

Committee: Governance, Audit and Performance

Date:

Title: Local Plan Costs – 2017/18

27 September 2018

Author: Gordon Glenday– Assistant Director – Planning

Summary

1. The Committee have requested a report summarising the annual costs of the local plan, this reports gives details of the costs for 2017/18.
2. The costs relating to the Local Plan form part of the consolidated accounts which are subject to an external audit. The accounts received an unqualified opinion and were approved by this Committed at the July meeting.

Recommendations

3. None, this is an information only report.

Financial Implications

4. None, this is an information only report.

Background Papers

5. None.

Impact

Communication/Consultation	Discussed at CMT and JET prior to this committee
Community Safety	None
Equalities	None
Health and Safety	None
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None
Sustainability	None
Ward-specific impacts	None
Workforce/Workplace	None

Situation

6. This report summarises the 2017/18 cost of the local plan.

	2017/18 Budget		2017/18 Actual	
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Employee Expenses	345,692		479,065	
Travel Expenses	1,920		1,434	
Supplies and Services - Consultancy	175,000		257,701	
Supplies and Services - Garden Communities - DPD	0		0	
Supplies and Services - Examination Costs - Inspection	0		0	
Supplies and Services - Other	2,358		24,130	
Direct Expenditure		524,970		762,331
Internal Charges - Management	41,616		39,340	
- Specialist Services	9,648		14,512	
- Central Support	10,596		16,402	
- Accommodation	4,422		2,966	
- Administration	3,468		17,884	
Indirect Expenditure		69,750		91,104
Internal Charges - Income	(19,392)		(35,238)	
Indirect Income		(19,392)		(35,238)
TOTAL		<u>575,328</u>		<u>818,197</u>

7. There was an overspend on the direct expenditure against budget of £237,361 which was offset against a draw down on the Planning Reserve.
8. The overspends were highlighted to Cabinet as part of the budget monitoring process and this was updated on a quarterly basis. The final outturn was approved by Cabinet at the July 2018 meeting.
9. To ensure that a sound set of proposals, supported by a robust evidence base would be submitted an injection of funds was required to;
- Maintain the pace of plan making against a potential policy position, under which the council could lose a substantial amount of new homes bonus.
 - Address the implications of emerging demographic forecasts which increased the scale of housing needed and led to even greater complexity of planning issues in accommodating growth in a sustainable way.
 - To address issues arising from the representations of the Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation.
10. Employee expenses show overspend in excess of £130,000. June 2017 UDC were successful in recruiting to three vacant posts – Policy Manager; Policy Team Leader and Policy Officer. To ensure that knowledge was transferred from the temporary agency team leader there was a four month handover period.
11. Continued support was also gained from three additional agency planners. This work continued past the forecast of the contract ending September 2017 because of the additional work identified by the Reg. 18 consultation.

12. The consultancy budget shows an overspend of over £80,000. This budget has also funded a number of key studies to form the evidence base for the Local Plan. These are statutory requirements in order to produce a “sound” Plan to submit to Government for Public Inspection.
13. The Regulation 18 consultation closed in September 2017, and due to the significant representations received from statutory consultees and duty to co-operate partners additional work was required and therefore, additional cost was incurred.
14. The additional evidence base work identified towards the latter part of the financial year included:

Transport Study –

- Further modelling work was required to identify potential transport impacts on the South Cambridgeshire roads.
- High level feasibility study to identify potential improvements to the A505

Archaeology and Heritage Impact Assessment -

- Historic England objected to the brief Heritage Impact Assessments of the Garden Communities as not being detailed enough to support the development options.

The Water Cycle Study –

- The Environment Agency objected to the Water Cycle Study as not being detailed enough to support the development options.

Joint AECOM study with North Essex Garden Communities

Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment study with neighbouring authorities.

Other studies such as the Retail Assessment, Employment Study, Viability Appraisal, Infrastructure Delivery Plan, Sports facilities, Landscape and the SA/HRA have also been updated following the Reg.18 consultation to reflect the consultation comments.

15. Due to the increased administration, there is an overspend shown on internal charges for support from central services and a temporary administration officer.