

Committee: Executive
Date: Monday 2 November 2009
Time: 6.30 pm
Venue: Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury, OX15 4AA

Membership

Councillor Barry Wood
(Chairman)

Councillor Ken Atack

Councillor Norman Bolster

Councillor Michael Gibbard

Councillor G A Reynolds (Vice-Chairman)

Councillor James Macnamara **Councillor D M Pickford**

Councillor Kieron Mallon

Councillor Nicholas Turner

Councillor Nigel Morris

AGENDA

1. Declarations of Interest

Members are asked to declare any interest and the nature of that interest that they may have in any of the items under consideration at this meeting.

2. Apologies for Absence

3. Petitions and Requests to Address the Meeting

The Chairman to report on any requests to submit petitions or to address the meeting.

4. Urgent Business

The Chairman to advise whether they have agreed to any item of urgent business being admitted to the agenda.

5. **Minutes** (Pages 1 - 8)

To confirm as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 5 October 2009.

Strategy and Policy

6. **Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report and Local Development Scheme** (Pages 9 - 30) **6.35 pm**

Report of Head of Planning and Affordable Housing Policy

Summary

To seek approval of the Local Development Framework's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) and Local Development Scheme (LDS) for submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, and to present the district's current housing land supply position. The AMR is the Council's main tool for monitoring housing delivery and the impact of other development. The LDS is used to project manage the production of the Local Development Framework and provides a programme for completion of Local Development Documents.

Recommendations

The Executive is recommended to:

- (1) Approve the revised Local Development Scheme for submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government;
- (2) Resolve that the Local Development Scheme shall have effect as from the date when the Secretary of State notifies the Council that he does not intend to direct the authority to amend the Scheme,
- (3) Approve the Annual Monitoring Report for submission to the Secretary of State;
- (4) Note the district's housing delivery position and instruct the Head of Development Control and Major Developments to apply the interim policy approach set out in paragraphs 2.11 to 2.16 of this report to planning applications for 10 or more dwellings in the interests of increasing the supply of housing sites that can be delivered by 31 March 2015;
- (5) Instruct the Head of Planning and Affordable Housing Policy to closely monitor the supply of deliverable housing sites and to publish regular updates on the housing land supply position;
- (6) Instruct the Head of Development Control and Major Developments to provide the Planning Committee with regular updates on the district's housing land supply position and to advise the Committee as soon as the Council can again be confident that its supply of deliverable housing sites meets the requirements of PPS3;
- (7) Resolve that the Council continues to bring forward proposals for the delivery of sites identified for residential development in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011, which was approved as interim planning policy for development control purposes on 13 December 2004, and that officers

continue to work with the development industry, local communities and other interested parties in order to do this in the interests of sustaining housing delivery (including the provision of affordable housing).

7. North West Bicester Eco Town Bid for Growth Funding Allocation (Pages 31 - 34) **6.45 pm**

**** Appendix to follow ****

Report of Head of Planning and Affordable Housing Policy and Head of Development Control and Major Developments

Summary

To inform members of the outline bid submission and provide details of the full bid for information.

Recommendations

The Executive is recommended to:

- (1) Note the report and consider any decisions that may arise (further detail may be available by the time of the meeting)
- (2) Approve the contents of the outline bid and supporting information in the Programme of Development as the Council's submission for eco town funding (copy to be circulated as soon as available)

Service Delivery and Innovation

8. Bicester Hospital Re - Provision (Pages 35 - 38) **7.15 pm**

Report of Strategic Director Environment and Community

Summary

To consider the current position regarding the Oxfordshire Primary Care Trust's (PCT) proposals to re-provide Bicester Hospital.

Recommendations

The Executive is recommended to:

- (3) Note the current position regarding the PCT's procurement process;
- (4) Support the PCT in local community involvement through the Community Engagement Forum

9. Urgent Business

Any other items which the Chairman has decided is urgent.

(Meeting scheduled to close at 7.35 pm)

Information about this Agenda

Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence should be notified to democracy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk or 01295 221587 prior to the start of the meeting.

Declarations of Interest

Members are asked to declare interests at item 2 on the agenda or if arriving after the start of the meeting, at the start of the relevant agenda item. The definition of personal and prejudicial interests is set out in the constitution. The Democratic Support Officer will have a copy available for inspection at all meetings.

Personal Interest: Members must declare the interest but may stay in the room, debate and vote on the issue.

Prejudicial Interest: Member must withdraw from the meeting room and should inform the Chairman accordingly.

With the exception of the some very specific circumstances, a Member with a personal interest also has a prejudicial interest if it is one which a Member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that it is likely to prejudice the Member's judgement of the public interest.

Local Government and Finance Act 1992 – Budget Setting, Contracts & Supplementary Estimates

Members are reminded that any member who is two months in arrears with Council Tax must declare the fact and may speak but not vote on any decision which involves budget setting, extending or agreeing contracts or incurring expenditure not provided for in the agreed budget for a given year and could affect calculations on the level of Council Tax.

Queries Regarding this Agenda

Please contact James Doble, Legal and Democratic Services james.doble@cherwell-dc.gov.uk (01295) 221587

Mary Harpley
Chief Executive

Published on Thursday 29 October 2009

Agenda Item 5

Cherwell District Council

Executive

Minutes of a meeting of the Executive held at Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury, OX15 4AA, on 5 October 2009 at 6.30 pm

Present: Councillor Barry Wood (Chairman)

Councillor G A Reynolds
Councillor Ken Attack
Councillor Michael Gibbard
Councillor James Macnamara
Councillor Nigel Morris
Councillor D M Pickford
Councillor Nicholas Turner

Apologies
for
absence: Councillor Norman Bolster
Councillor Kieron Mallon

Officers: Mary Harpley, Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service
Ian Davies, Strategic Director - Environment and Community
John Hoad, Strategic Director - Planning, Housing and Economy
Mike Carroll, Head of Improvement
Liz Howlett, Head of Legal & Democratic Services and Monitoring Officer
Karen Curtin, Head of Finance
Jo Smith, Communications Manager
James Doble, Democratic, Scrutiny and Elections Manager
Michael Sands, Trainee Democratic and Scrutiny Officer

2 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

3 **Petitions and Requests to Address the Meeting**

There were no petitions or requests to address the meeting.

4 **Urgent Business**

There was no urgent business.

5 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2009 were agreed and signed by the Chairman.

6 **Service & Financial Planning Process and Budget Guidelines for 2010/2011**

The Head of Finance and Community Corporate Planning Manager submitted a report which sought to inform the Executive of the service and financial planning process for 2010/11 and to agree budget guidelines for issue to service managers to enable the production of the 2010/11 budget and update the Medium Term Financial Strategy for 2011/12 onwards.

Resolved

- (1) That the service and financial planning process for 2010/11 be noted.
- (2) That the proposed budget guidelines and timetable for 2010/2011 budget process as set out in the Annex to the Minutes (as set out in the Minute book) be considered and agreed.

Reasons -The Council needs to set guidelines and a timetable for the preparation of draft estimates for 2010/11. These guidelines should support the objectives contained in the 5-Year Corporate Plan, Improvement Strategy and in particular the updated Medium Term Financial Strategy.

7 **Banbury Canalside Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

The Head of Planning and Affordable Housing Policy submitted a report which sought approval of the draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Companion Document for the Canalside site in Banbury for public consultation.

Resolved

- (1) That the Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) set out in the Annex to the Minutes (as set out in the Minute book) and the Companion Document (background paper to the report) be endorsed for public consultation.
- (2) That the Head of Planning & Affordable Housing Policy, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing, be delegated to make any further minor non-substantive changes as are necessary to the Draft SPD and Companion Document prior to the publication of these for public consultation.
- (3) That Officers be requested to arrange a Councillor workshop to enable Member participation at an early stage.

Reasons- The Council identified the Canalside site as part of a wider Regeneration Area in the Non Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011. More recently, the Council has been working with English Partnerships, and more recently the Homes & Communities Agency (HCA) to develop a vision for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Canalside area. In order to update the evidence base for the Local Development Framework and to

consider in more detail the regeneration opportunities that there may be in the canalside area, English Partnerships last year commissioned a study. This work was undertaken by consultants LDA Design. On 6 October 2008, the Executive considered a report summarising this work and endorsed the principle of 1,200 dwellings as part of a residentially led development including the relocation of uses on the site.

Options

Option One	To endorse the SPD and Companion Document for public consultation
Option Two	To endorse the SPD and Companion Document for public consultation with amendments
Option Three	To not endorse the SPD and Companion Document for public consultation

8 External Audit Annual Governance Report and Use of Resources Judgement

The Chief Executive submitted a report which sought to update the Executive on the key messages from the District Auditor in her 2008/09 Annual Governance Report and the judgements she had made on the Council's performance in the new Use of Resources assessment.

Resolved

- (1) That the use of Resources score contained in the District Auditor's Annual Governance Report and the scale of the achievement this represents be noted.
- (2) That the Chief Executive be requested to send a copy of the Auditor's report to the Taxpayers Alliance.

Reasons - The District Auditor's view on the Council's use of resources is an important judgement and contributes directly to the Organisational Assessment score.

9 Value for Money Review of Insurance

The Strategic Director Customer Services and Resources and the Head of Improvement submitted a report for consideration on the findings of the Value for Money (VFM) Review report and the recommendations arising from the report.

Resolved

- (1) That the conclusion of the review that the function is relatively high cost with average performance levels but high quality in terms of the qualifications of staff employed and low level of claims payments made be noted.

- (2) That the Council move away from the current policy of transferring the majority of council risk to an insurer, to one of self insuring a larger proportion of risk given the very low number of claims currently experienced. This will be achieved by:
 - a. Discontinuing unnecessary insurance policies and increase excesses on the remaining policies. This will deliver savings of £65,813 in 2010/11.
 - b. Determining claims in-house rather than pass to insurers to settle. Injury claims should continue to be handled by insurers given the complexity, potential high cost and the expertise needed in determining settlement figures;
 - c. Transferring the £500,000 reserve fund for the Spiceball reconstruction, following the completion of that project, to the Self Insurance Reserve which currently has a balance of £300,000.
- (3) That a net saving of £15,000 in the management of insurance and risk be achieved by:
 - a. Deleting the post of Risk Management and Insurance Officer in its current form with a gross saving of up to £46,244.
 - b. Transferring the corporate responsibility for the management of insurance to The Head of Finance, with the operational administration of claims delegated to Heads of Service and operational administrative teams;
 - c. Market testing for an external provider to deliver the corporate management of risk (but not the routine performance management of risk).
 - d. Using the balance from a. to fund the costs of b. and c.
- (4) That in advance of letting the new insurance contract from 2011/12 Officers be requested to explore the opportunities for achieving further financial savings through consortia purchasing and sharing support and expertise with other local authorities.

Reasons- This review forms part of the Value for Money programme of reviews, which aims to cover all services within the council and improve the value of services offered to residents of Cherwell.

10

Revenue and Benefits - Future Award of Tender

The Strategic Director Customer Service and Resources and the Head of Finance submitted a report on the progress to date following the decision to externalise the transactional elements of the revenues and benefits service and, following a tender process, to recommend a preferred supplier.

Resolved

- (1) That the project progress to date in relation to the primary objectives be noted and the proposals below agreed:

- a) That the transactional components of the revenues and benefits function are transferred to the preferred supplier with effect from 1 February 2010 to be delivered offsite in a specialist processing facility.
 - b) That benefit investigations, debt recovery, customer facing services, discretionary payment awards, and tribunal/court representation are retained in house. These elements will be incorporated into existing Finance, Legal and Customer Services teams.
 - c) That the supplier will be subject to rigorous performance monitoring by a newly established contract management team to ensure compliance with contracted standards.
 - d) That current customer services resources are increased by six posts, including three specialist revenues and benefits advisors.
 - e) That service support costs associated with the outsourced services are reduced by £123k per annum.
- (2) That a preferred supplier for the externalised components of the services as set out in the exempt Minute be appointed.

Reasons - Following a value for money review and an external options appraisal in December 2008, the Executive agreed, in March 2009, to seek an external supplier for the transactional “back office” elements of the revenues and benefits service with three primary objectives:

- a) To secure a sustainable service delivery model, sufficiently resilient to deliver consistently good levels of service to residents and able to meet peaks in demand such as that associated with the current economic climate
- b) To improve customer access and provide local area based service points for specialist revenues and benefits support
- c) To secure improved value for money, delivering the transactional elements of the service within the administrative subsidy envelope (£885k)

11 **Refurbishment of Old Bodicote House**

The Chief Executive, Strategic Director Customer Service & Resources and Project Manager submitted a report regarding the refurbishment works to Old Bodicote House. The Portfolio Holder drew the Executives attention to the revised recommendations which had been previously distributed.

Resolved

- (1) That the progress to date on determining the future use of Old Bodicote House be noted.

- (2) That any decision on the refurbishment of Old Bodicote House and the extension of Bodicote House car park be deferred to the November meeting of the Executive.
- (3) That sufficient funding in the capital programme for the outstanding work required to complete essential fire safety and other improvements to the stairwells of Bodicote House, to the sum of £40,000, be approved.

Reasons- The council's Asset Management Plan was adopted by Executive on 27 April 2009. It sets out the ambition to create and maintain new sources of income that can be used to sustain an appropriate level of future capital investment. A further ambition is to offer facilities for partner organisations to occupy, generating income for the Council, and potentially reduce the financial support those partners require while seeking to increase income by offering additional services to tenants, enabling the Council to offset part of its fixed overheads against this service charge.

12 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

Resolved

That in accordance with Section 100A(4) of Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business, on the grounds that it could involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of that Act.

13 **Refurbishment of Old Bodicote House - Exempt Annex**

Report withdrawn from agenda

14 **Revenue and Benefits - Future Award of Tender - Exempt Annex**

The Strategic Director Customer Services & Resources and the Head of Finance submitted a report which sought to select a preferred supplier for the award of the Councils Revenues and Benefits Service Provision Contract.

Resolved

- (1) That Supplier B be approved as the preferred supplier for the provision of the transactional components of the Revenues and Benefits service and after negotiation approve the award of a 5 year contract with a target date for commencement of 1st February 2010.
- (2) That the savings secured for inclusion in the 10/11 budget process be noted.
- (3) That the upfront capital costs to fund redundancies and pension costs be funded through the organisational change reserve and efforts to minimise these costs be approved.

Reasons - The Council has committed to securing the best quality service within the available financial resources. Both tenders evaluated fall within the requisite grant subsidy envelope but the proposal submitted from Supplier B represents best overall value for money.

Options

Option One	To select supplier A
Option Two	To select supplier B
Option Three	To appoint neither supplier and retain the service in-house. As both tenders represent improved value for money this is not recommended.

The meeting ended at 8:20 pm

Chairman:

Date:

This page is intentionally left blank

Executive

Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report and Local Development Scheme

2 November 2009

Report of the Head of Planning and Affordable Housing Policy

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To seek approval of the Local Development Framework's Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) and Local Development Scheme (LDS) for submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, and to present the district's current housing land supply position. The AMR is the Council's main tool for monitoring housing delivery and the impact of other development. The LDS is used to project manage the production of the Local Development Framework and provides a programme for completion of Local Development Documents.

This report is public

Recommendations

The Executive is recommended to:

- (1) Approve the revised Local Development Scheme for submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government;
- (2) Resolve that the Local Development Scheme shall have effect as from the date when the Secretary of State notifies the Council that he does not intend to direct the authority to amend the Scheme,
- (3) approve the Annual Monitoring Report for submission to the Secretary of State;
- (4) note the district's housing delivery position and instruct the Head of Development Control and Major Developments to apply the interim policy approach set out in paragraphs 2.11 to 2.16 of this report to planning applications for 10 or more dwellings in the interests of increasing the supply of housing sites that can be delivered by 31 March 2015;
- (5) Instruct the Head of Planning and Affordable Housing Policy to closely monitor the supply of deliverable housing sites and to publish regular updates on the housing land supply position;
- (6) instruct the Head of Development Control and Major Developments to provide the Planning Committee with regular updates on the district's housing land

supply position and to advise the Committee as soon as the Council can again be confident that its supply of deliverable housing sites meets the requirements of PPS3;

- (7) resolve that the Council continues to bring forward proposals for the delivery of sites identified for residential development in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011, which was approved as interim planning policy for development control purposes on 13 December 2004, and that officers continue to work with the development industry, local communities and other interested parties in order to do this in the interests of sustaining housing delivery (including the provision of affordable housing).

Executive Summary

- 1.1 The Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) and Local Development Scheme (LDS) are closely linked documents. One of the purposes of an AMR is to report progress on the timetable and milestones for the preparation of documents set out in the LDS. It follows that if circumstances dictate that the LDS should be revised, it is logical that this may be done as the AMR is considered.

Annual Monitoring Report

- 1.2 An Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) has been prepared for the period 1 April 2008 to 31 March 2009. The key findings are attached to this report at appendix 1. A full paper copy of the document has not been attached to this report, however it is available electronically on the Council's website. Furthermore, a copy of the report has been placed in the Members' Room and members of the Executive have each been sent a copy.
- 1.3 The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended) require the Council to produce an AMR. Upon approval by the Executive, it will form part of the Local Development Framework (LDF).
- 1.4 The information contained in the AMR will be used to inform policy making for the LDF and in consultations on planning applications. The Council is required to submit the AMR to the Secretary of State by 31 December 2009. It will be made publicly available but is not subject to consultation.
- 1.5 The monitoring of housing supply is a key part of the AMR. Since 2004, following a period of under-delivery, the Council has sought to increase housing delivery and sustain it at required levels. In 2005 it produced an Urban Housing Potential Study, undertook a 'plan, monitor and manage' review of housing land supply and resolved to bring forward proposals for the delivery of all sites identified for residential development in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011. Since Planning Policy Statement 3: *Housing* (PPS3) was published in 2006 the Council has monitored housing land supply closely and was able to demonstrate at a major inquiry in 2007 that it had adequate land supply. The Council has also improved its monitoring processes. Average housing completions increased from 459 per annum between 2001 and 2004 to 865 per annum between 2004 and 2007. Permissions are in place for major strategic developments at both Banbury and Bicester.

- 1.6 However, as a direct result of the economic recession, monitoring is now showing (a) the recording of only 455 completions in 2007/08 and 426 completions in 08/09, (b) further delay in the commencement of the development of key strategic sites, and (c) the expectation of low completions in 09/10 and 10/11. Consequently, the supply of housing sites that can be considered “deliverable” within five years has fallen.
- 1.7 PPS3 requires Local Planning Authorities to maintain a five year rolling supply of deliverable sites. This is very difficult to achieve in the current market. It does not just rely on Councils granting permission for developments but for developers to build sufficient numbers of houses within five years. This policy approach is likely to be increasingly problematic for all LPAs as it was devised at a time of housing ‘boom’ rather than for the current inactive market. At present, the district has a 4 year supply which is expected to rise to 4.5 years in 2010/11 (see appendix 3, row M). PPS3 therefore suggests a need to increase the supply of deliverable housing sites notwithstanding the difficulties of doing this in the current circumstances.
- 1.8 Paragraph 71 of PPS3 advises that where Local Planning Authorities cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites, “...*they should consider favourably planning applications for housing...*” having regard to the policies in the PPS including the following considerations:
- achieving high quality housing;
 - ensuring developments achieve a good mix of housing reflecting the accommodation requirements of specific groups, in particular, families and older people;
 - the suitability of a site for housing, including its environmental sustainability;
 - using land effectively and efficiently;
 - ensuring that development is in line with planning for housing objectives, reflecting the need and demand for housing in, and the spatial vision for, the area and does not undermine wider policy objectives e.g. addressing housing market renewal issues.
- 1.9 In view of the above monitoring information, there is presently a housing supply reason to apply the interim policy approach set out in paragraphs 2.11 to 2.16 of this report in the interests of securing some additional housing completions by 31 March 2015 on suitable sites in appropriate locations. Housing completions recorded after this date would have no effect on increasing rolling supply in 2010/11 above 4.5 years. The effect of this is that, for a period of time, each planning application for residential development on sites for 10 or more dwellings (the monitoring threshold for deliverable sites) will need to be carefully assessed to determine whether or not they accord with the suggested policy approach, meet PPS criteria and are deliverable. In view of the Government’s definition of deliverability, there is not presently a strong enough reason to refuse permission on the grounds of having a five year supply of deliverable housing land.
- 1.10 Paragraph 54 of PPS3 states that to be considered deliverable sites must:
- be available - the site is available now;

- be suitable - the site offers a suitable location for development now and would contribute to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities;
 - be achievable - there is a reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years.
- 1.11 In demonstrating deliverability, sufficient certainty is needed to enable the Council to consider the site as part of its supply of deliverable sites upon the grant of planning permission. This may require certainty over any legal agreement and confidence in the programme for delivering the site. Evidence from both developer and landowner should therefore be provided. Regular monitoring will be required so that Members of the Planning Committee are informed as soon as the supply of deliverable sites returns to the level required by PPS3.
- 1.12 In the interests of sustaining housing delivery over the longer term, there is also a need to continue to bring forward remaining sites identified for residential development in the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011 in accordance with previous resolutions of the Executive.

Local Development Scheme

- 1.13 The Local Development Scheme (LDS) guides the preparation of the LDF and its timetable for completion of the LDF documents is included in the AMR. The timetable from the LDS is attached to this report at appendix 2. As with the AMR, a full paper copy of the LDS has not been attached to this report, however it is available electronically on the Council's website. Furthermore, a copy has been placed in the Members' Room and members of the Executive have each been sent a copy.
- 1.14 The Executive last approved changes to the LDS in January 2008. Since that time, the programme for preparing the LDF, and the Core Strategy and Delivery DPDs in particular, has been affected by a number of important changes.
1. A number of key decisions were received in 2007 following the examination of other local authorities' Core Strategies. These Core Strategies were found to be unsound, due in part to an insufficient evidence base and inadequate consideration of different options. This led to further guidance being issued by the Government and the Planning Inspectorate, and required all local authorities to review their programmes for LDF production.
 2. Government formal planning guidance on preparing LDFs was then revised in the summer of 2008. This introduced some important changes to the way in which local authorities prepare their LDFs, and in particular, Core Strategies, which are now encouraged to identify strategic sites and also contain a delivery strategy. The Council has agreed to undertake this additional work for its Core Strategy, and the "Options for Growth" public consultation in the autumn of 2008 considered possible strategic development sites. The impact of this has been to put a greater emphasis on the work required to prepare the Core Strategy, with a commensurate delay in the preparation of the Delivery DPD.

3. The Government's eco-town programme led to a period of uncertainty for the Council which was only resolved in July 2009 with the publication of the Eco-Towns Planning Policy Statement which confirmed North West Bicester as an eco-town location and rejected the proposal for an eco-town at Weston Otmoor. The Council agreed with GOSE earlier in 2009 that until this matter was resolved it would be difficult to progress the Core Strategy or review the LDS.
 4. The availability of staff resources at management level has also had an impact particularly as there has been no Policy Team Leader in post since July 2008 and projects such as the eco-town (both responding to the Weston Otmoor proposal and considering the implications of North West Bicester) and Canalside regeneration have demanded staff time.
- 1.15 In the light of the above, and in particular the eco-town programme, it is only now that the Council is in a position to chart a way forward with any confidence for its Core Strategy, and then consider the impact of this work on its programme of other LDF documents. It is in the light of this at that LDS is now being revised.
- 1.16 The timetable set out in the revised LDS will now allow the Council to make good progress with respect to the Core Strategy. The LDF Advisory Panel has been meeting on a regular basis to monitor the work of preparing the Core Strategy and to advise on its contents and policy direction. When the draft Core Strategy is considered by the Executive (expected in January 2010), members will need to make some difficult decisions in particular regarding the allocation of strategic sites for new development. The draft Core Strategy will also provide an important opportunity to consolidate the position of the North West Bicester eco-development within the overall framework of growth for the district.
- 1.17 The key changes being proposed by the LDS are as follows.
- **Core Strategy:** A new timetable has been prepared which would see a draft Core Strategy brought before the Executive in January 2010. It is anticipated the Core Strategy will be adopted by November 2011, following a Public Examination. The detailed programme is as follows:-

Core Strategy DPD Timetable	
January 2010	draft Core Strategy to the Executive for approval
February / March 2010	public consultation on draft Core Strategy
August 2010	proposed submission document to Executive for approval
September / October 2010	public consultation on proposed submission document
December 2010	submission to the Secretary of State
May 2011 (provisional)	commencement of public examination
September 2011 (provisional)	Receipt of Inspector's report
November 2011 (provisional)	Adoption of Core Strategy

- **Delivery DPD:** Progress on this document is dependent upon the Core Strategy setting a clear framework within which the Delivery DPD will be written. In view of this, and the capacity of the officer team to prepare two

major Development Plan Documents, it is anticipated that a draft Delivery DPD will be prepared in January 2011.

Full and efficient use of resources will be needed to enable work on preparing a draft Delivery DPD to take place during 2010 as work on the Core Strategy continues. Although additional evidence gathering will be required for the Delivery DPD, the Core Strategy will provide it with direction and much of its evidence will also be used for the Delivery DPD.

The detailed programme for this DPD is as follows:-

Delivery DPD Timetable	
December 2010	draft Delivery DPD to the Executive for approval
January / February 2011	public consultation on draft Delivery DPD
August 2011	proposed submission document to Executive for approval
September / October 2010	public consultation on proposed submission document
December 2010	submission to the Secretary of State
May 2011 (provisional)	commencement of public examination
September 2011 (provisional)	Receipt of Inspector's report
November 2011 (provisional)	Adoption of Delivery DPD

- **Canalside SPD:** This Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) did not appear in the previous LDS, however, as members will be aware, work is well underway with this document and the Council is currently consulting on a Draft SPD. It is expected that the Executive will be asked to consider a "final" version of the SPD in February 2010, after which time it will be approved for development control purposes pending the adoption of the Core Strategy in due course.
- **Other SPDs:** There are two other SPDs in the LDS relating to Planning Obligations and "Living in Harmony with the Environment". Revised timetables for both of these have been included in the LDS.

1.18 Before the Council can bring the LDS into effect, we are required to submit it to the Secretary of State and give him four weeks (or longer if he determines that he needs more time) to decide whether he wishes to call it in. For this reason, we have already informally discussed the contents and the timetable of this LDS with the Government Office. It has informally accepted that the timetable and the programme accords with the advice of the Planning Inspectorate on scheduling for public examinations and the receipt of an Inspector's Report.

1.19 Giving the above requirement, we expect to be able to bring the LDS into effect by mid December 2009. It will then replace the previous LDS and be published on the Council's website.

Proposals

1.20 It is proposed that the Annual Monitoring Report and Local Development Scheme be approved and that the recommendations to apply an interim policy approach to housing land supply, to closely monitor this, and to

continue to bring forward the Council's non-statutory residential allocations, be approved in the interests of increasing housing supply in the near term and sustaining overall housing delivery.

Conclusion

- 1.21 The AMR provides important information to assist policy making and development control decision making and is a statutory mechanism for monitoring housing delivery. The revised LDS fixes important milestones for completing the Council's Core Strategy which will set the long-term vision, objectives and policies for securing development and associated infrastructure across Cherwell including the identification of strategic development sites. It also formalises revised milestones for a Delivery Development Plan Document containing non-strategic allocations of land and detailed policies for managing development.

Background Information

Annual Monitoring Report (AMR)

- 2.1 The key findings of the AMR are attached to this report at appendix 1.
- 2.2 On housing supply the main findings are:
- the South East Plan was published in May 2009. It sets a new housing requirement for the district of 670 dwellings per annum, compared to the former Structure Plan requirement of 623;
 - housing completions for 08/09 were 426 and are expected to remain low in 09/10 and 10/11 before economic recovery begins to impact on housing supply and before completions are recorded on some permitted strategic, and other large, housing sites;
 - since 1 April 2006, the start of the plan period of the South East Plan, total net housing completions have been 1734. This is 276 dwellings less than the three year requirement of 2010 and, in effect, increases South East Plan requirements to 686 per annum over the remainder of the plan period to 2026;
 - total existing housing land supply from 2006-2026 is estimated to be 7580 dwellings, leaving 5820 dwellings to be planned for through the LDF;
 - the district has a 4.0 years supply of deliverable housing land over the period 2009-2014 rising to 4.5 years from 2010 to 2015 (Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) requires a rolling five year supply);
 - net affordable housing completions in 08/09 were 87, compared to the minimum average annual target of 100 dwellings set by the Housing Strategy. Gross completions (i.e. including acquisitions and not allowing for losses) were 122. The total net supply since 2001 is now 816, an average of 102 per annum.

2.3 On employment land the main findings are:

- 42,961m² (gross) of business development (i.e. offices, industry or storage and distribution) was completed in Cherwell during 2008-9 (20,036m² net);
- 1546m² (gross) of 'town centre uses' (i.e. shops, financial and professional services, offices and leisure) was completed in Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington centres. However there has been a net loss of these 'town centre uses' to other uses including restaurants/takeaways, drinking establishments, residential, leisure and other uses;
- across the district, there has been 1.77 hectares of employment land lost to other uses, including on land identified in the Employment Land Review;
- total employment land availability in Cherwell is now 124.5 hectares.

2.4 Other findings include:

- 2 planning applications were permitted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flood risk grounds, although their concerns were resolved through the imposition of planning conditions;
- 13 renewable energy schemes have been permitted in 2008-9, an increase from 8 schemes in 2007-8;
- 14 out of 18 applicable planning permissions provided car parking in accordance with the maximum parking standards; 4 exceeded the maximum standards.

2.5 The main conclusion from this year's monitoring has been the need to boost the supply of deliverable housing sites where appropriate. PPS3 states that where actual performance, compared with housing trajectories, is within acceptable ranges (for example within 10-20 per cent), and future performance is still expected to achieve the rates set out in the trajectories, there may be no need for specific management actions at that time and that Local Planning Authorities will wish to continue to monitor and review performance closely and consider the need to update the five year supply, of deliverable sites where appropriate.

2.6 A four year supply in 09/10 represents a deviation of 20% from 5 years and a 4.5 year supply in 10/11 represents a 10% deviation (10/11 will be monitored for the next national indicator 159 return). However, performance over the next two years is expected to be low with an estimated 369 dwellings in 09/10 and an extremely low 181 in 10/11. This would effectively increase the district's annual South East Plan requirement to 741 dwellings per annum. Unidentified small windfall sites may increase these figures to over 400 and 200 respectively but this level of development would still be the lowest recorded in recent times. An average annual rate of 459 dwellings between 2001 and 2004 led to the measures to improve delivery referred to at paragraph 1.5.

2.7 There is also risk of further delay to the delivery of major housing sites such as Bankside, Banbury; Gavray Drive, Bicester; South West Bicester and former RAF Upper Heyford due to the consequences of economic recession

and the need to provide important supporting infrastructure. Whilst officer projections for future delivery seek to be as realistic as possible there are inherent risks in actual delivery matching these expectations. These risks are of course higher in the current economic climate.

2.8 It is therefore considered that for a period of time, the Council should carefully consider unanticipated planning applications for residential development to determine whether or not they provide an acceptable opportunity, in line with the guidance in PPS3, to increase the supply of deliverable sites. This does not necessarily mean that the rolling supply of deliverable sites in 10/11 would need to increase all the way back to five years, but the evidence of the AMR does suggest that actions to increase supply back towards a five year supply are needed to increase and maintain housing delivery (including the provision of affordable housing), to provide confidence that an acceptable rolling supply has been secured, and to ensure that, subsequently, the Council can successfully defend the district's housing land supply position when challenged in considering future applications and planning appeals.

2.9 Paragraph 69 of PPS3 lists considerations which LPAs should have regard to in determining planning applications for residential development:

- achieving high quality housing;
- ensuring developments achieve a good mix of housing reflecting the accommodation requirements of specific groups, in particular, families and older people;
- the suitability of a site for housing, including its environmental sustainability;
- using land effectively and efficiently;
- ensuring that development is in line with planning for housing objectives, reflecting the need and demand for housing in, and the spatial vision for, the area and does not undermine wider policy objectives e.g. addressing housing market renewal issues.

2.10 Whilst the Council does not yet have an adopted spatial vision as part of an approved Core Strategy, it is considered important that the Executive, without prejudice to future LDF decisions, endorses an interim spatial policy approach to guide the determination of speculative planning applications on unidentified sites. The approach would be superseded by a draft Core Strategy upon approval by the Executive should there still be a need to identify additional deliverable sites at that time. The suggested interim approach is informed by the following considerations.

- i. PPS3's objectives of creating mixed and sustainable communities; achieving housing in suitable locations which offer a range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure; securing development that is easily accessible and well connected to public transport; and giving priority to the use of previously developed land.
- ii. The South East Plan (policy SP3) states that urban areas should be the prime focus for development. In Cherwell this means, Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. The sub-regional strategy for Central Oxfordshire identifies Bicester as a main location for development (policy CO1). Banbury is identified as having an important role as a

small market town in supporting its wider hinterland and is expected to help meet wider housing needs through the provision of new housing.

- iii. The South East Plan seeks to retain the broad extent of Green Belts (policy SP5) and states that LPAs should positively plan to meet the defined needs of their rural communities for small scale affordable housing and other development (policy BE5). Policy BE5 states that the approach to development in villages should be based on the functions performed, their accessibility, the need to protect or extend key services and the capacity of the built form and landscape setting of the village. All new development should be subject to rigorous design and sustainability criteria so that the distinctive character of the village is not damaged.
- iv. Officers have been reviewing the broad sustainability of the district's villages in preparing the Local Development Framework. Thirty-three villages (meeting minimum requirements for access to services and facilities) were put forward for detailed assessment in a Cherwell Rural Areas Integrated Transport and Land Use Study (2009). The study assessed the villages using a set of criteria to determine the most suitable locations in transport terms for new housing development. The results showed that 14 villages performed well against the criteria and could accommodate new development in a sustainable way [for a rural area] with minimal adverse impact on the transport network. The 14 villages are:
 - Adderbury
 - Begbroke;
 - Bodicote;
 - Deddington;
 - Kidlington;
 - Launton;
 - Weston-on-the-Green;
 - Ambrosden;
 - Bloxham;
 - Chesterton;
 - Islip;
 - Kirtlington;
 - Middleton Stoney;
 - Yarnton.
- v. Of these 14 villages, Begbroke, Kidlington and Yarnton are surrounded by Green Belt, Islip is wholly within the Green Belt and Weston-on-the-Green is partly within the Green Belt.

Interim Spatial Policy Approach

- 2.11 In view of the above, it is suggested that until such time that the Council can again be confident that its supply of deliverable housing sites meets the requirements of PPS3, or until such time that a draft Core Strategy replaces this interim approach, opportunities for residential development for 10 or more dwellings on unallocated sites should, without prejudice to future decision making on the LDF, be restricted to the following:

- development within the built-up limits of settlements in accordance with the saved policies of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and the policies of the Non-Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011;
- appropriate development (see paragraphs 2.13 to 2.16) adjoining the built-up limits of Banbury or Bicester;

- appropriate development (see paragraphs 2.13 to 2.16) adjoining the built-up limits of Adderbury, Ambrosden, Bloxham, Bodicote, Chesterton, Deddington, Kirtlington, Launton, Middleton Stoney and that part of Weston-on-the-Green which lies outside the Green Belt (note: proposals for rural exception sites will not be restricted to these villages)
- 2.12 Development outside the built-up limits of other settlements should not be considered as appropriate locations. This interim approach is suggested to guide development control decision making ahead of, and wholly without prejudice to, the Council's consideration of a draft Core Strategy (expected January 2010). The CRAITLUS study does not rule out the possibility of future development in other villages but relying on villages that perform less well ahead of LDF decision making would increase the risk of future policy conflicts with consequent harm to the preparation of the LDF. Furthermore, the need for additional deliverable sites is relatively modest and there is not a housing supply justification to extend the parameters of opportunity.
- 2.13 Any proposals considered under this approach would need to accord with national planning policies and in particular meet the following criteria from PPS3:
- contributes to creating mixed and sustainable communities;
 - in a suitable location which offers a range of community facilities and with good access to jobs, key services and infrastructure;
 - easily accessible and well connected to public transport;
 - makes efficient and effective use of land;
 - produces high quality housing which is integrated with, and complements, the neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally in terms of scale, density, layout and access;
 - achieves a mix of housing, both market and affordable;
 - appropriately designed taking the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions;
 - creates or enhances a distinctive character that relates well to the surroundings.
- 2.14 The assessment of whether proposed developments would be in suitable locations should also include consideration of the following:
- the landscape sensitivity and visual impact;
 - highways and traffic impact;
 - the need to avoid the coalescence of settlements and to protect the identity of settlements
 - the impact on flood risk;
 - the impact on the historic environment;
 - impact on ecology and biodiversity.
- 2.15 Any proposal would need to be considered to determine whether it would result in unacceptable demonstrable harm. It would be particularly important to ensure that the scale of any development proposed is appropriate for the settlement concerned having regard to its size, function, character and other constraints.

- 2.16 It is also important that any proposal is proportionate to the relatively modest shortfall in deliverable sites, taking into account the fact that PPS3 allows for acceptable deviation from 5 years supply if performance is still expected to achieve housing trajectory rates. The impact on preparation of the LDF will also need to be considered having regard to LDF evidence available at the time of consideration and taking into account reasonable alternatives.

Local Development Scheme (LDS)

- 2.17 The LDS that is before the Executive today has been formulated to meet requirements set down by legislation (Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act (2004)) and regulations. The LDS is essentially a project plan that outlines what planning policy documents the Council intends to prepare. It has a number of key features:-
- It must cover a period of **three years**. The Government recommends that in some cases project timelines should be shown beyond the three years for information.
 - The LDS should record only **those documents that are covered by the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act**. There may be some planning policy work that we undertake that does not need to go into the LDS. For example, if the Council wishes to produce supplementary guidance on an issue or a site, it may wish to prepare a "*Supplementary Planning Document*" (SPD) under the terms of the new Act. It may, however, wish to produce more informal supplementary planning guidance (SPG). Since SPG is not contained in the Act, the LDS would not show these.
 - The LDS must be **submitted to the Secretary of State**. The Secretary of State will declare whether the LDS is "fit for purpose" and may object if it is considered that it is not.
 - The LDS should be as **user-friendly** as possible. It is the intention that it is the public's first point of contact with the Council's plan-making function and should be easy for them to use. It does, however, need to contain a number of prescribed elements and follow a certain format.
 - It should be a **resourced** document. There will be an expectation from Government that the Council can and will deliver on the plan-making commitments it makes in the Local Development Scheme. Within Cherwell District Council, this means that the implications of the LDS will need to feed into the service planning and budgeting process.
 - Having said this, it should also be a **flexible** document. The frequent review process for the LDS is an opportunity for the Council to respond to new circumstances and amend its plan-making programme accordingly.
 - The LDS should be **accessible** and published on the Council's website.

Key Issues for Consideration/Reasons for Decision and Options

- 3.1 The key issues for consideration are:
- the approval of the AMR and LDS to meet statutory requirements;
 - the district's housing land supply and the need to increase the supply of deliverable sites;
 - the programming for completion of the LDF's Local Development Documents.

Annual Monitoring Report

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Option One | To accept or seek amendment of the 2009 AMR and agree that it should be submitted to the Secretary of State. |
| Option Two | To note the district's housing land supply position and take the recommended actions to increase the supply of deliverable housing sites. |
| Option Three | To note the district's housing land supply position but not to take the recommended actions to increase the supply of deliverable housing sites. |

Local Development Scheme

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Option One | To support the timetable and contents in the LDS and agree that it should be submitted to the Secretary of State and subsequently brought into effect. |
| Option Two | To support the timetable and contents in the LDS with amendments and agree that it should be submitted to the Secretary of State and subsequently brought into effect. |
| Option Three | To not support the timetable and contents in the LDS. |

Consultations

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Cllr Michael Gibbard | Informal briefing |
| Others | The timetable of the LDS has been considered by the LDF Advisory Panel. Its contents and timetable have also been informally discussed with the Government Office prior to a formal submission that would follow its approval by this Executive. |

Implications

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| Financial: | <p>There are no significant direct financial implications arising from this report. The work on collecting data and preparing the AMR, and of reviewing the LDS, is met within existing budgets.</p> <p>The LDS does, however, set out a timetable for the preparation of planning documents which, themselves, will require significant resources. These include use of consultants and (in the case of the Core Strategy and Delivery DPD) funding public examinations. Provision has been made within budgets for these matters, which will continue to be kept under review through the service and budget planning process.</p> <p>There are risks of costs associated with unsuccessfully defending refusals of planning permission upon appeal particularly if the decisions made as a result of this report are not considered to be well founded.</p> |
|-------------------|--|

Comments checked by Eric Meadows, Service Accountant, 01295 221552

Legal:

The Council is required by regulations to submit an Annual Monitoring Report by 31st December each year. It is also required to keep its Local Development Scheme under review and update this as required. Since the previous LDS is now significantly out-of-date, it needs to be reviewed now.

The district's housing land supply position and the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 3: *Housing* (PPS3) will often be material considerations in determining planning applications for residential development. The reasons for the refusal of planning permission need to be reasonable and capable of being substantiated upon challenge.

Comments checked by Sue Christie, Solicitor, 01295 221690

Risk Management:

Not having an up-to-date LDS increases the risk of the Council's proposed Development Plan Documents being found 'unsound' at Examination with consequent delay implications for resources. It would also produce uncertainty in deploying resources for completion of the LDF.

Using the district's current housing land supply position as a reason to refuse planning applications for residential development will, at the current time, increase the risk of the Council being unsuccessful in defending planning appeals and associated risk of costs being awarded against the Council.

Comments checked by Rosemary Watts, Risk Management and Insurance Officer, 01295 221566

Equalities:

There are no equality issues arising from this report. In the process of preparing Local Development Documents under the LDS, Equality Impact Assessments will need to be carried out.

Comments checked by Clare Taylor, Community and Corporate Planning Manager, 01295 221563

Wards Affected

All

Corporate Plan Themes

- Theme 4: Promote prosperity and a sustainable economy
- Theme 5: Secure more affordable housing
- Theme 6: Protect and Enhance the Local Environment
- Theme 7: Improve Recreational Opportunities
- Theme 8: Rural Focus
- Theme 9: Urban Focus
- Theme 10: Focus on Cherwell's People

Executive Portfolio

Councillor Michael Gibbard
Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing

Document Information

Appendix No	Title
Appendix 1	Key findings from the 2009 Annual Monitoring Report
Appendix 2	Timetable for the proposed Local Development Scheme
Appendix 3	Housing Trajectory Chart (September 2009)
Background Papers	
Draft revised Local Development Scheme Draft Annual Monitoring Report 2009	
Report Author	David Peckford, Senior Planning Officer (AMR & Housing Delivery) Philip Clarke, Head of Planning and Affordable Housing Policy (LDS)
Contact Information	David Peckford - 01295 221841 david.peckford@cherwell-dc.gov.uk Philip Clarke - 01295 221840 philip.clarke@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

2 Key Findings

2.1 This chapter sets out the key findings of the Annual Monitoring Report for 2008-9. The results are presented and discussed in more detail in Section 5.

Progress on the Local Development Framework

- Evidence base: significant progress on several key areas including on transport, landscape assessment and affordable housing.
- Core Strategy: progress on preparing the evidence base and consultation on “reasonable alternatives for directions of growth and strategic sites” (September – November 2008).
- Canalside: commencement of work on a Supplementary Planning Document for this site.

Business Development and Town Centres

- 42,961m² (gross) of business development (i.e. offices, industry or storage and distribution) was completed in Cherwell during 2008-9 (20,036m² net). 42% of this floorspace was on previously developed land.
- 1546m² (gross) of 'town centre uses' (i.e. shops, financial and professional services, offices and leisure) was completed in Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington centres. However there has been a net loss of these 'town centre uses' in town centres to other uses including restaurants/ takeaways, drinking establishments, residential, leisure and other uses.
- Across the district, there has been 1.77 hectares of employment land lost to other uses, including on land identified in the Employment Land Review.
- Total employment land availability in Cherwell is now 124.5 hectares

Housing

- The South East Plan was published in May 2009. It sets a new housing requirement for the district of 670 dwellings per annum, compared to the former Structure Plan requirement of 623;
- Housing completions for 08/09 were 426 and are expected to remain low in 09/10 and 10/11 as economic recovery occurs and before completions are recorded on new strategic, and other major, housing sites;
- Since 1 April 2006, the start of the plan period of the South East Plan, total net housing completions have been 1,734. This is 276 dwellings less than the three year requirement of 2,010 and, in effect, increases South East Plan requirements to 686 per annum over the remainder of the plan period to 2026;
- Total existing housing land supply from 2006-2026 is estimated to be 7,580 dwellings, leaving 5,820 dwellings to be planned for through the LDF;
- The district has 4.0 years supply of deliverable housing land over the period 2009-2014 rising to 4.5 years from 2010 to 2015;
- Net affordable housing completions in 08/09 were 87, compared to the minimum average annual target of 100 dwellings set by the Housing Strategy. Gross completions (i.e. including acquisitions and not allowing for losses) were 122. The total net supply since 2001 is now 816, an average of 102 per annum;
- The number of demarked pitches available to Gypsies and Travellers has fallen from 48 to 39.

Environmental Quality

- 2 planning applications have been granted contrary to Environment Agency advice on flood risk grounds, although their concerns were resolved through the imposition of planning conditions

- 13 renewable energy schemes have been permitted in 2008-9, an increase from 8 schemes in 2007-8.
- There are no open spaces in the district managed to Green Flag Award standard.
- There has been a decrease of 4 hectares in the area of Local Wildlife Sites (formerly known as County Wildlife Sites) within Cherwell due to areas no longer meeting the qualifying criteria for Local Wildlife Sites and subsequently being 'de-selected'
- There has also been a decrease in the 'priority species' present within Cherwell but an increase in the 'priority habitats', due mainly to new types of habitats being added to the priority list rather than new habitat creation. Priority species and habitats are derived from the UK Biodiversity Action Plan and are a priority for biodiversity and conservation action.

Car Parking and Transport

- 14 out of 18 applicable planning permissions provided car parking in accordance with the maximum parking standards; 4 exceeded the maximum standards

2.2 The next chapter describes the monitoring framework and the indicators used to obtain the results provided within this report.

This page is intentionally left blank

Table 31 Cherwell District Council Housing Trajectory (September 2009) - Completions and Permissions as at 31/03/09

Source of Plan Target (Core Output Indicator H1a)	Start of Plan Period			End of Plan Period												Total Housing Required								
	01 April 2006	31 March 2006	13,400	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18		2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26
South East Plan 2009				670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670
A) South East Plan allocation annualised over 20 years	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670	670
B) Net additional dwellings completed in previous years	853	455																						
C) Net additional dwellings completed for the reporting year			426																					
D) Cumulative net additional dwellings completed	853	1308	1734																					
E) Net projected completions for deliverable (available, suitable and achievable) sites			369	181	624	702	893	800	761	452	200	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F) Supply over the next 5 year years from deliverable sites (5 year rolling supply going forward e.g. 08/09 to 12/13)			2769	3200	3780	3608	3106	2248	1448	687	235	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
G) Gross area of land (hectares) for all deliverable (available, suitable and achievable) sites (site areas to be deducted upon site completion)			689																					
H) Net projected completions for other specific, deliverable sites (excluding other housing potential)			0	0	40	141	89	89	135	175	160	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
I) Total projections for net additional dwellings in future years (completions for all deliverable and developable sites) (E+H)			369	181	664	843	982	889	896	627	360	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
J) Cumulative projections for net additional dwellings in future years (completions for all deliverable and developable sites)			369	550	1214	2057	3039	3928	4824	5451	5811	5846	5846	5846	5846	5846	5846	5846	5846	5846	5846	5846	5846	5846
K) Cumulative shortfall or surplus in meeting annualised South East Plan requirements	-	183	-32	-276	-577	-1066	-1072	-899	-567	-368	-142	-185	-495	-1130	-1800	-2470	-3140	-3810	-4480	-5150	-5620			
L) Annual requirement taking account of past completions (B & C) and projected completions for deliverable and developable sites (I)	-	670	660	672	686	706	741	747	739	719	703	684	691	732	831	970	1164	1455	1940	2910	5820			
M) Current and future estimation of 5 year rolling supply of deliverable (available, suitable and achievable) sites (E) having regard to past completions (B & C) and projected completions for deliverable and developable sites (I)			4.0	4.5	5.1	4.8	4.2	3.1	2.1	1.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

South East Plan Requirement 2006-2026 13400 Actual & Projected Completions 2006-2026 7580
 Shortfall to be planned for in LDF -5820

This page is intentionally left blank

Executive

North West Bicester Eco Town Bid for Growth Funding Allocation

2 November 2009

Report of Head of Planning and Affordable Housing Policy and Head of Development Control and Major Developments

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To inform members of the outline bid submission and provide details of the full bid for information.

This report is public

Recommendations

The Executive is recommended to:

- (1) Note the report and consider any decisions that may arise (further detail may be available by the time of the meeting)
- (2) Approve the contents of the outline bid and supporting information in the Programme of Development as the Council's submission for eco town funding (copy to be circulated as soon as available)

Executive Summary

1 Eco-towns – Funding Allocations – Bidding Guidance for Local Authorities 9 October 2009

- 1.1 The Government set out details of £60 million start up funding for the four eco town locations in the Planning Policy Statement published on 16 July 2009. The Ministerial Statement accompanying the announcement of North West Bicester as an eco town location also identified other sources of funding.
- 1.2 The £60 million The £60 million eco-town fund for 2009-11 is a separate ring fenced allocation within the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) Growth fund and is an additional source of funding for local authorities and partners to facilitate large scale housing growth and to support the delivery of eco-towns as national exemplars of low carbon and sustainable development. The Government hopes to announce confirmed funding for 2009-10 in December 2009 following bids for funding from eco

town lead local authorities. A further provisional amount for 2010-11 is expected to be announced in early 2010 and confirmed by Parliament soon after. This will be based on the £60 million allocated to eco towns on 16 July 2009 with £25m expected in 2009-10 and £35m in 2010-11. Eco town local authorities will be expected to provide an update for 2010-11 funding in February 2010 to confirm progress of plans and proposal set out in the funding application.

- 1.3 The Growth Bid provides unringfenced block grant and there are no grant conditions about how or when the funding allocation is spent. Outline bids must be sent to the HCA Regional Team and the CLG Eco towns team on 30 October with further supporting detail by 13 November 2009.

2 The Bid and Programme of Development

- 2.1 The deadline for further details to be submitted is 13 November 2009 and it is clear in the guidance that late submissions will not be accepted. The timetable for submission provides an opportunity to review, update and where necessary correct the outline bid to take account of the decision of the Executive before submitting further supporting detail by 13 November. A Government decision on funding bids is expected in December 2009.
- 2.2 A Draft Programme of Development (POD) and bid is being prepared in conjunction with Government agencies and other partners. The eco-town funding bid sets out Cherwell District Council's proposals for additional sources of funding for services and infrastructure to delivery the early phases of North West Bicester. An outline bid of £20 million will be submitted for eco town funding on 30 October 2009. The bid will be based on a financial model for start up funding over a 5 year period split approximately 1:3 in terms of revenue:capital. This takes account of the guidance from the Homes and Community Agency (HCA) and CLG requiring the bid to demonstrate that dedicated capacity is available to deliver the eco-town. The bid is supported by a Programme of Development (POD) setting out the planning timetable for delivering the eco development. It includes details of the demonstration schemes, the first phase of development to 2016 and the future phases to complete the eco-town development.
- 2.3 The bid follows the bidding guidance provided by CLG on 9 October 2009 which sets out the scope and contents of the POD. It will be assessed by the HCA as advisors to CLG. The HCA will send recommendations to CLG and the Ministerial funding decisions will be made in the light of the recommendations and the bids made. It is hoped to announce Ministers' decisions by the end of the year. The bid does not include other funding streams and programmes which can help support eco town local authorities.
- 2.4 The bid is based on the following headings:
 - Capacity (revenue funding)
 - Infrastructure (capital funding)
 - Demonstration projects (capital funding)
 - Land Acquisition (capital funding)
- 2.5 In summary the outline bid is for £20 million to support the start up of the eco town. The next stage will be to submit by 13 November 2009 further supporting information providing further details on the bid and POD. Given

the early stage of the eco town process and current position on land assembly, the outline sets out the Council's broad plans and aspirations for delivering the eco town. It builds on the known commitment of Bicester Town Council, Oxfordshire County Council, the landowners, private sector development interests and other public sector partners.

Background Information

- 3.1 The CLG published Eco-towns-Funding Allocations-Bidding Guidance for Local Authorities on 9 October 2009 following, John Healey's Ministerial Statement made on 16 July 2009. Other background information is contained on the "Eco Towns" pages of the Council's website (go to: www.cherwell.gov.uk/ecotowns).

Key Issues for Consideration/Reasons for Decision and Options

- 4.1 This report is presented for approval of the Council's submission for eco town funding to be submitted to the HCA Regional team and CLG by 13 November 2009. The outline bid and supporting information in the Programme of Development will be submitted on 30 October and further supporting detail is being prepared to meet the timetable for funding allocation submissions. The Executive is invited to consider the supporting material which provides the basis of the Council's bid.

The following options have been identified. The approach in the recommendations is believed to be the best way forward

- | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Option One | To agree the recommendations. |
| Option Two | To amend the recommendations. |
| Option Three | Not to agree the recommendations. |

Consultations

The issues in this report have not been the subject of consultation

Implications

- Financial:** The Council's response to the eco towns process is currently being resourced and staff within existing structures and budgets.
The outline financial fund budget is split 1:3 between revenue and capital.
The bid identifies a need for further resources to support

the eco town's delivery and has the potential to increase capacity within the local authority.

Comments checked by Eric Meadows, Service Accountant 01295 221552

Legal:

Some potentially complex legal issues arise from the proposed new partnership and delivery mechanisms.

Comments checked by Pam Wilkinson, Principal Solicitor 01295 221688

Risk Management:

The application for eco town funding allocations sets out the plans and proposals for North West Bicester and an update on progress. The additional funding is to support local authorities in facilitating the delivery of the eco towns as national exemplars of low carbon and sustainable development. The staff and resource requirements are set out in the bid and will be an important factor in determining the funding decision. There is potentially some risk of staffing and resource issues.

Comments checked by Rosemary Watts, Risk Management & Insurance Officer, 01295 221566

Wards Affected

Ambrosden and Chesterton, Caversfield, Bicester North and Bicester West directly, but impact on whole district and sub region.

Corporate Plan Themes

Cherwell: A District of Opportunity, A Cleaner, Greener Cherwell and A Safe and Healthy Cherwell

Executive Portfolio

**Councillor Michael Gibbard
Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing**

Document Information

Appendix No	Title
To follow	
Background Papers	
CLG published Eco-towns-Funding Allocations-Bidding Guidance for Local Authorities on 9.10.09 John Healy's Ministerial Statement was made on 16 July 2009.	
Report Author	Jenny Barker, Team Leader Major Developments Andrew Bowe, Implementation Officer
Contact Information	01295 221842 andrew.bowe@Cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Executive

Bicester Hospital Re - Provision

2 November 2009

Report of Strategic Director Environment & Community

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To consider the current position regarding the Oxfordshire Primary Care Trust's (PCT) proposals to re-provide Bicester Hospital.

This report is public

Recommendations

The Executive is recommended to:

- (1) Note the current position regarding the PCT's procurement process; and
- (2) Support the PCT in local community involvement through the Community Engagement Forum

Executive Summary

Introduction

- 1.1 The PCT has for some considerable period been planning the re-provision of Bicester Hospital and is now at a point where potential bidders have been short-listed using a Pre-Qualifying Questionnaire and a number of them will shortly be invited to submit outline solutions.

Proposals

- 1.2 In undertaking this exercise, the PCT has recognised the importance of communication and engagement with local people and are therefore setting up a Community Engagement Forum of key individuals and interested groups across the town. It should be noted that this hospital re-provision will cover an area far greater than the town of Bicester and the catchment for using the hospital in future is expected to extend as far as Woodstock.

Background Information

- 2.1 The Executive will recall that this matter was discussed at the Council meeting on 20 July where Alan Webb, Director of Commissioning for the PCT addressed the Council and explained the PCT's position in procuring new facilities and services.
- 2.2 At that meeting concern was expressed about the site options the PCT were considering and that the Council's favoured site to allow for future expansion of healthcare services and facilities for a growing town would be best located on the land allocated for a Health Village in South West Bicester. As a consequence of this, the Council instructed the Leader to write to the Minister of State for Care Services to express the Council's views and concerns over this matter.
- 2.3 A response from the Minister, Phil Hope MP, states that the planning and development of health services is a matter for local primary care trusts in partnership with their strategic health authority. The Council's letter has therefore been forwarded to the Chair of South Central Strategic Health Authority. No contact has yet been made by them. The Council has however met with the Chair of the PCT to discuss this issue and to reinforce its message.
- 2.4 Members will also recall the decision for the Council to submit to the PCT an expression of interest and pre-qualification questionnaire. In this, the Council offered to build and lease back a primary care centre with beds and promoted the South West Bicester site as the best location for delivering future and immediate healthcare needs for the people of Bicester and surrounding areas. This was duly done, but regrettably the Council was unsuccessful in making it through to the next round of the procurement process. As a consequence of this, the Strategic Director Environment & Community has engaged with the PCT and is now a member of the project team managing the procurement process.

Key Issues for Consideration/Reasons for Decision and Options

- 3.1 Members are reminded that there are currently three options for bidders available through this process. The first is for provision of bedded services, the second is provision of the facilities for the ambulatory care centre in order to house the out patient services currently provided at Bicester Hospital, and the third option is a combination of both of these. The PCT have indicated that no decisions have been made about site possibilities, although information will be provided to all bidders about both the existing site and the South West Bicester Health Village site.
- 3.2 The PCT is largely on track in its procurement programme with the target date of contract signature in the Autumn of 2010. The current stage of the procurement process involves the preparation of documentation to invite outline solutions from a short listed number of potential bidders following which there will be a period of dialogue with those bidders during the early part of 2010. Running alongside this process are a range of activities to ensure that any bidders proposals are realistic in terms of delivery and that local people are adequately engaged and aware of what is happening.

- 3.3 As part of the process of involving the community, the PCT wishes to establish a Community Engagement Forum to ensure effective and real involvement of a cross-section of the people of Bicester in the process of redeveloping this Community Hospital. Tony Baldry MP has agreed to assist and an offer has been made that this Council will also provide support.
- 3.4 This idea has been tried in previous and earlier stages in the development of this project with limited success, as the messages to local people were largely about process rather than potential outputs. In the coming months it is expected that there will be specific proposals developed which will require some degree of consultation and possibly options on which local people can comment.
- 3.5 It is recommended that the Council engages very positively and supportively with this process by becoming an active member of the community forum and support the PCT in delivering its objectives.
- 3.6 Earlier this year, the Government announced that North West Bicester will be one of four first-wave eco towns for the country. This 5,000 home development will clearly impact on the infrastructure of the town of which the Bicester Hospital re-provision is a key component. This point was also made to the Minister in the Council's letter to him and is subsequently being considered by the PCT as part of its procurement process. As a consequence, the PCT are reviewing the population projections which underpin the services being procured and are considering how this project can contribute to the eco town concept.

The following options have been identified. The approach in the recommendations is believed to be the best way forward

- | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Option One | To agree the recommendations. |
| Option Two | To amend the recommendations. |
| Option Three | Not to agree the recommendations. |

Consultations

None

Implications

Financial: There are no specific financial implications arising from this report or this particular project, based on the procurement process of the PCT to date. Officer and Member time in supporting the PCT in this exercise is regarded as normal activity.

Comments checked by Joanne Kaye, Service Accountant
01295 221545

Legal: There are no legal implications arising from this report.

Comments checked by Liz Howlett, Head of Legal & Democratic Services, 01295 221686.

Risk Management:

There are no notable risks associated with this project as this project is the PCT's responsibility. Public engagement is important in this respect and is currently being accommodated. Also future proofing is important to ensure that what is built is fit for purpose for many years.

Comments checked by Rosemary Watts, Risk Management & Insurance Officer, 01295 221566

Wards Affected

All southern District wards.

Corporate Plan Themes

Safe and Healthy Cherwell,

Executive Portfolio

Councillor George Reynolds
Portfolio Holder for Environment, Community & Health

Document Information

Appendix No	Title
None	
Background Papers	
None	
Report Author	Ian Davies, Strategic Director, Environment & Community
Contact Information	01295 221581 Ian.Davies@Cherwell-dc.gov.uk