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Introduction

1.1 This appendix includes responses from service providers to the second letter which was sent on 14 August 2015.

1.2 The responses are arranged in the order of the report. However, there may be gaps as responses were not received from all the service providers.

1.3 Additionally, the responses from Surrey County Council are combined and for ease of reference they are listed at the end of the report.
25 August 2015

Planning Policy Team
Tandridge District Council
8 Station Road East
Oxted
Surrey
RH8 0BT

Dear Sir/Madam

I am writing in reply to the letter we received from Ms Sarah Thompson dated 14th August regarding stage 2 consultation for local planning.

Ms Thompson’s letter enclosed six maps highlighting what I understand are areas for proposed development. I can confirm that the only areas which would be of direct interest to us, as deliverers of general medical services to residents of Crawley Down and surrounding areas, would be what is described in your listing as reference numbers DOM003, FEL004 and FEL008, i.e. developments at Snow Hill and Felbridge respectively.

To answer the specific questions listed in Ms Thompson’s letter I can confirm that we do not have existing capacity to accommodate growth, i.e. to take on a significant number of patients moving into, presumably, new housing. We do anticipate a need for additional infrastructure or services to cope with the demand arising from current development, but the source of this would be, in theory, extra funding from the Department of Health which in the present circumstances I see as a highly unlikely expectation. Even if funding were made available our dilemma at present, in tandem with most other general practices throughout the country, is that we simply cannot attract fully qualified General Practitioners who wish to commit to any long term post.

I am sorry to give you a rather negative response to the questions in Ms Thompson’s letter but I would be most happy to discuss this with you in greater detail if required.

Yours faithfully

Dr Alan Clifford
Health

26 August 2015

Sarah Thompson
Head of Strategy Planning Policy
Tandridge District Council
Council Offices
6 Station Road East
Oxted
Surrey RH8 0BT

Dear Ms Thompson

Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment – Stage 2 Consultation

Thank you for your letter of 14 August 2015. It is difficult to respond to each scenario, however, I hope the following response will be a helpful contribution to your consultation.

FCHC provides NHS community health services in East Surrey. In brief these cover:

- Careham Dene Hospital - beds
  - Minor Injury Unit
- Community Nursing
- Children’s Services (Health Visiting and School Nursing)
- Therapies – such as physiotherapy
- Specialist Nursing Services

Charges in particular population characteristics, such as the elderly and children, have the most significant impact on our services’ capacity. In East Surrey, according to national benchmarking, we have one of the lower levels of District Nursing staff per head of population. This, combined with annual efficiency targets, does mean the service is under pressure. As a Social Enterprise we are relatively good at recruiting and retaining staff, however, the cost of living in Surrey is an added factor in our ability to recruit against a backdrop of a shortage in skilled nurses and therapists.

Any additional developments will, therefore, add to these pressures.

I would be happy to discuss this in more detail.

Yours sincerely

Philip Greenhill
Managing Director

First-rate people. First-rate care. First-rate value.

Philip Greenhill, Managing Director, First Community Health and Care,
3rd Floor, Forum House, 45-51 Brighton Road, Reigate, RH2 0RN
Tel: 01737 773450  Email: info@firstcommunityhealthcare.co.uk
Fax: 01737 778332  Web: www.firstcommunityhealthcare.co.uk
Minnie Nguluwe

To: Skinner Adam (NHS WEST KENT CCG) CIL
Subject: RE: Infrastructure Needs

From: Skinner Adam (NHS WEST KENT CCG) [mailto:adam.skinner@nhs.net]
Sent: 23 September 2015 09:45
To: CIL
Subject: Infrastructure Needs

Dear team,

Thank you for the letter of 14th August. Our practice is a tenant of the Westerham Parish Council. Our practice area falls into Surrey, Bromley and Kent. We are regularly registering patients across the border in Surrey, but our focus is really on the Kent side, as our practice extends into Sevenoaks and up to Holsted. We would not be able to take on a large influx of patients in Surrey. We have inadequate parking as it is, and I would expect any patients wishing to register with us would travel by car, for the most part.

I hope this is helpful in your assessment.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Adam Skinner

for the Westerham Practice
Russell House Westerham

This message may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient please inform the sender that you have received the message in error before deleting it. Please do not disclose, copy or distribute information in this e-mail or take any action in reliance on its contents: to do so is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

Thank you for your co-operation.

NHSMail is the secure email and directory service available for all NHS staff in England and Scotland. NHSMail is approved for exchanging patient data and other sensitive information with NHSMail and GSI recipients. NHSMail provides an email address for your career in the NHS and can be accessed anywhere.
Dear Sarah

Please find attached our comments on the above consultation.

Any proposed development within Tandridge will need to comply with the National Planning Policy framework (NPPF) and the Strategic Flood Risk assessment (SFRA) with regard to flood risk. As such we would recommend that no residential development should take place within flood zone 3.

With regard to the specific scenarios:

**Scenario 2:**
The proposed sites appear to be centred upon Caterham/Whyteleafe, Oxted and Smallfield.

The area of Caterham experienced significant flooding during the winter 2013/14 from both fluvial, groundwater and surface water. As a consequence a project to explore a potential flood alleviation scheme is underway. It would therefore be prudent to consider the initial findings of this report prior to formalising any large increase in urban extent. The reason being that certain land parcels may be required for any scheme and also possible changes in the flood map may occur as a result of this project.

It is potentially possible that there could be the future opportunity for some of these sites to be considered and potentially contribute to improvements in flood risk management - via increased ability to store flood waters or exemplar SuDS systems. however the detailed discussions will need to take place after the Caterham Bourne FAS has progressed.

**Oxted:** Flood risk in Oxted is primarily from surface water - as such provided any development is in line with NPPF we would have no objections.

**Smallfield:** Further extreme flooding was experienced within Smallfield in 2013/14. Again an initial investigation into a potential Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS) is underway. We would therefore wish to prevent any formal agreement to allocate future sites within the Smallfield area until any decision is taken on developing a longer term solution to flooding.
We would welcome support from you in developing a solution for Smallfield and as such the acquisition of land or use of Tandridge District Council (TDC) land could be something we would wish to discuss in the future.

**Scenario 3:**
Comments for Smallfield, Oxted, Caterham and Whyteleafe remain the same as per scenario 2.

**Lingfield:** The floodplain from the Eden Brook is located around Lingfield and will need to be considered with regard to any future developments. We are presently updating the flood mapping and modelling for the River Eden catchment - therefore we shall be discussing any potential changes to the flood map that may occur. It would be prudent to await this updated flood map prior to confirming any sites within Lingfield.

**Godstone:** Flood risk in Godstone is primarily from surface water - as such provided any development is in line with NPPF we would have no objections.

**Warlingham:** The majority of sites would appear to be located within flood zone1 - however there would need to be some consideration for any groundwater interaction or possible impact upon the Caterham Bourne FAS.

**Scenario 4:**
**Nutfield:** Consideration of flood zone 3 around Nutfield should be considered in conjunction with surface water flood risks.

**South Godstone:** Flood risk in South Godstone is primarily from surface water - as such provided any development is in line with NPPF the Agency would have no objections.

**Felbridge:** Flood risk in Felbridge is primarily from surface water - as such provided any development is in line with NPPF we would have no objections.

**Blindley Heath:** There is a large tract of flood zone 2 and 3 that is within this area, therefore consideration of flood risks from all sources must be considered in detail.

**Scenario 5:**
Comments for previous sites remain.

**Tatsfield:** The majority of sites would appear to be located within flood zone1 - however there would need to be some consideration for any groundwater risks and consultation with Surrey County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority is recommended.
Commercial sites:

The sites ENA 18 and ENA14 are potentially in locations adjacent to possible flood risk management interventions for both the Smallfield FAS and the Burstow Stream FAS. We would therefore reiterate our desire that these are not put forward until more detailed understanding of possible flood alleviation schemes in these area are known.

We hope you find our comments useful. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact us on kslplanning@environment-agency.gov.uk

Kind Regards

Jennifer Wilson
Planning Specialist (KSL - Kent)
kslplanning@environment-agency.gov.uk

☎ 01732 223272
🎵 Orchard House, Endeavour Park, London Road, Addington, West Malling, Kent, ME19 5SH
Dear Sir or Madam,

Surrey County Council Response Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment - Stage 2 Consultation

With reference to our previous letter dated 25 September setting out our comments on the above, our flood risk management team have since reviewed the Tandridge Local Plan stage 2 assessment related to the degree of impact proposed developments would have on the local area flood risk and on the local highways infrastructure in Tandridge.

Please contact Alex Davis direct should you have any queries on this review or the information he has provided. He can be telephoned on: 01483 518837 or emailed at alexander.davis@surreycc.gov.uk

Otherwise, if you think I can provide you with further information, please contact me by email at kath.harrison@surreycc.gov.uk, or by phone on 0208 541 9453.

Yours sincerely

Katharine Harrison
Spatial Planning Team
Annexe

Surrey County Council Comments on Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment - Stage 2

Flooding

Development Scenario Infrastructure Impact

A qualitative assessment has been made comparing the supplied scenario maps to the Tandridge Flood Risk Assessment (TFRA) flood risk maps\(^1\) and Surrey County Council (SCC) historic flooding datasets e.g. wetspots. SCC currently has LEP funding for highway maintenance to be carried out along the A22 including mapping and clearing of the culverted main river (in partnership with the EA) located within the Whyteleafe area. The LEP funding also includes the road section south of the M25. The Caterham Bourne Flood Alleviation Scheme (joint project with SCC, Croydon Borough Council, Tandridge District Council, EA, Utility companies) is looking at the Bourne catchment and how flood risk can be managed. New developments within this area could impact the above mentioned schemes. Table 1 summarises the comparison of the supplied scenario maps with TFRA and SCC historic flooding maps.

Table 1. Qualitative assessment of the pressure on local highway infrastructure using the TFRA and historic flood risk maps. The site scenarios are cumulative in that they reference the previous scenario sites. The comments are based on the individual scenario not including previous sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Pressure on infrastructure</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Many of the areas e.g. Whyteleafe, Warlingham and Smallfield are in known flood risk areas (Tandridge FRA) including incidents of historical flooding (wetspots). Some sites e.g. IW1026 and Cat013 are adjacent to the A22 which could impact the Caterham Bourne Flood Alleviation Scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Many of the sites are in known areas of flood risk and have wetspots within the local area. Some sites e.g. CAT018 are adjacent to the A22 which could impact by the Caterham Bourne Flood Alleviation Scheme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderate - High</td>
<td>Some of the sites are at risk of fluvial flooding. The Blindley Heath, Godstone, Brenchley and Nutfield sites are in areas associated with historic flooding including wetspots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The impacts are high due to the input of the previous scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Moderate to High</td>
<td>The large urban extensions will have some local surface water risks which require management and SuDS should be considered. Redhill Aerodrome has an associated wetspot (ID - Tan151). Hobbs Industrial Park has historic flooding adjacent to the site and has two wetspots within 1 km. Lamb Industrial Park also has historic flooding near to the access road to the park. There are no specific site outlines for the remaining large sites; no comment can be made to the historic flooding of these sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tandridge Flood Risk Assessment:

http://www.tandridge.gov.uk/Planning/planningpolicy/evidence/localdevelopmentframeworkevidencebase.htm

Chapter 6 - Figs 4 and 5

Chapter 7 – Flood Risk to the main development areas.

Chapter 9; in particular 9.6

Chapter 10; in particular 10.8 – 10.13

Annex 8: Groundwater map.

1. Proposed Development FRA

A detailed site flood risk assessment (FRA) is required for proposed sites that are > 1 Hectare and /or > 10 units. The site specific FRA would indicate if the proposed development has had historic flooding and / or is at risk of fluvial and surface water risk. This would allow an assessment on whether the site would increase the local flood risk including the impact on highway drainage.

The Surrey Local Flood Risk Management Strategy (SLFRMS) and TFRA both state that new developments should not increase flood risk in the local area and promotes the use of SuDS where possible and in the first instance manage surface water within the development.

Table 2. Summary of scenario proposed developments (supplied by Tandridge) including the number of detailed flood risk assessment responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Number of detailed responses</th>
<th>Total number of developments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b: Res</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b: Com</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Res</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Com</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Res</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Com</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Res</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Com</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Broad location</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 176 220

Table 2 is a breakdown of the total number of proposed developments including the number that would require a detailed flood risk assessment and response from the Strategic Network.
Resilience Consulting team regarding SuDS. The SLFRMS and the TFRA both state that new developments should not increase flood risk in the local area (NPFF). This indicates that around 8 out of 10 proposed sites will require a detailed flood risk assessment.

2. Identifying Site Historic Flooding

From the supplied maps there is a site boundary extent for each proposed development scenario e.g. Cet054. GIS location analysis could be used to allow a first pass identification of proposed development sites that are within or in proximity to known historic flooding events and flood / surface water risk areas (EA datasets). This analysis would allow quantification of the number of sites that are within areas known and / or at risk of flooding and thus could impact or increase flooding (from surface water) if measures were not adopted during development to mitigate flood risk.

We recommend the application of GIS mapping to identify proposed sites with associated known historic flooding. Tandridge District Council has access to the SCC historic flooding data including Wetspots.

3. Groundwater

The TFRA indicates that groundwater flood risk within Tandridge is poorly understood (map in Annex B). The British Geological Survey (BGS) susceptibility to groundwater map indicates areas in the north and to the south of the district that are at risk of groundwater flooding. The BGS SuDS infiltration dataset is currently used in assessing the suitability of SuDS for new developments. This dataset also has information on groundwater risk.

It should be noted that SLFRMS 2016 review will be assessing the groundwater risk within Surrey. This will be an opportunity to assess the risk and possible causes of groundwater flooding in Tandridge.

4. Mitigation

Mitigation is outlined in the Tandridge FRA chapters 9 and 10. Together with the SLFRMS, SuDS are recommended for new development sites and that the new development should not increase the local flood risk. SuDS planning advice is available on the Surrey Council website at:


26th October 2015

Planning Policy Team
Tandridge District Council
(sent by email)

Our Ref: SP/IDC/IDP/CIL.001

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment, Stage 2 Consultation
Surrey Police - Infrastructure needs

I write on behalf of Surrey Police, in response to the current Stage 2 consultation on the infrastructure needs arising from the Tandridge District Local Plan 2013-2033. Thank you for engaging with us in this process and allowing us the opportunity to outline our infrastructure needs across the District over coming years.

Summary

Surrey Police note the housing provision proposed in the Local Plan 2013-2033, and the Scenarios identified, and welcome consideration of the policing infrastructure needed to support this new development.

Surrey Police have analysed and identified the infrastructure needed to support this new development, as set out below. Tandridge District Council may wish to update the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule to include the infrastructure projects identified. Further consideration may also be given to inclusion of this general policing infrastructure in any Revised Regulation 123 List, operated in connection with the Community Infrastructure Levy, given that this infrastructure is needed to support development and may therefore be eligible to be funded (in full or part) by this levy.

Principles of including police as infrastructure providers

The effective policing of a larger population is necessary in order to create safe and sustainable communities, where crime and disorder and the fear of crime do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion, which is a key part of planning for sustainable development and communities, as required by paragraphs 59 (5) and 69 (3) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012.

The definition of infrastructure is wide ranging. The DCLG published a guidance document to accompany the CIL Regulations in May 2011 ("Community Infrastructure Levy – An Overview") and Paragraph 12 of the...
document expands on paragraph 216 of the Planning Act (2008) which provides a non-exhaustive definition of infrastructure that informs the CIL Regulations. Paragraph 12 states:

“This definition allows the levy to be used to fund a very broad range of facilities such as play areas, parks and green spaces, cultural and sports facilities, district heating schemes and police stations and other community safety facilities”.

This definition enables facilities, including community safety facilities, to be defined as infrastructure. Given that the definition of facilities is “a place, amenity or piece of equipment provided for a specific purpose” (Oxford Dictionary), these facilities would include equipment necessary to provide community safety through the effective operation of the police service.

The Localism Act 2011 further broadened the definition of infrastructure in relation to the Levy to clarify that the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure was included.

Appeal decisions have also reinforced the acceptance ‘in principle’ to secure police infrastructure, where justified. A decision by the Secretary of State at Melton Road, Leicester on 11th May 2013, ref APP/K2410/A/12/2173963, considered the issue of police funding and contributions in detail at paragraphs 288 to 294, where it was stated:

“It seems to me that the introduction of additional population and property to an area must have an impact on policing, in the same way as it must on education and library services, for example. Moreover, it also seems to me that the twelfth core planning principle of the Framework, that planning should... take account of and support local strategies to improve health, social and cultural well-being for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs”, can only be served if policing is adequate to the additional burdens imposed on it in the same way as any other local public service. The logic of this is inescapable... Adequate policing is so fundamental to the concept of sustainable communities that I can see no reason, in principle, why it should be excluded from the purview of S106 financial contributions, subject to the relevant tests applicable to other public services.”

Due to the issues above, it is considered that the community safety facilities that are needed to support new development and operate an effective police service to serve that development can be defined as infrastructure. This also does not limit Surrey Police infrastructure to only new police stations or custody centres that may be needed to support growth. Wide ranging community safety facilities could include the provision of specialist equipment (such as CCTV, Automatic Number Plate Recognition Cameras, mobile vehicles, IT telecommunications apparatus, specialist police equipment and training) needed to provide adequate community safety. These infrastructure items would be in addition to the physical works needed to accommodate any larger staff numbers required as a result of growth.

The principle of accepting police infrastructure as a type of infrastructure needed to support new development is therefore becoming more established, as set out above. It should also be noted that this position has been accepted by all authorities in the neighbouring Sussex County who have so far progressed with their Community Infrastructure Levy, or engaged with the neighbouring Sussex Police force on future infrastructure needs. Surrey Police have also undertaken work with a number of local planning authorities in Surrey, including Guildford Borough Council, Waverley Borough Council and Reigate and Banstead Borough Council, to set out future policing infrastructure needs in relevant documents supporting the Local Plan. The Force have also secured inclusion within Infrastructure Delivery Plans, and Regulation 123 Lists, of some neighbouring Surrey authorities, who are due to consult on these proposals in due course.

Infrastructure needs of Surrey Police in the Tadworth District

Part 1 of the existing Infrastructure Delivery Schedule (November 2013) states that: ‘the number of staff needed to police an area is not based on population but on criminality...’ However, the two factors of population and criminality can be linked in order to predict and plan for policing needs arising from a future population. Essentially, any new population will result in new crimes; even if the crime rate per 1000 people is low, an additional 1000 people will still generate a rate of crime. That rate of crime, and the associated incidents, varies due to a number of factors. Surrey Police therefore have regard to these criminality factors, in the Tadworth District specifically, in order to predict future crime and incidents and assess infrastructure needed to address this.

The development scenarios identified in the Stage 2 consultation have been noted, and are considered in further detail below. However, it should firstly be noted that the overall housing provision identified in these scenarios (up to 4,000 homes as set out in Scenario 6) has been used as the baseline for assessing future
infrastructure needs. Surrey Police have based the assessments below on the provision of 4000 dwellings; should this number alter, please notify us to enable a revised assessment to be undertaken.

Based on an overall housing requirement of 4000 dwellings; the potential population uplift associated with it; and existing crime rates (52.98 crimes per 1000 of the population) in the Tandridge District, this development would lead to an ambient potential increase of 477 additional crime investigations per year. This is a notable rise in crime, therefore having an impact on policing operations of Surrey Police. It is also noteworthy that this increase will relate to 'resolved crime' only, and not 'incidents'; the latter of which are not recorded as official crimes but still require a police response, for example, suspicious acts, anti-social behaviour, medical concerns, missing people and road traffic issues. On average, around 25% of incidents dealt with by police officers are crimes, which suggest that the 477 increase in crimes experienced would translate into 1193 extra incidents which would need to be attended by police officers each year.

This is a significant increase in crime and incidents, leading to a subsequent increase in police officer and staff workload, which will require additional police infrastructure to provide the safe and sustainable future communities required by planning policy. Without this infrastructure, the existing resources of Surrey Police would be stretched and diverted; inevitably leading to an increase in crime and incidents and a reduced service to the public and victims of crime. This would be contrary to what national and local planning policies seek to achieve.

This increase in crime will therefore require additional police infrastructure in the form of staff, buildings, vehicles and equipment, to respond to and investigate these crimes, as well as an increased presence to deter crime and anti-social activity. When considering solely staff numbers, based on the existing operating model of Surrey Police, and this crime increase, the housing growth within the Tandridge District alone would necessitate an additional 35 staff being employed by Surrey Police; consisting of an additional 17 police officers and 19 support staff. This need would arise over the entire Plan Period, relating to all planned housing growth.

Whilst these additional staff posts are not sought to be funded through the planning system, there will be capital projects associated with accommodating growth and providing the necessary facilities and equipment to effectively operate the police service. There may be a medium to longer term need to provide additional space within District based accommodation. There will also be the adoption of flexible working practices, with a subsequent capital cost for IT and equipment, to ensure that police staff and officers remain highly visible in the local communities in which they work.

As Surrey Police provide force wide policing, there are cross boundary infrastructure requirements associated with growth. Any Surrey Police Headquarters accommodation will require adequate space to meet policing needs of the growing population at a force-wide level. This includes as a result of the growth identified in the Tandridge District. There may also be future needs associated with custody provision which are required as a result of development across all Boroughs and Districts in Surrey.

In addition to the extended/unfurnished/new police stations required, there will also be capital costs associated with providing support infrastructure in connection with new development. These support facilities may include additional fleet (in the form of marked and unmarked cars to enable police patrols or operation of our Road Policing Unit); additional IT/Communications (including remote IT facilities to enable more effective policing and carrying out of duties on site, away from local police stations); supporting equipment (such as the provision of Automatic Number Plate Recognition cameras on key transport links in the District and/or CCTV cameras within key locations of Anti Social Behaviour); and the facilities associated with providing new staff with the specialist equipment necessary to carry out their work.

It should be noted that these needs arise due to the number of dwellings proposed, rather than their location. When assessing locations, the incremental development of existing built up areas (e.g. through increasing density of development, or building in peripheral locations to existing settlements), as identified in Scenarios 1 to 5 inclusive, would require new infrastructure, but this is likely to be provided in existing locations. For example, there may be a need to extend existing police accommodation and provide further fleet vehicles to enable further visits, but staff would still be based within the population area they serve e.g. in existing service centres. However, if Scenario 6 were adopted, this would introduce a new population in a new service centre that is not currently served by police infrastructure. Surrey Police would therefore give consideration to a new policing presence in this area, to serve the new community, potentially via a satellite office and provision of crime detection technology (CCTV/VANPR), if required.

Overall, the above resources are considered to fall within the definition of infrastructure, and are necessary to operate an effective police service. As such, it is justified to seek support for provision of these resources in any
new Infrastructure Delivery Schedule, and potential funding of this through the town planning system and the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Cost of infrastructure and identified projects

In order to quantify the impact of strategic growth on the policing operations of Surrey Police, a baseline assessment has been undertaken for the Tunbridge Wells area to identify the current costs of providing an appropriate level of policing and community safety. This has been costed based on crime rates and population data available, and Surrey Police costs for providing a comprehensive policing service. This information has then been used to project the infrastructure costs resulting from policing an increased population, based upon the anticipated housing set out the development scenarios relating to the Local Plan 2013-2033. Further details on the cost formula can be provided, if required.

Based on the development plans, and the anticipated population increase, it has been identified that the cost of policing this anticipated growth equates to a potential Surrey Police infrastructure funding need of approximately £1.15m over the Plan period, which will be utilised for the infrastructure identified in Appendix 1.

It should be noted that these are indicative projects and costs at this stage, based on existing plans and priorities of Surrey Police. Further infrastructure will be necessary in the form of CCTV, dependent upon correlation of specific development sites and existing CCTV coverage, to identify future vulnerabilities. Further work is also to be undertaken to ascertain the costs associated with additional custody provision, required as a result of growth.

The needs and types of infrastructure identified may change over the Plan period, depending on the crime, incidents and policing model at the time development comes forward. Surrey Police therefore seek inclusion of these general infrastructure needs (accommodation, equipment and facilities) in any updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan, to give some flexibility on necessary infrastructure provision over the plan period.

Other funding sources

It is noted that consideration of alternative funding sources will be part of the process in considering funding through CIL. Further information is therefore provided as follows, to enable the Council to consider inclusion of policing infrastructure in any revised Regulation 123 List in due course.

Police Authorities are funded by similar methods used to fund all other Local Authorities and/or other Public Services. The funding allocated to Police Authorities via Home Office grants, the Council Tax precept and other specific limited grants is, in most cases, insufficient to fund in full requests for capital expenditure.

All Forces receive an annual capital grant from the Home Office to help fund their annual capital programme. In practice the grant is insufficient and cannot fund all identified capital needs. Although the Home Office has produced a 'needs based' funding formula to allocate general revenue and capital grant to individual Forces it has, for several years now, declined to allocate broadly flat rate annual funding increases and, more recently, funding reductions to Forces. This inevitably means that some Forces, such as Surrey Police, receive significantly less funding from the Government than it would otherwise receive, had the funding formula been applied in full.

Therefore the only option is to supplement it with alternative local funding sources such as prudential borrowing, reinvestment of capital receipts (necessarily a finite resource), redirection of funds from revenue budgets (increasingly intangible) and the one-off use of reserves or balance surpluses (also limited in scope). Many of these funding options have negative repercussions for policing.

When considering the disposal of force assets, as an alternative funding source, the disposal reflects two main issues; the disposal of assets no longer needed for policing purposes or the sale of an asset to enable a replacement to be procured. The use of the funds generated by such sales is therefore used to reflect the purpose of the sale. Sales from the former are aggregated to provide funds to meet the Force's overall prioritised capital spending plans. This would include, for example, the costs of premises, IT systems or equipment and vehicles. As stated above, these capital receipts are a finite resource and incapable of providing long term funding; especially over the entire Local Plan period. In cases where a replacement asset is sought after disposal, the justification bid would identify a potential capital receipt as a funding source for the acquisition, but in many cases the overall cost of re-provision would be in excess of the sales receipt and would therefore require additional funding.
Overall, the funding allocated and available to police forces is generally insufficient to fund new facilities required as a result of growth. Police forces are therefore having to supplement budgets with alternative local funding sources. Given that policing infrastructure is required to serve and support new development, as evidenced above, and this can be funded through mechanisms within the planning system, these mechanisms are now being actively pursued and considered as a funding source to support the needs of future development. It is therefore considered that inclusion of Surrey Police infrastructure as a type of infrastructure necessary to support development, and potentially funded through the planning system, should be supported.

**Conclusion**

I hope that the above information, and attached Appendix, provide further information on the infrastructure needs of Surrey Police. It is hoped that this enables inclusion within the Infrastructure Delivery Schedule associated with the Local Plan 2013-2033, and subsequent consideration for inclusion within the Regulation 123 List operated in connection with the CIL.

I look forward to working with you further on these matters as formulation of the Local Plan progresses. In the meantime, should you require any clarification or further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Samantha Prior
BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI
Joint Commercial Planning Manager
Surrey and Sussex Police

---

**APPENDIX 1**

**Infrastructure required by Surrey Police to address the impacts of growth in the Tandridge District, October 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Need for Infrastructure</th>
<th>Indicative Cost</th>
<th>Timescale for delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of costs, arising from growth and needs in Tandridge District, for Division based accommodation provided through provision, adaptation and extension of existing Police Stations and any other satellite Neighbourhood policing sites in the District</td>
<td>To provide Neighbourhood, Response and Division based policing to address increase in incidents/crimes generated by development</td>
<td>£19,219 (cost of adapted accommodation per official staff member) x 13 (those staff required as solely dedicated to division) = £245,847</td>
<td>Medium term for general Borough-wide accommodation dependent on building programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of costs, arising from growth and needs in Tandridge District, towards Central and Shared accommodation provided through the provision, adaptation and extension of central shared sites (e.g. Headquarters, Communication Centres, specialist county wide teams on Division)</td>
<td>To provide county wide and specialist policing to support new development and address increase in incidents/crimes generated by development</td>
<td>£19,219 (per official staff member) x 22 (shared staff) = £422,818</td>
<td>Dependent on building programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of fleet vehicles (marked and unmarked cars, vans, and units for Road Policing)</td>
<td>To address increase in incidents/crimes that require increased patrols and on site responses and visit by police officers</td>
<td>£3995 (cost of first per officer) x 17 (number of new officers) =</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision of fleet bicycles</strong> (fully equipped and including some provision of battery assisted bicycles) for use by new/reduced number of officers</td>
<td>£67,915</td>
<td>Dependant on building programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialist equipment and start-up facilities for each officer</strong> (e.g., body worn camera, radio/telecom, specialist safety/detection equipment and training)</td>
<td>£200 (cost of fleet per officer) x 17 (number of new officers) = £3,400</td>
<td>Dependant on building programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialist equipment/training for police staff member, for example uniforms for Control Centre Staff; training on Crime Recording/Niche/Ethics</strong></td>
<td>£17,619 (cost per officer) x 17 (number of new officers) = £295,293</td>
<td>Dependant on building programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Technology Equipment for each police officer, including equipment for on site use, enabling greater visibility</strong></td>
<td>£309,840 (cost per staff member) x 18 (number of new staff) = £5,574</td>
<td>Dependant on building programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Technology Equipment for each police staff member, providing support to officers</strong></td>
<td>£200,000 (cost of equipment per officer) x 17 (number of new officers) = £34,000</td>
<td>Dependant on building programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANPR Cameras</strong> (camera installation and connect to network) – to be located with regard to the delivery of development, and especially in relation to travelling crime and peripheral locations, or on potential new service roads should Scenario E (6000 dwelling Urban Extension) be developed – number of cameras dependant on development locations</td>
<td>£44,000</td>
<td>Dependant on building programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CCTV Cameras</strong> for areas of significant population growth</td>
<td>TBC and dependant on specific locations of development, in relation to existing CCTV and future areas of vulnerability</td>
<td>Dependant on building programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proportion of costs towards Surrey wide custody provision, required as a result of new development</strong></td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>Dependant on building programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL = £1,153,667</strong> + CCTV provision + potential custody cost</td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Sir/Madam,

After considering the draft plans which were issued for comments, please find below our views;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>No action required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>We would need to bolster our Community First Responder (CFR) scheme in Smallfield which may require additional funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>We would need to establish new CFR schemes in Lingfield &amp; Blindey Heath which would require funding as well as bolstering the CFR schemes in Smallfield &amp; South Godstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4</td>
<td>We would need to establish new CFR schemes in Nutfield &amp; Blindey Heath which would require funding as well as bolstering the CFR schemes in Smallfield &amp; South Godstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5</td>
<td>We would need to establish new CFR schemes in Lingfield &amp; Blindey Heath which would require funding as well as bolstering the CFR schemes in Smallfield &amp; South Godstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6</td>
<td>This option would require major changes to the way in which we respond to the whole area and is likely to incur the costs of at least 3 x 24Hr ambulances (36 WTE staff + approximately £300k in vehicles + mechanics time to service and maintain/repair them). In addition, CFRs schemes would be required - also requiring extra funding. Existing cover points may need to be moved as a result - which could incur costs of approximately £100k per location – could exceed 4 locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kind Regards

Steve Elliott
Operational Support Manager - East
SOUTH EAST COAST AMBULANCE SERVICE NHS FOUNDATION TRUST
Fire

From: Paul Otway (mailto:paol.otway@surreycc.gov.uk)
Sent: 05 October 2015 14:03
To: Minnie Ngaluwe
Cc: Keith Harrison, Sarah Thompson
Subject: Fw: Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment - Stage 2 Consultation

Hi Minnie

Please find attached additional comments provided on behalf of SFRS Planning and Resilience team:

“I've been through this and I can’t find anything that I can add really. From a response side we can add this into the modelling we do and look at impact but without the final detail we wouldn't do this work. From a Service perspective any new development towards the north of Tandridge is of interest as we don’t cover that area particularly well as you know (and rely on London Fire Brigade - LFB a fair bit) - but obviously we should adjust our provision around whatever is decided.

Accidental fires do increase with increases in population but I am guessing these are all new-builds so would suspect that this presents a relatively low risk to us. If of course the proposals indicated a large number of elderly population would be likely to move into the area this would obviously impact on our prevention work.”

I am still waiting for comments from the SFRS Service Improvement Manager and will forward once these are received.

Kind regards

Paul

Paul Otway
Group Commander East
Surrey Fire & Rescue Service
Croydon Road, Reigate, Surrey RH2 0EJ
Tel: 01737 224046
Mail: paul.otway@surreycc.gov.uk
15 September 2015

Planning Policy Project Manager

Sent by email to: cli@tandridge.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

TANDRIDGE DISTRICT COUNCIL - LOCAL PLAN 2013 – 2033: INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS AND CAPACITY ASSESSMENT – STAGE 2 CONSULTATION

Thames Water Utilities Ltd (Thames Water) Property Services function is now being delivered by Savills (UK) Limited as Thames Water’s appointed supplier. Savills are therefore pleased to respond to the above consultation on behalf of Thames Water.

As you will be aware, Thames Water is the statutory sewerage undertaker for the western and northern parts of Tandridge District and the statutory water undertaker for a small area in the north of the District and are hence a “specific consultation body” in accordance with the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012. We have the following comments on the consultation document on behalf of Thames Water:

General Comments

From a general point of view, new development should be co-ordinated with the infrastructure it demands and to take into account the capacity of existing infrastructure. Paragraph 156 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012, states: “Local planning authorities should set out strategic policies for the area in the Local Plan. This should include strategic policies to deliver: the provision of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater....”

Paragraph 162 of the NPPF relates to infrastructure and states: “Local planning authorities should work with other authorities to: assess the quality and capacity of infrastructure for water supply and wastewater and its treatment....take account of the need for strategic infrastructure including nationally significant infrastructure within their areas.”

The web based National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) published in March 2014 includes a section on ‘water supply, wastewater and water quality’ and sets out that Local Plans should be the focus for ensuring that investment plans of water and sewerage/wastewater companies align with development needs. The introduction to this section also sets out that “Adequate water and wastewater infrastructure is needed to support sustainable development” (Paragraph: 061, Reference ID: 34-001-20140306).

In order to ensure that the drainage requirements of development proposals are understood and that any upgrade requirements are identified, all developers should be encouraged to contact the relevant sewerage undertaker at the earliest opportunity to establish the following:

Error! AutoText entry not defined. Error! AutoText entry not defined.
The developments demand for wastewater infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met; and
The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and can it be met.

Specific Comments

Due to the limited level of information available to date on the proposed developments i.e. lack of information on numbers and phasing, Thames Water are not able to provide detailed specific comments at this stage. However, Thames Water welcomes the opportunity to work closely with the Authority and developers as the Local Plan evolves to identify the net increase in sewerage demand on our infrastructure.

In general terms, Thames Water’s preferred approach for growth is for a small number of large clearly defined sites to be delivered rather than a large number of smaller sites as this would simplify the delivery of any necessary sewerage/wastewater infrastructure upgrades.

Once further details of the proposed sites are available, Thames Water would welcome the opportunity to meet with the Authority to discuss the sewerage/wastewater infrastructure needs relating to the Local Plan.

Scenario 2b Residential & Commercial – Caterham, Warlingham – drains to Bexhillon Sewage Treatment Works (STW), difficult to comment on network impact without details regarding development size / location. Godstone, Lingfield served by other water company

Scenario 3 - Caterham, Warlingham – drains to Bexhillon STW, difficult to comment on network impact without details regarding development size / location. Oxed drains to Southern Water Network.

Scenario 4 - Godstone, Bletchley Heath served by other water company.

Scenario 5 - Caterham, Warlingham – drains to Bexhillon STW, Smalfield drains to Burstow, Tadfield drains to Longreach STW – difficult to comment on network impact without details regarding development size / location.
(South) Godstone, Lingfield, Oxed, Bletchley Heath drained by other water company.

Scenario 6 – Caterham, Warlingham, Smalfield, Lingfield, South Godstone, Woldingham - More details required to confirm development location and size

A number of Sewage Treatment Works (STWs) serve Tandridge District, and of these:

- Bexhillon STW (located in London Borough of Sutton) is to be upgraded to provide capacity for growth in the catchment. This upgrade will be carried out during the current Thames Water five year business plan period (AMP6, 2018 - 2020).

- Crawley STW (located in Crawley Borough) was upgraded, to provide capacity for growth in the STW catchment, during the previous five year business plan period (AMP5 2010 - 2015).

- No growth upgrades are planned during AMP6 for Burstow, Earlswood and Merstham STWs.

It maybe necessary for new or upgraded water and waste water infrastructure to be provided in respect of individual developments, depending on the type, scale and location of development. It is crucial that any such additional infrastructure is provided in time to service development to avoid unacceptable impacts on the environment such as sewage flooding of residential and commercial property, pollution of land and watercourses. This is the reason that Thames Water seeks adequate policy coverage and support for utilities infrastructure within Local Plans and related planning policy documents.
It is Thames Water’s understanding that it is unlikely that the provision of water and waste water infrastructure could be funded through CIL. Strategic infrastructure is ordinarily funded via the Water Industry Act and the Asset Management Planning (AMP) funding process that is regulated by OFWAT and ultimately comes from Thames Water customer’s bills.

Where water supply and sewerage network constraints are identified in relation to specific development proposals, network upgrades can be delivered in a number of ways. The two most frequently used are either through Thames Water’s 5 year asset plan where growth needs are prioritised against each other and the ones with the greatest need are delivered first or via the requisition route where the developer and Thames Water contribute to the solution which is then delivered.

We trust the above information is useful, please contact me if you have any further questions.

Yours faithfully

David Wilson BA (Hons), BTP, MRTPI
Associate Director Planning
Thank you for your email regarding Stage 2 of Tandridge’s Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment.

As I explained previously, Southern Water is the statutory sewerage undertaker for part of Tandridge District, providing wastewater services to Godstone, Oxed/Hurst Green, Lingfield, Petfold and surrounding rural villages.

It is likely that additional capacity will be required to accommodate some of the growth proposed in Tandridge District.

We have a statutory obligation to provide wastewater services to existing customers and planned new development within our area, as outlined in the National Planning Practice Guidance, ID 34-004-20140906.

Whilst it is likely that new and/or improved wastewater treatment and sewerage infrastructure improvement will be required to serve new development, we are unable to determine exactly what the requirements would be without more detailed information on the location and number of dwellings planned.

Once development sites have been identified in a development plan document, we could undertake modelling to assess whether or not current sewer capacity is sufficient to serve specific strategic sites. This would be carried out on a site by site basis so the exact location and number of units of a development is crucial. We would then be able to advise you on appropriate policies to facilitate the delivery of any requisite local infrastructure in parallel with the development.

Additional wastewater treatment capacity to serve new development can be planned and funded through the water industry’s price review process. The planning authority’s adopted development plan documents and five year supply of housing have informed our planning for the period 2015 to 2020. Future adopted documents will be an important part of our evidence base for the price review in 2019. Adoption provides the planning certainty we require to support proposals to Ofwat.

If you have any further queries please contact me at planning.policy@southernwater.co.uk.

Kind regards

Sarah Harrison
Planning Analyst
Southern Water
Dear Sir or Madam,

Surrey County Council Response Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment - Stage 2 Consultation

Thank you for consulting Surrey County Council on the Tandridge Local Plan Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment Stage 2. We have comments to make regarding education, waste, heritage, and public health. These are included under relevant heading in the annexe attached to this letter.

With regard to transport, there are some areas identified in the approved Local Transport Strategy forward programme for Tandridge need for highway improvements, most notably along the A22 in the Caterham and South Godstone area. These schemes aim to address existing problems rather than to facilitate future development. However, any further development in these areas will clearly increase the need for these schemes.

Our highway and transport teams are currently undertaking a strategic highway assessment for the emerging Tandridge Local Plan and you will be aware that the analysis of the first options by William Bryan’s team is due to be completed soon.

Our contact in the Fire Service needs more time to thoroughly consider the likely impact of the scenario’s on their service as he is in the process of consulting the area teams. Paul Otway is the Group Commander of the East Surrey Fire & Rescue Service. His telephone number is 01737 224049 and email address: paul.otway@surreycc.gov.uk

Likewise our flood risk management team also need more time to consider the proposed scenarios. Alex Davis is the local area contact: alexander.davis@surreycc.gov.uk

You will see that this response includes officer contact details and I would ask you to please copy me in on any correspondence with them. I will likewise keep you informed of any further updates they send through to me and please do let me know if you require any further information.
Please let me know if you have any queries or if you think I can provide you with further information. You can contact me by email at kath.harrison@surreycc.gov.uk, or by phone on 0208 341 9453.
Yours sincerely

Katharine Harrison
Spatial Planning Team
Annexe

Surrey County Council Comments on Tandridge District Council Local Plan 2013-2033: Infrastructure Needs and Capacity Assessment - Stage 2

Education
Primary schools in all areas, apart from South Tandridge (Blindley Heath, Smallfield Lingfield, Dormansland, Felbridge etc) are currently at, or close to capacity. South Tandridge currently has a small amount of surplus (15 places per annum in Reception), which is set to remain relatively consistent on the basis of the current housing projections.

All currently surplus secondary school places will be taken up and the need will exceed current provision by 2018. The County council is therefore looking to put additional places in the system for the 2016/19 academic year (approximately 2FE), after which numbers are currently projected to level-off at this higher figure.

Based on a primary pupil yield rate of approximately 0.25 per unit, any of the options 2b-6 would involve a relatively significant expansion need (in the range of 2-5FE), which may require an entirely new primary school (as opposed to expansions of existing), particularly if the development were to be as concentrated as in Scenario 6. One could also expect the need for a similar level of expansion at secondary.

Waste
The location and amount of development to be provided in the Borough Council’s Local Plan are matters that would be addressed through a review of the Surrey Waste Plan.

Industrial and employment land are generally considered as suitable locations for waste management use, particularly when housed within a building. ‘Scenario 3-5 Commercial’, which seeks to maximise all the existing employment area may reduce the options available for waste infrastructure. This is because of the difficulties experienced previously in finding suitable sites for waste management use in the county and the identified need for additional waste management infrastructure in Surrey, particularly in the east of the County where there are few sites allocated within the adopted Surrey Waste Plan.

Factors that will increase the need for additional waste management infrastructure in Surrey include:

- Pattison Court Land, Redhill is the only non-hazardous landfill remaining in the county. The site is required to be restored by 2030 with infilling anticipated to cease in 2027 in order to allow 3 years to complete the final restoration.
- Surrey has leases with a number of waste facilities outside the county for the treatment of residual municipal waste which will expire in due course.
It is noted that specific sites referred to as options for potential development include Hobbs Industrial Park and Lambs Industrial Estate. Hobbs Industrial Park contains land in existing waste management use which is safeguarded for such use under Surrey Waste Plan Policy DC1. Lambs Brickworks (currently closed) lies adjacent to the industrial estate and has an outstanding restoration condition which would require infilling the remaining void(s) with inert waste. The industrial estate is understood to contain some existing waste uses which could be threatened by any prospect of redevelopment.

Waste planning contact: David Maxwell, email davidmaxwell@surreycc.gov.uk

The County Waste Group Manager has made comments about the potential impact on existing facilities including the Community Recycling Centres at Caterham and Warlingham, (and possibly the materials bulking facility at Earlswood Depot which receives district municipal waste collections from Tandridge). Both are single level sites, which have to be closed for container exchanges so the conditions for current operations are not ideal.

The County Council has looked extensively for an alternative location to replace one or both of these facilities but have been unsuccessful to date.

Further expansion of housing in Tandridge, particularly, north of the M25 will place further strain on these sites and therefore consideration of potential opportunities to relocate one or both Community Recycling Centres would be welcomed. You will be aware that the existing site at Caterham is owned by Tandridge BC and the site at Warlingham is owned by Surrey CC.

To the south of the M25, the nearest Surrey Community Recycling Centre would be Earlswood, near Reigate, which has sufficient spare capacity to cope with additional housing development. The Earlswood Waste Transfer station and bulking facility is newly constructed and would also have the capacity to cope with the proposed new housing.

The Waste Group Manager is Richard Parkinson, email Richard.parkinson@surreycc.gov.uk

Heritage

The scenarios outline a varying amount of development. As a largely reactive service Heritage Conservation might be affected by some or all of these sites coming forward simultaneously whichever scenario is finally selected. However, current planning policy (as set out in the NPFF) requires developers to provide most of the supporting heritage information when submitting a proposal. Under normal circumstances, developers would be expected to engage in pre-application discussion regarding the possible implications for the historic environment of their proposals on a site-by-site basis, and
then submit the appropriate impact and significance assessments as required by national legislation and the relevant local planning policies.

The future development set out in these scenarios would be expected to adhere to the national policy framework in this way. Whilst this might represent pressure over and above the current levels, I do not anticipate that it would be unmanageable given present service capacity. I therefore have no concerns regarding the programmes outlined.

As a note of caution: developers that did not engage in this process could risk costly delays and late-stage alterations to their proposals and schemes of working - I’d strongly recommend that any revised local plan includes an appropriately worded policy and supporting text to emphasise the necessity for early consideration of and consultation on heritage issues.

Public Health

Our Public Health team have produced a response divided into two parts. The first reflects the way in which the plan could affect the commissioning of specific services, the second on how each scenario would impact on the wider health of the population in general.

Commissioned Services

Public Health within Surrey County Council are currently responsible for commissioning some services for local residents, including sexual health, school nursing, health checks, substance misuse and smoking cessation services. From October 2015, we will also be responsible for commissioning the health visiting service for under 5s. These services range from wholly open access, i.e. we are required to fund services regardless of where local residents access them (sexual health), to universal services, i.e. specified service provided to local residents (health visiting) to defined service provision, i.e. service provided to achieve specific outcomes within available resource (school nursing). Substantial increase in housing developments, will put considerable pressure on our services, particularly those offered to children and young people who are likely to form a significant proportion of the new residents.

No. 2b: Scenario 1 + sites within the existing urban areas in the district built at a higher density (70dph)

One of the key issues for East Surrey is that from 2004-2026 the number of people living in east Surrey that are over 80 years old is forecast to increase by 50%. According to the Tandridge Local Plan the population of those above retirement age (65+) will increase from 14,000 to 21,200 which indicates there will be a significant pressure on services required to support older people. From the term ‘high density’ I am unclear what is being built but if flats is a consideration then things to take into consideration when building a large number of flats is that they may be harder to access for those over 65yrs. Such accommodation can also increase the risk of isolation for the elderly.
due to accessibility issues. This can have a profound effect on an older person’s mental health and wellbeing. A recent suicide audit for Surrey identified that 21% of completed suicides were in people over the age of 60 years. It is therefore important that infrastructure is developed which supports people to help themselves and maintain good health and mental wellbeing into old age.

No. 3: Scenario 1 + Scenario 2 + sites that are currently in the Green Belt around the main urban settlements and large rural service settlements (these settlements are Oxted (including Limpstone), Caterham (including Caterham on the hill and Caterham Valley), Warlingham, Whyteleafe, Smallfield, Lingfield and Godstone). Some issues to be mindful of with this scenario is the expansion of the urban area taking away green space which according to NICE guidelines when ‘planning applications for new developments always prioritise the need for people (including those whose mobility is impaired) to be physically active as a routine part of their daily life’. Physical activity and mental health can be greatly affected by a person’s environment.

However, according to the Tandridge Local Plan the quality of play/activity areas is generally considered to be good and the ratio of green space to population is well above the National Playing Fields Association standard.

As well as ensuring there is an appropriate amount of green space it is important to include access to affordable public transport, not just active forms of travel such as walking and cycling. Consideration should be given to adequate cycle storage facilities, including adult tricycles, which can provide a more stable form of active travel for older or disabled people.

No. 4: Scenario 1 + Scenario 2 + sites that are currently in the Green Belt around the rural service settlements and limited service settlements (these settlements are Betchingley, Waldingham, South Nutfield, Dormansland, South Godstone, Tatsfield, Blindley Heath, Limpstone Chart, Nutfield, Felbridge and Old Oxted).

This scenario could increase the number of cars in the area and therefore the congestion on the M25, M23 and A22 increasing air pollution in the area. However, according to the Local Plan the Highways Authority and Surrey County Council have identified a number of schemes across the district to help reduce congestion in areas that will be made worse by future development. Another factor to consider is the importance of physical activity of residents by ensuring that cycling, walking and the use of public transport is encouraged. All forms of physical activity should be encouraged so that the population are able to meet the Chief Medical Officer Physical Activity Guidelines http://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-physical-activity-guidelines

No. 5: Scenario 1 + Scenario 2 + Scenario 3 + Scenario 4 (this scenario is based on maximum capacity).

Please see above

No. 6: A large urban extension of 4,000 homes and 33,500m² at South Godstone
The issues to consider with this scenario are impact on services a large increase in population might have. According to the Tandridge Local Plan Godstone has 3 GPs which may need to increase with the proposed development. There is likely to be an increase in cars in the areas which has the potential to cause congestion on the A22 and M25 resulting in an increase in air pollution.

**No.2a: commercial** Existing sites & No. 2b commercial: Existing sites & No. 3-5 commercial: Maximises all the existing employment area.
The re-generation of commercial sites will provide employment opportunities for the local population which could have a positive impact on mental health. However, things to consider are the importance of accessible green space for people to use during their working day on their breaks as this can support good mental health and wellbeing. The increase of commercial sites could also increase traffic congestion and air pollution which impacts on people's health.

**Affordable homes**
The provision of 'affordable homes' helps with the recruitment and retention of care workers required to support our aging population, a situation which is currently difficult and only likely to get worse. Consideration could therefore be given to designating some properties for key workers.

While increasing the number of dwellings in some of these areas could lead to improvements in public transport, attention should be paid not just to active transport such as walking and cycle but access to affordable public transport in new developments, particularly where those are planned for low-car owning areas.