



Rutland County Council

Catmose Oakham Rutland LE15 6HP.
Telephone 01572 722577 Facsimile 01572 75307 DX28340 Oakham

Minutes of the **MEETING of the GROWTH, INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES SCRUTINY PANEL** held in the Council Chamber, Catmose, Oakham on Thursday, 28th March, 2019 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Mr B Callaghan (Chair)
Mr E Baines
Mr J Dale
Mrs J Fox
Mr A Mann

OFFICERS

PRESENT: Mr R Harbour Deputy Director for Places
Mr D Pye Senior Transport Manager
Mr K Silcock Governance Officer

IN

ATTENDANCE: Mr G Brown Deputy Leader and Portfolio Holder for Planning, Environment, Property and Finance.
Mr O Hemsley Leader and Portfolio Holder for Rutland One Public Estate & Growth, Tourism & Economic Development, Resources (not including Finance)

764 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Mr Bird, and Mr Cross.

765 RECORD OF MEETING

The minutes of the Growth, Infrastructure and Resources Scrutiny Panel held on 14 February 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

766 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest had been received.

767 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS

No petitions, deputations or questions had been received.

768 QUESTIONS WITH NOTICE FROM MEMBERS

No questions with notice had been received from Members.

769 NOTICES OF MOTION FROM MEMBERS

No notices of motion had been received from Members.

770 CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE PANEL FOR A DECISION IN RELATION TO CALL IN OF A DECISION

No matter had been referred to the Panel for a decision in relation to a call-in of a decision in accordance with Procedure Rule 206.

771 INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN

Mr Rob Harbour, Deputy Director for Places, provided the Panel with a verbal update.

The adopted Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) included a Regulation 123 list, which identified the infrastructure requirements which would be funded by CIL payments in Rutland.

The Regulation 123 list was currently described as generalised, it identified the potential infrastructure funding gap that existed at the time of preparation in 2015/16. The infrastructure need was identified to support development proposed by the Core Strategy and Site Allocation and Policies Development Plan Document (DPD).

The review of the Rutland Local Plan would take the plan up to 2036. An integral part of the plan was to identify where new development would take place in that timeframe. The infrastructure needed to support the development would therefore be different to what was agreed in 2016 when the CIL was adopted. The Regulation 123 list would need to be reviewed following the adoption of the Local Plan to identify infrastructure.

As part of preparing the new Rutland Local Plan, an Infrastructure Delivery Plan had been commissioned looking at the existing provision across the county. It would also look at planned investments and where additional capacity could be provided, and looked at the impact of projected growth within the local plan and future demands and gaps in infrastructure provision through additional development, alongside where indicative costs towards meeting that infrastructure were required.

The IDP would set out potential infrastructure to support growth within the county. However, the funding was limited despite funding from CIL or Section 106, there would always be a funding gap which was common throughout the country.

A draft IDP was currently being produced, but this would need to be revised in order to accompany the next Local Plan, and made sure the two were synced.

The proposed next steps were to prioritise the infrastructure need identified to ensure provision of those elements which were considered essential. A stakeholder workshop would be held to help inform on the prioritisation process and ensure the IDP took a strategic approach. The workshop would include internal and external stakeholders.

The Regulation 123 list would be reviewed to reflect need and prioritisation process, and to provide greater clarity about the schemes and projects which could be funded through CIL payments.

The inclusion of schemes within the Regulation 123 list did not commit the Council to fund all which were on the list, however it did set out a transparent way to identify what the Council would consider.

The review of the Regulation 123 list would go through a public consultation and eventually be recommended for approval by Council.

There was a proposal from Government to remove the requirement for a Regulation 123 list and instead recommend the use of an “Infrastructure Funding Statement” that sets out infrastructure requirements. However this would require a change of legislation if it were to pass.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- i. Mr Harbour stated there was benefit to having an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Without both in place it would be difficult for the Council to properly negotiate funding with developers.
- ii. Money collected from CIL should be spent strategically, therefore there was clear benefit with setting out a strategic approach and being transparent with an Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
- iii. When Parish Councils received CIL money they could only spend on capital items and would receive more if they had a Neighbourhood Plan.
- iv. Mr Brown suggested that an item regarding spending CIL money should go to the Parish Council Forum.
- v. RCC was currently the collecting authority for CIL money and the money is paid out at the discretion of the Council to services such as the NHS and blue light services when a service comes to us with a need and is on the Regulation 123 list.

772 AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Mr Rob Harbour, Deputy Director for Places, provided the Panel with a verbal update.

House prices in Rutland had increased significantly over time to the point of Rutland being ranked 13th most expensive county in England and Wales, with average house prices at £317k, higher than the national average. Rutland had higher housing prices than those of neighbouring areas, which created a significant problem with population in particular with young people. Many young people found it difficult to access affordable homes due to a disparity of local wages and rising house prices, leading them to find housing in other counties.

There was also a lack of supply across the county of smaller homes with one, two, or three bedrooms, and these were the houses that sit at the more affordable market.

There were also issues with housing for the ageing population with people living longer and looking to move to Rutland to retire. Rutland currently did not have enough smaller accessible homes for the elderly with good mobility access, and they would stay in oversized homes rather than downsizing. This would have a knock on impact

to the health service if they could not manage their needs in an oversized house as they would be moved into health care for what could be a long period of time, meaning less beds in hospitals. If their homes were more suited to their needs it would be a lot easier for them and the hospitals.

It was important for Rutland to have a choice for people across the housing market, providing options such as starter homes, and shared ownership to make homes more affordable as well as renting. Renting can range from open market rental through to affordable rent via a number of products such as intermediate rent, affordable rent, and social rent.

Government had recently made changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). Previously it was possible for developers to overpay for land and come back to local authorities planning teams claiming they were unable to build the amount of affordable houses asked for as the developers could not afford to build them. The changes made to the NPPF made it more difficult for developers to renegotiate affordable housing numbers.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- i. The Council monitored the sale of shared ownership homes. Shared ownership homes were first made available to those within the County, and if they were not sold, the area the house was available to be expanded until there was an occupant. Mr Brown suggested that it could be worthwhile to provide training to Members regarding the understanding about arrangements for social housing and shared ownership.
- ii. Affordable housing was currently exempt from CIL payments from developers.
- iii. The Council had working relationships with local providers for social housing such as the Longhouse Group, Spire Homes, and the Waterloo Housing.
- iv. The Council was currently reviewing Section 106 agreements with the housing providers to make sure it was fit for purpose, up to date and that the wording was clear.

773 SAFEGUARDING AGAINST TRAFFIC

Mr Dave Pye, Senior Transport Manager, provided a presentation to the Panel, a copy of which is appended to the minutes.

During discussion the following points were noted:

- i. Login details for the Accident Statistics Portal would be distributed to Councillors and Parishes.
- ii. No-verge parking rules would be brought into effect around the Rutland Water area.
- iii. It was welcomed that the new system for safeguarding against traffic was more proactive and strategic than reactive.

774 REVIEW OF FORWARD PLAN AND ANNUAL WORK PLAN 2018-19

Mr Brown gave an overview of the Forward Plan, giving detail regarding the items being taken at Cabinet on 16 April 2019.

775 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

No other urgent business was received.

776 DATE AND PREVIEW OF NEXT MEETING

The date of the next meeting will be advised following Annual Council on 13 May 2019.

---oOo---

Chairman closed the meeting at 8.45 pm.

---oOo---