



Uttlesford District Council

Chief Executive: Dawn French

Cabinet

Date: Thursday, 17 March 2016
Time: 16:00
Venue: Committee Room
Address: Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden, CB11 4ER

Members: Councillors H Rolfe (Leader and Chairman), S Barker, S Howell, J Redfern and L Wells

Other attendees: Councillors A Dean (Liberal Democrat Group Leader and Chairman of Scrutiny Committee), J Lodge (Residents for Uttlesford Group Leader) and E Oliver (Chairman of Performance and Audit Committee)

Public Speaking

At the start of the meeting there will be an opportunity of up to 15 minutes for members of the public to ask questions and make statements subject to having given notice by 12 noon two working days before the meeting.

AGENDA PART 1

Open to Public and Press

- 1 Apologies for absence and declarations of interest**
To receive any apologies for absence and declarations of interest.
- 2 Minutes of the previous meeting** 5 - 12
To consider the minutes of the meeting held on 16 February 2016.
- 3 Matters Arising**
To consider matters arising from the minutes.

- 4 Questions or statements from non executive members of the council**
To receive questions or statements from non-executive members on matters included on the agenda.
- 5 Matters referred to the Executive (standing item)**
To consider matters referred to the Executive in accordance with the provisions of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules or the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules.
- 6 Reports from Performance and Audit and Scrutiny Committees (standing item)**
To consider any reports from Performance and Audit and Scrutiny Committee.
- 7 Refugee Working Group**
To receive a report from the Refugee Working Group (standing item).
- 8 New settlement option for the Local Plan** 13 - 18
To consider a report on a new settlement option for the Local Plan.
- 9 Members' New Homes Bonus Scheme** 19 - 20
To consider a report on the Members' New Homes Bonus scheme.
- 10 Any other items which the Chairman considers to be urgent**
To consider any items which the Chairman considers to be urgent.

MEETINGS AND THE PUBLIC

Members of the public are welcome to attend any of the Council's Cabinet or Committee meetings and listen to the debate. All agendas, reports and minutes can be viewed on the Council's website www.uttlesford.gov.uk. For background papers in relation to this meeting please contact committee@uttlesford.gov.uk or phone 01799 510430/369.

Members of the public and representatives of parish and town councils are permitted to speak or ask questions at any of these meetings. You will need to register with the Democratic Services Officer by midday two working days before the meeting.

The agenda is split into two parts. Most of the business is dealt with in Part I which is open to the public. Part II includes items which may be discussed in the absence of the press or public, as they deal with information which is personal or sensitive for some other reason. You will be asked to leave the meeting before Part II items are discussed.

Agenda and Minutes are available in alternative formats and/or languages. For more information please call 01799 510510.

Facilities for people with disabilities

The Council Offices has facilities for wheelchair users, including lifts and toilets. The Council Chamber has an induction loop so that those who have hearing difficulties can hear the debate.

If you are deaf or have impaired hearing and would like a signer available at a meeting, please contact committee@uttlesford.gov.uk or phone 01799 510430/433 as soon as possible prior to the meeting.

Fire/emergency evacuation procedure

If the fire alarm sounds continuously, or if you are instructed to do so, you must leave the building by the nearest designated fire exit. You will be directed to the nearest exit by a designated officer. It is vital you follow their instructions.

For information about this meeting please contact Democratic Services

Telephone: 01799 510433, 510369 or 510548

Email: Committee@uttlesford.gov.uk

General Enquiries

Council Offices, London Road, Saffron Walden, CB11 4ER

Telephone: 01799 510510

Fax: 01799 510550

Email: uconnect@uttlesford.gov.uk

Website: www.uttlesford.gov.uk

**CABINET MEETING held at COUNCIL OFFICES LONDON ROAD
SAFFRON WALDEN on 16 FEBRUARY 2016 at 7.00pm**

Present: Councillor H Rolfe (Leader)
Councillor S Barker (Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Environmental Services)
Councillor S Howell (Cabinet Member for Finance and Administration)
Councillor J Redfern (Cabinet Member for Housing and Economic Development)
Councillor L Wells (Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships)

Also present: Councillors A Dean (Liberal Democrat Group Leader and Chairman of Scrutiny Committee) and J Lodge (Residents for Uttlesford Group Leader).

Officers in attendance: R Harborough (Director of Public Services and Interim Head of Paid Service), A Knight (Assistant Director – Finance), M Perry (Assistant Chief Executive – Legal), M Cox (Democratic Services Officer) and A Webb (Director of Finance and Corporate Services).

CA81 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Oliver.

Councillor S Barker declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 25 as a member of Essex County Council.

CA82 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2016 were received and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

CA83 MATTERS ARISING

Minute CA78 – Homelessness Strategy

Councillor Redfern apologised that she had overlooked providing the information requested by Councillor Light. She confirmed that the cost of providing bed and breakfast accommodation for homeless people was £55 per night. Further information could be obtained from the housing department.

CA84 REPORTS FROM PERFORMANCE AND AUDIT AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Councillor Howell gave a brief summary of the issues that had been considered at the Performance and Audit Committee.

Councillor Dean reported on the recent meeting of the Scrutiny Committee. Members had made a number of comments on the budget items, which he

would raise under the appropriate agenda item. A speaker from Saffron Walden Town Council had raised issues in relation to the Kier appeal, which the committee would need to look at in the future. He had also requested that the committee pre-scrutinise the report on the proposed Building Control Partnership before the Cabinet considered it on 7 April 2016.

CA85 **REFUGEE WORKING GROUP**

Councillor Redfern reported that the properties identified for refugee families had not proved to be suitable and had now been re-let. The council was now looking for specific available properties to allocate to the refugee families, who were expected to arrive in greater numbers from March onwards. Councillor Redfern would be attending a conference for all partner organisations on 3rd March 2016 and any relevant information would be reported back to Cabinet.

CA86 **ASSETS OF COMMUNITY VALUE**

Councillor Barker presented a report on two buildings to be included as assets of community value. They were both public houses and had been nominated by the North West Essex campaign for real ale. It was explained that an asset was of community value if the local authority considered that it met either of the following criteria.

- The current use furthers the social wellbeing or interests of the local community; and
- It is realistic to think that at some time in the next five years the Asset will further the social wellbeing or social interests of the community or
- There was a time in the recent past when a use of building or land had furthered the social wellbeing or interests of the community; and
- It is realistic to think that in the next five years the building/land could further the social wellbeing or interests of the community.

Since the report had been published, the Green Man PH, Takeley had applied for a premises license and it was now recommended that it be registered as an asset of community value.

Jane Attwood, the owner of the Elmdon Dial PH spoke to the meeting. A full copy of her statement was circulated to members at the meeting. Her main concern was with Camra's assessment of the asset. She said she wanted to sell the property as a public house but no one from the community had come forward since it had been put on the market. Negotiations with a potential buyer had failed due to concerns about the possible listing. She considered the listing to be unnecessary, as there was other legislation to protect the future use of the pub. The ACV listing would just delay the sale and leave the village with an empty property.

The Leader said it was usual for the only public house in a village to be included on the Assets of Community Value list but this would not change the status of the asset or prevent it from being sold. The Cabinet was advised that it was required to list the asset if it was satisfied that it met the relevant criteria.

RESOLVED to include the following properties on the Assets of Community Value list:

- The Elmdon Dial, Elmdon
- The Green Man, Takeley

CA87

AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONTRIBUTIONS

The Cabinet was asked to approve the allocation of funding for the delivery of affordable housing, by utilising funds secured from planning obligations. This would enable two schemes in Chrishall and Saffron Walden to progress towards delivery.

RESOLVED

- 1 To approve the allocation of £112,000 towards the delivery of a rural exception scheme in Chrishall.
- 2 To confirm that the council remains open to granting £100,000 towards a learning disability scheme for Saffron Walden, but a firm allocation would be premature until funding by East Thames Housing Association and Essex County Council is clarified.

CA88

CORPORATE PLAN 2016 – 21

The Leader presented the annual update of the 5-year Corporate Plan. As in previous years, it was a one-page document setting out four key themes. This year the plan included a change in focus with an enhanced emphasis on health and wellbeing and the overall goal as a 'high quality and low tax council'.

Councillor Dean said that the document was too vague and lacked clarity on the outcomes and timescales for what the council was actually going to do. In reply the Leader said this was a strategic document that set out the overall direction of travel. The detail would feed through the four pathways into individual service plans.

Councillor Lodge said the council was already failing in the area of 'continuing to listen and respond to our communities' in its recent decisions in relation to the consultation on the Local Plan.

RESOLVED to approve the draft Corporate Plan for 2016 -21 for submission to Full Council.

CA89

2016/17 BUDGET

Councillor Howell presented a series of reports for the budget 2016/17, which would be considered by Full Council on 25 February. The reports had been prepared in the light of future expected budget cuts. There was an unprecedented level of uncertainty and some reports were still work in progress. He thanked officers for their efforts in preparing these reports and the Scrutiny Committee for its debate and questions.

ROBUSTNESS OF ESTIMATES AND ADEQUACY OF RESERVES

Councillor Howell presented the report setting out the Section 151 Officer's formal advice on the robustness of estimates and adequacy of reserves, to enable the council to set a budget with full awareness of the risks and uncertainties. The Reserves Strategy looked at the purpose and lifespan of each reserve. It was proposed that the working balance should remain at £1.234m and other risks would be managed through special reserves.

The Scrutiny Committee had questioned why the proposed SPV was not listed as a risk, as this would be a significant departure for the council. Members were informed that this project was still at an early stage but there would be a future Cabinet report that would set out all the risks. There had also been questions around the budget underspend, as the report did not clarify which of the items were within the council's control.

RESOLVED to recommend to Full Council

- 1 That the Council takes account of the advice in the report when determining the 2016/17 General Fund budget and Council Tax
- 2 That the Council approves the risk assessment relating to the robustness of estimates as detailed in the report
- 3 That the Council sets the minimum safe contingency level for 2016/17 at £1.234 million.
- 4 That the attached Reserves Strategy is adopted.
- 5 That the Council agrees that no transfers to or from the Working Balance should be built into the 2016/17 budget

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY

Councillor Howell presented the Medium Term Financial Strategy. The strategy looked ahead to anticipate issues around the council's finances and put in measures to ensure the ongoing financial health and stability of the council.

The council was in a strong position for 2016/17 due to a combination of prudent financial management and the New Homes Bonus (NHB). However, the Government was proposing changes to the funding of this scheme and it was anticipated that the council would have a funding deficit from 2018/19. It was proposing to address this by a combination of cost savings and income generation. An updated MTFs would be brought to the Cabinet in the autumn when the outcome of the NHB consultation was known.

Councillor Dean said the Scrutiny Committee was aware that this was an interim strategy but had raised the following points.

- In relation to the transformation reserve, could there be more clarity on the actual savings made.
- What percentage of savings had been made by the devolution of services to other local councils?

- More detail would be welcomed on the outcomes from the council's economic strategy and how this is monitored.

The Leader replied that the transformation reserve was to help the evolution of the organisation, particularly following the loss of the NHB. The council would be required to look at income generation and the effectiveness of any future initiatives.

Councillor Lodge said this was a very prudent budget, and questioned whether it was too conservative e.g. in terms of business rate retention. Officers said that the position for 2017/18 was unclear but the strategy had been based on the best information available.

It was noted that an extra £278,000 had been allocated to the rural services development grant scheme. The cumulative effect on the budget would not be significant but this would be mentioned in the budget report to Council.

RESOLVED to approve the Medium Term Financial Strategy for recommendation to Full Council.

CA89 **TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2016/17**

The Cabinet received the report on the Treasury Management Strategy for 2016/17, which set out the council's cash-flow management, use of banks, investments and borrowing. It included recent updates including the use of money market funds to include non UK- domiciled funds and increased cash and time limits, but the strategy remained prudent and transparent.

RESOLVED to approve the following items for recommendation to Full Council

- Treasury Management Strategy 2016/17
- Prudential Indicators
- Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) statement
- Economic Forecast

CA90 **CAPITAL PROGRAMME**

Members considered the capital programme, which included planned capital expenditure on the council's buildings, vehicles and IT assets, for both the General Fund and the HRA. It was noted that external borrowing had not been required to finance these schemes. Members made comment on the detailed schemes and felt there was a good spread of investment.

RESOLVED to approve, for recommendation to Full Council, the Capital Programme and associated financing as set out in the report.

CA91 **HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT**

The Cabinet received the HRA budget for 2016/17, which reflected the service arrangements and investment in relation to the council's housing service for the fifth year under self-financing. The HRA business plan set the financial strategy for 2016/17 and reflected the budget proposals in the report. There was a net operating surplus of circa £3m which had been allocated to key projects in the business plan. The budget also took account of the effect of the

national approach for rent setting and the reduction in grant funding from ECC for housing related support.

Members noted the appendix, which detailed many achievements to date arising from the HRA in terms of build schemes, stock and service improvements and the introduction of new policies and strategies.

RESOLVED to approve, for recommendation to Full Council the HRA Revenue Budget and 5 Year Financial Strategy.

CA92

GENERAL FUND AND COUNCIL TAX 2016/17

Councillor Howell presented the 2016/17 General Fund budget. It was consistent with the MTFs and had been reviewed by the Scrutiny Committee. He highlighted key areas in the report. He said that the council wished to protect local residents as much as possible, but having taken account of all circumstances, an increase of 1% in council tax had been proposed. To deal with the financial constraints from 2017/18 and beyond, the council would need to increase income and work smarter to achieve this. He proposed the recommendation and said this was a steady as she goes budget, which put in place the foundation for long-term stable finances.

In answer to a question, Members were informed that ECC had reduced the funding of the council's Locally Determined Highways budget by 50%. It was offering 50/50 matched funding which was currently being considered. Members hoped that there would be no reduction in the Highway Rangers budget.

RESOLVED

- 1 To recommend that the Full Council approves the General Fund Council Tax requirement of £4,827,584 summarised in paragraphs 15 -19.
- 2 To approve the schedule of fees and charges in Appendix F.

CA93

BUDGET MONITORING 2015-16 PERIOD 9

The Cabinet received details of the performance of the General Fund, HRA and Capital Programme from April to December 2015. These budgets were currently forecasting an underspend and it was proposed to transfer the general fund surplus to the Strategic Initiatives Fund. The treasury management activity had been in accordance with policy. The report also detailed areas that could have the potential to effect the year end position.

Councillor Howell said he was aware of comments made in relation to the forecast underspends but said this was preferable to the alternative of an overspend position. Many of the reported slippages were outside the control of the council.

RESOLVED

- 1 To note and approve the report

- 2 Approve the transfer of the General Fund Surplus of £1.661m to the Strategic Initiatives Fund.

CA94

NEW HOMES BONUS CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The Cabinet received the amended response to the New Homes Bonus consultation. Members were satisfied with the suggested changes, which put forward a more robust response.

RESOLVED that the response be submitted to the government to inform its decisions when it finalises the revised NHB scheme.

CA95

PAY POLICY

The Council was required to review its Pay Policy on an annual basis. This set out the remuneration schemes in place and set the criteria for the forthcoming year.

RESOLVED to approve, for recommendation to Full Council, the Pay Policy as set out in the appendix to the report.

CA95

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

The Cabinet considered a revision to the Local Development Scheme (LDS), which was the project plan for the production of the new Local Plan. It was necessary to update the timetable in line with Government expectations for the adoption of the Plan by the end of 2017.

Councillor Dean said that this matter had been discussed at the PPWG but the reason for the omission of the issues and options stage consultation and the slippage in the programme had not been explicitly explained. He was concerned at the absence of a more detailed project plan and was surprised that a Cabinet meeting had been called for March 17 to consider what he felt was an inadequate paper on the new settlement option. He was uncomfortable with this change in approach.

The Leader said that all Members had been advised of date of the Extraordinary Council meeting on 21 March 2016. The PPWG would discuss the report at its meeting in February, the recommendation would then go to Cabinet before all Members had the opportunity to discuss the issue in detail at Full Council. There would be no commitment at this stage, and work on the evidence would continue over the summer. The options would be considered in the autumn prior to the pre-submission consultation at the end of the year.

Members were advised that there were statutory stages to complete the timetable and the council had to bear in mind that a failure to submit the Plan by March 2017 could result in Government intervention.

Councillor Lodge felt that the PPWG was not working as intended, as it had been an officer decision to remove a consultation stage and to put forward the new settlement report. The Chairman said it was usual for officers to prepare the papers for the meeting but it was Members who made the decisions. The working group would have the opportunity to provide guidance to officers

about the shape of the future housing strategy and make recommendations to Cabinet prior to the Full Council meeting.

RESOLVED to adopt the revised Local Development Scheme.

CA96 STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

The Planning Policy Working Group had considered a review of the Statement of Community Involvement, which set out the council's approach to public consultation and involvement in the preparation of the Local Plan. The Cabinet considered the amended document.

RESOLVED to approve the Statement of Community Involvement for formal public consultation.

CA97 DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTION GUIDANCE

Councillor Barker presented the revised Developer Contribution Guidance, which had been updated to reflect the approval of the Housing Strategy and the recently published Strategic Housing Market Assessment. She mentioned that she would be discussing with officers whether the stated cost of £125k was too high for building an affordable home, and whether this should be reviewed or if some kind of indexation was required. Any proposed changes would be brought back to Cabinet.

RESOLVED to adopt a revised Developer Contributions Guidance, which is in accordance with the updated National Planning Practice Guidance, as a material planning consideration.

CA99 APPOINTMENT OF OUTSIDE BODY

RESOLVED to appoint Councillor A Mills to the Uttlesford Transport Forum.

CA100 SPORTS STRATEGY

The Council had commissioned a Sports Strategy, which built on the open space, sports facility and playing fields strategy that had been published in 2012. The document provided an inventory of existing facilities and identified where there was a shortfall. The strategy would be used to identify ways in which the shortfall could be met and to provide evidence for future funding. The next stage would be to prepare an action plan for prioritising and delivering the projects. The individual clubs and association would be involved in this process.

RESOLVED to adopt the Sports Strategy into the Local Plan evidence base as a material planning consideration and as a Sports Strategy for the District.

The meeting ended at 9.30pm.

Committee: Cabinet

Agenda Item

Date: 17 March 2016

8

Title: New Settlement Option for the Local Plan

**Author: Cllr Susan Barker, Deputy Leader and
Cabinet Member for Environmental
Services**

Summary

1. This report provides an initial justification for promoting the option of a new settlement or settlements in the draft Local Plan. It sets out the background to new settlements, including reference to their advantages and disadvantages and the history of proposals in Uttlesford, specifically in relation to the withdrawn Local Plan.
2. The report stresses that this report of itself should not influence the formal evidence based planning policy position nor does the report consider the merits of individual proposals.

Recommendations

3. That Cabinet recommend to Full Council that a new settlement (or settlements) should continue to be investigated and analysed alongside all other possible options for housing and employment distribution and should not be dismissed at this stage from the potential options for inclusion in the Local Plan.

Financial Implications

4. None.

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 Issues and Options Consultation included a question on the principle of new settlements.
Community Safety	Community Safety would be incorporated into any new settlement proposal.
Equalities	N/A

Health and Safety	N//A
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	Sustainability is a core principle of new settlements.
Ward-specific impacts	N/A
Workforce/Workplace	N/A

Situation

7. The Planning Policy Working Group considered a similar paper on 23 February and resolved to recommend to Cabinet and Full Council that a new settlement (or settlements) should continue to be investigated and analysed alongside all other possible options for housing and employment distribution and should not be dismissed at this stage from the potential options for inclusion in the Local Plan.

Background

8. The concept of purpose built new settlements originated in England through the work of philanthropic industrialists who developed model villages but is best known through the garden cities movement at the beginning of the last century. Ebenezer Howard pioneered the movement which was exemplified by new settlements such as Letchworth and Welwyn Garden Cities. The post war and 1960s new towns continued the tradition and more recent manifestations are the eco-towns promoted over the last decade.
9. New settlements and garden villages are to be distinguished from sustainable urban extensions through their scale and degree of self-containment e.g. Cambourne in Cambridgeshire. Whilst it is anticipated that urban extensions should provide requisite physical and social infrastructure there is still reliance on the original settlement for some facilities. New settlements have the complete range of employment, retail and transport facilities and are intended to be more self-sufficient. They require a higher population to create the critical mass necessary for this.
10. There are several key principles underpinning garden cities and these have been set out by the Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA), an advocate of garden cities, as follows:
 - Land value capture for the benefit of the community;
 - Strong vision, leadership and community engagement;
 - Community ownership of land and long-term stewardship of assets;
 - Mixed-tenure homes and housing types that are affordable for ordinary people;
 - A strong local job offer in the Garden City itself with a variety of employment opportunities within easy commuting distance of homes;

- Beautifully and imaginatively designed homes with gardens, combining the very best of town and country living to create healthy homes in vibrant communities;
- Generous green space linked to the wider natural environment, including a surrounding belt of countryside to prevent sprawl, well connected and biodiversity rich public parks, and a mix of public and private networks of well-managed, high quality gardens, tree-lined streets and open spaces;
- Opportunities for residents to grow their own food, including generous allotments;
- Strong local cultural, recreational and shopping facilities in walkable neighbourhoods; and
- Integrated and accessible transport systems – with a series of settlements linked by rapid transport providing a full range of employment opportunities.

These are the guiding principles as espoused by the TCPA and it may be unrealistic to expect their full realisation in an Uttlesford context.

11. There is Government support for new settlements in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Coalition Government’s Locally led Garden City Prospectus. The recent consultation on changes to the NPPF appeared to strengthen this backing.

The withdrawn Local Plan

12. The withdrawn Uttlesford Local Plan proposed a linked new settlement providing for 2,100 homes, a local centre (retail and employment uses and community and health buildings), primary education (and possibly secondary education, dependent upon future decisions concerning an existing school), and recreational uses at Elsenham.
13. The Inspector who held the Examination Hearings into the Plan held serious reservations about its soundness, including the Elsenham proposals (which he considered to be a “major village expansion” rather than a new settlement). However, in his letter dated 19 December 2014 he concluded “There appeared to me to be fairly widespread recognition that some form of ‘new settlement(s)’ may form an appropriate means for catering for the future long-term growth of the District and, if so, that this should be on a scale bold enough to achieve maximum possible sustainable critical mass and a long term solution, especially if there are judged to be limits as to how far relatively small towns with the characters of Saffron Walden and Great Dunmow can grow sustainably, attractively, and in an integrated way through successive phases of peripheral expansion. However, I do not consider it for me to comment further upon this matter.”

The Current Local Plan

14. Following the withdrawal of the former Local Plan in January 2015 the Council embarked on a fresh plan-making programme and consulted upon ‘issues

and options' for inclusion in the Plan between 22 October and 4 December 2015. The consultation document asked a question about the principle of a new settlement and the appropriateness of broad 'areas of search' for large scale development. Opinion was divided on the principle of a new settlement.

15. A separate 'call for sites' was undertaken between April and June 2015. This resulted in over 300 submissions, including several for substantial new settlements, some based on garden city principles. Whilst the issues and options consultation was not developer-led it is helpful in making an in principle decision to know that there are firm proposals which could potentially be implemented.
16. Various studies that will underpin the evidence base for the Plan are in preparation and it is hoped that most will be concluded by the summer. Several of these e.g. green belt review and transport will be particularly relevant to a new settlement option. The Council will then need to take some key decisions about the strategy and direction of travel for the Plan. One of these is whether a new settlement or settlements could form allocations in the Plan. It is therefore important to know early in the process if there is an appetite for this type of development. It is worth stressing that new settlements are not a 'one size fits all' solution and they would form part of a basket of measures required to meet the Council's housing targets.

Issues

17. There are advantages and disadvantages associated with new settlements. These are well documented and can be seen in the issues and options consultation responses.
18. The advantages include a comprehensive and cohesive strategic infrastructure package; a critical mass that will deliver social and community facilities; less drain on existing infrastructure; design coding etc. They can also form part of a longer term vision for the area beyond the lifetime of the current Plan and enable 'difficult' decisions to be made once.
19. In the Uttlesford context opting to expand existing settlements could lead to a greater number of negative socio-economic and environmental impacts and highlights a difficulty of mitigating against these negative impacts. Development of a new settlement alleviates this issue as it allows facilities and infrastructure to be appropriately designed into the development plan from concept e.g. secondary education
20. The disadvantages are high upfront infrastructure costs which can affect initial viability and long lead times and therefore a slower housing delivery rate. Deliverability is a major issue, given that effectiveness is one of the key soundness tests for the Local Plan. Further issues include the difficulties in achieving transport connectivity and genuine self- containment.

21. New settlements need to be of sufficient size to support the required range of social and physical infrastructure. In their comments to the Issues and Options consultation Essex County Council note that any new settlement would require its own secondary school as part of the provision. This would require a minimum of some 5,000 houses/flats to support this provision. Any new settlement(s) would therefore likely be in the range of 5,000 – 10,000 homes which would be developed over a 20 – 25 year period.
22. It is worth noting that the Council’s objectively assessed housing need is 568 dwellings per annum. Taking into account existing commitments the Council will need to allocate over 4,500 dwellings during the lifetime of the Plan until 2033. Housing completions in the early stages of the development of new settlements are as low as 50 or fewer and it may be some years before significant supply comes on stream, probably up to 200 per year. This means that some 2,000 of the homes could be expected to be built within the plan period.
23. As outlined earlier in this report and for these reasons new settlements can only form one of a range of measures to meet the Council’s housing requirement. They would have to satisfy the “reasonable alternatives” test for SA/SEA purposes. To rely solely upon them would jeopardise the Councils five year housing land supply and put the Council at risk of unwelcome speculative planning applications and successful appeals.

Conclusion

24. Cabinet is asked to decide in principle whether to recommend the consideration of new settlements as part of the Local Plan having had regard to the points set out above. Any decision will not prejudice the site selection process which is a separate discrete exercise. It is recommended that the Council considers the option as it would be unwise to rule out the principle this early in the process given the potential planning benefits that such schemes bring.

Risk Analysis

25.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
3. That the Council fails to consider the potential contribution of new settlements to the Local Plan.	1. Unlikely.	4. Potential for the Local Plan being found unsound.	1. That the Council fully considers the principle of new settlements early in the plan-making process.

- 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.

Committee: Cabinet

Agenda Item

Date: 17 March 2016

9

Title: Members' New Homes Bonus Scheme

Portfolio Holder: Cllr Simon Howell

Item for decision

Summary

- 1) This report recommends changes to the rules surrounding the £3,000 Members' New Homes Bonus Scheme.

Recommendations

- 2) The Cabinet is recommended to approve that:
 - a) Criteria b) of the scheme as set out in paragraph 5 is replaced with the wording as set out in paragraph 7.

Financial Implications

- 3) There are no implications for the council's budget beyond those approved as part of the 2015/16 and 2016/17 budget setting process.

Background Papers

- 4) None

Impact

Communication/Consultation	No specific implications
Community Safety	No specific implications
Equalities	No specific implications
Health and Safety	No specific implications
Human Rights/Legal Implications	No specific implications
Sustainability	No specific implications
Ward-specific impacts	No specific implications
Workforce/Workplace	No specific implications

Background

- 5) As part of the 2015/16 budget setting process it was agreed that the criteria for the scheme would be that:
 - a) It has to be spent in the Member’s Ward
 - b) It has to be spent in the year of allocation and any underspends will not be carried forward into future years
 - c) It has to be for the good of the community
 - d) It must not commit the Council to expenditure in future years
 - e) The Member should be mindful of the financial status of the recipients
 - f) The Member should have no personal interest in the organisation receiving the award
 - g) In election year the money only becomes available from 1 June (i.e. to the newly elected Member)

- 6) Following a review of allocations to date, it has become apparent that due to the elections in 2015 reducing the scheme time by three months, a number of councillors are not going to have allocated their entire grant by the end of March 2016. Under the current rules this would mean that any unspent grant would be lost.

- 7) It is therefore proposed to change criteria b) in paragraph 5 above to now read:

For 2015/16 year only, any unspent allocation can be carried forward to 2016/17. Thereafter any unspent allocation can be carried forward to the following year, providing the amount is less than 50% of the allocation for that year. If it exceeds 50% of the in year allocation only 50% shall be carried forward.

- 8) In practice for 2016/17 this means that the maximum that can be carried forward to 2017/18 will be £1,500 (half of the £3,000 in year allowance)

Risk Analysis

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
None			

- 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.