in the opinion of the Chair, should be considered as a matter of urgency in accordance with Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL

Minutes of the special meeting of the Council held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 20th October 2022 at 7.00pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Wren (Chair), Botten (Vice-Chair), Bilton, B.Black, Blackwell, Bloore, Booth, Caulcott, Crane, Evans, C.Farr, S.Farr, Flower, Gaffney, Gillman, Gray, Hammond, Jones, Langton, Lee, Lockwood, Montgomery, Moore, Pinard, Prew, Pursehouse, Robinson, Sayer, Shiner, Stamp, Steeds, Swann, C.White and N.White

PRESENT (Virtually): Councillors Mansfield and O'Driscoll

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillors Allen, G.Black, Chotai and North

149. HONORARY ALDERMAN - SIMON MORROW

A motion to confer the title of Honorary Alderman upon Simon Morrow, in accordance with Section 249 of the Local Government Act 1972, was moved by Councillor Botten and seconded by Councillor Pursehouse.

RESOLVED – that the title of Honorary Alderman be conferred upon Simon Morrow in recognition of his services as a District Councillor from 1990-1998 and from 2002-2022.

Rising 7.20 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

FULL COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 20th October 2022 at 7.30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Wren (Chair), Botten (Vice-Chair), Bilton, B.Black, Blackwell, Bloore, Booth, Caulcott, Cooper, Crane, Evans, C.Farr, S.Farr, Flower, Gaffney, Gillman, Gray, Groves, Hammond, Jones, Langton, Lee, Lockwood, Mansfield, Montgomery, Moore, O'Driscoll, Pinard, Prew, Pursehouse, Robinson, Sayer, Shiner, Stamp, Steeds, Swann, C.White and N.White

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillors Allen, G.Black, Chotai and North

150. MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING ON THE 21ST JULY 2022

Councillor Cooper proposed three separate motions in respect of the accuracy of the minutes, i.e.:

Minute 88 – motion to exclude the press and public for Minutes 89 and 90

Councillor Cooper moved that more accurate reasons for the exclusion of press and public should be provided in the minutes. This was seconded by Councillor Flower. Upon being put to the vote, this motion was lost.

Minute 89 – questions submitted under Standing Order 30 by Councillor Cooper

Councillor Cooper moved that his three questions be added to Appendix A to the minutes. This was seconded by Councillor Groves. Upon being put to the vote, this motion was lost.

Councillor Cooper moved that the responses to his three questions should have been supplied to all Councillors after the meeting. This was seconded by Councillor Groves. Upon being put to the vote, this motion was lost.

The minutes (without any amendments) were therefore confirmed and signed as a correct record.

151. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

(i) Queen Elizabeth II

As this was the first ordinary first meeting of Full Council since her passing, Members stood for a one-minute silence in memory of Queen Elizabeth II and her lifetime of service to the country.

(ii) Civic fundraising

The Chair confirmed that her charity quiz night would take place at St. Agatha's Hall, Hurst Green on Saturday, 3rd December 2022.

The Chair thanked everyone who had who supported her charity open mic night on Sunday, 9th October 2022. The evening had been a great success with over £800 raised for her charities (Clockwork and the Holland Get Fit Club).

152. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Jones declared a non-pecuniary interest in connection with Minute 96 of the Planning Committee minutes of the 28th July 2022 (2021/1800 – New Aldi Supermarket, 381 Croydon Road, Caterham).

Councillor Pursehouse declared a non-pecuniary interest in connection with Minute 123 of the Strategy & Resources Committee minutes of the 29th September 2022 (rental grant subsidy applications).

153. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER STANDING ORDER 30

Questions had been submitted by Councillors Jones, Gray, Prew and O'Driscoll. Details of the questions and responses are attached at Appendix A.

154. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

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

Planning Committee – 28th July 2022

Strategy & Resources Committee – 10th August 2022

Licensing Committee – 7th September 2022

Planning Policy Committee – 22nd September 2022

Audit & Scrutiny Committee – 27th September 2022

Strategy & Resources Committee – 29th September 2022

Housing Committee – 4th October 2022

Planning Committee – 6th October 2022

Community Services Committee – 18th October 2022

Rising 8.55 pm

COUNCIL – 20TH OCTOBER 2022 – STANDING ORDER 30 QUESTIONS

Question from Councillor Jones

Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Sayer)

With the shocking news that NatWest plan to close both branches in Tandridge in the near future, will the Leader of the Council undertake to write to Natwest on behalf the Council requesting that they reconsider their decision? These are vital services for residents in our communities.

Response from Councillor Sayer

Councillor Sayer advised that she had written to Alison Rose, the Chief Executive of NatWest on 18th October, asking the bank to reconsider these planned closures which would leave the c.90,000 Tandridge residents without a NatWest branch in the district. Councillor Sayer referred to the written response from Alison Rose’s office which stated that the bank would not be revisiting the decision, but explained the reasons for it, e.g.:

- a reduced demand for physical banks since 2019
- “78% of NatWest Caterham and 74% of NatWest Oxted customers are digitally active...”
- “the NatWest Caterham branch is only being visited by 3 customers on a regular weekly basis, and no customers visit the NatWest Oxted branch on a regular weekly basis...”
- there are other means of supporting customers as alternatives to branch banking.

Councillor Sayer undertook to forward the bank’s response to all Members for information.

Question from Councillor Gray

Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Sayer)

Will the Leader of the Council write to the Leader of Surrey County Council to raise an objection to the effective discontinuation of our Local Area Committee prior to the publication, discussion and scrutiny of any alternative mechanism for community engagement?

Response from Councillor Sayer

Councillor Sayer undertook to pursue the matter with the Leader of Surrey County Council (Councillor Tim Oliver) as requested. She referred to her previous correspondence with Councillor Oliver on the subject in which he highlighted SCC’s “*extensive programme of engagement with residents, including the appointment of community link officers, so I have no concern at all that residents are unable to easily raise issues with their County Councillor or through the SCC website in relation to issues we are responsible for*”. Councillor Oliver had also stated that Local Committees could continue but that SCC officers would not be able to support them. Councillor Sayer confirmed she would be happy to write to Councillor Oliver again, requesting further details about how the Local Committees would be replaced.

Supplementary question from Councillor Gray

Given that SCC could have tried to improve the Local Committee process (as opposed to withdrawing it) through which residents could force minuted, webcast discussions of things that concerned them, does the promise of enhanced public engagement appear to be a nonsense?

Response from Councillor Sayer

Councillor Sayer agreed that the withdrawal of SCC's Local Committees, and the fact that residents would no longer be able to attend a public meeting to express their views and have them recorded, represented a loss of openness and transparency. Despite the ability for residents to speak to a community link officer or a county councillor, there would be no public record of what was said, which is a real disadvantage. Councillor Sayer confirmed she would emphasise those points in her letter to Councillor Oliver.

Question from Councillor Prew

Question to the Chair of the Planning Policy Committee (Councillor Sayer)

In response to a Standing Order 30 Question asked by Councillor O'Driscoll at Planning Policy Committee on the 23rd June; the Interim Chief Planning Officer acknowledged that there was a delay in validating planning applications as a result of *"staff changes in the planning department and the increased number of applications being received"*. The Interim Chief Planning Officer went on to say that steps were being taken to urgently reduce the number of applications awaiting validation including: increasing the number of validation officers from within existing staff numbers; recruiting a new validation officer; retaining an interim validation officer.

I was approached as recently as last week by a resident who had submitted a planning application via the Planning Portal on 12 September and but had still not had an acknowledgement from the Council. When I enquired on his behalf, I was told that it is currently taking 6 to 8 weeks to process an application through to validation.

Can the Council please tell me:

- 1. Has the size of the validation team increased since June and what is the current staffing level in this department?**
- 2. What is the current average time taken to process an application from receipt to validation and how many applications are awaiting validation?**

Response from Councillor Sayer

Councillor Sayer advised that the size of the validation team had not increased since June. It comprised 4 x FTE ... one of those posts was currently occupied by a contractor although a permanent replacement was being sought. She explained that the validation backlog had been caused by IT issues relating to the Civica planning portal, with application documents having to be (temporarily) uploaded manually. Development Management staff had volunteered to work overtime to undertake this time-consuming process, which was considered preferable to engaging contractors. Councillor Sayer confirmed that the *"6 to 8 weeks"* processing time was correct and understood that 160 to 170 applications were awaiting validation. Councillor Sayer apologised to Members and the public for the delays but gave an assurance that staff were doing all they could to resolve the IT problems.

Supplementary question from Councillor Prew

As residents have been encouraged to use the planning portal, should we be issuing a notice about the delays?

Response from Councillor Sayer

Councillor Sayer explained that information had been provided on the website. The IT problems had been sporadic to date, although the provision of paper plans in libraries etc may need to be considered if the difficulties continued.

2nd Supplementary question from Councillor Prew

Are we risking incurring costs due delays in processing planning applications?

Response from Councillor Sayer

Councillor Sayer advised that there was no immediate risk. However, the problem couldn't be allowed to persist and the contract with Civica may have to be reviewed to assess the Council's options.

Questions from Councillor O'Driscoll

(pre-recorded and replayed at the meeting as Councillor O'Driscoll was not present in the Chamber – Standing Order 30 (1) (iii) refers

Question to the Chair of the Planning Policy Committee (Councillor Sayer)

There are concerns about the level of planning appeals to the Inspector and the associated costs to the Council. With applications in recent years being allowed by appeal in Felbridge, Coulsdon Lodge in Westway and the possibility of another appeal relating to a refused application in Croydon Road, Caterham. The cost to the council for all of the allowed appeals is in the millions of pounds. **What mitigations are being taken to reduce the possibility that local planning applications are decided by Bristol bureaucrats and not by local members and officers?**

Response from Councillor Sayer

Councillor Sayer acknowledged the 'Felbridge appeal' which had resulted in the most substantive costs being awarded against the Council in 2019. She understood that, so far, no appeal had been lodged in respect of the Croydon Road application (Aldi) referred to in the question. She commented that, while planning applications were assessed against relevant national and local planning policies, decisions were often based on finely balanced judgements. Because the current system empowered all applicants to appeal to the Planning Inspectorate who could always arrive at a different conclusion and overturn a decision to refuse planning permission, the situation was out of the Council's control, and it would take a change in government policy for that to alter. Councillor Sayer also referred to the Prime Minister's question time on 19th October, when the PM replied that she wanted decisions about homes and infrastructure to be driven by local people and not by Whitehall. Councillor Sayer concluded that the current planning system failed to respect local wishes or the role of Councils. She hoped that the government was committed to making changes.

Question to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Sayer)

The World Cup is in under a month's time and I want to take the opportunity to celebrate the work of our grassroots football teams in Tandridge, particularly the Caterham Pumas and AFC Whyteleafe. **Will the Leader of the Council join me in congratulating and celebrating the work of all of our grassroots football teams and will she work with me to ensure this Council fully supports the work they do in their communities?**

Response from Councillor Sayer

Councillor Sayer confirmed she would be delighted to join Councilor O'Driscoll in celebrating the work of grassroots football teams throughout the district and to support them wherever she could.

Question to the Chair of the Community Services Committee (Councillor Wren)

Residents are keen to see more TerraCycle stations in local shops in Caterham to recycle contact lenses cases and cheese wrappers among other items you can't usually recycle. **Will this Council provide support to local businesses in Caterham to host Terracycle facilities?**

Response from Councillor Wren

Councillor Wren advised that the TerraCycle business model sought to encourage householders and businesses to set up local pick-up points at their home address or business premise. It would be for a business to decide whether they have sufficient space to host the drop-off collection boxes and to make arrangements for the collected material to be posted to TerraCycle.

Councillor Wren stated that the Council had no plans to offer assistance at this stage. However, she suggested that Councillors could take the matter up with business organisations (e.g. Business Improvement Districts) within their Wards.

Councillor Wren also referred to the Panorama programme [BBC1 - June 2022] which challenged TerraCycle's green credentials. She concluded that a lot more work needed to be done before the Council could consider enabling businesses to host TerraCycle stations.

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL**COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE**

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 10 November 2022 at 7:30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Wren (Chair), Swann (Vice-Chair), Bilton, G.Black, Caulcott, S.Farr, Lee, North, O'Driscoll, Pinard and Moore (Substitute) (In place of Allen)

PRESENT (Virtually): Councillors Shiner

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillors Allen

155. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 18TH OCTOBER 2022

The minutes were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

156. FOOD HYGIENE RATING SCORES – PROPOSALS FOR INTRODUCTION OF A FEE FOR RE-INSPECTION

The Committee received a report recommending the introduction of a charge for requested Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS) re-inspections. The Council did not charge for requests for re-inspections, however the Food Standards Agency (FSA) had confirmed that, under the Localism Act 2011, local authorities in England were able to introduce fees on a cost recovery basis for re-inspections. The report sought approval of the introduction of a flat rate £246 fee for re-inspections. The fee had been calculated as the cost of time typically spent by officers in carrying out food safety inspections, including travel, and related follow up activities. The fee was considered representative of the actual costs of conducting an inspection. The revenue income generated would support the service in achieving its budgetary requirements.

During the debate, Members raised several questions. In providing answers, Officers confirmed that:

- It was anticipated there would be approximately 6 requests per year. Requests were more likely to come from larger organisations.
- Environmental Health and Licensing worked hard to ensure that organisations were not showing expired stickers, and if there was mis-representation from food business operators, this was reported to Trading Standards at Surrey County Council.
- There was an appeals process but it was very rare for an operator to appeal. It was not thought that the introduction of a charge for re-inspections would increase the number of appeals.

It was confirmed that the first inspection and automatic re-inspections necessary due to a poor score, within 6 months of the first inspection, were free to operators. It was noted that Environmental Health were up to date on inspections post-Covid.

RESOLVED to agree the introduction of a charge for requested food hygiene rating re-inspections under the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme on a cost recovery basis.

157. QUARTER 2 2022/23 BUDGET MONITORING - COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE

A budget monitoring report for the second Quarter of the financial year was presented. This concerned the expenditure against the Committee's 2022/23 revenue (£4,051k) and capital (£672k) budgets.

The projected full-year overspend was £324k. This was a £124k increase from the Quarter 1 position, but a £9k improvement from the Month 5 position. However, the overall position for the Council had improved since Quarter 1.

The key headlines were:

- A forecast revenue overspend of £238k in Waste Management, related to the projected impact of inflation. This forecast had increased by £38k from Quarter 1.
- A shortfall in expected income in relation to car parking income against budget (£44k), cesspool emptying income (£49k) and parks and open spaces income (£15k).

Appendix A to the report contained information about the revenue budget, the savings plans, the capital position and the revenue risks. It was noted that there were no changes to the savings tracker in Quarter 2 and it was expected that the majority of the £20k saving in relation to a reduction in the number of mechanical sweepers would be delivered. In terms of the capital budget, there was no variance forecast, and spend at Quarter 2 was £0.5m (25%). The revenue risks remained the same as Quarter 1, with a slight increase in the trees programming budget due to re-programming.

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

- The capital underspend on children's playground equipment was due to a review as part of the Future Tandridge Programme. Work was underway to ensure the equipment provided would fit with the needs of the community. It was confirmed that Parish Councils would be consulted as part of this process.
- Work was about to begin on the Grange Meadow access, and the end of year variance was expected to be nil.
- There was one mechanical sweeper off the road for repairs. The other sweeper continued to be operational.
- The overspend on Waste Management was as a result of inflation, and not other matters disguised by the inflationary impact. It was agreed that Officers would provide Members of the Committee more specific figures.

RESOLVED – that the Committee's forecast Revenue and Capital budget positions as at Quarter 2/Month 6 (September) 2022 be noted.

158. TO CONSIDER PASSING THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED – to consider agenda item 9 following the exclusion of the press and public in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) on the grounds that:

- i) the item involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act; and
- ii) the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

159. CONTRACT DISCUSSION

The Committee considered the exempt report. Councillor Wren, seconded by Councillor Swann, proposed an amendment to recommendation A. Upon being put to the vote, this motion was carried.

RESOLVED – that amended recommendation A and recommendations B and C in the report be approved.

Rising 8.46 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

HOUSING COMMITTEE

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 17 November 2022 at 7:30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Pursehouse (Chair), Lockwood (Vice-Chair), Evans, Gaffney, Hammond, Montgomery, Robinson, Shiner, Stamp, Swann and O'Driscoll (Substitute) (In place of Groves)

PRESENT (Virtually): Councillor Groves

ALSO PRESENT (Virtually): Councillors Moore, C.Farr and S.Farr

Prior to the business of the meeting, the Head of Housing made a statement on the issue of damp and mould. The Head of Housing explained that where damp and mould are reported in a Council owned property, a building surveyor will inspect and raise any necessary works to remedy the problem. Where damp and mould issues are reported within the private rented sector, the Council, through the joint Environmental Health partnership, will investigate and take the necessary steps with the landlord to resolve the issues. Advice on damp and mould was available on the Council's website and Members were asked to notify the Head of Housing if any issues were reported to them. A report would be presented to a future meeting of the Committee outlining how the environmental health team regulate housing standards.

160. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 4 OCTOBER 2022

The minutes were approved and signed as a correct record.

161. TO DEAL WITH ANY QUESTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER STANDING ORDER 30

Two questions were submitted under Standing Order 30. The questions and the responses were provided at Appendix A to these minutes.

162. HOMELESSNESS PREVENTION AND ROUGH SLEEPING STRATEGY 2019-2023 ACTION PLAN UPDATE - NOVEMBER 2022

The Committee received an update on the progress made during the past year in delivering the Homeless Prevention and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2019-2023. The Strategy lay out the Council's plan to address homelessness. It had been designed to complement the Council's Housing Strategy and developed in line with national policy and legislation and tailored to take account of local needs. The Action Plan set out the Council's actions it would undertake to deliver the Strategy.

The Council had continued to progress the actions set out in the Action Plan with most actions on or ahead of target.

In response to questions from Members, Officers confirmed:

- there was one rough sleeper in the District. Outreach workers were in regular contact with him and continued to offer appropriate assistance.
- they were confident that the actions marked as amber would be delivered during the life of the Strategy. Delays had been mainly due to the Covid-19 pandemic.
- the Council continued to fund a domestic abuse sanctuary and worked with partners in the East Surrey Domestic Abuse Service. Surrey County Council had recently announced it would be funding sanctuary schemes across the County, including East Surrey. Tandridge District Council provided funding for a scheme coordinator and Independent Domestic Abuse Advocates to work alongside survivors of domestic abuse.
- they would liaise with the Community Partnerships team and police colleagues to consider the development of a scheme enabling shops to be accredited as a safe space for people fleeing domestic abuse or whose safety is otherwise under threat

RESOLVED – that the contents of the report and progress made to date be noted.

163. QUARTER 2 2022/23 BUDGET MONITORING - HOUSING COMMITTEE

The Committee received a report outlining the financial position of the Revenue and Capital budgets for the Committee, including Housing Revenue Account, as of Quarter 2 2022/23.

The report set out a projected underspend of £44k for the Housing General Fund. This was an £44k improvement from the Quarter 1 position. In terms of the Housing Revenue Account, there was a projected underspend of £67k. The main reasons for this were a £22k salaries underspend due to a vacancy, and a one off £30k saving on vehicle repairs, as the vehicles were still under warranty, and fuel, due to improved fuel efficiency of the vehicles.

There was also a total net underspend in the Capital Budget of £381k. In the Housing General Fund Capital Budget, there was a £60k underspend due to Disability Facilities Grant costs being less than forecast. In the Housing Revenue Account Capital Budget, additional funding had been provided for potential development sites and inflationary pressures, and there had also been delays in development and slippages. These factors resulted in a total forecast net underspend of £321k.

Members noted that an underspend on the Capital budget as a result of delays and slippages meant that the Council was unable to deliver housing as quickly as it would like.

In relation to Meadowside Mobile Homes, Officers confirmed that the reported £10k reduced income on commission of sales of mobile homes had been identified as a one off increase to the target income for the 2022/23 financial year, based on assumptions made in January 2022. However, sales had not been as expected, and this assumption would not be made in the emerging 2023/24 budget. Members thanked Officers for the engagement work undertaken with residents of Meadowside.

RESOLVED – that the Committee’s forecast Revenue and Capital budgets positions as at Quarter 2 / Month 6 (September) 2022 be noted (including the Housing Revenue Account).

164. TO CONSIDER PASSING THE FOLLOWING RESOLUTION TO EXCLUDE THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED – that the press and public be excluded from agenda item 9 in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) on the grounds that:

- i) the item involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act; and
- ii) the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

165. CONTRACT UPDATE: CATERHAM ON THE HILL DEVELOPMENTS

RESOLVED – that the recommendations in the report be approved.

Rising 8.28 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

Housing Committee – 17 November 2022

Questions submitted under Standing Order 30

1. Question from Councillor O’Driscoll

Residents in housing association blocks across Tandridge have expressed concerns about anti-social behaviour taking place in recent months. What steps can this Council take to compel the housing associations to take action to address these issues?

Response from the Head of Housing:

As part of the ongoing work being undertaken around anti-social behaviour, a Council wide enforcement policy is due to be written. This work will be led by senior officers from housing, community partnerships, legal and environmental health. This policy will set out how anti-social behaviour will be tackled within the district, regardless of whether it is within Council owned housing stock or not. Consideration is also being given to delegate powers to housing associations within the district, allowing them to use the legal tools to tackle such behaviour in accordance with the anti-social behaviour, crime and policing Act 2014.

If residents within housing association owned properties are unsatisfied with the way in which their landlord is dealing with the anti-social behaviour, a Community Trigger can be instigated via the Councils website. Once a Community Trigger request is deemed to meet the threshold, the Council can call upon both the housing association and other partner agencies to resolve the matter. This is likely to result in the issue being discussed at the Community Harm and Risk Management Meetings held monthly which is attended by partner agencies and housing providers. It is through these forums that housing associations can be held to account.

2. Question from Councillor O’Driscoll

Vulnerable residents requiring new homes in Tandridge are facing lengthy waits in accommodation that is simply not for purpose. I've been contacted by younger families rehoused away from their support networks who are feeling trapped and isolated and by families with several autistic children who are living in one-bedroom flats in Whyteleafe and Caterham. Residents in both of these situations have told me they feel like hope is being sucked away from them as a result of there simply not being enough homes to suit their needs.

While I appreciate the positive steps being taken by this Council to reduce the waiting time for a new home, can this Council take steps to further reduce this?

Response from the Head of Housing:

The Council’s housing allocations scheme sets out how affordable accommodation is allocated within the district. The scheme assigns medical priority to households on the housing register where sufficient supporting medical evidence is provided. This is to help prevent lengthy waiting times for suitable accommodation. However to prevent lengthy waiting times there needs to be a sufficient supply of accommodation.

Appendix A

Members will therefore be aware that the Council has an ambitious house building programme that aims to deliver new council homes on both council owned land and land purchased on the open market. The programme is focussed on delivering family sized accommodation to reflect the greatest needs on the housing register. There has been a slow down over the last year, partly due to a lack of resources but largely due to the difficulties contractors have had with sourcing materials and labour to maintain their programmes. The situation has been further compounded by the financial collapse of W Stirling which will see the remaining 17 units at Uplands delivered a year later than originally forecast. There is no disguising the fact that the construction industry is experiencing unprecedented difficulties owing to the combined factors of Brexit, Covid and the invasion of Ukraine. To try and combat the slow-down in delivery and to assist with meeting the growing demand on the register, Officers will be proposing an extension of the buy-back programme in the next financial year to allow the open market purchase of a further 10 family sized properties in 2023/24. The emphasis will be on purchasing properties that assist in future scheme delivery such as those with restrictive leases or those that would enable access to developable land beyond.

Sales of new market properties have recently started to fall with the contraction in available mortgages and the cost of living crisis and there are signs of a slow-down in volume house building. This may see the more recent increases in material prices start to level off which will bring some stability back to the sector. The onset of a recession has historically seen housebuilders turn to local authorities and housing associations to buy their surplus stock in return for a quick capital receipt. Officers of the Council and our housing association partners will be monitoring the market closely so that we can capitalise on any opportunities that arise because of a downturn. Naturally, a recession will have other negative impacts on SMEs so there will still be risks associated with the building programme.

The Council also has a housing enabling function and Officers continue to be involved in pre application discussions where there is an obligation to provide affordable housing so that the proposed mix best meets the identified needs of the district. Financial viability agreements are robustly defended and affordable units are secured by way of a S106 obligation with early delivery of the units where possible.

In addition to the work being undertaken by the development team, initiatives such as the incentive scheme and assisted purchase scheme are in operation to incentivise residents to downsize or move from family sized accommodation where it is no longer required, in turn freeing up high demand accommodation. Work with private sector landlords continues through our private sector liaison officer which will be supported by the development of an empty homes strategy in 2023/24.

Supplementary Question from Councillor O'Driscoll:

Most of the shortage of housing in my experience has been found in north of District in Woldingham, Caterham and Whyteleafe. You mentioned the market purchase of family sized properties. Would these properties be located where the demand is greatest?

Appendix A

Response from the Housing Development Specialist:

The previous buyback programme will see us shortly complete on the tenth and final purchase. Almost all, if not all, are in Caterham and Whyteleafe and that's largely due to the fact that there are family sized properties in flatted schemes and where we already own the freehold it is much easier for us to buyback those properties from the leaseholder at a competitive price. I foresee the next 10 properties being in the north of the District, maybe some further south but values are higher further south for family sized accommodation which makes it difficult for us to put in a competitive offer.

This page is intentionally left blank

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL**PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE**

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 24th November 2022 at 7:30pm.

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

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

ALSO PRESENT (Virtually): Councillor Pursehouse

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor Botten

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

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

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

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

167. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

168. QUESTIONS SUBMITTED UNDER STANDING ORDER 30

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

169. CIL WORKING GROUP - 14TH NOVEMBER 2022

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Discussions took place regarding:

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

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

171. LOCAL PLAN UPDATE

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED – that the report be noted.

172. SITE ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT (SADPD)

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED – that the report be noted.

173. PRO-FORMA FOR PLANNING PERFORMANCE AGREEMENTS

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED – that:

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

175. TATSFIELD NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION

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

RESOLVED – that:

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

176. LINGFIELD CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL

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

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

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

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

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

Rising 9.33 pm

Planning Policy Committee – 24th November 2022

Standing Order 30 Questions from Councillor Lockwood

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

Response from the Interim Chief Planning Officer

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

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

These show for Tandridge that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Response from Councillor Sayer

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

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

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

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL**CIL WORKING GROUP**

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

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

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor Flower.

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

These were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECOMMENDED – that:

- A. prospective bids from GP practice managers referred to in (ix) above be brought forward in 2022/23, i.e.:
 - internal re-modelling of the Oxted Health Centre (up to £100,000)
 - solar and power bank for the Smallfield surgery (£25,000)
 - extension of the Caterham Valley surgery (£250,000)
- B. regarding potential CIL bids for enhanced primary health care infrastructure beyond 2022/23 (i.e. in addition to the three schemes referred to in A above) priority be given to improving the accessibility of the Lingfield surgery.

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

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

- (i) the award being utilised to cover the highways improvement scheme in the first instance, with any balance being allocated against the extended school building costs;*
- (ii) the Working Group being satisfied with the proposed highway / road safety mitigation measures, including an implementation timeline, the details of which will be requested for consideration at a meeting (of the Working Group) to be arranged for November 2022".*

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

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

5. GRANT MONITORING AND CIL PROGRAMME FOR 2023

A report was presented which advised Members about:

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

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

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

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

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

Ref IA-00263 – Lingfield skate-ramp

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

Ref IA-00264 – Lingfield Sports Association grounds and clubhouse

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

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

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

Ref IA-00268 – Caterham Valley medical practice

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

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

RECOMMENDED – that

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

6. UK PROSPERITY FUNDS - UPDATE

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

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

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

The meeting closed at 8.23 pm.

This page is intentionally left blank

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL**STRATEGY & RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 1st December 2022 at 7.30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Langton (Chair), Crane (Vice-Chair), B.Black, Bloore, Botten, Caulcott, Cooper, Gillman, Hammond, Pursehouse and Sayer (substitute in place of S.Farr)

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors Allen, Swann and N.White

ALSO PRESENT (Virtually): Councillors C.Farr and Moore

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillors S.Farr and Jones

177. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 29TH SEPTEMBER 2022

These minutes were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

178. COUNTY DEAL WORKING GROUP - 1ST NOVEMBER 2022

Councillor Sayer updated the Committee regarding item 2 of the minutes of this meeting. She confirmed that a joint proposal from the eleven Surrey Districts / Boroughs, for inclusion within a County Deal submission to Government, had been sent to the Leader of Surrey County Council (Councillor Tim Oliver) on the 17th November. This included all the points identified by Tandridge Members (minutes of the Working Group's meeting on 9th August refer) plus suggestions from elsewhere. A further meeting of the District / Borough Leaders and Councillor Oliver was expected to take place shortly. Councillor Oliver had also requested views on what powers should be devolved from central government to SCC under a County Deal.

Furthermore, District / Borough Leaders were considering a draft response to SCC's 'Surrey strategy for accommodation, housing and homes' to be sent in advance of its 'Housing Summit' on the 7th December.

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the County Deal Working Group meeting held on the 1st November 2022, attached at Appendix A, be received.

179. CHIEF OFFICER SUB COMMITTEE - 1ST NOVEMBER 2022

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the Chief Officer Sub-Committee held on the 1st November 2022, attached at Appendix B, be received.

180. INVESTMENT SUB COMMITTEE - 4TH NOVEMBER 2022

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the Investment Sub-Committee held on the 1st November 2022, attached at Appendix C, be received.

181. QUARTER 2 (2022/23) BUDGET MONITORING

An analysis of forecast expenditure against the Council's overall revenue budget of £11,351k, as at the end of September 2022 (Month 6) was presented. A £447k overspend was forecast, split between the four policy committees as follows:

- Community Services: £324k overspend
- Housing (General Fund): £44k underspend
- Planning Policy: £86k overspend
- Strategy & Resources: £111k overspend
- corporate items: £31k underspend

This represented a £126k improvement from Quarter 1. The Chief Finance Officer confirmed that the £484k contingency provision made a balanced budget achievable, without the need to draw upon underlying reserves. However, he emphasised the importance of taking mitigating actions to preserve those contingencies for 2023/24 and beyond, given the likely emergence of additional budgetary pressures.

The Chief Finance Officer also confirmed that:

- the savings plan was on track, with 88% of the £1.1m savings target having already been achieved or set to be delivered
- regarding debt management:
 - sundry debt had increased since Q1, largely reflecting the cost of living crisis
 - efforts to recruit an accounts receivable officer in line the Debt Improvement Plan had not been successful to date, although an alternative staffing strategy was now being pursued, together with a more holistic approach to debt recovery by in-house teams, and a potential County Council initiative to assist Districts and Boroughs with the collection of Council Tax and Business Rates
- net slippage of £1,272k within the capital programme was forecast, predominantly relating to Community Infrastructure Levy and council house building expenditure.

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

182. DRAFT BUDGET 2023/24 AND FUTURE TANDRIDGE PROGRAMME UPDATE

The Committee was presented with a draft budget for 2023/24 and a medium-term financial strategy to 2024/25. The draft budget had been prepared based on a 'neutral scenario', which assumed the same level of funding as 2022/23, with reductions in government support offset by increases in Council Tax and, potentially, business rates income. The position would be clarified by the provisional local government finance settlement expected later in the month. At this stage, a budget gap of £0.25m remained. Although the savings plan was broadly unchanged since the previous meeting, budget pressures had increased from £1.7m to £1.9m, primarily due to inflation and concerns regarding the delivery of budgeted fee income. Therefore, unless external funding increased, further savings would be required to balance the budget, the final version of which would be submitted to Full Council on 9th February 2023 following further consideration by policy committees in January.

The draft budget report included commentary on funding assumptions, with reference to anticipated future Government reforms; the gross Council Tax base for 2023/24; and collection fund performance. A Council Tax increase of £5 (2.2%) for households in Band D properties had been assumed, notwithstanding the Government's recent decision to raise the District Council ceiling for such increases to 3%. The report also confirmed the need to augment reserves (in the context of the CIPFA resilience index) and the intention to resubmit a capitalisation request to the Government for this purpose.

The following updates were provided on the Future Tandridge Programme which underpinned the draft budget:

- the progress of service reviews and a proposed savings plan for 2022/23 and 2023/24;
- business cases for the future delivery of 'communications' and 'assets & facilities management' services
- the 'operations, locality and waste services' and 'digital / customer services' workstreams.

In response to the debate, the Chief Finance Officer confirmed that efforts had focused on developing tailored, achievable saving targets for each service area, as examined at the various Member workshops during the previous month. However, it was accepted that the service reviews and associated business cases were at varying stages of progress. This prompted discussion about the wording of Recommendation C to the report. Some Members said they were unhappy to "approve" the business cases, but would accept "to note". The Chair and Leader made it very clear that, although the business cases had reached different levels of maturity, simply noting them would not provide the required foundation on which TDC could base the 2023/24 budget. They added that, having had the opportunity via the workshops for Members to comment and contribute to these business cases, it was now unacceptable to consider them as not fit for purpose. The discussion concluded with the Chair proposing wording for an amendment which Councillors Botten and Caulcott developed, the result then being seconded by Councillor Pursehouse:

"Approve the following ~~business cases and updates~~ to form the basis of the budgets to be finalised during the January 2023 committee cycle ..."

Upon being put to the vote, this amendment was agreed. Other issues raised by Members during the debate included:

- the need to assess the impact of emerging savings plans upon staff and residents

- a desire to explore the potential for partnership initiatives with Parish Councils to mitigate the impact of savings which the District Council would have to make
- arguments for and against the case for generating additional income from parking charges.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. the draft budget for 2023/24 and medium-term financial strategy to 2024/25, set out in Appendix A to the report (to form the basis of reports to Committees in January 2023) be approved;
- B. the gross Council Tax Base for 2023/24, determined at 39,377.5 after taking account of the Council’s agreed Council Tax Support Scheme, and the net Council Tax Base for 2023/24, be determined at 38,904.9 after adjustment by 1.2% to allow for irrecoverable amounts, appeals and property base changes, be approved;
- C. the following be approved to form the basis of the budgets to be finalised during the January 2023 committee cycle:
 1. the ‘communications’ business case which sets out the proposed new structure of the communications service and provides an update on future operating models being pursued by the service in consultation with Members (set out in Appendix D to the report)
 2. the ‘assets & facilities management’ business case which recommends an integrated property service delivery model, corporate landlord approach and provides an update on the recent strategic asset review and details how this will be taken forward (set out in Appendix E to the report)
 3. the direction of travel for the operations and localities service review, as provided to the Community Services Committee on 18th October 2022 and updated in Appendix F to the report)
 4. the updated direction of travel for digital transformation (set out in Appendix G to the report)
 5. the overall savings plan (set out in section 7 and Appendix B to the report) noting that further consideration may be required pending the local government finance settlement;
- D. the progress to date on delivering the Future Tandridge Programme, the direction of travel for the service reviews and associated savings targets included in section 7 and Appendix C to the report, be noted;
- E. it be noted that Officers will continue to update their business cases where these are required to achieve the target savings and will bring these for Committee approval where necessary over the coming months;
- F. the intention to re-submit the request for a capitalisation direction (from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities) to use the part of the receipt from the Redstone House property to replenish general fund reserves, be noted.

183. REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL ON MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES 2023/24

The Committee considered a report of the Independent Remuneration Panel which had been convened to review the Members' Allowances Scheme in accordance with the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003. The report acknowledged that, in normal circumstances, the Panel would be advocating an increase in allowances. However, given the financial context and following feedback from Group Leaders, the Panel had recommended that rates be maintained at current levels, index linked to the annual staff pay award process. The Chair, seconded by Councillor Crane, proposed that this recommendation be adopted.

The Regulations required Members' Allowances to be reviewed every four years. Nevertheless, in view of the Future Tandridge Programme and the electoral review being conducted by the Boundary Commission, the Panel had recommended that a further review be conducted in the second half of 2024.

COUNCIL DECISION (subject to ratification by Council)

RECOMMENDED – that, in accordance with the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel:

- A. with effect from the beginning of the 2023/24 Municipal Year:
 - 1. the Basic Allowance be retained at the current level (£4,317) and remain index linked to staff pay awards
 - 2. Special Responsibility Allowances be retained at the current level and remain index linked to staff pay awards
 - 3. travel and subsistence expenses and Dependents' Carers' Allowance be retained at the current level
- B. a full review of Members' Allowances be undertaken in Autumn 2024.

184. REVIEW OF THE REDUNDANCY POLICY

A report was submitted with an option to reduce the impact of redundancy payments on the Council's finances.

Under the statutory minimum redundancy scheme, payments were calculated according to an employee's age, length of continuous service and weekly pay with reference to a ready reckoner. At present, such calculations were capped in respect the years of service (i.e. 20) and weekly pay (i.e. £571). The Council's current policy was to enhance redundancy payments by removing the weekly pay cap and multiplying weekly pay by a factor of 1.5. It was standard practice for Councils to enhance the statutory scheme in this way although, as evidenced by benchmarking against other Surrey Boroughs and Districts, weekly pay multipliers varied. The report presented an option for the 1.5 multiplier to be removed, which would reflect the schemes in place at Epsom & Ewell and Reigate & Banstead.

Since the publication of the report, the Administration had prepared an alternative option having considered representations from staff, including concerns expressed at the staff briefing (attended by Councillor Sayer) on the 24th November. Representations from UNISON had also been sent to Members on the day of the meeting. Councillor Langton, seconded by Councillor Botten, proposed the alternative option (resolution at A below). During the debate, reference was made to the Council's obligations under equalities legislation concerning age. Nonetheless, it was acknowledged that the alternative proposal reflected Surrey County Council's redundancy policy which had been in place for over a year. Upon being put to the vote, the alternative option was agreed.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. with immediate effect, regarding the calculation of redundancy pay:
- (i) the Council offers a multiplier of 1.5 to existing employees in the event that the individual, at the date of leaving, is not entitled to immediate payment of pension benefits
 - (ii) the Council offers a multiplier of 1.0 to existing employees in the event that the individual, at the date of leaving, is entitled to immediate payment of pension benefits
 - (iii) in any event, the Council will offer a multiplier of 1.0 to all new employees
- B. the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, make any necessary amendments (relating to resolution A above) to paragraph 8 of the Council's Pay Policy Statement (which references a multiplier of 1.5) and any change to the current redundancy policy.

Note: In accordance with Standing Order 25 (3), Councillors Bloore, Cooper and Hammond wished it recorded that they abstained from voting on A and B above.

185. ENERGY REBATE PAYMENT - CONFIRMATION OF DECISION TAKEN UNDER URGENCY POWERS (STANDING ORDER 35)

On 3rd January 2022, the Government announced the £150 energy rebate payment for most households in Council Tax Bands A to D, plus those in Band E in receipt of a Disabled Band Reduction. A discretionary energy rebate scheme (not applicable for recipients of the other scheme) of up to £150 was announced at the same time.

A report was presented regarding the way in which the discretionary scheme had been implemented by the Council. This advised that £284,850 had been received for local distribution. The report outlined the principals of the scheme, including eligibility criteria, which had been implemented under the urgency provisions of Standing Order 35. The Chief Finance Officer confirmed that the £284,850 had been fully allocated following a second tranche of payments to original recipients to utilise the remaining balance before the prescribed deadline.

RESOLVED – that the decision taken under urgency powers in accordance with Standing Order 35 of the Constitution to approve the energy rebate payment discretionary scheme be ratified.

186. FREEDOM LEISURE UPDATE

The Committee resolved to consider this matter following the exclusion of the press and public in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) on the grounds that:

- (i) the item involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act; and
- (ii) the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

Freedom Leisure had requested financial support to offset increases in the cost of utilities needed to run their facilities. A report, which had been prepared in light of this request, was discussed.

RESOLVED – that the report be noted.

187. QUADRANT HOUSE, CATERHAM AND OTHER ACTIONS ARISING FROM 4TH NOVEMBER 2022 INVESTMENT SUB-COMMITTEE

The Committee resolved to consider this matter following the exclusion of the press and public in accordance with Section 100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) on the grounds that:

- (i) the item involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act; and
- (ii) the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

A report was presented regarding the Council's development of Quadrant House (Croydon Road, Caterham). This included:

- information about funding arrangements, including the contribution from the Coast to Capital Local Enterprise Partnership
- details of the Phase 1 and 2 refurbishments which had been completed by September 2022
- estimates of the associated overspends against the £5.64m budget and explanations about why they had occurred.

Members were also informed of confidential actions agreed by the Investment Sub-Committee on 4th November 2022 in respect of Quadrant House and other properties. A further discussion on some of those matters ensued.

Members acknowledged the positive impact of the Quadrant House project and the efforts undertaken to secure its delivery. However, the size of overspend, its relatively late discovery and the implementation delays had all highlighted the need to publish the lessons learnt from this project so that progress from the resulting actions can be reviewed and future re-occurrences prevented.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. the report be noted; and
- B. it be noted that decisions in relation to Gryllus Properties are made by the Gryllus board of directors, but that comments and questions from Councillors (made either directly or via the Investment Sub-Committee) are welcomed.

Rising 9.48 pm

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

COUNTY DEAL WORKING GROUP

Minutes of the meeting of the Working Group held in the Lyndsay Narcisi Room, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted, on the 1st November 2022 at 11.30 a.m.

PRESENT: Councillors Sayer (Chair), Bloore, Botten, Cooper, C.Farr, Gray, Langton and Pursehouse.

1. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GROUP HELD ON THE 9TH AUGUST 2022

These were approved as a correct record.

2. COUNTY DEAL SUBMISSION / UPDATE FROM COUNCILLOR SAYER FOLLOWING LIAISON WITH OTHER DISTRICTS AND BOROUGHES

At its previous meeting on 9th August, the Group had discussed what they thought TDC should be seeking from a 'Level 2* County Deal for Surrey', both in terms of additional powers and the retention of control and influence over other things. The process for co-ordinating input from the eleven Districts and Boroughs (D&Bs) had since been delayed due to the cancellation of meetings in light of the Queen's passing. SCC had therefore extended the deadline for considering input from D&Bs before finalising its submission to Government.

Councillor Sayer updated the Group following a 'District and Borough workshop' held on the 21st October at Epsom. She highlighted the significant concerns expressed by representatives of all D&Bs in attendance about recent examples of SCC seeking greater centralisation, as opposed to enabling D&B's to deliver additional services at more local levels, e.g.

- the emerging '*Surrey strategy for accommodation, housing and homes*' with the potential to diminish D&Bs' housing and planning powers; and
- termination of agency agreements for on-street parking enforcement and grass verge cutting (while the latter did not affect Tandridge, the current on-street parking agency agreement with Sevenoaks District Council would end in March 2023, whereupon direct service provision would revert to SCC).

Other D&Bs supported TDC's proposals for inclusion within a County Deal submission to Government (the minutes of the Group's 9th August meeting refer). A joint response from the D&Bs to SCC, incorporating these proposals, was being prepared.

D&B representatives favoured amalgams of three cluster authorities throughout Surrey as the basis for future joint services, or unitary authorities in the event of the current two-tier local government structure being challenged. This would mirror the ‘three cluster’ model identified by KPMG in 2020 (as an alternative to the single Surrey unitary initiative being promoted by SCC at the time) which included a potential East Surrey unitary covering Tandridge, Reigate & Banstead, Mole Valley and Epsom & Ewell.

Other outcomes from the workshop included a recommendation for a ‘*way we work charter*’ to be agreed with SCC for underpinning future joint working arrangements. This would emphasise the need for SCC to consult D&Bs regarding proposed service changes that affect residents and other key issues.

The workshop on 21st October had been facilitated by Rob Moran, the transformation consultant to Epsom & Ewell and former Elmbridge Chief Executive. The possibility of D&Bs contributing to the cost of his on-going services to support them with the County Deal and other related matters was being considered. Councillor Sayer was seeking clarification about the terms of his likely engagement before committing funding from TDC.

A further meeting of D&B representatives was scheduled for 11th November in advance of the SCC consultation events regarding the above mentioned ‘*Surrey strategy for accommodation, housing and homes*’. The event for the East Surrey area would be hosted by Tandridge on 16th November.

It was acknowledged that some functions undertaken by D&Bs might be discharged more effectively at a cluster level, or on a regional basis in some cases. Furthermore, the Group reflected that D&Bs should seek to work constructively with SCC (recognising the pressures it was under from Central Government) in pursuit of the most effective means of serving local residents.

In summary, it was agreed that the possibility of developing a service delivery model for the East Surrey cluster should be explored with the other relevant authorities, including the possibility of utilising the consultancy support from Rob Moran. In any event, such an approach would be in keeping with the aims of the Future Tandridge Programme, aside from any issues arising from the County Deal discussions.

The meeting closed at 12:38 p.m.

** in line with the ‘Level 2’ powers defined within the Levelling Up White Paper Devolution Framework, which would rely on effective partnership working between existing local authorities, with no change to the structure of local government throughout Surrey*

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL

CHIEF OFFICER SUB COMMITTEE

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held in the Lyndsay Narcisi Room, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted, on the 1st November 2022 at 1:30pm.

PRESENT: Councillors Bloore, Botten, Langton and Sayer

1. ELECTION OF CHAIR FOR THE MEETING

Councillor Langton was elected Chair for the meeting.

2. RECRUITMENT OF A DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Sub-Committee resolved to deal with this matter in 'Part 2' by virtue of Paragraph 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to an individual).

Four shortlisted candidates were interviewed for the post of Deputy Chief Executive.

RESOLVED – that the post of Deputy Chief Executive be offered to Taryn Pearson-Rose.

This page is intentionally left blank

**TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL
INVESTMENT SUB-COMMITTEE**

Minutes and report to Council of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted on the 4th November 2022 at 10.00am.

PRESENT: Councillors Langton (Chair), Booth, Botten, Cooper, C.Farr, Hammond and Jones

ALSO PRESENT: Councillor Sayer

1. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 17TH JUNE 2022

These minutes were approved and signed as a correct record.

2. SUMMARY INVESTMENT AND BORROWING POSITION AT 30TH SEPTEMBER 2022

The Sub-Committee was presented with a summary of the Council's investment and borrowing position as per Annexes A and B, together with updates on the following three matters:

Statutory override update

This referred to the 'override' of usual accounting practice, which meant that gains and losses in the capital value of investments did not impact on the revenue budget. The Government had still not decided whether to extend, amend or remove the override beyond 31st March 2023.

Officers had responded to a Government consultation in August, advocating that the override should be made permanent as it represented the lowest risk to the revenue budget and enabled options to change the mix of investment portfolios if deemed appropriate. The previous analysis of TDC's investment options in light of whether or not the override continued (submitted to the 17th June meeting) was re-presented.

Cash flow strategy and Funding Circle loans

Members were advised that the use of redeemed proceeds from Funding Circle had been under continual refinement since the adoption of a more robust, software-based approach to cash flow forecasting. In this respect, the Council had updated its cash flow projections to 30th September 2023 and a detailed 12-month cash flow analysis had been circulated to members of the Sub-Committee separately. In accordance with advice from Arlingclose (the Council's treasury advisors) cash balances, including redeemed Funding Circle proceeds, were being used to both:

- avoid or delay the need to borrow to fund the capital programme; and
- invest in money market funds.

This would remain the case whilst PWLB loan rates were in the region of 5%, as it represented a positive yield on the cash balances whilst avoiding undue risk.

Prudential Indicators

Performance data against the Council's prudential indicators (PIs) was presented.

The Chief Finance Officer confirmed that the internal auditors had recently upgraded their assurance opinion on the Council's arrangements for treasury management from 'limited' to 'reasonable'. Outstanding actions were to comply with key recommendations, namely training for Members; the provision of performance information to the Sub-Committee regarding PIs; and more regular reconciliation of investment balances to the finance system.

In response to Members' questions, the Chief Finance Officer advised that:

- Officers were endeavouring to obtain current information from Funding Circle about redemption proceeds arising from the repayment of its peer-to-peer loans.
- Information would be provided to members of the Sub-Committee to inform them about how Council's £3M investment holding with UBS was being applied.
- Arlingclose had recommended that TDC should consider whether surplus returns from money market funds (generated via rising interest rates) should be allocated to a financial reserve to mitigate against other potential budgetary deficits. The Sub-Committee supported this approach which would ultimately be discussed by the Strategy & Resources Committee, pending confirmation of the surplus position at outturn.
- Arlingclose had confirmed that the method of calculating revenue yields from money market funds (i.e. forecast return ÷ Net Asset Value) reflected the industry standard.

RESOLVED – that:

- A. the Council's investment and borrowing position at 30th September 2022, as set out in Annexes A and B, be noted;
- B. the update on the future of the statutory override be noted;
- C. the update on the Council's cash flow position and review of the use of redeemed proceeds from Funding Circle loans be noted; and
- D. the update on the Council's performance against its prudential indicators, as set in the Capital, Investment and Treasury Management Strategy for 2022/23, be noted.

ACTIONS:

	Action	Responsible Person	Deadline
1.	Current information to be circulated to the Sub-Committee about loan redemption proceeds from Funding Circle	Mark Hak-Sanders	TBA
2.	Details of the Council's £3M investment holding with UBS to be circulated to the Sub-Committee	Mark Hak-Sanders	TBA

3. INVESTMENT PROPERTY UPDATE

The Sub-Committee resolved to move into 'Part 2' for this item in accordance with Paragraph 3 (information relating to financial or business affairs) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

A report was presented to update the Sub-Committee about the commercial investment properties owned by the Council and its subsidiary company, Gryllus properties. The properties concerned and the issues discussed were:

TDC properties:

Linden House, Caterham on the Hill

The renewal of the lease completed on 26th August 2022.

Quadrant House, Caterham Valley

The refurbishment scheme had reached practical completion at the end of September 2022 with an official re-opening event held on 6th October. Efforts were ongoing to secure tenants for unlet suites. Members were advised that, due to contract variations and inflationary pressures, the cost of works could exceed budget by a significant margin. The exact adverse variance wasn't yet clear as the final account was still being negotiated, although greater clarification would be provided for the Strategy & Resources Committee meeting on 1st December.

While Members welcomed the many positive aspects of the project and acknowledged the complex challenges associated with bringing it to fruition, the potential level of overspend was an issue of great concern. The Chair requested that a detailed report be submitted to the next meeting and cascaded throughout the Council to raise awareness of the lessons learned for future project management purposes. These included the need for:

- financial risks to be shared by third parties commissioned to provide professional advice to the Council, upon which the financial viability of projects relies; and
- a more realistic contingency fund in future to protect against unforeseen circumstances.

Village Health Club, Caterham on the Hill

The implications of the financial challenges facing Freedom Leisure (the Council's tenant) were discussed.

Gryllus properties:

30-32 Week Street, Maidstone

The lease to Marks & Spencer had expired on 28th September, although they had not traded from the property since March 2020. A temporary letting had been secured for up to one year. Details about a further offer to rent the property were discussed as part of a future options analysis.

Castlefield House, Reigate

80-84 Station Road East, Oxted

The report also confirmed that the sale of Redstone House, South Nutfield completed at a price of £1,400,000 on 16th August 2022.

RESOLVED - that

- A. the content of the report be noted; and
- B. the options analysis for 30-32 Week Street, Maidstone be noted and concerns be raised with the Gryllus board about the actions to be taken.

Rising 11.10 am

Summary of Investments and Borrowing

Investment	Investment Amount 31/03/22 £	Net Asset Value 30/09/22 £	Yield Rate Note 1 %	Forecast Return 2022/23 £
<u>Non - Specified (Financial Investments)- Long Term (over 12 mths)</u>				
CCLA Property Fund	4,000,000	4,848,829	3.33	161,569
Schroders Bond Fund	3,000,000	2,452,677	5.98	146,567
UBS Multi Asset Fund	3,000,000	2,178,270	8.50	185,183
CCLA Diversification Fund	2,000,000	1,871,049	3.82	71,500
Funding Circle (Note 2)	391,191	236,668	-	-
Sub Total Non-specified (Financial Investments)	12,391,191	11,587,493		564,819
<u>Non - Specified (Non-Financial Investments)- Long Term (over 12 mths)</u>				
Gryllus Property Company Loan - Maidstone	2,394,000	2,394,000	5.81	139,023
Freedom Leisure- Loan (TLP)	674,857	484,286	5.50	31,963
Freedom Leisure- Loan (de Stafford)	496,571	310,357	7.58	28,230
Gryllus Property Company Loan - 80-84 Station Rd East	1,012,500	1,012,500	5.43	54,979
Gryllus Property Company Loan - Castlefield	11,664,000	11,664,000	6.10	711,504
Gryllus Property Company Share Capital Note 2	5,251,500	5,251,500	-	-
Sub Total Non-specified (Non-Financial Investments)	21,493,428	21,116,643		965,699
Total Non-Specified Investments	33,884,619	32,704,136		1,530,518
<u>Specified Investments-Short Term (less than 12 mths)</u>				
Notice Accounts	4,000,000	1,990,648	1.01	20,010
Money Market Funds	3,250,000	14,600,000	0.05	142,148
Total Specified Investments	7,250,000	16,590,648		162,158
Total Non- Specified and Specified Investments	41,134,619	49,294,784		1,692,676
Total Investment Income Budget 2022/23				1,495,700
Over/(under) budget				196,976

Borrowing	Loan Amount	Interest	Actual Cost
	£	%	2021/22
			£
General Fund Borrowing			
Gryllus Loan	3,420,000	2.46	84,132
Freedom Leisure Loan	2,225,000	2.45	54,513
Village Health Club	938,678	2.38	22,341
Linden House	4,175,000	2.69	112,308
Linden House	254,000	2.42	6,147
Quadrant House	15,340,000	2.41	369,694
Quadrant House	800,000	2.28	18,240
Gryllus - 80-84 Station Road	724,400	2.28	16,516
Gryllus - Castlefield	15,549,000	2.91	452,476
Sub Total General Fund Borrowing	43,426,078		1,136,366
Total GF PWLB Budget 2022/23			1,137,000
Over/(under) budget			(634)
HRA Borrowing			
Public Works Loan Board	58,839,000	2.70	1,640,708
Sub Total HRA Borrowing	58,839,000		1,640,708
Total HRA PWLB Budget 2022/23			1,639,600
Over/(under) budget			1,108
Total Borrowing	102,265,078		2,777,074
Total Budget 2022/23			2,776,600
Total Over/(under) budget			474

Notes:

1. Yield Rate - forecast return divided by net asset value. Arlingclose have advised that this is the standard approach, which allows for comparison of the current return to alternative investment options.
2. Return from Funding Circle investment has not been forecast as this is dependent upon information that is still to be received.

Market Value of Long Term Investments at 30/09/2022

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Carrying Value	Carrying Value	Carrying Value	Carrying Value	Carrying Value	Carrying Value	Carrying Value
31.3.2018	31.3.2019	31.03.2020	31.03.2021	31.03.2022	30.09.2022	
£	£	£	£	£	£	
CCLA Property Fund	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Schroders Bond Fund	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
UBS Multi Asset Fund	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
CCLA Diversification Fund	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Total	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Market Value	Market Value	Market Value	Market Value	Market Value	Market Value	Market Value
31.3.2018	31.3.2019	31.03.2020	31.03.2021	31.03.2022	30.09.2022	
£	£	£	£	£	£	
CCLA Property Fund(mid-market value)	4,276,854	4,276,005	4,188,063	4,158,183	4,888,056	4,848,829
Schroders Bond Fund	2,912,837	2,865,130	2,539,938	2,908,911	2,775,151	2,452,677
UBS Multi Asset Fund	2,918,160	2,868,479	2,520,713	2,777,398	2,639,592	2,178,270
CCLA Diversification Fund(indicative market value)	1,921,257	1,982,167	1,804,193	1,955,874	2,046,513	1,871,049
Total	12,029,108	11,991,781	11,052,907	11,800,366	12,349,312	11,350,825

	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Surplus/(Deficit)	Surplus/(Deficit)	Surplus/(Deficit)	Surplus/(Deficit)	Surplus/(Deficit)	Surplus/(Deficit)	Surplus/(Deficit)
31.3.2018	31.3.2019	31.03.2020	31.03.2021	31.03.2022	30.09.2022	
£	£	£	£	£	£	
CCLA Property Fund	276,854	276,005	188,063	158,183	888,056	848,829
Schroders Bond Fund	(87,163)	(134,870)	(460,062)	(91,089)	(224,849)	(547,323)
UBS Multi Asset Fund	(81,840)	(131,521)	(479,287)	(222,602)	(360,408)	(821,730)
CCLA Diversification Fund	(78,743)	(17,833)	(195,807)	(44,126)	46,513	(128,951)
Total	29,108	(8,219)	(947,093)	(199,634)	349,312	(649,175)

Full Year forecast at 30.09.22		
Yield	Yield	Yield
2022/23	2022/23	2022/23
£	£	%
161,569	161,569	3.33%
146,567	146,567	5.98%
185,183	185,183	8.50%
71,500	71,500	3.82%
564,819	564,819	

Full Year forecast at 30.09.22		
Surplus/ (Deficit)	Surplus/ (Deficit)	Surplus/ (Deficit)
2022/23	2022/23	2022/23
£	£	%
(39,227)	(39,227)	-0.81%
(322,474)	(322,474)	-13.15%
(461,322)	(461,322)	-21.18%
(175,464)	(175,464)	-9.38%
(998,487)	(998,487)	

Full Year forecast at 30.09.22		
Net Yield	Net Yield	Net Yield
2022/23	2022/23	2022/23
£	£	%
122,342	122,342	2.52%
(175,907)	(175,907)	-7.17%
(276,139)	(276,139)	-12.68%
(103,964)	(103,964)	-5.56%
(433,668)	(433,668)	

Gross Revenue Yield	Yield	Yield	Yield	Yield	Yield	Yield	Yield	Yield	Yield	Yield	Yield	Yield
	2017/18	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2019/20	2020/21	2020/21	2021/22	2021/22	2021/22	2021/22
£	%	£	%	£	%	£	%	£	%	£	%	%
193,758	4.53%	183,989	4.30%	185,240	4.42%	179,910	4.33%	158,867	4.33%	158,867	3.25%	3.25%
105,413	3.62%	120,508	4.21%	124,418	4.90%	125,529	4.32%	128,455	4.32%	128,455	4.63%	4.63%
146,788	5.03%	116,513	4.06%	137,531	5.46%	140,171	5.05%	120,654	5.05%	120,654	4.57%	4.57%
62,732	3.27%	67,030	3.38%	66,284	3.67%	62,069	3.17%	48,871	3.17%	48,871	2.39%	2.39%
508,691		488,040		513,473		507,679		456,847		456,847		

Surplus/(Deficit)- Capital Value	Surplus/ (Deficit)	Surplus/ (Deficit)	Surplus/ (Deficit)	Surplus/ (Deficit)	Surplus/ (Deficit)	Surplus/ (Deficit)	Surplus/ (Deficit)	Surplus/ (Deficit)	Surplus/ (Deficit)	Surplus/ (Deficit)	Surplus/ (Deficit)	Surplus/ (Deficit)
	2017/18	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2019/20	2020/21	2020/21	2021/22	2021/22	2021/22	2021/22
£	%	£	%	£	%	£	%	£	%	£	%	%
193,868	4.53%	(849)	-0.02%	(87,942)	-2.10%	(29,880)	-0.72%	729,873	14.93%	729,873	14.93%	14.93%
(50,726)	-1.74%	(47,707)	-1.67%	(325,192)	-12.80%	368,973	12.68%	(133,760)	-4.82%	(133,760)	-4.82%	-4.82%
(100,545)	-3.45%	(49,681)	-1.73%	(347,766)	-13.80%	256,685	9.24%	(137,806)	-5.22%	(137,806)	-5.22%	-5.22%
-78,743	n/a	60,910	3.07%	(177,974)	-9.86%	151,681	7.76%	90,639	4.43%	90,639	4.43%	4.43%
(36,146)		(37,327)		(938,874)		747,459		548,946		548,946		

Net Yield	Net Yield	Net Yield	Net Yield	Net Yield	Net Yield	Net Yield	Net Yield	Net Yield	Net Yield	Net Yield	Net Yield	Net Yield
	2017/18	2017/18	2018/19	2018/19	2019/20	2019/20	2020/21	2020/21	2021/22	2021/22	2021/22	2021/22
£	%	£	%	£	%	£	%	£	%	£	%	%
387,626	9.06%	183,140	4.28%	97,298	2.32%	150,030	3.61%	888,740	18.18%	888,740	18.18%	18.18%
54,687	1.88%	72,801	2.54%	(200,774)	-7.90%	494,502	17.00%	(5,305)	-0.19%	(5,305)	-0.19%	-0.19%
46,243	1.58%	66,832	2.33%	(210,235)	-8.34%	396,856	14.29%	(17,152)	-0.65%	(17,152)	-0.65%	-0.65%
n/a	n/a	127,940	6.45%	(111,690)	-6.19%	213,750	10.93%	139,510	6.82%	139,510	6.82%	6.82%
488,556		450,713		(425,401)		1,255,138		1,005,793		1,005,793		

Peer to Peer Investment Note 1** Funding Circle	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Carrying Value	2,075,341	2,056,664	1,831,028	863,160	391,191	236,668
Interest Paid by Borrowers	181,014	184,654	193,170	127,982	66,749	
Less FC Service fee	(19,668)	(19,729)	(19,611)	(12,462)	(6,279)	
Promotions/Transfer payment	-	-	470	0	0	
Bad Debts	(61,288)	(111,152)	(127,649)	(80,881)	(36,103)	
Recoveries	14,780	27,428	30,253	42,431	62,769	
Net Yield	114,838	81,201	76,633	77,070	87,136	0
Provisions for future losses	0	(10,000)				
		3.95%	4.19%	8.93%	13.89%	0.00%

Notes:

1. Funding Circle yield has not been forecast for 2022/23 as this is dependent upon information that is still to be received.

This page is intentionally left blank