Cranleigh Parish Council

MINUTES OF THE ONLINE EXTRAORDINARY PARISH COUNCIL MEETING HELD AT 7.00 P.M. ON MONDAY 01 FEBRUARY 2021 VIA GOTO MEETING

Councillors
Cllr E Townsend* (Chairman of the Council)
Cllr N Sanctuary* (Vice Chairman of the Council)
Cllr J Betts*
Cllr R Burbridge
Cllr R Cole*
Cllr R Denton*
Cllr S Jeacock*
Cllr D Nicholas*
Cllr M Scully*
Cllr R Tyler*
Cllr G Worthington*

PRESENT*

ALSO PRESENT: Parish Clerk B Bell FSLCC, 18 members of the public.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
There were no apologies for absence.

2. PUBLIC SESSION
There were no comments or questions by members of the public at this point.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
- Cllr E Townsend declared she is a Waverley Borough Councillor.
- Cllr R Cole declared he is a Waverley Borough Councillor.
- Cllr N Sanctuary declared an interest as Chairman of the Glebelands School Governors.
- Cllr S Jeacock declared that he is a former neighbour of item 6.
- Cllr R Denton declared an interest as a member of Cranleigh Cricket and Football Clubs.
- Cllr D Nicholas declared an interest as a member of Cranleigh Football Club.

4. CHAIRMAN'S REPORT
The Chairman had no report.

5. CLERK'S REPORT
The Clerk had no report.

6. PLANNING APPLICATION WA/2020/0965 – AMENDED PLANS
Erection of a building to provide a 64 bed care home with 16 community beds together with a building to provide 14 health worker accommodation units with access from Knowle Lane, associated parking and ancillary work (revision of WA/2018/1966)

The Clerk gave the following presentation to the Council:

DRAFT

CVHT Invitation to Parish Council Meeting

- 28 July 2020 - Invitation from Parish Council to CVHT to open discussions in the spirit of the exchange of letters 2010 as the hospital had not been built within 5 years
- 07 August 2020 – CVHT declined meeting as they said they are in the midst of a major planning application
- 23 October 2020 – Parish Council again extended an invitation to CVHT to an online meeting in the spirit of the exchange of letters 2010
- 05 November 2020 – CVHT replied to invite two Parish Council representatives and the Clerk to a private meeting as topics commercial in confidence
- 19 November 2020 – Parish Council unanimously welcomed a meeting with CVHT to discuss the future use of the Paddock Field at an online meeting held in public, whilst reserving the right to go into private session for commercially sensitive matters.
- 19 January 2021 – CVHT said their planning consultant is awaiting further input from WBC Planning Dept, so are not in a position to discuss their plans with the Parish Council.

CVHT Current Planning Status

WA/2018/1966 - 80 Bed Care Home including 20 community beds free at point of entry and 26 unit accommodation block.

- SUBMITTED 05/11/2018
- REFUSED 04/12/2019
- APPEALED 21/09/2020
- WITHDRAWN 05/11/2020

WA/2020/0965 - Erection of a building to provide a 64 bed care home including 16 community beds together with a building to provide 14 health workers accommodation units with access from Knowle Lane associated parking and ancillary work (revision of WA/2018/1966).

- SUBMITTED 15/06/2020
- AMENDED PLANS – closing date for comments 05/02/2021

Community Beds Previous Council Response

- The Parish Council had written to Surrey County Council, Surrey Heartlands CCG and CVHT for details about the provision of community beds within the proposed care home.
- The Parish Council felt the ICP response conflicted the response from Surrey County Council.
- The Parish Council does not support planning application WA/2020/0965.
- The Council said that all the additional information requested about the provision and funding of the community beds and the community benefit had not been forthcoming.

Accommodation Block Previous Council Response

- Previously the Council had written to CVHT for clarification of the qualifying criteria for the accommodation block which is proposed for key workers or healthcare workers employed in local health provision. The Council had said there is still no clarity on the legal agreement and connection between the care home and accommodation block.
- CVHT replied to confirm that while CVHT will, indefinitely, retain the freehold of the overall site in perpetuity (with an appropriate lease being granted to HC-One for the Care Home), the ‘accommodation block’ will have no commercial or legal link whatsoever with either HC-One or the 64-bed care home. CVHT said both ‘key workers’ and ‘local healthcare workers’ who work in the care home, or other local healthcare provision, could qualify for occupancy. Furthermore, CVHT will ensure that the Parish Council will be duly apprised of the ultimately selected qualifying criteria (and any subsequent variations thereto) when these are agreed with the Integrated Care Partnership and the potential relevant employers *(e.g. Cranleigh Medical Practice, Cranleigh Village Hospital, and Community Nursing Services)*.

- Councillors wanted a formal link between the care home and accommodation block in a legal agreement, but have not received the assurances they had requested, so are unable to support an accommodation block which is not ancillary to the care home.
- The Council AGREED to submit the additional information regarding the accommodation block to the Planning Inspectorate and Waverley Borough Council in respect of the planning appeal for WA/2018/1966 and planning application WA/2020/0965. In the absence of a legal link between the care home and the accommodation block, the accommodation block is an independent residential development outside the settlement boundary and within the ASVI and the Council does not support planning application WA/2018/1966 and WA/2020/0965.

Parish Council Roles Tonight:

PC has four roles:

- Consultee on planning application – through Planning Committee/Full Council
- Public interest of parishioners
- Adjacent landowner
- Beneficiary of the Covenant

Community Beds Considerations:

- No details on the criteria for the allocation of community beds or legally binding nature of the proposal. Means testing is usually a statutory role.
- No details of the agreement with the Care Home operator (yet to be selected) for refund of 'difference' in fees if a private patient occupies a community bed.
- ICP were never going to be party to the legal agreement on allocation of community beds.
- No details of the Community Bed Board and professional skills for the role, or how this board will be regulated.
- No legally binding agreement or independent oversight for any income generated – regarding grants to Cranleigh, Surrey and the surrounding area within the area covered by the Waverley Primary Care Group and in such other areas as the Trustees think fit. (Charity Commission – area of benefit).

Accommodation Block Considerations:

- No legal link between care home and accommodation block.
- Affordable private rented accommodation – owned by CVHT, how will this be secured in perpetuity? CVHT are not a registered provider.
- This is development beyond the settlement boundary and within the ASVI (landscape designation similar to mini green belt)
- Income generated – grants to Cranleigh and surrounding villages how can this be secured in perpetuity. Note the area of benefit from the Charity Commission is – Cranleigh, Surrey and the surrounding area within the area covered by the Waverley Primary Care Group and in such other areas as the Trustees think fit. (Charity Commission – area of benefit).

CVHT Viability Summary

- Point 1.8 Gross Development Value is £13,740,449. The Total Build Costs (net of funding costs etc) is £10,881,600 (Difference is £2,858,849)
- CVHT Financial Statement 31 August 2019 – The value of the site, including development costs to date, was independently valued by Fairweathers, Chartered Surveyors, as at 31 March 2015, at £2.4 million (this is not the BLV)
- Point 1.14 - In summary we can conclude the development does not generate a surplus over the benchmark land value, and thus the number of open market care home beds is less than is necessary to provide full funding to the community beds and health worker accommodation. The balance of funds required has been pledged by CVHT and local benefactors who wish to see the scheme proceed and the public benefit from these facilities

be realised.

- *How will the balance of funds from CVHT and local benefactors be detailed in the agreement for the care home beds?*

WBC Viability Summary

- Point 1.1.4 - The information supplied to DSP to inform and support this review process has been supplied on behalf of the planning applicant on a confidential basis. *How much has been allowed for the balance of funds from CVHT and local benefactors for the care home beds in this viability report?*
- Point 3.31 assumes HC1 will operate the care home.
- Point 4.1.4 - Therefore, we consider that the scheme is on the margins of viability and is unlikely to be able to support any further planning contributions.

Public Session

Following requests from members of the public, the Chairman agreed a further period of public session.

- A member of the public said that CVHT has no guaranteed care home provider until they have obtained planning permission. What is the long term outlook for the site if no provider is secured? It is now a completely private care home. Concerns were raised about the potential increase in traffic on Knowle Lane making it more dangerous and the impact of light pollution from the accommodation block. The member of the public questioned how a charity could be trusted that refused to meet in public. The Chairman said the Parish Council had been open and unanimously welcomed a meeting with CVHT held in public and would reserve the right to enter private and confidential session if commercially sensitive matters needed to be discussed.
- A member of the public said she is experienced working in the care sector and can see no benefit to the community from this planning application. She said there are NHS beds available at Knowle Park and Cedar Lodge, with a further 20 beds planned at Knowle Park and government plan for keeping people cared for in their own homes. She said she can see no reason for this application, the Parish Council should reclaim the Paddock Field land. The Chairman said in correspondence from Surrey County Council and the Integrated Care Partnership (ICP) they had outlined the new NHS Long Term Plan which is focused on community based care keeping people in their own homes. She added that the Tetlow King letter to WBC makes it clear that the 'free at the point of delivery' community beds means not from the public purse rather than to residents, and that HC-One will not necessarily be the care home provider.

Consultee on the Amended Plans

Councillors expressed the following concerns about the amended plans:

- There is the loss of Clinical Commissioning Group funding.
- Viability seems to be the same.
- Source of money remains unchanged.
- Access to beds is clearer – they are controlled by CVHT.
- Unless Surrey County Council fund individuals, they will have to pay the full price.
- The income difference between private and community beds will be means tested.
- The benefit is potential for 16 beds at local authority rates to Surrey residents, the ICP could still have access the same as other care homes, but now no policy.
- There is no defined developer.
- It does not seem like the benefits have improved; they have got worse.
- The dis-benefits remain the same.
- It is unclear how the difference in fees for private and community beds will be used to fund individuals.

- What is the provision for growth in the future?
- The development is on the cusp of viability and the parish could be left with a white elephant, but there is potential demand.
- There is no certainty over the legal agreements.
- It is not clear what happens to the income from the accommodation block, the original plan was for this income to fund the community beds.
- Who are the local benefactors?
- The case has not strengthened, CVHT should not ignore the community response which is that this care home is not wanted.
- Exception was taken to the tone of the letter from CVHT of 15 December 2020 and questions raised whether the charity is fulfilling its objectives.
- There is a real risk of agreeing the plans now and sorting out the details later, could lead to problems.
- The community beds are no longer free at the point of delivery, as the private beds will not be funding the community beds.
- Is this application an investment vehicle for the benefactors?
- The finances for this project could not ride a fluctuation in the market.
- The accommodation block will make a profit and the funds could be used in the care home or to meet the charity objectives. Capital sums from the benefactor are being used to build the care home which should generate a small amount of income. CVHT do not expect to pay much in to fund the running of the care home and may even make a small profit.
- Do the community want this care home built outside of the settlement boundary on the ASVI?
- It is a risk to challenge it commercially.
- The prices for the accommodation are expensive compared to the affordable accommodation currently available in Cranleigh.
- The development is on cusp of viability and is relying on funding from a benefactor/s.
- Concerns were raised about the role of the benefactor and their continued buy-in to the project.
- The Parish Council cannot rely on tying up loose ends later on, more certainty is needed.
- Without the accommodation block being ancillary to the care home, it is a building on land outside of the settlement boundary. The previous planning application was only granted permission by Waverley Borough Council for the exceptional circumstances to build a hospital. Does this current planning application meet those exceptional circumstances?
- Cranleigh is getting a lot of affordable housing as part of new development and questions were raised about the need for the accommodation block.

The Council AGREED to OBJECT to the amended plans 7 in favour, 1 against and two abstentions. Cllr E Townsend said she would reserve casting her vote for the Eastern Planning Committee at WBC as more information may yet be forthcoming.

The Clerk will draft a response using Councillor comments tonight and circulate to all Councillors prior to submission to WBC.

Public Interest of Parishioners

Councillors expressed the following additional concerns about the amended plans:

- The community beds would not be free at the point of access to the community.
- The income generated can be applied to such as areas at the Trustees think fit, this is very open and the Trustees have changed.
- The loss of the CCG role is a loss of benefit to parishioners.
- The Council and public should know who the local benefactor is and what their role is.
- Whilst we might not expect to see the legal agreement at this stage, we should expect to see heads of terms and clear key principles.

- There is a no contribution to local infrastructure through developer contributions.

Adjacent Landowner

- To repeat previous statement made against the planning application as adjacent landowner.
- The Clerk was asked to check the amended plans to see if access is still required onto the Downs Link as concerns were raised about vehicular access at this point.
- Councillors are very concerned about the impact of this development on the junction of Knowle Lane and the High Street, especially upon the pedestrian crossing point. There is a large volume of traffic at this junction with deliveries to the commercial properties in the vicinity.

Beneficiary of the Restrictive Covenant

The Clerk advised that the Council had previously agreed to take no further action on the restrictive covenant on the Paddock Field until the outcome of the planning application is known.
The Council AGREED to take no further action on the restrictive covenant until the outcome of the planning application is known in a vote: 9 in favour, 1 abstention.

7. YOUR FUND SURREY

The Clerk gave the following presentation provided by Surrey County Council:

- Surrey County Council is building a new relationship with residents, enabling them to do more to help themselves and each other.
- £100m capital funding available over a five-year period
- Bringing community-led place-making projects to life, a focus on wider community benefit, leaving a real legacy
- Residents, community groups, businesses and organisations will be invited to submit proposals and feedback on others' ideas.
- Supports Covid-19 recovery phase, stimulating local communities.
- Application process designed with the input of residents and communities.

The fund is open to community and voluntary organisations, but not to individuals, full criteria on the SCC website. It is a rolling fund with no closing date for applications, first round will be funded in the summer of 2021.

Applicants are encouraged to submit their ideas to the Commonplace to seek community support:

- The Commonplace is used here for ideas creation and development, as well as being an opportunity for applicants to gain community support. https://yourfundsurreymap.commonplace.is/
- Users will place initial ideas geographically on a map of Surrey, filling in key fields such as what their project is and who it will benefit.
- This site will be open all the time and users will be encouraged to share their posted ideas on social media at this stage.

The Council put forward the following ideas for the Clerk to circulate to the Working Party to make a recommendation to the next meeting of Council:

- MUGA
- Skate Park
- Pump Track
- Repair Café
- Tennis Club

- Mountain Bike Trail
- Trim Trail
- Community Centre
- Youth hub
- Community use of the Old Village Hospital building

8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 18 February 2021 at 7.00pm. The meeting closed at 9.11pm

Signature…..……. Date……..