Overview and Scrutiny Committee Agenda



20 November 2023 at 7pm

Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Duke Street, Chelmsford, CM1 1JE

Membership

Councillor J. Jeapes (Chair) Councillor A. Thompson (Vice Chair)

and Councillors

V. Canning, H. Clark, P. Davey. A. Davidson, S. Davis, J. Deakin, S. Dobson, K. Franks, M. Steel, M. Taylor, and S. Young

Local people are welcome to attend this meeting remotely, where your elected Councillors take decisions affecting YOU and your City. There will also be an opportunity to ask your Councillors questions or make a statement. These have to be submitted in advance to <u>committees@chelmsford.gov.uk</u>. Further details are on the agenda page. If you would like to find out more, please email jan.decena@chelmsford.gov.uk or phone Jan Decena in the Democracy Team on Chelmsford (01245) 606260.

Overview and Scrutiny Committee 20 November 2023 AGENDA

- 1. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions
- 2. Chairs Announcements
- 3. Minutes

To consider the minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2023.

4. Decision and Action Sheet

To consider the decisions and actions from the previous minutes from the 19 October 2023 meeting.

5. Declaration of Interests

All Members are reminded that they must disclose any interests they know they have in items of business on the meeting's agenda and that they must do so at this point on the agenda or as soon as they become aware of the interest. If the interest is a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest they are also obliged to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days of the meeting.

6. Public Question Time

Any member of the public may ask a question or make a statement at this point in the meeting. Each person has two minutes and a maximum of 20 minutes is allotted to public questions/statements, which must be about matters for which the Committee is responsible.

The Chair may disallow a question if it is offensive, substantially the same as another question or requires disclosure of exempt or confidential information. If the question cannot be answered at the meeting a written response will be provided after the meeting.

Any member of the public who wishes to submit a question or statement to this meeting should email it to committees@chelmsford.gov.uk 24 hours before the start time of the meeting. All valid questions and statements will be published with the agenda on the website at least six hours before the start time and will be responded to at the meeting. Those who have submitted a valid question or statement will be entitled to put it in person at the meeting.

7. Decisions Called-In

To report on any Cabinet decisions called in and to decide how they should be progressed.

- 8. Report on Cultural Strategy Task & Finish Group
- 9. Cabinet Portfolio Update Cabinet Member for a Growing Chelmsford
- 10. Cabinet Member for a Growing Chelmsford's Annual Report on Housing Delivery
- 11. Report on Decisions Taken Under Delegation to the Chief Executive

12. Work Programme

13. Urgent Business

To consider any other matter which, in the opinion of the Chair, should be considered by reason of special circumstances (to be specified) as a matter of urgency.

MINUTES

of the

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

held on 19 October 2023 at 7pm

Present:

Councillor J. Jeapes (Chair) Councillor A. Thompson (Vice-Chair)

Councillors, V. Canning, H. Clark, A. Davidson, C. Davidson, S. Davis, S. Dobson, K, Franks, M. Steel, M. Taylor and S. Young

Also in attendance:

Councillors M. Goldman, S. Goldman, R. Moore, S. Robinson, and P. Wilson

1. Apologies for Absence and Substitutions

No apologies were received for this meeting.

2. Chairs Announcements

No announcements were made for this meeting.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 July 2023 were agreed as a correct record.

4. Decision and Action Sheet

The decisions and action sheet were noted by the Committee. It was advised that the Planning Enforcement Inform and Debate session had been moved to the April 2024 meeting.

5. Declaration of Interests

All Members were reminded to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary interests or other registerable interests where appropriate in any items of business on the meeting's agenda. Any declarations are recorded in the relevant minute below.

6. Public Question Time

No questions were asked or statements made.

7. Decisions Called-In

To report on any Cabinet decisions called in and to decide how they should be progressed.

7.1. Public Spaces Protection Order – Hylands Park

The Committee considered the decision taken by Cabinet to approve a Public Spaces Protection Order for Hylands Park (Hylands PSPO) on 12th September 2023. The decision had been called in by five members of the Committee on 13th September 2023.

The Chair reminded members, officers, contributors, and other councillors present that the purpose of the call-in was to examine if the decision had been taken properly and that everyone should remain apolitical in the meeting. The call-in was to encourage discussion and that it might be considered in the future to include the Overview and Scrutiny Committee in relation to Cabinet decisions and reports, highlighting an element of accountability in the process.

The Chair gave the following reasons below why the Cabinet decision regarding the Hylands PSPO had been called in:

- 1. Questions about why Hylands Park, of the approximately 25 Parks controlled by Chelmsford City Council was selected for the Public Spaces Protection Order, (PSPO) were not adequately addressed. The data and statistics referred to did not appear to highlight Hylands Park as having a significant issue or being the priority for this type of action and the potential Criminalisation of dog walkers.
- 2. If it is shown that public safety from dogs off the lead and multiple dogs being walked by one person, is a real issue at Hylands, it was clear from the general debate during cabinet, that enforcement will be key to the success of any PSPO in providing any meaningful impact on the issue.
- 3. Given that there is to be no increase in enforcement officers and the refusal by the council at the meeting to engage in self-funding enforcement resources the introduction of the PSPO, at some public expense, does not appear to be value for money. Elsewhere it was stated that PSPOs in relation to litter were not impacting on the issues and an increase was being experienced.
- 4. The public consultation results and feedback did not appear to have been adequately addressed. This approach was further reinforced when the request by a member of the Public to have his question read out in full was not met. Nor was it appropriately answered as the specifics about the five-year figures and criminal convictions were not responded to, nor was there any commitment to provide the information."

Cllr Rose Moore, the Cabinet Member for a Greener and Safer Chelmsford and whose Cabinet decision was under their responsibility, was then introduced to explain the decision to approve the Hylands PSPO. The Committee received a report detailing why the Cabinet had approved the decision. Cllr Moore also introduced their contributors, Inspector Samuel Girdlestone for Essex Police, and the Deputy Leader of the Council, Cllr Marie Goldman.

Cllr Moore explained to the Committee that there had been a voluntary code of conduct for visitors in place for Hylands Park but it had not been easy to enforce. It was emphasised that dog attacks were a huge issue both locally and nationally. Hylands Park had been chosen to have the PSPO enforced due to the extensive use and size of the park. There had been reports of dangerous dog incidents over previous years at Hylands Park. It was also emphasised that everyone had a duty of care to park users and that the bar was set high to dog ownership as well. It was repeated that a PSPO would be one of the most effective methods to ensure a safe space from dangerous dogs. It was also noted that a dog did not have to be dangerous to cause alarm or distress but only needed to be perceived to be dangerous or out of control. Regarding the public consultation, it was emphasised that this helps inform the approach but was not a referendum on whether a PSPO should be put in place or not. Some amendments to the PSPO were made in response to the consultation. Members were advised that the Hylands PSPO would only allow four dogs per dog as these were in line with RSPCA recommendations. It was also stated that 85% of the parkland would still be available for dog walkers to provide exercise for their dogs. Officers who were requested for the call-in, the Director for Public Spaces and the Public Health Protection Services Manager, also reiterated the need for the Hylands PSPO as highlighted in the report and Cllr Moore's explanation.

Inspector Girdlestone from Community Policing, Essex Police added a few points in support of the Cabinet decision to implement the Hylands PSPO. Members were informed that the Community Safety Partnership had approached their team regarding the Hylands PSPO and continued to work with the dangerous dog manager. It was advised that the statistics showed that attacks were increasing including some in Hylands Park. It was noted that there were twelve investigations of out-of-control dogs in Hylands Estate with four related to dangerous dogs. They advised that the Hylands PSPO would be an effective and tactical option to safeguard the public. The Community Policing team would then proceed with prosecutions where required

Cllr Goldman then explained their support for the Hylands PSPO and thanked the Committee for being given an opportunity to speak about this in the call-in. It was emphasised that it was explained at the Cabinet meeting why the Hylands Park was selected as it had the capacity to apply the PSPO. The Hylands PSPO would provide a safe space for everyone to enjoy and that only 15% of the park would be restricted. It was stated that criminalisation of dog walkers was a misleading statement as the main purpose was to create safe spaces. It was recognised that enforcement was key to the PSPO. It was observed that some would comply with the voluntary code of conduct but some would also chose not to. The Hylands PSPO would have consequences and irresponsible dog owners would be fined and prosecuted for ignoring the rules. It was also emphasised that the Hylands PSPO looked out for the best interest of the park users. Regarding enforcement, it was noted that the idea of the PSPO was not to simply issue fines.

After Cllr Moore, officers, and contributors have explained their position on the decisions, the Committee then had an opportunity to ask questions and for clarifications.

In response to the questions and concerns raised by the Committee, it was advised that;

- The point of the PSPO was to stop anti-social behaviour. In the officer's view, it would be difficult to keep track of more than four dogs at the same time. It was noted that the Council support local businesses and, as the PSPO was to be enforced on Hylands, there were options for other professional walkers to select other parks and they would be able to carry on with their business.
- The reason why the RSPCA's guidance regarding the number of dogs per person was chosen was because it was believed that the charity was also considering the welfare of dogs. The Kennel Club have a more direct interest.
- Officers were also concerned regarding the behaviour of some dog walkers in confrontations.
- The Council currently had five PSPOs including dog fouling, Creamfields, fly posting, and specific ones for city centre and car parks. It was noted that public consultations do not usually receive a high number of positive feedback.
- It was also reiterated that Hylands Park was for the enjoyment for all, and no one would be restricted from walking their dogs except for small exceptions, such as the children's play area and grazing fields, highlighted in the proposed PSPO map. It was also reiterated that dog walkers would be questioned if the dog did not have a good recall.
- There was a misconception that the PSPO would ban dogs in the park. Officers would be available in the park to discuss the PSPO with the public and what it would entail.
- Regarding enforcement, it was noted that this would be initially advisory unless it was confrontational. It was reiterated that the aim of the Hylands PSPO was not to criminalise but to enforce the voluntary code of conduct that was already in place in Hylands Park. It was also noted that this was to deter anti-social behaviour.
- Regarding unintended consequences of the Hylands PSPO, it was advised that these had not been identified so far, and further amendments could be made in the future to ensure that these unintended consequences were managed.
- It was suggested that so far licensing had not been applied for professional dog walker, but this might be on the horizon at a national level given that this was a category of business.
- It was advised that the dog-friendly café area next to the Stables would permit dogs on lead as already implemented on the voluntary code of conduct. Members were informed that the Stables courtyard had in the past experienced a lot of anti-social behaviour including dog on dog attacks, or dog on people attacks. There were already signage indicating these restrictions.
- Regarding enforcement, it was advised that this could be done retrospectively but officers advised that it was difficult to identify perpetrators. However, the CCTV in the park would be identify certain individuals, particularly if they were regulars.
- Regarding whether the Hylands PSPO could be seasonal, it was advised that Hylands park was being used all the year around and the risks that the PSPO was trying to mitigate would still be present.
- It was advised that there were bylaws in place but as they were dated, they were virtually impossible to enforce whilst the PSPO would be enforceable immediately.

It was also noted that the Committee could not amend the Cabinet decision. The decision would be referred back to the Cabinet and any recommendations identified by the Committee would be taken into consideration by the Cabinet. The Chair then

put forward two options for decisions. The Committee then voted on the two below proposals:

- a.) To accept the Cabinet decision regarding the Hylands PSPO without any amendments, or;
- b.) To refer the decision back to the Cabinet to include a recommendation to amend the Hylands PSPO in terms of seasonality.

The Committee took a vote, and the majority chose to accept the Cabinet decision regarding the Hylands PSPO without any amendments.

RESOLVED that;

1. to the Committee accepted the Cabinet decision surrounding Hylands PSPO and that it needed no amendments.

(7.04pm to 8.24pm)

8. Cabinet Portfolio Report – Leader of the Council

The Committee received a portfolio update from the Leader of the Council, Cllr Robinson, highlighting their work from their last twelve months. The report outlined the various roles he undertook and the regular meetings which he attended. The Committee were referred to the <u>written report</u> which detailed each of these roles and what they entailed.

The Chelmsford Garden Community had been a huge part of Cllr Robinson's portfolio. Members were informed of the current discussions taking place regarding two planning applications. Cllr Robinson also informed the Committee of the current discussions regarding Devolution which was noted to be on the agenda often and the Council was briefed on the latest proposal for a "level Two" deal.

In relation to housing, Cllr Robinson highlighted the challenges faced in relation to homelessness and temporary accommodation. There were discussions with the CEO and Director of CHP in seeking out ways to tackle the challenges. Meetings with registered social landlords were also facilitated.

Cllr Robinson also updated the Committee regarding "Our Chelmsford, Our Plan" which the current version from January 2020 could be accessed via the website. The plan was currently in review and an updated draft would be presented to Policy Board on 2nd November 2023 and then to be reported to Council on 6th December 2023. Members of the Committee were also informed of a summary of the different responsibilities and liaisons carried out with various internal functions as well.

In response to the questions by members of the Committee, Cllr Robinson advised that;

• CHP have processes with regards to improving and maintaining dwellings that were empty for too long. They were advised to have these processes to be looked at further to ensure that the void period would be halved. It was also advised that this would be depending on how long these dwellings were empty and what kind of dilapidations there were. There were also issues on getting the suppliers.

• It was advised that the City Council do not have a formal role with regards to devolution and it was observed that there was a southern orientation to devolution.

RESOLVED that;

1. The Cabinet Portfolio Report be noted

(8.24pm to 8.30pm)

9. Cabinet Portfolio Update – Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for a Connected Chelmsford

The Committee received a portfolio update from the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for a Connected Chelmsford, Cllr Goldman, highlighting all the work that had been done in the last twelve months. Cllr Goldman also thanked officers in the services under their portfolio for the hard work they have done. Cllr Goldman gave updates regarding the achievements and current work in the following services under her portfolio.

With regards to revenue and benefits, Cllr Goldman reported that there had been big challenges facing the service. Members were advised of the grants that were received from the government such as the two Energy Support grants but they would need to be utilised. The Revenue & Benefits team had also successfully incorporated two new parish councils and their Council Tax liabilities for 2023/24 annual billing process.

In relation to Procurement services, Cllr Goldman reported the successful continuation of delivery of procurement services for Uttlesford District Council and this evidenced the two councils working together. Members were also informed of the new staffing within the Risk & Insurance Team as well as the successful defence of a high value insurance claim.

Within Human Resources, Cllr Goldman informed the Committee of the internal work that the team had achieved. Members were informed of the launch of the new friendly and accessible recruitment site and of the vacancies that were advertised there as well as on job sites. They were also informed of the challenge with regards to retaining staff and that payment was a main factor. Cllr Goldman reported the pay award that had been implemented for staff and it was ensured that the Council was advertised as a good place for work. Members were also advised of the recent recruitment of the new Director of Sustainable Communities.

Regarding the services in the Legal & Democratic team, Cllr Goldman reported the successful delivery of the 2023 Local Elections, both parish-tier and city, and that it was an achievement of the whole council. With regards to the legal services, it was reported that. the new legal case management system had helped streamline processes and was now fully functional. Cllr Goldman also informed members of the information requests received and that 90% were processed within statutory timescales.

In relation to Digital Services, Cllr Goldman informed that the team had six apprentices and it was reported that three had since joined the Council permanently. It was stated that the Council would continue to invest in apprenticeships. Members were also informed of the roll out of the Windows 11 devices as well as website migration. It was noted that the main website had been moved to ensure that it was easier to update and that the inhouse development would lead to savings. Cllr Goldman also informed members of the several releases of Dynamics and that the current development roadmap would not be delivered until October 2024.

Members of the Committee were advised of the work by the Marketing team including advertisement and email listings. Cllr Goldman updated the Committee of the achievements within the Marketing team including the increase in engagements to the new Hylands Estate Weddings website including an increase in unique visitors and repeat visitors. Increase in engagements had also been noted in the Chelmsford Museum Facebook page.

Cllr Goldman then updated the Committee of the work within the Communications Team. It was reported that 2,500 people including journalists received push notifications when a new story appears on the CityLife website. This was an increase of circa 500 in the last 12 months. Members were also updated regarding e-shots and that the open rate was around 48% which was above the benchmark from GovDelivery. The team would then continue to work with Marketing and ensure that relevant content continued to be advertised.

With regards to the Customer Services team, it was reported that they received around 94,000 calls in 2022 with majority involving Council Tax, Housing, and Benefits. Public had been encouraged to use the online system and that some calls were found to be distressing for staff.

In relation to Cultural Services, it was noted that the Council was in a process of a rebranding exercise and how it presented itself to the public. Cllr Goldman informed members of the events by Chelmsford Museum including the Behind the Rainbow exhibition which kick-started an ongoing relationship with Essex Pride, Carnival Finale, and school education sessions. Members were also informed of the Cultural Partnerships especially with Ignite where there were regularly monthly meetups. The Committee were also informed of the festivals and events including the Science Festival at ARU and Concrete Canvas. There was also a new events space at the refurbished Tindal Square. Cllr Goldman also gave updates with regards to the refurbished Chelmsford Theatre which had been completed in January 2023. It was noted that there had been excellent feedback and that the sold-out shows had doubled since re-opening including two weeks of West End Touring Shows.

A member of the Committee queried regarding the freedom of information requests and what trends were emerging from these. It was advised that they varied and that the increase was largely due to awareness of these information requests. Some of the requests were from journalists but that there were also many from members of the public.

RESOLVED that;

1. The Cabinet Portfolio Update be noted

(8.30pm to 8.51pm)

10. Work Programme

The Committee considered a report on its work programme for the year 2023/24 which had been updates following the last meeting on 18th July 2023.

Members were informed that the Theatre Task & Finish Group would be reformulated. It was noted that the terms of reference for the Task & Finish Group was also ready in existence and it was suggested for the existing membership to be continued. There were also further volunteers who would be interested in joining the Task & Finish Group.

The following councillors volunteered to join the Theatre Capital Refurbishment Task & Finish Group:

- a) Cllr S. Young (as the continuing Chair of the Task & Finish Group)
- b) Cllr A. Thorpe-Apps
- c) Cllr C. Davidson
- d) Cllr. D. Clark
- e) Cllr M. Taylor
- f) Cllr. S Dobson
- g) Cllr H. Clark

It was also advised that there would be an Independent member to be included in the Task & Finish Group as well. It was also noted that the current terms of reference for the Task & Finish Group was to be circulated to members and that it was reminded that the meetings of the Task & Finish Group would happen outside of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

RESOLVED that;

- 1. The Theatre Task and Finish Group to be reformulated;
- 2. The Work programme be noted.

(8.51pm to 8.57pm)

11. Urgent Business

There were no mattes of urgent business.

The meeting closed at 8.57pm.

Chair

Overview and Scrutiny Committee Decision and Action Sheet

Summary of Decisions taken at last meeting				
Item Details	Decision taken at the meeting	Any comments		
Item 3 – Minutes of last meeting	Minutes were agreed.	N/A		
Item 4 – Decision and Actions Sheets from the minutes of the last meeting	Decision and Action sheet was noted.	N/A		
Item 7 – Decisions Called In – Hylands PSPO	Committee agreed to uphold Cabinet Decision without amendments.	N/A		
Item 8 – Cabinet Portfolio Report – Leader of the Council	Cabinet portfolio update was noted.	N/A		
Item 9 – Cabinet Portfolio Report – Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for a Connected Chelmsford	Cabinet portfolio update was noted.	N/A		
Item 10 – Work Programme	Work programme was noted. Theatre Capital Refurbishment Review Task & Finish Group reformulated.	Theatre Task & Finish Group to meet outside of the O&S Committee meetings.		

Action Points			
Action Points agreed at 17 July 2023 meeting	Outstanding or Actioned?	Next steps	Officers to Action
Officers to formulate new proposal for continuing Task & Finish Group and new ToR to be drafted. A new Cultural Strategy report regarding context to be presented to Members.	Outstanding	 Chelmsford City Cultural Services Manager and Director of Connected Chelmsford to discuss proposal and new ToR. CEO of Culture Chelmsford and Chelmsford City Cultural Services Manager to give presentation on Cultural Strategy on November 2023 O&S meeting. 	Louise Goodwin and Marc De'ath
Work Programme to be looked at and amended as per Members' suggestions: - Youth Engagement with Council	Outstanding	 Officers to reconvene outside Overview & Scrutiny to make amendments to the work programme. Planning Enforcement Inform and Debate to be added on April 2024 O&S meeting (as per agreed with Chair and Vice Chair). Confirmed that Essex Countywide Traveller Unit would present on February 2024 O&S meeting. 	Louise Goodwin, Keith Nicholson, and Jan Decena
Theatre Capital Refurbishment Review to be reformulated	Outstanding	 Previous and new members of the Theatre T&F Group to reconvene and facilitate meetings outside of Overview & Scrutiny Committee meetings. The terms of reference to be circulated. 	Louise Goodwin, Marc De'ath, and Jan Decena



Chelmsford City Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee

20th November 2023

Presentation on Cultural Strategy

Report by:

Culture Services Manager

Officer Contact:

Marc De'ath, Chelmsford City Cultural Services Manager, tel: 01245 606520, email: marc.death@chelmsford.gov.uk

Purpose:

A presentation by Claire Gevaux, CEO of Culture Chelmsford, to provide a summary overview of the first district-wide Cultural Strategy for Chelmsford. To explain the rationale for establishing a Cultural Compact and set out its strategic roadmap.

Highlighting options for Chelmsford City Councillors, across all parties, to monitor progress and ensure equitable, diverse and inclusive engagement and outcomes for all local residents and their communities.

Recommendations

• Chelmsford City Council continue its support for Chelmsford's Cultural Strategy and its recommendations, which was commissioned and published, on behalf of the entire district, by the independent charity Culture Chelmsford.

- Oversight and responsibility for reviewing the Cultural Strategy and the Council's ongoing strategic support, shifts to the Chelmsford Policy Board.
- A cross party representation is nominated to sit on a 'Communities Working Group' set up by Culture Chelmsford to ensure consultation, engagement and investment is equitable, diverse and inclusive with outcomes for all local communities.

1. Background or Introduction

1.1 Chelmsford Culture, an independent charitable trust, led the development of a new cultural strategy for the district of Chelmsford. Chelmsford City Council is a key stakeholder in its development, delivery, and evaluation. To support and scrutinise the development of the strategy, a task and finish group was established to:

• Support access to seldom-heard voices and often marginalized communities.

• Test assumptions and evidence of current provision in Chelmsford, including its strengths and weaknesses.

• Test and confirm the strategy vision, objectives, and support subsequent action planning and evaluation.

• Establish the contribution - social, economic, and environmental - that culture makes to community and individual wellbeing.

1.2 Feedback from the Task & Finish Group was provided at an Overview & Scrutiny meeting in July 2023. It was recommended that a cross-party Task and Finish group continues. The proposed objectives of the group were to ensure:

• The Arts & Culture is effectively engaged with and embedded across every service in the council.

• The council is ensuring that diversity and inclusion are taken seriously - geographically and demographically - and the commitment to support access to seldom-heard voices and often marginalized communities is maintained.

• The council is delivering on its commitments to embed culture in the Corporate and Local Plan.

• The Council is meeting and playing an active role in establishing a cultural compact - leading by example.

2. Conclusion

2.1 It was agreed that further work was required to establish terms of reference for the Task & Finish group to assess whether it was an appropriate mechanism for achieving these objectives and ongoing cross-party engagement.

2.2 Upon further review post-meeting, it is now recommended that oversight and responsibility for reviewing the Cultural Strategy and the Council's ongoing strategic support shifts to the Chelmsford Policy Board.

2.3 In addition, it is recommended that a cross party delegation is nominated to sit on a 'Communities Working Group' due to be set up by Culture Chelmsford in January 2024. The objective is to ensure consultation, engagement and investment is equitable, diverse and inclusive with outcomes for all local communities.

2.4 To aid decisions, a presentation by Claire Gevaux, CEO of Culture Chelmsford will provide a summary overview of the first district-wide Cultural Strategy for Chelmsford, explain the rationale for establishing a Cultural Compact and set out the strategic roadmap.

Consultees:

Membership of the Task & Finish Group was as follows:

- Cllr Jude Deakin
- Cllr Richard Shaw
- Cllr Jannetta Sosin
- Cllr Chris Shaw
- Cllr Andrew Thorpe Apps
- Cllr Mike Steel
- Cllr Keith Bentley

Background papers and Relevant Policies and Strategies:

<u>Chelmsford's Cultural Strategy</u>



Chelmsford City Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee

20th November 2023

Annual Report of Key Housing Delivery Statistics

Report by: Cabinet Member for a Growing Chelmsford

Officer Contact:

Liz Harris-Best, Principal Housing Implementation and Strategy Officer, email:<u>liz.harris-best@chelmsford.gov.uk</u>, tel:01245 606378

Purpose

This report sets out, for the Committee's information, housing delivery monitoring statistics for 2022/23 and provides Members an update on existing, new, and proposed national and local initiatives that impact on the delivery of new housing.

Recommendations

That the Committee note the contents of the report.

1. Introduction

1.1. This report provides an overview of key housing delivery monitoring statistics in Chelmsford for the period 2022/23 (April 2022 – March 2023). The detailed information is contained within the Annual Report of Key Housing Monitoring Statistics attached at Appendix 1 of this report. This follows the nine previous Annual Reports which have been considered each year by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee since 2012.

1.2. This report provides an annual update on housing delivery statistics, including our performance against the annual housing requirement number and affordable housing delivery. In addition, it updates the Committee on national initiatives relating to housing supply as well as local initiatives to address housing need.

2. Context

- 2.1. Housing delivery has remained stable in 2022/23, with 822 completions recorded for the financial year. This is compared with 866 in 2021/22. Whilst this is slightly lower, it should be noted that completions for the year still exceed the annual housing requirement of 805 dwellings per annum.
- 2.2. The delivery of housing is forecast using information obtained from developers to produce an annual Housing Site Schedule (HSS). The latest HSS (April 2023) indicates a steady supply of housing completions over the next five years.
- 2.3. Tables 1 and 2 demonstrate the level of housing planning permissions and completions over the last five years.

	April 2019	April 2020	April 2021	April 2022	April 2023
Net New Homes with extant Planning Permission	6,694	6,566	5,532	6,204	4,751

Table 1 - Numbers of New Homes with extant planning permission

Table 2 - Numbers of New Homes completed in Chelmsford City Council area (Annual Percentage Increase/decrease)

	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23
Net New Completed Homes	1,256 (+24%)	832 (-33%)	829 (-0.4%)	866 (+4%)	822 (-5%)

- 2.4. Table 4 of Appendix 1 (Net Total Completed New Dwellings) shows the number of dwelling completions over the last 10 years and includes a breakdown of the number of affordable housing units delivered.
- 2.5. There has been a 68% increase in the delivery of affordable housing units in the last year, with 219 delivered in 2022/23 compared with 130 in 2021/22. This is set to remain stable over the coming years and then steadily increase as development on key strategic sites continues.
- 2.6. The affordable housing completions in 2022/23 consisted of 78 shared ownership units, 106 affordable rented units, 23 social rent units, 3 first homes and 9 gypsy and traveller pitches. The affordable housing for rent represents

63% of the total additional affordable housing, which is slightly below the planning policy requirement on planning gain sites in the Local Plan to deliver 67% of affordable housing on threshold sites as affordable housing for rent; but planning policy requirements reflect permissions, rather than completions data. The affordable housing tenure split relating to the 2022/23 affordable housing completions does not reflect the planning permissions on the relevant sites, but rather the phasing of the affordable housing delivery within this monitoring year.

2.7. The breakdown in bedroom size of the 138 affordable housing dwellings completed in 2022/23 compared to the identified need from the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update (SHMA) (2015) is set out below in Table 3:

No.	Affordable Housing for Rent						
Bedrooms	1 ¹		2		3	4	Sub-total
22/23 Q1	43		17		18	0	78
22/23 Q2	17		7		4	0	28
22/23 Q3	4		16		2	1	23
22/23 Q4	9		0		0	0	9
TOTAL	73		40		24	1	138
(SHMA %)	53% (22.5%)		29% (53.6%)		17% (14.2%)	1% (9.7%)	100%

Table 3 - Bedroom	size of	Affordable	Homes	for Rent
	0120 01	7 1101 44010	11011100	

- 2.8. The affordable housing completions data shows a significant oversupply of onebedroom dwellings and under supply of both two and four-bedroom dwellings, compared to the SHMA requirements. The Housing Additionality: Affordable Housing for Rent Planning Advice Note published in January 2022 seeks to address the undersupply of four-bedroom affordable housing for rent.
- 2.9. The Annual Monitoring Report for the same year 2022/23 records that planning permissions for affordable housing for rent have exceeded the SHMA percentage for 3 and 4-bedroom dwellings during this period.
- 2.10. Table 4 below provides a summary of development progressions on key strategic sites. Since the last report, work has completed on two phases at Beulieu and at Copperfield Road with further phases at Runwell Hospital and Beulieu commencing.

¹ This includes the 9 new gypsy and traveller pitches.

Table 4 – Summary of Development Progression on Key Strategic Sites currently under construction

Site	Total Homes	Completed ²
Land north, south and east of Belsteads Farm Lane, Broomfield (Channels) - Phase 3c 3d and 5	240	214
Land north south and east of Belsteads Farm Lane Broomfield (Channels) - Phase 6	128	69
Greater Beaulieu Park, White Hart Lane, Springfield - Phase 1 - Zone C1 (complete)	199	199
Greater Beaulieu Park, White Hart Lane, Springfield - Phase 1 - Zone C2 (complete)	123	123
Greater Beaulieu Park, White Hart Lane, Springfield - Phase 2 – Zones F&I (complete)	254	254
Greater Beaulieu Park, White Hart Lane, Springfield - Phase 2 – Zones K&L	300	82
Greater Beaulieu Park White Hart Lane Springfield - Phase 3 - Zone M, N & Q	272	63
Greater Beaulieu Park White Hart Lane Springfield - Phase 3 - Zone V	145	60
Greater Beaulieu Park White Hart Lane Springfield - Phase 3 - Zone W	194	15
Former Runwell Hospital (St Lukes), Runwell Chase, Runwell, Phase 4	134	112
Land North of Copperfield Road (East Portion) (complete)	198	198

3. Chelmsford Housing Delivery Statistics

- 3.1. Set out within the Annual Report of Key Housing Monitoring Statistics at Appendix 1 of this report, there are five tables providing the following statistical information:
 - 1) New homes in pre-planning stage
 - 2) New homes within current major planning applications
 - 3) New homes with planning permissions
 - 4) New homes completed
 - 5) Estimated housing trend.

² Total Completions as at Q2 2024/24

New Homes in Pre-planning Application Stage

- 3.2. At present, there are in the region of 1,400 new homes which are the subject of pre-application discussions with Officers. These consist of major development sites of 10 or more dwellings where an officer is actively engaged in discussions regarding the feasibility of a scheme.
- 3.3. There are several Planning Performance Agreements (PPAs) in place on the strategic allocations in the new Local Plan, which will include pre-application advice. Just over 10,600 dwellings are the subject of a PPA on the following sites:

Sites	Developer	Total number of dwellings
Former St Peter's College, Fox Crescent	ECC	185
West Chelmsford	Crest Nicholson	880
East Chelmsford 3a	Hopkins	360
East Chelmsford 3c and 3d	Redrow	174
Great Leighs 7a	Strategic Site 7 Landowners	750
Great Leighs 7b	Strategic Site 7 Landowners	190
Great Leighs 7c	Strategic Site 7 Landowners	100
North of Broomfield	Bloor	512
North of South Woodham Ferrers	Countryside	1,220
Chelmsford Garden Community	Developer Consortium of Countryside Zest Halley Developments and Ptarmigan Land	6,250
Total		10,621

Table 5 – Sites subject to Planning Performance Agreements

3.4 Table 1 in Appendix 1 provides an area-based summary of where pre-application discussions are in progress, with the total aggregated number of new homes expected. This figure also includes pre-application discussions on sites which already have outline planning permission on the reserved matter submissions.

New Homes within current major planning applications

- 3.5 There are 6,637 net new dwellings within major planning applications currently being considered by the City Council (as at 20/09/2023). A breakdown of these major applications is set out in Table 2 of Appendix 1, where a commentary is provided as to the status of each.
- 3.6 At the same time last year, there were 3,184 net new dwellings with planning applications currently being considered by the City Council. This reflects the success of the Local Plan bringing forward sites with over 6,100 net new dwellings currently being considered by the council being on sites allocated in the Local Plan.

New Homes with planning permission

- 3.7 There are 4,163 new homes which currently have a live (extant) planning permission but are yet to be built. Planning applications are time limited and require the commencement of development within three years of the date of the grant of planning permission.
- 3.8 A breakdown of these applications is set out in Table 3 of Appendix 1 and is based on the April 2023 Housing Site Schedule. A revised Housing Site Schedule is published in April every year to reflect new approvals and completions.

New homes completed

3.9 Between 2001/02 and 2022/23 there have been 15,138 new homes completed in the City Council's area which equates to an average annual completion rate of 688 new homes per year. The annual totals are set out in Table 4 of Appendix 1.

Estimated New Home Completions Trends

3.10 As can be demonstrated above, there are a significant number of new homes currently being developed or in the pipeline within the City Council's administrative area. In addition to the supply of housing already with planning permission, there are 6,637 new homes included within major planning applications yet to be determined by the City Council.

- 3.11 There are 4,163 new homes with planning permissions which are yet to be completed. Construction or groundwork has commenced on 118 sites, compared with 123 commencements this time last year.
- 3.12 Based solely on the information contained within Appendix 1, it is estimated that completion rates over the next 5 years will remain above the annual housing requirement of 805 dwellings per annum.

Change of use from Office to Residential

- 3.13 The Government introduced changes to the planning system in May 2013 which allows offices to be converted into residential use without the need for a planning application to be made to the local planning authority. This has been replaced by a streamlined 'prior approval' process whereby applicants submit their proposals, and the Council can only comment on a narrow scope of issues. There is no ability to request affordable housing through this process, regardless of the number of units proposed.
- 3.14 The Council has processed just over 100 prior approval applications (up to 31 March 2023) for the conversion of offices to residential, resulting in a further 1,489 residential units with planning permission. Of these, 554 units have already been completed. These units are counted in the housing data within Appendix 1. The current regulations stipulate that prior approval schemes must be completed within three years of the date of the approval.

4. Housing Delivery Test

- 4.1. The Housing Delivery Test works by comparing how many homes have been delivered over the previous three years to the number of homes required in the same period. The Housing Delivery Test is an annual test of housing delivery.
- 4.2. The planning policy consequences of not meeting the Housing Delivery Test are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
- 4.3. The November 2021 Housing Delivery Test result in Chelmsford was 140%, 1% higher than the November 2020 test result (139%). The November 2022 test results have not been published following the consultation on reforms to national planning policy launched in December 2022, as part of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Bill.

5. Housing Requirement

5.1. The Government first published a standardised approach to calculating housing need in September 2018. The standard method uses a formula to identify the minimum number of homes expected to be planned for, in a way which addresses projected household growth and historic undersupply. The standard method uses the same demographic starting point as the Council's Objectively

Assessed Housing Need, national household growth projections (the most recent projections calculated over a 10-year consecutive period, with the current year being the first year). The standard method then applies one market signal adjustment relating to a local affordability ratio. This is based on median house prices compared to median workplace earnings and is updated in March each year.

- 5.2. In February 2019, the Government updated the guidance to set the baseline using 2014 rather than 2016 based household growth projections. In Chelmsford's case, applying the standard method using the 2014-based population projections and March 2023 data release for the affordability ratio, produces a local housing need of 955 new homes per year, which is above the Objectively Assessed Housing Need of 805 homes per year.
- 5.3. The Local Plan's housing requirement is based on the Objectively Assessed Housing Need of 805 dwellings per annum and the Local Plan was examined on this basis. However, the housing supply in the Local Plan provides close to a 20% supply buffer above the Objectively Assessed Housing Need.
- 5.4. The Council will need to start to use the standard method at the first review of the Local Plan. The national standard method identifies a minimum annual housing need figure, it does not produce a housing requirement figure. The Council has commissioned a Strategic Housing Needs Assessment (SHNA) to help determine this.
- 5.5. The SHNA (2023) has considered whether there are exceptional circumstances to move away from the Standard Method (either in an upward or downward direction). This looked at up-to-date demographic trends, past build rates and labour supply.
- 5.6. The report looks at more recent demographic trends taking account of 2021 Census data and ONS mid-year population estimates up to 2021, this data was compared with the 2014-based projections. Whilst there were differences between sources, these were not considered to be substantial and did not point to any exceptional circumstances.
- 5.7. Data about household growth from the Census also showed a similar pattern to that in the 2014-based projections, again pointing to the projections underpinning the Standard Method as remaining reasonable.
- 5.8. Past build rates were also considered as areas with strong growth might be able to provide more homes than the Standard Method (also high delivery might point to an over-supply of housing). In Chelmsford, whilst delivery has been strong, averaging approaching 814-958 dwellings per annum over the past 5- and 10-years, it is again not considered that this provides any evidence to suggest a higher or lower figure than the Standard Method.

- 5.9. As a final test on exceptional circumstances, the Standard Method projection was used to look at potential changes to the resident labour supply and the number of additional jobs that might be supported. Overall, it was projected the labour supply would increase by around 21% over the 2022-41 period and that this could support around 21,000 additional jobs this is above an economic forecast (just over 12,400 jobs for the same period) and again points to there being no need to plan for housing in addition to the Standard Method.
- 5.10. Overall, the SHNA (2023) concludes that the Standard Method is a reasonable assessment of housing need for Chelmsford.
- 6. Planning White Paper Planning for the Future and the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill
- 6.1. The Planning for the Future White Paper published in August 2020 initially introduced and tested long term structural changes to the English planning system.
- 6.2. A proportion of the proposals in the White Paper were taken forward in the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill published in May 2022 which at the time of drafting this report is in its final stages of parliamentary scrutiny with consideration of amendments, prior to receiving Royal Assent. The Bill also incorporates some of the ambitions set out in the Levelling Up White Paper, published in February 2022.
- 6.3. The City Council responded to the consultation on the Planning White Paper and to subsequent consultations on proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). These were considered by Chelmsford Policy Board at meetings held on <u>1st October 2020</u>, <u>15th March 2021</u> and <u>28th February 2023</u>.

Technical consultation on the Infrastructure Levy

- 6.4. In March 2023, the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities launched its consultation on the introduction of the 'Infrastructure Levy' in England. The Infrastructure Levy is a sales tax levied on the Gross Development Value of completed development above a threshold comprising construction cost and an allowance for the cost of land.
- 6.5. Planning authorities will set the levies and thresholds, and these can vary by types of sites and across a local authority. The levy will be paid upon completion and based on Gross Development Value at that time. Indicative liabilities will be calculated using Levy charging schedules. These will set out expectations of Levy liabilities that reflect assumed values of a site. A provisional payment of the Levy will be made close to scheme completion. A final adjustment payment can be used on completion incorporating final values to ensure correct liabilities are discharged.

- 6.6. Charging authorities must publish an Infrastructure Delivery Strategy. There is a process of examination in public of Infrastructure Levy charging schedules, for rates to be adopted. Levy rates are to be set by charging authorities (generally the local authority), and when setting rates, they must consider certain factors. This includes the viability of development in the area and the desirability that rates can deliver affordable housing at a level equalling or exceeding what developers deliver now in that area.
- 6.7. Local authorities will be able to borrow to fund infrastructure before developments have been completed with borrowing secured against projected future Levy income. Borrowing against future Levy proceeds will be permitted, including from the Public Works Loan Board, to facilitate the forward funding of infrastructure. Cash reserves can also be built up across sites. The consultation asks respondents to consider the mechanics behind infrastructure delivery under the Levy.
- 6.8. Work to negotiate S106 agreements on large and complex sites and dealing with the integral infrastructure needed on all other sites will continue. 'Integral infrastructure' refers to matters that need to be provided within a development (for example open space or play spaces) and these will be handled by conditions or targeted planning obligations known as 'Delivery Agreements'. The consultation sought views on the definition of 'integral' and 'Levy funded' infrastructure. It also sought views on spending the Levy on matters typically considered non-infrastructure items.
- 6.9. The Levy will function as a cash-based system where rates and thresholds apply. The Levy will help fund other infrastructure, for example, new school provision. Local authorities will be able to require developers to provide on-site affordable housing and developers' costs in providing this will be netted off from their Levy payments. S106 will be retained in the new system but for restricted purposes. Sites will come forward through three different 'routeways' depending on their character. The consultation sought views from respondents on these routeways.
- 6.10. Levy rates and minimum thresholds (below which no Levy is charged) will be set by the local authority. Rates and thresholds can be varied by the type of development (including brownfield and greenfield) and local authorities can create different charging zones. The consultation sought views on instances where some brownfield sites should qualify for offsets from final Levy liabilities, where the nature of a fixed-rate Levy could unduly effect scheme viability.
- 6.11. On-site affordable housing can be delivered as an in-kind payment of the Levy through a new 'right to require' which will enable local authorities to secure affordable homes as a proportion of levy liabilities. The consultation sought views on the 'right to require' and in what circumstances exemptions from the Levy for registered provider-led schemes could be appropriate.
- 6.12. Imitating provisions under the existing Community Infrastructure Levy legislation, both a neighbourhood share, and administrative share of the new Levy will be

able to be retained to support funding of local community priorities and Levy administration respectively.

- 6.13. The Levy will replicate some existing exemptions from CIL. The consultation sought views on the case for other suitable exemptions or reduced rates, including a proposal to apply exemptions to qualifying small sites and publicly funded infrastructure. The consultation also sought views on enforcement mechanisms.
- 6.14. Prior to introduction of the Levy locally, work will need to be done on considering Levy rates and thresholds, taking proposed schedules through public inquiry, drawing up infrastructure delivery plans, borrowing against project Levy income to fund the infrastructure needed to get development underway, and deciding what to require by way of on-site affordable housing from developers. The Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities has proposed a 'test and learn' approach with local authorities progressively implementing it over several years.
- 6.15. The Council's response to this consultation is set out in Appendix 2.

Plan-making reforms: consultation on implementation

- 6.16. In July 2023 the Government commenced consultation on a further element of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill specifically relating to plan-making. In this consultation the Government were seeking views on:
 - A proposed set of core principles for local plan content
 - A new requirement for plans to include a focused, specific and measurable vision
 - A framework for local development management policies
 - An approach to nationally defined digital templates
 - A proposed 30-month timeframe for future plan-making, and
 - Possible transitional arrangements from the current to the new plan-making system.
- 6.17. The proposals to change the NPPF, national guidance and regulations are due to come force from autumn 2024 after the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill receives Royal Assent. The proposed responses to the consultation questions were considered by <u>Chelmsford Policy Board in September 2023</u>.

7. National Initiative Update

Next Steps Accommodation Programme (NSAP)

7.1. In July 2020, the Government issued the Next Steps Accommodation Programme, which made financial resources available to local authorities and their partners to increase the accommodation and support for rough sleepers and single homeless, following the emergency response that began in March 2020 - reducing the risk that some may return to being homeless and rough sleeping.

- 7.2. Essex County Council submitted a bid on behalf of Chelmsford City Council and the neighbouring districts of Braintree, Epping, Maldon and Rochford. This initially provided in Chelmsford:
 - An additional 73 units/bed spaces and support of intermediate accommodation from Autumn 2020 – March 2023 in a variety of accommodation settings.
 - Refurbishment of a redundant hostel
 - A pilot tenancy sustainment scheme.
- 7.3. During the current year, further funding has provided an additional 6 bedspaces in Council property leased to Chess, enabling two three bedroom properties to be released for temporary accommodation for families in Chelmsford.
- 7.4. From 2023/24 the NSAP programme was merged with the Rough Sleepers Accommodation Programme.

Rough Sleepers Accommodation Programme (RSAP)

- 7.5. In March 2021, the Government launched its Rough Sleeping Accommodation Programme 2021 – 2024 providing capital and revenue support to deliver additional units of longer-term move-on accommodation and support service.
- 7.6. Since March 2021, the Council has worked with partners to secure funding for the following projects:
 - 8 fully self-contained apartments with support for rough sleepers with complex needs provided by Home Group (Chelmsford based).
 - 15 additional bedspaces with support for those at risk of rough sleeping / homelessness due to leaving prison, provided by Housing Dilemmas (Chelmsford based).
- 7.7. In October 2023, a further award of monies will enable an additional 4 6 bedspaces provided by Housing Dilemmas to support rough sleepers.

Single Homelessness Accommodation Programme (SHAP)

- 7.8. Chelmsford is only one of two local authorities in Essex that has been invited to bid for monies under the new Single Homelessness Accommodation Programme which aims to increase the supply of good quality, specialist supported accommodation and housing-led approaches. It provides an opportunity to bid for long-term supported housing, Housing First, and other housing led accommodation, and specialist housing for young people. The fund offers capital for accommodation alongside three years' funding of support.
- 7.9. Council officers are working with specialist agencies to prepare a bid for this fund to develop the specialist housing offer locally.

Local Authority Housing Fund Round 2 (LAHF2)

- 7.10. The Council has secured capital grant funding to provide 15 additional dwellings to provide homes for households on Afghan resettlement schemes and additional temporary accommodation for households owed a homelessness duty by the local authority.
- 7.11. We are working in collaboration with a local registered provider to deliver these homes by March 2024.

Housing Infrastructure Fund

7.12. Funding from the Government's Housing Infrastructure Fund has been secured to support the delivery of housing in two of the strategic allocations in the adopted Local Plan.

Chelmer Waterside

- 7.13. £13.7m from the Marginal Viability element of the Housing Infrastructure Fund has been secured to support the delivery of the new access road and bridge and removal of the high-pressure gas constraints. For this element of the Fund, Chelmsford City Council is in contract with Homes England.
- 7.14. The outcome of initial indicative viability work showed that it should be possible to recover approximately £12.2m of the £13.7m HIF grant. However, the increasing costs for the bridge might absorb the anticipated recovery.
- 7.15. The first phase of the land remediation started in 2022. This has removed around 200 litres of non-aqueous phase liquids.
- 7.16. Planning permission for the relocation of the Gas Pressure Reduction System on the former Gas Works was granted in May 2022. This work commenced in November and will take up to 18 months to complete.
- 7.17. Following the grant of planning permission for the new bridge in June 2021, construction works began in early October to construct a new access road and bridge for Chelmer Waterside
- 7.18. Once the new infrastructure is delivered there is the capacity to deliver up to 1,100 new homes in this location, including 35% affordable housing.

NE Chelmsford - Chelmsford Garden Community

7.19. Strategic Growth Site Policy 6 – North-East Chelmsford, was given formal status as a Garden Community by Homes England in summer 2019 and encompasses the emerging communities of Beaulieu and Channels. The new development will deliver around 6,250 new homes, of which 35% will be affordable.

- 7.20. Stage 1 of the Masterplan Framework which is comprised of three core documents – the Development Framework Document, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and Planning Framework Agreement were presented to Chelmsford Policy Board in December 2022 and agreed by Cabinet in January 2023.
- 7.21. The delivery of the Chelmsford North-East Bypass (CNEB) and Beaulieu Park Railway Station are jointly funded through a £218 million Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) award. Due to significant increases in construction costs and inflationary pressures, the HIF award will now fund the first phase of the bypass.
- 7.22. The HIF Grant Determination Agreement (GDA) includes a Recovery and Recycling Strategy completed in March 2021, and sets out a per dwelling tariff, secured through the s106 Agreement. This is applied to each of the sites (residential element) dependent on the infrastructure secured through the HIF award. Essex County Council are currently reviewing the Recovery and Recycling Strategy considering changes to the GDA.
- 7.23. Planning permission was granted by ECC for the Chelmsford Northeast Bypass in March 2022 and advanced works started in November 2022. Final planning permission was granted for Beaulieu Park Station in June 2022 and construction work has started in 2023.

Garden Community Capacity Fund

- 7.24. A further bid for Garden Communities capacity funding was submitted to Homes England in 2021. In 2022 it was announced that the bid was successful in securing £164,000 to help advance and inform the Development Framework Document and supporting documents. This funding will support a range of workstreams including:
 - Dedicated ECC transportation planner and ECC infrastructure planner.
 - Continuation of Chelmsford City Council's independent advice provided by AK Urbanism, Dentons Lawyers, and LDA design landscape consultants.
 - Appointment of consultants Gerald Eve to provide infrastructure delivery and viability advice and Anthony Collins Solicitors to advise on future stewardship models.
- 7.25. A further award of £290,500 was awarded for four capital projects which are scheduled for delivery in 2023:
 - Resurfacing Pegasus Crossing to Channels Cycle Route
 - White Hart Lane footway extension
 - Personal Mobility Scheme (extension of e-scooter trial area)
 - Beaulieu and Channels secure cycle storage.

8. Local initiatives to address housing need

8.1. As a local authority, the Council has limited influence on the national economic climate and policies. However, it can use other means to ensure we meet our obligations locally.

Chelmsford Housing Strategy 2022 – 2027

- 8.2. The Chelmsford Housing Strategy was adopted in March 2022. It established 6 strategic priorities required to achieve a better, more balanced supply of homes that meet the Council's statutory duties and the City's strategic housing needs.
- 8.3. Each strategic priority is accompanied by a range of initiatives and interventions. An update of these initiatives and interventions against the strategic priorities is provided in Table 6 below.

Strategic Priority Increasing the supply of affordable homes with a focus on larger units	 Actions Closer monitoring of the mix of affordable housing on strategic sites and implementation of the Housing Additionality Planning Advice Note to capture more 4-bedroom affordable homes for rent. Completion of a new Strategic Housing Needs Assessment and Local Plan Viability assessment to explore an increase in the proportion of affordable housing for rent secured through planning gain.
	 Implementation of a First Homes Planning Advice Note that includes a requirement to provide an element of affordable housing for rent. Two sites in the planning process that will deliver 100% affordable housing which would not otherwise be released for housing. Completion of a 12-unit scheme for affordable housing.
	 Extension of the council owned hostel to provide 6 additional bedspaces. Secured planning permission for an additional 29 units of affordable housing on council owned land that will deliver a higher proportion of larger homes. Approved two Council capital grants to deliver one 4-bed refurbished dwellings and four 3-bed new build dwellings.
Increase the supply of affordable homes from the existing housing stock	 Acquisition of 37 units of temporary accommodation. Completion of an audit of social housing stock to inform better monitoring of nomination rights.
SIOUR	Developed a Relationship Strategy with CHP.Held a stakeholder meeting with key partners.

Table 6 – Chelmsford Housing Strategy 2022 – 2027 Actions Update

	 Conducted a void survey with RPs to review current vacancy levels. Discussed / appraised tenure conversions of unsold shared ownership dwellings with Registered Providers. Conducted feasibility studies on underused garage sites for Registered Provider partners. Explored ways to make the best use of the Council's housing policies for the allocation of homes.
Supporting landlords and tenants of privately rented homes	 Established a private landlords' forum.
Enabling the right supply of specialist housing to meet local need	 Implementation of a Specialist Residential Accommodation Planning Advice Note to enable more flexible delivery of supported housing through the planning process. Maximised opportunities through the NSAP, RSAP, SHAP and LAHF2 funds as referenced in section 7 above.
Develop Effective Partnerships	 Secured Investment Partner status with Homes England and established regular investment partnership meetings. Prepared a statement for partners setting out our priorities. Instigated an arrangement with Registered Provider to acquire additional temporary accommodation and improve management of the existing temporary accommodation. Established a service level agreement with Eastern Community Homes and action plan to improve knowledge and awareness of community-led housing. Developed a Community-Led Housing Planning Advice Note.
Monitoring trends and performance to inform future actions.	 Reviewed the KPIs within the Housing Service. Scheduled review meetings with Registered Providers.

8.4. A Housing Action Group consisting of a range of officers from across the Council has been established to examine different ways of sourcing temporary accommodation at an acceptable cost and review processes within the Housing Service, as well as their interface with other services, to identify ways to streamline administration within / across the services.

Plan-making and Land Allocation

8.5. The Council is expected to allocate land for new development in the new Local Plan and ensure there is a rolling supply of deliverable sites to provide at least five years' supply of new homes. The Council adopted the Chelmsford Local Plan 2013-2036 on the 27 May 2020.

- 8.6. At the time of adoption, the Local Plan included provision for:
 - around 9,579 houses on new site allocations
 - around 1,200 houses on sites not identified (windfalls)
 - around 11,064 new homes which already have planning permission
 - 9 Gypsy and Traveller pitches
 - 24 Travelling Showpeople plots.
- 8.7. The Masterplans listed below have all been through the consultation process and approved by Cabinet:
 - Strategic Growth Site 1b: former St Peter's College.
 - Strategic Growth Site 2: West Chelmsford.
 - Strategic Growth Site 3a: East Chelmsford, Manor Farm.
 - Strategic Growth Sites 3B, 3C and 3d: East Chelmsford, land north and south of Maldon Road.
 - Strategic Growth Site 7: Great Leighs.
 - Strategic Growth Site 8: North of Broomfield.
 - Strategy Growth Site 10: North of South Woodham Ferrers.
- 8.8. The review of the adopted Local Plan commenced in 2022. An Issues and Options consultation ran for 10 weeks and closed in October 2022. A <u>Housing</u> <u>Topic Paper</u> was published alongside the consultation and identified several areas that we may explore for new or significantly altered housing related local policies.
- 8.9. For the purposes of the Issues and Options Consultation, the Council proposed a Housing Requirement figure of 1,000 homes per annum for the plan period 2022 – 2041 and this figure is considered a reasonable figure following completion of a new SHNA.
- 8.10. The SHNA identified a total affordable housing need in Chelmsford of 642 affordable dwellings for rent per-annum, which is notionally 67% of the local housing need calculated using the Standard Method. The SHNA considers this figure and notes that interpreting the affordable need figure in the context of the local housing need calculated using the Standard Method is not possible as the two do not measure the same thing. Many households already live in housing and do not therefore generate an overall net need for an additional home. When those already in housing are excluded from the affordable housing need calculation, the affordable need falls to 467 per annum.
- 8.11. The SHNA concludes that whilst there is no direct link between the affordable need and the overall housing need, the need for affordable housing is acute across the Council area. It recommends a 40% affordable housing target is tested on sites of 10 or more dwellings although notes that the amount of affordable housing delivered will be limited to the amount that can viably be provided.

- 8.12. The SHNA reviews a range of affordable housing products available to meet housing need. The SHNA concludes that there is a need for both social and affordable rented housing and social rents should be prioritised where delivery does not prejudice the overall delivery of affordable homes. It recommends the Council seeks a 75:25 split between rented and affordable homes ownership (30% of all housing:10% of all housing).
- 8.13. The SHNA is inconclusive about the scale of the need for affordable home ownership products although notes that there are many households in Chelmsford who are being excluded from the owner-occupied sector. The study considers First Homes and shared ownership and notes that each will have a role to play. Shared ownership is likely to be suitable for households with more marginal affordability as it has the advantage of a lower deposit and subsidised rent. The SHNA does not recommend the Council investigates higher discounts than 30% from market value for First Homes unless this can be proven to not impact on overall affordable housing delivery. It also concludes that regardless of need and demand, the Council should not seek to reduce the amount of social/affordable rented homes by prioritising First Homes. Where major development involving the provision of housing is proposed, national planning policy (NPPF 2019) requires (with some exceptions) at least 10% of homes to be available for affordable home ownership and National Planning Practice Guidance states that a minimum of 25% of all affordable housing units secured through developer contributions should be First Homes.
- 8.14. The Local Plan Viability Update (2023) incorporated four sets of appraisals based on 30%, 35%, 40% and 45% affordable housing with sensitivity testing in relation to costs and values as well as variations in environmental and accessibility standards. The Update found that should the Council seek all affordable housing for rent as social rent, this would reduce the scope for affordable housing provision by 5%. The Update also shows that increasing the discount on First Homes is likely to have a substantial impact on the viability of development.
- 8.15. The recommendations in the SHNA and the outputs of the Local Plan Viability Update (2023) will inform the next draft of the review of the Local Plan – the Preferred Options Document – which is due to be published and consulted on in 2024.

9. Conclusion

- 9.1. Chelmsford has delivered more new homes than required over the last year and forecasts indicate that completion rates are set to remain above the annual housing requirement over the next 5 years.
- 9.2. Despite the number of new homes with extant planning permissions falling this monitoring period, the number of homes at the pre-planning stage and within major applications has increased.

- 9.3. Whilst there has been an increase in affordable housing delivered this year and successful partnerships to maximise national funding initiatives to secure additional affordable housing, it remains critical to secure increased delivery of the right type of affordable homes. The SHNA shows the acute need for affordable housing for rent and progress in delivering against the priorities in the Chelmsford Housing Strategy remains a priority.
- 9.4. The review of the Local Plan is well underway and new evidence base documents including the SHNA and Local Plan Viability update will inform the next draft of it.
- 9.5. The Council will continue to monitor and respond to changes to the national planning framework to support the delivery of housing and other essential infrastructure identified in the Local Plan.

List of appendices:

- Appendix 1 Annual Report of Key Housing Monitoring Statistics
- **Appendix 2** Chelmsford City Council response to the 'Technical consultation on the Infrastructure Levy'

Background papers: None

Corporate Implications

Legal/Constitutional:

The statutory framework for planning obligations is set out in Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended. Regulations 122 and 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and paragraphs 54 to 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) set out the Government's policy on planning obligations.

The Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill is currently at the final stage with consideration of amendments prior to Royal Assent. When it achieves Royal Assent the full implications of final changes can be considered.

Financial:

The rate of new housing delivery directly impacts upon the amount of New Homes Bonus received by the Council and financial contributions to supporting infrastructure through the existing planning obligations process (Section 106 Agreements) and Community Infrastructure Levy receipts. The rate of delivery of new affordable housing for rent impacts on the Council's reliance on temporary accommodation, including the most expensive forms of temporary accommodation provided in the form of bed and breakfast accommodation and nightly lets.

The council grant funding monies are required to be spent on affordable housing proposals having been secured in lieu of on-site contributions for affordable housing through planning obligations. The grant funding programme will address priority housing need and reduce the need and cost of temporary accommodation although they will result in a loss of interest when spent.

Potential impact on climate change and the environment:

The Local Plan promotes sustainable development and includes policies to mitigate and adapt to climate change and to protect the environment.

Additional new development outlined within the Chelmsford Local Plan could have an adverse impact on climate change and the environment. These can be mitigated by Building Regulation and planning policy requirements related to environmental sustainability.

The Housing and Regeneration Bill aims to do more to measure and reduce emissions in the built environment through planning. It also aims to do more to support environmental enhancement, nature recovery and climate change adaptation; to mitigate the effects of pollution; and to embed reforms introduced by the Environment Act. Any changes introduced by the Bill when it receives Royal Assent will be considered in the review of the adopted Local Plan.

Contribution toward achieving a net zero carbon position by 2030:

The Local Plan promotes sustainable development and includes policies to reduce carbon emissions e.g. NE4 Renewable and Low Carbon Energy and Site Allocations Policies.

Future additional new homes will be required to comply with Building Regulation and planning policy requirements. This includes the Future Homes Standard and emerging Future Buildings Standard.

The Review of the Local Plan will consider how policies can be strengthened/updated and some new policies introduced to better reflect the Council's Climate Change and Ecological Emergency declaration and Action Plan to make the Council's activities net-zero carbon by 2030 and recommendations of the Essex Climate Action Commission (ECAC).

Personnel:

None

Risk Management:

None

Equality and Diversity:

Housing delivery is important for all tenures and types of housing to meet the community's needs. The Council will need to undertake an Equalities and Diversity

Impact Assessment, if any new policies or procedures to be introduced or implemented, particularly to ensure that no identified group from within the Equalities Act is more affected than others.

There are no new policies recommended in this report.

Health and Safety:

None

Digital:

None

Other:

Consultees:

Chelmsford City Council – Sustainable Communities Directorate

Chelmsford City Council – Financial Services

Relevant Policies and Strategies:

Corporate Plan

The above report relates to the following priorities in the Corporate Plan:

Promoting sustainable and environmentally responsible growth to stimulate a vibrant, balanced economy, a fairer society and provide more housing of all types.

Making Chelmsford a more attractive place, promoting Chelmsford's green credentials, ensuring communities are safe and creating a distinctive sense of place.

Encouraging people to live well, promoting healthy, active lifestyles and reducing social isolation, making Chelmsford a more enjoyable place in which to live, work and play.

Bringing people together, empowering local people and working in partnership to build community capacity, stronger communities and secure investment in the city.

Chelmsford Local Plan 2013-2036

Chelmsford Housing Strategy 2022-2027

Chelmsford Homelessness and Rough Sleeping Strategy 2020-2024

Annual Report of Key Housing Monitoring Statistics

November 2023



Contents

Introduction

- Table 1
 New Homes in Pre-Planning Application Stage
- Table 2
 New Homes in Current Major Planning Applications
- Table 3New Homes with Planning Permissions
- Table 4
 Total Completed New Dwellings (Net)
- Graph 1 Estimated Housing Trend
- Graph 2 Affordable Housing Completions

Introduction

Set out below is the explanatory text for each of the following tables which provide the key monitoring information for housing delivery in the City. Where it is possible the number of affordable housing is shown as a sub-set of the overall housing numbers.

Table 1 - New Homes in Pre-Planning Application Stage

Table 1 contains the number of planned new dwellings on major development sites¹ within each of the City Council's development plan areas. The sites have been aggregated and individual sites have not been identified due to the confidential and sometimes commercially sensitive nature of the pre-planning process.

Table 2 – New Homes in Current Major Planning Applications¹

Table 2 contains the number of new dwellings that are contained within planning applications that are currently under consideration by the City Council. It provides the specific site information by application; it also contains a commentary of the status of each individual site.

Depending on the type of application i.e. Outline or Full, the number of new dwellings may be either a range or an identified number. In addition, the number of new homes can vary through the life of an application due to amendments to schemes made before a formal decision is made. Although most of the sites trigger the City Council's policy requirement to provide affordable housing (11 or more dwellings), the final level and type of affordable housing secured can only be reported once a formal decision has been issued.

Table 3 – New Homes with Planning Permissions

Table 3 contains the number of new dwellings which have been granted planning permission and are still within the time limit to commence development. This is presented site by site and contains the level of affordable housing on the relevant sites. The information is sourced from the latest Housing Site Schedule which is published in April each year. To ensure that there is no double counting with completion data, Table 3 only contains development sites that have yet to be completed and provides the specific site information by application.

Table 4 – Total Completed New Dwellings (Net)

Table 4 provides an annual total of completions of new dwellings in each financial year since 2012/13 with affordable homes reported separately and then included within annual totals. In addition, a cumulative total is provided in order to provide a total of new dwellings completed. The first two quarters of 2023/24 are provided for information only.

¹ 10 or more dwellings

 Table 1 – Aggregated New Homes at Pre-Planning Stage on Major Development Sites

Local Plan Area	No. of Sites	No. of New Homes	Status of Sites (20/09/23)
Growth Area 1	8	964	Variety of sites most of which are acceptable in principle
Growth Area 2	4	460	Includes reserved matters for Beaulieu
Growth Area 3	1	14	
TOTAL	13	1,438	Note – as explained in the status box there is some double counting in this number as Beaulieu has outline planning permission.

Site	Application Reference	No. of New Homes	Status of Application (20/09/2023)
Strategic Growth Sites 3B, 3C and 3D North and West of Brick Kiln Road Sandon Chelmsford	22/00916/OUT and 22/00916/FUL	174	Hybrid application, part full and part outline. Currently under consideration, negotiations ongoing with applicant. Likely to be determined early 2024.
Land at Manor Farm Sandford Mill Lane Great Baddow Chelmsford	22/01732/OUT and 22/01732/FUL	360	Hybrid application, part full and part outline. Currently under consideration, negotiations ongoing with applicant. Likely to be determined early 2024
Land Rear of 17 to 37 Beachs Drive Chelmsford	23/00116/FUL	18	Resolution to grant permission subject to the completion of a S106. S106 negotiations underway.
Land West of the Fox and Raven Chelmer Village Way Chelmsford	23/01105/FUL	54	Currently under consideration. Development an exception to policy and will be subject to a Committee decision.
1/1A Moulsham Street Chelmsford	22/01541/FUL	10	Currently under consideration. Negotiations taking place with applicant regarding contributions (RAMS, Open Space, Trees, Public Art). Decision expected by the end of 2023.
Windermere Main Road Broomfield Chelmsford	22/00004/FUL	16	Currently under consideration. All but one consultation responses in; awaiting response from ECC SUDs. Acceptable in all other regards. Decision expected by the end of 2023.
Strategic Growth Site North of Woodhouse Lane Broomfield Chelmsford Essex	20/02064/OUT	512	Planning Committee resolution to grant planning permission subject to conditions and a S106 to include (amongst other matters) a financial contribution towards a Park and Ride Shuttle Bus service to the Hospital in lieu of the previously proposed hospital link road. S106 negotiations are ongoing. Decision anticipated before 2024.

Table 2 – New Homes within Current Major Planning Applications for Major Development

International House 2 Navigation Road Chelmsford	22/00482/FUL	48	Officers are awaiting a signed S106 agreement to be submitted. Planning permission can then be issued. Decision expected by November 2023.
Zone 3 Chelmsford Garden Community Beaulieu Parkway Chelmsford	23/00124/FUL and 23/00124/OUT	1250	Amendments received September 23 and are to be considered, negotiations ongoing with applicant. Committee date to be confirmed.
Site at 24 Duke Street Chelmsford	22/02059/FUL	118	Currently under consideration, viability being the only consideration. Works have re-commenced at the site – awaiting response/update from developer.
Car Wash Centre New Street Chelmsford	22/02263/FUL	41	Currently under consideration, viability being the main issue. Likely to be determined late 2023 or early 2024.
Land North of Warren House Roxwell Road Writtle Chelmsford	21/01545/OUT	880	Currently under consideration, negotiations ongoing with applicant. Likely to be determined early 2024.
Banters Field Main Road Great Leighs Chelmsford	21/02490/OUT	190	Currently under consideration. Fundamental highways objections, scheme being reworked, negotiations ongoing with applicant. Likely to be determined Spring 2024.
Land North West of Hamberts Farm Burham Road South Woodham Ferrers Chelmsford	21/01961/OUT and 21/01961/FUL	1020	On 7 th February 2023, Planning Committee resolved to grant planning permission subject to conditions, the completion of a s.106 agreement and the lifting of a holding direction from the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State lifted their holding direction on 12 April 2023. The s.106 now needs to be drafted
Land North of South Woodham Ferrers Burnham Road South Woodham Ferrers	22/00311/OUT	200	On 17 th April 2023, Planning Committee resolved to grant planning permission subject to conditions and the completion of a s.106 agreement. The s.106 agreement is currently being drafted.
Greater Beaulieu Park White Hart Lane Springfield Chelmsford	23/00607/REM	246	Planning application currently under consideration. Amended plans expected shortly.
Zone 1 Chelmsford Garden	22/01950/OUT	1500	Amendments received late July 23; these are being considered

Table 3 – New Homes with Planning Permissions

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total	No of which AH	Status	Governing Planning Permission and	Work Started		
				АП		completions	completions		approval date			
			Extant Local D	evelopment Fra	mework Sites							
Town Centre Area Action Plan Allocations												
24 Duke Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	TCAAP10 (part of)	112	19	16%	0	0	Permission granted	17/01172/FUL approved 26/07/2018	Y		
SUB TOTAL			112	19	16% Average	0	0					
			North Che	Imsford Area A	ction Plan							
Land north south and east of Belsteads Farm Lane Broomfield (Channels) - Phase 3c 3d and 5	Broomfield - Broomfield and the Walthams	NCAAP 6, 26-27	240	94	35% spread across all phases	194	84	Permission granted	10/01976/OUT approved 31/10/2012	Y		
Land north south and east of Belsteads Farm Lane Broomfield (Channels) - Phase 4	Broomfield - Broomfield and the Walthams	NCAAP 6, 26-27	27	0	35% spread across all phases	0	0	Permission granted	10/01976/OUT approved 31/10/2012	Y		
Land north south and east of Belsteads Farm Lane Broomfield (Channels) - Phase 6	Broomfield - Broomfield and the Walthams	NCAAP 6, 26-27	128	28	35% spread across all phases	57	28	Permission granted	10/01976/OUT approved 31/10/2012	Y		
Land east of North Court Road and north of Hospital Approach Broomfield (Care Home)	Broomfield - Broomfield and the Walthams	NCAAP1	26	0	0%	0	0	Permission granted	13/00409/FUL approved 28/05/2014	Y		
Greater Beaulieu Park White Hart Lane Springfield - Phase 2 - Zone K and L	Springfield - Springfield North	NCAAP 5,7-10,12	300	81	27%	106	36	Permission granted	09/01314/EIA approved 07/03/2014	Y, November 2014		
Greater Beaulieu Park White Hart Lane Springfield - Phase 2- Zone J	Springfield - Springfield North	NCAAP 5,7-10,12	82	23	27%	0	0	Permission granted	09/01314/EIA approved 07/03/2014	Y, November 2014		
Greater Beaulieu Park White Hart Lane Springfield - Phase 3 - Zone M, N & Q	Springfield - Springfield North	NCAAP 5,7-10,12	272	84	27%	74	16	Permission granted	09/01314/EIA approved 07/03/2014	Y, November 2014		
Greater Beaulieu Park White Hart Lane Springfield - Phase 3 - Zones O & P	Springfield - Springfield North	NCAAP 5,7-10,12	111	30	37%	2	0	Permission granted	09/01314/EIA approved 07/03/2014	Y, November 2014		
Greater Beaulieu Park White Hart Lane Springfield - Phase 3 - Zone V	Boreham - Boreham and the Leighs	NCAAP 5,7-10,12	145	39	27%	52	9	Permission granted	09/01314/EIA approved 07/03/2014	Y		
Greater Beaulieu Park White Hart Lane Springfield - Phase 3 - Zone W	Springfield - Springfield North	NCAAP 5,7-10,12	194	52	27%	0	0	Permission granted	09/01314/EIA approved 07/03/2014	Y		
Greater Beaulieu Park White Hart Lane Springfield - Phase 3 - Zone T	Springfield - Springfield North	NCAAP 5,7-10,12	66	18	27%	0	0	Permission granted	09/01314/EIA approved 07/03/2014	Y		
Greater Beaulieu Park White Hart Lane Springfield - Remainder of phase 2-4	Springfield - Springfield North	NCAAP 5,7-10,12	1246	461	27%	0	0	Permission granted	09/01314/EIA approved 07/03/2014	Y		

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
SUB TOTAL			2837	910	27.5% Average	485	173			
		Site A	llocations Devel	opment Plan D	ocument Alloca	tions				
Former Runwell Hospital (St Lukes) Runwell Chase Runwell - Phase 4	Rettendon - Rettendon & Runwell	SAD17	134	47	35%	98	20	Permission granted	12/01480/OUT approved 21/11/2013	Y
Former Runwell Hospital (St Lukes) Runwell Chase Runwell - Phase 5	Rettendon - Rettendon & Runwell	SAD17	71	25	35%	0	0	Permission granted	12/01480/OUT approved 21/11/2013	Ν
Land at Former Runwell Hospital Runwell Chase Runwell Wickford	Rettendon - Rettendon & Runwell	SAD17	29	10	35%	0	0	Permission granted	21/02041/FUL approved 05/08/2022	Y, Oct 2022
Morelands Industrial Estate, Tileworks Lane, Rettendon	Rettendon - Rettendon & Runwell	SAD16	92	0	0%	0	0	Permission granted	19/00384/OUT approved 06/04/2020	Y, Sept 2022
Land between Back Lane and Old Church Road East Hanningfield	East Hanningfield - Bicknacre and West Hanningfield	SAD20	20	10	50%	0	0	Permission granted	17/01646/OUT allowed at appeal 02/01/2020	Ν
SUB TOTAL			346	92	31% Average	98	20			
			Large	Sites (Unalloca	ted)					
47 Broomfield Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Marconi	TCAAP	14	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	16/01145/FUL approved 30/09/2016	Y, Building Demolished Dec 2016
Site rear of 30-34 Broomfield Road	Chelmsford - Marconi	ТСААР	24	0	0%	0	0	Permission granted	18/01544/FUL approved 28/02/2019	Y, Jan 2022
10-13 Hoffmans Way Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Marconi	Growth Area 1	11	0	N/A as prior approval	0	0	Prior Approval Required - Approved	22/02192/CUPAMA approved 26/01/2023	Ν
South Side Car Park Railway Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Marconi	Growth Area 1	10	10	100%	0	0	Permission granted	21/01767/FUL approved 28/01/2022	N
Site at The Atlantic Hotel New Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Marconi	Growth Area 1	10	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01982/FUL approved 25/07/2022	IN September 2022
Hill & Abbott First Floor Threadneedle House 9-10 Market Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	ТСААР	66	0	N/A as prior approval	0	0	Prior approval required - approve	19/01849/CUPAO approved 06/01/2020	IN Jan 2020

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Saxon House 27 Duke Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	39	0	N/A as prior approval	0	0	Prior approval required - approve	21/01594/CUPAO approved 21/09/2021	N
Makerstudy House Waterloo Lane Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	22	0	N/A as prior approval	0	0	Prior approval required - approve	21/01588/CUPAO approved 21/09/2021	Ν
1 Legg Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	94	0	N/A as prior approval	0	0	Prior Approval Required - Appeal Allowed	21/01504/CUPAO allowed at appeal 08/11/2022	IN November 2021
Sadlers House 2 Legg Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham and Central	ТСААР	13	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/01058/FUL approved 14/05/2020	Y
39 Springfield Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	18	0	N/A as prior approval	0	0	Prior Approval Required - Approved	21/00323/CUPAO approved 13/04/2021	N
Site at 137 Beehive Lane Great Baddow Chelmsford	Great Baddow - Great Baddow West	SAD	10	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00791/FUL approved 02/09/2020	N
Land to the rear of 51- 54A High Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	10	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/01381/FUL approved 15/01/2021	N
39 Moulsham Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	12	0	N/A as prior approval	0	0	Prior Approval Required - Approved	21/00318/CUPAO approved 07/04/2021	N
Royal & Sunalliance Parkview House Victoria Road South	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	TCAAP	45	0	0%	0	0	Permission granted	15/01651/MAT/1 approved 19/08/2016	Y (See 17/01984/CLEUD)
Royal & Sunalliance Parkview House Victoria Road South	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	ТСААР	15	0	0%	0	0	Permission granted	15/01590/MAT/1 approved 19/08/2016	Y
Site at Dorset House Duke Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	40	0	N/A as prior approval	0	0	Permission granted	21/00716/CUPAO approved 25/05/2021	N
Site at Victoria House 101-105 Victoria Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	78	0	N/A as prior approval	0	0	Permission granted	21/00719/CUPAO approved 25/05/2021	N
Victoria House 101-105 Victoria Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	44	0	N/A as prior approval	0	0	Prior approval required - approved	22/01075/P20AA approved 23/09/2022	IN Feb 2023

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
St Josephs Nursing Home Gay Bowers Road Danbury	Danbury - Little Baddow Danbury and Sandon	SAD	10	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/00866/FUL approved 07/11/2019	Y, Oct 2022
Brook Farm Riding Stables Stock Road Stock Billericay	Stock - South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting	SAD	10	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	17/02001/FUL approved 01/03/2018	IN June 2020
Site at Indian Nights London Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Goat Hall	Growth Area 1	10	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00733/FUL approved 24/09/2021	Ν
Site at Windermere Main Road Broomfield Chelmsford	Broomfield - Broomfield and the Walthams	Growth Area 2	14	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00004/FUL approved 02/12/2022	Ν
SUBTOTAL			619	10	33% Average	0	0			
			Small	Sites (Unalloca	ted)					
Boreham Village Store Main Road Boreham	Boreham - Boreham and the Leighs	SAD	5	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00992/FUL approved 22/09/2020	Ν
Land Adjacent Restmore Main Road Boreham Chelmsford	Boreham - Boreham and the Leighs	Growth Area 2	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01432/FUL approved 08/01/2021	Ν
Land North West Of 5 Bulls Lodge Cottages General Lane Boreham	Boreham - Boreham and the Leighs	Growth Area 2	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01567/FUL approved 16/12/2020	IN April 2022
Site at North Bungalow Elm Way Boreham	Boreham - Boreham and the Leighs	Growth Area 2	9	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01776/FUL approved 23/02/2023	Ν
Land South of 124 Plantation Road Boreham Chelmsford	Boreham - Boreham and the Leighs	Growth Area 2	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission n granted	20/00340/FUL approved 28/08/2020	Y, Sept 2022
Site at Paglesham House Hollow Lane Broomfield Chelmsford	Broomfield - Broomfield and the Walthams	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/01211/FUL approved 02/09/2019	Y, May 2022
Site at Vehicle Workshop Thrift Farm Moulsham Thrift Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Goat Hall	Growth Area 1	3	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00608/FUL approved 24/06/2022	Ν
Land at Thrift Farm Moulsham Thrift Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Goat Hall	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00688/FUL approved 04/12/2020	Ν
Site at West House 34 Broomfield Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Marconi	TCAAP	4	0	N/A	0	0	Prior Approval not required	20/01448/CUPAO approved 23/11/2020	Ν
Site at West House 34 Broomfield Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Marconi	ТСААР	5	0	N/A	0	0	Prior Approval not required	20/01477/CUPAO approved 15/12/2020	Ν

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Land Rear of 11A to 15 Broomfield Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Marconi	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00506/FUL approved 19/05/2022	IN Jan 2023
Site at 6-14 Rainsford Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Marconi	Growth Area 1	3	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01037/FUL approved 19/12/2022	Ν
11A - 15 Broomfield Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Marconi	Growth Area 1	3	0	N/A	0	0	Prior Approval Required - Approved	21/02066/CUPAMA approved 10/12/2021	Ν
82-86 Kings Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Marconi	Growth Area 1	5	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00958/FUL approved 08/09/2020	Y, Jan 2022
6 Hoffmans Way Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Marconi	Growth Area 1	8	0	N/A	0	0	Prior Approval Required - approved	20/00885/CUPAO approved 28/07/2020	Ν
Land at Moulsham Grange Moulsham Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	9	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00897/FUL approved 30/06/2022	Ν
Land Rear of Stuarts Moulsham Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/00361/FUL approved 31/07/2019	Y, June 2022
Land Rear of Colinton Moulsham Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01468/FUL approved 28/10/2022	Ν
Second Floor 163-164 Moulsham Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	0	0	Prior approval - not required	21/01182/CUPAO approved 02/08/2021	Ν
42 Moulsham Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01302/FUL approved 07/09/2021	Y, Jan 2023
King William House 6 New Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01109/FUL approved 19/07/2022	Y
4 Baddow Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	o	0	Permission granted	20/01458/FUL approved 12/11/2020	Ν
37 Shrublands Close Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	ТСААР	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00075/FUL approved 22/05/2020	Ν

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Land South East of Riverbank Court Shrublands Close Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	ТСААР	3	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	12/00917/FUL approved 25/07/2012	Y, (works stalled)
Land Rear of 101 New London Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	ТСААР	8	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/00126/FUL approved 13/02/2020	IN Feb 2023
Carlton House 101 New London Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/02492/FUL approved 01/06/2022	Ν
Chelmsford Club 108 New London Road	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	ТСААР	5	0	N/A	2	0	Permission granted	14/01406/FUL approved 28/11/2014	Y
Chambers Wealth Management 130 New London Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00894/FUL approved 14/08/2020	Ν
32-33 New Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/02086/FUL approved 27/05/2022	Ν
Back Inn Time 13 Cottage Place Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	7	0	N/A	0	0	Appeal allowed	21/01563/FUL allowed 25/05/2022	Ν
Site at 65-66 Victoria Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	3	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00193/FUL approved 29/05/2020	Y, March 2021
90 High Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	3	0	N/A	o	0	Permission granted	20/00743/FUL approved 27/08/2020	IN June 2022
22A Duke Street, Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	TCAAP	5	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	15/01231/FUL approved 03/11/2015	Y, May 2017 (stalled)
Site at 10 and 10A Duke Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	4	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00870/FUL approved 06/09/2022	Ν
86 Duke Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	4	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01972/FUL approved 06/01/2023	Ν
Site Rear of 20 St Vincents Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01462/FUL approved 14/10/2022	Ν
33 Redmayne Drive Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01361/FUL approved 08/10/2021	Ν

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Land East of 2 St Mildreds Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	16/01686/FUL approved 20/12/2016	Y, Dec 2019 (stalled)
Kingdom Hall Of Jehovahs Witnesses Bradford Street Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01633/FUL approved 30/11/2021	Y, June 2022
15 Van Diemans Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Moulsham and Central	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	permission granted	21/00972/FUL approved 13/07/2021	Y, November 2021
10 Brian Close Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham Lodge	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00066/FUL approved 09/03/2022	Ν
Land Adjacent 31 Sycamore Way Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham Lodge	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00695/FUL approved 10/06/2022	IN June 2022
187 Gloucester Avenue Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Moulsham Lodge	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00113/FUL approved 25/03/2022	N
Site Adjacent 21 Sunrise Avenue Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Patching Hall	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01143/FUL approved 03/08/2022	N
Land at 3 Town Croft Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Patching Hall	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/02258/FUL approved 07/02/2023	N
Land Between 59-61 Rutland Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Patching Hall	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00911/FUL approved 26/08/2020	Y, July 2022
Site at 127 Melbourne Avenue Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - St Andrews	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01598/FUL approved 21/10/2022	Ν
Site at Writtle Wick Family Centre Chignal Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - St Andrews	Growth Area 1	7	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00396/FUL approved 10/06/2020	Ν
18A Belvawney Close Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - St Andrews	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01520/FUL approved 07/10/2022	IN May 2021
Land at 24 Mendip Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - St Andrews	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/00990/FUL approved 21/07/2021	N
21 Seven Ash Green Chelmsford	Chelmsford - The Lawns	SAD	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	12/01499/FUL approved 30/11/2012	Y, (stalled)

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Site at 171 Springfield Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Trinity	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/02010/FUL approved 12/02/2021	Y, July 2021
Block 1 to 11 Abbotts Place Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Trinity	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01432/FUL approved 11/10/2022	Ν
37 Arbour Lane Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Trinity	Growth Area 1	9	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01769/FUL approved 25/01/2022	Y
37 Arbour Lane Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Trinity	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/02076/FUL approved 28/03/2023	Y
Land rear of 270 to 272 Springfield Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Trinity	TCAAP	2	0	N/A	1	0	Permission granted	13/00996/FUL approved 11/09/2013	Y (stalled)
73 Rainsford Lane Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Waterhouse Farm	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00638/FUL approved 02/07/2020	Ν
5-7 Robjohns Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Waterhouse Farm	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Prior Approval Required - Approved	21/00853/CUPAO approved 10/06/2021	Ν
Land Adjacent 28 Hainault Grove Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Waterhouse Farm	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	23/00019/FUL approved 09/03/2023	Ν
106 Forest Drive Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Waterhouse Farm	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01044/FUL approved 26/08/2022	Ν
Land Adjacent to 1 Savernake Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Waterhouse Farm	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01952/FUL approved 20/01/2023	Y, Feb 2023
Site at 43 Waterhouse Lane Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Waterhouse Farm	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00462/FUL approved 05/05/2022	Ν
32 Writtle Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Waterhouse Farm	Growth Area 1	3	0	N/A	0	0	Prior approval required - approved	20/01246/CUPAO approved 22/09/2020	Ν

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Land and Buildings West of Beaumont Otes Cottage Chignal Road Chignal Smealy Chelmsford	Chignal - Chignal Rural West	Growth Area 1	8	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00121/FUL approved 27/05/2020 and 22/01466/FUL approved 13/01/2023	Y, September 2021
Barn South Hillcroft Chignal Road Chignal Smealy Chelmsford	Chignal - Chelmsford Rural West	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00825/FUL approved 17/12/2020	BR, Jan 2023
Land Between Trelawn and Tylarke Southwood Chase Danbury Chelmsford	Danbury - Little Baddow Danbury and Sandon	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	O	o	Permission granted	20/01522/OUT approved 27/11/2020	Ν
Gordon House Hyde Lane Danbury Chelmsford	Danbury - Little Baddow Danbury and Sandon	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00194/FUL approved 04/04/2022	IN June 2022
WI Hall Old Church Road East Hanningfield Chelmsford	East Hanningfield - Bicknacre and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	23/00093/FUL approved 24/03/2023	N
Stables at Highwater Farm Main Road East Hanningfield Chelmsford	East Hanningfield - Bicknacre and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	2	0	N/A	0	0	Prior Approval Required - Approved	22/01637/CUPAQ approved 03/11/2022	N
212 Watchouse Road Galleywood Chelmsford	Galleywood - Galleywood	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01156/FUL approved 25/08/2022	N
2 Skinners Lane Galleywood Chelmsford	Galleywood - Galleywood	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01332/FUL approved 02/09/2022	IN Dec 2022
Site at Kirriemuir Stock Road Galleywood Chelmsford	Galleywood - Galleywood	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00926/FUL approved 13/07/2022	N
Site at Mapletree Works Brook Lane Galleywood Chelmsford	Galleywood - Galleywood	SAD	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	17/00290/FUL approved 25/07/2018	Y (demolition)
Site at 190 Galleywood Road Great Baddow Chelmsford	Great Baddow - Great Baddow West	Growth Area 1	4	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01564/FUL approved 21/10/2021 and 21/01564/FUL	Y
30 Chelmerton Avenue Great Baddow Chelmsford	Great Baddow - Great Baddow West	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01817/FUL approved 06/01/2021	Ν

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
275 Baddow Road Great Baddow Chelmsford	Great Baddow - Great Baddow East	Growth Area 1	8	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00014/FUL approved 06/04/2022	IN April 2022
Land Between 273-277 Baddow Road Great Baddow Chelmsford	Great Baddow - Great Baddow East	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00887/FUL approved 29/06/2022	IN Oct 2022
Site at 346 Baddow Road Chelmsford	Great Baddow - Great Baddow East	Growth Area 1	8	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/00818/FUL approved 30/07/2021	Y, June 2022
Land South of the Bell Centre Bell Street Great Baddow Chelmsford	Great Baddow - Great Baddow East	SAD	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/01791/FUL approved 21/05/2020	Y, June 2022
Site at the Bell Centre Bell Street Great Baddow	Great Baddow - Great Baddow East	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/00160/FUL approved 05/07/2019	Y, June 2022
Land North of 373 Baddow Road Chelmsford	Great Baddow - Great Baddow East	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01391/FUL approved 05/10/2022	N
Site at 291-293 Baddow Road Chelmsford	Great Baddow - Great Baddow East	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01774/FUL approved 16/11/2021	IN Oct 2022
Outbuilding at Whitehouse Farm Boreham Road Great Leighs Chelmsford	Great and Little Leighs - Boreham and the Leighs	SAD	1	0	N/A	o	O	Permission granted	21/00599/FUL approved 02/06/2021	N
Agricultural Building South West of Pippins Hornells Corner Little Leighs Chelmsford	Great and Little Leighs - Boreham and the Leighs	Growth Area 2	1	0	N/A	0	0	Prior Approval Required - Approved	22/00447/CUPAQ approved 29/04/2022	N
Site at Pond View Banters Lane Great Leighs Chelmsford	Great and Little Leighs - Boreham and the Leighs	Growth Area 2	3	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/02026/FUL approved 14/05/2020	N
Site at Pond View Banters Lane Great Leighs Chelmsford	Great and Little Leighs - Boreham and the Leighs	Growth Area 2	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/00880/FUL approved 01/07/2021	N
Land South West of Blue Barnes Farm Gubbions Lane Great Leighs Chelmsford	Great and Little Leighs - Boreham and the Leighs	Growth Area 2	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01481/FUL approved 04/10/2021	N

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Land Adjacent Corner Cottage Banters Lane Great Leighs Chelmsford	Great and Little Leighs - Boreham and the Leighs	Growth Area 2	4	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01726/FUL approved 02/12/2022	N
Land at 37 Main Road Great Leighs Chelmsford	Great and Little Leighs - Boreham and the Leighs	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	17/01365/FUL approved 16/10/2017	Y, September 2021
Buildings at Wakerings Farm Leighs Road Great Leighs Chelmsford	Great and Little Leighs - Boreham and the Leighs	Growth Area 2	3	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01954/FUL approved 01/03/2021	IN Feb 2023
Land at Sunnyside Margarets Woods Road Great Waltham Chelmsford	Great Waltham - Broomfield and the Walthams	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	18/01487/FUL approved 11/02/2019	Y, June 2020 (self build)
Barn South of Poulters Farm Ringtail Green Ford End Chelmsford	Great Waltham - Broomfield and The Walthams	Growth Area 2	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00470/FUL approved 16/06/2020	N
Site adjacent 31 Pleshey Road Ford End Chelmsford	Great Waltham - Broomfield and the Walthams	Growth Area 2	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/00478/FUL approved 25/06/2021	Y
Barn at Garnetts Farm Mashbury Road Great Waltham Chelmsford	Great Waltham - Broomfield and the Walthams	Growth Area 2	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01327/FUL approved 15/12/2021	Y, Oct 2022
Land South of Firland Woods Road Great Waltham Chelmsford	Great Waltham - Broomfield and the Walthams	Growth Area 2	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/00432/FUL approved 22/04/2021	IN Jan 2022
Barn South West of Lavender Farm Main Road Great Waltham Chelmsford	Great Waltham - Broomfield and The Walthams	Growth Area 2	2	0	N/A	0	0	Change of use Prior Approval - Prior Approval Required - Approved	20/00978/CUPAQ approved 21/08/2020	Ν
Lavender Farm Main Road Great Waltham Chelmsford	Great Waltham - Broomfield and The Walthams	Growth Area 2	6	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00967/FUL approved 25/09/2020	Y, Feb 2023
Land East of Rye Cottage Larks Lane Great Waltham	Great Waltham - Broomfield and The Walthams	SAD	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/01261/FUL approved 07/05/2020	IN June 2022
Land Adjacent Riverview House Lucks Lane Howe Street Chelmsford	Great Waltham - Broomfield and The Walthams	Growth Area 2	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00370/FUL approved 28/08/2020	Ν
Land South of Firland Wood Road Great Waltham Chelmsford	Great Waltham - Broomfield and The Walthams	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/01645/FUL approved 20/11/2019	IN Jan 2022
Site Adjacent 24 Souther Cross Road Good Easter Chelmsford	Good Easter - Chelmsford Rural West	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00578/FUL approved 15/07/2020	Y March 2023

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Barn at School Road Good Easter Chelmsford	Good Easter - Chelmsford Rural West	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Prior Approval Required - approved	22/02054/CUPA approved 04/01/2023	N
Awes Farm Ingatestone Road Highwood	Highwood - Chelmsford Rural West	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	12/01679/FUL approved 23/01/2013	Y, Jan 16 (works stalled)
Land at Phillips Farm Highwood Road Highwood Chelmsford	Highwood - Chelmsford Rural West	SAD	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	14/00756/FUL approved 02/07/2014	Y (phased)
Land Adjacent Barbers Orchard Colam Lane Little Baddow Chelmsford	Little Baddow - Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/00641/FUL approved 18/06/2019	Y (Stalled)
Land Adjacent Sandpit Cottage Holybread Lane Little Baddow Chelmsford	Little Baddow - Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00945/FUL approved 01/12/2022	N
Barn Little Baddow Hall Farm Church Road Little Baddow Chelmsford	Little Baddow - Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00389/CUPAQ approved 11/05/2022	N
Barn North of Graces Farm Graces Lane Little Baddow Chelmsford	Little Baddow - Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Prior approval required - approved	20/01273/CUPAQ approved 05/10/2020	N
Site North of Rolphs Cottages Blasford Hill Little Waltham Chelmsford	Little Waltham - Broomfield and the Walthams	Growth Area 2	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/02104/FUL approved 04/02/2022	IN June 2022
Land South of the Wilderness Leighs Road Little Waltham Chelmsford	Little Waltham - Broomfield and the Walthams	Growth Area 2	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/02058/FUL approved 01/03/2023	N
Site at the Bungalow Belsteads Farm Lane Little Waltham Chelmsford	Little Waltham - Broomfield and the Walthams	Growth Area 2	5	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01954/FUL approved 14/01/2022	N
Larmar Engineering Co Ltd Main Road Margaretting Ingatestone Chelmsford	Margaretting - South Hanningfield, Stock and Margaretting	Growth Area 3	5	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01831/FUL approved 03/12/2021	IN April 2022

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Land at Margaretting Hall Church Lane Margaretting Chelmsford	Margaretting - South Hanningfield, Stock and Margaretting	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01540/OUT approved 18/01/2022	N
Site at Farthings Pennys Lane Margaretting Ingatestone	Margaretting - South Hanningfield, Stock and Margaretting	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/01514/FUL approved 09/02/2020	IN March 2020
Site at the Leys Maldon Road Margaretting Ingatestone	Margaretting - South Hanningfield, Stock and Margaretting	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00678/CUPAQ approved 24/05/2022	BR May 2022
Farm Office Canterburys Main Road Margaretting	Margaretting - South Hanningfield Stock and Margaretting	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/00464/FUL approved 26/04/2021	Y, BR Aug 2022
Bearmans Farmhouse Writtle Road Margaretting Chelmsford	Margaretting - South Hanningfield, Stock and Margaretting	SAD	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	17/00711/FUL approved 23/10/2017	IN Oct 2020
Barn North of Bury Farm Bury Road Pleshey Chelmsford	Pleshey - Chelmsford Rural West	SAD	3	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	23/000159/CUPAQ approved 28/03/2023	Ν
and at Holly Tree Farm Burnham Road Battlesbridge Wickford.	Rettendon - Rettendon & Runwell	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01489/FUL approved 14/12/2020	Ν
and at Whitegates Woodham Road Rettendon Chelmsford	Rettendon - Rettendon & Runwell	Growth Area 3	3	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01335/OUT approved 10/09/2021	Ν
ite at High House Farm Woodham Road Rettendon Chelmsford	Rettendon - Rettendon and Runwell	Growth Area 3	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00200/FUL approved 07/04/2022	Ν
lunters Lodge Chalk Street Rettendon Common	Rettendon - Rettendon & Runwell	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01394/FUL approved 29/10/2020	IN June 2022
The Old Nursery Rettendon Wickford	Rettendon - Rettendon & Runwell	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00102/FUL approved 21/03/2022	Y

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Pooty Pools Farm Radley Green Road Roxwell	Roxwell - Chelmsford Rural West	SAD	3	0	N/A	1	0	Permission granted	14/01069/FUL approved 10/11/2014	Y, March 2015 (phased and stalled)
Barn at Skreens Park Road Roxwell Chelmsford	Roxwell - Chelmsford Rural West	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	18/01843/CUPAQ approved 18/12/2018	IN July 2019
Site at The Oaks Runwell Chase Runwell Chelmsford	Runwell - Rettendon & Runwell	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/00565/FUL approved 26/05/2021	Y, Sept 2021
Car Sales Highover Cottage Runwell Road Runwell Chelmsford	Runwell - Rettendon & Runwell	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/02075/FUL approved 18/01/2023	Ν
Land West of Hedge Grove Meadow Lane Runwell	Runwell - Rettendon & Runwell	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00632/FUL approved 09/06/2022	Ν
Land Adjacent Brick Cottages Runwell Road Runwell Wickford	Runwell, Rettendon and Runwell	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/02127/FUL approved 05/03/2021	Y, May 2022
Land Adjacent 2 Brick Cottages Runwell Road Runwell Wickford	Runwell, Rettendon and Runwell	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/02500/FUL approved 09/03/2022	Ν
The Laurels 130 Church End Lane Runwell Wickford	Runwell, Rettendon and Runwell	Growth Area 3	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01319/FUL approved 27/09/2022	Ν
Land South of 8 Canewdon Gardens Runwell Wickford	Runwell, Rettendon and Runwell	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/02023/FUL approved 12/01/2023	IN March 2023
Site at the Mount Meadow Lane Runwell Wickford	Runwell, Rettendon and Runwell	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/00088/FUL approved 08/03/2021	N
Land South of 132 Brock Hill South Hanningfield Wickford	Runwell, Rettendon and Runwell	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/00398/FUL approved 06/06/2019	Y, December 2021
The Barn Timbering East Hanningfield Road Sandon	Sandon - Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/00904/FUL approved 01/07/2021	Y, April 2022
Barns at Mill Hill Farm East Hanningfield Road Sandon	Sandon - Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	18/02065/FUL approved 13/03/2019	IN March 2021 (phased)

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Kaeden Place Blind Lane Sandon Chelmsford	Sandon - Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/00537/FUL approved 27/07/2022	N
Chamberlains Farm Sporhams Lane Sandon	Sandon - Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon	SAD	4	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	15/01900/OUT approved 15/06/2016	Y, May 2021 (stalled)
Site at Wild Oaks East Hanningfield Road Sandon	Sandon - Little Baddow, Danbury and Sandon	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01714/FUL approved 02/03/2023	Ν
Ambleside Park Lane Ramsden Heath Billericay	South Hanningfield - South Hanningfield Stock and Margaretting	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01305/FUL approved 16/11/2020	N
Land Rear of 9 School Road Downham Billericay	South Hanningfield - South Hanningfield Stock and	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	permission granted	20/00944/FUL approved 27/08/2020	IN April 2021
Outbuildings at Whitedown South Hanningfield Road South Hanningfield	South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting - South Hanningfield	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/01629/FUL approved 25/11/2019	Y, Oct 2022
Land at Nightingale Lodge, Brock Hill South Hanningfield	South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting - South Hanningfield	SAD	2	0	N/A	1	0	Permission granted	18/01423/FUL approved 12/10/2018	Y, December 2020
Site at Park Lane Riding School Park Lane Ramsden Heath	South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting - South Hanningfield	SAD	6	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	17/00079/FUL approved 12/07/2017	Y, July 2020
20 Church Road Ramsden Heath	South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting - South Hanningfield	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	12/01256/OUT approved 04/10/2013	N

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Stables Tylde Hall Farm Heath Road Ramsden Heath Chelmsford	South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting - South Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00472/FUL approved 01/06/2022	Ν
Agricultural Building at Park Lodge Ramsden Heath	South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting - South Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Prior approval required - approved	21/01948/CUPAQ approved 17/11/21	Y
Livery Yard Lodge Farm Heath Road Ramsden Heath	South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting	Growth Area 3	5	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/01500/FUL approved 15/06/2020	Ν
Land at 121 Downham Road Downham	South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting - South Hanningfield	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/02034/FUL approved 26/02/21	Y, May 2021
Site at 25 Mountbatten Way Springfield Chelmsford	Springfield - Springfield North	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01224/FUL approved 11/11/2020	BR Jan 2023
Land East of 48 Mayne Crest Springfield Chelmsford	Springfield - Springfield North	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00738/FUL approved 28/07/2020	Ν
Land Adjacent 77 Rushleydale Springfield Chelmsford	Springfield - Springfield North	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	17/01379/FUL approved 11/10/2017	Y, Nov 2021
Windmill Pasture Little Waltham Road Springfield Chelmsford	Springfield - Springfield North	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	18/00886/FUL approved 16/11/2018	IN April 2021
Land North of 95 Brook End Road South Springfield Chelmsford	Springfield - Chelmer Village and Beaulieu Park	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Appeal allowed	19/01434/OUT appeal allowed 09/11/2020	Y, June 2022
110 Mill Road Stock Chelmsford	Stock - South Hanningfield Stock and Margaretting	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01136/FUL approved 08/10/2021	Y, April 2022
Site at 9 The Paddock Stock Chelmsford	Stock - South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00541/FUL approved 17/05/2022	BR Dec 2022

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Land Rear of 4 The Lindens Stock Chelmsford	Stock - South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Appeal allowed	20/00246/OUT allowed at appeal 25/11/2020	N
Land Rear of 3 The Lindens Stock Chelmsford	Stock - South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01611/FUL approved 16/02/2023	Ν
Site at Ashridge Stock Road Stock Chelmsford	Stock - South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting	Growth Area 3	4	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01514/FUL approved 08/01/2020	Y
Agricultural Building at Farrows Farm Stock Road Stock Chelmsford	Stock - South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting	Growth Area 3	3	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01243/FUL approved 13/01/2023	IN March 2023
Aircraft Hangar 1 Brock Farm Ingatestone Road Stock	Stock - South Hanningfield Stock and Margaretting	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01972/FUL approved 16/03/2021	IN May 2022
Site at 6 Well Lane Stock Chelmsford	Stock - South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Appeal allowed	21/00143/FUL allowed 28/03/2022	Ν
Land East of 106 Mill Road Stock Chelmsford	Stock - South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/02191/FUL approved 08/02/2023	N
Land and Buildings South of Heathfield Dowsett Lane Stock Chelmsford	Stock - South Hanningfield Stock and Margaretting	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00487/FUL approved 13/05/2020	Y, Jan 2022
Site at Church Green Cottage and Lammas Cottage High Street Stock Chelmsford	Stock - South Hanningfield Stock and Margaretting	SAD	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	18/00538/FUL approved 29/05/2018	Y, Sept 2021
Land South West of Five Houses Common Lane Stock Chelmsford	Stock - South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00436/FUL approved 26/06/2020	BR Sept 2022

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Brock Farm Ingatestone Road Stock Ingatestone	Stock - South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting	SAD	4	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01564/FUL approved 02/12/2020	IN April 2021
Barn South West of Dowsett Farm Dowsett Lane Ramsden Heath Chelmsford	Stock - South Hanningfield, Stock & Margaretting	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/00449/FUL approved 11/03/2022	N
Flat 6 Guild Way South Woodham Ferrers	South Woodham Ferrers - South Woodham, Elmwood & Woodville	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	18/01158/FUL approved 06/12/2018	Y, September 2020
Site at 7 and 9 Trinity Square South Woodham Ferrers Chelmsford	South Woodham Ferrers - South Woodham, Elmwood & Woodville	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Prior approval not required	20/01218/CUPAM approved 24/09/2020	N
Land at 19 Albert Road South Woodham Ferrers Chelmsford	South Woodham Ferrers - South Woodham, Elmwood & Woodville	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/00341/FUL approved 24/06/2019	Y May 2022
Land North Of Communication Station At Bushy Hill Edwins Hall Road Woodham Ferrers Chelmsford	South Woodham Ferrers - South Woodham, Elmwood & Woodville	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Prior approval required - approved	22/02221/CUPAQ approved 06/02/2023	N
Land at 210 Hullbridge Road South Woodham Ferrers Chelmsford	South Woodham Ferrers - South Woodham, Elmwood & Woodville	Growth Area 3	3	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01298/FUL approved 07/03/2023	N
171 Hullbridge Road South Woodham Ferrers Chelmsford	South Woodham Ferrers - South Woodham, Elmwood & Woodville	Growth Area 3	7	0	N/A	0	0	permission granted	21/02068/FUL approved 16/12/2021	IN June 2022

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
46 Hullbridge Road South Woodham Ferrers Chelmsford	South Woodham Ferrers - South Woodham, Elmwood & Woodville	Growth Area 3	3	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01807/FUL approved 09/02/2023	N
Site at South Woodham Garage Old Wickford Road South Woodham Ferrers Chelmsford	South Woodham Ferrers - South Woodham, Elmwood & Woodville	Growth Area 3	6	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/02035/OUT approved 26/08/2020	N
Kharis Cottage Bakers Lane West Hanningfield Chelmsford	West Hanningfield - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/00600/FUL approved 19/10/2020	IN April 2021
Land at Summerseat Church Road West Hanningfield Chelmsford	West Hanningfield - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/02062/FUL approved 06/02/2020	IN April 2022
Land South of Brookfield Main Road Bicknacre Chelmsford	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/01204/OUT approved 23/08/2019	N
Site at West View Main Road Bicknacre Chelmsford	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/02388/FUL approved 02/02/2022	Y, Jan 2023
Tally Ho Main Road Bicknacre Chelmsford	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01459/FUL approved 18/11/2022	N
Outbuildings at the Barn White Elm Road Bicknacre Chelmsford	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01864/FUL approved 06/12/2021	N

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Ridings White Elm Road Bicknacre Chelmsford	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01956/FUL approved 02/12/2021	N
Priory Corner Garage Priory Road Bicknacre Chelmsford	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	9	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01315/FUL approved 22/10/2021	Y Aug 2022
Agricultural Building at Oak Lodge Farm Leighams Road Bicknacre	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/01588/FUL approved 25/11/2022	N
Land Adjacent Carlyon Cottage Main Road Woodham Ferrers	Woodham Ferrers & Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/00615/OUT approved 11/08/2021	N
Land South of Tower Farm Main Road Woodham Ferrers Chelmsford	Woodham Ferrers & Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Prior approval required - approved	21/02533/CUPAQ approved 09/02/2022	N
Stable Bankside Main Road Woodham Ferrers Chelmsford	Woodham Ferrers & Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01526/FUL approved 27/10/2021	Y, Jan 2022
Site at Wantz Cottage Crows Lane Woodham Ferrers	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01807/FUL approved 25/01/2021	N

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
Land South West of Broadacres Lodge Road Bicknacre Chelmsford	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	6	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/01800/FUL approved 14/10/2020	Y, May 2021
Spice Restaurant The Street Woodham Ferrers Chelmsford	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01640/FUL approved 08/01/2021	N
Oak House Bicknacre Road Danbury Chelmsford	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	Growth Area 3	8	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	19/02037/OUT approved 07/05/2020	N
Site at 2 Tower Road Writtle Chelmsford	Writtle	SAD	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00032/FUL approved 11/03/2022	IN June 2022
Grove House Ongar Road Writtle Chelmsford	Writtle	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01244/FUL approved 06/10/2020	N
Land East of 1 Purcell Cole Writtle	Writtle	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/01565/FUL approved 30/11/2021	IN April 2022
Barn South of 240 Ongar Road Writtle Chelmsford	Writtle	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	20/01766/CUPAQ approved 18/12/2020	N
Land Adjacent 275 Ongar Road Writtle Chelmsford	Writtle	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	21/02075/FUL approved 28/01/2022	N
Site at Oak Lodge 275 Ongar Road Writtle	Writtle	Growth Area 1	2	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00646/FUL approved 17/06/2022	IN December 2022

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started	
Clarendon House Veterinary Centre 24 The Green Writtle Chelmsford	Writtle Growth Area 1 1 0		0	N/A	0	0 Permission granted		21/02374/FUL approved 11/03/2022	Ν		
Land East of 26 The Coverts Writtle	Writtle	Growth Area 1	1	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	22/00804/FUL approved 24/06/2022	Ν	
SUBTOTAL			426	0	N/A	5	0				
			L	ocal Plan Sites							
Growth Area 1 - Central and Urban Chelmsford											
Land West of Eastwood House Glebe Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford - Marconi	SGS1f	197	36	23%	0	0	19/01618/FUL approved 23/11/2021		Ν	
Rivermead Bishop Hall Lane Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - The Lawns	GS1u	136	0	N/A	0	0	Permission granted	18/01326/FUL approved 03/09/2019	Y	
Site at Play Area Woodhall Road Chelmsford	Chelmsford Town Area - Patching Hall	GS1o	12	12	100%	0	0	Permission granted	19/01579/FUL approved 10/08/2021	Y, April 2022	
Land north of Galleywood Reservoir Beehive Lane Galleywood	Galleywood - Galleywood	GS4	24	9	36%	0	0	Permission granted	22/00397/OUT approved 23/12/2022	Ν	
SUBTOTAL			369	57	40% Average	0	0				
			Growth Area 3	- South and Ea	st Chelmsford			I	1		
South of Bicknacre	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre - Bicknacre and East and West Hanningfield	SGS11	42	15	36%	0	0	Permission granted	20/01507/FUL approved 29/04/2021	Y, April 2022	

Site Address	Ward/Parish	Allocation	Total Capacity	No of which AH	% of which AH	Total completions	No of which AH completions	Status	Governing Planning Permission and approval date	Work Started
SUBTOTAL			42	15	36% Average	0	0			
Total with Planning Permission			4751	1103		588	193			
Total dwellings with planning permission still to complete (April 2023)					4163					

In accordance with The Housing for Older and Disabled People Planning Practice Guidance published in June 2019, a weighted average of 1.87 has been applied to the total number of bedrooms to produce the output shown in this Schedule

In accordance with the Housing Supply and Delivery Planning Practice Guidance published in 2019, a ratio of 2.31 has been applied to the total capacity of the site to produce the output shown in this Schedule

	2012/ 13	2013/14	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	2022/23	2023/24 *
Affordable	27	62	250	53	226	198	287	189	264	130	219	63
Annual Total **	274	470	826	792	1002	1008	1256	832	829	866	822	409
Total Cumulative	6,435	6,905	7,731	8,523	9,525	10,533	11,789	12,621	13,450	14,316	15,138	15,547

 Table 4 – Total Completed New Dwellings (Net)

* 2023/24 Combined Q1 and Q2 only ** Total of market and affordable dwellings

Graph 1 – Projected Housing Trend

This provides a summary of the April 2023 housing trajectory for the period 2023/24 to 2027/28. The projected completions are based on the April 2023 Housing Site Schedule (table 3) where phasing information is obtained from developers of major development sites to gage delivery timescales. The delivery of smaller sites is estimated and based on approval and commencement dates.

Estimated Housing Trend in Chelmsford



Graph 2 – Affordable Housing Completions

This shows the number of affordable housing completions between 1 April 2012 and 31 March 2023. Projected completions are provided for 2023/24 to 2027/28.



Annex D: list of Infrastructure Levy technical consultation questions

Chapter 1 – Fundamental design choices

Question 1: Do you agree that the existing CIL definition of 'development' should be maintained under the Infrastructure Levy, with the following excluded from the definition:

- developments of less than 100 square metres (unless this consists of one or more dwellings and does not meet the self-build criteria) Yes/No/Unsure
 Yes
- Buildings which people do not normally go into -Yes/No/Unsure

Unsure – see comments

 Buildings into which peoples go only intermittently for the purpose of inspecting or maintaining fixed plant or machinery -Yes/No/Unsure

Yes

 Structures which are not buildings, such as pylons and wind turbines. Yes/No/Unsure

Yes

Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

It is unclear how buildings which people do not normally go into is different from buildings that people go into intermittently. There is no example of buildings that people do not normally go into, so there could be an opportunity to abuse this exclusion as the term 'normally' is open to interpretation. Any changes to buildings through permitted development also need to be considered. Suggest combining exclusions 2 and 3 e.g. Buildings which people do not normally go into such monuments and mausoleums or go only intermittently for the purpose of inspecting or maintaining fixed plant or machinery.

Appendix 2: CCC RESPONSES 9.6.23

Question 2: Do you agree that developers should continue to provide certain kinds of infrastructure, including infrastructure that is incorporated into the design of the site, outside of the Infrastructure Levy? [Yes/No/Unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Yes, the ability for developers to be provide integral site infrastructure that is required to mitigate impact or support the needs of future residents, or users of new development is essential to be provided in kind and on site and outside the Infrastructure Levy. This is particularly important for strategic sites where 'up front' or early provision of infrastructure make sites deliverable. In kind infrastructure is the only effective way strategic schemes can be delivered. All types of green infrastructure should be delivered 'in kind' as they are integral to the design and place making of new places.

Question 3: What should be the approach for setting the distinction between 'integral' and 'Levy-funded' infrastructure? [see para 1.28 for options a), b), or c) or a combination of these]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer, using case study examples if possible.

All of the proposed distinctions within the consultation should be used to determine this. Essentially infrastructure that is required by policy on-site or unlocks a site should be considered integral. The need for infrastructure arising from the cumulative impact of several or areabased developments is more appropriate for 'levy funding'.

Question 4: Do you agree that local authorities should have the flexibility to use some of their Levy funding for non-infrastructure items such as service provision? [Yes/No/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Yes, in part if it is significantly limited. Consideration should be given to a form of cap, as there could be a pressure to fund an existing service provision deficit which is not related to development proposals to the detriment of effectively mitigating and supporting the specific development itself. Services related to placekeeping and stewardship of a development site could be an example, but not for general Council expenditure.

Question 5: Should local authorities be expected to prioritise infrastructure and affordable housing needs before using the Levy to pay for non-infrastructure items such as local services? [Yes/No/Unsure]. Should expectations be set through regulations or policy? Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Yes, see above response. A regulatory response would be the most appropriate.

Question 6: Are there other non-infrastructure items not mentioned in this document that this element of the Levy funds could be spent on? [Yes/No/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Yes. Services related to placekeeping and stewardship of a development site could be an example. Wider community capacity building related to a specific development(s) could be another.

Question 7: Do you have a favoured approach for setting the 'infrastructure in-kind' threshold? [high threshold/medium threshold/low threshold/local authority discretion/none of the above]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer, using case study examples if possible.

This should be at the local authority's discretion as a proposals impact will differ across the country. In the future this could be defined and incorporated into the Local Plan site allocation and IDP process. The proposed threshold of 10,000 homes is considered too high. 2,000 homes would be more appropriate considering the type of infrastructure needed for developments less than this threshold.

Question 8: Is there anything else you feel the government should consider in defining the use of s106 within the three routeways, including the role of delivery agreements to secure matters that cannot be secured via a planning condition? Please provide a free text response to explain your answer.

On strategic scale development, especially where there are multiple land ownerships, the use of s106 framework agreements not linked to a grant of planning permission agreements to establish infrastructure

delivery objectives and equalisation of deliverables. The use of s106 should be applicable across all three routeways.

Chapter 2: Levy rates and minimum thresholds

Question 9: Do you agree that the Levy should capture value uplift associated with permitted development rights that create new dwellings? [Yes/No/Unsure]. Are there some types of permitted development where no Levy should be charged? [Yes/No/Unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Yes. Agree that the Levy should capture value uplift associated with permitted development rights that create new dwellings as Permitted Development Rights (PDR) that create new dwellings create a demand for infrastructure and the impact of the development must be mitigated.

It will be very difficult to establish a workable national value threshold and cap on the maximum Levy charge, therefore, this should be left to local authorities to test and establish.

Local authorities should be able to use their own discretion, depending on local circumstances, to determine which PDR would be exempt or should be charged the Levy. Residential annexes and extensions should be exempt from the Levy, as is the case currently with the Community Infrastructure Levy.

Question 10: Do you have views on the proposal to bring schemes brought forward through permitted development rights within scope of the Levy? Do you have views on an appropriate value threshold for qualifying permitted development? Do you have views on an appropriate Levy rate 'ceiling' for such sites, and how that might be decided?

The Levy should secure additional funds through capturing changes of use, including on projects where there is no additional floorspace, and for some permitted development rights (PDRs) including office to residential conversions. This will enable developments to better contribute to infrastructure. Over recent years significant housing numbers have been provided in city/ town centres across Chelmsford

through the change of the use from offices to residential, but which have been exempt from planning obligations and CIL.

The value threshold for qualifying permitted development should be determined locally as the viability of different forms of development varies significantly between different parts of England.

On brownfield developments, early viability testing at plan level in Chelmsford has shown that typical brownfield development requires a relatively high value threshold (£3,900) and a relatively low Levy rate (between 0 and 10%) on the maximum levy charge for development to be viable. With typical brownfield values of £4,150 and flats of £4,360 per sqm this is above the threshold for brownfield sites (£3,900/£3,500), but below the threshold for brownfield flatted sites (£5,000/£4,700).

Question 11: Is there is a case for additional offsets from the Levy, beyond those identified in the paragraphs above to facilitate marginal brownfield development coming forward? [Yes/No/Unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary, using case studies if possible.

Unsure until tested fully at the local level although it is unlikely that there will be a wide scope for charging on brownfield development, especially higher density development. If there are cases for additional offsets from the levy this should be established at the local authority, rather than the national level. Early testing at plan level has shown that the Levy could yield more than CIL and s106 but much less than CIL, S106 and affordable housing.

Question 12: The government wants the Infrastructure Levy to collect more than the existing system, whilst minimising the impact on viability. How strongly do you agree that the following components of Levy design will help achieve these aims?

 Charging the Levy on final sale GDV of a scheme [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Strongly disagree because of the burden and financial uncertainty/risk it then places on local authorities to temporarily borrow on a scale needed to fund the required infrastructure.

- The use of different Levy rates and minimum thresholds on different development uses and typologies [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Agree but would note that this is true of the existing approach.
- Ability for local authorities to set 'stepped' Levy rates [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Disagree as local authorities will need to establish a viable threshold and rate at the outset to ensure appropriate infrastructure can be provided. The setting of a low rate would be counter-productive unless the majority of required structural change can be achieved through 'integral' delivery. If the Levy is to be based on a package of infrastructure required to support the planned development across an area and is set out in an Infrastructure Delivery Strategy that is subject to consultation and independent examination, the expectation should be that all development would be required to contribute fairly and equitably towards the cost and that this is reflected in the price paid for the land by the development.
- Separate Levy rates for thresholds for existing floorspace that is subject to change of use, and floorspace that is demolished and replaced [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Agree, however, it is difficult to understand how a workable national value threshold and cap on the maximum charge can be set and properly tested across different market areas. Therefore, this should be established at the local authority level.

Question 13: Please provide a free text response to explain your answers above where necessary.

Chapter 3 – Charging and paying the Levy

Question 14: Do you agree that the process outlined in Table 3 is an effective way of calculating and paying the Levy? [Yes/No/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

The fundamental issue is the uncertainty of the total levy payable until completion and valuation of the development. This makes it very

difficult for local authorities to plan for how the levy will be used to deliver infrastructure. It is not clear if the payment of the provisional liability at the point of planning permission is mandatory for the developer. If not, payment is not settled until development completion and in some cases, this could be after many new homes are built with no levy available for the authority to direct to infrastructure provision. In other words, the homes will be built before the funds allow for the infrastructure to be delivered. The three-stage process also presents the following challenges for LAs:

- Monitoring across multiple developments will place pressure on LA resources which they may not have. For some smaller developers it is unlikely they will provide the required information across the 3 stages.
- Sales price could developers sell at reduced prices for quick sales, using their reduction in Levy payment to offset loss of profit?
- How is the valuation carried out if there is no sale and how are disputes dealt with?
- Local authorities do not have the resources or technical expertise to carry out valuations and this will be expensive to outsource
- For larger developments of multiple phases detailed layouts, house types and therefore floorspace changes multiple times and this will be challenging to monitor
- Developers will rely on the LA to monitor and follow through on the 3-stage process which on the face of it looks cumbersome, complicated, and over-involved.

Question 15: Is there an alternative payment mechanism that would be more suitable for the Infrastructure Levy? [Yes/No/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

The mechanism needs to be simpler with earlier certainty for both the developer and LA in terms of what the payment will be without the complication of the final adjustment payment.

So, this could be payment of amount based on the charging schedule values to be triggered by commencement, and not subject to dispute /

alternative valuations post commencement, until the time of the final sale together with a limit on the amount that can be returned to the developer at final payment.

Staged payments of Levy liabilities throughout the build-out period would avoid the situation as proposed which shifts too much of the 'cashflow' burden from developers to the local authority. In high growth areas, the level of borrowing required by local authorities with many large infrastructure projects/sites is also likely to be very significant. The risks and costs of this borrowing – particularly where projects slow down due to poor market conditions for example - will be carried by local councils, not developers. This risks the fundamental erosion of local councils' ability to deliver both infrastructure and to maintain services to its community.

Question 16: Do you agree with the proposed application of a land charge at commencement of development and removal of a local land charge once the provisional Levy payment is made? [Yes/No/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary

No. The final adjustment payment will likely be difficult to collect in many cases when the Levy is no longer a land charge. The land charge should be retained until the Levy sum is settled.

Question 17: Will removal of the local land charge at the point the provisional Levy liability is paid prevent avoidance of Infrastructure Levy payments? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/ Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Disagree. Keeping the local land charge in place will provide the safeguard of a penalty for those who are late or fail to make the payments. It would be the most effective preventative measure.

Question 18: To what extent do you agree that a local authority should be able to require that payment of the Levy (or a proportion of the Levy liability) is made prior to site completion? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure]. Please explain your answer.

Strongly agree. Phased payment of Levy liabilities throughout the build out period and when infrastructure is needed works best for the new residents as well as the Developer by reducing sales risk; but would also reduce the financial risk and burdens for the local authority.

Question 19: Are there circumstances when a local authority should be able to require an early payment of the Levy or a proportion of the Levy? Please provide a free text response to explain your where necessary.

Yes, particularly if the Levy is intended to be used towards infrastructure to benefit the new development that it is derived from. Infrastructure is often required to be delivered ahead of the development being occupied to avoid otherwise unacceptable impacts and to ensure new development is accessible and functional.

Question 20: Do you agree that the proposed role for valuations of GDV is proportionate and necessary in the context of creating a Levy that is responsive to market conditions [Yes/No/Unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

It is agreed that GDV is an important mechanism through which land value can be captured to secure an appropriate and proportionate levy. However, the proposed approach does not seem to be clear and workable for local authorities and if the principle of final payment on final GDV calculation at the completion of the development is applied, there could not only be resource issues for LAs but also the opportunity for developers to dispute values and delay payment. The proposed role for valuation of GDV at any stage is likely to be complex and open to misinterpretation between local authorities and developers. It will need to be resourced to provide valuation expertise and will likely result in a negotiated agreement with the developer. Much more detailed guidance on how this would work in practice is required.

Chapter 4 – Delivering infrastructure

Question 21: To what extent do you agree that the borrowing against Infrastructure Levy proceeds will be sufficient to ensure the timely delivery of infrastructure? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/

Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Strongly disagree, it will not be sufficient. Most councils face considerable funding pressures to maintain core services. Manv Councils will find themselves not financially strong enough or large enough to take on temporary borrowing on a scale needed to fund the infrastructure. The revenue costs of servicing debt if levy income does not arrive in a timely manner could be crippling to small local authority. There may also be disagreements over who holds the risk of any debt amongst stakeholders. Uncertainty around the delivery of schemes and therefore uncertainty about the receipt of contributions arising out of such schemes will make it very difficult for local authorities to appropriately plan and deliver their own infrastructure Further details and consultation on this matter is requirements. required, especially regarding the liability for borrowing costs (this cannot be met by local authorities), the uncertainty about the point and amount of the final payment and the mechanism by which local authorities can borrow against funds without increased levels of certainty.

Question 22: To what extent do you agree that the government should look to go further, and enable specified upfront payments for items of infrastructure to be a condition for the granting of planning permission? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Strongly Agree. This about local choice made by local Councilors and should also reflect the specific development. This will assist in the delivery and implementation of the right infrastructure at the right place and time, particularly for strategic and major development sites to support sustainable growth and development. Why should the local taxpayer take on the cashflow risk of a developer who is making a profit from the development.

Question 23: Are there other mechanisms for ensuring infrastructure is delivered in a timely fashion that the government should consider for the new Infrastructure Levy? [Yes/No/Unsure] Please provide free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Unsure. A wider point is Central Government mechanisms for grant funding local authority services (core spending power) in recent years have clawed-back grant year on year as a Council's tax base has increased. Instead, Council's should be enabled to retain all additional Council tax income from growth this would give greater financial incentive and security to local Council's to take on debt funded infrastructure as revenue would be more resilient if some Levy income did not arrive in a timely manner. Central Government could also share some of the risk with local authorities by guaranteeing some or all of the debts.

Question 24: To what extent do you agree that the strategic spending plan included in the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy will provide transparency and certainty on how the Levy will be spent? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Disagree. There will remain a high degree of uncertainty regarding costs at the plan-making stage, and the IDS would require a significant amount of work to identify reliable cost estimates, with the burden of funding this work seemingly being placed upon local authorities. This uncertainty risks reducing the value of using an IDS to support delivery as development comes forward.

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) is a part of the evidence base and is a 'living' document, where assessments of costs, funding, delivery, and phasing will continue to be updated, in conjunction with further work being undertaken with site promotors, ECC and other infrastructure providers and funding partners. This ongoing review ensures the best and most up-to-date information is available, particularly to inform the more detailed planning application process. Consequently, the IDS should not be a binding document on future infrastructure costs but can be used to set and agree infrastructure priorities.

Question 25: In the context of a streamlined document, what information do you consider is required for a local authority to identify infrastructure needs?

A range of information is required including an up-to-date Local Plan as well as evidence on current and future infrastructure deficits, needs

costs, phasing, funding sources and responsibilities. Infrastructure investment strategies and programmes from service providers operating within the local authority area will also be important sources of information. Most of the information required is currently set out in IDPs.

Question 26: Do you agree that views of the local community should be integrated into the drafting of an Infrastructure Delivery Strategy? [Yes/No/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Appropriate community engagement on the emerging Infrastructure Delivery Strategy is supported alongside the use of digital tools to help minimise new local authority administrative burdens. Approaches could include online surveys to inform the drafting of the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy.

Question 27: Do you agree that a spending plan in the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy should include:

- Identification of general 'integral' infrastructure requirements
- Identification of infrastructure/types of infrastructure that are to be funded by the Levy
- Prioritisation of infrastructure and how the Levy will be spent
- Approach to affordable housing including right to require proportion and tenure mix
- Approach to any discretionary elements for the neighbourhood share
- Proportion for administration
- The anticipated borrowing that will be required to deliver infrastructure
- Other please explain your answer
- All of the above

The strategy needs to comment on the extent of financial risk placed on the local authority by supporting the strategy, especially if borrowing is being used. The proposed content of the spending plan appears to be wide-ranging. We have no further suggestions at this stage.

Question 28: How can we make sure that infrastructure providers such as county councils can effectively influence the identification of Levy priorities?

- Guidance to local authorities on which infrastructure providers need to be consulted, how to engage and when
- Support to county councils on working collaboratively with the local authority as to what can be funded through the Levy
- Use of other evidence documents when preparing the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy, such as Local Transport Plans and Local Education Strategies
- Guidance to local authorities on prioritisation of funding
- Implementation of statutory timescales for infrastructure providers to respond to local authority requests
- Other please explain your answer

The above proposals appear to be comprehensive and are supported in principle. We have no further suggestions at this stage.

Question 29: To what extent do you agree that it is possible to identify infrastructure requirements at the local plan stage? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

An Infrastructure Delivery Plan provides valuable information on infrastructure requirements required to support development growth within a local plan. However, this needs to be regularly updated to reflect changes with regards to infrastructure costs (especially build cost inflation in the current market), priorities and needs as a plan is implemented. As such, not all infrastructure requirements may be fully known or anticipated at plan making stage.

Chapter 5 – Delivering affordable housing

Question 30: To what extent do you agree that the 'right to require' will reduce the risk that affordable housing contributions are negotiated down on viability grounds? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Unsure. It could be a useful tool but doesn't address the more fundamental problem that early viability testing at plan level indicates that the levy will capture less value than the existing regime of CIL, s106 and affordable housing. It is likely that there will continue to be a need to secure such provision through Delivery Agreements/s106 to ensure suitable securitisation provisions, namely perpetuity provision and nomination requirements. Some of the current negotiation of affordable housing provisions in s106 agreements is around more than just the quantum or tenure mix of the housing but around allocation criteria and mortgagee in possession provisions. The consultation is silent on these issues.

Question 31: To what extent do you agree that local authorities should charge a highly discounted/zero-rated Infrastructure Levy rate on high percentage/100% affordable housing schemes? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary

Agree however 100% affordable housing schemes will struggle to meet the value threshold to viably deliver integral infrastructure without capital subsidy from Homes England, especially considering build cost inflation and fluctuating market conditions.

Question 32: How much infrastructure is normally delivered alongside registered provider-led schemes in the existing system? Please provide examples.

Normally integral infrastructure can only be secured when capital grant funding is in place to support the delivery of 100% affordable housing schemes.

Question 33: As per paragraph 5.13, do you think that an upper limit of where the 'right to require' could be set should be introduced by the government? [Yes/No/unsure] Alternatively, do you think where the 'right to require' is set should be left to the discretion of the local authority? [Yes/No/unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

This should be set at the discretion of the local authority as there are too many variations in values and housing need across different geographical areas.

Chapter 6 – Other areas

Question 34: Are you content that the Neighbourhood Share should be retained under the Infrastructure Levy? [Yes/No/Unsure?]

Unsure. Parish councils are well placed to determine what their neighbourhoods want to improve and have their own powers to raise funds via Council Tax and other mechanisms. But tighter spending restrictions could be used to focus spending on more strategic uses, with the authority becoming involved if necessary.

Question 35: In calculating the value of the Neighbourhood Share, do you think this should A) reflect the amount secured under CIL in parished areas (noting this will be a smaller proportion of total revenues), B) be higher than this equivalent amount C) be lower than this equivalent amount D) Other (please specify) or E) unsure. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary

C – a greater proportion of the Levy should be directed towards the delivery of strategic infrastructure to support the growth of an area and the key areas of infrastructure as defined in the Planning Act. Most Parish Councils are small organisations with few staff and may not have the capacity to manage the spending of large sums of money from the Levy.

Question 36: The government is interested in views on arrangements for spending the neighbourhood share in unparished areas. What other bodies do you think could be in receipt of a Neighbourhood Share in such areas?

It should be elected Members from the charging and collecting authority that determines how the neighbourhood share is dealt with in unparished areas, with appropriate freedoms and flexibilities to enable local communities to be involved in the decision-making process. At Chelmsford City Council, Councillors from the unparished areas make recommendations on Neighbourhood CIL.

Question 37: Should the administrative portion for the new Levy A) reflect the 5% level which exists under CIL B) be higher than this equivalent amount, C) be lower than this equivalent amount D) Other (please specify) or E) unsure. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

B – it is necessary for the portion to be higher to enable additional resources to manage the complexities that are proposed through the new Levy, particularly in relation to the three-stage process.

Question 38: Applicants can apply for mandatory or discretionary relief for social housing under CIL. Question 31 seeks views on exempting affordable housing from the Levy. This question seeks views on retaining other countrywide exemptions. How strongly do you agree the following should be retained:

- residential annexes and extensions; [Strongly Agree/Agree/ Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree]
- self-build housing; [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree]

If you strongly agree/agree, should there be any further criteria that are applied to these exemptions, for example in relation to the size of the development?

If self-build housing is adding a new dwelling (not demolishing and rebuilding) a Levy could still be chargeable at a reduced rate if required and determined at the local authority level. Exemption for annexes / extensions could be automatic (i.e. no forms required) and just registered as a land charge for 3 years if necessary.

Question 39: Do you consider there are other circumstances where relief from the Levy or reduced Levy rates should apply, such as for the provision of sustainable technologies? [Yes/No/Unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

It would depend on the impact the development would place on local infrastructure and should be determined at the local authority level. It could include some specialist residential accommodation that doesn't qualify under current CIL charitable or affordable housing relief. Also, the scope of mandatory relief for affordable housing should be reviewed and be broader than the existing CIL regulations relating to affordable housing provided by local authorities that aren't afforded the same flexibilities as Registered Providers when providing more temporary accommodation.

Question 40: To what extent do you agree with our proposed approach to small sites? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Disagree. All new residential development, including small sites, cumulatively, place an increased burden on local infrastructure. All development should contribute to infrastructure requirements. If such development is viable and can afford the full Levy, the full Levy should be sought. This should be established at the local, not national, level.

Question 41: What risks will this approach pose, if any, to SME housebuilders, or to the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas? Please provide a free text response using case study examples where appropriate.

Disagree about the assumed impact on SME builder in the current approach. The ability to set lower thresholds in designated rural areas in current policy does not apply in several local authorities and should be reviewed. Currently, Chelmsford has no areas that meet the designation therefore this perceived benefit should be reviewed, and the threshold determined at the local authority level.

Question 42: Are there any other forms of infrastructure that should be exempted from the Levy through regulations?

None identified at this stage

Question 43: Do you agree that these enforcement mechanisms will be sufficient to secure Levy payments? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Disagree. If a developer has already disposed of a property/s and will not pay a final Levy, it seems unlikely a fine will then make them pay it.

Chapter 7 – Introducing the Levy

Question 44: Do you agree that the proposed 'test and learn' approach to transitioning to the new Infrastructure Levy will help deliver an effective system? [Strongly Agree/Agree/

Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary

Agree. The 'test and learn' must encompass a range of local authority settings across England. This must include a significant period given the need to consider the implications for plan making (setting rates; Infrastructure Delivery Strategies, preparation timescales); the build out of strategic sites in relation to payments and effectiveness of Levy forward funding infrastructure and the general impacts of both economic and property cycles impacting upon values and interest rates. However, it is important to ensure early testers are supported and are not penalised if this process delays local plan preparation.

Question 45: Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010? [Yes/No/Unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Yes, given early viability testing at plan level indicates that the levy will capture less value that the existing regime of CIL, s106 and affordable housing. It could have a negative impact on the supply of the most expensive types of affordable housing to deliver - affordable housing for rent – which have a higher percentage of groups that share protected characteristics living in it or likely to become reliant on it.



Chelmsford City Council Overview and Scrutiny Committee

20th November 2023

Report on Decisions Taken Under Delegation to the Chief Executive

Report by: Director of Connected Chelmsford

Officer Contact:

Jan Decena, Democratic Services Officer, email: jan.decena@chelmsford.gov.uk, tel: 01245 606260

Purpose

To report on the decisions taken under delegation to the Chief Executive for the period 1 June 2023 to 10 November 2023.

Recommendations

That the report be noted.

1. Background or Introduction

1.1. The Constitution of the Council includes, at Part 3 (Responsibility for Functions), details of matters on which the officers of the Council are authorised to take decisions. These are known as delegations to officers and among them is the following, which is delegated to the Chief Executive:

"Deal with any matter on grounds of urgency, following consultation with the Leader of the Council or the Chair and Vice Chair of the appropriate Committee in respect of non-executive matters.

1.2. The decisions taken by the Chief Executive under this delegation are recorded and notified to the public and members of the Council by publication on the Council's website. On 8 February 2010, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed that a list of those decisions should also be brought to the Committee for information in June and November each year.

2. Latest Decisions

- 2.1. Three decisions was taken under delegation to the Chief Executive during the period 1 June 2023 to 10 November 2023. The summary of the decision is attached as appendix to this report.
- 2.2. Members are asked to note the content of the report.

List of appendices:

Appendix 1 – Decisions taken under delegation to the Chief Executive for the period 1 June 2023 to 10 November 2023.

Background papers: Nil

Corporate Implications

Legal/Constitutional: None
Financial: None
Potential impact on climate change and the environment: None
Contribution toward achieving a net zero carbon position by 2030: None
Personnel: None
Risk Management: None
Equality and Diversity: None
Health and Safety: None
Digital: None
Other: None

Consultees: Director of Connected Chelmsford

Relevant Policies and Strategies: None relevant

Appendix 1 - DECISION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATION TO THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Subject: Proposed Amendments to Housing Allocations Policy

Date of Decision: 19.7.23

Decision Number:

2/2023

Background:

There is a significant gap between the need and supply of larger homes which is why we are seeking approval to begin this process of consultation and amendment to our policy as a matter of urgency.

The Council's current policy for the allocation of affordable housing gives priority to existing tenants who would like to downsize to a smaller home, freeing up and improving the supply of much needed larger affordable homes. Applicants are restricted to apply for one-bedroom properties which whilst of a size that may meet their need, may often fail to meet their aspiration. Officers and members have discussed how extending this policy to allow tenants to downsize to two as well as one-bedroom homes would create more choice and a better incentive, which in turn could create a better supply of larger affordable homes in Chelmsford.

Any proposed change to a local housing authority's allocation policy must be consulted with those that are likely to be affected, in this case local Registered Providers of social housing under Housing Act 1996 s.168(3). There is no specified time period or process for this consultation and previously we have done this by letter emailed to our partners giving four weeks to respond. We therefore propose to apply the same timescale and process.

Decision and Reasons for Urgency:

The Chief Executive decided to exercise his delegated authority to take urgent decisions and authorise the start of the process of consultation and amendment to Housing Allocations Policy. He did so on the grounds that there was a significant gap between the need and supply of larger homes and starting the process as soon as possible would be beneficial. There was also a gap over the Summer until the next Cabinet meeting.

Supporting Information:

The Leader of the Council was consulted before taking the decision and had no objection to it.

Subject: Proposed Amendments to Housing Allocations Policy

Date of Decision: 22.8.23

Decision Number:

3/2023

Background:

The Council is working in partnership with CHP to acquire larger family size properties homes to be used as affordable rented homes for Afghan families who have become homeless as a result of the closure of the Atlantic Hotel. Funding is being made available from government to contribute towards the cost at a rate that is more generous than usual making this a good opportunity to meet this need and also provide a supply of larger affordable homes for the use of other families in the future.

Officers highlighted to colleagues in the Home Office and DLUHC that legally local housing authorities can only provide affordable housing through their Housing Register and Allocations Policy. This means that with more than 50 other families already homeless and in temporary accommodation it would not be permissible to take advantage of this funding opportunity without making an amendment to our policy. We therefore propose to create a new clause which would allow the Council to nominate directly applicants of certain groups without the need to advertise properties which have been acquired specifically for that group as a result of specific funding.

Legally the Council must consult with those who may be directly affected, i.e. Registered Providers of social housing. As it is possible some of these homes could be acquired and available to let within the next few months we need to ensure both the consultation and policy change is completed beforehand. Although only CHP will be providing these homes, it is possible offers could be made by others and there may also be other opportunities in the future for other groups in housing need. For this reason, the consultation will not be specifically about the need to amend the policy for Afghan refugees but will instead cover the broader issue of non-supported general needs affordable housing that is provided by a Registered Provider through funding for a specific group.

Decision and Reasons for Urgency:

The Chief Executive decided to exercise their delegated authority to take urgent decisions and authorise the start of the process of consultation and amendment to Housing Allocations Policy. They did so on the grounds that there was a significant gap between the need and supply of larger homes and starting the process as soon as possible would be beneficial.

Supporting Information:

The Leader of the Council was consulted before taking the decision and had no objection to it.

Subject: Business Rates Pooling and Pilot for Non-Domestic Rates in 2024-25

Date of Decision: 20.9.23

Decision Number:

4/2023

Background:

Business Retention scheme

In April 2013 the Government introduced a business rates retention scheme that was intended to create incentives for local authorities to promote business growth over the long term. Under the scheme local authorities are allowed to retain some of the benefit from any growth in non-domestic rates, however, are also exposed to the risk of reduced income from any reduction in the amounts of Rates collected.

If an authority collects more business rates than the Government has determined they need to fund their services (business rates baseline funding) then these authorities are required to pay over the excess to Central Government in the form of a tariff. Conversely, if an authority's funding requirement is higher than income collected, then they will receive a "top-up" from central government.

There is a levy mechanism built into the Business Rates Retention regime, so that authorities will pay a proportion of their growth to Central Government. The levy rate is set at 50% for Chelmsford City Council, which means the Council will only retain half of the increase in business rates growth over and above a Government set business rates baseline.

The Government has put in place a safety net to protect local authorities from significant negative shocks to their income by guaranteeing that no authority will see its income from business rates fall beyond 7.5% of its spending baseline. The maximum loss for Chelmsford in this instance would be £0.3m.

Business Rates Pooling

As part of the rates retention scheme, authorities can formally seek designation as a pool. The pool will be formed of two or more authorities and enables those authorities to retain a higher percentage of business rate growth by reducing or removing the levy that needs to be paid on any income growth. If an authority experiences negative growth that falls below the Government set 7.5% safety net, the loss needs to be funded by the pool and therefore has an adverse impact on the other authorities in the pool. The Government treat the Pool and its members as one authority and the safety net limit is calculated on overall Baseline funding level of the Pool. For 2024/25 it worth noting that :

• The Government can nationally decide to abolish pools, even after the Council has signed up. This is thought to be unlikely but none the less is possible.

Pool arrangements for 2023/24

Chelmsford entered into an Essex Business rates pool with other Local Authorities in 2018/19 and remained member of the Essex pool in 2019/20, 2020/21 2021/22 2022/23 and 2023/24. In 2018/19 2 the Council received additional income of £1m, in 2019/20 received

additional income of £0.6m,in 2020/21 received additional income of £0.8m in 2021/22 received an additional income of £1.1m and in 2022/23 received an additional income of £0.8m from the pool as a proportioned benefit of levy saved that would have otherwise been paid to the Government. The income from the Pool for 2021/22 and 2022/23 is subject to the risk of change during the external audit of member authorities. The lead authority (Essex County Council) is currently estimating £0.7m of additional income from the Pool in 2023/24 for Chelmsford.

Chelmsford's options for 2024/25

Chelmsford and the lead authority is required to notify the Government of its intentions for pooling for the next financial year by 10th October 2023. Essex County Council are therefore seeking a formal confirmation of our intention to remain in the Essex Business rates pool. Depending on the response from other Essex authorities, the options for the pool are to either continue as it is with the current members, to dissolve completely or to dissolve and seek designation as a new pool for 2024/25 should the pool's membership change.

To provide assurances before entering the pool, historic experience has shown pool membership to be beneficial to the authority, even during the COVID-19 pandemic due to government support. This support meant that there has not been the need to further increase the bad debt provision however this could potentially be impacted by any future recession. The current pool members have been asked to expressed confidence in being able to maintain their business rates income at a required level for the pool to remain successful. Brentwood was removed from the pool in 2023/24 and will remain a non-member of the pool in 2024/25 as it does not have confidence that it will not be in a safety net position.

Option 1

Notify the lead authority of the intention to leave the Essex Business rates pool and continue as a standalone authority

- Potential increase from Business Rates growth £0.3m
- Maximum loss £0.3m (7.5% of Government set Baseline need)

Option 2

Join the Essex business rates pool for another year, with the intention to maximise the business rates income retained by the authority. Indicatively the gain to the City Council could be an extra £0.7m.

The risk, in the unlikely situation where income for the whole pool falls below its business rates baseline is that Chelmsford will lose its additional income and will have to proportionately suffer the loss of pool income. The extent of City Council losses will depend on the overall position of the pool. This cannot be accurately quantified until the end of the pool's financial year, but losses could exceed the £0.3m maximum identified in option 1.

Decision and Reasons for Urgency:

The Chief Executive was of the view that option 2 would be of most benefit to the Council. As a decision on whether to join the Pool needed to be made by 22 September 2023, he agreed to exercise his delegated authority to take urgent decisions and authorised the Accountancy Services Manager to negotiate for the Council the terms on which the Council would enter the Pool and to join it if those terms were acceptable.

Supporting Information:

The Leader of the Council was consulted before taking the decision and had no objection to it.



Chelmsford City Council Overview & Scrutiny Committee

20 November 2023

Work Programme

Report by: Director of Connected Chelmsford

Officer Contact:

Jan Decena, Democratic Services Officer, email: <u>jan.decena@chelmsford.gov.uk</u>, tel: 01245 606260.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to invite Members' comments on the Committee's work programme which has been updated since the Committee last met on 19 October 2023.

Recommendations

Members are invited to comment on the Committee's work programme, attached as Appendix 1 to this report and make any necessary amendments to it.

1. Background

- 1.1. The Committee's work programme has been updated following the meeting held on 19 October 2023 and is attached at Appendix 1.
- 1.2. Any changes to the programme since the last meeting are indicated by an asterisk and bold text in Appendix 1.

2. Conclusion

2.1. Member's comments are invited on the work programme.

List of appendices: Appendix 1 – Work Programme

Background papers: None

Corporate Implications

Legal/Constitutional: None

Financial: None

Potential impact on climate change and the environment: None

Contribution toward achieving a net zero carbon position by 2030: None

Personnel: None

Risk Management: None

Equality and Diversity: None

(For new or revised policies or procedures has an equalities impact assessment been carried out? If not, explain why)

Health and Safety: None

Digital: None

Other: None

Consultees:

Chair and Vice Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Relevant Policies and Strategies: Not applicable

APPENDIX 1

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Work Programme

* Any changes to the programme since the last meeting are indicated by an asterisk and bold text.

<u>Subject</u>	Author	
Report/s to be confirmed:		
Performance Review Items		
Theatre Refurbishment Project Evaluation Task and Finish Group	Marc De'ath Chelmsford City Culture Services Manager	
Presentation on Youth Engagement	Marc De'ath Chelmsford City Culture Services Manager	
20 November 2023		
Performance Review Items		
*Cabinet Portfolio Updates	Cabinet Member for a Growing Chelmsford	
Cabinet Member for Growing Chelmsford's Annual Report on Housing Delivery	Jeremy Potter Spatial Planning Services Manager	
Report on Cultural Strategy Task & Finish Group	Marc De'ath and Clare Gevaux, CEO of Culture Chelmsford	
Standing Items		
Report on Decisions Taken Under Delegation to the Chief Executive	Jan Decena Democratic Services Officer	
12 February 2024		
Performance Review Items		
Cabinet Portfolio Updates	Cabinet Member for Greener and Safer Chelmsford	
Annual Presentation by Safer Chelmsford Partnership and Essex Police	Spencer Clarke Public Protection Manager	
	Essex Police	

Presentation on Essex Violence and Vulnerability Unit	Deputy Chief Constable, Essex Police	
*Essex Countywide Traveller Unit Presentation		
22 April 2024		
Performance Review Items		
Cabinet Portfolio Updates	Cabinet Member for an Active Chelmsford	
	*Cabinet Member for a Fairer Chelmsford	
Reports from Representatives on Outside Bodies	Jan Decena Democratic Services Officer	
Planning Enforcement Inform and Debate	Keith Holmes and Kirsty Dougal Planning Development Services Manager	