

**MINUTES of the SURREY HILLS AREA OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL BEAUTY (NATIONAL LANDSCAPE) BOARD (SURREY HILLS BOARD) held at 1:30pm on 3 December 2025 at Templeton Room, Juniper Hall FSC, Old London Rd, Mickleham, RH5 6DA**

**MEMBERS PRESENT = \***

<p><b>Independent Chair</b> Kathy Atkinson*</p>	
<p><b><u>Core Members</u></b>  <b>Councillor Catherine Young*</b> Guildford Borough Council  <b>Councillor Roger Adams*</b> Mole Valley District Council  <b>Councillor Nadean Moses*</b> Reigate and Banstead Borough Council  <b>Councillor Catherine Sayer*</b> Tandridge District Council  <b>Councillor Ruth Reed*</b> Waverley Borough Council  <b>Councillor Marisa Heath*</b> Surrey County Council  <b>Stephen Rudd*</b> Natural England  <b>Stephanie Fudge*</b> The National Trust</p>	<p><b><u>Delivery Partners</u></b>  <b>Michael Coughlin*</b> Surrey Hills Enterprises Community Interest Company  <b>Gordon Jackson*</b> Surrey Hills Society and Surrey Hills Trust Fund</p> <p><b><u>Advisory Members</u></b>  <b>Mike Waite*</b> Surrey Wildlife Trust  <b>Tom Peters</b> National Farmers Union  <b>John Goodridge*</b> Campaign to Protect Rural England  <b>Lucy Charman*</b> Country Land and Business Association  <b>Deborah Sherry*</b> Surrey Association of Local Councils</p> <p><b><u>Observer</u></b>  <b>Alison Clarke, Jo Bradshaw*</b> Surrey Hills Arts</p>

---

**RECONFIRMATION OF CHAIR**

The Board unanimously agreed to confirm Kathy Atkinson as Independent Chair for a further year, subject to the outcome of the proposed Governance Review.

The proposal was seconded by Ruth Reed (Waverley Borough Council) and Catherine Sayer (Tandridge District Council).

**1. CHAIR'S WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chair, Kathy Atkinson, welcomed Members and observers to the meeting and thanked everyone for attending.

The Chair made the following announcements:

- Positive news was reported from Defra regarding National Landscapes, with confirmation of a forthcoming three-year funding settlement anticipated. The funding was expected to cover core costs, including key staff posts such as the Director, Planning Advisor, Communications Lead, and Administrator.
- The repeal threat to the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act had re-emerged under the Nuclear Task Force Recommendation 19, despite a previous amendment to the Planning and Infrastructure Bill having been withdrawn. This would require continued monitoring, with the National Landscapes Association prepared to respond should the threat progress.
- An update was provided on the boundary extension project, with the notice period having commenced on 20 December and due to run until 14 January.
- The Management Plan had been adopted by all District and Borough councils. Surrey County Council had a brief delay due to Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). Final adoption was expected at full Cabinet on the 16 December 2025.
- Concerns were raised regarding planning decisions both locally and nationally, particularly in relation to housing pressures and recent Planning Inspectorate decisions that appeared to give reduced weight to evidence where representatives were not present at inquiries. This was considered a concern given limited planning capacity at national landscape level. Further discussion was to follow under a later agenda item.
- Emma Cole, Communication Lead, Surrey Hills National Landscape, would be leaving at the end of January to take up a new role. Thanks were recorded for her four years of service, and recruitment to her post would commence urgently.
- The recent symposium was positively reviewed, and thanks were extended. It was noted that the ideas generated at the event would inform the National Lottery Heritage Fund bid.

---

## **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received by Councillor Claire Malcomson (with Councillor Roger Adams substituting for Mole Valley District Council), and Josh Redford & Tom Peters (National Farmers Union)

---

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None declared.

---

## **4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2025 were approved, subject to an amendment to the attendance record to reflect that Kathy Atkinson was present.

---

## 5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None.

---

## 6. GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

The Chair, Kathy Atkinson, introduced the item.

- Thanks were recorded to Stephen Rudd for chairing the Governance Sub-Group and working with Resources for Change, who had presented their report in March.
- It was noted that the current proposal differed from the original recommendation, reflecting constructive engagement and feedback from members over several meetings.
- The Board had considered the proposals in March, June and September, with an additional dedicated meeting held in early November. It was reported that the structure had undergone several iterations and now better reflected members' concerns, questions and objectives

Rob Fairbanks, Surrey Hills National Landscape Director gave further context.

1. The Officer asked the Board to consider Appendix 1, the draft Terms of Reference and the proposed Constitution for the Surrey Hills National Landscape Partnership Board.
2. Context was provided regarding the longstanding national debate on governance, funding and hosting arrangements for Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, including recommendations arising from the Glover Review (2019) and ongoing discussions within Defra. It was noted a current issue was most National Landscapes remained hosted by local authorities which presents challenges such as pressure on local authority finances.
3. The legal structure was tied in to being a Local Authority Joint Advisory Committee with the executive functions retained within the hosting accountable body. The proposed structure therefore retained the advisory model rather than creating an Executive Management Board as previously recommended by Resources for Change.
4. It was highlighted that the proposals needed to remain flexible in light of LGR impacts, the possible creation of mayoral authorities, and the proposed boundary extensions for the Surrey Hills, which would introduce additional local authorities and stakeholders.
5. The recommended governance structure was to create a new and extended Partnership Board to be more inclusive and representative (it was highlighted that some key sectors and organisations were not currently represented on the current Board such as the Environment Agency) and creation of a Steering Group with representation from all local authorities.
6. It was proposed to hold two Partnership Board meetings per year, and confirmed that the annual tour would continue, providing an on-site opportunity to network and observe Surrey Hills projects and impact.
7. The Steering Group would provide scrutiny, advice, and support, including oversight of business planning, staff management, and collaboration.
8. The Partnerships Board's role would be primarily convening, rather than delivering projects, given that it does not own or manage land. The need to prioritise actions within the Management Plan was highlighted, using members to chair and support working groups.
9. The National Landscape core team would comprise a Surrey Hills National Landscape Director, a Planning Advisor, a Communications Lead, and an Administrator post, supported by a wider flexible team and external partners. This

- arrangement was intended to ensure the capacity and expertise needed to support the governance structure and deliver the secretariat functions effectively.
10. It was noted Annex 1 provided a more detailed view of the draft Terms of Reference for the Partnership Board and associated structures.
  11. The Chair asked for comments from the Board before the Terms of Reference could be signed off. A Member raised a concern that broadening the Partnership Board could make meaningful engagement more challenging. It was questioned whether limiting meetings to two per year reflected best practice. It was agreed that engagement across a broad range of stakeholders required focused work through task and finish (working) groups. This would enable Partnership Board Members to contribute beyond the two formal meetings per year, providing input on significant plans, policies, and strategies as needed. The wording in the Terms of Reference would reflect a minimum of two meetings per year, with additional meetings scheduled as required.
  12. A Member asked about leadership roles within the Partnership Board and Steering Group, noting that if the Board Chair also chaired the Steering Group, they could not effectively scrutinise their own work. The Member emphasised the importance of consistent leadership to maintain focus, accountability, and depth of engagement, suggesting that other individuals could step up to provide additional leadership.
    - a. In response, it was noted that the Steering Group could determine its own leadership, with potential for a local authority representative to share the Chair role. Various options were acknowledged, including continued independent chairing or greater engagement from local authority partners. The need to address potential gaps arising from transitions, such as unitary authority changes, was highlighted.
    - b. It was further emphasised that the Chair should be able to steer, hold the group to account, and reflect on performance. Clear Terms of Reference would define leadership expectations, ensure the group's effectiveness, and provide opportunities for shared representation where necessary.
  13. A Member asked whether future representatives from East Hampshire, the Heritage/National Trust, or Environment Agency should be included on the Partnership Board, noting they were not currently listed.
    - a. It was confirmed that the revised Steering Group Terms of Reference allow flexibility to invite stakeholders for specific agenda items. With the extension and new land/stakeholders, the Terms of Reference would be updated to ensure East Hampshire and the London Borough of Croydon are included once confirmed.
  14. It was noted that the Terms of Reference should remain flexible and responsive, allowing for adjustments as needed. Members agreed it is important to retain the ability to make timely decisions and respond to urgent matters. The Chair suggested that an annual review could be conducted to ensure the Terms of Reference remain effective, without requiring full revision each year.
  15. A question was raised about the reporting structure of the National Landscape staff team, noting that while the team formally reports to the Partnership Board, day-to-day oversight may sit with the Steering Group.
    - a. It was clarified that: the team was independent in culture reporting to the Partnership Board and legally accountable for day-to-day operational issues through line management within Surrey County Council. ; The distinction between formal reporting and daily operational oversight was emphasised to avoid confusion. It was noted an organogram showed both accountability to the Board and practical delegation through the Steering Group as well as indicating how annual programme responsibilities were structured.

16. A discussion took place regarding the next steps for approving the revised Terms of Reference. The Board agreed the Terms of Reference, noting that they required final approval by the relevant Local Authorities.

**Resolved:**

The Board:

1. Agreed the terms of reference, subject to approval by the relevant Local Authorities
2. Advised on membership of the Partnership Board
3. Agreed the recruitment of an Administrator as part of the core team, subject to business case

---

## **7. MANAGEMENT PLAN**

Rob Fairbanks, Surrey Hills National Landscape Director, introduced the item.

1. Rob Fairbanks reported that delivery continued to align with the Management Plan, supported by quarterly monitoring. A five-year review of progress had been completed (Annex 1).
2. The new Management Plan had gone through all the boroughs and districts to be adopted and was due to be considered by Surrey County Council Cabinet on 17 December. No issues were anticipated, but publication was being held pending formal confirmation, partly in light of local government reorganisation considerations.
3. The Management Plan introduced a 75-year vision rather than a five-year plan. It set strategic targets focused on thriving nature, climate change mitigation and adaptation, enhancing beauty and heritage, and engagement with the natural environment. The policy framework guided responsible bodies in fulfilling the duty to seek to further the purpose of the protected landscape.
4. The Plan will be published primarily online, with a PDF version available.
5. The Board were advised that an Executive Summary document would be also be published, presenting the 75-year vision, strategic targets, and policy framework. This would be circulated to Members, local authorities, and responsible bodies as a reference document, with further detail available within the full Management Plan online.
6. A public-facing document had also been published, setting out how individuals can support and contribute to conserving and enhancing the Surrey Hills.
7. Members were invited to provide comments on the Executive Summary and Annex 1.
8. The Chair raised concerns regarding Pillar One, noting that monitoring landscape change is a significant and resource-intensive task, and questioning how meaningful impact would be achieved without additional capacity. Under Pillar Three, concern was also expressed about the ongoing impact of illegal use of byways and the increasing loss of dark skies due to LED lighting. The Chair emphasised that dark skies should be treated as a priority in the next plan period, given the long-term and potentially irreversible impact on the landscape.
9. Under Pillar 5 (Planning), concern was raised about increasing pressure from progressing Local Plans, planning reforms, and potential extension impacts. It was noted that development pressures, including “grey belt” applications within the

National Landscape, were rising. The need for sufficient capacity to respond effectively was emphasised. In response, it was noted that confirmation of the Defra three-year settlement would provide greater financial certainty, enabling consideration of additional planning support, particularly in light of a potential extension. It was also reported that consultations had begun on proposed extension areas, and the new Management Plan policies were already being referenced in planning submissions where authorities had adopted the Plan. Upcoming hearings in January would provide further opportunity to apply the updated policy framework.

10. Members supported concerns regarding dark skies, noting increasing evidence of the impact of artificial lighting on bats and other nocturnal species, and Surrey's national importance bat populations. It was acknowledged that lighting controls were difficult to enforce and that limited technical expertise within planning authorities and inspections could place the National Landscape at a disadvantage.
11. Another Member highlighted local initiatives on dark skies, including engaging schools and businesses to manage lighting. They noted challenges with balancing safety and dark skies and acknowledged resource limitations meant local planning officers had limited capacity to assess developer lighting submissions effectively. Members agreed on the ongoing importance of addressing dark skies locally. It was proposed one of the first working groups in the new governance structure could be around dark skies.
12. A member noted the importance of framing heritage proactively, emphasizing access to activities such as horse riding, which may otherwise become restricted or elitist. They highlighted the need to balance farming, land use changes, and planning pressures with maintaining traditional practices, livestock, and landscape character. It was suggested that heritage should inform future management plan implementation, guiding actions over the next 10–20 years while addressing emerging threats such as Grey Belt policy.
13. The Board noted progress under the current Management Plan and proposals for the new Business Plan, to be presented at the next meeting. Flexible working groups would identify priorities and target resources, with Board members invited to sessions in early 2026.

**Resolved:**

The Board:

1. Noted the progress in delivering the 2020 – 2030 Management Plan
2. Noted the progress in adopting the Management Plan (2025 – 2030), its publication and promotion
3. Agreed proposals to develop the new Delivery Plan (2025 – 2030)

---

## **8. NATIONAL HERITAGE LOTTERY FUND**

Rob Fairbanks, Surrey Hills National Landscape Director, introduced the item.

1. It was noted that Members would receive a copy of the paper following the meeting.
2. The Board was briefed on an opportunity from the National Lottery Heritage Fund to support a 5-year programme aligned with the Surrey Hills 75-year vision. The purpose of the briefing was to note the opportunity and look at identifying resources to support a potential bid.

3. It was noted the initiative arose from the Julian Glover review of designated landscapes, which identified under-resourcing of these areas. The National Lottery Heritage Fund (NLHF) now allocated a significant portion of funding to natural heritage, including a £150 million programme for National Parks and National Landscapes.
4. Officers confirmed that Surrey Hills National Landscape had been specifically invited to submit a bid, although progression remains at the Board's discretion. It was noted that bids were expected to be substantial (circa £5–6 million) and would require significant time, evidence gathering and partnership development.
5. The programme aimed to increase access and inclusion, support nature recovery, strengthen local partnerships and assist those who live and work in the landscape.
6. It was advised that any bid must meet the National Lottery Heritage Fund four investment principles, including landscape and habitat recovery, learning and developing heritage skills, inspiring wider society to access and enjoy and building long-term resilience through innovative funding and strong partnerships.
7. Current work to date included a new management plan with a 75-year vision, a nature recovery strategy (which aligns with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy), the proposed extension of Surrey Hills, priority communities and an Acorn Fund held within the Surrey Hills Society. Existing partnerships and programmes in farming, land management and access were highlighted as opportunities to strengthen delivery and lever additional funding.
8. Officers reported that, at the recent symposium, it was asked how circa £5 million over five years should be invested to recover nature, develop skills and improve access. Over 100 responses were received, with strong emphasis on education, training, apprenticeships and accredited qualifications, particularly for young people. Improved public transport access was also highlighted, alongside habitat and species recovery and better interpretation to foster a sense of shared ownership of the landscape.
9. In considering alignment with the Lottery investment principles, officers outlined a potential focus on delivering the Nature Recovery Strategy through a farmer- and landowner-led approach. This would include targeting indicator species linked to priority habitats and establishing clusters across the landscape. Proposed activity could combine habitat improvement with training in conservation skills, citizen science, monitoring, mapping and data collection, creating a coordinated and measurable programme of nature recovery and skills development.
10. Officers outlined proposals to widen access and engagement, including continued work on nature connectedness and accredited programmes with Surrey Outdoor Learning and Development, co-designed interpretation, residential initiatives such as "Nights Under the Stars," arts partnerships, and active travel and public transport campaigns.
11. Reference was made to the South Downs Trust Fund, established by the South Downs National Park Authority, which now had an annual turnover of approximately £2 million and supports programmes implementing the South Downs Management Plan. It was highlighted that information and learning from this model had been shared by the South Downs National Park Authority. The Board was advised the intention would be to establish a similar ring-fenced fund, through which investment could be made. The Surrey Hills Acorn Fund would seek to achieve a multiplier effect by attracting contributions from other charitable trusts, lottery funding, and potentially elements of the Board's own funding, to support delivery of key programmes. It was further noted that a separate governance structure would be required for the Acorn Fund.
12. Next steps following the Board meeting included submitting an Expression of Interest to share with the NLHF mentor, establishing a steering group and commissioning a consultant to develop the bid. The intention then was to hold thematic workshops in February to refine proposals around nature recovery, skills and learning, and

engagement, with a view to submitting a development bid (circa £200,000) in April. The development bid would fund capacity, including potential fundraising and project development roles, to prepare a larger partnership bid. It was emphasised that existing partnerships should be maintained and strengthened given their importance in developing the wider strategic vision.

13. The Chair sought clarification that Board approval was being requested for the use of resources to develop the Expression of Interest further.
14. A Member emphasised the need to clearly define strong, measurable outcomes aligned with NLHF priorities to ensure the bid stands out and passes to next stage. It was agreed that bringing in external support to help draft the bid would sharpen the vision, clarify impact and strengthen the submission.
15. It was noted that a proposed £5,000–£10,000 consultancy budget for an advisor would support preparation for the bid.
16. It was noted that the source of match funding was not yet fully determined, and it was unclear whether it would come from revenue or capital funds. However, there were opportunities to identify funding, particularly in light of anticipated announcements of additional funds. Some Defra funding could potentially be used, with expectations of more capital programmes in the future from Defra, although revenue funding would remain limited.
17. Members noted that discussions with partners were already well advanced. Many existing partners, including local councils and organisations with similar charitable objectives, had access to funding that could be aligned with the programme. It was suggested that partners could potentially contribute staffing costs, while the programme could fund activity and bursary costs, which are often challenging for partners to cover. Existing county programmes were highlighted as a strong foundation, with the aim of scaling up current work through this initiative.
18. The Board asked for further detail on timelines. If the bid for development funding was submitted to the local or regional committee, it could be approved quickly, as the funding was under £250,000 and did not require national-level approval. Members acknowledged potential recruitment challenges with the new authority in taking on development staff and anticipated that the development stage would run for approximately one year. This stage would allow for the formulation of the full programme. The guidance indicated that the programme would cover a five-year period, with certainty required for the first two years and indicative plans for years three to five to maintain flexibility. It was suggested that the full programme would likely run from 2027 to 2032.
19. A Member highlighted that the current proposal could further emphasise enabling education, skills, and certification, which could open pathways into private nature markets—an approach the South Downs National Park was developing effectively. It was noted that establishing an independent fund would create opportunities for corporate contributions. It was clarified that Surrey Hills National Landscape did not plan to own or manage land directly; instead, the fund would operate through partnerships, not in competition.
20. The Chair noted there was clear backing for allocating additional resources to develop the Expression of Interest and asked that Members were kept informed and involved as the process progresses.

**Resolved:**

1. The Board noted the opportunity and looked at identifying resources to support a potential bid.
2. The Chair noted there was clear backing for allocating additional resources to develop the Expression of Interest and asked that Members were kept informed and involved as the process progresses.

---

## 9. SCOTLAND PARK HOUSING PROPOSAL, RED COURT, HASLEMERE

Clive Smith, Surrey Hills Planning Advisor introduced the item.

1. It was explained a proposal for 111 dwellings on elevated land south of Haslemere, classified as prime Surrey Hills National Landscape, had its original planning application refused due to the Green Belt and national landscape considerations. This had gone to appeal, but the inspector dismissed the appeal on strong national landscape grounds.
2. The officer stated the High Court then overturned the appeal decision. A second public inquiry was then held in which a second inspector acknowledged harm to the national landscape and contrary adherence to government/local policies, but gave great weight to exceptional circumstances presented by the appellants (benefits to the community such as scout hut, forest school and management of undeveloped land).
3. The Officer informed the Board that local opposition included the town council, the Haslemere Society, and hundreds of residents, but these objections were largely disregarded in the decision.
4. Waverley Borough Council was consulted and the Planning Director advised there were insufficient grounds to challenge the decision in the High Court.
5. There was concern that the Haslemere appeal decision may set a precedent, potentially increasing pressure for more housing across the Surrey Hills National Landscape. There was emphasis that the decision was a one-off, based on specific exceptional circumstances, and does not indicate reduced government protection for national landscapes however residents remained frustrated, as the High Court overturned a firmly dismissed appeal, undermining public confidence in the planning appeal system.
6. It was noted there was a proposal to write to the Planning Inspectorate to highlight concerns about consistency and public trust, requesting assurance that substantive evidence presented by the board will be fully considered in future inquiries.
7. Following discussion, it was requested that Councillor Ruth Reed seek written justification from Waverley Borough Council regarding why the decision could not be challenged further by her authority.
8. The Chair noted concerns raised by the Officer regarding the Planning Inspectorate's lack of understanding of the limited capacity for planning advice within national landscapes. It was highlighted that Surrey Hills had more planning advice support than many other national landscapes, and it was unreasonable to expect in-person attendance at every appeal or inquiry. The Board agreed to write to the Planning Inspectorate on this issue and to ask the National Landscapes Association to reinforce the point on behalf of all national landscapes.
9. Board members discussed concerns about inconsistent planning decisions and the potential financial risks of appeals. It was noted that planning departments were often too stretched to challenge decisions, leading to uncertainty. Suggestions included contacting local Members of Parliament to request ministerial review of decision-making processes, and for the Chair to write to the Chief Executive of the Planning Inspectorate to formally respond and seek clarification.

10. Board members discussed the lack of consistency in Planning Inspectorate (PINS) rulings, which was creating uncertainty about the fairness and reliability of decisions. Concerns were raised about the high financial risk of pursuing judicial reviews without confidence in the outcome. It was suggested that a coordinated approach—such as a partnership between Waverley Borough Council, CPRE, local residents' associations, and the town council—could provide a united front for any potential judicial review, while discussions around funding responsibilities and existing fighting funds would be necessary.
11. The Chair summarised the actions:
  - a. Councillor Ruth Reed would request written justification from Waverley Borough Council as to why the decision could not be challenged further.
  - b. The Chair would write to the Chief Executive of Waverley Borough Council seeking the same justification as Councillor Ruth Reed, copying Councillor Ruth Reed into the correspondence.
  - c. The Board would write to the Planning Inspectorate to raise awareness of national landscapes' planning capacity issues and to challenge the interpretation applied in the recent case.
  - d. The Board would also engage with the National Landscapes Association in regard to potential coordinated communication with the Planning Inspectorate.

**Resolved:**

The Board:

1. Considered how to respond to the significant appeal decision and considered counsel's opinion.

---

## **10. RESPONSE TO THE SURREY HILLS BOUNDARY EXTENSION PROJECT**

Introduction provided by Stephen Rudd (Natural England).

1. The Surrey Hills National Landscape boundary extension was in its final legal stage.
2. The notice period launched on 21st November and would close on 14th January. Notices had been published in the London Gazette, local newspapers, Surrey Advertiser, and online, fulfilling the statutory requirements.
3. The proposal sought a 30% increase to the landscape, adding approximately 130 km<sup>2</sup>.
4. During the notice period, anyone could submit representations or evidence, which may be considered and could lead to amendments to the proposal.
5. All submitted evidence would be reviewed before the final submission to the Secretary of State, likely targeted for summer next year.
6. Local authorities were encouraged to submit official letters of support, even if brief, to reinforce backing for the boundary extension.
7. The team would aim to respond to all constraints set out in the notice period while progressing the extension as quickly as possible. The process included briefing DEFRA to ensure government departments understand the proposals and could respond efficiently.

8. The Chair requested each Local Authority Representative on the Board to ask their Local Authority to submit responses to the boundary extension.
9. The boundary extension submission was slightly delayed from early next year to the summer, primarily due to coordinating with the Yorkshire Wolds boundary proposal.
10. There were two simultaneous boundary processes: Surrey Hills and Yorkshire Wolds. The advice was to submit both to the Secretary of State at the same time to streamline the process. Both areas shared the same consultant, Allison Farmer, so timing depended on the volume and complexity of responses from the notice period.
11. The Surrey Hills notice period closed on 14th January, after which responses would be reviewed. Any substantive issues may delay submission but if there were no major issues, submission could occur as soon as possible after the notice period, though still coordinated with Yorkshire Wolds.
12. A draft letter of support for the Surrey Hills boundary extension was prepared on behalf of the Board, and the Board agreed to its submission.
13. Board members expressed thanks to Stephen Rudd for guiding the project through the final stages.

### **Resolved**

The Board:

1. Noted progress on the Surrey Hills National Landscape (AONB) Boundary Variation Project
  2. Agreed a response on behalf of the Surrey Hills Board
- 

### **11. MEETING DATES 2026**

1. The Board noted that 2026 dates were to be confirmed.
- 

### **12. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the new Partnership Board will be in 6 months

**Kathy Atkinson**

Independent Chair