

**Committee:** Cabinet

**Agenda Item**

**Date:** 17 February 2015

**21**

**Title:** S106 Community Pot Stansted

**Portfolio Holder:** Cllr Barker

Key decision: No

---

## Summary

1. The Council has approved the residential development of land at Rochford Nurseries/Forest Hall Road Stansted. As part of this approval a number of S106 legal agreements were entered into by the developers. These have provided, amongst other things, financial contributions which are intended to be used for "such leisure recreational and/or community facilities in the District of Uttlesford as arise out of or are reasonably related to the needs of persons occupying or to occupy the dwellings within the Development".

## Recommendation

2. That a maximum of £52,290 be allocated to the Stansted skateboard redevelopment fund, subject to agreement with the developer(s) as required.
3. The allocation will be reduced to take account any grants also awarded by ECC or Viridor to whom applications for funding this project have been made by Stansted Mountfitchet Parish Council.

## Financial Implications

4. The funding requested will be drawn from ring fenced funds available for this purpose. There are no other financial implications arising from this report.

## Background Papers

5. The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report.

None

## Impact

- 6.

Communication/Consultation	The projects have been developed following community consultation.
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None

Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	Improvements to Stansted South and Stansted North wards.
Workforce/Workplace	None

## Situation

7. The Council holds substantial funds currently totalling some £796,025, out of which £542,070 is already committed, (leaving £253,955 available) which are provided by the developers to mitigate the impact of the new development and to provide the necessary leisure, recreation and community facilities within the local area to support the development.
8. The projects have been considered against a range of criteria devised by officers to enable a fair assessment to be made and to ensure that the funds are used to the best advantage of the community. The criteria are:
  - Demonstrable link to Forest Hall Park residents
  - Not provided for by other S106 contributions (i.e. highways, education)
  - Delivering a community benefit
  - Charity/not for profit
  - Capital rather than revenue funding
  - Provide a balanced investment for the overall fund
  - Contribution sought proportionate to use made/likely to be made by Rochford Development residents
  - Other funds held by organisation applying should be called upon first
  - Evidence of other funding sources being investigated
  - Evidence of community consultation/ engagement carried out

<b>Total amount collected from developers</b>	<b>Funding of community schemes approved by Cabinet</b>	<b>Further allocation of funds as recommended in this report</b>
£1,403,250	£1,149,295 Total	£50,290

9. The Council has received a request from Stansted Parish Council to allocate funds to the Stansted skateboard park rebuild project in Stansted.
10. The project cost is £174,208. Significant funds have already been raised or secured from grants but there is still a shortfall. Two bids to Viridor and ECC

are still outstanding. If these bids were successful then the amount required from the S106 pot would reduce. The request is that the balance required is provided from the community funds held.

11. The proposal is a key local youth facility which is within easy walking/cycling reach of Forest Hall Park. There are no other similar facilities within the area so its upgrade will be a direct benefit to residents of Forest Hall Park.

## Conclusion

13. The proposal is considered to be acceptable and will help to provide a high class facility for all the residents of Stansted.

## Risk Analysis

- 14.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
Design and further investigation work on projects may reveal scheme is not feasible/viable.	2 Sites are constrained by limited area or distance to services.	3 Scope may need to be reviewed.	Project has been designed and feasibility work has been completed.

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.