

[democraticservices@tandridge.gov.uk](mailto:democraticservices@tandridge.gov.uk)

01883 722000

[www.tandridge.gov.uk](http://www.tandridge.gov.uk)

13 November 2024

**Planning Policy Committee****Thursday, 21st November, 2024 at 7.30 pm****Council Chamber, Council Offices, Station Road East, Oxted****Agenda****Members of the Planning Policy Committee**

Councillor Catherine Sayer (Chair)	Councillor Chris Farr (Vice-Chair)
Councillor Claire Blackwell	Councillor Julie Duggan
Councillor Sue Farr	Councillor Richard Fowler
Councillor Alun Jones	Councillor Liz Lockwood
Councillor Keith Prew	Councillor Robin Spencer
Councillor Lesley Steeds	

**Substitute Members**

Councillor Robin Bloore	Councillor Mike Crane
Councillor Jenny Gaffney	Councillor Jeffrey Gray
Councillor Jeremy Pursehouse	Councillor Deborah Sherry

If a member of the Committee is unable to attend the meeting, they should notify Democratic Services. If a Member of the Council, who is not a member of the Committee, would like to attend the meeting, please let Democratic Services know by no later than noon on the day of the meeting.

If any clarification about any item of business is needed, contact should be made with officers before the meeting. Reports contain authors' names and contact details.

David Ford

**Chief Executive****Information for the public**

This meeting will be held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Oxted and the public are welcome to attend. Doors for the Council Offices will open 15 minutes before the start of the meeting.



The meeting will also be broadcast online at [tinyurl.com/webcastTDC](https://tinyurl.com/webcastTDC). In attending this meeting, you are accepting that you may be filmed and consent to the live stream being broadcast online and available for others to view.



Information about the terms of reference and membership of this Committee are available in the Council's Constitution available from [tinyurl.com/howTDCisrun](https://tinyurl.com/howTDCisrun). The website also provides copies of agendas, reports and minutes.



Details of reports that will be considered at upcoming Committee meetings are published on the Council's Committee Forward Plan. You can view the latest plan at [tinyurl.com/TDCforwardplan](https://tinyurl.com/TDCforwardplan).

**democraticservices@tandridge.gov.uk Tel: 01883 722000****[www.tandridge.gov.uk/Your-council/Councillors-and-committees](http://www.tandridge.gov.uk/Your-council/Councillors-and-committees)**

Tandridge District Council, Council Offices, 8 Station Road East, Oxted, Surrey, RH8 0BT

Once you have finished with this pack, please recycle it. If it contains confidential information, it must be securely disposed of.

## **AGENDA**

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

**2. Declarations of interest**

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

- (i) any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests (DPIs) and / or
- (ii) other interests arising under the Code of Conduct in respect of any item(s) of business being considered at the meeting. Anyone with a DPI must, unless a dispensation has been granted, withdraw from the meeting during consideration of the relevant item of business.

If in doubt, advice should be sought from the Monitoring Officer or her staff prior to the meeting.

**3. Minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2024 (Pages 3 - 8)**

To confirm as a correct record.

**4. To deal with questions submitted under Standing Order 30**

Questions must be sent via email or in writing to Democratic Services by 5pm on 19 November 2024 and comply with all other aspects of Standing Order 30 of the Council's Constitution.

**5. Quarter 2 2024/25 Budget Monitoring - Planning Policy Committee (Pages 9 - 18)**

**6. Quarter 2 2024/25 Key Performance Indicators and Risk Register - Planning Policy Committee (Pages 19 - 26)**

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

## 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 19 September 2024 at 7:30pm.

**PRESENT:** Councillors Sayer (Chair), Chris Farr (Vice-Chair), Blackwell, Duggan, Sue Farr, Lockwood, Prew, Spencer, Steeds, Gaffney (Substitute) (In place of Fowler) and Gray (Substitute) (In place of Jones)

**ALSO PRESENT:** Councillors Nicholas White

**ALSO PRESENT (Virtually):** Councillors Bloore and Pursehouse

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:** Councillors Fowler and Jones

#### 102. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 20TH JUNE 2024

The minutes were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

#### 103. NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY CONSULTATION

On 30 July 2024, the Government had begun a consultation on proposed changes to the planning system, including a draft National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the outcomes of a proposed revised standard methodology for calculating housing need. Some of the detail was contained in a consultation document which sat alongside the NPPF. The Government had also issued a Written Ministerial Statement and letters to Chief Executives and Leaders of Local Planning Authorities and the planning Inspectorate. The Committee received a report summarising the proposed changes. The report also sought delegated authority to submit a response to the consultation.

Officers explained that there were five themes to the consultation, and drew Members' attention to two:

- changes in the approach to housing need and how it was calculated
- changes in relation to brownfield, greenbelt and greybelt definitions.

Given the proximity of the deadline for responses, recommendation B had been amended as follows:

- B. the Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with the Planning Policy Working Group, be given delegated authority to submit a response to the Government's consultation paper on changes to national planning policy by 24<sup>th</sup> September 2024.

The Chair had circulated a draft response to the Committee. There were 5 responses to questions where alternative views had been put forward. The Chair asked Members to submit their views on these before the final version was agreed.

During the debate, the following matters were discussed:

- whether the definition of grey belt; *land in the green belt comprising previously developed land (PDL) and other green belt land that made a limited contribution to the purposes of the green belt and was not subject to any the constraint listed in footnote 7 of the NPPF*, was clear or if it could be better defined to reduce the risk of uncertainty around its meaning. It was important to understand what the Government meant by grey belt in order to understand how it would impact the District.
- the ambiguity around the meaning of ‘vision-led’ transport, and the importance of ensuring infrastructure. It could suggest less infrastructure for less car use.
- whether agreeing with the removal of the urban uplift would result in pressure to take additional development that London would not be able to achieve.
- clarity was needed from the Government on whether development on the green belt was to be considered inappropriate or not, in the case that a 5-Year Housing Land Supply was not demonstrated or a Local Planning Authority failed to meet the Housing Delivery Test.
- there were no further details at this stage about what the Government meant by *modernising Planning Committees by introducing a national scheme of delegation*.

**RESOLVED** – that:

- A) the report be noted; and
- B) the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Planning Policy Working Group, be given delegated authority to submit a response to the Government’s consultation paper on changes to national planning policy by 24th September 2024.

## 104. NATIONAL LANDSCAPES UPDATE

The Committee received an update on the Surrey Hills AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) (known as Natural Landscapes) Boundary review. Natural England had published an analysis report of the 2023 consultation. This report set out the proposed changes to the boundary extension, with 27 additions and 13 deletions. A second consultation opened on 17 September and would close on 10 December 2024. The focus of the consultation was on the proposed additions and deletions to the proposed boundary amendment. Approval was sought for the Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with the Planning Policy Working Group and Planning Policy Officers, to prepare a response.

It was also noted that Natural England had suggested Surrey authorities work together on the issue of Areas of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) that had not been included.

Members were pleased with the additions but expressed concern over several areas that were proposed to be deleted, or which had been suggested for inclusion but had been rejected.

The Committee were also informed about the Dark Skies Technical Advice Note published by the High Weald Joint Advisory Committee. This guidance was an important tool to enable appropriately designed lighting schemes within the AONB.

**RESOLVED** – that the report be noted and the Deputy Chief Executive, given the timescales involved, be authorised to prepare a formal response to the forthcoming consultation, in collaboration with the Planning Policy Working Group and Planning Policy Officers.

## 105. PLANNING ENFORCEMENT

In June 2024, the Committee had adopted an amended Enforcement Policy. A report setting out the work that had been undertaken since that meeting to strengthen and improve the effectiveness of the Enforcement Team to deliver on the policy. This included:

- i) Recruitment of permanent Enforcement Officers.
- ii) Improvements to caseload and data management.
- iii) Development of an 'Out of Hours' solution.
- iv) Improvements in communication and stakeholder management.

The Council had commissioned external companies to strengthen the Council's enforcement by tackling priority enforcement cases and provide on-site attendance outside normal working hours. The external support would help the Council to determine the future operating model of enforcement services and ensure it is on a stable basis by the end of 2024/25.

In response to Member questions, Officers explained:

- a budget of £50k had been initially agreed to commission external support in tackling priority cases. It was not known the length of time the trial would last.
- the success of the trial would be determined by how well the external organisations support the service, as well as determining value for money.
- 15 of the highest priority 40 cases had been allocated to the external organisations. Officers would be able to share these with the Committee, as well as data on the oldest and the median. If Members wanted updates on particular cases, they could contact the Interim DM Manager.
- the external organisations would be reporting back fortnightly from the end of September.
- improved communications between Officers and Members would be a measure of success in the improvement plan.
- enforcement tended to be a long process due to the steps that needed to be gone through. Information from the Planning Inspectorate suggested it took around a year to deal with enforcement appeals. If the appeal is dismissed, there was then the compliance period which could be up to a further year.

**RESOLVED** – that the updates to the Planning Enforcement Team be noted and the decision taken under urgency powers be ratified.

## 106. QUARTER 1 2024/25 BUDGET MONITORING - PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

An analysis of expenditure against the Committee's revenue budget for 2024/25, as at the end of June 2024 (Month 3) was presented. The approved budget had been set at £1,817k and,

subject to approval at the Strategy & Resources Committee on 26 September, would be increased by £83k to distribute an amount held corporately for the 2024/25 pay award. The total budget was therefore expected to be £1,900k.

A full year underspend of £34k was forecast. Several risk and opportunities were being managed within the budget including overspends on salaries, offset by a surplus on planning application fees.

The revenue budget included investment of £320k which had been approved by Full Council in February 2024. This was to strengthen Development Management and deliver the new Enforcement Policy. The report sought approval to restructure the budget to accurately reflect line management and planned staffing structure and distribute the £320k to Development Management and Enforcement.

Regarding the Committee's capital programme (entirely funded by Community Infrastructure Levy income), the total budget was set for £1,801k. There was no projected slippage in projected scheme expenditure, with a nil variance forecast.

Councillor Spencer, seconded by Councillor Gray, proposed the following additional recommendation:

An overview of the planning team structure to be provided to this committee which details current permanent and temporary staff, and open positions, to include a summary of the measures being taken to understand and mitigate the retention risks. This would detail the recruitment process and initiatives being taken to attract candidates with a report that includes the number of applications and outcome for each position.

Upon being put to the vote, this motion was agreed.

**RESOLVED** – that:

- A) That the Committee's Revenue and Capital budget forecast positions as at Quarter 1 / M3 (June) 2024/25 be noted.
- B) That the virements to:
  - i. restructure the Committee's budget to more accurately reflect line management and planned staffing structures; and
  - ii. distribute the £320k additional planning investment to Development Management and Enforcement

be approved.

- C) An overview of the planning team structure be provided to this committee which details current permanent and temporary staff, and open positions, to include a summary of the measures being taken to understand and mitigate the retention risks. This would detail the recruitment process and initiatives being taken to attract candidates with a report that includes the number of applications and outcome for each position.

## 107. QUARTER 1 2024/25 KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS - PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE

The Committee considered a report with key planning performance indicators for the first quarter of 2024/25 as collected by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG). The KPI outturns were in line with MHCLG's required performance levels for planning applications and demonstrated an upward trend in improvement in the delivery of the planning service. There were also continuous improvements in the reduction of backlogs. The number of applications allowed at appeal for both 'major' and 'non-major' applications were under the 10% at which intervention would be considered. These were reported with a 9 month lag.

Officers responded to Member questions by confirming that:

- the timescales of the validation of applications had reduced. It was explained that deadlines were set where it was necessary for the applicant to submit additional information.
- in terms of undetermined applications, the Planning Department were working to reduce the number of applications where no extension of time had been agreed. Various reasons existed as to why an extension of time might not have been agreed, such as waiting for legal agreements or technical reports.

**RESOLVED** – that the Quarter 1 2024 - 2025 performance indicators for the Planning Policy Committee be noted.

## 108. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS UPDATE

A report providing a summary of Neighbourhood Plan progress across the District was presented to the Committee. Of the ten areas that had been designated as a neighbourhood planning area, four had made Neighbourhood Plans. Five were currently being developed, including a review underway of one made plan. The current positions of the developed plans were outlined:

- Burstow had submitted a draft regulation 16 plan to the Council for comment.
- Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe were reviewing the made plan to consider the addition of new policies. A draft plan in advance of a regulation 14 consultation had been submitted to the Council for comment.
- Dormansland had submitted a draft plan in advance of a regulation 14 consultation which the Council had commented on.
- Godstone had submitted a draft plan in advance of a regulation 14 consultation to the Council.
- Lingfield undertook a regulation 14 consultation and the Parish Council were reviewing comments.
- In the case of Burstow; Caterham, Chaldon and Whyteleafe; Dormansland; and Godstone, a screening for the purpose of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and / or a Habitats Regulations Appropriate Assessment (AA) had been undertaken with the three consultation bodies confirming the plans should not be the subject of either.

**RESOLVED** – that progress on Neighbourhood Plans be noted.

## 109. GATWICK UPDATE

Examination into the proposed Gatwick Airport Development Consent Order (DCO) closed on 27 August 2024. The Examining Authority (ExA) had until 27 November to make a recommendation to the Secretary of State for Transport regarding whether or not to approve the DCO and, if so, the requirements that would apply in the interests of avoiding and mitigating impacts. If made, it would be the subject of a S106 Legal Agreement that would require Gatwick Airport to undertake certain actions and provide funds to mitigate and compensate for impacts.

The Council had submitted final representations to the ExA. In a Closing Statement the Joint Local Authorities (JLAs) stated that the Councils can only support making the DCO if additional requirements were included to cover the matters in the Environmentally Managed Growth proposal. The ExA, or the Secretary of State, may seek the views of the JLAs on any changes to the requirements in the DCO.

The decision of the Secretary of State was anticipated on or before 27 February 2025.

**RESOLVED** – that the report be noted.

## 110. APPROVAL OF AIR QUALITY STRATEGY

The Committee considered a report recommending the adoption of an Air Quality Strategy (AQS). The Department for Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) had advised all Local Authorities which had not been subject to a breach of exceedances that they were obliged to adopt an AQS. The AQS set out the actions the Council, and its partners, undertook to maintain and improve air quality.

In response to Member questions, Officers confirmed:

- the Council had the power to undertake enforcement on woodburning stoves and bonfires. It could only do so if there was sufficient evidence to prove a case and residents were encouraged to keep logs to assist with investigations.
- information would be provided to Members on the schools undertaking the Schools' Air Quality Monitoring for Health & Education and number of electric vehicle charging points installed at Council owned car parks.
- the Surrey Air Alliance Group (SAAG) provided air quality advice to the public on the Council webpages. Future initiatives included replacing the existing notification system of high pollution levels with an advanced service that notifies residents who sign up via text message and email.
- as there had not been any breaches of the exceedances monitored, the Council did not have an Air Quality Management Area. This would impose controls on the Council to manage air quality, such as on highways.

**RESOLVED** – that the contents of this report are noted and the Air Quality Strategy (appendix 1 to the report) be approved.

Rising 9.27 pm



## Quarter 2 2024/25 Budget Monitoring - Planning Policy Committee

### Planning Policy Committee Thursday, 21 November 2024

Report of: Director of Resources (S151)

---

Purpose: To note the 2024/25 Quarter 2 / Month 6 (September) financial position of the Committee and take associated decisions.

---

Publication status: Unrestricted

---

Wards affected: All

---

#### **Executive summary:**

This report presents the 2024/25 Quarter 2 / Month 6 (September) financial forecast against both Revenue and Capital budgets for the Committee.

---

**This report supports the Council's priority of:** Protecting and enhancing our environment./Delivering affordable housing for local people./Financial prudence and sustainability./Putting residents at the heart of what we do./A safe, healthy and caring community supporting those most in need./A thriving economy.

**Contact officer** Mark Hak-Sanders, Director of Resources (S151)  
mhaksanders@tandridge.gov.uk

---

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

That the Committee's Revenue and Capital budget forecast positions as at Quarter 2 / M6 (September) 2024/25 be noted.

---

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

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

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

Quarterly financial monitoring updates are presented to each Committee to ensure that all Members are aware of the financial position of the services within their remit, as context for decisions needed to mitigate any variance to budget and in terms of the impact on the Medium-Term Financial Strategy.

The consolidated forecast position for Quarter 2 will be reported to Strategy & Resources Committee on the 28<sup>th</sup> November 2024.

---

## **Introduction and background**

- 1 The 2024/25 Planning Policy revenue budget was proposed at £1,817k on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2024 and approved by Full Council on the 8<sup>th</sup> February 2024.
- 2 This was increased by £83k to distribute an amount held corporately for the 2024/25 pay award, bringing the total budget to £1,900k.
- 3 The Community Infrastructure Levy Capital Programme for 2024/25 was approved by Committee at £1,619k on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2024. Carry forwards of £182k were approved at Strategy & Resources Committee on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2024 to increase the available budget to £1,801k. It was agreed by Strategy & Resources Committee to revisit the phasing of the Capital Programme for 2024/25 in the September Committee cycle. The Capital Programme for this Committee remained unchanged by rephasing and is set out in paragraph 9 below.

## **Key implications**

### **Revenue**

- 4 At Quarter 2/Month 6 a £158k overspend for the Committee is forecast. This is a movement of £192k from Q1, and predominantly relates to a drop in expected planning application fees from £105k surplus to £33k deficit against budget. Volumes of high value applications fees (above £10,000) received in Quarter 2 have not met the expectations built into the forecast at Quarter 1.
- 5 Full detail on the forecast variance is set out in Appendix A.
- 6 It should be noted that this forecast includes a number of risks and opportunities are being managed within the budget,

particularly:

- Development Management - overspend on salaries due to reliance on contract staff and further unexpected falls in planning application fee income, driven by the national economic situation. Pay, non-pay costs and income are being closely monitored.
- Enforcement - overspend on salaries due to reliance on contract staff.
- Planning Strategy & Policy Guidance including the Local Plan. The process of assessing how much will be spent on Planning Policy work and the Local Plan is being developed within the Service and will be considered with due oversight from the Chair and Vice Chair and the Planning Policy Working Group.

### **Use of Planning Reserves**

- 7 At Quarter 2/Month 6, the amount to be spent on Planning Policy work and the Local Plan in 2024/25 is being compiled within the Service. The majority of work and therefore resource is likely to be in 2024/25 and 2025/26. The Council is looking for opportunities for efficiencies, including by joint working with other authorities.
- 8 Funding for the Local Plan and Planning Policy matters in 2024/25 is limited and requires robust management. The maximum funding available for all Planning Policy matters in 2024/25, including the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan, is £1,551k. This consists of £1,021k in the Local Plan reserve, and £20k in the Neighbourhood Plan reserve at the end of 2023/24 and £510k 2024/25 in year budget. The Local Plan is likely to span multiple years, meaning that use of the reserve should be carefully considered. Other matters are unpredictable and are likely to further place further constraints on the budget.

### **Capital**

- 9 For 2024/25 a Capital Budget for Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) schemes of up to £1,801k is available to the Committee. This consists of £1,619k approved as the original budget for 2024/25 plus carry forwards of £182k approved at Strategy & Resources Committee on 27th June 2024. Whilst this is the available budget, Officers have been considering the likely timing of capital expenditure and the amount required for 2024/25. The proposed capital programme is set out in Appendix A and summarised below.
- 10 The entire £1,801k has been retained as the budget for 2024/25, meaning there is no rephasing of budget in this Committee.
- 11 At M6 24/24 slippage of £282k is expected due to delays experienced by projects linked with match funding.

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

The Council faces a financial challenge of £4m (30%) over the MTFS period:

- A savings target of £1m per year, every year, will be needed to balance the MTFS.
- If no savings were made, funding would fall short of requirements by £1m in 2025/26, £2m in 2026/27 and so on, with a gap of £4m per year after four years.
- The Council is legally required to set a balanced budget, and so savings are inevitable. The Council cannot rely on reserves or one-off funding to meet this challenge.
- If no action was taken, the Council's General Fund would be exhausted by the end of 2026/27.

Financially prudent and well-reasoned decision making is critical:

- All decisions must be taken in the context of the financial position and move the Council closer to a balanced MTFS. Once Committee budget envelopes are established, any decision to commit further spend must be met by a proposal for funding it.
- Difficult decisions will be required, including a reduction in discretionary spend, increased fees and a full review of the services the Council can provide.
- Full Council approved 11 budget principles on the 17th October 2024, by which decisions regarding future budget setting and management will be taken. These principles are available in the Full Council Papers.

Savings have not been allocated to the Planning Policy Committee whilst the budget position, income opportunities and Local Plan funding continue to be assessed. Setting a prudent and realistic budget for the Committee for 2025/26 and beyond is a priority as part of the budget process.

Through Planning Performance Agreements and other initiatives, there is significant opportunity to generate income for the Council. This will be pursued, with the budgetary impact kept under review.

The Section 151 Officer confirms that the monitoring position set out in this report is consistent with these principles and that variances will be reviewed in context of setting the budget for 2025/26.

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

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

It is essential, as a matter of prudence, that the financial position of services continues to be closely monitored. In particular, Members must satisfy themselves that across the Council sufficient mechanisms are in place to ensure that new

expenditure is contained within the overall resources. Accordingly, any proposals put forward must identify the realistic measures and mechanisms to produce those savings.

Under S28 of the Local Government Act 2003, a local authority must review its budget calculations from time to time during the financial year and take appropriate action if there is any deterioration in its budget. This report satisfies this statutory requirement.

## **Equality**

There are no equality implications associated with this report.

## **Climate change**

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

## **Appendices**

Appendix A – Committee 2024/25 Q2 /M6 Financial Report & Supporting Data

## **Background papers**

- Planning Policy Committee 2024/25 Draft Budget, Medium-Term Financial Strategy and capital programme – 18<sup>th</sup> January 2024
- 2024/25 Final Budget, MTFS and Capital Programme - Strategy and Resources Committee 30<sup>th</sup> January 2024
- 2024/25 Final Budget, MTFS and Capital programme – Full Council 8<sup>th</sup> February 2024
- Quarter 1 2024/25 Budget Monitoring - Planning Policy Committee 19<sup>th</sup> September 2024
- 2023/24 Budget – Outturn Report – Strategy and Resources Committee 27<sup>th</sup> June 2024

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

This page is intentionally left blank

# **Quarter 2 - 2024/25**

## **Financial Report - Planning Policy Committee**

Page 15

**Mark Hak-Sanders**  
Director of Resources (S151)

**November 2024**

# Revenue Commentary – Planning Policy

2023-24 Outturn £k		2024-25 Forecast £k	Annual Budget £k	Forecast Variance £k	Change from Qtr1 £k	One-off events £k	Ongoing Pressures £k
526	Development Management	698	582	116	183	116	
352	Enforcement	329	247	82	9		82
270	Appeals	200	200	0	0		
104	Tree Preservation & Advice	107	107	0	0		
(0.2)	Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)	2	2	0	0		
510	Planning Strategy & Policy Guidance inc. Local Plan	510	510	0	0		
21	Gatwick Airport DCO	0	0	0	0		
(41)	Land Charges, Developer Contribution Management & Street Naming & Numbering	211	251	(40)	0		(40)
<b>1,742</b>	<b>Planning</b>	<b>2,058</b>	<b>1,900</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>42</b>

**Note** – the forecast currently assumes that the budgets for the local plan and other planning policy matters are spent in full in 2024/25 or remain ringfenced to the local plan if not.

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

**Planning Policy overspend £158k (M3 24/25 was £34k under).** The variance mainly comprises of:

**£116k Development Management** overspend forecast variance at year end based upon the following (M3 £67k favourable) :  
**£95k** overspend on salaries (M3 £5k over) due to reliance on contract staff for longer than originally anticipated (includes £20k of ecologist cost). £48k overspend on running costs (£33k over in M3) related mainly to third party external consultant advice and legal professional advice.

£33k deficit on planning application fees (M3 £105k surplus). Change due to reduced planning fee volumes. Q2 volumes of high value planning fees (above £10,000), have not supported the Q1 estimate.

**£82k Enforcement** overspend at year end (M3 £73k worse). £86k salary overspend (M3 £88k overspend) due to reliance on contract staff and one-off injunction costs (M6 £2k over, M3 £15k under), offset by £6k Enforcement Appeal Fees income.

**(£40k) Land Charges, Developer Contribution Management and Street Naming & Numbering** underspend (£40k favourable). Land Charges income £28k worse than budget caused by external pressures of rising inflation and high interest rates causing reduced activity for the service. The overall position includes a £40k Government grant to facilitate Land Charges LLC1 data migration to Central Government. £40k underspend mainly due to a reduction in Corporate Support service recharges

## Planning Service Additional Investment

Planning budgets have been recast to reflect the Planning Service Additional Investment budget of £320k, being redirected to the most recently approved staff structure in Development Management and Enforcement. Some further redistribution of Planning budgets may be need later in the year, as the Committee's budgets are reviewed and re-based on a line-by-line basis.

## Planning Strategy & Policy Guidance inc. Local Plan

Officers are in the process of assessing how much will be spent on Local Plan development within the service.



# Revenue Risks

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

Committee	Outline of Risk	Mitigation	Range Max - Min £k
Planning	Unexpected fall in future planning application fee income, driven by the national economic situation	Monitor and report, taking commensurate actions where opportunities arise	
Planning	Planning appeals and associated legal costs may exceed the Committee's budget to deal with such matters (£200k).	The £200k included in the budget is supplemented by amounts held on the balance sheet for known appeals and further supported by the Council's overall contingency of £1.2m.	
Planning	<p>Planning Guarantee ; The planning guarantee is defined by Government as "a policy that no application should spend more than a year with decision-makers, including any appeal." The policy sits alongside statutory time limits for decision making, subject to the potential to agree extensions. The Council has no control over the timing of Appeals. Linked to this is a risk that current planning fees become repayable if secured extensions of time are exceed in certain circumstances.</p>	Extensions of time will be sought where appropriate.	

# Capital Budget – Planning Policy

Service	Original Budget 2024/25 £k	Carry Forward from 2023/24 £k	Approved Additions and Rephasing £k	Annual Budget 2024-25 £k	Forecast M6 2024/25 £k	Variance M6 2024/25 £k	Nature of Variance	
							Variance Overspend/ (Underspend) £k	Variance Acceleration/ (Slippage) £k
<b>Planning Policy</b>								
Capital contributions to third parties from CIL	1,619	182	0	1,801	1,519	(282)	0	(282)
<b>Total Planning Policy</b>	<b>1,619</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,801</b>	<b>1,519</b>	<b>(282)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(282)</b>

- Page 18 of 18
- Capital Budget was approved by Full Council on 8th February 2024 at £1,619k.
  - The request for Capital carry forwards of £182k from 2023/24 was approved in the S&R Committee on 27th June 2024.
  - The total available budget for 2024/25 is therefore £1,801k.
  - At M6 24/24 slippage of £282k is expected due to delays experienced by projects being linked with match funding.
  - Actual expenditure across the Committee's schemes is £310k (17%) at Q2.

## Quarter 2 2024/25 Key Performance Indicators and Risk Register - Planning Policy Committee

### Planning Policy Committee Thursday, 21 November 2024

Report of: Interim DM Manager

---

Purpose: For information

---

Publication status: Open

---

Wards affected: All

---

#### **Executive summary:**

This report includes information about the key planning performance indicators for quarter 2 (1 July – 30 September 2024). The Council is required to submit this data quarterly to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG). It also contains information about current planning applications.

---

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

Creating the homes, infrastructure and environment we need

**Contact officer** Tom James - TJames@tandridge.gov.uk

---

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

That the Quarter 2 2024 - 2025 performance indicators and risks for the Planning Policy Committee be noted.

---

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

To support the committee in monitoring and managing development management performance.

---

## Introduction and background

1. Performance reports are presented to each policy committee at the end of each quarter. This report covers quarter 2 period of 2024/25 and is divided into two sections: the first is a summary of the position with regard to the statistics collected by MHCLG, and the second contains a broader performance update on the work of the Planning Service.

## Statistics collected by MHCLG

2. The following performance information has been submitted to MHCLG for Q2. With reference to the indicator descriptions, an "agreed extension of time" relates to when the applicant has given their consent to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) exceeding the Government's statutory target date for the determination of their application. The Government measures LPA's on their speed of decision and quality of decision. The speed of decision is based on 'major applications' and 'non-major applications' which is generally a combination of 'minors' and 'other applications'. The quality of decision is based on the number of applications allowed at appeal for 'major applications' and 'non major applications' against the total number of decisions determined by the LPA.
3. The performance statistics only cover applications for planning permission but exclude a whole range of other application types including Prior approvals, Lawful Development Certificates, Pre-application advice, discharge of conditions and tree applications. They are the official statistics that the government monitors and which our performance is judged on. The table below shows the speed of decisions but broken down more specifically to 'minor applications' and 'other applications' as well as 'major applications'. As can be seen in the table, the planning service has continually exceeded the national target in all 4 quarters of 2023/24 with the exception of Q3 of 2023/24 for major applications where the target was met.

Performance Indicator: Percentage of decisions on major applications made within 13 weeks or within agreed extension of time.

Q3 2023-2024	Q4 2024-2025	Q1 2024-2025	Q2 2024-2025	Target
October – December 2023	January – March 2024	April – June 2024	July- September 2024	National Target 60%
60%	71%	100%	89%	Met

### Comments:

Performance Indicator: Percentage of decisions on minor applications made within 8 weeks or within agreed extension of time.

Q3 2023-2024	Q4 2024-2025	Q1 2024-2025	Q2 2024-2025	Target
October – December 2023	January – March 2024	April – June 2024	July- September 2024	National Target 70%
86%	87%	89%	84%	Met

**Comments:**

Performance Indicator: Percentage of decisions on other applications made with 8 weeks or within agreed extension time.

Q3 2023-2024	Q4 2023-2024	Q1 2023-2024	Q2 2023-2024	Target
October – December 2023	January – March 2024	April – June 2024	July- September 2024	National Target 70%
88%	91%	96%	100%	Met

**Comments:**

4. During quarter 2 there were 189 decisions, made on the following categories of applications:

Type of application	Total	Granted	Refused
Major applications	9	8	1
Minor applications	58	40	18
Other applications (incl. 177 householder)	122	111	11
<b>Total decisions</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>30</b>

5. Of the 9 major applications detailed in the table above, 8 (89%) were decided within the agreed time or with an agreed Extension of time.
6. Of the 58 minor applications detailed in the table above, 49 (84%) were decided within the agreed time or with an agreed Extension of time.
7. Of the 122 other applications detailed in the table above, 122 (100%) were decided within the agreed time or with an agreed Extension of time.
8. Cumulatively of the 189 decisions issued in quarter 2 as detailed above, 179 (95%) were made within the statutory deadlines or with an agreed Extension of time.
9. These results are in line with MHCLG’s required performance levels for planning applications and demonstrate the continued improved performance of the planning service.
10. Councils which decide fewer than 60% of major applications within the statutory deadline of 13 weeks or 70% of minor and other applications within the 8 week deadline may be liable to government intervention.
11. With regards to the quality of decision as measured by MHCLG, they are measured on ‘major’ and ‘non-major’ applications. These are measured on a 2 year (8 quarter) rolling basis with a 9 month lag to take into account appeals determined. The latest provisional statistics on the quality of decision from MHCLG shows 1.6% of total applications determined for ‘non major’ schemes allowed at appeal from July 2021 to June 2023. For ‘major’ applications, the figure is 8.6%.

12. Councils which have more than 10% of both their major applications and non major applications overturned at appeal may be liable to government intervention. On both matrices, the Council is below the threshold.

**Planning service performance – reducing the backlog (including non-MHCLG statistics)**

13. Work continued during Q2 to further reduce the backlog of planning applications.

14. A backlog occurs when the number of planning applications being determined is less than the number of new applications received. If this occurs over a succession of quarters then the backlog position gradually worsens. The total number of regular applications for planning permission received in Tandridge in the year 2023-2024 was 879.

15. Work on reducing the backlog continues and further progress is being made. The reduction in the backlog of applications can be shown in the table below where it is measured as “cases past their target with no EOT”. This shows there has been a reduction in the backlog of 11 applications from 22 August 2024 to 29 October 2024. At the start of the year 49% of cases were past their target date and this has reduced to 17%.

16. The following table shows the comparison between the figures reported on 30 August and those prevailing at the time of writing there were:

<b>Measure</b>	<b>30 August 2023</b>	<b>5 January 2024</b>	<b>24 May 2024</b>	<b>22 August 2024</b>	<b>29 October 2024</b>
Undetermined planning applications	354	287	191	170	162
Undetermined Lawful Development Certificates	54	59	36	38	19
Undetermined Prior Notifications	14	9	12	2	6
Other outstanding submissions*	176	158	82	82	66
Cases waiting to be validated	41	62	72	42	37
Invalid applications	35	32	57	87	76
Cases past their target date with no EOT	186 (53%)	142 (49%)	55 (28%)	39 (23%)	28 (17%)

\*including pre-application advice cases, notifications, consultations, discharge of conditions and non-material amendments.

17. The validation timescales have substantially reduced since last year. There has been an increase in the number of invalid applications since the start of the municipal year due to the introduction of a new validation checklist. There has been a reduction in the number of invalid applications since the last quarter.

18. In terms of outstanding cases, of the 162 undetermined planning applications, 28 (i.e. 17%) were past their target determination date with no agreed extension of time. In most cases an extension of time will be requested and granted before a decision is made.
19. Officers aim to deal with applications in chronological order and within the statutory time limit but this is not always possible due to the reasons set out below:-
- Further information requested from the applicant.
  - Amendments being made to the application.
  - Specialist advice being sought.
  - Waiting for responses from key consultees
  - The need to consult again once revised information is received.
20. On Appeals, the performance has been as follows:
- Planning appeals – 13 decision issued of which 4 were allowed and 9 were dismissed.
  - Enforcement appeals – 3 decisions were issued of which 1 was allowed and 2 were dismissed.
  - New Planning appeals received during the quarter – 26
  - New Enforcement appeals received during the quarter – 3
  - Live Planning appeals at beginning of quarter – 77 in total, comprising 2 Hearing, 17 Householders, 3 Inquiries & 55 Written Representations.
  - Live Enforcement appeals at beginning of quarter – 19 in total, comprising 4 Hearings, 2 Inquiries & 13 Written Representations.
  - Live Planning appeals at end of quarter – 63 in total, comprising 2 Hearings, 14 Householders 3 Inquiries & 44 Written Representations.
  - Live Enforcement appeals at end of quarter – 13 in total, comprising 3 Hearings 2 Inquiries & 8 Written Representations.

## **Key implications**

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

21. There are no direct financial implications from this report as it is presented for noting. Performance against specific KPIs may have a financial impact. Financial implications will be drawn out where relevant in the quarterly financial update report.

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

22. There is no statutory duty to report regularly to Members on the Council's Planning performance, however under the Local Government Act 1999 a best value authority has a statutory duty to secure continuous improvement in the way in which its functions are exercised having regard to a combination of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. Regular reports on the Planning Service performance assist in demonstrating best value.
23. The Council's Annual Governance Statement for 2022/23 included a number of actions, including an action to improve the systems in place for managing performance. This stated that the Council must ensure basic systems and controls are in place to ensure that performance is managed, and risk appropriately identified, reported and monitored. Performance data should measure the quality of services for users, use of resources and value for money.

### **Equality**

24. This is a factual report with no implications for equalities.

### **Climate change**

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

### **Appendices**

26. Appendix A: Planning Departmental Risk Register

### **Background papers**

27. None

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



Appendix A: Planning Departmental Register

Planning Departmental Register														
Committee	Risk title	Risk consequences	Risk owner	Inherent risk assessment (initial risk score without mitigating actions)			Existing measures in place (mitigating actions)	Residual risk assessment (risk score after mitigating actions)			Measures to be Taken	Risk Category	Does this risk need to be escalated to corporate and committee risk registers	Date risk raised and date last updated.
				L	I	Risk Score		I	L	Risk Score				
Planning	Ensuring program for the Local Plan is achievable and realistic	Financial impact Demand on resources Delays to the local plan causing ongoing uncertainty for the community. Local plan found unsound following decision from inspector with no plan in place	Taryn Pearson Rose Deputy Chief Executive	4	4	16	Interim Policy Statement for Housing Delivery in place and is successfully bringing forward a housing supply.	3	4	12	Prepare new Local Plan timetable and update evidence base.  Retain existing evidence base on website and review to determine which can remain extant and relied on to inform future decision making and what needs updating.  Seek support, e.g. from PAS, to help ensure a robust approach to future plan-making that takes on board latest advice and experience elsewhere.	Treat	Y- P1	Last updated 29/10/2024

Planning	Source housing land supply including gypsy and traveller land over the next five years	Financial cost to the Council in potentially having to defend inappropriate planning applications at appeal.  Increase in pressure to accommodate traveller and show people with sites outside of plan making.	Taryn Pearson Rose Deputy Chief Executive	4	4	16	Call for sites, update Brownfield Register and HELAA.  Updating of traveller need and supply evidence.  Defend appeals.	3	4	12	Call for sites completed on 17 March and Brownfield Register updated.  Prepare Interim Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Show people position statement.	Tolerate	Yes - P2	Last updated 28/10/2024
Planning	Ensure the planning team has capacity by recruiting permanent staff and appropriate IT systems to carry out planning functions for the council	Financial pressures due to use of interims.  Inability to sustainably maintain desired policy work programme.  Difficulty providing non-statutory services which are valued because of prioritisation of statutory services.	Taryn Pearson Rose Deputy Chief Executive	4	4	16	Review of recruitment practices and speeding them up.  Reduce reliance on interim staff.  Recruit apprentices.  Review IT systems.	3	4	12	New round of recruitment for permanent staff.  Hiring of junior planner(s) to support senior officers to free up time spent on more administrative tasks.  Explore opportunities to share resources with neighbouring authorities.	Tolerate	Yes - P3	Last updated 28/10/2024