

Committee Agenda



**Epping Forest
District Council**

Council Housebuilding Cabinet Committee Thursday, 30th August, 2018

You are invited to attend the next meeting of **Council Housebuilding Cabinet Committee**, which will be held at:

**Council Chamber, Civic Offices, High Street, Epping
on Thursday, 30th August, 2018
at 7.00 pm .**

**Derek Macnab
Acting Chief Executive**

**Democratic Services
Officer**

Jackie Leither Tel: 01992 564756
Email: democraticservices@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Members:

Councillors S Stavrou (Chairman), S Kane, G Mohindra, J Philip and N Avey

WEBCASTING/FILMING NOTICE

Please note: this meeting may be filmed for live or subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site - at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed. The meeting may also be otherwise filmed by third parties with the Chairman's permission.

You should be aware that the Council is a Data Controller under the Data Protection Act. Data collected during this webcast will be retained in accordance with the Council's published policy.

Therefore by entering the Chamber and using the lower public seating area, you are consenting to being filmed and to the possible use of those images and sound recordings for web casting and/or training purposes. If members of the public do not wish to have their image captured they should sit in the upper council chamber public gallery area or otherwise indicate to the Chairman before the start of the meeting.

If you have any queries regarding this, please contact the Public Relations Manager on 01992 564039.

1. WEBCASTING INTRODUCTION

(a) This meeting is to be webcast;

(b) the Chairman will read the following announcement:

“I would like to remind everyone present that this meeting will be broadcast live to the Internet and will be capable of subsequent repeated viewing, with copies of the recording being made available for those that request it.

By being present at this meeting, it is likely that the recording cameras will capture your image and this will result in your image becoming part of the broadcast.

You should be aware that this may infringe your human and data protection rights. If you have any concerns then please speak to the Webcasting Officer.

Please could I also remind Members to activate their microphones before speaking.”

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

3. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

(Assistant Director of Governance) To report the appointment of any substitute members for the meeting.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(Assistant Director of Governance) To declare interests in any item on the agenda.

5. MINUTES (Pages 5 - 10)

To confirm the minutes of the last meeting of the Cabinet Committee held on 05 April 2018.

6. BIDS TO MHCLG FOR ADDITIONAL HRA BORROWING (Pages 11 - 24)

(Director of Communities) To consider the attached report, CHB-001-2018/19.

7. APPROPRIATION OF LAND AT VARIOUS SITES (Pages 25 - 34)

(Director of Communities) To consider the attached report, CHB-002-2018/19.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, together with paragraphs 6 and 25 of the Council Procedure Rules contained in the Constitution require that the permission of the Chairman be obtained, after prior notice to the Chief Executive, before urgent business not specified in the agenda (including a supplementary agenda of which the statutory period of notice has been given) may be transacted.

In accordance with Operational Standing Order 6 (non-executive bodies), any item raised by a non-member shall require the support of a member of the Committee concerned and the Chairman of that Committee. Two weeks' notice of non-urgent

items is required.

9. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

Exclusion: To consider whether, under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press should be excluded from the meeting for the items of business set out below on grounds that they will involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the following paragraph(s) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act (as amended) or are confidential under Section 100(A)(2):

Agenda Item No	Subject	Exempt Information Paragraph Number
Nil	Nil	Nil

The Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, which came into effect on 1 March 2006, requires the Council to consider whether maintaining the exemption listed above outweighs the potential public interest in disclosing the information. Any member who considers that this test should be applied to any currently exempted matter on this agenda should contact the proper officer at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

Background Papers: Article 17 - Access to Information, Procedure Rules of the Constitution define background papers as being documents relating to the subject matter of the report which in the Proper Officer's opinion:

- (a) disclose any facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the report is based; and
- (b) have been relied on to a material extent in preparing the report and does not include published works or those which disclose exempt or confidential information and in respect of executive reports, the advice of any political advisor.

The Council will make available for public inspection for four years after the date of the meeting one copy of each of the documents on the list of background papers.

This page is intentionally left blank

EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Committee: Council Housebuilding Cabinet **Date:** Thursday, 5 April 2018
Committee

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, **Time:** 7.00 - 9.00 pm
High Street, Epping

Members Present: S Stavrou (Chairman), S Kane, G Mohindra, J Philip and C Whitbread

Other Councillors: R Bassett, D Dorrell, S Heap, R Morgan, M Sartin, J M Whitehouse and D Wixley

Apologies: W Breare-Hall

Officers Present: P Pledger (Assistant Director (Housing Property)), M Rudgyard, J Leither (Democratic Services Officer), H Pradun (Senior Communities Officer (Quality and Performance)) and J Whittaker (Finance Officer)

28. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

The Cabinet Committee noted that Councillor C Whitbread would substitute for Councillor G Mohindra at this meeting.

29. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest pursuant to the Council's Code of Member Conduct.

30. MINUTES

That the minutes of the meeting held on 29 January 2018 be taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

31. APPOINTMENT OF FRAMEWORK CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS FOR THE FUTURE DELIVERY OF THE COUNCIL HOUSE-BUILDING PROGRAMME

The Assistant Director (Housing Property & Development) presented a report to the Cabinet Committee. He advised that at its meeting in January 2018, the Cabinet Committee were advised that East Thames had exercised their right to end their role as Development Agents and as a result, the Council considered a report on the way forward in terms of delivering future phases of the Council's Housebuilding programme.

The report explained how the Council had reviewed its approach based on its experiences over the last 4-years, and how it would deliver a more efficient service and de-risk some of the aspects of the programme that have so far resulted in additional costs across schemes that were on site. This included dealing with ground contamination, drainage, foundations and advancing the designs to a more detailed stage prior to appointing the Contractor. The Cabinet Committee were advised that

this would require an EU procurement exercise in order to make the necessary appointments.

The Council had appointed Cameron Consulting, a specialist procurement consultant to undertake the EU Procurement exercise. Notices were placed in the European Union Journal for a Multi-Disciplinary Design Team (MDDT), Employers Agents and Contractors. Expressions of interest were received and evaluated based on quality, price and interview to explore the approach they would take to engage and deliver as part of a team on behalf of the Council.

The Council sought two separate services contracts, MDDT and Employers Agent and Cost Consultants (EA). There were a combined number of 143 expressions of interest for each of the MDDT and EA roles, which resulted in just three formal bids for the MDDT Consultant and five bids for the EA Consultant. The tenders were evaluated by Cameron Consulting Limited with Council Officers undertaking a final moderation exercise.

The tenders were based on quality, price and interview using a weighting of 60:30:10 for the MDDT and 50:40:10 for the EA. The tables below summarise the scores for each of the bidders:

Final Summary – Lot 1 Multi-Disciplinary Design Team

Tenderer	Rewighted Quality (Desktop)	Rewighted Quality (Presentation)	Cost	TOTAL
Available Score	50.00%	10.00%	40.00%	100.00%
ECD Architects Ltd	50.00%	10.00%	33.78%	93.78%
Pellings LLP	40.63%	6.50%	40.00%	87.13%
Duggan Morris Architects	33.24%	0.00%	0.00%	33.24%

Final Summary – Lot 2 Employer's Agent/ Cost Consultant

Tenderer	Rewighted Quality (Desktop)	Rewighted Quality (Presentation)	Cost	TOTAL
Available Score	50.00%	10.00%	40.00%	100.00%
Airey Miller Limited	44.87%	10.00%	39.69%	94.56%
Macegreen Consulting Limited	50.00%	5.41%	35.18%	90.59%
Frankham	43.27%	7.03%	37.11%	87.41%
Equals Consulting	41.99%	8.11%	37.28%	87.38%
PDSI Construction Consultants (Initiate Consulting)	36.22%	0.00%	0.00%	36.22%

Based on the results of the tender exercise, it was therefore recommended that ECD Architects Limited be appointed as the MDDT team and Airey Miller Limited be appointed as the EA.

Decision:

(1) That, following an open procedure EU Procurement Exercise, the Consultants listed below be appointed, based on a Quality/Price/Interview (50/40/10) evaluation methodology, to assist the Council with the future delivery of the Council House-building programme:

- a. ECD Architects Ltd be appointed based on an overall weighted score of 93.78% as the Architects and Multi-disciplinary Design Team (MDDT); and
- b. Airey Millar Ltd be appointed based on an overall weighted score of 94.56% as the Employers Agents.

(2) That, following an open procedure EU Procurement Exercise, the list of Framework of Contractors below be agreed, based on the first stage of a 2-stage tender process using a Quality/Stage one Price/Interview (60/30/10) evaluation methodology, from which second stage tenders will later be sought to construct the future delivery of the Council House-building programme:

- a. Neilcott Construction Ltd, based on an overall weighted score of 96.59%;
- b. Roof Ltd, based on an overall weighted score of 85.59%;
- c. TSG Building Services Ltd, based on an overall weighted score of 74.35%; and
- d. Indecon Building Ltd, based on an overall weighted score of 65.91%.

Reasons for Decision:

The Council's procurement rules require a Cabinet decision to award any contract over £1m. However, the Cabinet Committee have been delegated authority by the Cabinet to approve any tenders relating to the Council House-building Programme.

By appointing these Consultants and Contractors it will lead to the formation of a multi-disciplinary design and build team that will work alongside the Council's Development Team that will take over from the previous approach that was led by East Thames as Development Agents.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

To employ the relevant resources in-house to deliver the programme directly.

32. CHB-008 SITES FOR RESUBMISSION TO PLANNING APRIL 2018 (2)

The Assistant Director (Housing Property & Development) presented a report to the Cabinet Committee. He advised that 12 sites had either been refused planning permission or withdrawn from the Council's Housebuilding programme. These sites were now brought back to this meeting to decide on the future outcomes.

Where any of the Council's development sites were identified for Council house-building and was not developable for any of the reasons below, then the Cabinet Committee were to decide on each site's future use:

- (1) They do not receive planning permission;
- (2) They are not financially viable for the Council to develop based on a development appraisal; or
- (3) The Cabinet Committee considers for whatever reason, the site should not be developed for Council housing

The options already agreed by the Cabinet Committee were as follows:

- (a) To sell the site for social housing to a Housing Association in return for a capital receipt to fund future Council house-building and to gain nomination rights for Council housing applicants;
- (b) To sell the site for private development, either for residential or other use in return for a capital receipt to fund future Council house-building;
- (c) To divide up the site and sell the land to local residents to extend their private gardens in return for a capital receipt to fund future Council house-building;
- (d) To demolish the garages, re-surface and mark out the land and to leave the site as open car parking for local residents;
- (e) To sell the site to a Town or Parish Council for their own purposes (eg. public amenity space) in return for a capital receipt to fund future Council house-building; or
- (f) To continue to market and rent the garages to local residents

A further option now available to the Cabinet Committee was to submit a new planning application for each of the sites which were either withdrawn or refused by the relevant Area Planning Committee, since the Council's Constitution has recently been amended allowing any future planning applications that are refused permission at the relevant Area Planning Committee to be referred to District Development Management Committee (DDMC) as the Council's appeal mechanism.

Each of the sites at Hillyfields, Pyrles Lane (Sites A and B) in Loughton; Hornbeam Close (Site A) in Buckhurst Court; Colvers in Matching Green; Gant Court, Mallion Court and St Thomas's Close in Waltham Abbey; Palmers Grove and Pound Close in Nazeing; Hansells Mead/Parkfields in Roydon and Springfields in Epping had been identified as being undevelopable, either because they did not, or would not likely to receive planning permission.

The Assistant Director advised that there were concerns with the paid for parking garage site at Springfield (B) as residents were not keen in taking up the spaces due to the cost involved. The first year cost was £500 per space and £250 every subsequent year. The Council would only be recouping their costs in preparing the sites for paid resident parking and the installation of posts so that each space allocated to a resident would not be able to be used by anyone else.

Members of the Cabinet Committee agreed that local residents should be given one last opportunity to take up the available parking, the site should be remarketed so that the nature of the charges were clear and transparent, and if there was no take up that the site be redesigned and submitted for planning approval.

Decision:

- (1) That the garage sites, either previously withdrawn or refused planning permission be redesigned and resubmitted for planning approval, at the following locations:
 - a. Garage site to the rear of 80-98 and 100-112 Hillyfields, Loughton – development of 2no. 2 bed-houses.
Agreed to be redesigned and resubmitted for planning approval. At the Pre-app stage, should it not be possible to obtain the positive support of the Planning Officer, then the site be offered for paid parking and residents' consulted; if there is insufficient interest for paid parking from residents,

then the site is be sold on the open market and the proceeds be recycled back into the Council House-building Programme.

- b. Garage site to the rear of 109 to 127 Pyrles Lane (Site A), Loughton – development of 2no. 2 bed-houses.
Agreed to be redesigned and resubmitted for planning approval. At the Pre-app stage, should it not be possible to obtain the positive support of the Planning Officer, then the site be offered for paid parking and residents' consulted; if there is insufficient interest for paid parking from residents, then the site is be sold on the open market and the proceeds be recycled back into the Council House-building Programme.
- c. Garage site to rear of 100 to 108 Pyrles Lane (Site B), Loughton – development of 3no. 3 bed-houses.
Agreed to be redesigned and resubmitted for planning approval. At the Pre-app stage, should it not be possible to obtain the positive support of the Planning Officer, then the site be offered for paid parking and residents' consulted; if there is insufficient interest for paid parking from residents, then the site is be offered for sale to the developer of the Pyrles Lane Nursery site in the first instance, or be sold on the open market and the proceeds be recycled back into the Council House-building Programme.
- d. Garage site at Hornbeam Close (Site A), Buckhurst Hill (adjacent to 6 Cascade Close) – development of 2no. 2 bed-houses.
Agreed that this site would be developed for paid for parking.
- e. Garage site adjacent to 25 Colvers, Matching Green – development of 3no. 2-bed houses.
Agreed to be redesigned and resubmitted for planning approval. At the Pre-app stage, should it not be possible to obtain the positive support of the Planning Officer, then the site be offered for paid parking and residents' consulted; if there is insufficient interest for paid parking from residents, then the site is be sold on the open market and the proceeds be recycled back into the Council House-building Programme.
- f. Garage site at Gant Court, Waltham Abbey – development of 3no. 2-bed houses.
Agreed that this site would be developed for paid for parking.
- g. Garage site at Mallion Court, Waltham Abbey – development of 4no. 2-bed houses.
Agreed but to be held for 12 months in order for the new Leisure Centre to open and settle down.
- h. Garage site adjacent to 44 Palmers Grove, Nazeing – development of 3no. 3-bed houses and 1no. 2-bed house.
Agreed that this site would be developed for paid for parking.
- i. Garage site adjacent to 52 Hansells Mead and 2 Parkfields, Roydon – development of 2no. 3-bed houses.
Agreed to be redesigned and resubmitted for planning approval. At the Pre-app stage, should it not be possible to obtain the positive support of the Planning Officer, then the site be offered for paid parking and residents' consulted; if there is insufficient interest for paid parking from residents, then the site is be sold on the open market and the proceeds be recycled back into the Council House-building Programme.

- j. Garage site adjacent to 14A Pound Close Nazeing – development of 2no. 3-bed houses and 2no. 2-bed houses.
Agreed to be redesigned and resubmitted for planning approval. At the Pre-app stage, should it not be possible to obtain the positive support of the Planning Officer, then the site be offered for paid parking and residents' consulted; if there is insufficient interest for paid parking from residents, then the site is be sold on the open market and the proceeds be recycled back into the Council House-building Programme.
- k. Garage site at St Thomas's Close, Waltham Abbey – development of 2no. 3-bed houses and 1no. 2-bed house.
Agreed to be redesigned and resubmitted for planning approval. At the Pre-app stage, should it not be possible to obtain the positive support of the Planning Officer, then the site be offered for paid parking and residents' consulted; if there is insufficient interest for paid parking from residents, then the site is be sold on the open market and the proceeds be recycled back into the Council House-building Programme.
- l. Garage site adjacent to 36 Springfield (Site B), Epping – development of 2no. 1-bed bungalows.
Agreed to be redesigned and resubmitted for planning approval. At the Pre-app stage, should it not be possible to obtain the positive support of the Planning Officer, then the site be offered for paid parking and residents' consulted; if there is insufficient interest for paid parking from residents, then the site is be sold on the open market and the proceeds be recycled back into the Council House-building Programme.

Reasons for Decision:

The Cabinet Committee is required to decide on the future use of garage sites that have previously been refused planning permission but are to be re-submitted with the reasons for planning refusal being taken into account in the new application in line with the Council's Policy.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

To adopt any other of the options within the existing Policy on the future use of undevelopable sites, as set out in the body of the report.

33. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Cabinet Committee noted that there was no other urgent business for consideration.

34. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

The Cabinet Committee noted that there were no items of business on the agenda that necessitated the exclusion of the public and press from the meeting.

CHAIRMAN

Report to the Council Housebuilding Cabinet Committee



**Epping Forest
District Council**

Report reference: CHB-001-2018/19
Date of meeting: 30-August-2018

Portfolio: Housing – Cllr S. Stavrou

Subject: Bids to MHCLG for additional HRA borrowing

Responsible Officer: Alan Hall – Director of Communities (01992 564004)

Democratic Services: Jackie Leither (01992 564756)

Recommendations:

That the following recommendations be made to the Cabinet:

- (1) That, subject to any minor amendments approved informally with the Housing Portfolio Holder (including bid amounts and borrowing profiles), the Director of Communities be authorised to submit four separate bids to Homes England for additional Housing Revenue Account (HRA) borrowing approvals, for four separate “schemes” totalling £8.052million, with the borrowing profiles set out in the report;**
- (2) That the Council’s Chief Financial Officer reports to a future meeting of the Finance and Performance Cabinet Committee on the most appropriate way to arrange the additional HRA borrowing when required; and**
- (3) That the Cabinet notes that, due to the deadline for bids being 7th September 2018, the Chairman of Council has been requested to determine that the call-in provisions of Rule 21 of the Overview and Scrutiny Rules, contained within the Council’s Constitution, can be disregarded for this decision – the Chairman’s decision will be reported orally.**

Executive Summary:

The Council is unable to borrow money for Housing Revenue Account (HRA) purposes above the amount for which HRA borrowing approval(s) have been granted by the Government (MHCLG).

In 2012, the Council borrowed £185.456million from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLb) to fund the levy that had to be paid to the Government at that time in order to enable all stock-retained councils, and councils with arms-length management organisations (ALMOs), to leave the discredited former HRA Subsidy System. As a result of this transaction, the Council is left with HRA Borrowing Headroom of £31.065million, set by the Government, which is the amount of additional borrowing that the Council can undertake for HRA purposes.

This HRA Borrowing Headroom is sufficient to cover the additional borrowing required by the Council to fund its current Housebuilding Programme, up to and including Phases 4-6

and the purchase of the affordable rented homes to be built by a private developer at the Pyrles Lane Nursery Site, Loughton.

However, the Council is one of a number of councils invited to bid, by 7th September 2018, for additional HRA borrowing approvals from the MHCLG. If the Council submits one or more bids for additional borrowing approvals, and they are successful, these additional approvals could be utilised to cover the borrowing requirements for Phases 4-6 and Pyrles Lane, enabling the Council's existing HRA Borrowing Headroom of £31.065million to be maintained. This would then provide scope to enable the Council to undertake further borrowing in the future if it wanted - to either extend the Housebuilding Programme or to fund expenditure for other HRA purposes.

The Council's HRA Business Planning Consultant has worked with senior housing and finance officers to assess the additional borrowing requirement to fund the remainder of the Council's existing Housebuilding Programme, bearing in mind that 30% of the costs will be funded from One-for-One Replacement RTB Receipts ("141 Receipts").

As a result, it is proposed that four bids covering the three Broad Market Rental Areas (BRMAs) in the District and the development of the Pyrles Lane Nursery site, Loughton, totalling additional borrowing approvals for £8.052million, be submitted to Homes England (which is acting on behalf of the MHCLG), in accordance with the bidding strategy set out in the main report.

Reasons for Proposed Decision:

The Council would benefit from additional HRA borrowing approvals to cover additional borrowing in the future if the Council needed, which could be used to either fund an extension to its current Housebuilding Programme or to fund expenditure on other HRA purposes.

Other Options for Action:

The main alternative options appear to be:

(1) Not to bid – but this would mean that this current opportunity to obtain additional HRA borrowing approvals to cover any additional borrowing required in the future, to fund either an extension of the current Housebuilding Programme or expenditure on other HRA purposes, would be lost – and there are no indications of any further opportunities arising in the foreseeable future.

(2) To submit a different number of bids, and/or for different amount(s) of additional HRA borrowing approvals – although the Director of Communities is of the view that the officers' recommended bid proposal is appropriate under all the circumstances.

Introduction

1. The Committee will be aware that, in April 2012, in order to pay the required levy of £185.456million to the Government - as its contribution to enable all stock-retained councils and councils with arms-length management organisations (ALMOs) to exit the discredited former Housing Subsidy Scheme - the Council took out a number of loans from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLb).

2. The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital Financing Requirement (CFR) at the time became £154.391million, due to the fact that it previously lent capital resources to

the General Fund to finance General Fund capital expenditure – meaning that the HRA still has a Borrowing Headroom of £31.065million available.

3. The HRA Borrowing Headroom is the amount of additional borrowing that the Council is authorised by the Government to undertake for HRA purposes if it wishes. This could be used to fund additional council housebuilding, or expenditure for any other housing purposes (e.g. investment in the existing housing stock).

4. The Council's HRA Borrowing Headroom is sufficient to cover the additional borrowing required by the Council to fund its current Housebuilding Programme, up to and including Phases 4-6 and the purchase of the affordable rented homes to be built by a private developer at the Pyrles Lane Nursery Site, Loughton.

MHCLG invitation to bid for additional HRA borrowing approvals

5. The Government (the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government – MHCLG) has recently issued a Prospectus to all stock-retained councils (such as this Council), and councils with arms-length management companies (ALMOs), setting out a criteria for local authorities to bid for additional HRA borrowing approvals over the next three years, from a total amount of £1billion of borrowing approvals, in order to increase their council housebuilding programmes.

6. The £1bn additional borrowing headroom will be apportioned between London boroughs and local authorities across the rest of the country on a 50/50 basis. Outside of London, only those councils determined as being "in areas of high affordability pressures" are able to bid to use the additional £500million of borrowing approvals to build new rented housing. These areas of high affordability pressures have been defined by the MHCLG as those where there is a difference of more than £50 per week between the average social rent and average private rent in their area. A list of 162 local authorities defined as being in areas of high affordability pressures are listed, which includes Epping Forest. Homes England (previously known as the Homes and Communities Agency – HCA) has been asked to oversee the bidding process on behalf of the MHCLG.

7. The deadline for submitting bids is 7 September 2018 and the Director of Communities has been working with colleagues in both the Housing and Finance Services, as well as with the Council's HRA Business Planning Consultant, Simon Smith from SD Smith Consultancy, to assess whether or not a recommendation should be made to members to submit a bid and, if so, for how much additional borrowing approval(s). Following this assessment, it is the view of officers that it would be appropriate to submit four separate bids, hence the reason for this report.

8. It is a requirement of the bidding process that on-line confirmation is provided to Homes England that the Council's Cabinet supports the bid, at least in principle. Since the Cabinet Committee has oversight of the Council Housebuilding Programme, it is being asked to give detailed consideration to the proposal and to recommend to the next Cabinet meeting the submission of bids. It will also enable all the required information for the bids to be input between the Cabinet Committee and Cabinet meetings.

9. The Prospectus makes it clear that bids will be assessed by reference to, and that councils will need to demonstrate, the following 3 key elements:

- **Value for money** - based on unit scheme costs and maximising the number of homes delivered, for example by utilising their own land or offering cross-subsidy where possible.

- **Deliverability** - local authorities must demonstrate that they are ready to start building in relevant years and have the capability and a track record of delivery to time and budget
- **Affordability** - bids will be ranked according to the areas of the highest affordability

10. Councils must also set out in any bid their existing HRA Borrowing Headroom and the extent to which such Headroom is committed for other schemes in their 30-year HRA business plans. In assessing deliverability, factors taken into account will include:

- The stage of planning achieved;
- The status of land ownership;
- Forecast delivery in terms of numbers of units and draw-down of borrowing approval; and
- The council's track record of housing delivery

11. Providing that bids are assessed as demonstrating value for money and deliverability, they will then be ranked according to those local authority areas where there are judged to be the highest affordability pressures - with local authorities with the highest affordability pressures having priority in the allocation of additional borrowing headroom.

Funding the currently-agreed Council Housebuilding Programme

12. In March 2017, the Council's Finance and Performance Management Cabinet Committee, and subsequently the Cabinet, considered Stage 1 of the Council's HRA Financial Options Review Report commissioned by the Director of Communities and produced by Simon Smith. The purpose of the Options Review was to consider whether or not the Council should continue with its Council Housebuilding Programme and to what standard the Council's existing housing stock should be maintained.

13. After consideration of the Review Report, and on the recommendation of the Finance & Performance Cabinet Committee, the Cabinet agreed that:

- The Council Housebuilding Programme should be continued up to at least Phase 6 (i.e. to continue with Phases 4-6) of the Programme;
- The maintenance of the Council's existing housing stock should revert from the Council's own Modern Homes Standard back to the Government's Decent Home Standard; and
- The Director of Resources should report to a future meeting of the Committee on the most appropriate way to arrange the required additional Housing Revenue Account borrowing;

14. Subsequently, the Cabinet agreed that the affordable rented homes to be built by the Council's selected developer on the site of the former Pyrles Lane Nursery, Loughton should be included within the Council Housebuilding Programme and purchased by the Council at pre-specified prices.

15. Based on the estimated costs of the Council Housebuilding Programme at that time, and the estimated savings though reverting to the Decent Homes Standard, the Options Review identified that, although additional HRA borrowing would be required, it could easily be covered by the Council's current HRA Borrowing Headroom.

16. Since that time, a number of changes have occurred that affect the Council's likely borrowing requirements, including:

- Actual RTB sales (and therefore 141 Receipts) have been different from assumed;
- Interest rates have increased;
- Financial contributions received for the provision of affordable housing from Section 106 planning agreements have increased;
- Assessments of works costs and cash flows for the developments on-site and the proposed developments have been able to be firmed-up more, as construction works have progressed; and
- Purchases prices for the affordable homes at Pyrles Lane have been finalised.

17. Simon Smith has therefore undertaken an updated assessment of the Council's borrowing requirements. This has identified the following for the purposes of assessing the level of Bid to be made to Homes England:

(a) If all the existing HRA resources (£14.5million) currently identified as being available within the HRA Financial Plan to re-pay the £31.8million loan that matures in 2021/22 are utilised for this purpose, £17.3million would need to be borrowed to repay the balance of the loan. In order to complete the Housebuilding Programme, and assuming 30% of the Housebuilding Programme costs are funded by 141 Receipts, only an additional £1.352million would need to be borrowed – this can be considered as the "Minimum Borrowing Scenario".

(b) Ignoring the repayment requirements for the existing £31.8million loan, if no existing available HRA resources are utilised to fund the Housebuilding Programme, and 30% of the costs of completing the Housebuilding Programme are funded by 141 Receipts, the Council would need to borrow £15.852million to fund the Programme – this can be considered as the "Maximum Borrowing Scenario".

(c) If the £7.8million of surpluses available within the HRA are used to fund the Housebuilding Programme, the current balance on the Council's HRA Self-Financing Reserve could be maintained at its current level. In this case, in addition to the planned borrowing requirement to pay off the existing loan of £31.8million, an additional £8.052million would need to be borrowed for the Housebuilding Programme – this can be considered as the "Mid Borrowing Scenario"

18. Although the Council already has sufficient HRA Borrowing Headroom to cover the required additional borrowing, the invitation from the Government to submit bids for additional borrowing approvals provides a unique opportunity to cover this additional borrowing requirement with additional borrowing approvals – thereby enabling the Council to increase its current HRA Borrowing Headroom. This could then be used to enable the Council to undertake further borrowing in the future if it wanted - to either extend the Housebuilding Programme or to fund expenditure on other HRA purposes (e.g. investment in its housing stock).

19. There are a number of ways that this additional borrowing could be undertaken, which would be based on the advice of the Council's treasury advisers when required.

Phases 4-6 and the Pyrles Lane development

20. The development sites and property types currently comprising Phases 4-6 are provided at the Appendix to this report.

21. The land for the Council's former nursery at Pyrles Lane is currently being marketed, with the tenders received due to be reported to Cabinet in the near future. Tenderers have been invited to provide two prices for the purchase of the land:

- One price based on 100% of the affordable housing being provided as affordable rented housing purchased by the Council; and
- Another price based on 75% of the affordable housing being provided as affordable rented housing purchased by the Council, and 25% to be provided as shared ownership, to be purchased by one of the Council's Preferred Housing Association Partners

22. The property and tenure mix for Pyrles Lane is not yet known, since it will be determined by the successful tenderer who purchases the site from the Council. Although it is likely to be different from the property mix for which Outline Planning Consent has been obtained, for the purposes of this report, Simon Smith's latest assessment, and the proposed bid, the most prudent assessment is to use the affordable housing mix for which Outline Planning Consent has been obtained, and to assume that all the affordable housing will be provided as affordable rented housing. This property mix is also provided in the Appendix to this report.

23. It should be noted that there are two further Council-owned sites that are planned to be included in Phases 4-6 - at Vere Road, Loughton and St. Peter's Avenue, Ongar - that the Council Housebuilding Cabinet Committee has considered suitable for development, but which have not yet secured planning consent.

The proposed bid to MHCLG for additional borrowing approvals

24. It is stressed that any bid to the MHCLG would only be for additional borrowing approvals and would **not** relate to any commitment to borrow any more money for the HRA than is already required to fund the existing Housebuilding Programme. An analogy often used relates to when a person seeks an increase in their credit limit from their credit card provider; it doesn't mean that they then have to borrow up to their new credit limit – it just enables them to do so if they need to spend more at any time in the future.

25. However, it is clear that the MHCLG would expect a council that has been given additional borrowing approval(s) to then actually borrow additional resources for at least the amount(s) bid.

26. As explained at Paragraph 17 above, the Council could submit (and justify) bids to Homes England for additional borrowing approvals ranging from £1.352million to £15.852million. In view of the overall amount of borrowing approvals available across the country (just £500million), it is suggested that bids totalling £15.852million of borrowing approvals is unlikely to be successful. Therefore, it is suggested that bids totalling £8.052million of borrowing approvals be submitted, based on the "Mid Borrowing Scenario" set out in Paragraph 17.

27. The remaining funding for the Housebuilding Programme would come from 141 Receipts and HRA balances (and any additional Section 106 financial contributions that are received from developers of large sites, in lieu of on-site affordable housing provision). Since the actual works costs and fees for these developments will be far greater than the required borrowing, the borrowing requirement would be a relatively low percentage of the total scheme costs, offering a good value-for-money bid to the MHCLG.

28. As explained earlier, if all the bids are successful, it would enable the Council to not only maintain its current HRA Borrowing Headroom, but also increase it by an additional £8.052million. This increased HRA Headroom could then be used, if the Council wanted to at a later date, to extend the Housebuilding Programme or for other HRA purposes in the future. For example, the HRA Borrowing Headroom could be used to cover additional HRA borrowing to purchase the affordable homes secured under any Section 106 Agreement for Council-owned land – e.g. the existing Waltham Abbey Swimming Pool site at Roundhills or the proposed development site at Jessel Green, Loughton. Alternatively, if the policy ever comes to fruition, it could be used to fund any levy payable to the Government under its Sale of High Value Voids Policy, in order to reduce the number of void properties that actually need to be sold. These are all decisions that would be made at a later date, when required.

29. It is suggested that a number of separate bids be submitted, which – bearing in mind the anticipated number of bids from across the country - would then provide Homes England and the MHCLG with the flexibility to accept either all the bids, or just some of the bids. In any event, separate bids would have to be submitted for sites in different Broad Rental Market Area (BRMAs). These BRMAs set out the towns/villages in the District with different “Local Housing Allowances (LHAs)” – which specify the maximum levels of rent that can be charged for different property types for tenants to be able to receive full housing benefit.

30. There are three BRMAs in the District, and since the relevant LHAs in these BRMAs often dictate the affordable rent to be charged by the Council on new development sites under its Rents Policy – and the MHCLG has specified that sites within “schemes” must have the same level of rents – the Council would need to submit at least three separate bids, since the sites in Phases 4-6 are all located in different BRMAs (Loughton, Ongar and Waltham Abbey).

31. It is also suggested that a separate bid should be made for the purchase of the completed Section 106 affordable rented homes at the Pyrles Lane Nursery site. This is because, unlike all the other sites in the Council Housebuilding Programme, the actual property mix for this site will not be determined until the developer that purchases the site obtains detailed planning permission. Therefore, the bid can only be submitted with an indicative property mix, based on the mix for which outline planning permission has been granted, which would then need to be varied, with the MHCLG’s agreement, at the time detailed planning permission is obtained – and this agreement may not be forthcoming.

32. Therefore, it is proposed that the four bids comprise the following:

- Bid 1 - Ongar
- Bid 2 - Waltham Abbey
- Bid 3 - Loughton (excluding Pyrles Lane)
- Bid 4 - Pyrles Lane, Loughton

33. It is proposed that the two potential development sites without planning permission at Vere Road, Loughton and St. Peters Avenue, Ongar are not included in any bids, since it is not yet known whether or not they will receive planning permission and can be delivered. In any event, the final mixes cannot yet be confirmed, since they are also subject to the planning process.

34. Based on the latest forecast housebuilding cash flows, anticipated 141 Receipts and the Council’s borrowing requirements, the following borrowing profile for the bid is proposed:

	2019/20	2010/21	2021/22	Totals
Bid 1 – Ongar	-	-	£204,319	£204,319
Bid 2 – Waltham Abbey	-	£1,309,613	£187,755	£1,497,368
Bid 3 – Loughton	£3,890,304	£1,993,923	-	£5,884,227
Bid 4 - Pyrles Lane	-	£244,629	£221,539	£466,168
Totals	£3,890,304	£3,548,165	£613,613	£8,052,082

35. The Cabinet Committee is asked to note that, due to the deadline for bids being 7th September 2018, the Chairman of Council has been asked to determine that the call-in provisions of Rule 21 of the Overview and Scrutiny Rules within the Council's Constitution can be disregarded for this decision. The Chairman's decision on this request will be reported orally.

Resource Implications:

If all the bids are successful, they would increase the Council's HRA Borrowing Headroom by £8.052million. If less than the 4 bids are successful, the HRA Borrowing Headroom would not be increased by so much. Although this report only relates to borrowing approvals, obviously, there will be resource implications when the required borrowing is undertaken.

Legal and Governance Implications

Local Government and Housing Act 1989.

Safer, Cleaner and Greener Implications

Many of the Council's proposed development sites will be aesthetically improved, and will also provide a safer environment from crime, if they are developed

Consultation Undertaken

The Council's HRA Business Planning Consultant, Simon Smith from SD Smith Consultancy, has been fully involved with the formulation of the proposed bids.

Background Papers

None

Risk Management

The bid is only for additional borrowing approvals, and not to borrow any additional amount than that already required to fund the Council's existing Housebuilding Programme. Therefore, the risks to the Council of its decision are minimal.

The main risk that arises if a bid is submitted, and is successful, is that if the Council either does not actually undertake borrowing for the amounts bid in the years specified, or does not deliver the number and/or type of new homes specified in the bid, the MHCLG

could potentially reduce or withdraw the borrowing approval(s). However, this would place the Council in no worse position than if it did not submit any bids.

Equality Analysis

The Equality Act 2010 requires that the Public Sector Equality Duty is actively applied in decision-making. This means that the equality information provided to accompany this report is essential reading for all members involved in the consideration of this report. The equality information is provided as an Appendix to this report.

**Sites currently included in Phase 4-6 of the Council Housebuilding Programme
(with planning permission)**

<u>Site</u>	<u>Property Mix</u>
<u>Loughton</u>	
Chequers Rd (Site A)	3 X 3BH
Chequers Rd (Site B)	5 X 2BH
Chester Rd	3 X 2BH
Lower Alderton Hall Lane	2 X 2BH
Bushfields	2 X 2BH
Etheridge Rd	2 X 3BH + 1 X 2BB
Kirby Close	4 X 2BH
Ladyfields	6 X 2BH
Whitehills Rd	2 X 2BB
Thatchers Close	1 X 2BH
 <u>Ongar</u>	
Millfield	2 X 1BB
Queensway	4 X 1BB
 <u>Buckhurst Hill</u>	
Bourne House	2 X 3BH
Hornbeam House	2 X 2BH
Hornbeam Close (Site B)	3 X 2BH
Pentlow Way	2 X 2BF + 5 X 1BF
 <u>Waltham Abbey</u>	
Denny Avenue	1 X 2BH + 2 X 3BH
Pick Hill	2 X 3BH
Beechfield Walk	4 X 3BH + 1 X 2BH
Woollard Street	9 X 1BF
Wrangley Court	1 X 1BB
Broomfield Court	1 X 1BB
Shingle Court	1 X 2BB
Stonyshotts	1 X 2BH

**Indicative Property Mix for Pyrles Lane, Loughton
(based on Outline Planning Permission)**

7 X 3BH
5 X 2BF
3 X 1BF

Section 1: Identifying details

Your function, service area and team: **Office of the Chief Executive: Transformation Team**

If you are submitting this EqIA on behalf of another function, service area or team, specify the originating function, service area or team: **Communities Directorate**

Title of policy or decision: **Bids to MHCLG for additional HRA borrowing**

Officer completing the EqIA: **Tel: Monika Chwiedz x2076
mail:mchwiedz@eppingforestdc.gov.uk**

Date of completing the assessment: **17/08/2018**

Section 2: Policy to be analysed

2.1	Is this a new policy (or decision) or a change to an existing policy, practice or project? No. The report only relates approval to borrow additional money
2.2	Describe the main aims, objectives and purpose of the policy (or decision): The report is for noting and only relates approval to borrow additional money What outcome(s) are you hoping to achieve (ie decommissioning or commissioning a service)? The aim is to make recommendations to the Cabinet for additional HRA borrowing.
2.3	Does or will the policy or decision affect: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• service users• employees• the wider community or groups of people, particularly where there are areas of known inequalities? No Will the policy or decision influence how organisations operate? No
2.4	Will the policy or decision involve substantial changes in resources? The financial impacts are given in detail within the report.
2.5	Is this policy or decision associated with any of the Council's other policies and how, if applicable, does the proposed policy support corporate outcomes? No

Section 3: Evidence/data about the user population and consultation¹

As a minimum you must consider what is known about the population likely to be affected which will support your understanding of the impact of the policy, eg service uptake/usage, customer satisfaction surveys, staffing data, performance data, research information (national, regional and local data sources).

3.1	What does the information tell you about those groups identified? N/A – this report focuses on financial provision.
3.2	Have you consulted or involved those groups that are likely to be affected by the policy or decision you want to implement? If so, what were their views and how have their views influenced your decision? N/A see above
3.3	If you have not consulted or engaged with communities that are likely to be affected by the policy or decision, give details about when you intend to carry out consultation or provide reasons for why you feel this is not necessary: N/A see above

Section 4: Impact of policy or decision

Use this section to assess any potential impact on equality groups based on what you now know.

Description of impact	Nature of impact Positive, neutral, adverse (explain why)	Extent of impact Low, medium, high (use L, M or H)
Age	None in this category as there are no equality implications arising from the specific recommendations of this report	
Disability		
Gender		
Gender reassignment		
Marriage/civil partnership		
Pregnancy/maternity		
Race		
Religion/belief		
Sexual orientation		

Section 5: Conclusion

		Tick Yes/No as appropriate	
5.1	Does the EqIA in Section 4 indicate that the policy or decision would have a medium or high adverse impact on one or more equality groups?	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	If 'YES', use the action plan at Section 6 to describe the adverse impacts and what mitigating actions you could put in place.

Section 6: Action plan to address and monitor adverse impacts

What are the potential adverse impacts?	What are the mitigating actions?	Date they will be achieved.
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		

Section 7: Sign off

**I confirm that this initial analysis has been completed appropriately.
(A typed signature is sufficient.)**

Signature of Head of Service: Alan Hall

Date: 17/08/2018

Signature of person completing the EqIA: Monika Chwiedz

Date: 17/08/2018

Advice

Keep your director informed of all equality & diversity issues. We recommend that you forward a copy of every EqIA you undertake to the director responsible for the service area. Retain a copy of this EqIA for your records. If this EqIA relates to a continuing project, ensure this document is kept under review and updated, eg after a consultation has been undertaken.

Report to the Council Housebuilding Cabinet Committee



**Epping Forest
District Council**

Report reference: CHB-002-2018/19
Date of meeting: 30-August-2018

Portfolio: Housing

Subject: Appropriation of land at various sites

Responsible Officer: P Pledger – Asst Director (Housing Property & Development) (01992 564248)

Democratic Services: J Leither (01992 564756)

Recommendations/Decisions Required:

- (1) **That the former garage sites and associated amenity land at the following former garage sites, namely:**
 - a. **Pound Close, Nazeing;**
 - b. **Palmers Grove, Nazeing;**
 - c. **Colvers, Matching Green; and**
 - d. **Parkfields (Site A), Roydon**

and that have been previously considered and agreed by the Cabinet Committee at its meeting in June 2015 as viable for the development of Council House Building, be appropriated for planning purposes under provisions laid out in the Local Government Act 1972 and Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on the grounds that the land is no longer required for the purposes for which it is currently held in the Housing Revenue Account.

Executive Summary:

At its meeting in June 2015, the Council House-building Cabinet Committee recommended that the land at Pound Close and Palmers Grove, Nazeing, the land at Colvers, Matching Green and land at Parkfields (Site A), Roydon be appropriated under the Local Government Act 1972 and Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to change the purpose for which the land is held from one statutory purpose to another. However, due to an administrative error that recommendation was not presented to the Cabinet Committee for approval.

Reasons for Proposed Decision:

Appropriation of the land cannot take place after a planning application has been submitted otherwise there is a risk that the proposed re-development scheme may be frustrated by third party rights, which would in turn frustrate the Council's regeneration objectives for the site. By appropriating land, once planning permission is obtained, the rights of affected third parties can be overridden to the extent that they become an entitlement to compensation rather than a right to obtain an injunction to prevent the scheme.

Other Options for Action:

1. Not to appropriate the land and take the risk that a third party will not try to prevent the development by laying claim to a long established right of access across the land.

Report:

1. The Cabinet Committee have been delegated authority to appropriate land for planning purposes as set out in its Terms of Reference. However, as a reminder, the Council holds property for various statutory purposes in order to provide its various functions. Such land is used only for the purpose of the function for which it was originally acquired, until such time as the land is disposed of or “appropriated” for another use.
2. Appropriation is the procedure under the Local Government Act 1972 and Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to change the purpose for which the land is held for one statutory purpose to another, provided that the land is no longer required for the purpose for which it was held immediately before the appropriation. The consent of the Secretary of State is required to appropriate the land.
3. The Council wishes to see each of the development sites redeveloped for the specific purpose of residential accommodation on a land which previously was used for garages and / or amenity land, which in the current usage the former are not fit for that purpose. By appropriating the sites for planning purposes, the Council will be able to secure its redevelopment and future use by relying on the statutory provisions relating to the redevelopment and disposal of the land held for planning purposes.
4. There is a risk that the proposed re-development scheme may be frustrated by third party rights, which would in turn frustrate the Council’s regeneration objectives for the sites. By appropriating land, once planning permission is obtained, under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 the rights of affected third parties can be overridden to the extent that they become an entitlement to compensation rather than a right to obtain an injunction to prevent the scheme.
5. Due to an administrative oversight the recommendation for the appropriation of the following sites was not presented to the Cabinet Committee as part of the decision to progress to detailed planning stage agreed by the Cabinet Committee at its meeting in June 2015:

(a) Pound Close, Nazeing

That the Cabinet Committee agreed this was a viable site to progress to a detailed planning stage.

(b) Palmers Grove, Nazeing

That the Cabinet Committee agreed this was a viable site to progress to a detailed planning stage. However, Members requested that the design should accommodate a vehicular turning circle on the site.

(c) Colvers, Matching Green

That the Cabinet Committee agreed that Option B, 2 x 3 bedroom 2 storey houses with 5 parking spaces, was a viable site to progress to a detailed planning stage.

(d) Parkfields (Site A), Roydon

That the Cabinet Committee proposed that this site would be included in a future phase of the Council House-building Programme as the access to the site would need to be looked at due to being narrow and no turning point on the site.

6. It is therefore recommended that the former garage sites and associated amenity land listed above and that have been previously considered and agreed by the Cabinet Committee at its meeting in June 2015 as viable for the development of

Council House Building, be appropriated for planning purposes under provisions laid out in the Local Government Act 1972 and Town and Country Planning Act 1990 on the grounds that the land is no longer required for the purposes in which it is currently held.

Resource Implications:

There are no direct resource implications associated with this report. However, there may be claims from third parties whose rights have been “interfered with” as a result of the appropriation and development, which could entitle them to make a claim for compensation for any loss in market value they have suffered. This would need to be assessed in accordance with the “Compulsory Purchase Code”. Such claims are usually settled between Valuers, by agreement; but there is a right to refer the claim to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) for determination.

Legal and Governance Implications:

Local Government Act 1972, Housing Act 1985, the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and the Housing and Planning Act 2016.

Safer, Cleaner and Greener Implications:

Not Applicable

Consultation Undertaken:

None

Background Papers:

Council House-building Cabinet Committee report and minutes associated with the feasibility study for the various sites contained within the report, dated 4 June 2015.

Risk Management:

The risks associated with third party claims are set out within the body of the report, as well as the risk mitigation of appropriating the land.

Equality Analysis:

The Equality Act 2010 requires that the Public Sector Equality Duty is actively applied in decision-making. This means that the equality information provided to accompany this report is essential reading for all members involved in the consideration of this report. The equality information is provided as an Appendix to this report.

This page is intentionally left blank

Equality Impact Assessment

Section 1: Identifying details

Your function, service area and team: **Governance Directorate – Democratic Services**

If you are submitting this EqIA on behalf of another function, service area or team, specify the originating function, service area or team: **Communities Directorate**

Title of policy or decision: **Appropriation of land at various sites**

Officer completing the EqIA: **J Leither x4756**
jleither@eppingforestdc.gov.uk

Date of completing the assessment: **17/08/2018**

Section 2: Policy to be analysed

2.1	<p>Is this a new policy (or decision) or a change to an existing policy, practice or project? No. The report only relates approval to appropriate land at various sites across the district.</p>
2.2	<p>Describe the main aims, objectives and purpose of the policy (or decision):</p> <p>The report relates to the EFDC Council Housebuilding programme. EFDC plan to build 300 new affordable homes over the next 10 years.</p> <p>What outcome(s) are you hoping to achieve (ie decommissioning or commissioning a service)?</p> <p>That all Council homes meet the “Decent Homes Standard”.</p> <p>The Council House-building (CHB) programme aims to provide well-designed, quality homes that are affordable, sustainable and suitable for the needs of people across all protected groups.</p> <p>This assessment intends to fully evaluate the effect the programme could have on protected groups, and therefore aims to give an overview of the actual and potential impacts of actions set out within the programme.</p> <p>This assessment will continually evolve as the programmes of work progress</p>

2.3	<p>Does or will the policy or decision affect:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • service users • employees • the wider community or groups of people, particularly where there are areas of known inequalities? <p>All of the above</p> <p>Will the policy or decision influence how organisations operate?</p> <p>No</p>
2.4	<p>Will the policy or decision involve substantial changes in resources?</p> <p>No</p>
2.5	<p>Is this policy or decision associated with any of the Council's other policies and how, if applicable, does the proposed policy support corporate outcomes?</p> <p>The delivery of new affordable housing is part of a wider Corporate objectives namely to deliver new homes to meet the needs of local people while also supporting economic development; and design and building our services around the needs of our ageing population and residents living in deprivation.</p>

Section 3: Evidence/data about the user population and consultation¹

As a minimum you must consider what is known about the population likely to be affected which will support your understanding of the impact of the policy, eg service uptake/usage, customer satisfaction surveys, staffing data, performance data, research information (national, regional and local data sources).

3.1	What does the information tell you about those groups identified? N/A
3.2	Have you consulted or involved those groups that are likely to be affected by the policy or decision you want to implement? If so, what were their views and how have their views influenced your decision? N/A
3.3	If you have not consulted or engaged with communities that are likely to be affected by the policy or decision, give details about when you intend to carry out consultation or provide reasons for why you feel this is not necessary: N/A

Section 4: Impact of policy or decision

Use this section to assess any potential impact on equality groups based on what you now know.

Description of impact	Nature of impact Positive, neutral, adverse (explain why)	Extent of impact Low, medium, high (use L, M or H)
Age	None in this category as there are no equality implications arising from the specific recommendations of this report	
Disability		
Gender		
Gender reassignment		
Marriage/civil partnership		
Pregnancy/maternity		
Race		
Religion/belief		
Sexual orientation		

Section 5: Conclusion

		Tick Yes/No as appropriate	
5.1	Does the EqIA in Section 4 indicate that the policy or decision would have a medium or high adverse impact on one or more equality groups?	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	If 'YES', use the action plan at Section 6 to describe the adverse impacts and what mitigating actions you could put in place.

Section 6: Action plan to address and monitor adverse impacts

What are the potential adverse impacts?	What are the mitigating actions?	Date they will be achieved.
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		
N/A		

Section 7: Sign off

**I confirm that this initial analysis has been completed appropriately.
(A typed signature is sufficient.)**

Signature of Head of Service: Alan Hall

Date: 17/08/2018

Signature of person completing the EqIA: Jackie Leither

Date: 17/08/2018

Advice

Keep your director informed of all equality & diversity issues. We recommend that you forward a copy of every EqIA you undertake to the director responsible for the service area. Retain a copy of this EqIA for your records. If this EqIA relates to a continuing project, ensure this document is kept under review and updated, eg after a consultation has been undertaken.

This page is intentionally left blank