

South Cambridgeshire Hall
Cambourne Business Park
Cambourne
Cambridge
CB23 6EA

t: 03450 450 500
f: 01954 713149
dx: DX 729500 Cambridge 15
minicom: 01480 376743
www.scambs.gov.uk



Wednesday 12 May 2010

To: Councillors David Bard and Nick Wright, Portfolio Holders

Val Barrett	Scrutiny Monitor, Planning
Trisha Bear	Opposition Spokesman, Planning Portfolio
Roger Hall	Scrutiny Monitor, New Communities
Bridget Smith	Scrutiny Monitor and Opposition Spokesman, New Communities
Jim Stewart	Opposition Spokesman, New Communities
John F Williams	Opposition Spokesman, Planning Portfolio

Dear Sir / Madam

You are invited to attend the next meeting of **PLANNING AND NEW COMMUNITIES JOINT PORTFOLIO HOLDERS' MEETING**, which will be held in **COUNCIL CHAMBER, FIRST FLOOR** at South Cambridgeshire Hall on **THURSDAY, 20 MAY 2010** at **10.00 a.m.**

Yours faithfully
GJ HARLOCK
Chief Executive

Requests for a large print agenda must be received at least 48 hours before the meeting.

AGENDA

	PAGES
PROCEDURAL ITEMS	
1. Declarations of Interest	
2. Minutes of Previous Meeting The Portfolio Holders are asked to sign the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 2 March 2010 as a correct record.	1 - 10
ITEMS RELEVANT TO THE NEW COMMUNITIES PORTFOLIO ONLY	
3. St Edmundsbury Borough Council Local Development Framework: development management policies submission draft, and rural site allocations preferred options	11 - 14
4. Revision of Process and Guidance Notes for Sustainable Communities Capital Grants Programme	15 - 36
5. Self-Commissioned Housing at Orchard Park	37 - 76

- 6. Climate Change Action Plan 2010-13: Consultation Process** **77 - 80**
- The Climate Change Action Plan was discussed by the Climate Change Working Group on 8 April 2010 and can be accessed via the following link:
<http://scambs.moderngov.co.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=779&MIId=5117&Ver=4>
- If you want a paper copy of this Plan please contact Democratic Services on 01954 713408.
- 7. New Communities Performance Report 2009/10** **81 - 86**
- ITEMS RELEVANT TO THE PLANNING PORTFOLIO ONLY**
- 8. 09-10 Performance Report - Planning - Final** **87 - 104**
- STANDING ITEMS**
- 9. Forward Plans** **105 - 108**
- The Portfolio Holder will maintain, for agreement at each meeting, a Forward Plan identifying all matters relevant to the Portfolio which it is believed are likely to be the subject of consideration and / or decision by the Portfolio Holder, or recommendation to, or referral by, the Portfolio Holder to Cabinet, Council, or any other constituent part of the Council. The plan will be updated as necessary. The Portfolio Holder will be responsible for the content and accuracy of the forward plan.
- 10. Date of Next Meeting**
- The next meetings of the Planning Portfolio Holder and the New Communities Portfolio Holder will be held on Tuesday 13 July.

GUIDANCE NOTES FOR VISITORS TO SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE HALL

While the District Council endeavours to ensure that visitors come to no harm when visiting South Cambridgeshire Hall, those visitors also have a responsibility to make sure that they do not risk their own or others' safety.

Security

Members of the public attending meetings in non-public areas of the Council offices must report to Reception, sign in, and at all times wear the Visitor badges issued. Before leaving the building, such visitors must sign out and return their Visitor badges to Reception.

Emergency and Evacuation

In the event of a fire, a continuous alarm will sound. Evacuate the building using the nearest escape route; from the Council Chamber or Mezzanine viewing gallery this would be via the staircase just outside the door. Go to the assembly point at the far side of the staff car park.

- **Do not** use the lifts to exit the building. If you are unable to negotiate stairs by yourself, the emergency staircase landings are provided with fire refuge areas, which afford protection for a minimum of 1.5 hours. Press the alarm button and wait for assistance from the Council fire wardens or the fire brigade.
- **Do not** re-enter the building until the officer in charge or the fire brigade confirms that it is safe to do so.

First Aid

If someone feels unwell or needs first aid, please alert a member of staff.

Access for People with Disabilities

The Council is committed to improving, for all members of the community, access to its agendas and minutes. We try to take all circumstances into account but, if you have any specific needs, please let us know, and we will do what we can to help you. All meeting rooms are accessible to wheelchair users. There are disabled toilet facilities on each floor of the building. Hearing loops and earphones are available from reception and can be used in all meeting rooms.

Toilets

Public toilets are available on each floor of the building next to the lifts.

Recording of Business

Unless specifically authorised by resolution, no audio and / or visual or photographic recording in any format is allowed at any meeting of the Council, the executive (Cabinet), or any committee, sub-committee or other sub-group of the Council or the executive.

Banners, Placards and similar items

No member of the public shall be allowed to bring into or display at any Council meeting any banner, placard, poster or other similar item. The Chairman may require any such item to be removed.

Disturbance by Public

If a member of the public interrupts proceedings, the Chairman will warn the person concerned. If they continue to interrupt, the Chairman will order their removal from the meeting room. If there is a general disturbance in any part of the meeting room open to the public, the Chairman may call for that part to be cleared.

Smoking

Since 1 July 2008, the Council has operated a new Smoke Free Policy. Visitors are not allowed to smoke at any time within the Council offices, or in the car park or other grounds forming part of those offices.

Food and Drink

Vending machines and a water dispenser are available on the ground floor near the lifts at the front of the building. Visitors are not allowed to bring food or drink into the meeting room.

Mobile Phones

Visitors are asked to make sure that their phones and other mobile devices are set on silent / vibrate mode during meetings or are switched off altogether.

This page is left blank intentionally.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning and New Communities Joint Portfolio Holders' Meeting held
on
Tuesday, 2 March 2010 at 9.00 a.m.

Portfolio Holders: David Bard and Nick Wright

Councillors in attendance:

Scrutiny and Overview Committee monitors: Val Barrett

Opposition spokesmen Trisha Bear and John Williams

Also in attendance:

Officers:

Andrew Beyer	Building Control Manager
John Garnham	Finance Project Officer
David Grimster	Accountant
David Hamilton	Landscape Design Officer
Peter Harris	Principal Accountant (General Fund and Costing)
Caroline Hunt	Local Development Framework Team Leader
Jane Lampshire	Sports Development Officer
Keith Miles	Planning Policy Manager
Jo Mills	Corporate Manager, New Communities
Joseph Minutolo	Senior Administration Officer
Andy O'Hanlon	Arts Development Officer
Ian Senior	Democratic Services Officer
Claire Spencer	Senior Planning Officer (Transport Policy)
Alison Talkington	Senior Planning Policy Officer
Jane Thompson	Cultural Services Manager

61. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

62. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Planning Portfolio Holder and New Communities Portfolio Holder agreed that the minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2010 were a correct record, and signed them accordingly.

63. PROCUREMENT STRATEGY 2010

The Planning Portfolio Holder considered a report on Procurement Strategy.

Responding to the Portfolio Holder, the Finance Project Officer explained that the Council's commitment to Fair Trade had to be balanced with its responsibility not to act in an anti-competitive manner.

The Planning Portfolio Holder **agreed** to adopt the updated Procurement Strategy 2010/11, attached to the report as Appendix F.

64. FINAL SERVICE PLANS 2010/11: CORPORATE SERVICES (PROCUREMENT AND EFFICIENCY)

The Planning Portfolio Holder considered and **approved** the procurement and efficiency elements of the draft Service Plan for Corporate Services 2010-11 to 2012-13.

65. FINAL SERVICE PLANS 2010/11: PLANNING

The Planning Portfolio Holder considered the draft Service Plan for Planning and Sustainable Communities 2010-11 to 2012-13.

The Planning Policy Manager and Building Control Manager outlined the challenges facing Development Control, Conservation, Planning Policy, Building Control and Registration. Among other things, these related to

- Resources
- New computer systems
- Workload
- Redundancies
- Service continuation

Concern was expressed at reducing the number of planning officers and the implications this might have should there be an increase in the number of planning applications being submitted to the Authority. The Corporate Manager (New Communities) summarised the measures being taken to minimise any adverse impact.

The Planning Portfolio Holder **approved** the Service Plan 2010-11 to 2012-13 for Planning and Sustainable Communities.

66. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

The New Communities Portfolio Holder considered a report on the Local Development Scheme, which set out the timetable for plan preparation for the three-year period from April 2010 to March 2013. Such timetable was subject to change under certain circumstances.

In response to a question from the Planning Portfolio Holder, the Planning Policy Manager said that 2010-11 was likely to be the last year during which Housing and Planning Delivery Grant monies would be available to Councils. He added that South Cambridgeshire District Council could expect to receive about £1 million on the basis of plans adopted during 2009-10. Beyond that, and primarily as a result of plan making having become more complex, officers were unlikely to be able to progress more than two plans at any one time. Payment is made against adoption, and this Council's next plan for adoption was unlikely to be ready until 2012. Therefore, available funds might decrease during 2010-11.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder **agreed** the Local Development Scheme 2010-2013, as amended.

67. FINAL SERVICE PLANS 2010/11: NEW COMMUNITIES

The New Communities Portfolio Holder considered the draft Service Plan for New Communities 2010-11 to 2012-13.

The Corporate Manager (New Communities) reported that Senior Management Team had

not suggested any amendments.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder commented as follows

- Progress at Northstowe should be made in consultation with local Members and parish councils
- At 2(d) of the Service Plan Overview, the outcome of the Clay Farm Inquiry should be listed as a Success.
- At Section 8 (Workforce Overview), staff changes should be identified in terms of Full-Time Equivalents

It was noted that for future years, Planning and New Communities would prepare a joint service plan to reflect the new management arrangements from 1st April 2010.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder **approved** the New Communities 2010/11 Service Plan, subject to minor amendments relating to the 'SWOT' analysis and Workforce Overview.

68. CAMBRIDGESHIRE GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY

The Planning Portfolio Holder considered a report on the Cambridgeshire Green Infrastructure Strategy consultation.

The Local Development Framework Team Leader informed the Portfolio Holder that, while the principles set out in the document were to be welcomed, she had a few concerns with the consultation draft relating to

- Methodology
- The need for a robust evidence base
- Need to work in partnership with Cambridgeshire Horizons
- Resource implications
- Criticism of the baseline and delivery reports set out in paragraph 26 of the report

The New Communities Portfolio Holder emphasised that Green Infrastructure provided an environmental support system set within, and contributing to, a high quality natural, historic and built environment. which helped create places that were attractive, healthy and gave a good quality of life, and that delivered a range of other social, economic and environmental benefits.

The Planning Portfolio Holder said it was important to strike a balance between the demand for Green Infrastructure and the need for agricultural land.

The Planning Portfolio Holder **agreed** that the Council's reply to the Green Infrastructure Strategy consultation should be:

- (a) The Council supports the role that an effective strategy will have in the protection, creation and management of green infrastructure.
- (b) The Council supports the development of a strategy, which will provide a robust and defensible basis for green infrastructure planning and delivery, for both existing communities and the growth areas.
- (c) The Council has significant concerns about the approach and content of the draft Green Infrastructure Strategy as set out in this report and previous officer comments to Cambridgeshire Horizons.
- (d) The Council will require major changes to the strategy addressing its concerns before it will be able to endorse it.
- (e) Council officers will work with Cambridgeshire Horizons and other partners to achieve the changes required.

69. SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT: AFFORDABLE HOUSING, DESIGN GUIDE AND LANDSCAPE

The Planning Portfolio Holder and New Communities Portfolio Holder considered a report on the results of a public consultation exercise relating to three Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD relating to Affordable Housing, the District Design Guide and Landscape in new developments.

Appendix 1 to the report listed the changes made to the draft SPDs following the consultation process.

Once adopted, the SPDs would form part of the Local Development Framework and be used to help determine planning applications.

The Portfolio Holders agreed that the Landscape Design Officer should expand the planting list in the Appendix to the Landscape SPD

The Planning and New Communities Portfolio Holders **agreed** the adoption of the SPDs relating to Affordable Housing, Design and Landscape as contained in Appendices 5 to 7 of the report, and to proceed in accordance with Regulations 18 and 19.

70. LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN

The Planning Portfolio Holder and New Communities Portfolio Holder considered a report seeking agreement to a proposed response by South Cambridgeshire District Council to Cambridgeshire County Council about the latter's consultation on the third Local Transport Plan (LTP).

The Planning Portfolio Holder emphasised the District Council's opposition to a congestion charge for the city of Cambridge.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder stated that the Cambridge Park and Ride service did nothing to help South Cambridgeshire in terms of reducing carbon emissions.

The Planning and New Communities Portfolio Holders **agreed** that the Council make the following representation to Cambridgeshire County Council in response to the LTP3 consultation:

"The Council supports the overarching objectives of LTP3 and prioritises non-car modes as these will provide travel choice and best achieve the objectives with limited resources. The strategy areas should be prioritised as follows:

- Public Transport
- Cycling
- Walking
- Smarter Choices
- Road Safety
- Traffic Management

"It is important to ensure the needs of all sectors of community are addressed, including the most vulnerable – the young, elderly and disabled. At present many residents experience social isolation as they are unable to access essential services, shopping, leisure or simply meet with friends, due to a lack of bus or community transport service and/or the prohibitive cost of using it.

“The Council would urge the County Council not to forget linkages to market towns outside the county as many of the remoter parts of the district look to these areas for their services.

“The Council would also ask the County Council to take in to consideration the outcomes of plans and strategies produced by other organisations, including the South Cambridgeshire Local Development Framework, Community Transport Strategy and Air Quality Action Plan, Parish Plans, the Children and Young People’s Plan (BigPlan2), and Cambridgeshire Horizon’s Green Infrastructure Strategy, to name a few. These may provide an extensive evidence base of transport provision and need, highlight issues concerning specific groups of people, and many contain an action plan including issues that can be addressed through LTP3.

“The Council would like to continue to work closely with the County Council and the other Cambridgeshire districts on drafting LTP3.

“The Council would like to remind the County Council that it remains opposed to any form of congestion charging in Cambridge.”

71. SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT: WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Planning Portfolio Holder and New Communities Portfolio Holder considered a report seeking agreement to a proposed response by South Cambridgeshire District Council to consultation currently being carried out by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council. The consultation related to Supplementary Planning Documents relating to

- The Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities
- The Recycling in Cambridgeshire and Peterborough Partnership (RECAP) Waste Management Design Guide.

The Planning and New Communities Portfolio Holders **agreed** that the Council should respond to Cambridgeshire County Council in the terms contained in the report and as set out in Appendix 2 for The Location and Design of Waste Management Facilities SPD and Appendix 3 for ReCAP Waste Management Design Guide SPD.

72. MINERALS AND WASTE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION

The Planning Portfolio Holder and New Communities Portfolio Holder considered a report seeking agreement to a proposed response from South Cambridgeshire District Council to consultation currently being undertaken by Cambridgeshire County Council and Peterborough City Council on the proposed Submission version of the Minerals and Waste Development Plan.

The Planning Portfolio Holder and New Communities Portfolio Holder **agreed** the responses to the Minerals and Waste Development Plan consultation as contained within the report to their 2 March 2010 meeting and in Appendices 2, 3 and 4.

73. COMMUNITY CAPITAL GRANTS PROGRAMME 2009/10

The New Communities Portfolio Holder considered a report detailing applications for community capital grants.

The New Communities Portfolio Holder **agreed** to the following grants being made,

requiring a virement of £5,651 from Arts Capital Grants to Community Facility Grants:

Community Facilities Grants

Applicant	Project	Total Cost	Grant Recommended
West Wrating Village Hall Committee	Renovation of the west gable wall	£1,900	£700
Landbeach Village Hall	To extend and refurbish the Village Hall	£273,000	£10,000 (with a further £15,000 to be allocated from 2010/11)
Hinxton Village Hall	Refurbishment of WC's	£11,993	£3,000
Little Wilbraham PCC	Installation of public toilets	£27,060	£4,000 subject to PC granting a minimum of £2,000 and the PCC making the church available for wider community uses
Cottenham Community Centre	New Community Centre – conversion and renovation of existing Methodist Church	£210,175	£8,000 (Top-up in future if required and subject to funds being available)
Fowlmere PC	Extension of play area	£2,770	£700
Milton Community Centre	Refurbishment of Community Centre	£166,685	£8,500
The George Long Charity, Swavesey	Improvements to Swavesey Memorial Hall	£67,506	£9,500
Whaddon PC	Improvements to the Village Hall	£353,630	Defer until 2010/11

Village Sports Facility Grants

Applicant	Project	Total Cost	Other Income	Grant Recommended
Histon and Impington PC	Improvements to the Recreation Ground	£35,131	PC - £1,396 Community Chest - £500 Applications to WREN £10,000 and Football Foundation £6,485	£15,000
Gamlingay PC	New multi-use	£32,000	The Parish	£10,000

	changing room and a store as part of the Eco-Hub Project		Council has committed £49,684 towards the whole project and has also applied to the Public Works Loan Board for £500,000. £20,000 has also been requested from the Football Foundation.	
Thriplow Cricket Club	Installation of two astroturf practice nets for cricket.	£24,575	Club funds - £3,575 Applications to:- ECB Lord Taverners £3,000, Awards for All Lottery £10,000 and Cambridgeshire Community Foundation £5,000.	£5,000
Barton Recreation Improvement Group	New pavilion	£196,000	Own funds - £19,000. Other grants applied for total £145,000.	£30,000
Caldecote PC	New pavilion	£346,414	S106 funding £131,908 Grant applications have been submitted to the ECB, Football Foundation and Donarbon, and funds will be submitted on	£33,400 subject to support from the Local Member

			the transfer of the land.	
Castle Camps PC	New changing-room facility	£111,060	PC - £11,106 Changing Room Cmmtte - £3,000 Application to FF - £20,000	Defer until 2010/11

Arts Capital

Applicant	Project	Total Cost	Other Income	Grant Recommended
Swavesey Village College	New performing arts centre - retractable seating; lighting equipment, sound equipment, film equipment and drapes.	£200,000	£140,000 secured	£27,260
Melbourn Village College	Video kiosk for community consultation (part of the equipment bank)	£6,904	None	£6,904 subject to South Cambridgeshire District Council being able to make use of the equipment
Inspire	Digital arts equipment	£5,306	Own funds - £3,184	£2,122

The New Communities Portfolio Holder paid tribute to Jane Thompson (Cultural Services Manager) and Jane Lampshire (Sports Development Officer), both of whom would soon be leaving the Council's employment. Both the New Communities Portfolio Holder and the Planning Portfolio Holder thanked them for the contributions they had made to the quality of life in South Cambridgeshire.

74. PLANNING PORTFOLIO: CARRY FORWARD OF UNCOMMITTED GRANT BALANCES AS AT 31 MARCH 2010

The Planning Portfolio Holder considered a report seeking approval to carry forward the uncommitted grant balance in respect of Heritage Initiative Grants and the total balance on the Historic Buildings Preservation Fund.

The Planning Portfolio Holder **agreed** that the following uncommitted grant balances be carried forward into the 2010-11 financial year:

- Heritage Initiatives Grants: £29,061
- Historic Buildings Preservation Fund: £54,622

75. FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT: PLANNING PORTFOLIO

The Planning Portfolio Holder received and noted a report comparing actual revenue and capital expenditure to 31 January 2010 for the Planning Services Portfolio with the revised

annual budget for the year ending 31 March 2010.

He noted that the overspend was less than in 2009-10, but expressed concern at the state of the Museums budget.

76. FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT: NEW COMMUNITIES PORTFOLIO

The New Communities Portfolio Holder received and noted a report comparing actual revenue and capital expenditure to 31 January 2010 for the New Communities Portfolio with the revised annual budget for the year ending 31 March 2010.

He noted the under spend of £54,900 in Planning Policy.

77. PERFORMANCE UPDATE - PLANNING PORTFOLIO

In the absence of a report, the Corporate Manager (New Communities) undertook to send performance details to the Planning Portfolio Holder as soon as possible.

78. FORWARD PLANS

The Planning and New Communities Portfolio Holders noted their Forward Plans as at 18 February 2010. The following amendments were made at the meeting:

Planning

- 20 May 2010 – deletion of Green Infrastructure Strategy (considered 2 March 2010)
- Unscheduled item – add St. Denis Church, East Hatley (update)
- July 2010 – add Financial Performance 2009/10

New Communities

- July 2010 – add Financial Performance
- Unscheduled – South Cambridgeshire Sustainable Parish Energy Programme
Corporate Manager should be Jo Mills not Gareth Jones

79. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next scheduled Planning and New Communities Portfolio Holders' meeting had been moved from 11 May 2010 to 20 May 2010, starting at 10.00am in the Council Chamber.

The Meeting ended at 1.00 p.m.

This page is left blank intentionally.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: New Communities Portfolio Holder 20 May 2010
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director (Operational Services) / Corporate Manager (Planning and New Communities)

**ST EDMUNDSBURY BOROUGH COUNCIL LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK:
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT POLICIES SUBMISSION DRAFT, AND RURAL SITE
ALLOCATIONS PREFERRED OPTIONS**

Purpose

1. The purpose of this report is to agree the response to St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC) on their Local Development Framework documents.

Recommendations and Reasons

2. That New Communities Portfolio Holder agree the one representation be made to St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Development Management Policies Draft Submission document as follows:

Support Policy HH9 Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople.

The Council supports the inclusion of Policy HH9 Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. This criteria-based policy is consistent with Government guidance and will allow sites to come forward, where they meet the criteria, to meet local needs. It may also help address the provision of sites in the period to 2011, which might otherwise not be met by solely relying on allocations in the Rural Site Allocations DPD and Area Action Plans for Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill, which are in early stages of production.

3. The Council has previously made representations to SEBC on their approach to planning for Gypsy and Travellers, for failing to address the provision of sites or the requirements set out in the East of England Plan (Policies H3 and H4). SEBC have subsequently included Policy HH9, a criteria-based policy for the consideration of sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, in the Development Management Policies document, which addresses some of these concerns.

Background

4. St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC) is currently undertaking an eight-week consultation between 12 April to 10 June 2010 on its Development Management Policies Draft Submission Document and Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options.
5. The New Communities Portfolio Holder previously considered a report on the SEBC Core Strategy Draft Submission Document, Development Management Preferred Options and Site Allocations Issues and Options in October 2009. This resolved to respond to SEBC on their Core Strategy DPD, but no comments were submitted on the Development Management Policies or Site Allocations documents.

6. The Core Strategy has subsequently been submitted and the Examination by an Independent Planning Inspector is currently underway. SEBC are now consulting on the next stage of the other two documents.

- **Development Management Policies Draft Submission Document**

7. The Development Management Policies document sets out the development control policies against which proposals for development will be considered. It contains policies on many issues including affordable housing, climate change and nature conservation. Many of these policies are 'saved' Local Plan policies which have been rolled forward, some with minor amendments. SEBC is currently consulting on the final draft of the document before submitting it to the Secretary of State for Examination by an independent Planning Inspector.

- **Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options**

8. The Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options document sets out SEBC's preferred options for site allocations in the six key service centres and the 12 local service centres identified in the Core Strategy Document. It reviews the existing Housing Settlement boundaries for all villages and also proposes to designate the general employment areas and operational use areas outside Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill. SEBC is currently seeking views on these proposals.
9. SEBC previously asked developers and landowners to submit details of sites that they considered appropriate for development to meet the needs of the borough to 2031. The Council has consulted on 153 sites in November 2008, and 74 sites additional sites in August 2009. None of the rural sites consulted upon would impact on South Cambridgeshire.
10. SEBC is currently seeking suggestions for Gypsy and Traveller sites as part of the Rural Site Allocations document consultation. A working group is also identifying preferred locations. SEBC intends to consult on sites in a separate document in Summer 2010. The sites identified by the working group and as a result of the current consultation will be allocated in the Rural Site Allocations Draft Submission document, due for publication in Autumn 2010. Any sites suggested in the towns of Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill will be considered separately through the Area Action Plans for these towns.

Issues for South Cambridgeshire

11. The report considered by the New Communities Portfolio Holder on 1 October 2009 outlined a number of issues arising in the consultation documents, primarily pertaining to Gypsy and Travellers, which was only addressed in the Core Strategy Submission Draft document. At this time SEBC did not address the provision of sites, referring instead to sites being identified through the Area Action Plans and Site Allocations DPD. It also failed to fully address the requirements set out in the East of England Plan (Policies H3 and H4). As a result, the Council made a representation objecting to the Core Strategy Policy CS6 Gypsy and Travellers Accommodation.
12. SEBC, as part of the Core Strategy Examination process, have subsequently consulted on proposed changes to Policy CS6. These changes address most of the Council's concerns.
13. The Development Management Policies document now includes a criteria-based policy against which proposals for sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling

Showpeople will be considered: Policy HH9 – Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Show People. The criteria in Policy HH9 are consistent with Government guidance. Inclusion of this new policy would allow unallocated sites to come forward if they met the policy criteria, thus allowing the timely delivery of sites instead of relying solely on the allocation of sites in the Rural Site Allocations DPD and Area Action Plans for Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill. The Rural Site Allocations DPD is in the early stages of production and the Area Action Plans have not yet begun, therefore relying on these plans would delay sites coming forward to meet local needs, particularly in the period to 2011. As a result the Council would support the inclusion of a criteria-based policy.

Proposed Response to St Edmundsbury Borough Council

- 14. The Council did not make any representations on the Development Management Preferred Options or Site Allocations Issues and Options documents. With the exception of the Gypsy and Traveller policy, there are no further issues for South Cambridgeshire District Council raised in the current consultation documents.
- 15. As a result, it is suggested the Council make the following representations to the St Edmundsbury Development Management Policies Draft Submission Document:

Support Policy HH9 Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople

The Council supports the inclusion of Policy HH9 Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople. This criteria-based policy is consistent with Government guidance and will allow sites to come forward, where they meet the criteria, to meet local needs. It may also help address the provision of sites in the period to 2011, which might otherwise not be met by solely relying on allocations in the Rural Site Allocations DPD and Area Action Plans for Bury St Edmunds and Haverhill, which are in early stages of production.

Implications

16.	Financial	None
	Legal	None
	Staffing	Within existing resources
	Risk Management	None
	Equal Opportunities	None
	Climate Change	None

Consultations

- 17. None

Effect on Strategic Aims

- 18. The St Edmundsbury Borough Council Local Development Framework documents have potential to impact on the residents of South Cambridgeshire, particularly close to the district boundary. As a consultee the Council has the opportunity to review and comment on the proposals and help to maintain the quality of environment for our community living close to St Edmundsbury borough. The current consultation documents should not have adverse impact on South Cambridgeshire residents or the Council’s Strategic Aims.

Conclusions / Summary

19. St Edmundsbury Borough Council (SEBC) is currently undertaking an eight-week consultation between 12 April to 10 June 2010 on its Development Management Policies Draft Submission Document and Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options. The Council has previously made representations to SEBC on their approach to Gypsy and Traveller provision, particularly in the Core Strategy DPD. A new policy has been included in the Development Management Policies document and this addresses the Council's previous concerns. It is proposed that the Council support the inclusion of new Policy HH9 Sites for Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople in the Development Management Policies DPD.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Development Management Policies Draft Submission documents April 2010
- St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Rural Site Allocations Preferred Options documents April 2010
- St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Core Strategy Draft Submission Document August 2009
- St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Development Management Preferred Options August 2009
- St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Site Allocation Issues and Options August 2009
- New Communities Portfolio Holder Decision January 2009
- Growth and Sustainable Communities Portfolio Holder Decision May 2008
- St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Core Strategy Preferred Options Report November 2008
- St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Strategic Sites Issues & Options Report November 2008
- St Edmundsbury Borough Council's Core Strategy Issues & Options Report March 2008

Contact Officer: Claire Spencer – Senior Planning Policy Officer
Telephone: (01954) 713418

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Portfolio Holder for New Communities 20th May 2010
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director / Corporate Manager for Planning and New Communities

REVISION OF PROCESS AND GUIDANCE NOTES FOR THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES CAPITAL GRANTS PROGRAMME**Purpose**

1. The PFH is asked to consider revisions to the guidance notes for the Sustainable Communities Capital Grants Programme, as attached to this report, with a view to approving them for release to applicants and to manage and deliver the 2010/11 programme.
2. This is not a key decision. Portfolio Holder agreement and approval is sought to formalise the revised guidance notes for applicants to the Sustainable Communities Capital Grants Programme as the programme is highly valued and appreciated across the district. Most specifically the revisions cover the formalisation of the approach introduced in the second half of 2009/10 in considering grant applications in batches.

Recommendation

3. That the Portfolio Holder for New Communities approve: the revisions to the guidance notes for the Sustainable Communities Capital Grants Programme as outlined in this report (and as attached in full).

Background

4. In 2009/10 the decision making process for the allocation of capital funds through the Council's Community Services Capital Grants Programme (now known as the Sustainable Communities Capital Grants Programme, following organisational restructuring) was altered.
5. In the past, funding bids had been received throughout the year and grant decisions were made relatively quickly upon receipt of the application. However, in September 2009, Officers identified the likelihood that the budgets were going to be oversubscribed. In order to be as accessible, transparent, and equitable as possible, the Portfolio Holder consequently made the decision to hold all capital grant award applications until early 2010 when all bids could be considered at the same time.
6. The keen take-up of the grants illustrates both their importance and the effective level of advertising on the Council's website and via the South Cambs Magazine.
7. This revised 'batching' process proved effective in maximising both the programme's ability to equitably cater to local needs aligned against SCDC priorities and deliver the greatest cross-district value for money from the funds available.

8. It should be noted that there are other 'community' type grants available from the Council but these are typically much smaller and aimed at enabling community activity (rather than the larger facilities and equipment capital grants referred to in this report). These will be subject to a review over the next 2-3 months to ensure that the delivery process for these is still working effectively and efficiently.

Considerations

9. Although it is not possible to accurately predict the number of capital grant applications the Council is likely to receive in 2010/11 it is felt, from the 2009/10 experience, that a twice yearly batching up and consideration of all valid applications will prove a more satisfactory method of fairly allocating the capital grant monies available.
10. These decision-making sessions would be scheduled as the last New Communities PFH meeting in September 2010 and similarly in February 2011.
11. The number of applications, and potential applications, will be regularly monitored to assess the ongoing level of pressure upon the programme budget and reported by Officers to the PFH as deemed necessary.
12. In extreme circumstances where schemes would be demonstrably jeopardised by adhering to the twice yearly decision-making timetable, or there were other verifiable emergency grounds for the very rapid deployment of grant funds, then the PFH could choose to allocate funds outside of the fixed schedule.
13. In order to both provide clarity and certainty to applicants it is therefore proposed that this approach be laid out in an appropriately revised set of application guidelines (ass attached) and advertised in all areas where the Grant is promoted.

Implications

14. Financial	Deliver the greatest cross-district value for money from the funds available.
Legal	None
Staffing	None
Risk Management	The revised approach should reduce the risk of priority projects not receiving the appropriate SCDC element of the funding and support they warrant.
Equal Opportunities	Maximising the programme's ability to equitably cater to local needs aligned against SCDC priorities
Climate Change	The revised guidance contains a specific section on climate change

Consultations

15. None – key revisions already tried and tested but not formally adopted.

Effect on Strategic Aims

16. Revised guidance directly supports the council aim that:

'We are a committed and listening council providing first class services accessible to all.'

Conclusions / Summary

17. An important revision to the decision-making process for the award of Sustainable Communities (previously known as Community Services) Capital Grants was successfully introduced/trialled in the second half of 2009/10 and is recommended to be carried forward into 2010/11. This revision essentially sees the decision-making process shifting from a first-come first-served approach to a twice-yearly batched approach where all eligible applications received in a six month period are considered and assessed together by the PFH.
18. In order to provide clarity and certainty to the process for applicants it is important that these revisions are formally approved for adoption within revised current capital grant application packs (as attached).

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

- PFH Meeting 02:03:2010, Agenda item and report: Community Capital Grants Programme 2009-2010
- Community Services Capital Grants Programme Guidance Notes

Contact Officer: Richard Hales – Team Leader Sustainable Communities
Telephone: (01954) 713135
Joseph Minutolo – Resource Officer Sustainable Communities
Telephone: (01954) 713359

This page is left blank intentionally.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL NEW COMMUNITIES CAPITAL GRANTS PROGRAMME

GUIDANCE NOTES 2010/11

1. Who is eligible to apply?

Parish councils, village hall committees, sports clubs, arts groups, youth groups and any other community groups that are based within South Cambridgeshire, have a constitution, are non profit-making, are open to all and have a strong focus on community benefit.

The application should come from the organisation with legal ownership or long-term tenure (minimum 25 years) of the facility or land in question and should have day-to-day responsibility for the building or land in question.

2. What capital grants are available?

The Council has 5 grant aid schemes within its overall Sustainable Communities Capital Grants Programme. The total available 2010/11 budget allocations for which are as follows (i.e. to fund all successful grant applications for the financial year April 2010 to March 2011):

• Community Facility Grants	(Appendix B1)	}	£100,000
• Play Facility Grants	(Appendix B2)		
• Village Sports Facility Grants	(Appendix B3)	}	£100,000
• Youth Sport Initiative Grants	(Appendix B4)		
• Arts Capital Grants	(Appendix B5)		£40,000

Details about the type of projects that are eligible for each scheme are provided as 5 appendices to this guidance note. The appendices also provide more detailed information about what projects might be eligible and what you need to do.

As a potential applicant you should read both this guidance note and also the appendices attached to identify which scheme your organisation is eligible to apply for. The contact details for each scheme are also provided.

When considering capital grant applications, the Council will take into account the level of previous SCDC capital grants to the village concerned and also the range of facilities available in the village.

Council will consider awarding grants to a maximum of 50% of the total project costs, with a maximum grant award of £40,000.

No grants will be for more than 50% total costs and SCDC awards will normally be for 25% - 35% of the total scheme cost. The maximum grant award will be £40,000. Applicants may

return to the Council for a further “top up” award so long as the total grant for the scheme does not exceed £40,000, and, if they can provide evidence that all other sources of funding have been exhausted.

Successful applicants should be aware that it is not always possible to offer the full grant sum applied for.

3. How to apply and the application process

Applicants should always contact the Sustainable Communities Resource Officer (by phone on 01954 713359 or by e-mail to sustainablecommunities.grants@scamb.gov.uk) to register a grant application enquiry and request the necessary application pack. The Resource Officer will assist with the application process. This may include a site visit and access to a specialist officer to provide specific pre-application advice.

Capital grant applications can be submitted at any time throughout the year. In normal circumstances, the applications will be batched twice a year and a report outlining the recommended awards will be written by Officers. This report will be presented to the Portfolio Holder at his/her last meeting in September and last meeting in February for decision. The Sustainable Communities Resource Officer will be able to advise on the precise date of these meetings as any fully completed application will need to be received at least 2 weeks before these dates to be eligible for consideration.

In emergency circumstances the Council may consider applications outside of this standard biannual framework. The Sustainable Communities Resource Officer should again be the first point of contact for applicants in any such instances.

The application pack includes a check list for other information required; in addition there is a Parish Council Consultation form which must be completed and signed by the Chairman or his/her representative on behalf of the Parish Council in which your project is located. This should be submitted with your application form. SCDC takes the views of Parish Councils very seriously and expects the local Parish Council to contribute financially towards all capital projects.

A Local Consultation Form must also be completed and submitted as part of the application. This is to demonstrate that the project has the support of the local residents and that their views have been actively sought.

The Council does not provide loans and grants will not be awarded retrospectively. Please contact us as early as possible.

4. What happens after your application has been considered

Following any necessary call-in period (as part of the Council’s internal democratic processes) you will receive confirmation of the Council’s decision in the form of a letter. Should you have been successful, this will also outline the Council’s grant conditions. You may contact us at any time during the decision-making process for a verbal update.

The grant conditions will include a timescale for claiming the monies made available as follows:

- Your project should commence within 18 months of receiving the offer letter.
- The grant should be claimed in full within 3 years

Written requests to extend these timescales will be considered by officers as your project moves towards its delivery or construction phase, however, justification for this will be required.

Please note that for all capital projects involving SCDC grants of £10,000 and over, the grant recipient will be expected to organise an official opening ceremony and invite the appropriate Elected Members. It will be expected that a commemorative plaque, provided by SCDC, be placed on a prominent aspect of the building. Further advice will be provided as part of a grant offer letter.

5. Access Standards

Projects must offer equal access to all and provide the opportunity for increased levels of community activity.

Applicants must submit an Access and Equality Statement confirming that the facility will be open and accessible to all regardless of disability, age, gender, ethnicity and cultural background.

The only exception to this will be youth facilities that are provided specifically to meet the needs of young people and may not be equally available to adult groups.

This statement may be based on the sample Access and Equality Statement provided with these guidance notes and must be signed.

6. Child Protection

The Council has a statutory duty to ensure it considers child protection in all its services and activities. As such community groups receiving SCDC capital grant aid must also ensure that child protection measures are in place. Where facilities are used by children and youth groups aged 0-18 years, applicants are asked to submit copies of their Child Protection Policy (which may be linked to booking/ letting policy and process). This will ensure that adults working with children and young people at the facility are checked through the Criminal Record Bureau (CRB). This might include an “enhanced” check for those working directly with children or a “standard” for people with less direct and prolonged access to children. Further information is available from the CRB Website.

Applicants may wish to sign up to The South Cambs District Council Child Protection Policy and a ‘Designated Person’ will need to be assigned. This person will be the contact for all Child Protection matters.

Alternatively, the applicant may wish to provide evidence of a commitment to the child protection policy of a national body to which your organisation relates.

7. Health and Safety

Applicants must submit a Health and Safety Statement outlining, amongst other things, the process for undertaking risk assessments and health and safety processes in response to legislation. Applicants will also be asked to provide a copy of their insurance cover, including public liability.

8. Taking account of climate change

The Council is committed to tackling the climate change agenda through both reducing South Cambridgeshire greenhouse gas emissions and ensuring that it is taking steps to adapt to the effects of a changing climate.

To this end, applicants must:

a) ensure that their application includes an assessment of the anticipated greenhouse gas emissions arising as a consequence of the project (often referred to as its 'carbon footprint'), both during implementation and its longer term legacy, and the measures that have been incorporated to minimise these emissions.

b) assess the vulnerability of the project outputs to the impacts of future changes in climate (e.g. intense surface water run-off, drought, water shortages, heatwaves) and take steps to reduce this vulnerability.

The clear identification and costing of such measures must be included within the application.

9. Other sources of funding

The Council expects you to explore and exhaust all other sources of funding for your project and to provide us with information about what funds you have raised and what other sources of funding you are/have explored.

The Council has developed a very helpful Funding Toolkit which you can find on our website www.scambs.gov.uk under Sustainable Communities.

The Council expects the applicant to find at least 10% of the total cost themselves.

10. Quotations and Accounts

You are expected to seek 3 quotations for the work in question, no more than 3 months old, and copies of these must be attached to your application. Applications must also include a copy of your most recent financial accounts.

11. Further information we need

All submissions must include some proof of local consultation and a checklist for this is provided in the Appendices to this guidance. The 'Parish Planning' process is an excellent means of facilitating such consultation and we particularly encourage villages to undertake such an exercise (the Council is able to offer specific advice in this area). Where a Parish Plan has been drafted it should be appropriately referenced as evidence of need for the proposed project. If such a reference cannot be made or a Parish Planning process is not presently possible then consultation should be as wide and as inclusive as possible.

In particular you must consult fully with those residents who are likely to be most affected by any new or improved facility or structure and we suggest you discuss your plans with all people living within at least 100m of the site, as well as wider consultation. The latter is the case regardless of whether Planning Permission is required or not.

Larger projects and those looking for grant aid of £20,000 or more from the Council will require a business plan showing how the facility will be managed, pricing policy and how it will be maintained into the future.

Further information will also be required that is specific to each different grant aid scheme as is outlined in appendices B1-B5.

12. Payment of grant awards

Once awarded, grants can be claimed in instalments on completion of part of the work or full completion. Each claim for funding will require proof that work has been completed to the specified cost; this may be in the form of copies of architects certificates or construction invoices (do not send us the originals).

However, for smaller projects, where our SCDC grant is for £5,000 or less, we expect to pay in one instalment only, on completion of the project.

The Council will retain 10% of the total grant award until formal completion and "sign off" by the Sustainable Communities Resource Officer. This is in addition to any Building Control inspection required as part of a building project.

This page is left blank intentionally.

NEW COMMUNITIES CAPITAL GRANTS PROGRAMME

APPENDIX 1 - COMMUNITY FACILITY GRANTS

1. Who is eligible to apply?

Parish Councils or their representatives, village hall committees, youth organisations or community groups. The application should come from the organisation with legal ownership or long-term tenure of the facility or land in question.

The applicant should have day-to-day responsibility for the building or land in question.

The facility or land will have full community access and have insurance cover, including for public liability.

2. What projects are eligible ?

New village halls or community centres and improvements to existing village halls and community centres

Village car parks associated with village halls, community centres, youth facilities or recreation grounds

Other community buildings where it is the primary community building in the village; for both new build and improvements to existing facilities.

Community mini buses, which are available to the whole community and accessible to disabled users.

New/improvements to disabled access to any community facility, which is substantially used by the community.

Youth buildings/centres or drop-in facilities.

Priority will be given to the main village halls or community centres in a village, where one exists. Halls linked to places of worship/churches may be eligible to apply for grants towards disabled access only where there is substantial community and non-faith related use of the hall. Evidence of this will be required including a programme of use and letters of support from user groups. Parish Councils will also be expected to support and contribute financially towards any scheme.

3. Consultation

Thorough consultation is expected for any new village or community hall project or indeed any substantial improvement scheme. Evidence must be provided that all sections of the community have been consulted, including young people, those with a disability and those from minority groups.

We wish to see these capital grants helping to increase community activity, rather than maintain existing activity levels.

4. Further information required

All applications must include a programme of use for the existing or proposed new facility.

5. Maximum Grant award

The Council's maximum grant award under this scheme is £40,000.

6. Contact Officer

For more information and an application pack please contact the Resource Officer, Sustainable Communities on 01954 713359, or by email at sustainablecommunities.grants@scambs.gov.uk

NEW COMMUNITIES CAPITAL GRANTS PROGRAMME

APPENDIX 2 - PLAY FACILITY GRANTS

1. Who is eligible to apply?

Parish Councils or their representatives, village hall committees or recreation ground committees.

Grants are only available to smaller villages within the District.

Villages with a total population of 1,000 or less are eligible for up to 50% of the total cost in grant awards (please see point 5).

Villages with a total population of 2,000 or less are eligible for up to 25% of the total cost in grant awards (please see point 5).

The application must come from the organisation with legal ownership or long-term tenure of the facility or land in question. The applicant must have day-to-day responsibility for the play area.

In exceptional cases, SCDC Housing Associations or Tenants' Groups may also apply subject to the approval of the landowner (normally SCDC) and written evidence of insurance and long term management/liability arrangements. SCDC will not take any responsibility for managing these facilities. The Parish Council must be supportive of the project and will normally be expected to take responsibility for its management and maintenance.

2. What projects are eligible ?

New play areas and improvements to existing play areas.

Grants may be awarded towards equipment, safety surfacing, fencing, bins, benches and signage as well as associated paths, landscaping and cycle parking.

All play areas must meet ROSPA approval and meet standards EN 1176 and BS EN 1177 (parts 1-7) and any further amendments.

Play areas must be accessible to children and carers with a disability and designed with all abilities in mind.

Please note that grants are also available for outdoor facilities aimed at teenagers such as skate parks, facilities for wheeled sports and ball courts/informal multi use games areas.

These come under a different grant aid scheme:-

The Youth Sport Initiative (See Appendix 3).

3. Health and Safety

Applicants must make it clear who is responsible for the application of relevant health and safety laws for the play facility, for the life of the equipment. Where this is not the landowner (or long term lease holder), a written contract must be produced and a copy attached to your application form. This contract will be between the landowner (or long term leaseholder) and the organisation providing the safety checks.

For child protection reasons, the Council advises that children's play areas should be overlooked (from a distance) by family homes, where possible. This allows for natural surveillance. The Council also advises that children's play areas should be protected from dog fouling, including provision of appropriate signage.

4. Consultation

Consultation must involve local children and young people as well as parents and carers; this might involve working with your local primary school.

In particular you must consult fully with residents who are likely to be most affected by any new or improved play facility or structure and we suggest you discuss your plans with all people living within 100m of the site, as well as wider consultation. The latter is the case regardless of whether Planning Permission is required or not.

5. Level of grant awards available.

The Council will consider awarding maximum grants for between 25-50% total project costs, depending on the size of the village, with a maximum of £40,000.

For villages with a population of up to 1,000, no grants will be for more than 50% total costs and SCDC awards will normally be for 25% - 35% total cost. If appropriate, applicants may return to the Council for a further "top up" award if they can provide evidence that all sources of funding have been exhausted.

For villages with a population of up to 2,000, no grant will be for more than 25% total cost and SCDC awards will normally be for 15-20% total cost. If appropriate, applicants may return to the Council for a further "top up" award if they can provide evidence that all sources of funding have been exhausted.

6. Contact Officer

For more information and an application pack please contact the Resource Officer, Sustainable Communities on 01954 713359, or by email at sustainablecommunities.grants@scambs.gov.uk

NEW COMMUNITIES CAPITAL GRANTS PROGRAMME

APPENDIX 3 - VILLAGE SPORTS FACILITY GRANTS

1. Who is eligible to apply?

Parish Councils, their representatives or sports clubs and organisations. The application must come from the organisation with legal ownership or long-term tenure of the facility or land in question.

The applicant must have day-to-day responsibility for the building or land in question.

The facility or land will have full community access and have insurance cover, including for public liability.

2. What projects are eligible ?

The project must cater for a recognised sport (in accordance with Sport England guidelines) and must meet all appropriate health and safety requirements.

Eligible projects are for: -

- New/improvements to sports pavilions, tennis courts, changing facilities as part of other community facilities, multi-use games areas, artificial training pitches, bowls greens, artificial wickets, practice nets and floodlighting.
- Car parks associated with sports facilities on recreation grounds
- New/improvements to disabled access to any sports facility, which is substantially used by the community.
- Purchase and improvements to recreational land.

3. Sports Clubs

All sports clubs that will be using the new/improved facilities, must be of amateur status and non-profit making, and must have a written constitution and an elected committee. A copy of the club accounts must accompany the application. Club membership must be open to all and membership fees must be reasonable and not prohibitive.

4. Club Accreditation Scheme

All sports clubs should be aware of their Governing Body Club Accreditation award and have either received this or be working towards it (this should be highlighted within the Club Development Plan). For Bowls clubs, a junior development plan should be submitted instead.

5. Sports Development Plan

The project should cater for a proven local need and should be part of a development plan (grants under £5,000 a 1 yr plan / grants £5,000 to £40,000 a 3 yr plan) taking into account:

- Current Situation/Club Structure
- A profile of Users
- Aims and Objectives
- Constitution
- A profile of coaches and officials
- Marketing and Publicity
- Regular activities, coaching programmes and events
- Facility and equipment need
- Funding and sponsorship
- Governing body club affiliation number
- Child Protection and Equality Policy
- Action Plans highlighting the proposals to increase participation, especially with specific groups, and the development of coaches through club accreditation.

6. Contact Officer

For more information and an application pack please contact the Resource Officer, Sustainable Communities on 01954 713359, or by email at sustainablecommunities.grants@scambs.gov.uk

NEW COMMUNITIES CAPITAL GRANTS PROGRAMME

APPENDIX 4 - YOUTH SPORT INITIATIVE GRANTS

1. Who is eligible to apply?

Parish Councils or their representatives, youth organisations or community groups. The application should come from the organisation with legal ownership or long-term tenure of the facility or land in question.

The applicant should have day-to-day responsibility for the building or land in question.

The facility or land will have full community access and have insurance cover, including for public liability.

Parish Councils may apply for a grant up to 50% of the total cost of the project to a maximum of £15,000 depending on the type of facility.

2. What projects are eligible ?

These grants are to assist casual sport and recreation facilities that would be aimed mainly at young people aged 12 and over. These facilities will normally have open access to casual users but may be booked (Multi-use Games Areas only) for use by identified groups on a weekly or occasional basis. Projects may include, but are not restricted to,:-

- Multi-use games areas (MUGA's)
- Skateboarding park
- Rollerblading park
- BMX bike ramps
- Kickwalls
- Single basketball posts

3. Consultation

Proof of consultation is essential to and must include the involvement of young people in decision making, design and raising funds. Partnership projects are strongly encouraged that involve Community Education and partnership with other local groups.

Local residents who may be affected by the project including noise pollution and the possibility of anti-social behaviour must be consulted.

A presentation to an Officer and designated Member of the Council by the Young People may be required before the final application is submitted.

4. Other Considerations

Parish Councils planning this type of facility should consider the following:-

- Involvement of young people at the earliest possible stage
- The views of these young people
- Management of the Facility and Booking systems required.
- Revenue implications
- Procedures for the regular inspection of facilities for damage/vandalism.
- Possible storage requirements for equipment
- Health and Safety policy, procedures and signage.

5. Contact Officer

For more information and an application pack please contact the Resource Officer, Sustainable Communities on 01954 713359, or by email at sustainablecommunities.grants@scambs.gov.uk

NEW COMMUNITIES CAPITAL GRANTS PROGRAMME

APPENDIX 5 - ARTS CAPITAL GRANT AID

1. Who is eligible to apply?

The Council welcomes applications from organisations involved in the following projects:-

1. Artists working in public spaces
2. Building new and refurbishing existing arts facilities (e.g. new halls, dressing rooms, dance floors etc.)
3. Equipment including lighting, sound and musical instruments

Early involvement of the Parish Council and other local groups is essential. A good case for the project and its relevance to the locality must form part of the application.

Prospective applicants should contact the local Arts Development Officer (ADO) regarding the feasibility of the application before completing the form. A meeting with the Officer may be required depending on the scale, complexity or likely impact of the project.

Please note that arts capital grant applications will not be accepted if:

- SCDC is requested for more than 50% of the total cost
- the application includes revenue costs
- the application does not show significant community benefit
- the application includes equipment or upgrades which are not mainly arts based

1. Artists work in public spaces

'Public Art' refers to any contribution by artists in a publicly accessible location and will encompass:

- landscape design, tree planting and mazes
- painting, sculpture, ceramic, prints, mixed media and artist in residence schemes
- brickwork, terracotta and patterned tiling or slates
- doors, gates, engraved and stained glass
- lighting, metalwork, tapestries and carpets
- wood and stone letter carving, banners and original graphics
- seating, bollards, railings, clocks and boundary features

Applications are actively encouraged from parish councils and community groups for publicly accessible art, craft and design works— both permanent and temporary - involving commissioning artists in new building, townscape and landscape developments and village enhancement schemes. Works eligible under this scheme are defined in the Council's public art policy (see

<http://www.scams.gov.uk/environment/planning/districtplanning/localdevelopmentframework/supportingdocument/publicart.htm>)

The Arts Development Officer can offer advice and support for parish councils and local organisations wishing to engage visual artists in village enhancement schemes.

This can include contributions (normally up to £5,000) towards costs associated with the involvement of artists in projects which aim to have a positive impact on the natural and built environment, including

Fees:

- advertising and selection costs
- the artist's idea, design and development fees
- the artist's commission fee
- consultant's fees
- project management costs

Consultation / Community engagement:

- the costs of engaging local people, running workshops, education and training programmes
- exhibition and events
- recording the process ('documentation')

Realisation:

- extra costs involved in carrying out artist's designs including materials, fabrication and transport costs
- marketing costs
- interpretation and evaluation costs
- non-recoverable VAT

The Council's capital arts grant aid fund **will not** support large areas of paving, 'off-the-shelf' street furniture, lighting or public amenities. However, if the artist has had a particular role in the design of such items, contributions towards the extra costs that result from the artist's idea are possible. In these circumstances, artist's costs would be calculated as a percentage of each item.

For more information and an application pack please contact the Resource Officer, Sustainable Communities on 01954 713359, or by email at sustainablecommunities.grants@scambs.gov.uk

2. Building new and refurbishing existing arts facilities

For the acquisition, design, construction, repair, renovation, rehabilitation or other capital improvements of a community facility for arts purposes. All of the following would qualify for consideration under this description:

- New construction.
- Additions to an existing structure.
- Renovations or repairs to an existing structure.
- Any combination of the above.

The Arts Development Officer can offer advice and support for parish councils and local organisations wishing to build new and refurbish existing arts facilities.

This can include contributions (normally up to £25,000) towards costs associated with:

- architectural competition costs
- development costs
- professional fees

- construction costs
- fit out and equipment costs
- non recoverable VAT
- inflation
- contingencies
- closure costs (temporary accommodation, removals, other disruption costs)
- commissioning artists or craftspeople
- training and equipment costs directly related to the building project
- start-up costs, e.g., the re-launch of the new facility
- additional staffing for specific work during the capital project

Applications for grants in the later phases of building fundraising campaigns are welcome. Matching funds for Capital Grants may include private or public contributions designated to the capital project and received up to three years before the date of application.

Applicants awarded an arts facilities grant will only receive the sum or its instalments once the Council is assured that:

- matching funds have been received
- invoices for work performed on the project have been submitted to the Council

3. Lighting And Sound Equipment

Applications for **equipment** (normally up to £15,000) may include the cost of:

- sound and lighting equipment
- musical instruments
- vans, minibuses and trailers
- cameras, editing and video equipment
- box office equipment
- new media equipment for experimental artwork
- integrated IT solutions which develop an organisation's activities
- audio visual or multimedia equipment
- recording equipment
- broadcasting equipment
- equipment for making facilities accessible to people with disabilities

Applications can include the cost of training where it is directly related to the new equipment. Computers, touring equipment and vehicles are anticipated to have a working life of five years, and other equipment for 10 years.

The Council's art capital grant aid **cannot fund**:

- second-hand equipment
- uniforms and costumes
- consumable and disposable items, e.g. art materials, sheet music

Other sources of funding

Please consult the Council's Funding Toolkit on www.scambs.gov.uk. Advice from the Department of Culture Media and Sport is available from <http://www.culture.gov.uk/NR/rdonlyres/DEF88565-E0C7-4D9D-A18A-9DF3D79D80FB/0/guidetoartsfunding.pdf>

This page is left blank intentionally.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: New Communities Portfolio Holder Meeting 20 May 2010
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director Operational Services/ Corporate Manager Planning and New Communities

SELF-COMMISSIONED HOUSING AT ORCHARD PARK**Purpose**

1. To inform the Portfolio Holder of a report commissioned by the Council, and subsequent action agreed by Cambridge City Council regarding development of its site K1 at Orchard Park.
2. This is not a key decision and it brought before this meeting because it may raise new options for policy in terms of enabling housing development.

Recommendations and Reasons

3. That the Portfolio Holder New Communities note the contents of this report and recommends that:
 - (a) New planning policies continue to adopt a positive approach towards self-commissioned housing including enabled co-housing;
 - (b) Officers continue to work collaboratively with Cambridge City Council in the next stage of work for site K1 at Orchard Park – to include setting up a Self-Providers Forum, soft-market testing and, subject to the outcome of the market testing, procurement of a development partner for an Enabled Co-Housing Project;
 - (c) Sites within South Cambridgeshire that are suitable for self-commissioned housing be included in the soft-market testing of the K1 project, subject to agreement with the relevant landowner or developer.

Background

4. In 2008, there was considerable concern that development at Orchard Park had slowed due to the recession. The partners involved on the site, including South Cambridgeshire District Council (SCDC), Gallaghers, Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association, Cambridge City Council and Cambridgeshire Horizons, came together to tackle the serious concerns of residents and members, and in early 2009 considered a range of options to facilitate build-out of the site. The measures included tenure swaps, a bid for Kickstart funding and proposals for self-commissioned housing. In order to explore the potential for self-commissioned housing, South Cambridgeshire District Council, in partnership with Cambridge City Council, commissioned a Scoping Study in September. The study looked at the development of the K1 site at Orchard Park.
5. Site K1 is a City Council owned site at Orchard Park situated in South Cambridgeshire on the northern fringes of Cambridge. It is approximately 2.4 acres (0.97 hectares). The City Council entered into a collaboration agreement with other development partners to bring the whole site forward for development. This enabled a collective approach to obtaining overall planning consent, undertaking infrastructure

works and servicing the various land parcels. The Council's land was split into 2 sites for housing: K1 for market housing and K2 for affordable housing (now sold and development completed on site). The collaboration agreement allocated the total number of units on the various sites with K1 having an allocation of 37 homes. The City Council had planning consent for this, subject to submitting a "reserved matters" application within 3 years.

6. Futureplanners were engaged to undertake the study. They held interviews with relevant interested parties, collected background information and organised a workshop in November. The workshop was well-attended and included small-scale developers, co-housing representatives, architects, planners and urban designers. The report was finalised in January, and is available as a background report. The report is concise whilst containing a wealth of information, and members are asked to read it. The report's recommendations fall into three groups: Spatial Planning, Enabling and Delivery. This report focuses on enabling delivery through collaborative working with Cambridge City Council, and in a more general way on planning policy.
7. Self build housing schemes include a wide range of approaches:
 - a) Self-building: literally building the whole dwelling
 - b) Self-finishing: taking a shell property from a house builder and then completing from first fix, second fix or decorating stages
 - c) Self-commissioning: directly procuring professional design services and a contactor or a house-builder.

In each option, the activity may be carried out by an individual or groups, as conventional home owners or renters, or in a group with some form of social organisation and corporate structure such as a community land trust, mutual co-operatives or co-housing groups.

8. The K1 report concludes that a community self commissioned scheme could be viable at Orchard Park and should produce a net capital receipt comparable to that received by a more traditional open market sale at the current time. In addition, self-commissioning is likely to bring more social capital than traditional development.
9. The recommended approach for K1 is Enabled Co-housing. This involves providing houses in partnership with an established house builder for outright ownership with collective ownership of the public realm. This approach has a strong track record of providing good quality homes and stable communities in other European countries. The developers interested in this approach are likely to be smaller or niche house builders with an interest in higher quality or more sustainable homes. They will forego some of their usual profit as the project risks are shared across those involved and the profit may come on the build cost rather than the scheme overall. From a homeowner perspective, there is local interest from Enlinca, the Cambridge Co-Housing Group and the Argyle Street Housing Co-op.
10. The proposed scheme provides an innovative opportunity to offer community minded individuals a site where they could play a key part in the design, planning and development of their homes and of the community that would be created.
11. The main stages of the proposed Enabled Co-housing scheme are expected to be as follows, although it should be accepted that the plans may alter as a result of consultation during the feasibility work:

- a) City Council procure a consultant to undertake a more detailed feasibility study of Site K1 including soft market testing, negotiation with mortgage companies and production of business plan. The timetable is that a consultant will be appointed by 30 June with soft-market testing event in September 2010.
- b) If the study outcomes are positive, the consultant will provide support to set up a co-housing group for K1, progress through a procurement process to appoint a development partner, and facilitate disposal of the site. This stage to be completed by 31 March 2011.
- c) City Council's development partner will design and build a scheme on the designated site in close liaison with the co-housing group. At this stage, it is anticipated that prospective participants will confirm their commitment to the scheme.
- d) Development partner develops integrated housing and landscape vision, and obtains planning consent.
- e) Development partner develops site and sells to the individual purchasers in the usual way by way of freehold or long leasehold sales.
- f) Each sale document requires purchasers to become members of the Resident Management Company, usually a not for profit Industrial and Provident Society.
- g) Ownership of common areas and benefit of covenants on upkeep of the houses vested in the Resident Management Company.
- h) Purchasers arrange their own mortgages with consortium lenders and pay for homes on completion.
- i) Development partner takes all risk on development.
- j) Purchasers all pay a service charge for the upkeep and development of the common areas and maintenance charges.
- k) Resident Management Company takes all decisions regarding ongoing management and maintenance of the site and buildings.
- l) Purchasers can sell on properties subject to the above covenants.

Considerations

- 12. At a meeting of the Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 29 March 2010, Cambridge City Council agreed to proceed with the disposal of K1 and management of the process by way of an enabled community self build scheme as set out above. It should be noted that it was agreed by the Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee that Cambridgeshire Horizons would fund the next feasibility study.
- 13. Work is currently underway to produce a Supplementary Planning Document providing design guidance for undeveloped sites at Orchard Park, including K1. It is intended that the guidance will support an application for co-housing and also that consultation for the draft SPD will include groups interested in bringing forward self-commissioned housing.
- 14. Vauban in Freiburg is recognised as an exemplar new development and includes a significant proportion of self-provided housing. The proposed project for Orchard Park provides the opportunity for new ways of working to be trialled, with potential for other developments including Northstowe and the City Council's land on the south of Cambridge. The first-wave eco-towns are keen to include self-commissioned housing in their plans.

15. Self-commissioned housing is currently the subject of considerable interest nationally from the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors, CABE, the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) and the Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG). CLG will be including a page on co-housing in the briefing pack for the new Housing Minister. Hanover Housing Association, one of the largest national providers of housing for older people, is working with the London Women’s Co-Housing Group to bring forward a co-housing scheme. Within the county, East Cambridgeshire District Council is keen to support self-commissioned housing particularly through a community land trust.
16. The Futureplanners’ report states that Government data collection does not make it easy to analyse the numbers of self-provided homes, but it is accepted in ‘normal years’ this sector represents 8-10% total completions, that is 15,000 – 20,000 homes. During 2009, when total output fell significantly, the self-provided sector will represent 20-25% on the basis that evidence from previous recessions shows that self-provided output has been maintained or increased during the period of recession.
17. The big house-building companies such as Barretts, Bovis, Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon construct the vast majority of new homes on our major developments. At Cambourne, land was reserved for self-build, but proposals have not come forward for these sites yet. There is a real shortage of first hand learning and experience of delivering such schemes and so learning from a live scheme would be very beneficial.

Implications

18. Financial	None
Legal	None
Staffing	Some staff input will be provided within the overall context of providing support for Orchard Park.
Risk Management	At this stage there is very low risk for South Cambridgeshire District Council. It is important that any self-commissioned scheme at Orchard Park is very well run in order to avoid issues for local residents. This will be managed by Cambridge City Council through careful procurement, and through good development control.

Equal Opportunities	<p>One of the key barriers to self-build schemes is the availability of land when competing with developers in a buoyant economy. When the market is low, however, one of the key barriers to self-build becomes the availability of finance for development. Discussions with Cambridgeshire Building Society suggest that an enabled self build scheme in the manner proposed would be acceptable for funding to reasonable levels of loan to value ratios. Given the probable mix of properties on the site, this should enable new entrants to the property market to get onto the property ladder as well as existing homeowners.</p> <p>Co-housing groups can represent a cross section of the communities from which they are drawn. They tend to come together from cultural, family or ideological backgrounds. A scheme offering a mix of property types and values can meet their requirements well. Such schemes may also offer opportunities for specific ethnic or cultural communities that are difficult to bring together by more traditional approaches.</p>
Climate Change	<p>Whilst it is possible to impose specific environmental and sustainability targets on Site K1, this may impact significantly on the value depending upon the level specified. Many co-housing groups have high sustainability expectations and so it is anticipated that the site is likely to achieve good performance in this respect. It may be seen as contrary to the principles of self-build if targets are imposed rather than agreed by the ultimate residents of the scheme themselves (accepting that they will be bound by the requirements of current planning and building regulation legislation).</p>

Consultations

19. The report by Futureplanners was developed with guidance from a multi-agency steering group including SCDC and Cambridge City Council representing planning, estates and housing strategy, Cambridgeshire County Council in its role as promoters of the Hive, Gallaghers, Unex and Bedfordshire Pilgrims Housing Association (BPHA). The workshop held in November 2009 was attended by around 50 people and interviewees for the report included the Director of Joint Planning, Enlinca, the Argyle Housing Co-op, Cambridge Building Society, Carter Jonas, local housing associations and developers, and local architects.
20. As stated above, a report on self-commissioned housing and K1 at Orchard Park was presented to Cambridge City Council's Strategy and Resources Scrutiny Committee on 29 March 2010. A verbal report on the study and proposed project was given to the Joint Strategic Growth Implementation Committee in February 2010.

Effect on Strategic Aims

21. The recommendations of this report support three of the Council's Strategic Aims:
 - a. We are committed to being a listening council providing first class services accessible to all. This report recommends that the Council's planning policies continue to support a positive response to self-commissioned housing, thereby showing a willingness to listen to and engage with smaller developers and community-focussed housing groups.

- b. We are committed to making South Cambridgeshire a place in which residents can feel proud to live. Co-housing and self-provided housing has a history of providing high quality homes and garden areas, that are very well-regarded by residents and visitors.
- c. We are committed to assisting provision of local jobs for you and your family. Enabled co-housing and self-commissioned housing provides opportunities for local employment and skills programmes.

Conclusions / Summary

- 22. Self-commissioned housing including enabled co-housing is receiving a high level of interest nationally. The site K1 at Orchard Park, that is owned by the City Council, has been identified as a potentially suitable site for enabled co-housing by a study. The City Council has agreed to take forward the recommendations of the study regarding K1, with funding from Cambridgeshire Horizons. SCDC will work with the City Council and other partners to facilitate the enabled co-housing project, and identify lessons that may be applied to other developments.
- 23. SCDC should take account of the potential contribution of self-commissioned housing as it revises and updates planning policies.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change (Report and Recommendations) by Futureplanners

Orchard Park Scrutiny Report – November 2009

Contact Officer: Jo Mills- Corporate Manager Planning and New Communities
Telephone: (01954) 713350

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

CONTENTS

- 1.0 Executive Summary**
- 2.0 Recommendations**
- 3.0 Proposals**
- 4.0 Enabling and Project Delivery – Generic models of self-provided housing**
- 5.0 Orchard Park KI Project Plan**
- 6.0 Use of Resource Implications at K1**
- 7. 0 Legal Implications**
- 8.0 Cost Profile and Financial Implications**
- 9.0 Conclusion**

ANNEX A: GENERIC CO-HOUSING MODELS

ANNEX B: OUTLINE PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPER PROCUREMENT AND LAND DISPOSAL, AND PROJECT PROGRAMME

ANNEX C: Extract RICS SELF- PROVIDED HOUSING DISCUSSION PAPER FOR CLG November 2009

ANNEX D: K1 PROJECT PLAN ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

ANNEX E: Q&A on BEST CONSIDERATION ISSUES

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 In September 2009, Cambridge City Council and South Cambridgeshire District Council commissioned a Scoping Study for the development of Orchard Park K1 site through some form of self-provided housing. The outcome of the study has been to understand self-provided housing as a potentially valuable additional source of supply for the Sub-Region, not just for this site, or only on public land, or just in the current difficult housing markets.

1.2 Central Government is also taking a renewed interest in the self-provided sector, especially as it may make up upto 20-25% of new housing supply in 2009-10. In December, CABE published a study of “citizen-led” housing as part of a book of proposals for alternative ways of producing new housing and places, *“Who should build our homes?”*¹.

1.3 Self-provided housing includes a wide spectrum of approaches:

- Self-building: literally building the whole dwelling;
- Self-finishing: taking a property from a housebuilder and completing from first fix, second fix or decorating stages; and
- Self-commissioning: directly procuring professional design services and contractor or housebuilder.

In each of these options, the activity may be carried out by an individual or groups, as conventional home owners or renters, or in a group of variable size with some form of social organisation and corporate structure, such as community land trusts, mutual cooperatives, or co-housing groups; institutional forms of delivery to which all political parties are giving increasing attention

1.4 This report suggests a three pronged approach to develop:

- Housing and planning policies to reflect the need and demand for self-provision;
- Preferred methods of enabling and delivering self-provided housing viz “Independent” and “Enabled” Co-housing, and
- Working up a range of site specific proposals.

1.5 The aim is to create a policy context in which future decisions can be taken by both councils about their Use of Resources, particularly land in their ownership, to promote self-provided housing where this will deliver desired policy wellbeing outcomes more effectively than other ways of delivering new housing supply. However, where there is a sufficient evidence base, policies will be needed to apply the requirement for self-provision to sites in other public and private ownerships through planning conditions, or S.106 obligations.

1.6 In this report, it is recommended that the preferred option for a project specific proposal at Orchard Park K1 is Enabled Co-housing, providing homes in partnership with an established housebuilder for outright ownership, with collective ownership of the public realm. Other options and tenures will be appropriate in other situations.

1.7 The Co-housing model is becoming more widely promoted in England for both rented and home ownership housing. It can be seen as a good and recognizable brand

¹ <http://www.cabe.org.uk/news/who-should-build-our-homes>

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

to promote in the Sub-Region, with a strong track record of providing good quality homes and places, and stable communities, in other northern European countries.

2.0 Recommendations

Spatial Planning:

- The scope of the next Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Strategic Land Availability Assessment should be extended to cover appropriate questions about current activity, levels of need and demand, and land availability for self-provided housing.
- Following the results of both assessments, the updated evidence base should be evaluated to formulate any new policies that will be required to apply on land in public and private ownership.
- Interim policies for the use of council owned land to support self-provided housing should be adopted on a site-by-site basis, to support the delivery of existing policy objectives.

Enabling:

- As part of their strategic housing activities, the Councils should initially set up a joint consultative Self Providers Forum [SPF] with the established self-providers to assess the potential role, capacity and enabling and promotional requirements for a self-provided sector in growth area projects in and around the city.
- The two councils should canvass other potential organisations that might have a role to play in identifying and/or representing other potential self-providers eg. the University of the Third Age, rural housing enablers, travellers, and ethnic representative bodies.
- The two Councils should canvass the interest in working together with other adjoining councils in the sub-region engaged in similar initiatives eg. East Cambridgeshire District Council's programme of support to village-based Community Land Trusts: a possible forerunner of the Local Housing Trusts proposed in the Conservative Housing Green Paper as an extension of the current cross-part support to community land trusts.

Delivery:

- The Councils should develop generic concept models for Independent Co-housing and Enabled Co-housing, both to assist Members and officers understand the operating and policy context in which such schemes can be promoted, and how council assets can be sold through OJEU compliant procedures (where these are needed) at the best consideration reasonably obtainable. [An outline of the two approaches and disposal and procurement guidelines are contained in Annex A]

Orchard Park KI Project Plan:

- The Councils should start working with the Enlinca Co-housing group, within the context of the Self-Providers Forum, to carry out a soft market testing to establish whether they can build up an active cohort of prospective purchasers for homes on the K1 site.
- Subject to the outcome of the market testing, the City Council should proceed with proposals to market the site and procure a development partner for an Enabled Co-Housing Project.

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

- The Councils should engage with central government, other public bodies and representative bodies to draw up a project brief and joint funding proposal for an Action Learning Project and the Orchard Park Innovation Fund to run alongside the development project.

3.0 Proposals

3.1 Spatial Planning Policy and Housing

Housing policy relating to new housing supply in England is primarily embodied in planning policy, particularly PPS3 Housing. This provides guidance on the qualitative and quantitative application of the evidence base which must assess market activity, need and demand, and the availability of land to meet the demand.

Self-provided housing output nationally is generally recognised by government and the mainstream housebuilding bodies to be in the order of 15000 to 20000 homes each year. Government data collection methods does not distinguish sufficiently between different types of private sector providers to pick up all self-provided homes, but it is accepted that, in 'normal' years, this output represents about 8-10% of total completions. In the current year, when total output may fall to 90,000 or lower, it will represent between 20-25%. Evidence from previous recessions shows that self-provided output has either been maintained or even increased during the recessionary period.

Politicians of both main parties have belatedly recognised the significance of the sector, with speeches in December 2009 by Housing Minister John Healey at the Fabian Society and Shadow Housing Minister, Grant Shapps, in Cornwall, both acknowledging the contribution of the sector and its potential value to boosting supply and meeting very local needs and demand that the mainstream market cannot. The Liberal Democrat spokesperson, Sarah Teather, and earlier Matthew Taylor, have always been more supportive of citizen led housing solutions. It is possible that the Pre-Budget Review and other pre-election announcements by all parties, in the New Year will propose measures, and possibly pilot projects or initiatives, to support the sector.

The government's proposals will probably cover some of the following areas of planning and housing policy; areas which have also been reflected in the interviews with stakeholders during the Scoping Study, or emerged in the feedback from participants in the Study's stakeholder workshop in November 2009.

3.2 The Evidence Base required for national and local planning policies

- Strategic Housing Market Assessments [SHMA] largely ignore this segment of supply. The scope of the SHMA needs to assess the current levels of activity and supply, (with definitions of what counts,) the levels of unmet demand, and support needed to realise demand.
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments [SHLAA] similarly ignore this segment of the market, including the assessment of sites that may be suitable for particular kinds of self-provided housing, e.g. infill sites that may be unattractive to mainstream housebuilders, or Walter Segal construction methods on sloping sites

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

or poor made-up ground, and site sizes/locations that may support the growth of intentional communities.

3.3 Policies grounded in the broad themes of national and local planning objectives

- Economic Development – availability of housing supply for local employment, localised product development and off-site production, technology and skills development.
- Housing Market Performance – Resilience of housing providers and maintenance and increase of supply during recessions, kickstart of weak housing markets by early adopters, increased competition from innovation, quality, aftercare and speed of production.
- Climate change, sustainable development and sustainable communities – the capacity of ‘early adopters’ to build new intentional communities, and to promote a critical mass of collective sustainable behaviours to supplement sustainable technologies in achieving low carbon lifestyles.
- Affordability – self-building and self-finishing cost options, reduced risk and profit structures to reduce outturn cost to occupier, and potential to attract institutional funding for rent to mortgage products.
- Placeshaping – the capacity of intentional communities to contribute to the design, delivery and ongoing stewardship and governance of localities, especially in the establishment of new neighbourhoods and settlements.
- Housing need and community cohesion– the capacity of intentional communities to cater for specific housing and social care needs through mutual support and pooling of social, environmental and economic capital, eg. housing for older people, vulnerable and lonely single people, and Black and Ethnic Minority communities, including travellers.

3.4 Refining existing planning practice and processes

There was acceptance that there was a need to investigate:

- Better quality and more pro-active and creative pre-planning discussions to build trust between applicants and LPA staff, and to create greater certainty before formal planning to reduce planning risk and provide the platform for developing higher quality schemes capable of delivering wellbeing outcomes. (This is also a mainstream point that has also emerged strongly in the CLG’s Pre-Budget Review consultation with industry stakeholders.) The success of Project Vauban in Freiburg, according to Freiburg’s Chief Planner, was due to the active role played by him and his staff in negotiations amongst the self-provider groups and in assisting the applicants to realise what were already much higher aspirations for quality and sustainability than mainstream developers.
- The potential to use the new style Local Development Orders and Sustainable Communities Act 2007 designations to enable self-provided housing solutions in particular places, where special procedures are justified.

3.5 Land disposals related to planning policy

Access to land is the most commonly cited reason for the relatively low market share of self-provided housing. Established housebuilders control the dominant share of sites of all sizes, and access to finance to secure options or ownership.

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

In the short term, at least, most enabling measures will therefore have to focus on unlocking access to existing public land supply:

- More detailed understanding of public land asset management practice and the relationship of Use of Resources to corporate and spatial planning policy and the achievement of policy and operational outcomes. The Audit Commission's first round of Comprehensive Area Assessment [CAA] reports, launched in December 2009, highlighted the importance of this area of local authorities' activities. The Local Government Association was concerned that the reports identify significant shortcomings in performance, especially in the context of capital finance shortages over the next Comprehensive Spending Review settlement 2010-2013. The potential for sales to self-providers to generate higher plot prices than bulk purchasers, as in Germany, should be explored and tested.
- Public land sales with a prescribed proportion of self-provided plots, within the normal constraints of planning conditions, S106 requirements, masterplan, design code, density requirement and development brief for the site, to reflect the evidence base and the consequential policies. This approach would be the same as the land disposal practice of the former Commission for New Towns, agreed with the Treasury, to ensure that new provision reflected the broad composition of existing markets in terms of tenure, size, price and method of provision; between 5-12% of new housing plots were allocated to various kinds of self-provision. The comprehensive housing market evidence base now available through SHMAs and SHLAAs would now provide a more informed basis for responding to both previously unrecorded and evolving types of need and demand, eg. more and different models of housing and care for the aging "baby boomer" generation for which the market is not yet providing, the growth of single person households, and the renewed emphasis on family houses, both generally and for specific ethnic and cultural communities.

In the longer term, however, where there is a sufficient evidence base, policies will be needed to apply the requirement for self-provision to sites in all other public and private ownerships through planning conditions or S.106 obligations.

3.6 Recommendations

- The scope of the next Strategic Housing Market Assessment and Strategic Land Availability Assessment should be extended to cover appropriate questions about current activity, levels of need and demand, and land availability for self-provided housing.
- Following the results of both assessments, the updated evidence base should be evaluated to formulate any new policies that will be required to apply on land in public and private ownership.
- Interim policies for the use of council owned land to support self-provided housing should be adopted on a site-by-site basis, to support the delivery of existing policy objectives.

4.0 Enabling and Project Delivery – Generic models of self-provided housing

4.1 Options considered

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

The Scoping Study explored a range of options for enabling and project delivery:

4.1.1 *Independent self-organising groups and individuals*: includes:

- Co-housing projects such as the recently completed of 35 self-commissioned homes at Springhill, Stroud and other co-housing projects now in planning,
- Community Land Trust [CLT] projects, such as the 12 home self-build St. Minver CLT in the Cornish CLT programme which now totals over 120 homes in 17 villages across the county;
- Self-build groups, which are either grant aided for rent or Homebuy, or private self-build groups, some of which received assistance from the former Housing Corporation's Self-Build Revolving Fund designed to assist groups with site acquisition and up-front fees in advance of normal development finance, and
- Cooperatives, both privately funded par value ownership and grant aided social rent projects

Risk assessment: Groups take on all risks – site purchase, development finance, planning, construction costs, and marketing if group members drop out. Both CLTs and cooperatives have or are developing primary and secondary structures in which secondary agencies provide professional expertise to support the primaries which actually undertake and occupy the new developments. This substantially reduces the risks of cost and time overrun.

4.1.2 *Enabled self-provision*: includes:

- Project Vauban in Freiburg, which has been cited in the work supporting the Cambridge Quality Charter for Growth. The local authority enables self-provider groups to participate in the development of a new suburb through offering plots by open market tender, and then enabling the purchasing groups to appoint panel architects and constructors to build homes on serviced land prepared by the local authority in accordance with a master plan and design code. The City Planner takes a proactive role in ensuring high quality proposals within the policy constraints, as well as through managing negotiations between adjoining plot developments in the pre-planning stages. Many of the purchasers made a positive choice to live in Vauban because of the city's vision and leadership to deliver high quality homes, public space, and community facilities for families, public transport and the opportunity for sustainable living.
- Other German cities, such as Tübingen, Dresden, Leipzig and the former East Berlin, where projects similar to Vauban have been promoted either by developers trying to kickstart weak housing markets, or by local authorities, of many different political persuasions to support social and economic policies, particularly for encouraging integration across ethnic, cultural and age barriers.

Risk assessment: Groups take on the same risks as self-organising groups above, but benefit significantly from the leadership role of the local authority as both planning authority and land developer, with project management and coordinating functions, and an ability to implement the masterplan flexibly to respond to experience and changing needs over the course of the development.

4.1.3 *Developer-led resident managed housing*

This is not a true self-provided solution at the development stage, but includes:

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

- SPAN housing developments from the mid-1950's to early 1970's. Purchasers were obliged to set up and participate in resident controlled management companies which owned the common areas and sometimes the freehold of all the leasehold flats and houses. The companies had responsibilities to manage and maintain the homes and the landscape setting that were such a feature of the SPAN housing developments. SPAN projects, such as Highsett in Cambridge, are characterized by plain architecture, high quality public realm, and community stability. SPAN schemes remain highly sought after, despite their age, and often command premium resale values. Some niche housebuilders interviewed for the study are also looking back to the SPAN model, as well as developing new ways of working directly with potential purchasers on the design, co-funding and building or finishing of new homes.

Risk assessment: The developer takes all the risks. Incoming residents assume stewardship responsibilities and therefore the risk to the resale value and cost of occupation if they fail to carry out their responsibilities effectively. The enduring popularity of SPAN schemes suggests this is a very low risk.

4.2 Applicability of options

In the UK and Cambridge setting, the Freiburg approach is not currently practical. UK local authorities rarely fulfill the same combined functions of planning and delivery, and few are resourced to do so. The Homes and Communities Agency does have plan making and planning management powers, as well as delivery capacity, but it accepted that they will only use their planning powers, as a last resort and on political direction. Their priority is to assist local authorities through Local Investment Agreements negotiated through the 'single conversation' setting out capital investment plans, enabling activity and outcome and output objectives.

However, UK local authorities **do** have strategic housing and economic development functions which require and enable them to support any approach to housing provision and supply, and the strengthening of local housing markets, that meets agreed policy priorities. The interviews and practical workshops for the Scoping Study indicated strong levels of interest in self-provided housing and an understanding of the added value that self-providers could bring to the making of new neighbourhoods, both from public bodies, professionals, and potential self-providers in the city. Given the increasing level of mainstream political interest in self-provision, especially in the context of 'localism', it is possible that local authorities will be expected to play a growing enabling and facilitating role.

4.3 Preferred options

The presumption has been made, therefore, that strategic housing objectives could be strengthened by enabling self-provided housing projects in the sub-region to enrich the current range of housing provision, and to improve quality and diversify production. From the examples examined through the Scoping Study, two approaches are favoured:

- **Independent Co-housing**, as a brand name for all the independently self-organised categories described in 4.1.1 above, viz co-housing, CLTs and cooperatives; and
- **Enabled Co-housing**, as a brand name for a hybrid of Enabled self-provision [4.1.2] and Developer led approaches [4.1.3] to cover groups recruited either by

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

themselves, or with support from a council [or RSL/professional firm/agent], working with a developer, who will carry an agreed level of the project risks. Such developers are likely to be smaller or niche housebuilders, with an interest in higher quality and more sustainable homes, and already innovative in the ways they engage with prospective purchasers. Several of these were interviewed during the course of the study.

4.4 Building local capacity

In regeneration good practice, it is a truism that local authorities should “work with what is there”. In the city, there are three established groups of self-providers who are keen to undertake new developments for their communities of interest:

- **Argyle Street Coop**, located off Mill Road, just north of the mainline railway, is a thriving mutual coop of over thirty years’ standing, designed in the 1970’s for single people. It is looking for new sites to build larger family homes for some of its existing members and broaden its mix of dwelling types. It also aspires to meet the very highest standards of sustainable construction, aiming for Level 5/6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. They are supported by Birmingham Cooperative Housing Services, part of the Accord Housing Group in Birmingham, providing services to primary coops.
- **Enlinca**, the Cambridge co-housing group has been in existence for about 8 years. It has a small organising committee, but an extensive mailing list of over 150 members. The national co-housing movement also aspires to very demanding standards of sustainable living and construction. The local group has been limited by the difficulty of obtaining access to land in fierce competition with mainstream housebuilders and a continuously rising land market over the period of their existence, making market entry almost impossible, without a structured land purchase deal, subject to planning and funding. They have established links with the Argyle Street Coop, the UK Co-Housing Network, and other co-housing projects under development.
- **Cambridge Chinese Community**, representing members of the Chinese community living in and around Cambridge and relatives and businesses overseas. They have negotiated with Cambridge Housing Society and the City Council to provide an extra-care housing scheme for Chinese elders. There is interest from the community to establish other housing projects for their members, and they have resources in the UK and overseas to support their plans.

Between them, these three cover the full spectrum of interest from grant-aided social rent and Homebuy [shared ownership] to shared equity and market housing. All three have been operating on a volunteer self-funded basis.

4.5 Enabling Recommendations

- As part of their strategic housing activities, the Councils should initially set up a joint consultative Self Providers Forum [SPF] with the established self-providers to assess the potential role, capacity and enabling and promotional requirements for a self-provided sector in growth area projects in and around the city.
- The Councils should canvass other organisations that might have a potential role to play in identifying and/or representing other potential self-providers, eg. the University of the Third Age, rural housing enablers, travellers, and ethnic representative bodies.

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

- The Councils should canvass the interest in working together with other adjoining councils in the sub-region engaged in similar initiatives eg. East Cambridgeshire District Council's programme of support to village-based Community Land Trusts: a possible forerunner of the Local Housing Trusts proposed in the Conservative Housing Green Paper as an extension of the current cross-part support to community land trusts, and proposals to support their development in the RSS Implementation Plan.

The Councils may wish to start promoting policies or land disposals to enable both independent self-organising and developer-led or enabled self-providers.

4.6 Delivery Recommendations

- The Councils should develop generic concept models for both Independent and Enabled Co-housing, both to assist Members and officers understand the operating and policy context in which such schemes can be promoted, and how council assets can be sold through OJEU compliant procedures (when these are needed) at the best consideration reasonably obtainable. [An outline of the two approaches is set out in Annex A, and notes on disposal and procurement guidelines are contained in Annex B.]

5.0 Orchard Park KI Project Plan

5.1 The Site

Site K1 is a serviced site at the eastern end of Orchard Park, in a section in which only K1 and L2 are still undeveloped. The site is approximately 2.4 acres/ 1.0 hectares, with a lapsed outline planning permission for 37 market homes. The affordable housing obligation has already been met elsewhere in Orchard Park.

The site was marketed for sale in 2007, with the benefit of this permission, then valid, for homes to be built at Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3. An offer made in June 2007 was not completed, and housing and land markets collapsed shortly afterwards.

5.2 The City Council's priorities

The Council has spent approximately £xx on its contributions to infrastructure, and its objective is to recoup as much of this as possible. The Council aims to obtain the best consideration reasonably obtainable in current market conditions and in the context of its corporate planning objectives for the Use of Resources. [See further sections 6.0 Use of

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

Resources and Annexes B and E] It intends to recycle the capital receipt from K1 in order to re-invest in other City priorities.

5.3 Development and Mortgage Finance

The Scoping Study examined the current mortgage market conditions both for development finance for a group schemes as well as retail mortgages. It found that mainstream bank lending was excessively cautious, whereas local building societies and specialist lenders, like the Ecological, were more supportive. The supply of mortgages was still very tight, both in volume and cautious Loan to Value ratios ranging from 65% to 85%.

None of the lenders was enthusiastic about development finance. Lenders looked for additional comfort through working with established developers, and any extra financial security and underwriting that might be on offer, eg. building on land under licence, with land price paid over on the sale of each completed home.

Unlike conditions pre-2007, a development of 40-50 homes is now rated a “large scheme”, meaning that lenders would expect to share risk, even on retail mortgages, with 2-3 other lenders. The Cambridge Building Society was willing to take the lead in putting together such a consortium of lenders for retail mortgages.

5.4 House Price Sales Values

Orchard Park is an established market, with clear benchmark values, currently reflecting the thresholds of the current SDLT bands. The table below shows the changes from the peak of the market in 2007 to date:

<i>Unit Type</i>	<i>Size</i>	<i>Sales Values 2007 >2009</i>
4Bed House	110m ²	£320,000 > £250,000
2Bed Flat	61- 70m ²	£220,000 > £162,500 average

5.5 Site value

Average Plot Prices in Orchard Park, at the 2007 peak, were in the order of £130,000+. If the site had been sold as planned in mid-2007, by the time the homes had come to market, the build cost as a residual would have had to be in the order of £450/m² ie. about half the typical mainstream housebuilders rate of £900/m², and one third of a standard RSL Code 3-4 home rate of £1200/m². The development would not have been viable, and it unlikely that it would have proceeded.

Today, assuming a Code 3-4 standard of approximately £1200/m² build cost, plot prices might be in the order of:

<i>Unit Type</i>	<i>Size</i>	<i>Plot Price 2009</i>
4Bed House	110m ²	£55,000 - £63,000
2Bed Flat	61- 70m ²	£32,000 - £37,000

ie. very broadly between a third and half of land values in 2007, reflecting the national trend in the fall of land prices since the peak of 60-75%. Without a full viability test of the site with a specific mix and design, it is only possible to put a very broad current guide price of between £1.9m to £2.2m for the scheme that previously had planning permission.

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

5.6 Site utilization

The scheme density of 36 dwellings per hectare complies with the current proposal for the whole development. However, the proposals for Orchard Park will shortly be reviewed to accommodate the impact of the Planning Inspector's additional allocation of 200 units to the area. It may be appropriate and necessary to modify the density of currently undeveloped sites.

Possible benchmarks of 40-45 dwellings per hectare, from the high quality Cala and Abode projects in the urban extension at New Hall, Harlow, might be explored, especially if a self-provided approach is adopted. For example, a self-provided group might be more interested in adopting a low car use/ownership lifestyle, thus reducing the amount of the site required for mews roads, garages and parking courts.

A higher density scheme, still within the spirit of the current Design Brief, should therefore yield a higher site value that would recover a greater proportion or even all of the Council's outlay.

[NB. The information contained in the preceding paragraphs 5.4 to 5.6 does not constitute formal valuation advice, is derived from secondary market data and is intended to be indicative only.]

5.7 Development options

The development process for a self-provided scheme will need to take account of:

- the current financial climate, and likely mortgage valuation levels and LTV ratios;
- the Council's objectives to maximise its receipt; and
- the limited development and project management resources of the Councils.

5.8 Responsibilities of the Councils

The outcome of the Scoping Study is to favour an Enabled Co-housing project, in order to minimise risk and ensure the development takes place within the timescale required by the Council to ensure that it can recycle the capital receipt to Clay Farm

The key elements of the process of self-provision will require both Councils to work together on the following enabling functions:

- Establishing a new planning and development brief for the site to establish density and other design criteria that will provide sufficient planning certainty and flexibility to attract development partners and prospective self-providers;
- Procuring an enabling development partner via open tender/OJEU process to develop the land under licence, on deferred purchase terms;
- Supporting Enlinca, the Cambridge Co-housing group, to recruit prospective purchasers, and to form them into a corporate body to work with the Councils as joint commissioners of the project;
- Supporting a collaborative pre-design & pre-planning process between the developer, co-housing group and the Councils;
- Integrating Building Society building risk assessment and mortgage commitment into the pre-planning of the site and design of sustainable dwelling types;
- Overseeing the negotiation of a risk sharing and profit protocol between the developer and co-housing group, including a contract to build the agreed scheme to a timetable.

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

Outline proposals for the developer procurement and land disposal arrangements, and a project programme are contained in Annex B.

5.9 Action Learning Project

The Councils would be pioneering a new approach to the development of public land, at a time when public policy is focusing more closely than ever on the potential contribution of self-provided housing to national housing supply, and on the effective Use of Resources to deliver both quality policy outcomes and capital resources to reinvest in other council activities. [An extract from a Discussion Paper on Self-Provided Housing submitted by the RICS to the Minister of Housing in November 2009 is attached in Annex C.]

Following the Pre-Budget Review in mid-December, the DCLG are proposing to make a series of announcements, in the New Year, about housing market interventions and pilots aimed at increasing new supply whilst maintaining quality. There is a reasonable likelihood that some new measures will be announced to support the self-provided sector and its promoters.

However, there is a real shortage of first hand learning and experience of delivering such schemes, so it would be essential to take the opportunity to maximise the learning opportunities provided by a live project. Key areas of learning would be the leverage of public assets to:

- Increase choice and competition, and raise quality
- Diversify providers and increase rate of supply
- Increase land value per plot
- Develop a brand for sustainable living

Learning from these topics would have immediate relevance to other self-provided housing schemes, already planned eg. at Cambourne, and potential initiatives for the sustainability exemplar at Clay Farm, and other publicly owned sites, including Northstowe. Such learning would also have an impact beyond the City and Sub-region up to the region and nationally eg. for other self provided housing projects currently being considered by councils and regeneration initiatives in Sheffield and Essex.

During the course of the study, it was established that a number of bodies would be interested in participating in an action learning network associated with the project: CLG Housing Futures and Eco-Towns teams, HCA, and Cambridge Horizons. Other bodies could also be approached: Cambridge County Council, HCA Academy, UK Co-housing Network, the recently relaunched Joseph Rowntree Foundation Sustainable Urban Neighbourhoods [formerly New Communities] Network [SUNN], facilitated by Urbed, that includes the Orchard Park Community Council, and the National Self-Build Association. Some would be in a position to contribute to the funding of an Action Learning Project where there was a direct relationship to the formulation of new or better policies and developing good practice.

Locally, the Councils are keen to use the project to build relationships with other complimentary initiatives such as the Cambridge Regional College and SmartLIFE project, The Hive, on the site between Orchard Park and the College. They also wish to take up the Orchard Park Innovation Fund to support a project focused on the way an

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

intentional community, such as a co-housing group, can develop a low carbon lifestyle, with lessons that could be used elsewhere and disseminated through the Orchard Park Community Council, the Hive and the Parish Energy Partnerships.

Further details of the possible sustainability characteristics, synergies and learning objectives are set out in Annex D.

5.10 Recommendations

- The Councils should start working with the Enlinca Co-housing group, within the context of the Self-Providers Forum, to carry out a soft market testing to establish whether they can build up an active cohort of prospective purchasers for homes on the K1 site.
- Subject to the outcome of the market testing, the City Council should proceed with proposals to market the site and procure a development partner for an Enabled Co-Housing Project.
- The Councils should engage with central government, other public bodies and representative bodies to draw up a project brief and joint funding proposal for an Action Learning Project and the Orchard Park Innovation Fund to run alongside the development project.

6.0 Use of Resource Implications at K1

6.1 Council objectives

The City Council, as landowner, wishes to maximise its receipt, and to recycle it within a given timescale to other Council priorities. South Cambs District Council, as local planning authority, wishes to secure a development on the K1 site that will enhance the quality, social mix, wellbeing and sustainability of the new neighbourhood.

Although the two Councils have different roles and responsibilities in relation to this site, they have shared objectives and interests in ensuring that Orchard Park is a successful place. It is anticipated that a future realignment of the administrative boundaries between the two councils will bring Orchard Park into the City Council's control.

6.2 Guidance on the Use of Resources

Both Councils will therefore have regard to the way in which this site can be used to achieve social, economic and environmental objectives and wellbeing outcomes contained in their Sustainable Communities Strategies and Local Area Agreements. They will also have regard to the Key Lines of Enquiry in the Audit Commission's Comprehensive Area Assessment on the use of resources, as well as Treasury guidance on the disposal of local authority assets.

The Stakeholder workshop considered a number of key themes from these sources, exemplified by the following:

- *“Councils do not own land for its own sake or to make profits. Assets are held for pursuing policy objectives.” Value for money and the valuation of public sector assets [HM Treasury, July 2008]*
- *“Councils should work with partners and community groups to make the best use of their assets for the benefit of their local community...using property to shape*

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

places and deliver economic, social and environmental outcomes.” **Local Authority Asset Management Best Practice Guides - Introduction [RICS for CLG, June 2009] on Audit Commission's Comprehensive Area Assessment, KLOE on the Use of Resources.**

- *“Councils will have to show how they have used assets to mainstream the principles of Sustainable Development ... [that includes]...achieving the ultimate goal of improving the quality of life for people now and in the future.”* **Comprehensive Area Assessment Use of Resources Framework [Audit Commission, Feb 2009 paras 3.5.1/5]**
- *“The valuation of a publicly owned asset is based on the interests of society as a whole, not the council alone.”* **Value for money and the valuation of public sector assets [HM Treasury, July 2008]**

None of these extracts imply that the Council's duty and ability to secure 'the best consideration reasonably obtainable' would be compromised by having to accept a receipt that is less than market value; rather they describe the circumstances in which market value is understood, established and obtained. The issue of "less than" only arises if the Council sells for a use that is less valuable than another more valuable one that is also permitted on that site. [Provided the difference is less than £2m, the Council can make a sale under the Local Authority General Consent 2003].

In this case, the only and thus most valuable use of the site for private housing for sale [or rent] has already been determined by the masterplan and previous outline planning permission. In Annex E: Q&A's about 'best consideration', it is suggested that there is no reason for assuming that a disposal for self-provided housing intrinsically requires the site to be sold at less than market value.

The means of delivering the housing may, however, have a material effect on the ability of the development to achieve a number of wellbeing outcomes. Section 3.0 of this report, on Spatial Planning Policy and Housing, suggests the kind of policy context that might be adopted to achieve a range of mainstream policy outcomes in a development by self-providers that might be less easily achieved by other means. The report advocates setting clear policies about the circumstances in which self-provided housing is required to meet identified needs and demand, and/or to achieve desired policy objectives. Disposals of public land made in the context of such policies will, by definition, be at market value, and thus at the 'best consideration reasonably obtainable'.

The RICS has commissioned new valuation guidance for the Red Book that will clarify these issues on the interpretation of 'best consideration', taking account of the impact of the spatial planning reforms of 2004, and subsequent administrative reforms and arrangements that have taken place since the Local Authority General Consent 2003. The new guidance is planned for publication in 2010.

7. 0 Legal Implications

7.1 Local Authority powers

The earlier sections of this report describe the policy context and administrative arrangements that relate to a local authority's actions to promote self-provided housing

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

through national and local spatial planning and housing policies. The Local Government Acts of 1972 and 2000 provide local authorities with the powers to do whatever is necessary to promote the wellbeing of their areas and citizens.

7.2 Procurement and terms of disposal

On October 2009 the Office of Government Commerce published new guidance on the disposal of local authority assets in Information Note 11/09. This helps to clarify the position of councils selling land subject to development agreements, in the light of the Roanne Case. The Note places a greater onus on councils to determine whether they are procuring works through the disposal of an asset, and to observe the OJEU tendering procedures where works are required and described by the tendering authority. Councils' contracts can be invalidated if they are challenged and found not to have observed the correct procedures.

This report will not give an authoritative view on whether an OJEU process would be required for K1. Specialist legal advice should be sought. However, it does suggest that it would be advisable and even beneficial to use the OJEU procedures, partly to avoid the risk of later delay, additional costs and potential disruption of development by a third party challenge, and partly because there may be merit in ensuring the opportunity is canvassed widely in national and mainland European markets, on the basis of a well described tender brief and evaluation process.

8.0 Cost Profile and Financial Implications

8.1 Project Costs and the Unit Cost Profile

This study was not intended to provide a detailed cost appraisal of “a scheme”. However, the study has made an analysis of an indicative ‘cost profile’ of typical dwellings that are found elsewhere in Orchard Park, and which will form the basis of the K1 development. The purpose of the cost profile is to understand the capital structure of a typical dwelling and indicate areas of flexibility, eg. amount of profit commensurate to an agreed profile of risks, and the limits of discretionary spending. The Cost Profile will be used to obtain comparable bids from potential development partners, to establish an offer price for the land. Annex E contains some Q&A’s about the relationship of dwelling cost to plot price, and thus total site value.

The main discipline for all is to recognise the limits imposed by current mortgage markets. Purchasers will not get mortgage valuations and offers in excess of those being made for typical dwellings elsewhere in Orchard Park. Purchasers wishing to spend more on dwelling quality or additional space will have to negotiate what they can within the typical cost profile, and meet any extra-over cost from their own equity investment, in cash; kind or labour. This will be in addition to any capital required to cover the gap between the purchase price and mortgage advance, depending on the Loan to Value criteria in force at the time.

Profit levels for the enabling development partner will depend on who takes the marketing, sales, cost of finance and construction risks, and the degree to which they can be shared, mitigated or even substituted. For example, if the developer partner is married to a ready made group for the whole development, both marketing costs can be reduced and marketing risk discounted. The developer’s costs in managing a group of

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

active and involved 'off plan' purchasers will bring its own set of costs and risks, which might be substituted for all or part of the marketing costs.

It is suggested that the procurement documentation should include a schedule of risk items to be priced by the tenderers, with options for reducing or sharing risk, and/or substituting expenditures.

The summary Cost Profiles below also give indicative residual plot prices, within a range dependent on varying profit levels. [As in Section 5, this table does not constitute formal valuation advice.]

ORCHARD PARK K1 TYPICAL UNIT COST PROFILES Q4 2009		
Type	3/4 Bed House	2 Bed Flat
Size	110m2	65m2 av
Selling Price/m2	Say £2270	Say £2500
Selling Price Q4 2009	£250K	£162.5K
Development Costs/Unit @ Code 3 Build cost /m2	£1200	£1350
• Unit Build Price	£132k	£88k
• Fees/Legals/Marketing/SDLT/Planning/Building Control/Insurance/Finance Costs	£32k	£21k
• Profit on capital employed @ 15%	£23.5k	£16k
• Profit on capital employed @ 20%	£31.5k	£21.5k
TOTAL	£187 to £195k	£125k to £130k
Residual Plot Prices at 20-15% Profit	£55k to £63K	£32k to £37k
Land as % of Gross Development Value	22-25%	20-23%

8.2 Council Costs

The Councils will need to consider what additional costs they might incur in promoting a self-provided housing scheme. It is hard to put an exact figure on this. As this is the first project of its kind, it would be unrealistic to expect that there would be no more work than a "normal" project. However, it is also important to ensure that such schemes are discriminated against for that reason alone. If they become a more mainstream delivery mechanism, any extra cost and time should be judged against the required or desired policy objectives and the weight of evidence behind the policy or project.

The Councils should consider the amount of money that they would normally expect to spend on Member, officer or consultancy time. For this site, the activities will be broadly allocated as follows on a range of standard and extra-over activities:

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

8.2.1 City Council activities:

- Preparing site information
- Legal advice and documentation
- Marketing and/or tender advice and documentation
- Evaluation of offers/tenders
- Negotiation with a number of potential purchasers/preferred bidder
- Valuation
- Senior management, and committee work
- Liaison with South Cambs DC and Orchard Park Community Council on planning brief, infrastructure costs and provision etc.
- Member involvement and decision-making

Extra-over activities for self-provided project might include:

- More detailed tender brief and evaluation process
- Liaison with South Cambs DC, Orchard Park Community Council, Enlinca and Self Provider Forum on pre-planning
- Organisation of and participation in soft market testing

8.2.2 South Cambs DC and Orchard Park Community Council activities

- Planning and urban design brief
- Development management negotiations with prospective developer
- S.106 Agreements
- Planning committee work
- Member involvement and decision-making
- liaison with City Council on planning brief, infrastructure costs and provision etc.
- Orchard Park management, coordination of RSL and housebuilder partners, liaison with Gallagher etc
- Community Development and integration of new arrivals
- Community Council capacity building, organisational development, forward planning and budgets
- Promotion of sustainable living, use of Innovation Fund, linkages to the Hive project

Extra-over activities for self-provided project:

- More detailed tender brief and evaluation process
- Liaison with South Cambs DC, Orchard Park Community Council, Enlinca and Self Provider Forum on pre-planning
- Organisation of and participation in soft market testing
- Ongoing support to co-housing group

8.2.3 City Council, South Cambs DC and Orchard Park Community Council activities

- Linkages to regional and sub-regional learning networks eg. SHAPE East, Inspire/ East, Sustainable Built Environment East, Foundation East etc

Extra-over activities for self-provided project:

- Setting up action learning structures and funding with Cambridge Horizons, CLG, HCA and others.

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

- Contributing to (and benefiting from) action learning

To ensure all these standard and extra over activities are effectively managed, coordinated and focused to ensure the project as a whole proceeds in a timely manner, it is suggested that the Councils should allocate:

- A senior Member and Council Officer as Project Champions
- A Principal Officer as Project Manager with joint council responsibilities and accountabilities to coordinate and manage all the activities. This could be a mix of consultancy and officer time.

The extra over Project Manager time should be focused on the first year, as set out in the programme in Annex B, to get the project into contract. This might be as much as 1 day per week at peak periods, by might average out at 3 days per month over the year. One of the tasks of the Council's Project Manager would be to ensure that adequate management and accountability arrangements were built into the management of the project by the enabling development partners and co-housing group, so that the councils could increasingly relate to the project in much the same way as an RSL project.

If the bulk of the project management role was undertaken by a consultant, provision should be made for between 30-40 days consultancy time, at between £xx /day ie. say between £xxx and £xxx. A lower day rate with a success related bonus for achieving key milestone dates would help keep the overall cost and risks down. The additional costs should be seen as part of the set up costs for the wider process of enabling self-provided housing in the sub-region.

8.3 Timing of Capital Receipt

The programme in Annex B shows that it would be possible to achieve the capital receipts within a three year period. The time allowances for some activities are realistic and slightly on the cautious side, but it must be acknowledged that any new process will have its teething problems and unfamiliarities. The key to achieving the programme will be the dedicated project management time by an experienced programme manager, either internal or external, or with additional support.

9.0 Conclusion

The Council's interest in promoting a project at Orchard Park K1 has coincided with renewed interest by politicians in the self-provided sector. The reasons for this interest are partly concerned with finding "new entreats" to the market to boost sources of housing supply, and partly relate to political ideas about localism and redressing the balance between the role of the State and the citizen. Both these themes will be at the forefront of the general election in 2010, and in whatever new political environment exists after the election. The Councils are in a position to capitalise on the work they have done so far and to take advantage of their position, both to be involved in informing government on appropriate ways of supporting the sector and councils, and benefitting from any financial support from government for pilot projects and enabling activities.

Stephen Hill, Director, C₂Ofutureplanners

ANNEX A: GENERIC CO-HOUSING MODELS

Option 1: Independent Co-housing

Based on Springhill Co-housing, Stroud: an autonomous self-organising group

C₂O futureplanners - Advice Note

Working @ the Hub Kings Cross stephenhill@futureplanners.net Tel 07795 813

080

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

Basic Key features:

- Prospective group members club together to develop a vision and find site
- Form company limited by shares; all members [35] buy 5000 x£1 shares
- Each household chooses one member to be a director of the company
- Each household puts up their plot price [£18-38k] to buy freehold of the site [£550k]
- Company appoints consultants and contractor
- Members input to design of site layout, and develop a range of generic house types for each household size. House types then customized for individual households
- Company arranges commercial loan from Coop Bank [£3.6m] to start the building [as stage payment self-build mortgages not possible as homes will be leasehold not freehold]
- Everyone pays a monthly sum [upto £300 max for 5B houses] to service the Coop loan
- Individuals arrange own mortgages and pay for homes on completion
- Company grants 999 years leases on all properties [check...with covenants to the freeholder and other leaseholders]
- Company takes all risk on development costs; limited marketing risk to fill vacancies if anyone dropped out
- Initial share capital repaid to members after completion
- Company takes all decisions regarding ongoing management and maintenance of site and buildings
- Exit routes: individuals notify company which has 28 days to nominate replacement or individual can offer for sale openly.

Comments:

- Strong commitment to corporate structure and collective responsibility.
- Availability of pump-priming finance for land came from purchasers with capital or ability borrow against existing mortgages
- The group input to the site layout was crucial, but there was probably too much customisation of house types: led to complications with contractor. Less choice would not have been a real restriction.
- Project depended on a strong leader to initiate it and lead it. In retrospect, members feel they should have had professional project manager to take more control over consultants and contractor, rather than rely on the group leader.
- Original estimate £650/sq.m unrealistic, but final figure £1100/sq.m quite reasonable when benchmarked against “normal” RSL for equivalent standards, and considering extreme slope of site, site being occupied as homes finished etc.
- Unfamiliar process meant that all the rules had to be made up as they went along. Hard work to get project finance, mortgages, professional services and construction all lined up; required exceptional determination.
- The process and design solution disturbed the status quo for members and officers.
- Completed scheme is very popular, with only 2 moves since completion in 2005: one death and one family move for employment.
- Values about 10% premium on area
- ‘Design’ is the ongoing experience of living there

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

A model Joint Venture proposal and structure for this approach has been offered to the Councils by Nick Hood, partner at Carter Jonas and non-executive director of the Cambridge Building Society.

Option 2: Enabled Co-housing

Based on a hybrid of the German model and SPAN developments, with a developer assisted self-commissioning development with resident self-management...with options

Basic key features, assuming publicly owned site:

- Council procures development partner through OJEU to design, build and market scheme on designated site
- Council enables a local sponsor co-housing group to register potential self-commissioners as “off-plan” purchasers
- Development partner develops integrated housing and landscape vision, and obtains planning permission
- Purchasers pay reservation fee for their plots
- Partner develops site and sells to individual purchasers in usual way
- New properties sell freehold or on 999 years leases
- Each sale document requires owners and leaseholders to become members of the Resident Management Company, usually a not-for-profit Industrial & Provident Society
- Freehold of common areas and benefit of covenants on upkeep of the homes vested in the Resident Management Company
- Individuals arrange own mortgages with consortium lenders and pay for homes on completion
- Partner takes all risk on development
- Everyone pays a service charge for the upkeep and development of the common areas. and maintenance charges for the flats
- Resident Management Company takes all decisions regarding ongoing management and maintenance of site and buildings
- Exit routes: individuals can offer for sale openly.

Options:

- Land transfer: initial transfer to development partner and individual onward sales by partner, or conventional building under licence and individual back to back transfers direct from council via partner - with freehold of shared areas transferred to Resident Management Company on completion of whole.
- Ownership: freeholds on houses and leases on flats or all 999 year leases
- Role of prospective purchasers: as shadow or formal company structure, as consumer or clients, as end purchasers or co-funders
- Risk sharing protocols to suit project eg. reduced developer profit in exchange for reduced marketing risk
- Finance: pay on completion with contract to buy at fixed price at outset or contracted stage payments from individuals via self-build type mortgages to reduce financing cost risk.
- Design choices by prospective purchasers: site layout and/or generic house types and/or bespoke variations, integrating building society technical risk and valuation assessment into design stage.

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

- Choices of finish for self-completion...at first fix/second fix/ decoration/fully finished
- Land/plot price: fixed at Day 1, subject to planning, or varied to reflect changes in market and subject to overage or clawback.

Issues:

- How to reduce risk to partner to bring down profit on risk?
- How to minimize incidence of SDLT on land and dwelling transfers?
- How to avoid any VAT liabilities on new build work?
- How to make it all as simple as possible?

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

ANNEX B: OUTLINE PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPER PROCUREMENT AND LAND DISPOSAL, AND PROJECT PROGRAMME

1.0 Next Steps

The following key actions were established at the workshop as being needed:

- before the Councils could formally agree to commit to the project, **in bold**, and
- For consideration in early project planning.

No.	ACTIVITIES	Lead	
		City Co	S Cambs
	An agreement between the Councils to establish roles and responsibilities for developing and championing a shared vision, delivery arrangements, planning, community leadership and learning	Joint	
	Establish and work with the Self-Providers Forum to undertake some soft market testing of both potential development partners and purchasers	Joint	
	Assist the Self-Providers Forum to hold an Open Day Event	Joint	
	Establish a new planning and development brief for the site to establish density and other design criteria that will provide sufficient planning certainty and flexibility to attract development partners and prospective self-providers;	Joint	
	Develop a Land disposal & Partner procurement plan for KI that will satisfy the new OGC guidance	Y	
	Take advice on appropriate structures for Individual ownerships and corporate ownership and stewardship of shared space	Y For KI disposal	Y For link to O.Park C'ty Co.
	Liaison with Building Society to establish technical risk and funding audit requirements and processes; integrating Building Society building risk assessment and mortgage commitment into the pre-planning of the	Joint	

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

	site and design of sustainable dwelling types		
	Supporting Enlinca, the Cambridge Co-housing group, to recruit prospective purchasers, and to form them into a corporate body to work with the Councils as joint commissioners of the project		Y
	Develop with Self-Providers Forum a model capital structure for the project eg. how best to reduce sales and construction risk, through contract arrangement and finishing options	Joint	
	Develop the potential of the Synergies already identified	Joint	
	Develop Action Learning proposal to identify partners and sources of funding	Joint	
	Agree Planning & Communications strategies	Joint	
	Overseeing the negotiation of a risk sharing and profit protocol between the developer and co-housing group, including a contract to build the agreed scheme to a timetable.	Y	
	Supporting a collaborative pre-design & pre-planning process between the developer, co-housing group and the Councils		Y

2.0 Notes on Procurement and Disposal Criteria

2.1 Land Price Options: All Subject to Planning and built under licence

- Agreed Fixed Price on Day 1
 - Paid on completion of contract
 - Paid on transfer of completed dwellings to individual purchasers
- Agreed Minimum Price plus overage at time of transfer of completed dwellings
 - On open book accounting
 - Guaranteed Minimum Price plus fixed % overage against maximum allowable costs
- Agreed Fixed or Minimum Price plus clawback at time of first resale, on difference between initial purchase price and resale price, on a sliding scale of reducing % over eg. 5 years, say 100% in Year 1, 80% in Year 2 etc.

2.2 Cost Control Options

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

- Tenders for land sought on the basis of typical dwelling sizes and total site capacity and dwelling mix described in the disposal brief, together with a baseline performance specification eg. Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3, compliance with Design Code etc.
- Tenderer bids for land on a per plot basis and agreed schedules of construction and other costs, including self-provider group management; allows for changes to dwelling mix to be accommodated and variations to total land price to be negotiated later.
- Alternative specification and size choices can be negotiated between enabling developer and individual purchaser within the agreed cost profile of the dwelling type.
- Individual purchasers can increase the specification of their homes by negotiation. Any costs in excess of the cost profile will have to be met by the purchaser, and will not affect the plot price for the home.
- The Council can seek alternative bids for different criteria eg. induction and training of co-housing group, Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 or higher, establishment of a car club, setting up an Energy Service Company, or other long term ownership and maintenance arrangements etc.
- A similar bid structure should determine the cost and value impact of the shared common spaces ie. a baseline performance specification to be priced with developers estimated costs or an agreed Provisional Sum, apportioned to each plot to allow for more detailed design within an agreed cost profile once the developer has been selected and is in negotiations with co-housing group and the local planning authority.

2.3 Enabling and Risk Sharing Options

Developers interviewed in the Study had a range of ideas about how they would apportion risk and relate to the prospective purchasers, individually and as a group. The tender brief should capitalize on the potential for innovation and variation. A set of minimum performance expectations should be established between the Council and the Self Providers Forum, for inclusion in the disposal brief, offering tenderers the opportunity to improve or go beyond the minimum requirements.

The marking system for the tenders should give the Enabling and Risk Sharing Options sufficient weight to ensure it was a material consideration in choosing between alternative tenders, to balance the price offered for the land, the co-housing group's preferences for a customer friendly partner, and any risk to the amount and timing of the sales receipt.

2.4 Project Timetable

The indicative timetable below shows that a well programmed and managed programme should return the receipts from land sales over a three year period.

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

The activities upto March/April 2010 are intended to enable the councils to decide whether to proceed with an Enabled Co-housing project or dispose of the site to a housebuilder for conventional development. The request for Expressions of Interest from developers will require them to demonstrate they are able and willing to support a Co-housing group and/or deliver a conventional scheme of the required quality, to a new planning brief agreed during Q1/2010.

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

Key Activities/Events	09/q4	10/q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	11/q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	12/q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
<i>Set up/Meet SP Forum</i>	■	■											
<i>OJEU PIN/Eol soft market test</i>		■											
<i>Open Day Event</i>		■											
<i>Establish Co-housing Company</i>		■											
<i>Establish new planning brief</i>	■	■											
<i>City Council decision on SP or normal sale</i>		■											
<i>OJEU full procedure</i>			■										
<i>Tender Evaluation</i>				■									
<i>Post-tender negotiation and pre-planning</i>				■	■								
<i>Full Planning</i>					■	■							
<i>Sale and build contract negotiations</i>						■	■						
<i>Build programme</i>							■	■	■	■	■	■	
<i>Sales and Receipts</i>										■	■	■	■

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

ANNEX C: Extract RICS SELF- PROVIDED HOUSING DISCUSSION PAPER FOR CLG November 2009

1.0 Policy promotion

If self-provision is to be adopted as a modest but significant strand of local housing markets, with similar status and legitimacy to other mainstream providers, there are several overarching themes that will need to be promoted:

- Advocacy at ministerial level that covers and joins up sustainability, housing, planning, skills/business/product development, third sector and community cohesion policy strands.
- Brand recognition, through ministerial visits to eg. Springhill in Stroud, other self-provided schemes/groups, completed and underway, and attention to overseas exemplars.
- Building of capacity through publicity, local enabling initiatives, recognition of and support to national bodies, eg. NaSBA, UK Co-housing Network, CSBA etc.

All these measures need to be characterized as “leveling up the playing field...promoting innovation and more effective competition ...etc”, and must directly resist the charge that will inevitably be made that this sector is being supported as unfair competition to established providers.

The following paragraphs set out a range of levers for change in each of the key areas of activity. Some of these will apply to all market sectors. The self-provided perspective is a useful means of seeing more clearly problems that affect all sectors.

2.0 Finance and enabling for land purchase, development and retail mortgages

A range of new or increased/improved financial products to facilitate development:

- Revolving funds for land purchase and up front design and viability fees, based on the Housing Corporation Revolving Fund established in 1988 for group private sector self-build schemes. [Still exists within the HCA?]
- Model JV partnerships between public land owners and self-providers for land to be developed under licence, with residual outturn valuations, or geared ground rentals, or sliding scale clawback arrangements on resales within 5 years, similar to Right to Buy and co-ownership leases.
- Locally approved panels of professionals, housebuilders and constructors, appointable on standardised terms and risk sharing protocols.
- Expansion of mainstream mortgage products for recognised/branded self-provider models, in context of express government support for the self-provided sector.
- Local Authority Mortgages for self-providers building to Code for Sustainable Homes 4 standard and above, and/or partial mortgage guarantees to mainstream lenders to cover extra-over Code costs in excess of mortgage valuations.
- Local Authorities and RSLs providing deposits to cover the current LTV ratio gap.
- Equity transfer and release products for older people downsizing to self-care co-housing or other mutual schemes, and needing extra care services later in life.

3.0 Cultural and business model change

Any programme for supporting new market entrants will be characterized by established providers as additional competition for land, more expensive, difficult, more risky etc. ie.

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

thinly disguised code for “not like us, the devil you know, and unnecessary and unwelcome competition both in markets and for political access”. Cultural change will therefore need to be explicitly valued and supported:

- Government should commission an action research programme to promote and evaluate a range of self-providers in a number of different “place” settings, over say a 3 to 5 year period, as basis for assessing all alternative approaches to housebuilding more critically for their value for money and capacity to deliver policy outcomes. This could be done by HCA, as part of their current VfM studies and outcome appraisals, in partnership with JRF, following their ‘self-build’ studies in 1999/2001, and the recent re-establishment of their New Communities Network.
- IDEA, CABE, and HCA training for culture change and capacity building for public bodies to develop enabling skills and attitudes.
- RDA and local authority economic development strategy support for new business opportunities for self-provider group enablers, project managers, professionals and enabling partnerships with mainstream and niche housebuilders.

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

ANNEX D: K1 PROJECT PLAN ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The generic model for Enabled Co-housing in Annex A above would form the basis of this project plan.

In addition to the principles described in the main text, further details of the K1 proposal are outlined below:

1.0 Sustainability objectives:

- Technology and Social Organisation
- Target: minimum Code 3 level but preferred Code 4, and/or with options for future-proofing retrofitting
- Tax efficient retrofit options through non-profit status of co-housing company
- Behavioural change: consumption, energy, waters, waste, car use, food buying and growing
- Retention of trees, adapting field ditch/drain as SUDS
- Adopting measurable individual and collective Carbon Reduction targets to be supported through the Orchard Park Innovation Fund
- Learning about impact of social organisation to inform the sustainability objectives for the “exemplar sustainability” project at Clay Farm

2.0 Synergies:

- Cambridge Growth Charter 4 C's: new tenures and production
- Alignment of LDF, SCS, LAA, Climate Change Strategies and evidence base – SHMA and SHLAA
- The Hive, SmartLIFE, CityLIFE
- BRE/EEDA Hub – SME services and products
- Orchard Park Community Council role in community building
- Parish Energy Partnerships
- Orchard Park Innovation Fund
- City Council new housebuilding and land use
- Inspire/SHAPE/Sustainable Built Environment/ Foundation...EASTs

3.0 Action Learning Project

The project will need to be supported by a real time evaluation process, to provide feedback (with structured strategic peer review) during the project and to identify and disseminate key learning points. The key areas of learning will probably need to include:

- Partner procurement, and leverage of public land under new Office of Government Commerce guidance
- Integrating occupiers into supply chain, understanding what is important to occupiers, and what producers can really do
- Risks and rewards of permissive permissions, masterplans and design codes
- Normalisation of funding, land disposal and planning eg. new style LDOs and Sustainable Communities Act 2007
- Social impact on scheme and neighbourhood
- Economic impact on value of homes and land
- Effective dissemination and knowledge sharing

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

4.0 Challenges to existing practice

This project will test many assumptions and established ways of working. The following were identified as challenging questions during the Scoping Study interviews and workshop:

- Location, location, location – Is this the right place to pilot the approach?
- Rebuilding trust – How to use the planning process more creatively through permissive and flexible planning?
- Understanding the essence of self-provision – How to shift from controlling to enabling?
- Creating a culture of co-production - What is really important to policy makers and providers?
- Relevance to policy context – What can be learnt about housing market resilience, and bottom up ideas about sustainable living, localism and new citizenship?
- Learning for the future –How to involve young people as the occupiers of the future, and through school based learning?

ANNEX E: Q&A on BEST CONSIDERATION ISSUES

The project at KI will involve everyone in working in unfamiliar territory. Here are some likely reactions to the proposal, and responses to the concerns that these reactions imply:

- ***Q. On Value - The individual specification of each unit will obviously cost more money. This additional build cost can only be reflected in the land value as the buying public will have the choice between the competing house builders next door.***
- A. Purchasers will only be able to get mortgages based on well established market levels of lending for typical houses in Orchard Park, so unless purchasers have extra equity of their own, they will be limited to norm market levels of cost and value, and building societies' Loan to Value ratios.
- ***Q. On Value - The plot values used in the Study report are based on where sales to private house builders currently are. It is likely the plot value on a self-provided basis will be considerably lower due to the reasons raised above.***
- A. The procurement of the development partner can prescribe a norm level of build cost per dwelling type for the standard required by the Council, ie. Code for Sustainable Homes level 3 or 4. Expenditure in excess of the norm can be incurred by individuals to achieve even higher Code levels, or other quality standards, but these will not reduce the land value.
- ***Q. On Value - The Study suggests there is evidence that sales to self-providers can produce higher plot prices than sales to bulk purchasing housebuilders. This is surprising.***

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

- A. That is the evidence of land sales by the German local authorities cited. Individuals and housebuilders will price differently for risk, and the opportunity cost of buying a particular site. Individuals and small groups may pay more for the opportunity to build their own home per se, or for a specially favoured (to them) location. They may be able to use the equivalent of the developer's profit, financing costs and overheads to get the "right" site.
- **Q. Number of units – The Study suggests that the number of homes be increased from 35 to 40-45 units. Maybe this is too high, and if private developers were asked to build on this basis, the Council would doubtless also get a higher land value.**
- A. High quality developments by mainstream developers in similar urban extensions have commonly adopted densities slightly higher than those adopted at Orchard Park. Higher values would be expected, but the expectation would apply to any kind of housing provider.

Also, increasing the utilization of the site may be dependent on whether prospective occupiers wish to adopt a low car ownership and usage strategy, leaving more space for extra homes. A developer would probably discount the value of the site if required to develop on that basis, as it would be seen as a serious deterrent to the "normal" purchaser. Self-selecting self-provider groups of occupiers can make different choices and take the benefit of those choices in ways that the unknown speculative purchaser cannot.

- **Q. On Timing and amount of capital receipt - Some market research suggests that the market will be very much on the mend in 18 months or so. Land values might have increased substantially in the next 18 months. If the Council is going to wait that long, or longer for its capital receipt, though the building under licence mechanism, doing the same with a private sale, would mean there would be a higher capital receipt.**
- A. Market forecasts at this time are likely to fluctuate regularly while the recession continues. Some forecasters currently suggest that the "double dip" of the recession is yet to hit the housing market. Mortgage and development finance remains tight. Cash rich developers are active purchasing sites, but they are a limited segment of the market and are focusing on forced sale situations where they can strike the hardest bargains.

Also, individual purchasing decisions will be tied very closely to employment prospects and future taxation levels; neither of which is likely to be capable of being predicted with any degree of certainty in the next 6-9 months.

There is no intrinsic reason why self-providers will pay less than a 'private' sale. Self-providers are also private purchasers. Market forces apply to them as much as any other purchaser.

Given the continuing uncertainties in land and housing markets, an early sale even with a deferred receipt may give a level of certainty that the Council would prefer over the prospect of an enhanced receipt that remains uncertain. The Council

Self-provided Housing in the Cambridge Sub-Region: Levers for Change – Report and Recommendations

could also consider some kind of clawback from the first purchasers on the difference between the purchase and the resale value, if the first resale takes place within a prescribed number of years, say between 5 and 10 years; similar to the old co-ownership housing resale rules and the Right to Buy.

- ***Q. On Location – Self-provided housing sounds an excellent proposition. However, the location of this site is not suitable. The quality of surrounding buildings may detract from people wishing to spend time and energy on building their own property. Perhaps Clay Farm would be a better location.***
- A. Taking decisions by second guessing what self-providers may or may not want is one of the reasons why self-providers find it so difficult to access the land market. The proposed soft market testing would be a more helpful guide to the likely level of demand and long term commitment.

Orchard Park may not be everyone's preferred location, but it provides a good range of new housing at the all important entry level to local housing markets, in which demand continues to exceed overall levels of supply. The site will be well located in relation to the guided bus, the Regional College, and the Hive project. Clay Farm and other council owned sites would certainly be other good places to promote the self-provider approach, to meet the demand from purchasers at different price levels and with their unique needs and expectations that can most advantageously be met in those locations.

- ***Q. On the Developer's role – The Council will take on all the risk whilst the developer takes a profit for both the project management and the contracting.***
- A. The procurement of the enabling developer partner should ensure that the price of the land is fixed, subject to planning, and that the development and marketing risk is taken on by the developer, and/or shared in agreed proportions between the developer and the group of prospective purchasers. The Council would continue to take the risk for its own expenditure upto the exchange of contracts that it would in any event expect to incur on any land sale, subject to planning.
- ***Q. On Valuation - It might be an idea to have an independent Red Book valuation of the site if sold on a conventional basis to a private developer or on a self-provided basis.***
- A. A Red Book valuation will be required to frank any price finally agreed between the Council and the purchasers. The question implies that the self-providers would by definition only be able or willing to pay a lower price than a mainstream housebuilder. Earlier answers suggest this should not be the case. Unless the Council places more conditions (that might affect the value) on one class of purchaser as opposed to another, a Red Book valuation would not intrinsically be able to distinguish between a housebuilder and self-providers.

The procurement process will aim, in any event, to secure competitive bids for the land on a like for like basis.

This page is left blank intentionally.

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Portfolio Holder for New Communities20th May 2010**AUTHOR/S:** Executive Director / Corporate Manager for Planning & New Communities

SCDC CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN 2010-13: RELEASE OF CONSULTATION DRAFT AND APPROVAL OF PUBLIC AND PARTNER CONSULTATION PROCESS**Purpose**

1. The purpose of this report is to secure:
 - (a) permission to release the consultation draft of the Council's Climate Change Action Plan 2010-13 (CCAP), and;
 - (b) approval for the proposed consultation process and schedule.
2. The consultation CCAP is currently in the closing stages of full drafting and as such still has some contextual sections and action details to be finalised. These sections are in the process of being completed and will be finished before the proposed release to public and partner consultees from w/c 24:5:10. The plan as presented with this report has been reviewed and approved by both the member-led Climate Change Working Group and the Executive Management Team. In order to avoid delay in beginning the public and partner consultation process, the Portfolio Holder is requested to pass delegated authority for release of the finalised draft for these consultation purposes to the Corporate Manager for Planning and New Communities.
3. This is not a key decision as the CCAP does not raise specific new issues of Council policy. The Council is already committed to tackling the full climate change agenda as a signatory to the Nottingham Declaration, The Cambridge Climate Change Charter and the 10:10 national carbon reduction campaign.
4. What the CCAP does do, however, is open an important dialogue up between the Council and its partners as to the most appropriate methods and delivery mechanisms for reducing South Cambridgeshire's greenhouse gas emissions and its preparation for the impacts of climate change over the medium term. The CCAP as it stands is a working draft that, for its shorter term actions, is already tied into the relevant Council Service Plans for 2010/11. Delivery on climate change is not 'on hold' as the CCAP goes through consultation – the agenda is too pressing for this to be possible.
5. Elected representatives and local democracy are at the heart of community engagement. Thus Portfolio Holder approval, commitment and support for strategic responses and integrated delivery programmes, such as this CCAP, is important in terms of legitimating and validating the process. It is for this reason that the Portfolio Holder for New Communities (with responsibility for covering climate change-related matters) is asked to approve, and in effect formally put in motion, the consultative community engagement process that is designed to ensure that the CCAP is a living document with essential awareness and 'buy-in' from residents, communities and partner organisations across South Cambridgeshire and beyond.
6. The request for approval was first published in the February 2010 Forward Plan.

Recommendations

7. That the Portfolio Holder for New Communities:
 - (a) approve the public and partner consultation process outlined in this report as regards the release of the consultation draft of the Council's new Climate Change Action Plan 2010-13, and;
 - (b) delegate approval of the finalised draft for consultation release (i.e. the fully completed version of that attached to this report) to the Corporate Manager for Planning and New Communities (scheduled for w/c 24:5:10)

Background

8. In 2002 the Council signed the Nottingham Declaration and in 2005 published a Climate Plan. Much has changed since then, especially in terms of the required extent and urgency of response to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and preparing for the effects of climate change. We have seen very significant national policy shifts and developments since the Climate Change Act 2008 was placed in the statute books with its legally binding UK target of an 80% reduction in CO₂ emissions by 2050.
9. The new local government performance framework (first reported through for 2008/09) introduced three very specific climate change national indicators: NI 186 - per capita CO₂ emissions for the local authority area; NI 188 - extent of preparedness to respond to the impacts of climate change, and; NI185 - direct CO₂ emissions from local authority operations. The former are LAA indicators and have very specific targets attached to them for delivery by the end of 2010/11.
10. The original 2005 SCDC Climate Plan laid a firm foundation for its time but the pressure to deliver significant carbon savings and prepare effectively for climate change have seen the Sustainability element of the New Communities Service Plan stretch the Climate Plan's influence to and beyond the point of usefulness. A replacement was therefore placed on the delivery list for 2009/10.
11. The drafting of the new CCAP has been guided and assisted by the Council's Climate Change Working Group (CCWG) in several sessions over the past 6-8 months.
12. It was recognised and agreed that a comprehensive Plan was required. Not one that simply laid out a set of actions but, through seeking to put across a full understanding of climate change and what it means in the context of South Cambridgeshire, also sought to engage with its audience by making it clear why the plan was proposing the actions as put forward. Establishing this district and subject-specific underlying rationale would also mean that the Council would be better placed to handle new climate change-related issues and opportunities as they arose outside of the CCAP's specified array of actions. This approach was endorsed by the Council's Executive Management Team at its meeting on 24:03:10.

Considerations

13. As indicated previously, due to time-constraints this draft of the CCAP is not yet fully complete – sections that require further authoring have been marked-up as such. It is felt however that this draft is sufficiently complete to allow it through for Portfolio Holder consideration in the context of approval for release for public and partner consultation on the proviso that delegated authority be passed to the Corporate Manager for Planning and New Communities to ensure that the consultation process is not formally started until the current draft is fully completed.

14. The following table outlines the proposed consultation process over a 12 week period (following the guidelines of the Cambridgeshire Compact):

Audience	Schedule	Consultative activity
(preparation)	by w/c 24/5	Finalise full consultation draft Draft 4 page Summary document
All	w/c 24/5	Place Summary document & full consultation draft on SCDC website
All	w/c 24/5	Press release & front page website
Parish Councils, key public bodies & other local strategic partners	24/5-4/6	Despatch Summary doc to all Parish Councils, key public bodies and other local strategic partners
SCDC Members	w/c 7/6	Member Briefing & Bulletin
SCDC key staff identified for CCAP delivery	w/c 14/6	SCDC Service workshop
All SCDC staff	w/c 21/6	Lunchtime seminar/briefing
Local climate change 'movers & shakers'	w/c 28/6	Expert Panel workshop
Joint LSP Board	nearest scheduled meeting	Joint LSP briefing
All	w/c 9/8	Deadline for receipt of all consultation responses
final steps...		
Climate Change Working Group	soonest scheduled meeting	Consider post-consultation revised draft
Portfolio Holder for New Communities	soonest scheduled meeting – pls add a target date	Consider final draft for adoption
Full Council	as/if required	Adoption

Implications

15. Financial	Sstaff time and limited/controlled print run
Legal	None
Staffing	Principal co-ordinator: Team Leader Sustainable Communities
Risk Management	Failure to meaningfully and effectively engage runs risk of producing a sterile and under-performing plan
Equal Opportunities	Access for all central tenet of consultation/engagement process
Climate Change	Self-evident

Consultations

16. Climate Change Working Group
Executive Management Team

Effect on Strategic Aims

17. Consultation process directly supports the council aim that:
'We are a committed and listening council providing first class services accessible to all.'
18. The CCAP itself supports the council aim that:
'We are committed to ensuring that South Cambridgeshire continues to be a safe and healthy place for you and your family.'

Conclusions / Summary

19. This report seeks Portfolio Holder approval to initiate the formal consultation process (over a 12 week period) relating to public and partner engagement with the adoption and delivery of the Council's new Climate Change Action Plan 2010-13.

Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:

Executive Management Team, 24/03/10, Agenda and Minutes
Climate Change Working Group, 08/04/10, Agenda and Minutes

Contact Officer: Richard Hales – Team Leader Sustainable Communities (and Principal Lead for Sustainability and Climate Change)
Telephone: (01954) 713135

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning and New Communities Portfolio Holders' meeting 20 May 2010
AUTHOR/S: Executive Director (Operational Services) / Corporate Manager (Planning and New Communities)

NEW COMMUNITIES PERFORMANCE REPORT 2009/10**Purpose**

1. This report outlines the progress made by the New Communities Service in meeting its targets, as set in the published 2009/10 Service Plan. The Portfolio Holder is asked to note the progress made.
2. The information presented details the service performance for the period up to the end of quarter 4 (31 March 2010), with one or two exceptions where data is not yet available.
3. This not a key decision, and has been brought forward to inform the Portfolio Holder of the progress made over the last year, and was first published in November Forward Plan.

Recommendations

4. It is recommended that the portfolio holder note the progress made to date against identified targets, and notes the action taken on the exception areas.

BackgroundOverview

5. Overall the team has generally delivered strong performance against targets.

Council Actions

6. In 2009/10 The New Communities Service was charged with the delivery of eight Council Actions and a number of the Council's key indicators. The summary report (Appendix A) summaries progress made over the last year.
7. Of the eight Actions, six are complete and in some instances target have been exceeded for example, double the number of parishes (12 in total) have signed up to the Sustainable Parish Energy Project.
8. The remaining two Council Actions (promoting the development and take up of small businesses and identifying spin-offs from London 2012) are subject of on-going work with good progress having been made. The baseline study of business space is complete and will shortly be on the Council's website and a programme of events and possible spin-offs leading up to the Olympics has been developed and is being kept

under review. The first significant event in the countdown to the Olympics will be 'Park Life' to be held on Sunday 25th July at Milton Country Park.

Exceptions

9. Red indicators NC5 (Number of events in arts guide) did stand at 68% at quarter 3, however the Guide has since been discontinued as part of the Council's budgetary savings.
10. Amber indicators
 - (i) NC8 (Action plan to improve communications). The production and adoption of the engagement strategy has been reviewed in discussions with partners. It has been agreed that site specific strategies will now be produced for each growth site, overseen by the: Community Infrastructure and Services made up of Directors and Service Head from partner organisations and chaired by SCDC Corporate Manager - Planning and New Communities.
 - (ii) In some instances, the indicators are to be assessed annually for example N1008 (Adult participation in sport), N1010 (Young people's participation in positive activities), NI 011 (Engagement in the arts) N1 171 (Vat registered rate) and for these the data will not be available until Q3 of 2010/11. SCDC is involved in activities which will influence outcomes and it is anticipated that these will remain green.
 - (iii) N185a and b (CO2 reduction from local authority operations). Target of 10% reduction was agreed at the January Portfolio Holder meeting to be delivered by the end of 2010/11.
 - (iv) NI186 (per capita CO2 emissions in the local area). This indicator will always remain amber. The council is a key contributing agent, but precise quantification of this contribution will never be possible. The indicator value is provided annually by DEFRA and is subject to an 18-24 month time lag in reporting. NB. DEFRA have recently recalculated the 2005 baseline figure for South Cambs as 9.39t co2/year, the most recent figure shows a slight reduction to 9.7 t co2/year. The Sustainable Energy Parish Partnership is one example of a project run by SCDC to influence these figures.
11. Other areas of recent work to be noted include:
12. Customer satisfaction
 - a) The first survey of applicants of growth sites was carried in April 2010, conducted by way of a telephone survey. Out of 32 applicants/agents, 13 took part (40%). The majority of respondents were very satisfied with the service they received (54% rated the service 8 out of 10 or above, 31% rated the service 7, 15% rated the service 6).
 - b) Respondents find the service accessible, courteous and professional; a number noted the improvements since the dedicated New Communities Service was formed and several commented that SCDC were easier to work with than neighbouring authorities.

- c) Areas where improvements should be focussed are working with third parties and external consultees particularly Parish Councils and Cambridgeshire County Council. This could be in the form of more pre-application advice and providing developers with clear direction once comments are received from these parties. Timely discharge of planning conditions is an area where it is recognised that progress has improved. The Planning IT system will assist further.
- d) The survey will be conducted on an annual basis in future.

13. Northstowe Ecotown Bid

Officers from New Communities Service coordinated a joint authority working group which made the successful Ecotown bid in February 2010. The bid was awarded £1.135m March 2010 and officers are now taking forward the Demonstrator Project at Rampton Drift and refining the brief for additional studies.

Implications

14.

Financial	None. It should be noted that the performance of the service has been achieved against a background of a reduction in expenditure.
Legal	None
Staffing	The New Communities service was undergoing a restructure during the quarter. Service performance has generally been maintained at high levels. Exceptions to this are highlighted with this report.
Risk Management	The New Communities service maintains a comprehensive risk register, which feeds major and significant risks to the corporate risk register. The Service is a contributor and key partner in wider strategic risk management regarding the delivery of growth sites, working with the City and County Councils within the Cambridgeshire Horizons Partnership.
Equal Opportunities	None.
Climate Change	Type here

Effect on Strategic Aims

15.

(a) Commitment to being a listening council, providing first class services accessible to all.

Action 06, to review grant system has been successfully completed.
NC9 Telephone survey of growth sites applicants completed April 2010.

(b) Commitment to ensuring that South Cambridgeshire continues to be a safe and healthy place for all.

Action 11 & NI110 are both green. Good progress is being made in this area.

(c) Commitment to making South Cambridgeshire a place in which residents can feel proud to live.

The Climate Change Action Plan will be presented to Council later this year. Strong delivery in the Sustainable Parish Energy Plan, with targets for number of Parish Councils engaged exceeded.

(d) Commitment to assisting provision for local jobs for all.

Economic Development indicators show that strong progress has been made in this area. The Economic Development strategy has, however been delayed, will be considered at July PFH meeting.

(e) Commitment to providing a voice for rural life.

(i) Improved work in the delivery of Section 106 agreements has been carried out. The establishment of a single database of agreements and the monitoring of existing agreements has been put in place.

Conclusions / Summary

















16. The service has performed strongly and generally met its aim of delivering the Council Actions and objectives within the agreed timescales. This has been completed against a backdrop of meeting identified savings targets within the year and undertaking a significant restructure.








Background Papers: the following background papers were used in the preparation of this report:





New Communities Customer Service Satisfaction Survey April 2010.
Arts Development Action Plan 2009-12 Update.

Contact Officer: Jane Green – Head of New Communities.
Telephone: (01954) 713164

Appendix A – End of Year Summary Report 2009/10

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN		Status at Year End
ACTION 06 - Review the current grant scheme and introduce talented performers.	Action is 100% complete. The scheme has been reviewed and the Elite Athletes grant scheme is now in place. Panel have awarded £14,250 to 24 applicants. Remaining budget carried over to 2010/11	
ACTION 11 – Increase % residents taking up sport or formal exercise by 1%	Action 100% complete.	
ACTION 23 - Climate Change Action Plan	Action complete – working draft in place and approved by CCWG and EMT – anticipate full council adoption August 2010.	
ACTION 24 - Renewable energy & low carbon living schemes (Sustainable Parish Energy Partnership)	Exceeded annual target of 6 schemes (12 schemes are signed up).	
ACTION 25 – Set up a Business Forum & Business Breakfasts.	Action complete.	
ACTION 27 – Promote the development and uptake of Business space in the District.	Actions undertaken - on target to deliver practical solution.	
ACTION 28 - Spin-offs from London 2012 Olympics.	Draft Action Plan has been developed and projects identified. Pending full implementation of NC Service Review.	
ACTION 32 - New premises for small businesses.	Action complete.	
IMPROVEMENT PLAN		
NC8 - Action plan to improve communications.	Measure amended. Strategic steering group established to oversee site specific approaches.	
NC9 - More efficient working practices.	Telephone survey completed April 2010, summary to be included in May PFH meeting.	
NC10 - Low-Carbon Living Community Network webpages.	Action complete and webpages now subject to regular update and development.	
OPERATIONAL PLAN		
NC1 - Training programme for Parish Councils on Youth Participation.	Target of 10 for the year exceeded - 12 completed.	
NC2 - Increase by 5% -under 16's - swimming pool users	Target exceeded by 34%.	
NC3 - Increase by 5% -over 60's - swimming pool users	Target exceeded by 31%.	
NC4 - Fitness4Health Scheme	46% of the annual target met after qtr 2. Awaiting Q4 figures.	
NC5 - Art events in the Event Guide	68% of the annual target met after qtr 3. Qtr 4 Event guide not produced due to budget cuts.	

NC6 - External funding in Grants programme.	On course to deliver £2.2M (target £1.6M) in external funding depending on panel decisions in new year on remaining grant money allocation. Final figures to be calculated (Joseph M).	
NC7 - Review of 75% of historic S.106 agreements.	Target exceeded (100% of S106 agreements reviewed).	
NI008 - SCDC - Adult participation in sport.	Annual indicator by survey. Data will be available Q3 2010/11	 n/a
NI110 - Young people's participation in positive activities.	Annual indicator by survey at county level. SCDC local reporting to be carried out in 2010/11.	 n/a
NI011 - CC - Engagement in the arts	Annual indicator by survey. Data will be available Q3 2010/11	 n/a
NI171 - CC - VAT registration rate - All Cambs.	Annual indicator - Work ongoing promoting Business start-up and running skills workshops.	 n/a
NI185a - SCDC - CO2 % reduction from LA operations.	Target of 10% reduction by end of 2010 has been agreed by PFH - working group established.	 n/a
NI185b - CO2 reduction LA operations – tonnage.	Target of 10% reduction by end of 2010 has been agreed by PFH - working group established.	 n/a
NI186a - Reductions in CO2 emissions in LA area –	Yearly PI - Figures come from DEFRA, Parish Energy programme is one example of a project run by SCDC to influence these figures.	 n/a
NI186b - SCDC - Tonnes of CO2 emissions in LA area - Yearly PI –	Figures come from DEFRA (as above).	 n/a
NI188 - SCDC - Adapting to climate change - South Cambs –	Level 1 requirements met.	

- Key  **Completed or on target**
-  **corrective action being taken**
-  **n/a Annual target (data not yet available n/a)**
-  **Not on target**

SOUTH CAMBRIDGESHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

REPORT TO: Planning & Sustainable Communities
Portfolio Holder Meeting

20 May 2010

AUTHOR/S: Steve Hampson
Executive Director

Jo Mills, Corporate Manager
Planning & Sustainable Communities

PLANNING & SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES PERFORMANCE REPORT

Purpose

1. To provide the Portfolio Holder with a performance update for 2009-10 (1 April 2009 to 31 March 2010) by Planning & Sustainable Communities. This report shows how Local and National Indicators, Councils' Aims and Actions have been met.
2. Planning & Sustainable Communities were asked to find savings of £165,000(sic) for 2009/10 and this target has largely been achieved.
3. Planning & Sustainable Communities has delivered a strong performance against its targets.

Recommendations and Reasons

4. The Portfolio Holder is requested to note achievements to date and improvements needed to meet performance targets moving forward.

Executive Summary

5. Government targets for NI157A, B and C have been met, together with the Council Aims and Actions.
6. Due to a technical error on the Corvu system, data in respect of: BV204, SP944, SP902, NI157A, NI157B, NI157C, SH320 and SP921 are showing incorrectly. This report details the true traffic lighting based on actual figures and is shown in Appendix II.

Background

7. Government targets for NI157A, B and C were successfully met during this financial year. By achieving the Government set targets, there should be no abatement of next years Housing Planning Delivery Grant (HPDG) award.

	Government Target	Internal Target	Actual
NI157A Major planning applications in 13 weeks	60%	71%	67%
NI157B Minor planning applications in 8 weeks	65%	71%	77%
NI157C Other planning applications in 8 weeks	80%	86%	83%

8. The following Council Actions have been met and continue to be delivered:

(a) **Action 13 - Parish Council and Others Forum**

Set up a forum of parish councils, housing associations and others by Sep 2009 to examine the workings of our exception sites policy in light of recent experience and current market conditions.

Background continued ...

(i) **Exception Sites Parish Review Group**

This has been set up with Housing as a task and finish group (to complete its work in the financial year); the first meeting was held on Monday 18 January 2010 with a further 2 meetings due to be held in 2010. Further information can be found via the web:

<http://www.scambs.gov.uk/Environment/Planning/esprg.htm>

(ii) **Planning Parish Forum**

The first meeting was held on 19 January 2009 and continues to meet every six months. To date, the Forum has achieved:

- Briefing notes on:
 - o Delegation system
 - o How parish planning consultation should properly be dealt with
 - o The process of compulsory purchase (CPO)
 - o Noise
- Presentations on:
 - o Biodiversity, planning and communities
 - o Trees and landscape
 - o Changes in the planning appeal process
 - o Public Art Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)
 - o Open Space SPD
 - o Conservation SPD
 - o Enforcement
 - o Responding to Planning Applications
 - o Listed Building SPD
 - o Biodiversity SPD

The Parishes have been very positive about the Forum as they see it as a chance to learn about different areas of planning, understanding the SPDs being adopted, S106 and provides them with the opportunity to discuss any issues/problems they may be experiencing. The difference the Forum has made is that it was used as a vehicle to give the Parishes input into developing the new system of delegation, has provided a better level of understanding and has seen an improvement in relations with officers. Further information can be found via the web: <http://www.scambs.gov.uk/Environment/Planning/ParishForum/default.htm>

(b) **Action 14a - Retirement homes in new major developments**

Include an appropriate proportion of retirement homes in each new major development

Two sites have been approved during this financial year:

- 101 retirement units for over 55's on the former EDF depot and training centre, Ely road, Milton
- 76 close care units for over 75's on land to the north of Wellbrook Way, Girton

(c) **Action 34 - Innovative working with developers**

Exploring innovative ways of working with developers

An Agents Forum was set up towards the end of 2007 and is held every six months. Attendance has grown so that while the initial meetings were held in a Committee room, they now have to be held in the Council Chamber. Thus far, Agents for the major growth sites have not attended and this should be included in a general review of the panel, suggested to take place towards the end of 2010. The Forum is used for consultations for various services ie pre-application charging and has proved successful in terms of providing information and obtaining valuable feedback from Agents. Further information can be found via the web:

<http://www.scambs.gov.uk/Environment/Planning/agentsForum.htm>

Background continued ...

9. Pre-application charging came into effect on 5 October 2009 and generated the £20,500 revenue that was originally anticipated; £20,640.50 by 31 March 2010. The service has proved successful in terms of quality advice, reasonable fees and working with applicants to achieve high standards of development. This is evident by the quality of applications being received (officer comments taken on board and addressed, substantial plans, design & access statements enclosed where applicable etc) and verbal positive feedback received from those who have received advice. Pre-application advice has also proved successful in terms of validating an application due to not having to contact the Applicant for missing data etc as all information is enclosed, together with addressing Officer concerns, policy and highways issues where applicable. Further information can be found via the web: <http://www.scams.gov.uk/Environment/Planning/pre-AppAdvice.htm>
10. A review of pre-application charging will be undertaken in the Autumn to include a wider range of areas ie Conservation, Building Control and Major Developments.
11. A breakdown of performance is provided below:

Red Indicators

- (a) SH320 - Affordable housing planning permissions
The target has not been met as outline planning permission for 380 dwellings at the former Bayer Crop Science site, Hauxton, granted in February 2010 did not secure 40% affordable housing as the preference was for the provision of a much needed 70 unit extra care scheme which has been secured on this site instead of general needs housing. Also a development of 10 dwellings at Gamlingay did not secure any affordable housing as the outline planning permission was determined against the Local Plan policies and the development did not meet the affordable housing triggers.
- (b) SP938 - Number of days to process 'others'
This has not been met due to delays in the registration process, vacant posts being frozen in advance of the planned improvements to work practices, improvements to the IT system and staff resources being diverted to developing the new work practices and acquiring and then installing the new planning IT system.
- (c) P10 - Core Strategy - Initial Consultation and Sustainability Appraisal
Planning Policy will take forward a revised timetable as a new local development scheme was agreed in March 2010. The new timetable is consistent with the revised timetable for the East of England plan.
- (d) P9 - Core Strategy - Preparation and Scoping of Sustainability Appraisal
Planning Policy will take forward a revised timetable as a new local development scheme was agreed in March 2010. The new timetable is consistent with the revised timetable for the East of England plan.
- (e) P15 - Gypsy & Travellers DPD - Initial Consultation and Sustainability Appraisal
Additional stage of consultation required entitled 'Issues and Options 3'. A revised timetable is included in local development schemes 2010-13. Approved in March 2010.
- (f) P20 - Planning obligations SPD - Adoption and Publication
This is in progress, with joint working with Cambridge City Council, linked with CIL and is due to be completed June 2011.
- (g) P5 - Statement of Community Involvement - Initial Consultation
The regulations for the production of a SCI changed in April 2009 and it is no longer necessary to do an initial consultation. SCI was adopted in January 2010.

Background continued ...

Amber Indicators

- (h) BC4 - Number of inspections and time taken
This information will be reported at the meeting.
- (i) SP922 - Initial notice submission response
This information will be reported at the meeting.
- (j) SP902 - Delegations to officers
From the PS1/2 reports, this measure was met in the last two quarters. However, as performance was 91% in Apr-Jun and 94% in Jul-Sep, performance is slightly less than anticipated.
- (k) NI157A - Major planning applications in 13 weeks
Delays in the registration process reduces the time Officers have to determine an application.
- (l) NI157C - Other planning applications in 8 weeks
Delays in the registration process reduces the time Officers have to determine an application.
- (m) SP921 - Householder applications in 8 weeks
Delays in the registration process continue to impact determining minor applications as it reduces the time Officers have to determine an application.
- (n) SP937 - Number of days to process 'Minors'
Delays in the registration process, vacant posts being frozen in advance of the planned improvements to work practices, improvements to the IT system and staff resources being diverted to developing the new work practices and acquiring and then installing the new planning IT system.
- (o) SP945 - Average days for Prior Notifications
Delays in the registration process, vacant posts being frozen in advance of the planned improvements to work practices, improvements to the IT system and staff resources being diverted to developing the new work practices and acquiring and then installing the new planning IT system.

Green Indicators

- (p) All green indicators are completed or on target.

12. The below noted Council Aims have been completed within the agreed timescales:

- (a) **DC1 - Meeting with Parish Councils**
Introduce a new system of meetings to which all Parish Councils will be invited by March 10
First meeting held on 19 January 2009 and continues to meet every six months.
- (b) **DC2 - Duty Officer System**
Establish a Duty Officer System by June 2009
System went live on 1 February 2009 operating from 9-5pm Monday to Friday. The system has proved very successful as it has met customer expectation by providing direct access to a qualified planning officer and has seen fewer complaints. However, the increased demand on the service will need to be reviewed due to the reduction in officers to find efficiency savings. Further information is available via the web:
<http://www.scams.gov.uk/Environment/Planning/dutyOfficer.htm>
- (c) **DC3 - Design Guides for 'major majors'**
Require the submission of Design Guides with applications for 'major major' developments by Sep 2009 (Arbury Park report recommendation)
The Council adopted (subject to no call in) the District Design Guide SPD on 2 March 2010. The adopted SPD takes account of any representations received during the six-week period of public consultation undertaken in October-December 2009. Further information is available via the web:
<http://www.scams.gov.uk/Environment/Planning/DistrictPlanning/LocalDevelopmentFramework/SPDs/DistrictDesignGuideSPD.htm>

Background continued ...

(d) **DC4 - S106 obligation database**

Increase staff resource to develop, launch and utilise the S106 obligation database by June 2009

The District Council appointed a Section 106 Implementation Officer in January 2009. The role is now secured via new policy requiring funding from Section 106 contributions across all new developments. The Section 106 monitoring database was created using Microsoft Access in January 2009 and has since been populated with circa 500 of the most recent legal agreements. Plans are in place to capture all remaining Section 52 and Section 106 agreements. The Section 106 Implementation Officer works closely with colleagues in Housing/Council Tax and Building Control to monitor the status of developments and agreements.

(e) **DC5 - Protocol for pre-application discussions**

Prepare a protocol for pre-application discussions, by June 2009 following discussions and agreement at the Agents Forum

Pre-application discussions were available by June 2009. Pre-application charging came into effect on 5 October 2009 and generated the £20,500 revenue that was originally anticipated; £20,640.50 by 31 March 2010.

Further information is available via the web:

<http://www.scambs.gov.uk/Environment/Planning/pre-AppAdvice.htm>

Considerations

13. The introduction of the planning computer system will need to be carefully managed in order to maintain performance and improve service to our customers.
14. A modified form of systems thinking has been applied to the Development Control process and a new way of working identified and agreed. This will be a radical departure and will result in the Registration team being integrated within the area development control teams.
15. Once the recommendations have been implemented, it is expected that officers will have more time to determine applications. To help achieve the necessary savings and to resource the DC teams, the Appeals team will also have to be lost.
16. Short term measures such as transferring staff resources are in place, or are being considered to ameliorate the expected dip in performance. However as the new method of working is introduced and the IT system, it is planned that we should be able to meet our performance targets despite the cuts in staff resource. The challenge will be to make good the anticipated dip in performance over the remainder of the year.
17. A detailed review of pre-application charging across Planning and New Communities will see an increase in revenue, closer working of departments, a smoother process and quality applications.
18. In the last national survey of customer satisfaction in 2007, 67% of applicants were reportedly very or quite satisfied with the service provided. Over the last two years our own sample survey of customer satisfaction (based on the national survey questions) showed a significant improvement to 83% and from the comments made by customers on their returns, factors such as the Agents Forum and the Duty Officer System have played a part in this improvement. Regrettably there was a decline in the last quarter and from the supporting comments, this is a reflection in the difficulties reported above in registering applications.

Options

19. There are no options to consider at this moment in time.

Implications

20. Financial	A financial report was submitted by Finance, outlining spend to date. Financial savings have been met in the sum of £165,000.
Legal	There are no legal implications.
Staffing	Staff meetings are being held during the planning restructure. Low staff morale and stress levels are being monitored.
Risk Management	Performance may drop during the Planning restructure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Working to new processes ▪ Pressure to deal with the change including applying for new jobs whilst maintaining a high level of service/determining applications on time ▪ New computer system
Equal Opportunities	The Council is committed to providing equal opportunities.

Consultations

21. All relevant planning sections were consulted with the production of this report.

Effect on Strategic Aims

22.	Commitment to being a listening council, providing first class services accessible to all.
	A customer satisfaction survey is sent to every other applicant once a decision has been issued, providing the Council with feedback.
	Commitment to ensuring that South Cambridgeshire continues to be a safe and healthy place for all.
	Planning is critical to South Cambridgeshire continuing to be a safe and healthy place for people to live, ensuring good quality development and community infrastructure.
	Commitment to making South Cambridgeshire a place in which residents can feel proud to live.
	Planning is critical to South Cambridgeshire continuing to be a safe and healthy place for people to live, ensuring good quality development and community infrastructure.
	Commitment to assisting provision for local jobs for all.
	Encouraging development proposals for small businesses and providing free pre-application advice for micro businesses up to 9 employees.
	Commitment to providing a voice for rural life.
	An Agents Forum is held every six months to share good practice and provides training on 'what makes a good development'.

Conclusions/Summary

23. Performance, in terms of budget and local and national indicators has delivered:

- (a) National Indicators for NI157A, B and C have been met:
- (i) NI157A - Major applications determined in 13 weeks
Exceeded Government target by 7%
Internal target of 71% was not met by 4%
 - (ii) NI157B - Minor applications determined in 8 weeks
Exceeded Government target by 12%
Exceeded internal target of 71% by 6%
 - (iii) NI157C Other applications determined in 8 weeks
Exceeded Government target by 3%
Internal target of 86% was not met by 3%

Conclusions/Summary continued ...

(b) Council Actions completed:

- (i) Action 13 - Parish Council and Others Forum
- (ii) Action 14a - Retirement homes in new major developments
- (iii) Action 34 - Innovative working with developers.

(c) Council Aims completed:

- (i) DC1 - Meeting with Parish Councils
- (ii) DC2 - Duty Officer System
- (iii) DC3 - Design Guides for 'major majors'
- (iv) DC4 - S106 obligation database
- (v) DC5 - Protocol for pre-application discussions.









24. Feedback from our customer survey and the joint panels referred to above, support the view that there are improving relations with our Parish Councils, Housing Associations, and Agents. The feedback on the Duty Officer System also suggests that we have improved our service to Householders. However the challenge in the current year is to make good the slippage we are currently experiencing while achieving the necessary savings.

Background Papers: True year end figures for: BV204, SP944, SP902, NI157A, NI157B, NI157C, SH320 and SP921 (Appendix I)

















Corvu detailed performance report (Appendix II)







Contact Officer: Cerise Bradford
Performance Manager, Planning & Sustainable Communities
Telephone: (01954) 712902





**True Year End Figures for:
BV204, SP944, SP902,
NI157A, NI157B, NI157C, SH320 and SP921**

Measure	Target	Actual	Performance
BV204 % of appeals allowed	<36%	33%	
SP944 Customers satisfaction with planning application process	73%	83%	
SP902 Delegations to Officers	95%	94%	
NI157A Major planning applications in 13 weeks	71%	67%	
NI157B Minor planning applications in 8 weeks	71%	77%	
NI157C Other planning applications in 8 weeks	86%	83%	
SH320 Affordable housing planning permissions	40%	33%	
SP921 Householder applications in 8 weeks	90%	87%	

Appendix A – End of Year Summary Report 2009/10

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN		Status at Year End
ACTION 06 - Review the current grant scheme and introduce talented performers.	Action is 100% complete. The scheme has been reviewed and the Elite Athletes grant scheme is now in place. Panel have awarded £14,250 to 24 applicants. Remaining budget carried over to 2010/11	
ACTION 11 – Increase % residents taking up sport or formal exercise by 1%	Action 100% complete.	
ACTION 23 - Climate Change Action Plan	Action complete – working draft in place and approved by CCWG and EMT – anticipate full council adoption August 2010.	
ACTION 24 - Renewable energy & low carbon living schemes (Sustainable Parish Energy Partnership)	Exceeded annual target of 6 schemes (12 schemes are signed up).	
ACTION 25 – Set up a Business Forum & Business Breakfasts.	Action complete.	
ACTION 27 – Promote the development and uptake of Business space in the District.	Actions undertaken - on target to deliver practical solution.	
ACTION 28 - Spin-offs from London 2012 Olympics.	Draft Action Plan has been developed and projects identified. Pending full implementation of NC Service Review.	
ACTION 32 - New premises for small businesses.	Action complete.	
IMPROVEMENT PLAN		
NC8 - Action plan to improve communications.	Measure amended. Strategic steering group established to oversee site specific approaches.	
NC9 - More efficient working practices.	Telephone survey completed April 2010, summary to be included in May PFH meeting.	
NC10 - Low-Carbon Living Community Network webpages.	Action complete and webpages now subject to regular update and development.	
OPERATIONAL PLAN		
NC1 - Training programme for Parish Councils on Youth Participation.	Target of 10 for the year exceeded - 12 completed.	
NC2 - Increase by 5% -under 16's - swimming pool users	Target exceeded by 34%.	
NC3 - Increase by 5% -over 60's - swimming pool users	Target exceeded by 31%.	
NC4 - Fitness4Health Scheme	46% of the annual target met after qtr 2. Awaiting Q4 figures.	
NC5 - Art events in the Event Guide	68% of the annual target met after qtr 3. Qtr 4 Event guide not produced due to budget cuts.	

NC6 - External funding in Grants programme.	On course to deliver £2.2M (target £1.6M) in external funding depending on panel decisions in new year on remaining grant money allocation. Final figures to be calculated (Joseph M).	
NC7 - Review of 75% of historic S.106 agreements.	Target exceeded (100% of S106 agreements reviewed).	
NI008 - SCDC - Adult participation in sport.	Annual indicator by survey. Data will be available Q3 2010/11	 n/a
NI110 - Young people's participation in positive activities.	Annual indicator by survey at county level. SCDC local reporting to be carried out in 2010/11.	 n/a
NI011 - CC - Engagement in the arts	Annual indicator by survey. Data will be available Q3 2010/11	 n/a
NI171 - CC - VAT registration rate - All Cambs.	Annual indicator - Work ongoing promoting Business start-up and running skills workshops.	 n/a
NI185a - SCDC - CO2 % reduction from LA operations.	Target of 10% reduction by end of 2010 has been agreed by PFH - working group established.	 n/a
NI185b - CO2 reduction LA operations – tonnage.	Target of 10% reduction by end of 2010 has been agreed by PFH - working group established.	 n/a
NI186a - Reductions in CO2 emissions in LA area –	Yearly PI - Figures come from DEFRA, Parish Energy programme is one example of a project run by SCDC to influence these figures.	 n/a
NI186b - SCDC - Tonnes of CO2 emissions in LA area - Yearly PI –	Figures come from DEFRA (as above).	 n/a
NI188 - SCDC - Adapting to climate change - South Cambs –	Level 1 requirements met.	

- Key  **Completed or on target**
-  **corrective action being taken**
-  **n/a Annual target (data not yet available n/a)**
-  **Not on target**

Planning and Sustainable Communities 09/10: March 2010

Measure Name	Frequency	Responsible Officer	Unit of Measure	Current Performance		End of Year Performance			Comments
				Target	Actual	YTD Actual	End of Year Target	Estimate	
Aim : Building Control Service									
Approach : Customer Satisfaction									
BC1 - Annual customer survey.	QUARTERLY	Andrew Beyer	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
BC2 - Time taken to acknowledge applications	QUARTERLY	Andrew Beyer	Percentage	100	100		100	97	
BC3 - Time to check applications & issue decisions	QUARTERLY	Andrew Dearlove	Percentage	100	100		100	99	
BC4 - No: of inspections and time taken	QUARTERLY	Andrew Dearlove	Percentage	100	99		100	99	
BC5 - Procedures in place to ensure consistency of response	QUARTERLY	Andrew Beyer	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
BC6 - New enforcement procedures	QUARTERLY	Andrew Beyer	Percentage	50	50		50	50	
SP922 - Initial notice submission response	QUARTERLY	Andrew Beyer	Percentage	98	96		98	96	
SP923 - Acknowledgement of building regulation application	QUARTERLY	Andrew Beyer	Percentage	99	100		99	97	
SP924 - Full plan applications assesses	QUARTERLY	Andrew Dearlove	Percentage	60	63		60	70	
SP925 - Building Control applications decided in relevant period	QUARTERLY	Andrew Dearlove	Percentage	99	100		99	99	
SP926 - Inspections undertaken on same day	QUARTERLY	Andrew Dearlove	Percentage	95	99		95	99	
SP928 - Immediately dangerous requests responded to on time	QUARTERLY	Andrew Beyer	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
SP929 - Probably dangerous requests responded to on time	QUARTERLY	Andrew Beyer	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
SP930 - May become dangerous requests responded to on time	QUARTERLY	Andrew Beyer	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
SP935 - % customer satisfaction - Building Control	YEARLY	Andrew Beyer	Percentage	80	89		80	89	

Planning and Sustainable Communities 09/10: March 2010

Measure Name	Frequency	Responsible Officer	Unit of Measure	Current Performance		End of Year Performance			Comments
				Target	Actual	YTD Actual	End of Year Target	Estimate	
Aim : Development Control Service									
Approach : Appeals									
BV204 - % of appeals allowed	QUARTERLY	John Koch	Percentage	36	27		36	33	
Approach : Customer Satisfaction									
SP944 - % Customers satisfied with planning application process	QUARTERLY	Cerise Bradford	Percentage	73	100	91.3	73	80	
Approach : Delegations to Officers									
SP902 - Delegations to officers	QUARTERLY	Gareth Jones	Percentage	95	79		95	79	
Approach : Design Guide SPD									
DC3 - Design Guides for 'major major' developments.	QUARTERLY	Cerise Bradford	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
Approach : Parish Councils									
DC1 - Meetings with Parish Councils	QUARTERLY	Cerise Bradford	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
Approach : Planning Applications									
DC5 - Protocol for pre-application discussions	QUARTERLY	Cerise Bradford	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
NI157a - SCDC - Major planning applications in 13 weeks	MONTHLY	Gareth Jones	Percentage	71	100	69.2	71	71	Delays in registration process continue to impact determining applications.
NI157b - Minor planning applications - in 8 weeks	MONTHLY	Cerise Bradford	Percentage	71	68	85.5	71	71	Delays in registration process continue to impact determining applications.

Planning and Sustainable Communities 09/10: March 2010

Measure Name	Frequency	Responsible Officer	Unit of Measure	Current Performance		End of Year Performance			Comments
				Target	Actual	YTD Actual	End of Year Target	Estimate	
NI157c - Other planning applications - in 8 weeks	MONTHLY	Cerise Bradford	Percentage	86	80	92.9	86	86	Delays in registration process continue to impact determining applications.
SH320 - Affordable housing planning permissions	QUARTERLY	Gareth Jones	Percentage	40	27.4		40	33.4	Data for SH320 is obtained from the Research & Monitoring team at Cambs County Council. The target has not been met as outline planning permission for 380 dwellings at the former Bayer Crop Science site, Hauxton, granted in February 2010, did not secure 40% affordable housing, as the preference was for the provision of a much needed 70 unit extra care scheme which has been secured on this site instead of general needs housing. Also a development of 10 dwellings at Gamlingay did not secure any affordable housing as the outline planning permission was determined against the Local Plan policies and the development did not secure any affordable housing.
SP921 - Householder applications in 8 weeks	MONTHLY	Cerise Bradford	Percentage	90	86	82.7	90	82	Delays in registration process continue to impact on determining applications on time.
Approach : Registration Team									
SP936 - Reg: Team - Days to process Majors	MONTHLY	Rachael Fox	Number	7	7	30.8	7	7	
SP937 - Reg: Team - Days to process	MONTHLY	Rachael Fox	Number	5	7	34.5	5	7	

Planning and Sustainable Communities 09/10: March 2010

Measure Name	Frequency	Responsible Officer	Unit of Measure	Current Performance		End of Year Performance			Comments
				Target	Actual	YTD Actual	End of Year Target	Estimate	
Minors									
SP938 - Reg: Team - Days to process	MONTHLY	Rachael Fox	Number	3	7	26.1	3	7	
Others									
SP945 - Reg: Team - Average days for Prior Notifications	MONTHLY	Cerise Bradford	Days	2	3	38.5	2	1.9	
Approach : Section 106									
DC4 - S106 obligation database	QUARTERLY	Cerise Bradford	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
Approach : Staffing									
DC2 - Duty Officer System	QUARTERLY	Cerise Bradford	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
Aim : Planning Policy Service									
Approach : Affordable Housing SPD									
P2 - Prepare Affordable Housing SPD - By Feb 10	QUARTERLY	Caroline Hunt	Percentage	100	100		100	100	Adopted March 2010.
Approach : Annual Monitoring Report									
P26 - Annual Monitoring Report - Submission Annually to SoS by December	QUARTERLY	Jenny Nuttycombe	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
Approach : Biodiversity Strategy SPD									
P25 - Biodiversity Strategy SPD - Adoption and Publication by Oct 09	QUARTERLY	Claire Spencer	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
Approach : Community Transport Plan									
P29 - Develop a Community Transport Plan - By Jan 10	QUARTERLY	Claire Spencer	Percentage	100	100		100	100	

Planning and Sustainable Communities 09/10: March 2010

Measure Name	Frequency	Responsible Officer	Unit of Measure	Current Performance		End of Year Performance			Comments
				Target	Actual	YTD Actual	End of Year Target	Estimate	
Approach : Core Strategy									
P10 - Core Strategy - Initial Consultation and SA by Sep 10	QUARTERLY	Caroline Hunt	Percentage	10	0		10	0	
P11 - Core Strategy - Public Consultation on Draft Submission and SA by Jun 11	QUARTERLY	Caroline Hunt	Percentage	0	0		0	0	
P12 - Core Strategy - Submission to SoS by Dec 11	QUARTERLY	Caroline Hunt	Percentage	0	0		0	0	
P13 - Core Strategy - Adoption and Publication by Dec 12	QUARTERLY	Caroline Hunt	Percentage	0	0		0	0	
P9 - Core Strategy - Preparation and Scoping of SA by Feb 2010	QUARTERLY	Caroline Hunt	Percentage	100	0		100	0	Delayed to take account of the outcome of the East of England Plan Review.
Approach : Council 2009/10 Action									
ACTION 02 - Statement of Community Involvement - By Sep 10	QUARTERLY	Keith Miles	Percentage	100	100		100	100	Adopted January 2010.
ACTION 13 - Parish council & Others Forum - By Sep 09	QUARTERLY	Gareth Jones	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
ACTION 14a - Retirement Homes in new major developments	QUARTERLY	Gareth Jones	Percentage	100	100		100	100	Adopted LDF policies do not require the inclusion of retirement homes in developer plans. However developers do occasionally put in plans for retirement homes, which will then go through the normal planning
ACTION 34 - Innovative working with developers	QUARTERLY	Gareth Jones	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
Approach : Design Guide SPD									
P23 - Design Guide SPD - Adoption and	QUARTERLY	Claire Spencer	Percentage	100	100		100	100	Adopted March 2010.

Planning and Sustainable Communities 09/10: March 2010

Measure Name	Frequency	Responsible Officer	Unit of Measure	Current Performance		End of Year Performance		Comments	
				Target	Actual	YTD Actual	End of Year Target		Estimate
Publication by Feb 10									
Approach : Gypsy & Travellers DPD									
P1 - Prepare Gypsy & Travellers DPD - By Jan 12	QUARTERLY	Jonathon Dixon	Percentage	35	35		35	35	
P14 - Gypsy & Travellers DPD - Initial Consultation and SA by Nov 09	QUARTERLY	Jonathon Dixon	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
P15 - Gypsy & Travellers DPD - Public Consultation on Draft Submission and SA by Sep 10	QUARTERLY	Jonathon Dixon	Percentage	60	0		60	0	Additional stage of consultation required - Issues & Options 3. A revised timetable is included in the Local Development Scheme 2010-2013.
P16 - Gypsy & Travellers DPD - Submission to SoS by Dec 10	QUARTERLY	Jonathon Dixon	Percentage	0	0		0	0	Additional stage of consultation required - Issues & Options 3. A revised timetable is included in the Local Development Scheme 2010-2013.
P17 - Gypsy & Travellers DPD - Adoption and Publication by Jan 12	QUARTERLY	Jonathon Dixon	Percentage	0	0		0	0	Additional stage of consultation required - Issues & Options 3. A revised timetable is included in the Local Development Scheme 2010-2013.
Approach : Listed Buildings SPD									
P24 - Listed Buildings SPD - Adoption and Publication by Oct 09	QUARTERLY	Claire Spencer	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
Approach : Local Development Scheme (LDS)									
P27 - LDS annual programme update each April	QUARTERLY	Keith Miles	Percentage	100	100		100	100	

Planning and Sustainable Communities 09/10: March 2010

Measure Name	Frequency	Responsible Officer	Unit of Measure	Current Performance		End of Year Performance		Comments	
				Target	Actual	YTD Actual	End of Year Target		Estimate
Approach : North West Cambridge AAP									
P19 - North West Cambridge AAP - Adoption and Publication by Oct 09	QUARTERLY	Caroline Hunt	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
Approach : Planning Obligations SPD									
P20 - Planning Obligations SPD - Adoption and Publication by Feb 10	QUARTERLY	Jonathon Dixon	Percentage	100	25		100	25	
Approach : Site Specific Policies DPD									
P18 - Site Specific Policies DPD - Adoption and Publication by Oct 09	QUARTERLY	Caroline Hunt	Percentage	100	100		100	100	Adopted January 2010.
Approach : Statement of Community Involvement									
P5 - SCI - Initial Consultation by May 09	QUARTERLY	Alison Talkington	Percentage	100	0		100	0	The regulations for the production of a SCI changed in April 2009, it is no longer necessary to do an initial consultation.
P7 - SCI - Public Consultation on Draft Submission by Oct 09	QUARTERLY	Alison Talkington	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
P8 - SCI - Adoption and Publication by Feb 2010	QUARTERLY	Alison Talkington	Percentage	100	100		100	100	Adopted January 2010.
Approach : Sustainable Design & Construction SPD									
P22 - Sustainable Design & Construction SPD - Adoption and Publication by Feb 10	YEARLY	Keith Miles	Percentage	100	100		100	100	
Approach : The East of England Plan									
P28 - Review the East of England Plan - By Dec 09	QUARTERLY	Keith Miles	Percentage	100	100		100	100	Draft East of England Plan approved for submission. Consultation is dependent on the

Page 103

This page is left blank intentionally.

Date of Portfolio Holder Meeting	Agenda Item	Key	Purpose	SMT / Corporate Manager Lead	Responsible Officer(s)
20-May-10	Performance indicators full year report 2009 - 2010				
	Authorise Orchard Park SPD Consultation				
	Authorise Papworth West Central SPD consultation				
	Cambridge North West retail study findings (Provisional)				
	Pre-application charging - Update		Identify improvements, review charging levels, quantify use made of the service by agents, consider extension to other applications and to New Communities	Jo Mills	
	Service plan improvement milestones full year report 2009 - 2010.				
13-Jul-10	Economic Development Strategy	Y		Jo Mills	Nicole Kritzinger
	Endorse Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Study				
	Authorise Gypsy and Traveller Site Options 2 consultation				
	Cambridge North West retail study findings (Provisional)				
	Endorse Green Infrastructure Strategy and Water Cycle Strategy (provisional)				
	Financial performance full year report 2009 - 2010		Monitoring		
	Responding to the Economic Downturn		Monitoring	Jo Mills	Nicole Kritzinger
	Procurement Savings 2009-10		Information - Annual Report	Alex Colyer	John Garnham
	Integrated Business Monitoring (as required)		Monitoring		
7-Oct-10	Responding to the Economic Downturn		Monitoring	Jo Mills	Nicole Kritzinger
	Orchard Park SPD adoption				
	Papworth West Central adoption				
	Authorise Health Impact Assessment SPD consultation				
	Authorise Dwellings Associated with Rural Enterprise SPD consultation				
	Authorise Fen Drayton LSA SPD consultation				
	Endorse Green Infrastructure Strategy and Water Cycle Strategy (provisional)				
	Draft Service Plan 2010/11				
	Draft Budget				
14 Dec 10	Integrated Business Monitoring (as required)		Monitoring		
	Financial Monitoring				

Date of Portfolio Holder Meeting	Agenda Item	Key	Purpose	SMT / Corporate Manager Lead	Responsible Officer(s)
14-Dec-10	Annual Monitoring Report				
25 Jan 11	Capital and Revenue Estimates				
	Gypsy and Traveller DPD Stage 1 Submission				
	Responding to the Economic Downturn			Jo Mills	Nicole Kritzing
8 Mar 11	Final Service Plans				
	Integrated Business Monitoring (as required)		Monitoring		
	Health Impact SPD adoption				
	Dwellings Associated with Rural Enterprise SPD adoption				
	Fen Drayton LSA SPD adoption				
	Procurement Strategy				
	Local Development Scheme				
	Service Plan				
	Budget				
Unscheduled	Considerate Contractor Scheme	Y		Jo Mills	Kirsty Human
	Systems Thinking			Jo Mills	Keith Miles
	Duxford Airfield Revised Conservation Area Appraisal			Jo Mills	

Date of Portfolio Holder Meeting	Agenda Item	Key	Purpose	Corporate Manager(s)	Responsible Officer(s)
20-May-10	Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document	Y		Gareth Jones	Jonathan Dixon
	Performance indicators full year report 2009 - 2010		Monitoring		
	Self-Commissioned Housing at Orchard Park		Information	Jo Mills	Jo Mills
	Customer Satisfaction Survey				
	Climate Change Action Plan			Jo Mills	Richard Hales
	Service Plan improvement milestones full year report 2009 - 2010.		Monitoring		
Jul-10	Financial Performance full year report 2009 - 2010		Monitoring	Jo Mills	Peter Harris
	Youth Participation Strategy	Y	For decision	Jo Mills	Tracey Mann
	Integrated Business Monitoring (as required)		Monitoring		
7 Oct 10	Integrated Business Monitoring (as required)		Monitoring		
	Financial Monitoring				
	Draft Service Plan				
14 Dec 10					
225 Jan 11	Capital and Revenue Estimates				
8 March 11	Final Service Plans				
	Integrated Business Monitoring (as required)		Monitoring		
Unscheduled	South Cambs Sustainable Parish Energy Programme	Y	For decision following Climate Change WG consideration	Jo Mills	Richard Hales
	South Cambs Community Facilities Audit		To provide a summary of the consultants' findings and make a recommendation for the Council to agree to a standard which will guide negotiations for developer contributions towards community facilities, in advance of the Planning Obligations DPD being agreed.	Jo Mills	Jane Thompson
	s106 Agreements Supplementary Planning Document		Currently programmed for consultation beginning July 2011	Jo Mills	Keith Miles

This page is left blank intentionally.