



Strategic Planning  
Planning and Regeneration  
Bromsgrove District Council  
Burcot Lane  
Bromsgrove  
B60 1AA

Date: 5 November 2013

Our Ref: EB M11/0804-06

By email only:  
[strategicplanning@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:strategicplanning@bromsgrove.gov.uk)

Dear Sir / Madam

**RE: REPRESENTATIONS ON THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION BROMSGROVE DISTRICT PLAN**

We submit these representations on behalf of **Bromsgrove District Housing Trust (bdht)**. They raise fundamental concerns about legal compliance and soundness which will prevent the Plan being progressed in its current state.

Our comments about the failure to assess and thereby accommodate Birmingham's housing growth within the district's boundaries are further underlined by the Birmingham Development Plan (Pre-Submission Version) and evidence base documents including the 'Birmingham Housing Targets Technical Paper' (Peter Brett Associates, September 2013) which were put on public view earlier today. These documents confirm that the City Council does not intend to instigate a joint SHMA that would satisfy the requirements of the NPPF. We appreciate that this poses a problem for Bromsgrove District Council but one that must be resolved if there is any prospect of the District Plan being found sound once it does reach examination stage.

Yours faithfully



Encs: Report  
Response Form

Cc: Mike Brown, bdht

**Part B** (see Note 1 and Note 8 para 4.2)

**Please use a separate Part B form for each representation you wish to make**

Name or Organisation(see Note 8 para 4.1)

bdht

1. To which part of the BDP does this representation relate?

Page:	Paragraph:	Policy:
Policies Map:	Other document:	

If your representation does not relate to a specific part of the document, or it relates to a different document, for example the Sustainability Appraisal, please make this clear in your response.

2. Do you consider the BDP is legally compliant?(see Note 2)

Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------	---

3. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is not legally compliant. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments.(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Failure to meet the Duty to Cooperate in respect of assessing and accommodating Birmingham's housing needs, as outlined in the attached report.
---

4. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP legally compliant, having regard to the issue(s) you have identified above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP legally compliant. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)(see Note 8 para 4.3)

Progress the District Plan only once a joint SHMA has been completed for the functional housing market area centred around Birmingham City, alongside a Green Belt review. The revised Plan will require a revised housing target, strategic land allocations and policy wording to satisfactorily accommodate the additional growth. Further Sustainability Appraisal will be required also.
---

5. Do you consider the BDP is sound?(see Note 3)

Yes: <input type="checkbox"/>	No: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------	---

Do you consider the BDP is **unsound** because it is not:

(1) Justified(see Note 4)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) Effective(see Note 5)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(3) Consistent with national policy(see Note 6)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(4) Positively prepared(see Note 7)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

6. Please give details of why you consider the BDP is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the soundness of the BDP, please also use this box to set out your comments. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

Policies are unsound, as outlined in the attached report. Specific concerns are raised about their <b>effectiveness</b> in securing affordable housing provision and balanced growth throughout the district; and that they are not <b>justified</b> owing to the Council's rejection of more effective policy options that would be more closely aligned to evidence base and would ensure <b>consistency</b> with the NPPF where this is currently lacking.
---

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the BDP sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 6 above. You will need to say why this change will make the BDP sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary) (see Note 8 para 4.3)

Suspend work on the District Plan to ensure legal compliance, as above.

*Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change(s), as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.*


**After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

8. If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? *Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.*

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

9. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary. (Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

To allow the views of the key provider of affordable housing in the district to be fully represented.

Signature: 	Date: 05.11.13
--	----------------



Directors  
R S J Tetlow MSc Dip Surv FRTPI FRICS FCIH FRSA  
S Hinsley BA (Hons) MRTPI  
J M Adams BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI  
J Sneddon BSc (Hons) MRTPI  
J Stacey BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

## **REPRESENTATIONS ON THE PROPOSED SUBMISSION BROMSGROVE DISTRICT PLAN**

**ON BEHALF OF:** bdht

**PREPARED BY:** TETLOW KING PLANNING  
UNIT 2, ECLIPSE OFFICE PARK  
HIGH STREET  
STAPLE HILL  
BRISTOL BS16 5EL

**TEL:** 0117 956 1916  
**FAX:** 0117 970 1293  
**EMAIL:** [all@tetlow-king.co.uk](mailto:all@tetlow-king.co.uk)  
**WEBSITE:** [www.tetlow-king.co.uk](http://www.tetlow-king.co.uk)

Constructionline Approved - Registered No: 8559

**OUR REF:** EB\M11\0804-01.RPT

**DATE:** NOVEMBER 2013

	<b>SECTION</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	POLICY REPRESENTATIONS	2
3.	REPRESENTATIONS ON THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL	8
4.	CONCLUSIONS	9

## **APPENDICES**

- A. EXTRACT FROM THE NHF'S WEST MIDLANDS HOME TRUTHS 2012 REPORT
- B. MINUTES OF BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL MEETING OF 17 JULY 2013

---

## SECTION 1

### INTRODUCTION

---

- 1.1 We are retained as planning agent to **Bromsgrove District Housing Trust (bdht)**.
- 1.2 These representations represent bdht's views on the emerging Plan in its capacity as the primary affordable housing provider in the district. bdht will work to ensure the Plan presents a realistic framework to meet significant local housing needs via its delivery programme of 50 new affordable homes per annum.
- 1.3 Our representations build on those submitted at the previous stages of Plan preparation, most recently on the Second Draft Core Strategy in 2011 and Housing Growth Development Study in 2013.
- 1.4 While we are encouraged by some of the changes presented in the Proposed Submission version, we still have fundamental concerns about the ability of the Plan to maintain a pipeline of deliverable housing sites. Its failure to address Birmingham's growth needs means it does not fulfil the Duty to Cooperate and we do not agree that it is sound for the Council to defer critical decisions about level and location of growth to a Plan review. Moreover, the affordable housing provisions are weak and do not offer certainty to bdht that affordable housing delivery will be prioritised when negotiating individual planning applications and putting them forward for determination by Planning Committee members.
- 1.5 We are concerned about the dilemma that the Council will need to face. It will have to decide whether to progress with a Plan that will be found unsound and forced to undertake substantial modifications, or pre-empt this by reworking the Plan now and postpone examination for at least 12 more months.
- 1.6 Either strategy will certainly extend the period of time for which the district is not covered by an up-to-date Local Plan. That is undesirable for bdht, not least because an absence of robust policy weakens the ability for Council officers to defend to members, schemes that will deliver a sufficient level and type of affordable housing. On balance, bdht encourages the Council to defer submission until it has an up-to-date SHMA and an informed and effective delivery strategy.

---

## SECTION 2

### POLICY REPRESENTATIONS

---

#### Housing Requirement, Cross-Border Growth and the Duty to Cooperate

- 2.1 The fundamental problem with the Plan emerges from the selection of a housing target (7000) on the basis of a solely district-wide SHMA data set. We are conscious that this problem is underpinned by the absence of a joint SHMA for the functional housing market area associated with Birmingham City, and the decision of the City Council to progress its own Plan based on housing data from the current Birmingham SHMA which deals with its own administrative boundaries only.
- 2.2 The only realistic outcome of progressing plans on the basis of separate SHMAs is under-planning for the city's growth. Even Birmingham's current SHMA indicates a mismatch between the level of development needed in the city and land capacity. The adjoining local authorities were put on notice of the likely overspill in a letter from the City Council on 8 August 2012. The prospect of unmet need within the city's boundaries has been reiterated in the current consultation draft Greater Birmingham & Solihull LEP Spatial Plan for Recovery and Growth.
- 2.3 Not only does that contravene the NPPF, paragraph 159, and the requirement to meet the Duty to Cooperate "from the outset" of Plan preparation in the draft NPPG, but has severe implications for Bromsgrove District. Our concerns about this are set out below.

#### Affordability

- 64/1  
(BDP 3)
- 2.4 The effect of this planned under-provision at Birmingham will be for those seeking housing to look to Bromsgrove and other neighbouring authorities in the functional housing market area. This poses a real possibility that the 7000 homes being planned for the district will be diverted to meet the demand of an influx of in-migrants from the city well above and beyond the historic migration rates. This runs counter to the Council's own aspiration to discourage in-migration and focus on local needs, for example as asserted at paragraph 8.52 of the Proposed Submission Local Plan.
- 2.5 At paragraph 2.8, the Proposed Submission District Plan notes that "average (mean) annual earnings of people who work within the District is £20,697 compared with the average annual earnings for residents of Bromsgrove District, which is £29,552, a difference of 30% (ONS, 2012). This would suggest that the District's population earn higher salaries than average, but they earn them in employment locations outside the District". It is therefore likely that in-migrants will have the financial ability to outbid local people for this housing.
- 2.6 Demand exceeding supply will inflate local housing prices which are already documented to be among the highest in the region (see extract from the NHF's West Midlands Home Truths 2012 report at **Appendix A**); this poses a significant threat to housing affordability which already stands at a house price to income ratio of 10.8:1.



There is already imbalance in the housing market (affordable housing representing around 10% of the district's stock) which could easily be exacerbated.

- 2.7 bdht strongly objects to **Core Policy BDP3** and appeals for the Council not to proceed with the proposed housing target in the knowledge that this will be the outcome. The Council has hitherto engaged a corporate commitment to support affordable housing delivery and this was broadly reaffirmed in the Council meeting of 17 July as noted under Item 25/13 of the minutes included at **Appendix B**.
- 2.8 The same minutes highlight another problem with the Proposed Submission Bromsgrove District Plan which is the proposed affordable housing targets now being expressed as "up to" 30% and 40% in **Core Policy BDP8**. It is a matter of fact that, when faced with the option for flexibility, developers will nearly always seek to minimise the level of affordable housing provision. We know this is already happening, with the Council approving housing applications at as little as 20% even in absence of any robust viability evidence. For example, land at Regents Park Road (The Oakhalls) (reference no. 13/0242). Given the ability this currently creates for developers to under-provide, the comment in BDP8.2 that: *"In exceptional circumstances where the applicant can fully demonstrate that the required target cannot be achieved the Council may negotiate a lower provision"* is superfluous.
- 2.9 This will only become more apparent with the need for developers to pay a greater amount of infrastructure costs as indicated will be the case in the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). Without a CIL Charging Schedule, after April 2015 the Council will not be able to pool developer contributions from any more than five approved developments within its administrative boundaries (Redditch will be required to do the same). This will have a significant impact on the viability of developments which are earmarked in the IDP to fund some costly pieces of highways infrastructure in the district some of which are indicated as likely to cost over £1 million. We are concerned that affordable housing will be the weak point in negotiation and with the "up to" policy as drafted, the Council will not be in a position to resist issuing permissions with 20% provision and probably even less. This can only be remedied by having an absolute affordable housing target and the therefore urge the Council to remove reference to 'up to' in BDP8 as well as in the Redditch growth policy, RCBD1.1.
- 2.10 In view of the considerable affordability pressures outlined in the Bromsgrove SHMA Overview Report, a 40% target should be applied across the majority of the district on the basis that the evidence base shows this as being viable. We previously supported 40% in earlier drafts of the Plan.
- 2.11 The SHMA estimates that 4,161 affordable dwellings will be needed across the Plan period to meet the district's backlog and emerging housing need. This is calculated with an inbuilt assumption that the backlog will in part be met by 'committed supply' for a five-year delivery pipeline equating to 113 per annum. Given that 113 has only be achieved once in the past (in 2011/12) and there is little scope to achieve this from the committed supply as noted below, it is improbable that all 113 will transpire to sufficiently offset the backlog in the manner envisaged in the SHMA.
- 2.12 This means that the net level of affordable housing need to be met over the Plan period will most certainly be much greater than the estimated 4,161. For example, if you replace the 113 with the average number of completions (gross) for the past five years, of 86 per annum, the total need arising from residual backlog alone would increase from an estimated 175 to 202 per annum.

64/2  
BDP 8



- 2.13 Just taking the 4,161 at face value, the Council will be aware that this represents 60% of the proposed 7000 housing target. However, given that 570 of the 7000 will be windfalls, and not needing to make any affordable housing provision (see below) the percentage required from the residual housing requirement rises to 65% (4,161/6,430). When planned under-delivery on strategic sites such as Polymer Latex is factored in (also see below) the burden on the remainder falls even greater than 65%.

### **Housing Land Supply**

- 2.14 The Council's latest Five Year Housing Land Supply Paper (1 April 2013) identifies completion of 386 dwellings in the first two years of the Plan period. Its Housing Land Availability Report 2013 identifies that over half of these were affordable (200 and 52%) but this output is largely attributable to bdht's development of 158 affordable dwellings at Perryfields Road. That was achieved on the basis of a substantial amount of grant funding; it is highly unlikely that a similar opportunity will arise in the remaining Plan period.
- 2.15 The ability to satisfy the next five years' housing requirement is contingent upon a number of strategic sites being commenced including the remainder of the Perryfields Road sites which are not yet subject to planning applications. An overview of those strategic sites with planning applications pending indicates that not all are on track to achieve 40% or even 30% affordable housing provision. This is highlighted by the fact that the Council is currently negotiating under-delivery at Polymer Latex and Whitfield Road which together represent 647 dwellings / 10% of the proposed housing requirement. We appreciate the significant constraints present in the former however it is notable that no affordable units are planned to be delivered on the site, with approval for issue of consent under delegated powers made on the basis of 15 units for low cost discounted sale being acceptable. The supporting planning documentation for Whitfield Road refers to an offer of 'up to' 40% affordable housing.
- 2.16 A windfall allowance is assumed at a rate of 30 dwellings per annum. Thus, the Proposed Submission Local Plan assumes that windfalls will deliver 480 of the first phase of the housing requirement (to 2023) rising to a total of 570 across the entirety of the 19-year Plan period. According to the Five Year Housing Land Supply Paper, each windfall site is assumed to comprise fewer than 10 dwellings meaning that not a single one would be required to make affordable housing provision under the operation of the proposed threshold in Core Policy BDP8. By these means the Council is actively planning to ensure that a significant amount of its supply, namely 8% of the 7000, will not be affordable.

### **Viability**

- 2.17 We are concerned about some of the assumptions underpinning the Affordable Housing Viability Study of April 2012, which are compounded by the Council's interpretation of the findings in its application to draft policies.
- 2.18 Taking the assumptions first. Per unit, the consultant makes a baseline allowance in construction costs that equates to achieving Code for Sustainable Homes Levels 4 and 6 by 2013 (for market and affordable tenures respectively) rising to Level 6 for all tenures thereafter. Plus an allowance of £1,200 per unit towards on-site renewable energy generation. Not surprisingly, these are modelled as significant costs which have a noticeable bearing on the viability outcomes. Given that the Government has rescinded its aspirations for the 2013 levels and is likely to replace the Code with

enhanced building regulations in the near future, we question the validity of their application to the findings. The same can be said for the renewable energy allowance as the Council does not make this compulsory for new development; it is merely encouraged via Policy BDP22 of the Proposed Submission District Plan.

- 2.19 Even with these assumptions in place, the Study does recognise that there are marked geographical differences in the viability of achieving 30% or 40% affordable housing provision. Geographical location (as an indicator of widely variable land values), closely followed by density, is the most significant variable in viability outcomes, much more so than the development size. At paragraph 11.51, we note the consultant's statement that *"we have not found scale to be an overwhelmingly important determining factor in the viability of developments"*.
- 2.20 Whilst the SHMA shows that over 50% of the district housing requirement needs to be affordable, we acknowledge that the Study shows that this would not be viable on sites with the notable exception of those in Value Area 1. Value Area 1 is in fact representative of approximately one quarter of the district in which residential land values are highest. It is therefore not surprising that 40% is also shown as being viable on most sites in Value Area 1 regardless of the size of site, though the density of development may come into play to a small extent.
- 2.21 It may be the case that 40% becomes viable across the entirety of this high value area once the above mentioned assumptions about construction standards are removed from the equation. The same can be said in Value Areas 2 and 3 which prevail across the majority of the remaining part of the district not in Value Area 1, and where viability of achieving 40% is assessed as being constrained largely by the assumed need to achieve certain Code for Sustainable Homes levels. Certainly in Value Area 2, 40% is likely to be achievable on the majority of sites at most housing densities, less so in Area 3 which has marginally lower residential land values. It is somewhat surprising, given its decision to allow less than 30% on some sites, to see the Council's statement at paragraph 8.105 of the Proposed Submission District Plan that: *"The evidence highlights that the Council's aspiration of achieve 40% affordable provision on-site is achievable in most circumstances"*.
- 2.22 With that in mind, it is noted that the consultant outlines the benefit of a geographical spread of affordable housing targets, namely the ability to capture the viability of 40% provision in the substantial areas containing higher land values. We agree that this is preferable to the site size split selected herewith by the Council. The site size variation it has selected is not borne out by the viability evidence to be necessary and in fact there is evidence in the Study that schemes of 10 dwellings or less (which the Council will class as windfalls) may have potential to make an off-site affordable housing contribution also.
- 2.23 A more effective means of securing maximum levels of affordable housing would be a 40% target in those parts of the district in Value Areas 1 and 2. We encourage reworking of some of the viability assessment from the notional schemes in Value Area 3 without assumptions about Code for Sustainable Homes and renewable energy, to ascertain whether this too might be placed in the 40% category. Otherwise this would be more appropriately placed in a 30% zone with the lower Value Areas 4, 5 and 6. This geographic approach is proving successful in other authorities as a means of maximising provision. There will always be scope for reduction where viability issues are proven, by the developer, to be present on marginal sites through negotiation, however by affirming the targets as absolute this will define full provision as the expectation and normal starting point for landowners and developers when assessing the value of developing their sites.

- 2.24 We also encourage the Council to reconsider the consultant's advice for a tapered approach to windfalls by means of an off-site contribution; again this will help capture provision in the higher value areas. This is especially important in Bromsgrove given the important role which windfalls are proposed to play towards achieving 8% of the housing requirement. It would also match the approach being proposed in Redditch's Local Plan No.4 Proposed Submission, Policy 6 (for developments of five to 10 units) in the interest of cross-border parity.

### **Housing Mix**

- 2.25 Since the Council consulted on the Second Draft Core Strategy in 2011, the findings of the Bromsgrove SHMA Overview Report have confirmed that affordable rent is likely to be ineffective in meeting the district's housing need. Between 35% and 43% of those in need are assessed as lacking the financial means to access affordable rented housing. Moreover, bdht's own records indicate that, while shared ownership housing plays a useful role in meeting some of the district's housing needs, just over 30% proportion of that built and sold by bdht in the last three years was purchased by people moving from addresses outside Bromsgrove. The majority of that 30% moved from elsewhere in the region further indicating the role that the district plays in the wider housing market area, and the need to ensure the Plan provides headroom for accommodating a satisfactory in-migration factor, especially in terms of Birmingham's overspill, in its housing target.
- 2.26 As such, social rented housing must remain the focus when negotiating provision on individual development sites. This is not altered by the possible changes to the allocation regime posited in paragraph 8.104 of the Proposed Submission District Plan.
- 2.27 We object to the flexible approach proposed under the third arm of **Policy BDP8.** We do not consider it sufficient to emphasise the priority need for social rent in the explanatory text (as at paragraph 8.103); the most effective means of securing its delivery will be through inclusion of a preferred tenure split in the upper case policy. The abovementioned Viability Study shows that a 40% affordable housing target can be upheld with an affordable housing tenure split of two thirds social rented to one third shared ownership in most instances. That tenure split ought, therefore, to be the Council's starting point.
- 2.28 Without a clear starting point, the Council will continue to be vulnerable to developers seeking to not only reduce overall housing provision but within that steer away from social rented within the mix on the basis that this is the more costly option, again as already seen at The Oakhalls and at Polymer Latex where the tenure does not even meet the NPPF's affordable housing definition. That effect would further diminish the ability to rebalance the housing market.

### **Settlement Hierarchy, Rural Exception Sites and Green Belt**

- 2.29 We are pleased that the Council has now assessed the sustainability of settlements as a means of understanding their placement in the hierarchy under **Policy BDP2.** However, this does not overcome our previous concern entirely. The Settlement Hierarchy Background Paper of September 2012 is static in that it appraises the current situation only. By its own admission, it does not consider the extent to which development is needed or is already being proposed and the changing village dynamics, a matter which it defers to the IDP. Again, this is of particular concern for Stoke Prior which the Council has consistently demoted to the 'Small Settlement' tier but which is now likely to expand on account of the Polymer Latex site's

64/3

BDP 2



redevelopment, referenced above. We suggest that this might be resolved via annual monitoring and future adjustment of the hierarchy to accommodate any such changes in village composition or rural development needs.

- 2.30 We are also encouraged by the revision of the Plan to accommodate cross subsidy on rural exception site when necessary to achieve development viability, and the prominence now given to the matter via its inclusion **Policy BDP9**. We are also pleased to see the Council introducing some flexibility over the upper size limit for an exception site beyond its traditional stance of 10 units, which has proven impractical for some time.

64/4  
BDP9

- 2.31 However, we are concerned about the potential limitations imposed by the intention to retain the current settlement boundaries in view of deferment of its Green Belt review. Those boundaries, as defined in the adopted Local Plan, derive from concepts in a long since defunct Structure Plan which bears no relationship with current thought about sustaining rural development. NPPG is seeking to confirm that *"all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence"* (draft NPPG, Rural Housing topic).

64/5  
BDP4

- 2.32 As with some of the Plan's other shortcomings, this particular issue can be addressed by undertaking Green Belt review as part of a more informed view about housing targets and site allocations ahead of its submission. We note that the Council has made some ad hoc Green Belt adjustments on the Policies Map but there is no indication of this being formed by any robust assessment of Green Belt function and the ability of the newly included sites to make an alternative contribution to development needs. A case in point is land to the rear of 115 Wildmoor Lane, Catshill outlined in red below, allocated in the Local Plan for a play area/open space but now being proposed to form a seemingly arbitrary extension to the Green Belt. Until such matters are remedied, Policy BDP4 cannot be supported.



**Elderly Peoples Accommodation**

- 2.33 We continue to lend support to Policy BDP10 as an exemplar policy.

64/6  
BDP10

---

## SECTION 3

### REPRESENTATIONS ON THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL

---

- 3.1 We cannot support the Sustainability Appraisal's findings.
- 3.2 While it does recognise that the draft policies will not allow the Council to fully meet the objectively assessed housing need in the district, as required by the NPPF (for example at paragraphs 3.40 and 3.45 where commenting on the 'key weaknesses' of the proposed housing target in Policy BDP3) the suggested mitigation via future Plan review (paragraph 3.48) is a wholly insufficient tool. 64/1
- 3.3 Moreover, it is entirely misguided to conclude, as it does at paragraphs 3.95 and 3.96, that the proposed affordable housing targets in Policy BDP8 "will help to address the high level of need for affordable housing". As shown in Section 2, this is not the case. 64/2
- 3.4 With that in mind, it is considered that the Sustainability Appraisal is not satisfactory thus further undermining the soundness of the Plan.

---

## SECTION 4

### CONCLUSIONS

---

- 4.1 As noted in Section 2, affordability is already acute in Bromsgrove and recent delivery has not been at a level sufficient to diminish the housing need, which still remains at a pressing level. ~~bdht~~, with the Council, needs to ensure the Plan offers the best opportunity to rectify this if it is to meet its stated aim that:

*"In the next 15 to 20 years, the District will have achieved a more balanced housing market and be continuing to deliver the required level of housing growth to meet local needs" (paragraph 4.6).*

- 4.2 With that in mind, we consider that the Council will not be able to produce a sound Plan until a joint SHMA has been prepared with Birmingham and other local authorities in the functional housing market area and it is able to ensure a robust strategy for meeting that element of the city's needs that will overspill, currently not precisely quantified though estimated in the Birmingham SHMA as being around 360 homes per annum.
- 4.3 The District Council will also need to undertake a full Green Belt review at the start of the Plan preparation process and not part way through *"prior to 2023"* as currently stated in Policy BDP3 of the Proposed Submission Bromsgrove District Plan. This will undoubtedly require the Council to undertake further consultation and Sustainability Appraisal work and we acknowledge the problems that may well arise in the absence of an up-to-date local planning framework in the interim.
- 4.4 However, this appeal is made in the knowledge that members are already unable to make sound planning decisions; as indicated in the minutes at **Appendix B** they are using policies in this draft Plan to allow applications to be approved with an insufficient quantum of affordable housing. If this draft Plan were to be progressed, not only would this waste resources in abortive inquiry work towards inevitably being found unsound but, in the interim, it would give members further belief that such a perverse policy stance to affordable housing delivery can be applied. At least by going back a step to redraft the District Plan, officers will give members a clear signal that affordable housing is not a moveable feast and will need to default to the measures to maximise provision under the NPPF.



## **APPENDIX A**

### **EXTRACT FROM THE NHF'S WEST MIDLANDS HOME TRUTHS 2012 REPORT**

	Average (mean) house prices 2011 <sup>1</sup>	Average (median) incomes 2011 <sup>2</sup>	Gross annual income needed for a mortgage [75% at 3.5%] <sup>3</sup>	Ratio of house prices to incomes <sup>1,2</sup>	Households on waiting list 2011 <sup>4</sup>
ENGLAND	£216,510	£21,366	£50,492	11.1	103,042
West Midlands	£171,777	£17,678	£39,774	8.7	183,245
Herefordshire UA	£216,690	£17,477	£46,412	12.4	5,054
Stoke-on-Trent UA	£97,409	£18,392	£20,873	5.3	6,533
Telford and Wrekin UA	£162,874	£18,699	£32,759	8.2	17,569
Shropshire UA	£203,887	£19,204	£43,690	10.6	10,798
Staffordshire	£168,818	£20,067	£36,176	8.4	18,688
Cannock Chase	£137,346	£19,438	£29,431	7.1	1,984
East Staffordshire	£156,219	£18,965	£33,476	8.2	1,850
Lichfield	£213,162	£23,072	£45,478	9.2	2,375
Newcastle-under-Lyme	£145,253	£19,334	£31,126	7.5	2,138
South Staffordshire	£199,069	£21,013	£42,658	9.5	1,044
Stafford	£184,771	£20,920	£39,594	8.8	2,850
Staffordshire Moorlands	£156,304	£19,807	£33,494	7.9	4,261
Tamworth	£146,506	£19,152	£31,394	7.6	2,186
Warwickshire	£212,100	£21,923	£45,450	9.7	13,612
North Warwickshire	£163,036	£21,190	£34,936	7.7	1,894
Nuneaton and Bedworth	£137,044	£19,786	£29,538	7.0	2,094
Rugby	£182,194	£23,223	£39,042	7.8	2,702
Stratford-on-Avon	£276,762	£21,923	£59,092	12.6	4,127
Warwick	£239,373	£23,260	£51,294	10.3	3,095
West Midlands (Former County)	£151,789	£19,448	£32,520	7.8	90,560
Birmingham	£183,660	£19,536	£32,927	7.9	14,429
Coventry	£136,335	£20,176	£29,215	6.8	20,460
Dudley	£145,130	£19,204	£31,099	7.6	6,157
Sandwell	£118,783	£18,777	£25,054	6.3	8,682
Solihull	£237,783	£23,899	£50,954	10.0	13,310
Walsall	£139,374	£17,711	£29,866	7.9	14,511
Wolverhampton	£128,503	£18,538	£27,536	6.9	11,011
Worcestershire	£206,137	£19,578	£44,172	10.5	21,131
Bromsgrove	£237,280	£21,991	£50,846	10.8	2,978
Malvern Hills	£242,416	£17,118	£51,946	14.2	1,988
Redditch	£168,326	£19,977	£33,927	8.8	3,367
Worcester	£176,924	£20,769	£37,912	8.5	4,637
Wychevon	£239,716	£21,986	£51,368	10.9	4,235
Wyre Forest	£172,085	£17,444	£36,875	9.8	3,926

Figures in *italics* are estimates based on previous years' data

#### Footnotes to tables

1. Land Registry, 2011
2. Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE), 2011
3. Communities and Local Government Housing Statistics Live Tables
4. Homes and Communities Agency, Regulatory and Statistical Return 2011
5. Homes and Communities Agency Completions data, 2010/11
6. Office for National Statistics model-based estimates of unemployment, 2012 (Crown Copyright reserved)

Unemployment rates 2011/12 <sup>5</sup>	Homeless acceptances per 1,000 population 2011/12 <sup>2</sup>	All new housing association homes completed with HCA funding 2010/11 <sup>3</sup>	Total rented housing association homes 2011 <sup>4</sup>	Total rented local authority homes 2011 <sup>3</sup>	New lettings made by housing associations and local authorities 2010/11 <sup>3</sup>	Percentage of homes that are second homes 2011 <sup>3</sup>
9.1%	2.0	49,196	2,314,384	1,725,995	323,048	1.09%
9.1%	3.8	4,401	242,636	207,822	47,832	0.59%
5.6%	3.4	96	11,369	9	765	0.94%
10.1%	2.6	309	7,020	19,190	2,544	0.34%
8.6%	2.0	181	13,538	0	1,307	0.27%
6.2%	2.2	217	13,458	4,240	1,493	1.01%
6.6%	1.4	564	42,365	9,973	4,077	0.32%
9.3%	1.1	128	1,633	5,441	621	0.32%
6.6%	0.5	102	6,356	0	668	0.35%
6.4%	2.9	14	5,675	0	364	0.18%
7.8%	0.1	146	9,859	7	684	0.59%
6.2%	1.2	60	6,368	8	432	0.29%
5.1%	1.2	66	7,266	0	498	0.23%
5.2%	2.3	18	3,646	0	277	0.41%
9.8%	3.5	30	1,562	4,525	533	0.07%
6.5%	1.9	393	14,312	18,341	2,770	0.83%
6.3%	0.9	95	967	2,745	399	0.24%
8.0%	2.7	147	1,844	6,047	837	0.10%
6.6%	1.4	70	2,183	3,918	478	0.48%
4.7%	1.7	76	6,849	0	477	1.08%
5.0%	2.1	5	2,549	5,631	579	1.03%
11.7%	5.6	2,298	109,844	151,981	23,980	0.61%
13.7%	9.7	888	40,337	64,635	9,335	0.98%
9.7%	4.5	171	24,229	127	2,576	0.70%
9.9%	1.2	78	4,174	23,051	2,444	0.32%
11.9%	4.4	242	5,802	30,896	3,122	0.08%
7.3%	3.9	179	2,547	10,553	1,130	0.41%
11.3%	1.2	616	26,915	0	2,769	0.24%
12.8%	3.7	124	5,840	23,519	2,584	0.60%
6.3%	3.0	283	30,930	6,088	2,896	0.59%
6.1%	1.7	56	3,945	0	271	0.26%
5.7%	1.7	33	4,457	0	320	1.11%
7.0%	1.3	44	1,480	6,071	770	0.11%
7.6%	5.2	23	6,767	8	595	0.52%
4.6%	3.9	68	7,465	9	586	0.84%
6.9%	3.4	59	6,416	0	354	0.67%

#### Note

The facts in this booklet use the latest available official government statistical sources at the time of going to print. In some areas, the National Housing Federation has carried out additional analysis to draw out the social and economic implications of the figures. The commentary is our own. Some of this data is © Crown copyright.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **MINUTES OF BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL MEETING OF 17 JULY 2013**

# **BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

## **MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

**WEDNESDAY, 17TH JULY 2013 AT 6.00 P.M.**

PRESENT: Councillors J. M. L. A. Griffiths (Chairman), R. J. Laight (Vice-Chairman), S. J. Baxter, C. J. Bloore, D. W. P. Booth, J. R. Boulter, J. S. Brogan, M. A. Bullivant, M. T. Buxton, R. A. Clarke, B. T. Cooper, S. J. Dudley, K. A. Grant-Pearce, P. A. Harrison, R. Hollingworth, H. J. Jones, P. Lammas, B. Lewis, L. C. R. Mallett, C. M. McDonald, P. M. McDonald, E. J. Murray, J. A. Ruck, C. R. Scurrall, E. M. Shannon, R. J. Shannon, S. P. Shannon, M. A. Sherrey, C. J. Tidmarsh, L. J. Turner, M. J. A. Webb, P. J. Whittaker and C. J. K. Wilson

### **14/13 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J. M. Boswell, S. R. Colella, R. J. Deeming, R. L. Dent, C. J. Spencer and C. B. Taylor.

Apologies for late arrival were received from Councillor P. M. McDonald.

### **15/13 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The following declarations of interest were made:

#### **Item 6 – Council Tax Support**

Councillor S. J. Dudley declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as a local planning consultant and agent. Councillor Dudley left the room during the consideration of the item.

#### **Item 12 – Affordable Housing**

Councillor S. J. Dudley declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as a local planning consultant and agent. Councillor Dudley left the room during the consideration of the item.

Councillors E. M. Shannon and S. P. Shannon each declared an other disclosable interest as Councillor S. P. Shannon was a Board Member of BHI a subsidiary of Bromsgrove District Housing Trust. Councillors S. P. Shannon and E. M. Shannon both left the room during the consideration of the item.

16/13 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Council held on 15<sup>th</sup> May 2013 were submitted.

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Annual Meeting of the Council held on 15<sup>th</sup> May 2013 be approved as a correct record.

17/13 **ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIRMAN, THE CIVIC HEAD AND/OR HEAD OF PAID SERVICE**

The Chairman announced that she had been invited to visit Fisher House a "home from home" for military patients being cared for at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Birmingham and their families.

It was proposed by Councillor E. J. Murray and seconded by Councillor R. Hollingworth and

**RESOLVED** that the Council's best wishes be conveyed to the patients and their families.

18/13 **ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER**

The Leader referred to a scheme involving the development of 70 timber framed homes in Redditch and stated that if any member wished to visit the site, he would make the necessary arrangements with the Leader of Redditch Borough Council.

19/13 **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CABINET ON 5TH JUNE 2013 AND 3RD JULY 2013**

(i) **Financial Reserves Statement 2013**

The recommendations from the Cabinet were proposed by Councillor R. Hollingworth and seconded by Councillor M. A. Sherrey.

The Leader together with the relevant Portfolio Holder responded to questions from a number of Members in relation to the purpose of some of the reserves, whether in some instances the levels were appropriate and why had other reserves had not yet been utilised.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) that the establishment of the new reserves of £1,994 as detailed at Appendix 1 be approved subject to the deletion of the "Potential Appeals" item;
- (b) that the movements of £220,000 reserves as included in Appendix 1 which reflects the approval required for January-March 2013 be approved;
- (c) that the addition of new reserves of £158,000 as included in Appendix 1 which reflects the approval required for January-

March 2013 be approved subject to the deletion of the "Potential Appeals" item

- (d) that the carrying forward of capital budgets of £1,607,000 as set out in Appendix 2 to be utilised in 2013/14 be approved ; and
- (e) that the additional capital expenditure of £87,000 as set out in Appendix 2 be approved.

**(ii) Restructure of Enabling Heads of Service**

In view of the very limited opportunity for Members to consider the comments received as a result of the consultation process with staff in relation to the restructure proposals it was proposed by Councillor R. Hollingworth and seconded by Councillor L.C. R. Mallett and

**RESOLVED** that consideration of the recommendation from the Cabinet in respect of the Restructure of Enabling Heads of Service be deferred until the next meeting of the Council on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2013.

**(iii) The Council Plan**

The recommendations from the Cabinet were proposed by Councillor M. A. Bullivant and seconded by Councillor M. J. A. Webb. Councillor Bullivant referred to the Strategic Purposes within the Plan and the intention that the document should be more visual and simplified than previous lengthy versions and therefore more accessible. It was intended the document would be reviewed on an annual basis.

Councillor L. C. R. Mallett moved an amendment which was seconded by Councillor C. J. Bloore that the matter be referred back to Cabinet for further consideration. In moving the amendment Councillor Mallett stated he felt the document was lacking in detail and did not contain any actions or targets which would contribute to the achievement of the strategic purposes contained within the Plan or would enable progress to be measured. Having been put to the vote the Chairman declared the amendment to be lost.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) that the Council Plan attached as Appendix 1 to the report be approved; and
- (b) that as a minimum the Council Plan be reviewed on an annual basis.

**(iv) Disposal of the Council House Site**

The recommendations from the Cabinet were proposed by Councillor R. Hollingworth and seconded by Councillor M. A. Sherrey.

Members queried whether the car parks associated with the existing flats would be included within the sale and The Leader stated they would remain as at present.



**RESOLVED:**

- (a) that the Council House, Burcot Lane site be marketed for disposal in readiness for the vacation of the site by this Council and the move to the former Parkside Middle School site in 2014/2015; and
- (b) that £20,000 be taken from balances in order to fund any associated pre-sale costs.

**(v) Financial Outturn Report 2012/2013**

The recommendations from the Cabinet were proposed by Councillor R. Hollingworth and seconded by Councillor M. A. Sherrey.

In discussing the recommendation on the outturn report Members commented on apparent inaccuracy of the original budgets. It was suggested that this and subsequent financial management had resulted in a significant underspend at a time of cutbacks in services.

**RESOLVED** that the outturn financial position for 2012/2013 in respect of Revenue and Capital as detailed in the report be noted, together with the transfer of £513,000 to balances.

**(vi) Council Tax Support Scheme**

Councillor S. J. Dudley declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item and left the room during its consideration and determination.

The recommendations from the Cabinet were proposed by Councillor R. Hollingworth and seconded by Councillor M. A. Sherrey.

In proposing the recommendation the Leader reminded Members of the previous decision taken by the Council in February 2013 to take steps to mitigate some of the impact of the changes in the national Council Tax Benefit Scheme. These steps had resulted in the "claw back" of approximately £30,000 of the £61,000 shortfall to this Authority. At that time there had also been a decision to review further the Council Tax Benefit Scheme.

The Leader drew attention to the current recommendation to take no further action to recover the remainder of the shortfall, but in doing so also requested Council to consider whether there should be further public consultation on the proposal. The Leader also referred to the potential impact of the decision on the County Council in terms of loss of income and commented on whether Members who were County Councillors should participate in the discussion and subsequent vote.

Members commented on the need to consult with the public on the proposals in view of the likely costs of undertaking such an exercise.

In order to obtain the view of the Chamber on the matter it was proposed by Councillor R. Hollingworth and seconded by Councillor M.

A. Sherrey that a public consultation be undertaken on the recommendation to take no further action to recover the remainder of the shortfall following changes to the national Council Tax Benefit Scheme. On putting this proposal to the vote the Chairman declared it to be lost and it was

**RESOLVED** that notwithstanding the previous decision review the Council Tax Benefit Scheme, in the circumstances outlined no further action be taken and the remainder of the shortfall of approximately £31,000 be met by this Council.

20/13 **MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE CABINET HELD ON 5TH JUNE 2013 AND 3RD JULY 2013**

The minutes of the meetings of the Cabinet held on 5<sup>th</sup> June 2013 and 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2013 were received.

21/13 **SCHEME OF DELEGATION**

Members considered a report on the annual review of the Officer Scheme of Delegations.

Councillor M. A. Bullivant drew Members' attention to a number of additional amendments to the Scheme in respect of Strategic Housing issues. Councillor Bullivant proposed a recommendation that the granting of new site Licences under section 3(3) of the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960 which at present it was proposed within the Scheme be delegated to the Strategic Housing Manager, be deleted from the Scheme of Delegation.

Approval of the Scheme of Delegation to Officers as set out in the report to the Council was moved by Councillor M. A. Bullivant and seconded by Councillor R. Hollingworth.

**RESOLVED** that subject to the amendment referred to in the preamble above, the current version of the Officer Scheme of Delegations as set out in the report be agreed.

22/13 **APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES**

Council considered a report of the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services on a number of appointments to be made to outside bodies. Members' attention was drawn to an amended Appendix to the report. It was noted that it was proposed that the appointment of representatives on the Midland Joint Advisory Council for Environmental Protection be moved from the "List of Bodies to be appointed to by Office" to the "Other Bodies" List.

Attention was also drawn to section 3.5 of the report which set out the proposed amendments to the list covering the appointments made by office since the previous year.

Members also considered the request from Bromsgrove District Housing Trust to cease making appointments to the Board of the Trust.

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) that the request from Bromsgrove District Housing Trust to amend its Articles to remove the requirement to appoint two representatives from the Council be approved;
- (b) that authority be delegated to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services to take the necessary steps to implement the amendment to the Articles;
- (c) that the Portfolio Holder for Human Resources be appointed to West Midland Employers organisation by office;
- (d) that the appointments made by office as set out in the attached Appendix be noted; and
- (e) that the appointments to the other organisations as set out in the attached Appendix be approved.

23/13 **BOUNDARY COMMISSION REVIEW FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Reference was made to the final recommendations of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in respect of the review of electoral arrangements for Bromsgrove District Council. Details of the final recommendations which included 31 Councillors to represent 29 single-member wards and 1 two-member ward had been made available to Members. Following the necessary Parliamentary procedures, the new arrangements would come into force at the District Council elections in 2015.

A number of Members expressed disappointment at the way in which the Boundary Commission had undertaken the review as it was felt that input from Members had been largely disregarded. There was concern that the approach taken by the Boundary Commission had been over reliant on numerical data and had resulted in the division of communities into different wards.

The Leader stated that whilst the objective of determining the optimum number of Councillors had been achieved he was disappointed in the lack of understanding and logic the Boundary Commission had displayed.

The Monitoring Officer reminded Members that the request for a review had been made by this Council and that Officers had been required to follow the procedures laid down by the Boundary Commission for such reviews.

Members acknowledged the work which had been undertaken by officers during the review process and expressed thanks for this.

**RESOLVED** that the final recommendations of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England be noted.

**24/13 QUESTIONS ON NOTICE**

**Question submitted by Councillor R. J. Shannon**

"This year there are no hanging baskets in Bromsgrove High Street, with the removal of the trees nearly a year and a half ago, why has there been no effort made to make the High Street more appealing to shoppers in the summer months?"

Councillor Booth responded that work was on going in the High Street but that he would raise the issue with the relevant officers.

**25/13 MOTION - AFFORDABLE HOUSING**

Councillors S. J. Dudley, E. M. Shannon and S. P. Shannon had declared a disclosable pecuniary interest and other disclosable interests respectively in this item and left the room during its consideration and determination.

Members considered the following motion submitted by Councillor L.C. R. Mallett.

"Council is concerned about its current ability to deliver required numbers of affordable homes within the District to meet our local housing needs.

Council notes the current housing waiting list and the shortages of supply in affordable and smaller properties.

Council reaffirms its commitment to providing affordable homes across the District and maximising the opportunity to secure high quality affordable homes within any developments coming forward. Council further resolves, as a matter of urgency, to instigate an investigation to report on how the affordable housing need can best be met in Bromsgrove and District."

The motion was moved by Councillor L. C. R. Mallett and seconded by Councillor C. J. Bloore.

In moving the motion Councillor L. C. R. Mallett stated that affordable housing was essential to assist those who would otherwise be unable to afford a property within the District and drew attention to one of the Strategic Purposes within the Council Plan "help me to find somewhere to live in my locality." Councillor Mallett referred to the current housing waiting list of approximately 3,000 people.

Councillor Mallett also expressed concern in relation to the recent amendment to the previous requirement for developers to provide 40 per cent affordable housing to a requirement of "up to" 40 per cent. This had been an issue during consideration of the recent planning application on The Oakalls where the requirement for affordable housing had been reduced to 20 per cent. He suggested this approach could lead to inconsistency and with a limited land



supply, there would be a need to utilise Green Belt land at an earlier stage than would otherwise be the case.

Councillor D. W. P. Booth stated that whilst the provision of affordable housing was a high priority for the Council, he queried whether the figure of 3,000 people on the Housing Waiting List, and therefore in urgent need of a property, was realistic. This could only be a "snapshot" but investigations had indicated that around 338 people had a high housing need. Work was on going to review the Housing Waiting List and the Allocations Policy with a view to improving the opportunities for local people.

In addition the Authority was working with the Bromsgrove District Housing Trust and with private Landlords to increase the supply of good quality affordable accommodation. The Council would continue to work to ensure there was a continuing supply of affordable homes throughout the District including investing in Bromsgrove District Housing Trust projects. He considered the Council's approach was realistic and transparent. Applications would be considered on a site by site basis, focussing on those most in need.

Following further discussion the motion was put to the vote and the Chairman declared the motion to be LOST.

26/13 **MOTION - CHINESE STYLE LANTERNS**

Members considered the following motion submitted by Councillor R. J. Shannon.

"With recent events at the plastic recycling plant in Smethwick, yet again it has been highlighted the risk involved in allowing Chinese style lanterns in our community.

As Bromsgrove is a rural area, we are all only too aware of the dangers these lanterns can cause to crops and animals if ingested.

West Midlands Fire Service has campaigned about the dangers of sky lanterns in the past, and they have now urged community leaders and members of the public to discourage the use of lanterns. This Council should take immediate steps to prohibit the use of Chinese style lanterns on its property, open spaces and parks."

The motion was moved by Councillor R. J. Shannon and seconded by Councillor P. M. McDonald.

During discussion on the motion the proposer and seconder referred to the increased popularity of this style of lantern over recent years and to the dangers they posed to property, wildlife and livestock. The ban on use on Council owned land would emphasise the dangers.

Councillor M. J. A. Webb supported the sentiments contained within the motion whilst recognising that a large number of lanterns would be launched from land other than that in the ownership of the Authority. In order to address

this he requested that the motion be extended to include the sending of a letter to the relevant Government Department, to be signed by the Leaders of all three parties, calling for a wider ban on the launching of such lanterns. This was acceded to by the proposer and seconder.

The altered motion was put to the vote and it was

**RESOLVED:**

- (a) that this Council takes immediate steps to prohibit the use of Chinese style lanterns on its property, open spaces and parks; and
- (b) that a letter be sent to Central Government calling for a ban on the launching of such lanterns and that this be signed by the Leaders of each party.

The meeting closed at 8.28 p.m.

Chairman



This page is intentionally left blank

## Appendix 1

Description	Movements in Reserves £000	Balance at 31 March 2013 £000	Request for budget carry forward £000	Projected balance 31 March 2013 (year end) £000
Support for changes to Benefit Rules	-33	69	41	110
Fire Risk Management System	0	4		4
Elections	0	17		17
Finance System Development	0	10	30	40
Freedom of the District - Mercian	0	5		5
New Burden Temporary Deferment Business Rate	0	3		3
Liveability Reserve	0	16		16
Local Public Service Agreement Reserve	0	2		2
Play Areas - Catshill / Pitches	0	12		12
Christmas Lights - Replacement Fund	0	6		6
Drinks Machines - Members area	0	1		1
Options Appraisal Dolphin Centre	0	0	36	36
Sanders park - Roof/Tree works	0	18	10	28
Olympics - TV screen	-6	0		0
Sports Development Grants	-4	28	30	58
Building Control Partnership Reserve	11	17		17
Local Plans Inquiry	-26	16		16
Town Centre Development	13	51		51
Business Start up grants	0	6		6
Town centre Market Stalls	0	4		4
Housing Initiatives	-24	167		167
Land Charges - transferred to litigation	0	0		0
Emergency Planning - Flood & W/Course mgmt	0	9		9
Youth Provision	0	85		85
Strategy for Increased Employment	0	26		26
Building Control - mobile working	0	0	7	7
Recycling Extension	0	74		74

## Appendix 1

Description	Movements in Reserves £000	Balance at 31 March 2013 £000	Request for budget carry forward £000	Projected balance 31 March 2013 (year end) £000
Replacement Vehicles/Plant	0	289		289
Climate Change - Salix	2	4		4
Route Optimisation	-35	0		0
Specialist Fees for Land Drainage projects	-4	0		0
Civil Parking Enforcement setup costs	-25	49		49
Bowling Green refurbishments	0	2		2
Bin Replacement Scheme	0	12		12
Reg Services - Grant Reserves / Partner % Underspends	2	2		2
Reg Services IT Transformation Reserve	0	45		45
Litigation Reserve (incl Land Charges)	54	230		230
Shared Services	-131	293		293
Equalities	0	1		1
ICT refresh	0	153		153
LNP Frankley	0	0	4	4
Local Strategic Partnership	0	3		3
Health and Wellbeing	0	9		9
National Health Clinical Commissioning Group	-14	43		43
Q-Matic System (Customer Services)	0	10		10
Community Right to Challenge New Burdens	0	13		13
Apprenticeships	0	32		32
Potential Appeals	0	0	150	150
Balance	-220	1,836	308	2,144

Capital Scheme	Additional budget approvals £	Budget Carry Forwards £	Comment
<b>Leisure &amp; Culture</b>			
Barnsley Hall new park '04/05 (LivPshp/BDC)		320,997	The delays in the Barnsley Hall project have led to increased costs because the Council has had to re-tender the contract works as the original process took place in 2009 and the quotations were no longer valid.
Barnsley Hall - Req of land/prov of play area 0506		7,000	Budget to be used for Barnsley Hall project above
Sports Facility- Braces Lane AMG		140,000	Project delayed due to retendering
Play area removals upgrades		9,106	Work has commenced budget required to complete project - orders raised in 13-14.
S106 Harvest/ Heath Close- Play area Enhancements		12,400	Originally expected 20% of the project costs to be incurred during 2012-13 unfortunately work didn't commence until after 31st March therefore remaining budget required in 2013-14. £14,752 was for Battlefield Brook but has now been approved for Barnsley Hall
Crown Close Open Space Enhancements		40,000	Infrastructure Work to take place in Crown Close during 13-14
<b>Planning and Regeneration</b>			
Town Centre Development - Project Management		3,740	Please carry forward to fund project management for 2013/14
Town Centre - Public Realm		19,000	Please carry forward to fund project management for 2013/14

Capital Scheme	Additional budget approvals £	Budget Carry Forwards £	Comment
	62,000		Approve 62k for blue light works as per schedule from planning approval financed by contributions and S106
<b>Community Services</b>			
Discr.HomeRep'rAssist/HsgRenewGrants		37,717	Request carry forward of balance to meet 2013/14 expenditure
Energy Efficiency Home Insulation Project	10,000	17,292	Grant of 40k received from County, request approval of 40k budget in 12/13 with a carry forward of £7,292 plus additional budget of £10K approval requested.
Grants to Princ Pref Partners affordable housing		23,000	Staged payments of grant, the whole 200k has been committed and the remained required to meet the councils obligations
Disabled facilities Grant		185,283	Request Carry forward of £185,283 to bring budget up to £500,000 with DFG grant.
<b>Environmental Services</b>			
N Cemetery -Phase 2 Expansion		79,000	Project delayed due to consultation with local residents regarding the use of both fields and design, money required in 2013-14
Vehicle replacement programme		562,000	Some vehicles were on order at the cross over of the financial year and have since been delivered, the rest of the budget is required for vehicle replacements in line with route optimiastion results

Capital Scheme	Additional budget approvals £	Budget Carry Forwards £	Comment
Cemetery Toilets		-1,563	Budget carry forward was agreed at Council 17th April however a small amount of expenditure was incurred in 2012-13 clawback amount spent and reduce budget
Depot Security		46,343	Work has started on this project, including new windows and fencing the value of the work completed so far is 18.5k, the remaining budget is required to complete the project
Bromsgrove Monument - Armed Forces memorial		20,000	Work has commenced and needs to be complete by 29th June for armed forces day.
CPE (Civil Parking Enforcement)	15,000	4,000	Member approval to recognise the capital element of the introduction of CPE, when original report was approved it was unsure as to the capital / revenue split all financed by an earmarked reserve. CPE is due to go live 30th May approximately 75% of the capital expenditure was incurred during 2012-13, and the remaining 25% balance in April
<b>Business Transformation</b>			
Member ICT facilities RBC/BDC		-1,327	reduce amount already carried forward
XP Sunray Servers		2,702	
Sunray Devices		6,360	
ESX Services		16,063	
<b>Regulatory services</b>			



Capital Scheme	Additional budget approvals £	Budget Carry Forwards £	Comment
BDC share of Regulatory - WETT shared service		32,930	Project has commenced and budget required as BDC's contribution towards the 1m Reg services joint capital scheme
<b>Resources</b>			
Income management PCI compliance		25,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>87,000</b>	<b>1,607,042</b>	

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL****COUNCIL****17<sup>th</sup> JULY 2013****Appendix 1****Outside Bodies Appointed to by Office**

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Representative (s)</b>	<b>Appointments - Councillors</b>
Age Concern	Portfolio Holder with responsibility for Older People	Sherrey
Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)	Leader ( with nominated substitute of the Leader of Redditch Borough Council)	Hollingworth Hartnett as deputy
Bromsgrove Local Strategic Partnership	Leader (with nominated substitute of the Deputy Leader)	Hollingworth Sherrey as substitute
Bromsgrove Youth Homelessness Forum	Portfolio Holder with responsibility for Young People	Sherrey
District Councils Network Assembly	Leader (with nominated substitute of the Deputy Leader)	Hollingworth Sherrey as substitute
West Midlands Employers (previously West Midlands Councils)	Portfolio Holder for Human Resources	Bullivant
PATROL	Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Cultural Services and Environmental Services	Webb
Shared Services Members Board	Leader Deputy Leader	Hollingworth Sherrey
Local Government Association General Assembly	Leader (with nominated substitute of the Deputy Leader)	Hollingworth Sherrey as substitute

# BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

**COUNCIL**

**17<sup>th</sup> JULY 2013**

Worcestershire Customer Strategic Board (formerly the Worcestershire Hub Board)	Leader and Portfolio Holder with responsibility for Customer Service	Hollingworth  Webb
Worcestershire Local Strategic Partnership	Leader (with nominated substitute of the Deputy Leader)	Hollingworth
Worcestershire Partnership – Place Shaping Board	Councillor P Mould, Redditch Borough Council, to represent the three Councils in the north of Worcestershire	Mould, Redditch BC

## Other Bodies

Organisation	Number of Representatives	Term of office	Current representatives	Nominations Councillors
Amphlett Hall Management Committee	4	1 year	Councillors Boswell Griffiths Sherrey Jones	Boswell Griffiths Sherrey Jones
Bromsgrove Arts Centre Trust – charitable company  (terms of office were staggered when the Trust was set up. Future terms of office to be 4 years)	5  2 terms of office end this year	  4 yrs 4 yrs	Councillors  Brogan Griffiths	  Brogan Griffiths
Bromsgrove Citizens' Advice Bureau	2	1 year	Councillors Sherrey Ruck	Sherrey Ruck

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL**

**17<sup>th</sup> JULY 2013**

Bromsgrove Community Engagement Group	4	1 year	Councillors Jones Spencer Tidmarsh Harrison	R Shannon (Lab) Spencer Tidmarsh Harrison (Con)
Bromsgrove Sporting Board (observers only)	2	1 year	Councillors Lammas Webb	Lammas Whittaker
Midlands Joint Advisory Council for Environmental Protection (moved from appointments by office above)	2	1 year	Member Champions for the Environment and Climate Change	Colella (Con) S Shannon (Lab)
Shared Services Members Board (2 representatives also by office)	2 and a substitute	1 year	Councillors Colella Webb  Bullivant (substitute)	Bullivant Webb  Brogan (substitute)
Worcestershire County Council Health O&S Cttee  Rep must be a member of O&S Board	1	1 year	Councillor Cooper	Cooper
Worcestershire County Council Corporate Parenting Steering Group	1	1 year	Councillor Griffiths	Sherrey
Worcestershire County Council Highways (Bromsgrove) Partnership Forum	2	1 year	Councillors Dent Lewis	Dent Lewis

**BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL**

**17<sup>th</sup> JULY 2013**

Worcestershire Shared Services Joint Committee	2  To include relevant Portfolio holder and one other member of the controlling group and one substitute	1 year	Councillors Taylor Bullivant  Sherrey (named substitute)	Taylor Bullivant  Sherrey (substitute)
--	--	--------	---	--