

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

Item	Pg	Para(s)	Errata or Amendment
	9	Background Papers	Reference to the NPPF (March 2012) should refer to the NPPF (July 2021) (latest version).
<b>Both</b>	13		On Index Sheet: Replace items 5.1 and 5.2 with items 4.1 and 4.2 respectively
<b>Application 20/P/02173</b>			
	17		Replace for Parish 'Part of site Worpelsdon.'
	20	2 Formal Recommendation	Add new para at end  'If the application is granted regulation 30 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017, which sets a duty on the local planning authority to inform the Secretary of State, consultation bodies and the public of the final decision, shall be complied with.'
	40	Policies Section	Add after 6.5  'Burpham Neighbourhood Plan Made April 2016.  Only policies B-T 2c: Cycle Routes and BT-T 2f Foot Paths are relevant to this application. '
	20	2	New text at end to say:  'If the application be granted regulation 30 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017, sets a duty on the local planning authority to inform the Secretary of State, consultation bodies and the public of the final decision, shall be complied with.'
	61	Appendix 1 S106 Heads of Terms	The bellmouth to the main access off Clay Lane has dangerous potholes.  Add new HoT. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Improvement to bell mouth of access to Burpham Court Farm to bring to a Safe Standard.</li></ul>
	61	Appendix 1 S106 Heads of Terms	Amend HoT. Reason in italics <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Improvements to the Bowers Lane Bridge, <u>with public access granted by confirmatory deed.</u></li></ul> <i>To ensure that in return for refurbishment a right of access to Burpham Court Farm over the Wey is granted.</i>

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p>Change to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction of a <u>safe</u> controlled pedestrian crossing across Clay Lane</li> </ul> <p><i>Premature to determine form of crossing prior to design and safety audit</i></p> <p>Clay Lane Crossing HOT add Add '<u>and costs of any associated TRO to adjust extent of Jacobs Well speed limit</u>'</p>
<b>Appendix 2</b>	62	Condition 3	<p>Should read in condition: 'The change of use to Public Open Space (intended for SANG purposes) does not apply to the <u>following</u> areas:'</p>
	49	Condition 3	<p>Change to <u>60</u>DbA.</p> <p>Typo</p>
	63	Condition 5	<p>Linked to above a Grampian Element is needed so the SANG cannot operate until the safe access is provided.</p> <p>Correct typo 'a minimum of <u>two</u> DDA wide bays.'</p> <p>Add at end of condition.</p> <p>'In addition, the Car Park shall not be opened for public access until the planning obligation for improvement to the bellmouth has been implemented.'</p>
	49	Condition 6	<p>Amend wording: add words in underline to final sentence.</p> <p><u>The</u> management plan shall be carried out and maintained thereafter <u>in accordance with the approved details</u>.</p>
	51	Condition 8	<p>Delete first para.</p> <p>Added in error from report.</p>
	66	Condition 14	Correct Typographic Error 'Public Open <u>S</u> pace'
<b>20/P/02155</b>			
	83	Formal Recommendation	Replace with

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p>'Subject to the objections of the Statutory Consultees set out below being withdrawn: - <del>Highways England National Highways</del> <del>Surrey County Council (Highways Authority)</del></p> <p>That this application be GRANTED subject to securing a planning obligation with the heads of terms as set out in Appendix 1, and subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 2, for the reasons set out in this report, with the proviso that should there be objections from the above statutory consultees that cannot be resolved, the application is returned to the Committee for redetermination.</p> <p>That the Head of Place (or person with acting authority thereof) is delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the committee's decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions and/or informatives), <u>in consultation with the Chairman of Planning Committee</u>, prior to a decision notice being issued, provided <u>that those persons are the Head of Place (or person with acting authority thereof)</u> is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the committee. <u>Where any such changes to the decision are made Group Leaders, the Lead Councillor for Development Management and Ward Councillors for Stoke Ward shall be notified before the final decision is issued.</u> <del>where necessary in consultation with the Chairman of the Planning Committee and lead Ward Members for Stoke Ward.</del></p> <p>That upon completion of the planning obligation, the application be determined by the Head of Place. That if negotiations on the planning obligation are not successfully concluded within six months of the date of the committee decision the Head of Place (or person with acting authority thereof) be authorised to refuse the scheme on grounds lack of provision of the matters that would have been secured in the heads of terms set out in Appendix 1.</p>
--	--	--	--

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p><u>If the application is granted regulation 30 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017, which sets a duty on the local planning authority to inform the Secretary of State, consultation bodies and the public of the final decision, shall be complied with.</u></p> <p>Replace 'Highways England' through rest of report with 'Highways England (Now National Highways).' Other than in consultation replies section.</p>
	40	6.5.1	<p>Add to list of saved policies</p> <p>CF1, CF2, CF3, CF4 Community Facilities</p>
	89	5.1.7	<p>Replace with <u>Royal Surrey NHS Foundation Trust 23.6.2021</u> (No objection subject to acute care contribution) 'The Weyside Urban Village will have a significant impact on our GP and community services in the area as we estimate at this stage it will create an additional 3100 patients once fully developed. In General Practice terms this equates to c1.9 FTE GPs plus associated supporting clinical and admin staff.' Contribution required of £3,185,854.50.</p> <p><u>NHS Surrey Heartlands Clinical Commissioning Group</u> The CCG and local Guildford and Waverly Integrated Care Partnership (ICP) has already initiated business case development to address a number of existing and emerging GP and Community services premises issues for the local GP Primary Care Network impacted, and this included the Weyside Urban Village area. An initial CCG feasibility study 2019/20 has identified an option to develop our NHS Property Services site – the Jarvis Centre - as a suitable location to create new GP and Community services capacity. The key GP Practices impacted will be Woodbridge Hill Surrey, Guildowns Group, and to a lesser extent Fairlands Surgeries. The NHS (ICP/CCG) is looking to commence our OBC stage to consider our 'North Guildford' GP premises requirement in the next few months. It would be good to discuss if there are alternative sites within the proposed development area that provide good access and</p>

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p>good value and how best for the future Weyside growth can be accommodated. We will include engagement on WUV within our project brief to ensure the essential factors are included.'</p> <p>They have suggested a figure for capital provision towards primary, intermediate and mental health provision – capital only – which is included in the appendix 1 proposed Heads of Terms.</p>
	80	1.3.4	Typo - Reference to SDF SDP should be to SDF SPD
	81	1.4.1	Amend to  '  The scheme complies with the requirements of site allocation A24 ( <u>considered as a whole</u> ) within the development plan.
	81	1.4.4	This should read 'The scheme complies with the development plan in all other respects, and as a whole; however, policy compliance is subject to the application of the planning obligation heads of terms, and the planning conditions, as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 of this report respectively.'
	85	3.1.1	This paragraph should read –  'Planning applications were approved in May and June 2020 for the provision of new allotment facilities at Aldershot Road and North Moors respectively to accommodate allotment holders who would be displaced from Bellfields Allotments (refs: 20/P/00197 and 20/P/00478). Taken together with the allotment plots proposed to be re-provided at Bellfields, these new facilities have the capacity to facilitate re-provision of the allotments in their entirety and at reasonably accessible locations. However, Secretary of State consent under section 8 of the Allotments Act 1925 is also necessary prior to any change of use or disposal of statutory allotment land (section 8). '
	168	7.8.11	Replace with

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

		<p>'Planning deals with land uses not land users and conditions are proposed on both the club and cycle facility to ensure replacement provision of the land use, temporary where necessary in order to comply with saved policy CF2 and the paragraph 93 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Regarding the Bike Hub . Clear legal advice has been received that Bike Project Surrey provides a community facility as a Bike Hub and that both local plan policy CF2 and NPPF para 93 apply. As the Councils website states "It provides a range of <u>other community benefits</u> too, for example the supply and service of cycles for disabled children, opportunities for those with learning difficulties, bikes for those in need of transport for work and Duke of Edinburgh volunteering placements".</p> <p>Paragraph 93 of the NPPF would be engaged in any event regardless of arguments put forward by the applicant, because it also separately refers to "other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments" — which this clearly is as— and to "valued facilities and services" — which this, again, clearly is. Paragraph 93 requires the council to "plan positively for the provision and use of community facilities" and to "guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services".</p> <p>CF2 says that the council will resist the loss of community buildings or uses unless it is demonstrated that the retention of the building has been fully explored; or, adequate alternative provision exists or is made available. Officers consider the applicants suggested gap in provision for the bike hub (from 2022 when the current use has to cease due to new sewer works and 2027/8 when the local centre and a new mobility hub opens to breach policy CF2 due to a 5-6 year gap in alternative cycle hub provision. Officers are not satisfied that a site search has not been undertaken to find alternate site premises and hence a condition is needed to make the scheme national policy and local plan compliant. Hence the need for a temporary replacement for the use, proposed by condition 17.'</p>
--	--	--

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p>To deal with applicants late challenge to this condition and following legal advice on the response.</p>
	174	7.9.1	<p>The following should be added to the start of paragraph 7.9.1 – <u>'As stated in paragraph 6.1.2 of this report, Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires local planning authorities, in determining planning applications, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.</u></p> <p><u>In addition, the NPPF includes Chapter 16, 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment', which sets out a framework for decision making in planning applications relating to heritage assets (which includes conservation areas) and has been taken into account by officers in preparing this report.</u></p> <p><u>Paragraph 195 of the NPPF states that 'Local planning authorities should identify and assess the particular significance of any heritage asset that may be affected by a proposal (including by development affecting the setting of a heritage asset) taking account of the available evidence and any necessary expertise. They should take this into account when considering the impact of a proposal on a heritage asset, to avoid or minimise any conflict between the heritage asset's conservation and any aspect of the proposal.'</u></p> <p><u>Paragraph 197 of the NPPF states that, in determining applications, LPAs should take account of (a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; (b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic viability; and (c) the desirability of new development in making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.</u></p> <p><u>Paragraph 199 of the NPPF states that 'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any</u></p>

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p>potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.’ Paragraph 200 goes on to note that ‘any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification’. Paragraph 201 of the NPPF sets out guidance where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset and paragraph 202 of the NPPF states ‘Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.’ Conservation areas are designated heritage assets and this guidance therefore applies to the Wey &amp; Godalming Navigations Conservation Area. (new wording underlined)</p>
	176	7.9.22	<p>A sentence should be added at the end of this paragraph to read – <i><u>‘In line with paragraph 203 of the NPPF, the effect of this application on the significance of this non-designated heritage asset has been taken into account by officers in determining the application and a balanced judgement formed having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset in reaching the recommendation to approve the application.’</u></i></p>



## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

	177	7.9.23	<p>The second sentence onwards of paragraph 7.9.23 should form a new paragraph (7.9.23a) and be amended read – <u>'Officers also consider that there would be less than substantial harm to the Wey and Godalming Navigation Conservation Area. In line with paragraph 202 of the NPPF, as less than substantial harm has been identified to the Wey and Godalming Navigation Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. Careful detailed design of buildings could offset some of this less than substantial harm and be considered alongside other potential public benefits such as high-quality urban design. Without detailed designs however the public benefits are those of the scheme as a whole, in particular housing delivery, employment provision and promotion of active travel measures. These public benefits as a whole outweigh the less than substantial harm to the Wey and Godalming <u>Navigation</u> conservation area.'</u> (new text underlined</p>
	219	7.14.94	<p>Replace with following. Reason, to provide a fuller explanation as requested as to the status of the non-planning Allotment Act process.</p>

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			<p>Regarding the impact on the existing Bellfields Allotments; The applicant has stated that discussions with Guildford allotment Society (GAS) have been underway since 2004 surrounding the relocation of the allotments and discussions continued through to the local plan consultation and at GAS/GBC allotment meetings. Discussions commenced in August 2019 to establish a relocation site for the allotments. A site at North Moors was purchased for potential use as allotments. Whilst the GAS were not pleased that the allotments were to be moved, they acknowledged that if they were to be moved then they would like to be party to the design of the new facilities. GAS were involved in the design of the new facilities on both North Moors and Aldershot Road. Both sites now have planning permission.</p> <p>The Allotments Act 1924 process for loss of and relocation of Allotment Plots is not a planning matter; however, it is useful to explain the process. On the 12th February 2020 and following the design and due diligence a section 8 application was made to the Secretary of State for the relocation of Bellfields Allotments in its entirety. On 3rd September 2020, the SOS issued the decision on whether the statutory criteria had been met. Following the SOS refusal, the applicants undertook a consultation process with the intention of remedying the refusal reasons and a section 8 application allotments Act new application made on 23rd June 2021. A response from SOS is awaited on the second application. The Planning Matter here is compliance with policy on replacement allotments as open space. This is dealt with in detail later in the report.</p>
	244		No text on page 244 should be underlined apart from subheading 7.6.81 Electric Vehicles
	249	Add new para after 7.16.111	7.16.111a Following further discussion with the Highways authority about the enforceability of the above measures, and on going discussions with them concerning a review mechanism for parking, it has been agreed that the best mechanism would be as part of a wider regular review of the document what sets

## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

			standard for the scheme. This would require the standards by phase to be placed in the design code (a revised design code is required by condition in any event), the code review examining the past success or failure of standards and design as a whole. This flexible, pragmatic compromise is acceptable to GBC and SCC and is recommended as part of the condition on reviewing design codes. This way members can be assured there is a back stop on parking they can control to ways, through their controlling of private road parking enforcement and the review mechanism for the design code.
	250	7.6.113	Replace final sentence with “The County have stated in the event of planning permission being granted they have recommended heads of terms and conditions. They have not issued any formal objection.”
	252	7.17.13	Should not be underlined
	272		<p>Replace text paragraph after table with:</p> <p>‘For those strategies marked with an Asterix, revised versions of each document shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to commencement of any development other than initial site preparation and groundwork, and those revised documents as approved shall be substituted in this table. Variation shall not deviate from the scope of the permission or lead to materially different significant environmental effects to those assessed in the Environment Statement without any fresh consent/assessment required to be.’</p> <p>Correction of errors.</p>
	467	HoT 25	Replace Head of Term 25 with below

<b>25. a &amp; b</b>	a. GBC to transfer primary care	a. Primary Care Contribution towards local primary health care	a. Either on site primary Care GP surgery or alternate financial provision based on formula formula approach <b>£1,413,002 Capital £941 per unit</b> , for
----------------------	---------------------------------	--	--

**Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

**Update/Amendment/Correction/List**

	<p>funds to CCG,.</p> <p>b. Acute care funds to Royal Surrey Hospital NHS Trust.</p>	<p>needs of the development's new residential population.</p> <p>b. Acute Care Contribution towards Royal Surrey Hospital health care services arising from the development's new residential population</p>	<p>Primary Care, Intermediate care, and mental health capital facilities</p> <p>b. Formula approach for acute Care. based on Healthy Urban Development Unit model, Coplug Model or Equivalent (to be agreed) pro rata for population, but only accounting for primary care capital outputs of model=, and other CIL reg 122. Compliant costs to be agreed..</p> <p>Each to be paid prior to first occupation of the development for a relevant phase.</p>
--	--	--	---

**Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

**Update/Amendment/Correction/List**

<b>Appendix 2</b>	294	Condition 48	Add at end  'that the parking management plan shall be thereafter permanently retained and maintained, subject to any changes agreed through the agreed design code review process.'
	297	Condition 53	Replace With  'No development shall commence in any phase until a Construction Logistics Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to include details of: (a) parking for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors (b) loading and unloading of plant and materials (c) storage of plant and materials (d) programme of works (including measures for traffic management) (e) provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones (f) HGV deliveries and hours of operation (g) vehicle routing (h) measures to prevent the deposit of materials on the highway (i) before and after construction condition surveys of the highway and a commitment to fund the repair of any damage caused (j) measures to prevent conflict with school drop off and pick up times (k) on-site turning for construction vehicles  Only the approved details shall be implemented during the construction of the development. '  As Agreed with SCC.
		New Condition	Add new condition after condition 58 Outline Section  <b>59. Odour Control From Existing STP (pre-Occupation condition)</b> Prior to the occupation of residential properties within 393 metres of the boundary of the

**Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

**Update/Amendment/Correction/List**

			<p>existing Guildford Sewage Treatment Works (STW), alongside the reserved matters application for the part of the site currently occupied by allotments or the Council Depot or the former sludge lagoons, a written statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, alongside the aforesaid reserved matters application(s) for appearance, which shall either demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i) that no significant adverse odour impacts from the existing Guildford Sewage Treatment Works (STW) will arise that are likely to harm future occupants of these residential properties; or</li><li>ii) if any temporary significant odour impacts are identified which are likely to be present until such time as the odorous elements of the STW are decommissioned, or are the subject of mitigation in accordance with regulatory requirements in relation to the existing STW then:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) either appropriate mitigation measures shall be secured and will be implemented for the duration of any such impacts, or</li><li>b) the decommissioning of the odorous elements of the existing STW have been completed or are the subject of mitigation in accordance with regulatory requirements in relation to the existing STW prior to occupancy of such residential properties.</li></ul></li></ul> <p>Reason: To ensure residential amenity of future residential properties.</p> <p>Add one to numbering of all subsequent conditions and correct (condition x to condition y) Text of Sections one of four inclusive conditions sections</p>
	304	Condition 72	<p>Change first sentence to</p> <p>‘As part of the Reserved Matters application for layout of each phase, details shall be provided of secure and covered storage accessible to, for</p>

**Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

**Update/Amendment/Correction/List**

			apartments, or within the curtilage of, each dwelling that does not have access to a garage.'
	305	Condition 73	<p>Replace with</p> <p>No phase of the development hereby approved shall be first unless and until space has been laid out within the site in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for vehicles to be parked within that phase. Thereafter the parking areas shall be retained and maintained for their designated purpose.</p> <p>No phase of the development hereby approved shall be occupied unless and until at least 75% of the available parking spaces within that phase are provided in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.</p>
	305	Condition 74	Replace second bullet with '20% of unallocated car parking spaces, or whatever % per phase is agreed through the agreed design code mechanism, to be fitted with 1 fast charge socket'
	310	Condition 85	<p>Replace with</p> <p>'The proposed Woking Road access shall be right turn in only with no egress, and right turn in only for buses, as shown on drawing 18179-ma-im-depo-dr-c-0100 rev p03. The revised access shall be fully implemented before occupation of any part of the former Sewage Treatment Works site.'</p> <p>Change to correctly describe bus turning restriction agreed with Highways Authority.</p>

**Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

**Update/Amendment/Correction/List**

	310	Condition 86	<p>Details of the bus gate (which shall allow for the passage of buses, pedestrians and cyclists), including its position in relation to access to adjacent uses shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to occupation of the new industrial area off Moorfields Road or the residential areas accessed off Slyfield Green. The bus gate shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details before any part of the new industrial area or Gypsy and Travellers site is occupied. ‘</p> <p>Clarification sought by SCC</p>
--	-----	--------------	---

20/P/02155 Appendix 1 Weyside Urban Village s106 Heads of Terms

Item	Page	Para(s)	Errata or Amendment
4.2	261	HOT ref: 4	Detail column: remove “pursuant to the” Remove square brackets from 100 units
4.2	261	HOT ref: 4	Detail column: Remove square brackets from 100 units
4.2	262	HOT ref: 11	Requirement: Off-site playing pitch and outdoor sports provision Detail column: “a minimum provision of 5.3ha for a playing pitch and outdoor sports to be provided by the applicant at a location to be agreed with the LPA”
4.2	263	HOT ref: 16	Insert into detail column: “To submit for approval by the LPA a site-wide plan which sets out the parameters for the scheme in principle” prior to first occupation of the development” Remove square brackets from number of car club spaces: 3 Correct typo so that obligation reads “covenant restricting on site residents from applying...”
4.2	264	HOT ref: 17	Detail column to read: “An appropriate contribution is necessary to aid the funding of sustainable transport schemes in the vicinity of and relating to the use of the site to help improve the accessibility of the site by modes alternative to the private car”.
4.2	264	HOT ref 19:	Detail column to read: “trigger for delivery will be prior to occupation of a specified number of residential units on the whole site. Where necessary, this will include obligation to use reasonable endeavours to enter into a s278 agreement. SCC to confirm the appropriate trigger to be approved by the LPA”



## Planning Committee

20 October 2021

### Update/Amendment/Correction/List

4.2	264	HOT ref 20:	<p>Requirement column: “A public transport contribution towards provision and operation of a new bus route”</p> <p>Detail column to be updated to read: “A public transport contribution of £1,541,482 towards provision and operation of a new bus service payable in instalments prior to First Occupation of the Development and at subsequent milestones for a defined period, such contribution to be applied towards continued operation of the bus service. In respect of longer term funding, inclusion of a mechanism to assess the need for and to contribute to ensuring continuity of provision via a Sustainable Funding Mechanism for a defined period, or an annual payment by the Owner for a defined period, in either case to be agreed in the s106 agreement subject to an appropriate cap.”</p>
4.2	265	HOT ref 21:	<p>Note: numbering to be updated. Offsite Highway Works to become HOT ref 22.</p> <p>Requirement column: remove “n” typo in final bullet point</p> <p>Detail column; amend to read “obligations to enter into a s278/38 agreement with SCC to deliver the relevant works prior to commencement of development of a relevant phase in accordance with a phasing plan for the Off-site Highways Works. Phasing plan to be approved by the LPA and Off-Site Highways Works to be approved by CHA”</p> <p>Note: relevant works to be carried out prior to the commencement of development on each phase.</p> <p>Remove “Final bullet point relates to crossing referred to in condition.”</p>
4.2	266	HOT ref 22	<p>Note: amend Early Years Contribution to be HOT ref 23</p> <p>Detail column to read: “Early Years Contribution (taken from the SCC pupil yield calculator and currently estimated at £1,043,228) or appropriate works in kind to a specification (proportionate to the number and housing mix of units) to be agreed with SCC and approved by the LPA. Financial contribution to be paid to SCC which is proportionate to the number and housing mix of units prior to Commencement of Development of each residential phase”</p>

**Planning Committee**

**20 October 2021**

**Update/Amendment/Correction/List**

4.2	266	HOT ref 23	<p>Note: amend Primary Education Contribution to be HOT ref 23</p> <p>Detail column to read: "Formula approach to be used. Primary education contribution (taken from the SCC pupil yield calculator and currently estimated at £3,260,400 based upon average pupil yields) to be recalculated and based upon actual pupil yields when the housing mix is agreed with LPA. Financial contribution to be paid to SCC which is proportionate to the number and housing mix of units upon Commencement of Development of 601st unit on the Site"</p>
4.2	267	HOT ref 25	<p>Note: amend to HOT ref 26 a) and 26 b)</p> <p>a) GBC to transfer primary care funds to CCG Requirement: Primary Care Contribution towards local primary health care needs of the development's new residential population Detail: Formula approach for primary care. Either on site primary Care GP surgery or alternate financial provision based on Healthy Urban Development Unit model, Coplug Model or equivalent (to be agreed) pro rata for population, but only accounting for primary care capital outputs of model.</p> <p>b) Acute care funds to Royal Surrey Hospital NHS Trust Requirement: Acute Care contribution towards Royal Surrey Hospital health care services arising from the development's new residential population Detail: Formula and appropriate contribution to be approved by the LPA pursuant to delegated authority pending detail review of the NHS Trust request relating to operational expenditure in order to ensure compliance with regulation 122.</p>