



BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE CABINET

WEDNESDAY 1ST MARCH 2017 AT 6.00 P.M.

PARKSIDE SUITE - PARKSIDE

MEMBERS: Councillors G. N. Denaro (Leader), K.J. May (Deputy Leader),
C. B. Taylor, R. D. Smith and P. J. Whittaker

AGENDA

1. To receive apologies for absence
2. Declarations of Interest

To invite Councillors to declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interests or Other Disclosable Interests they may have in items on the agenda, and to confirm the nature of those interests.
3. To confirm the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 1st February 2017 (Pages 1 - 8)
4. Council Response to Local Transport Plan No 4 (Pages 9 - 18)
5. Council Response to Solihull Local Plan Review (Pages 19 - 30)
6. Council Response to Worcestershire County Council Minerals Plan (Pages 31 - 38)
7. Financial Monitoring Report 2016/17 Quarter 3 (Pages 39 - 52)
8. To consider any other business, details of which have been notified to the Head of Legal, Equalities and Democratic Services prior to the commencement of the meeting and which the Chairman, by reason of special circumstances, considers to be of so urgent a nature that it cannot wait until the next meeting

K. DICKS
Chief Executive

Parkside
Market Street
BROMSGROVE
Worcestershire
B61 8DA

21st February 2017

BROMSGROVE DISTRICT COUNCIL

MEETING OF THE CABINET

1ST FEBRUARY 2017 AT 6.00 P.M.

PRESENT: Councillors G. N. Denaro (Leader), K.J. May (Deputy Leader),
C. B. Taylor, R. D. Smith and P. J. Whittaker

Observers: Councillors S. R. Colella, M. Glass and C. A. Hotham

Officers: Mr K. Dicks, Ms J. Pickering, Ms R. Bamford, Ms D. Poole, Mr M.
Hanwell, Ms R. Dunne, Mrs J. Burton, Mrs S. Sellers and Ms R. Cole.

77/16 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence on this occasion.

78/16 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

79/16 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11th January 2017
were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 11th
January 2017 be approved as a correct record.

80/16 **OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY BOARD**

The minutes of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Board held on
16th January 2017 were submitted.

Reference was made to the recommendation in Minute 86/16 of the
Overview and Scrutiny Board regarding the Cabinet Work Programme. It
was noted that the request from the Board had been discussed with the
Corporate Management Team by the Chief Executive Officer with a view
to ensuring that items were included in well in advance on the Cabinet
Work Programme.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Overview and
Scrutiny Board held on 16th January 2017 be noted.

81/16

THE COUNCIL PLAN 2017- 2020

The Cabinet considered a revised version of the Council Plan which had been refreshed following comments from Members at the Council Meeting on 23rd November 2016.

It was reported that the main changes were on pages 6 and 7 of the Plan in that 6 key priorities for the next four years had been included, supported by the Council's six Strategic Purposes. Key actions had also been included to ensure a Sustainable Council. In addition the style of the Plan had been re-designed.

The Leader and Members welcomed the refreshed Council Plan and thanked officers for their work in bringing this about.

RECOMMENDED that the Council Plan attached at Appendix 1 to the report be approved.

82/16

LOW COST HOUSING SCHEME

Cabinet considered a report on a possible amendment to the Low Cost Housing Scheme which could potentially result in the release of some capital receipt which could then be used to help fund other housing initiatives in support of the Council's Strategic Purpose "help me to find somewhere to live in my locality".

Members were reminded of the background to the Scheme which had been established approximately 25/30 years ago with a view at that time to assisting local first time buyers.

Under the scheme the Council retains a 30% share in the property but this does not generate any income as there is no rent payable. Whilst a number of the homeowners have purchased the remaining 30% the Council still holds a share in 110 properties. At one stage a waiting list of prospective purchasers was maintained by the Council and nominees from the list could purchase when an existing resident wished to sell their 70% share and move. In recent years however it had become very rare for the scheme to be used to assist a household in need which met the criteria. A waiting list was no longer maintained due to the low turnover in properties and properties were sold on the open market.

The report proposed that in future on disposal of the properties by the current home owners the Council's 30% should also be sold. It was noted that in 2016/17 this would have generated a capital receipt of approximately £100k. It was reported however that the sale of 100% of the property could only take place with the owner's agreement.

Members considered that whilst the funding level could not be guaranteed, potentially there was a source of additional capital funding which could be utilised to support appropriate housing projects, possibly in conjunction with a partner organisation.

The report also referred to the views of the Overview and Scrutiny Finance and Budget Working Group who were also aware of the potential asset available.

Following discussion it was

RESOLVED:

- (a) that when properties within the Councils Low Cost Housing Scheme are offered for sale, as far as possible the Council's 30% share should also be sold; and
- (b) that any capital receipt generated be ring-fenced to provide funding to assist the Council in meeting its Strategic Purpose "help me to find somewhere to live in my locality."

83/16

ALLOCATION OF HOMELESSNESS FUNDING 2017/18

The Cabinet considered a report on proposals to award Homelessness Grant to specific schemes to fund a range of homelessness support services and schemes which focus on the prevention of homelessness and repeat homelessness within the District in 2017/18. The total grant was £142k for 2017/18.

It was reported that constructive discussions had taken place with partners and the table at 3.7 in the report set out the proposed allocations for 2017/18. Following recent cuts to Worcestershire County Council funding, there was a focus on retaining the existing supported housing scheme with St Basil's which provides specialist accommodation for young people.

Following discussion it was

RESOLVED:

- (a) that the initiatives set out in section 3.7 of the report, as recommended by the Strategic Housing Manager be approved to receive funding from the Homelessness Grant for 2017/18; and
- (b) that delegated authority be granted to the head of Community Services following consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Housing to use any unallocated Homelessness grant during the year or make further adjustments as necessary to ensure full utilisation of the Homelessness Grant for 2017/18 in support of existing or new schemes.

84/16

PLANNING DEVELOPMENT SERVICES BUSINESS CASE

The Cabinet considered a report on the business case for a shared Development Management Service between Bromsgrove District Council and Redditch Borough Council. The business case had been recommended for approval by the Shared Service Board and at a previous Cabinet meeting on 2nd November 2016. At the meeting of the Council on 23rd November 2016 however, consideration of the Cabinet recommendation and the business case had been deferred to enable cross party discussion to be held on financial risk and cost apportionment.

Additional information had now been supplied relating to costs including salary, redundancy and pension costs. It was noted that the maximum possible redundancy cost would be £21k which would be split proportionately.

RECOMMENDED that the business case for the Development Management shared service be approved.

85/16

MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN 2017/18 - 2020/21

The Cabinet considered the report on the Medium Term Financial Plan 2017/18 – 2020/21.

The Executive Director Finance and Resources outlined the issues which had impacted upon to the development of the MTFP. These would continue to result in pressures on the Council over the next four years and included:

- Potential further reductions in the New Homes Bonus Grant;
- Impact of the Negative Revenue Support Grant;
- Impact of the Localisation of Business Rates Scheme; and
- Transfer from Housing Benefit to Universal Credit

Changes introduced by the Government to the New Homes Bonus funding scheme included reduced years for which NHB was payable and the assumption of a “baseline” for housing growth of 0.4%. During 2017/18 however funding had been confirmed as £1.912m which was £210k more than anticipated in the MTFP. Further changes were anticipated and there was a risk to the funding stream in future years.

There was more certainty around the Revenue Support Grant in view of the Council accepting the offer of a four year settlement. The transitional support for 2017/18 was £114k but there was an assumption of a £750k repayment to the Government in 2019/20.

It was noted that Council would consider the level of Council Tax for 2017/18 at its meeting on 28th February 2017. If the recommendations

Agenda Item 3

Cabinet
1st February 2017

in this report were approved the demand on the collection fund to meet this Council's own needs would be £7,580,550 which represented a £5 increase on Band D Council Tax compared to the current financial year.

In relation to the General Fund it was anticipated that the draw down over the four years of the MTFP would be £739k. This projected draw down was £1.3m less than originally included in the Efficiency Plan.

It was reported that the Efficiency Plan, which had been agreed by Council in October, had included a number of areas where the Council's costs could be reduced in a variety of ways. The budget included the delivery of savings and income as identified in the Efficiency Plan. It was noted however that whilst annual savings had been included to meet those referred to in the Efficiency Plan, there may be changes to funding and services delivered from 2018/19 which require alternative savings and income profiles to be delivered.

The report set out three pressures and income shortfalls which could not be managed by improved marketing or price increases . These were:

- Shortfall in income from Land Charges due to a reduction in demand on the service (£50k);
- Cost of Licences for Smartphones and iPads to ensure that officers have appropriate resources to undertake their roles (£11k);
- Unavoidable cost increases from Microsoft for Licences (£108k by 2020/21)

In addition to the unavoidable pressures a revenue bid of £15k had been proposed to provide funding for St Basil's Foyer Scheme to enable them to provide 24 hour support for vulnerable young people.

Members acknowledged the significant amount of work undertaken by officers which had resulted in a reduction in the funds required to be taken from balances. Work was still on going to reduce costs without cutting front line services. This would include increasing income by looking at ways of taking advantage of commercial opportunities. It was noted that there would be continual reviews every three months of the budget position.

With regard to the Capital Programme at Appendix 3 of the report, the Leader reported that Councillor C. A. Hotham and Councillor S. R. Colella had requested to speak in support of specific Capital bids from within their Wards and invited them to do so.

Barnt Green Millenium Park - Toilet

Councillor Hotham gave additional information on the bid for £62k in relation to the provision of a unisex pod toilet in proximity to Barnt Green Millenium Park to ensure there were appropriate community facilities for

those visiting the local park and shops and using Barnt Green Railway Station.

Further to the information provided by Councillor Hotham, reference was made to the potential availability of Section 106 funding associated with housing development in Fiery Hill Lane, Barnt Green which amounted to £44k which would leave the remaining sum of £18k to be met from Council balances.

Hagley Scout Hut

Councillor Colella gave additional information on the bid in relation to the proposed replacement of the existing Hagley Scout Hut which was in poor condition and was uneconomic to repair. There was an increased demand for the facility, particularly in view of the new housing developments within Hagley. The Head of Leisure and Culture had advised on the project and a Planning Application had been submitted. A business case was in place.

Hagley Community Hub

Councillor Colella gave additional information on the project relating to the proposed replacement of the existing Hagley Community Centre building which was now in its 50th year, having had an original life expectancy of 25 years. It was intended that a new Community Centre could serve Hagley and the wider community to provide a "One Stop Hub" for services provided by the Council and other public sector organisations.

Additional facilities were required within the area due to an increase in demand and expansion of households due to new housing developments. Councillor Colella confirmed that the Head of Leisure and Culture had advised on the project and was of the opinion that the business case was viable. At present the bid was under further development but it was likely to come forward during 2017/18.

Councillor Colella responded to queries from Cabinet regarding the bids as far as he was able to do so. Councillor Colella confirmed that if necessary, more detailed information could be provided. Cabinet recognised the benefits of the two schemes.

Following discussion it was

RECOMMENDED:

(a) that the following return/release from balances be approved:

- 2017/18 - £259k (return)
- 2018/19 - £37k (release)
- 2019/20 - £467k (release)
- 2020/21 - £494k (release)

- (b) that the additional income/efficiencies as attached at Appendix 2 be approved:

2017/18 - £1.113m
2018/19 - £626k
2019/20 - £177k

- (c) that with the exception of the bids in relation to Hagley Scout Hut and Hagley Community Centre the Capital Programme bids as attached at Appendix 3 be approved:

2017/18 - £145k
2018/19 - £46k
2019/20 - £1.108m

- (d) that the increase of Council Tax by £5 per Band D equivalent for 2017/18 be approved.

- (e) that the budget savings and pressures for 2018/19 – 2020/21 be subject to change due to the potential impact of changes to service delivery and the localisation of Business Rates together with any changes to the New Homes Bonus.

- (f) that consideration of the Capital Programme bids in respect of Hagley Scout Hut and Hagley Community Centre be deferred to enable further consideration of the Business Cases for the proposals. In addition officers include additional information to the report to Council on 28th February 2017 to explain the position in respect of the deferral.

86/16

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972

That under Section 100 I of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, the public be excluded from the meeting during the consideration of the item of business the subject of the following minute on the grounds that it involves the disclosure of “Exempt Information” as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act, the relevant part being as set out below and that it is in the public interest to do so.

Minute No
87 /16

Paragraph
3

87/16

ICT INFRASTRUCTURE REPORT

Cabinet considered a report on the outcome of the initial procurement exercise in respect of ICT infrastructure resource. It was noted that the outcome would be subject to a recommendation to Council.

Agenda Item 3

Cabinet
1st February 2017

Following discussion and consideration of the responses received to the tender exercise it was

RECOMMENDED that the Head of Transformation and Organisational Development be requested to proceed with the procurement of a contract with the preferred supplier (being the lowest of the tenders received) to deliver the ICT infrastructure functions.

The meeting closed at 7.05 p.m.

Chairman

Response of BDC to consultation on Local Transport Plan No 4 (LTP4)

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Kit Taylor
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Ruth Bamford
Wards Affected	All Wards
Ward Councillor Consulted	Yes
Non-Key Decision	Yes

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 1.1 Worcestershire County Council, as the Local Transport Authority, is required to produce, deliver and maintain a Local Transport Plan. The authority is now formally consulting on the contents of the LTP4. The consultation closes on 17th March 2017.
- 1.2 Five documents are being consulted on including:
 - 1. The main LTP4 document
 - 2. Habitats Regulation Assessment
 - 3. Network Management Plan
 - 4. Policies Document
 - 5. Strategic Environmental Assessment

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That Members note the contents of the report.
- 2.2 That Cabinet recommends to Council that the draft officer response to LTP4 (as attached at Appendix 1) be approved by Council and submitted to Worcestershire County Council as the formal consultation response.

3. KEY ISSUES

Financial Implications

- 3.1 As funding will be limited over the plan period the plan seeks to focus on ensuring that best use is being made of existing transport infrastructure, by focusing on maintenance and enhancement schemes where a robust business case and funding can be identified. The County Council states it also intends to bid for funding with partner organisations. The Council is urging WCC to develop a more robust infrastructure funding strategy to ensure the appropriate level of investment is secured for transport infrastructure across the District.

Legal Implications

- 3.2 Worcestershire County Council, as the Local Transport Authority, is legally required to produce, deliver and maintain a Local Transport Plan under the Transport Act (2000) and the Local Transport Act (2008).

Service / Operational Implications

- 3.3 Members will recall a pre consultation exercise was undertaken by WCC in July 2016 and this was followed up by a presentation on the consultation to Members on 12 January 2017.
- 3.4 The WCC have divided the County up into three geographical areas including:
1. South Worcestershire
 2. Wyre Forest
 3. North East Worcestershire
- 3.5 Transport packages within the North East Worcestershire delivery strategy are grouped into either:
1. North East strategic transport schemes (NEST)
 2. Redditch package (R)
 3. Bromsgrove package (BR)
- 3.6 There are eight 'NEST'- strategic projects which relate to Bromsgrove and six specific Bromsgrove (BR) schemes.

1. North East Strategic Transport (NEST) 1-Lickey End (M42 Junction 1). Major Junction Enhancement Scheme and Lickey End AQMA Remediation
Lickey End (M42, Junction 1) is widely recognised as operating in excess of built capacity and so is now heavily congested at peak times. The junction is the focus for an Air Quality Management Area and offers a challenging environment for non-motorised users. This major scheme would look at strategic options to tackle this issue, which could include redesign or junction relocation and will be delivered in partnership with Highways England.

2. NEST 2- Bromsgrove A38 Strategic Corridor (Lydiate Ash to 'Hanley' Turn) (Should read 'Hanbury')
The A38 Bromsgrove Corridor Major Scheme is currently being developed by Worcestershire County Council (WCC). An Outline Business Case was submitted to the Local Transport Body (LTB) in March 2016 for Programme Entry Approval. Conditional Approval is planned to be obtained in April 2017. The scheme will support the sustainable growth of Bromsgrove by enhancing the A38 Bromsgrove

Eastern Bypass. The scheme includes a series of junction enhancements where delay and congestion is currently experienced, and where conditions are predicted to deteriorate further without intervention. These works will be critical in helping to support the objectives of the Bromsgrove District Plan (BDP), the Redditch Local Plan, Worcestershire's LTP 4 and both the Worcestershire and Greater Birmingham and Solihull Strategic Economic Plans (SEP) prepared by the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP).

3. NEST 4- North East Worcestershire Transport Telematics Investment Package

This would include Variable Message Signs, Real Time Information Systems, Signalling Improvements and Traffic Counters.

4. NEST 5- Old Birmingham Road/ Linehouse Lane/Braces Lane Junction (Marlbrook)

A complete review of the junction's capacity, traffic flows, design and signalling apparatus (where provided) to identify whether capacity and/or safety improvements are required. If so, this will be followed by a detailed design process to identify a costed improvement scheme to tackle identified issues and constraints.

5. NEST 6- Hagley Junctions

A complete review of a number of junctions in a given area to assess capacity, traffic flows, design and signalling apparatus (where provided) to identify whether capacity and/or safety improvements are required. If so, this will be followed by a detailed design process to identify a costed improvement scheme to tackle identified issues and constraints.

6. NEST 7- Wythall Rail Station Enhancement Scheme,

7. NEST 8- Hagley Rail Station Enhancement,

8. NEST 9- Alvechurch Rail Station Enhancement Scheme

Station enhancements could include:

Improvements to passenger information and station facilities for passengers;

Facilities that will cater for current and future demand growth;

Improvements to walking /cycling routes to the station;

Improvements to access arrangements for cyclists and provide additional new cycle storage facilities;

Set-down and pick-up facilities for taxi users and operators;

Improve facilities for passengers with disabilities or who experience difficulty using the railway station facilities;

Improvement to car parking;

Working with Train Operating Companies to improve services

9. BR1- Bromsgrove Transport Strategy

This proposed scheme would involve a package of Public Realm Enhancements in Bromsgrove Town Centre and would be integrated with other schemes in the area. The scheme would also involve a comprehensive multimodal review of network efficiency and infrastructure. This study would identify where to focus investment to improve the operation of the local transport network. This would also include a review of Bromsgrove's highway network to explore options to improve and disperse traffic flow to increase efficiency and AQMA remediation at Worcester Road.

10. BR2-Bromsgrove - Strategic Active Travel Network Investment Programme (Including Catshill, Marlbrook and Lickey End)

Active Travel Investment Programme is a systemic investment in walking and cycling links across the Bromsgrove area to create a comprehensive, integrated off-road network linking residential areas with key trip attractors, including schools, rail stations, town centres and employment locations. This will include surfacing, signage, lighting and public realm improvements to create an attractive and coherent network.

11. BR3 -Broad Street/Stourbridge Road Junction, BR4 -Parkfield - Strand / Market Street / Stourbridge Road / Birmingham Road Junction, BR5- Bromsgrove - St John Street / Hanover Street / Kidderminster Road Junction

A complete review of the junction's capacity, traffic flows, design and signalling apparatus (where provided) to identify whether capacity and/or safety improvements are required. If so, this will be followed by a detailed design process to identify a costed improvement scheme to tackle identified issues and constraints.

12. BR6-Bromsgrove - Worcester Road/Rock Hill Key Corridor of Improvement (including Worcester Road AQMA Remediation)

A systemic investment in a key corridor to improve transport infrastructure to enable it to support increased economic activity (through quicker journey times and reduced congestion). This could include new technology (signals/signing) surfacing, lighting, enhanced walking/cycling infrastructure.

13. BR7-Bromsgrove Station - Car Park Extension Scheme

Potential to increase car park capacity if demand grows to a point where a suitable business case can be identified to support investment.

14. RB1 -Rubery Public Realm Scheme

A systemic investment in a town centre or area's transport infrastructure to enable it to support increased economic activity and diversification. This could include a redesign of space, new surfacing, lighting, drainage and functional changes to support enhanced

accessibility by walking, cycling, passenger transport or motorised vehicle. This would need to be funded by development growth, recognising that the main shopping area would need to be enhanced to support increased demand.

Summary of Draft Response

- 3.7 Appendix 1 contains the full response to LTP4, the main issue with the LTP is its lack of long term vision and strategy. It could be said that the document as it stands isn't really a plan or strategy and could be seen as a series of ad hoc schemes which are not clearly joining together to provide a coherent transport strategy for the District.
- 3.8 Policy BR1 - **Bromsgrove Transport Strategy** is the focus for much of the response, at the moment officers feel this policy is too limited in what it's trying to achieve. An early indication has already been given by WCC that the wording of BR1 can be altered to allow for a more overarching and longer term strategy to be produced in relation to Bromsgrove. This overarching strategy, which will consider all modes of transport, is likely to be a key element in shaping how the District develops in the future.
- 3.9 BDC would like this strategy to be seen as an opportunity for transport considerations to more heavily influence the decisions on where all forms of future development should take place. The Strategy should play a positive role in addressing infrastructure deficiencies, simply mitigating the impact of future development is not an option BDC can support.
- 3.10 An evidence based investment strategy needs to be developed which can be used to secure necessary infrastructure funding. This strategy needs to be robust and flexible to ensure it can address the requirements for a range of local and central government funding regimes which will inevitably change over the lifetime of any plan. The strategy needs to be fully integrated with other similar strategies being developed in adjoining areas.
- 3.11 In summary, it is believed that nothing short of a radical programme of investment in the transport infrastructure of the District will be needed to ensure Bromsgrove can cope with the pressures likely to be exerted on it over the next 20-30 years.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

- 3.12 Members will recall a pre consultation exercise was undertaken by WCC in July 2016 and this was followed up by a presentation on the consultation to Members on 12 January 2017.

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

- 4.1 The risks associated with not responding to this consultation is that BDCs views will not be taken into account by WCC in LTP4 consultation or future Planning, including the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and future bidding for funding towards essential transport infrastructure.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – BDC response to LTP4

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. The main LTP4 document
2. Habitats Regulation Assessment
3. Network Management Plan
4. Policies Document
5. Strategic Environmental Assessment

7. KEY

WCC- Worcestershire County Council
LTP- Local Transport Plan
BDP- Bromsgrove District Plan 2011-2030 Adopted January 2017
AQMA- Air Quality management Area
IDP- Infrastructure Delivery Plan

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Mike Dunphy
Strategic Planning Manager

E Mail: m.dunphy@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
Tel: 01527 881325

Bromsgrove District Council Response to Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4)

Response

1 Bromsgrove District Council (BDC) welcomes the production of a new Local Transport Plan for the County, although serious reservations remain about the effectiveness of the plan as currently drafted. The consultation document states that LTP4;

'Sets out the priorities for the County. It identifies the approach to managing the increased transport demand that is fully consistent with projected housing development and economic growth.'

2 It is the Council's view that whilst the above statement maybe correct, a key feature particularly in relation to Bromsgrove is not addressed in LTP4. There are future development needs identified but not allocated in the Bromsgrove District Plan (BDP) which currently do not feature in any context in the LTP4, failure to even acknowledge this issue is a significant omission within LTP4 to the extent that the Council cannot support the plan as it is drafted.

3 It has been widely known for a number of years that the Council will be reviewing the recently adopted BDP, including reviewing the green belt to find additional housing for both local needs and the wider needs of the Greater Birmingham Housing Market (GBHMA) area, which the district is a part of. This review as a minimum will be looking for land for 2300 houses which is approximately 118 hectares. There will also be a likely need to safeguard land for beyond the plan period of approximately 202 hectares to meet expected future development needs although this is could possibly change as future housing and employment needs are calculated. This figure does not include land for any wider GBHMA development needs, which cannot be met on brownfield and other suitable sites in the main urban areas.

4 The Council acknowledges that LTP4 cannot address these issues directly with scheme proposals until more information is known on the final scale and location of development. BDC considers that as currently drafted policy **BR1- Bromsgrove Transport Strategy** is too limited in its scope to adequately address this future challenge. The current wording does nothing to futureproof and add capacity into the Bromsgrove transport network to avert future congestion problems and consequent adverse impacts on air quality.

5 It is welcomed that at officer level indication has been given that the wording of BR1 can be altered to allow for a more overarching and longer term strategy to be produced in relation to Bromsgrove. This overarching strategy which will consider all modes of transport is likely to be a key element in shaping how the District develops in the future. It is essential that progress on the development of this strategy is reported back at regular intervals, and subjected to wider stakeholder consultation to ensure that it evolves in a manner which addresses the challenges being presented to those who currently, and in the future want to live and work in Bromsgrove District.

6 BDC would like this strategy to be seen as an opportunity for transport considerations to more heavily influence the decisions on where all forms of future development should take place. The Strategy should play a positive role in addressing infrastructure deficiencies which currently exist, and which will not be solved without intervention over and above that which can be secured from additional development. Simply mitigating the impact of future development is not an option BDC can support.

7 An evidence based investment strategy needs to be developed which can be used to secure necessary infrastructure funding. This strategy needs to be robust and flexible to ensure it can address the requirements for a range of local and central government funding regimes which will inevitably change over the lifetime of any plan. The strategy needs to be fully integrated with other similar strategies being developed in adjoining areas, particularly to the north in the West Midlands Conurbation to ensure that full advantage is taken of all additional infrastructure investment and possible funding that becomes available.

8 Further to the main strategic issue raised above the council would also comment that there is no discussion of the known problems in Bromsgrove and how the existing problems, let alone as mentioned above a vision for how future predicted ones, can be addressed. The current congestion problems are a key concern for Bromsgrove not only for the resident population but for the businesses that operate in the area who often cite the local transport infrastructure as being one of the major barriers to economic activity. The LTP documents as drafted seem to list a large number of ad hoc schemes within no overall defined strategy or prioritisation. It maybe that there is a strategy to these schemes but no detailed discussion is provided to explain how they interrelate to address the wide ranging concerns many stakeholders have already expressed in the early stages of consultation. In some instances the schemes identified are not explained in sufficient detail or with justification for the need and the prioritisation. One example of this is the priority for looking for more car parking at Bromsgrove station, when the station has only just opened and car park never seems to be at capacity.

9 Whilst the Council is not necessarily objecting, the reason for combining Bromsgrove and Redditch together as 'North East Worcestershire' also seems confused. The areas are very distinct areas, with markedly different socio economic structures, so therefore to say this is done for socio economic reasons and because both Councils relate to Birmingham is confusing. It is our understanding that the transport challenges the authorities face are very different. As the description of the North East Worcestershire Transport Challenges in LTP4 is very generic it is difficult to ascertain from the plan what these challenges really are across North East Worcestershire. Consequently without this understanding it difficult to form a view as to whether grouping Bromsgrove and Redditch together is for the benefit of each authority. Particularly as it is assumed that full strategies as per the one identified for Bromsgrove above will be produced for all areas of the county, including Redditch. As a whole again we assume these local elements will form a coherent transport strategy for the whole of Worcestershire which links complementary strategies in adjoining areas such as the West Midlands conurbation and Warwickshire.

10 In summary it is believed that nothing short of a radical programme of investment in all modes of transport infrastructure across the District will be needed to ensure Bromsgrove can cope

Agenda Item 4

with the pressures likely to be exerted on it over the next 20-30 years. The Council want to work closely with WCC to develop a future plan and investment strategy which can sensitively deliver both significant housing and employment growth in the future whilst still retaining the attractiveness and local distinctiveness of the District.

This page is intentionally left blank

Response to Solihull MBC on the Solihull Draft Local Plan Review consultation

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Kit Taylor
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Ruth Bamford
Wards Affected	All Wards
Ward Councillor Consulted	Yes
Non-Key Decision	Yes

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 1.1 The current local plan for Solihull, the “Solihull Local Plan” (SLP), was adopted in December 2013 and covers the period 2011 to 2028. Although it is a recently adopted plan, and is up-to-date in many respects, there are three reasons that have triggered the need for an early review of it.
- 1.2 Firstly, the successful legal challenge to the local plan post adoption means that the current Local Plan has no overall housing requirement for the Plan period. This makes it difficult to demonstrate that the Borough has a five-year housing land supply, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 1.3 Secondly, the examination of the Birmingham Development Plan has made clear that the City Council is unable to meet its own housing need within its boundaries, and that the shortfall will have to be met elsewhere within the Housing Market Area (HMA) (or other nearby areas) such as Solihull. The adopted Solihull Local Plan acknowledges that when work on housing needs identifies a need for further provision in the Borough, a review will be brought forward to address this. Solihull MBC believes that this is the appropriate time for doing this.
- 1.4 Finally, the arrival of HS2 to the Borough, and in particular the Interchange station marks a significant shift from the SLP. The ‘Proposed Local Area Plan for the High Speed 2 Interchange and Adjoining Area’ highlighted the need to review the Green Belt boundary.
- 1.5 Solihull MBC have therefore produced the Solihull Draft Local Plan (November 2016) and is now consulting on this stage of the Plan’s progression.
- 1.6 The closing date for submission of responses was 17th February 2017 and the attached response has been issued to Solihull MBC as an officer response until formal authorisation by the Council is received.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That Members note the contents of the report
- 2.2 That Cabinet recommends to Council that the officer response to the Solihull Draft Local Plan Review consultation (as attached at Appendix 1) be approved by Council as the formal consultation response.

3. KEY ISSUES

Financial Implications

- 3.1 None identified.

Legal Implications

- 3.2 The attached response discusses the Duty to Co-operate which is a legal requirement under Section 33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and Section 112 (2) of the Localism Act 2011.

Service / Operational Implications

3.3 **Summary of Response**

The response is structured in two parts; firstly, consideration of the housing and employment development targets and secondly, in relation to site selection in terms of potential impacts on Bromsgrove District.

- 3.4 Housing and employment development targets:
Robust evidence should be available regarding the justification and proportionality of the 2000 dwellings contribution contained within the Plan, towards meeting the unmet housing needs arising in the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area (GBHMA). Bearing in mind Solihull's pivotal economic position within the region, BDC consider that the appropriate level of growth commensurate with this position should be thoroughly evidenced and justified in an open and transparent manner, which will stand up to the scrutiny it will inevitably receive .
- 3.5 Solihull MBC need to remain committed to the recently advertised GBHMA Strategic Growth Study and ensure flexibility is maintained in the Plan to reflect the Study's strategic findings regardless of pre-existing local evidence. BDC consider that this issue strikes at the heart of the ethos of the Duty to Co-operate, that co-operation on this basis should be both meaningful and ongoing.
- 3.6 There appears to be an absence of an objectively assessed need (OAN) figure within the Plan at this stage. A clear calculation or

commentary should be included in the Local Plan as to how the dwellings target has been arrived at, specifically defining the OAN and any other 'policy-on' factors over and above this.

- 3.7 BDC would question the robustness of the decision in the SHMA to uplift the demographic starting point by 10% in response to market signals. This represents a modest uplift in the light of evidence and BDC consider a 20% uplift would be more appropriate.
- 3.8 Based on the evidence provided BDC consider that the growth in jobs in the Borough has been underestimated.
- 3.9 In addition to the modest uplift for market signals and the lack of any uplift for future jobs growth, it is noted that the SHMA does not propose an uplift to the OAN to address affordable housing need. BDC consider that this position should be reviewed.
- 3.10 Site selection:
Three sites appear to be proposed for allocation in the Plan in relatively close proximity to Bromsgrove;
1) Proposed site allocation 4 west of Dickens Heath-700 dwellings
2) Proposed site allocation 13 (Christmas tree farm) south of Shirley - 600 dwellings
3) Proposed site allocation 12- Dog Kennel Lane east of Dickens Heath- 850 dwellings
- 3.11 The first of these, site 4, abuts the County and District boundary, with Majors Green already abutting the boundary to the west. This is obviously contrary to purpose 2 of the function of Green Belts, to prevent the coalescence of settlements (Paragraph 80 NPPF). The other sites are situated to the south of Shirley at a further distance than site 4 but nonetheless could still have an impact on the infrastructure of Bromsgrove.
- 3.12 BDC are concerned that the evidence base being used, in many cases post-dates the Plans production in November 2016, for example, the Sustainability Appraisal (January 2017), Landscape Character Assessment (December 2016), Topic Paper 4- Options for Growth and Site Selection (December 2016). BDC therefore questions how the evidence base has been used to support the site selection process.
- 3.13 Furthermore BDC are also concerned about the lack of evidence regarding the impact of the three allocations, amounting to 2150 dwellings, on the infrastructure of nearby Bromsgrove District, for example, in terms of the impact on the wider transport network, highways and public transport; education; community facilities; GP surgeries and so forth.

4. Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

4.1 None identified.

5. RISK MANAGEMENT

5.1 The risks associated with not responding to this consultation is that BDC's concerns will not be taken into account by Solihull MBC in the future progression of the Local Plan which have an impact to a greater or lesser extent on Bromsgrove District.

6. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – BDC response to Solihull MBC

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

1. Solihull Draft Local Plan November 2016

8. KEY

Solihull MBC- Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
GBHMA- Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area
NPPF- National Planning Policy Framework 2012
OAN- objectively assessed need (housing)
SHMA- Strategic Housing Market Assessment
HS2- High Speed 2 (rail network)

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Rosemary Williams

r.williams@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

01527-881316



Policy and Spatial Planning
Solihull MBC
Council House
Manor Square
Solihull
B91 3QB

strategicplanning@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

17th February 2017

Dear Sir / Madam

Solihull Draft Local Plan Review

Bromsgrove District Council Consultation Response

1. Bromsgrove District Council (BDC) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Solihull Draft Local Plan. This response represents an informal view at this stage. Once formal endorsement is received from the Council, we will confirm the wording of the final response via email.
2. BDC have read the Solihull Draft Local Plan (November 2016) with interest and would like to comment on the parts of the draft plan that are relevant to the district and the wider Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area (GBHMA). The response is in two parts, firstly the consideration of the development targets contained within the plan and secondly in relation to site and selection methodology which impact on the Bromsgrove district.

Contribution to HMA shortfall

3. The Council questions SMBC's inclusion of the statement at para 211 that there is:

"A direction of travel that has received a measure of support is indicating that the Council ought to be testing, through this local plan review, the potential to accommodate a further 2,000 dwellings from the shortfall, in addition to accommodating the Borough's own needs."

Notwithstanding the fact there is a lack of similar wording within Policy P5 which would commit the Council to undertake this testing. It is notable that the possibility of SMBC testing a further 2000 dwellings only received a measure of support and not full support in discussions with other housing market area authorities.

4. The Council has been an active member of the GBHMA working group since its formation and has participated fully in all the activities undertaken by this group. This includes the agreement to participate in the recently advertised Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area Strategic Growth Study. It is essential that the Strategic Growth Study proceeds as per the brief and that all areas of the GBHMA are looked at with the same level of scrutiny. Whilst pre-existing work will play a part in informing this study, this work cannot be used to

undermine the strategic nature of what the study aims to achieve, particularly in determining which areas of Green Belt are worthy of consideration for future development needs. The need for a strategic green belt review is also highlighted in the recently published West Midlands Land Commission report which stresses;

The (Green Belt) review should pick up from and, where appropriate, supersede the reviews which a significant number of local authorities have underway, where the Commission has heard from a number of respondents that individual local reviews risk a piecemeal and unsustainable 'chipping away' of the Green Belt.

5. Under Challenge B on page 19 of the draft plan , it is stated that:

“To ensure that provision is made for an **appropriate proportion** of the HMA shortfall in new housing land consistent with the achievement of sustainable development and the other objectives of the Plan.” (emphasis added).

It is important to ascertain how any contribution, 2000 or otherwise, has been arrived at and how it has been concluded that this is an ‘appropriate proportion’. In the context of the Greater Birmingham and Black Country Authorities as mentioned above , the 2,000 contribution from SMBC has not been agreed. Any contribution towards meeting the shortfall from the HMA needs the full support of the GBHMA authorities and should be based on a robust and thorough apportionment methodology. The strategic growth study is mechanism to achieve this. Regardless of the all above it is also unclear whether this 2,000 dwelling contribution to the shortfall has been included within the 15,029 additional homes that SMBC plan to deliver between 2014-2033. This is discussed further in the OAN section of the response below.

6. It should be noted that the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) Strategic Housing Needs Study (SHNS) - Stage 3 Report (August 2015) states at para 2.45 that:

*“Of these ‘missing dwellings’ **most should be within easy reach of Birmingham and to a lesser extent, Solihull.** This is where the largest imbalances between need and supply are found.”* (emphasis added).

This is a reflection of Table 2.2 of the same report which shows that after Birmingham, Solihull had the biggest mismatch between need and supply for the study period of 2011-2031. Throughout the Draft Local Plan, it is emphasised that Solihull plays an important role in the region and is “a regional and nationally significant economic hub” (para 29). The proportion of the HMA housing need shortfall to be accommodated by SMBC should therefore reflect the significant role the Borough plays, and be aligned with its economic development aspirations to make the most of the exciting opportunities planned.

7. Para 211 of the draft Local Plan states that the HMA shortfall arising from the 2015 SHNS produced by PBA is 37,500. In the Birmingham Development Plan (adopted January 2017), the shortfall cited in Policy PG1 for Birmingham alone and to be accommodated elsewhere within the GBHMA is 37,900. This was added to the policy to reflect Main Modification 2 (MM2) and also to the Monitoring Section and Policy TP48 through MM84 arising from the Inspector’s Report. The 37,900 shortfall in the Birmingham Plan is a more robust figure which was endorsed through Examination and enshrined in an adopted Development Plan. It should be referred to until superseded by an updated OAN (and shortfall) for the HMA.

Objectively Assessed Need and the Solihull SHMA (November 2016)

8. There is an absence of an objectively assessed need (OAN) figure within the plan at this stage, and having read Part 1 of the November 2016 Solihull SHMA, it is important that the Council specify which of the two OAN figures stated at para 7.21 of their SHMA report that they are looking to deliver (13,094 or 14,278). Reflecting on the Council's own experiences at the examination of the Bromsgrove District Plan, the Inspector insisted that the Council specify Bromsgrove's OAN, in line with the requirements of the NPPF. Defining the OAN is particularly relevant in the context of establishing Solihull's contribution to the wider HMA shortfall.
9. Para 214 states that the target of 14,905 net additional dwellings reflects the full OAN, a contribution to the wider HMA shortfall and an allowance to ensure consistency with the SHNS (Strategic Housing Needs Study) for the period 2011-14. Firstly, it is unclear what the 14,905 figure refers to, given the target in Policy P5 is 15,029 and nor does it tally with the total estimated capacity figure of 15,534 in the Table on page 73. Secondly, a clear calculation or commentary should be included in the Local Plan as to how the dwellings target has been arrived at, specifically defining the OAN and any other 'policy-on' factors over and above this.

Market Signals

10. The decision in the SHMA to uplift the demographic starting point by 10% in response to market signals is an intriguing one. This is in the context of high house prices compared to regional and national averages which is referenced throughout the Draft Local Plan, but specifically at paras: 32, 49 and 63.
11. The conclusion that the market signals only represent the need for a modest uplift of 10% is also questionable based on para 4.57 which says:

"From the three cases discussed above we cannot draw definite conclusions about the correct market signals uplift for Solihull."

and para 4.58:

"In short, the size of any market uplift cannot be simply inferred from earlier examples; it also requires judgement."

12. Therefore it is interesting that this judgement has resulted in the use of a low uplift based on the comparison with the authorities of Eastleigh (10% uplift), Uttlesford (10% uplift) and Canterbury (30% uplift). It is suggested that alternative authorities could have easily been referenced to support a different conclusion and higher percentage uplift. It would have been prudent to use authorities which are more comparable to Solihull in terms of their housing markets and geography.
13. Using the recommendations of the Local Plans Expert Group (March 2016), specifically Appendix 6 which amends the text of the NPPG to provide advice on market signals and how plan makers should respond to them. This states that:
"Based on the data published by DCLG, LPAs should apply an upward adjustment to the demographic starting point in line with the following benchmarks
 - *Where the House Price Ratio is less than 5.3 and Rental Affordability Ratio is less than 25%, no uplift is required;*

- Where HPR is at or above 5.3 and less than 7.0, AND/OR the RAR is at or above 25% and less than 30%, a 10% uplift should be applied;
- Where the HPR is at or above 7.0 and less than 8.7, AND/OR the RAR is at or above 30% and less than 35%, a 20% uplift should be applied; and
- Where the HPR is at or above 8.7, AND/OR the RAR is at or above 35%, a 25% uplift should be applied.”

14. Para 183 of the Draft Local Plan states that the house price ratio (lower quartile house prices to lower quartile earnings) in Solihull in 2015 was 8.45 (which was notably higher than the average for England (7.02)). In line with the LPEG’s methodology, a **20% uplift** may be more appropriate to address the market signals.

Future Jobs

15. It is highly important that future labour supply matches future jobs growth and Experian forecasting has been used at Chapter 5 of the Solihull SHMA to explore this. The forecasting model shows an increase of 15,200 jobs over the plan period from 119,700 to 134,300 (para 5.9). On this basis the SHMA reports that “*the availability of labour will be sufficient to fill those jobs.*” Therefore there is no upward adjustment proposed to the demographic starting point in response to jobs growth. This growth of 15,200 jobs over the plan period appears relatively low and is questionable given the number of major employers in the Borough, coupled with the economic growth aspirations of SMBC. The commentary in the Draft Local Plan itself at paragraph 30 also appears to contradict this very conservative level of jobs growth when it is cited that:

“Over the five years 2010-2015 Solihull had the fastest growing labour market outside of London”

And

“At a broad sector level 2015 saw particularly strong employment growth in manufacturing (+1,300, +12%), transport and communications (+1,100, +14%), as well as across all financial, professional and business services;”

16. Based on the information provided in the Draft Local Plan, if 2,400 jobs were created from just two sectors in one year alone, this is equivalent to 16% of the predicted jobs growth over the entire plan period to 2033. It therefore appears that the Experian model has significantly underestimated the jobs growth for the plan period.
17. The SHMA attempts to quantify the impact of the UK Central proposal by undertaking bespoke modelling (in addition to the Experian forecasting) around this proposal. Para 37 of the Draft Local Plan states that:

“The potential of UK Central, to generate further economic and employment growth for the region as a whole is on a nationally significant scale – over 100,000 jobs and £15bn GDP in the West Midlands by 2040 – jobs and growth that are critical to Solihull, its neighbours and to the rebalancing of the national economy.”

18. Whilst it is accepted that the impact of UK Central will extend beyond SMBC’s boundaries, given the location of the project which is centred around Birmingham airport in the authority’s area, it would be expected that the majority of the jobs growth would be delivered within the Borough. The SHMA uses jobs figures from the UK Central Strategic Outline Case which “*estimates 16,500 gross additional jobs will be delivered in the UKC Hub*

between 2026 and 2045” (para 5.20). This figure is then reduced further to 9,286 reflecting purely the net additional jobs for the same period (para 5.21). However it is argued that this new reduced figure related to the whole of the GBSLEP sub-region and are not specific to Solihull. We do not follow this explanation as the SHMA notes at para 5.21 that these jobs would be located in Solihull.

19. Once all of the forecasting and modelling is disentangled, it is recommended at para 5.34 that:

“For the purpose of calculating the OAN, the rebalanced UKC Hub scenario results in an additional 400 people in 2033 over the baseline model. Experian comment that ‘the results are as you would expect, there is a small increase in population, jobs and employment and a fall in excess jobs to zero’.”

20. Common sense would dictate that the major infrastructure and economic growth proposed through the UK Central project should result in a far greater jobs growth and associated increase in labour supply than 400 additional people as cited in the SHMA. If it is surmised that the additional jobs would be filled by workers commuting in to Solihull from the rest of the West Midlands, as suggested at paras 5.27 and 5.36 of the SHMA, this would represent unsustainable commuting, contrary to para 70 of the NPPF and as quoted at para 5.1 of the Solihull SHMA.

21. The SHMA goes on to conclude Chapter 5 at para 5.39 by stating:

“Given we are recommending both a demographic adjustment and a market signals uplift on the 2014-based projections, we do not think that there is any justification for a separate economic uplift to address the UKC Hub, not least because it will only start to come forward at the very end of the period and the uncertainties surrounding long-term economic impact forecasting of this nature.”

22. The application of a demographic adjustment and a market signals uplift are separate factors and do not restrict the Council’s ability to apply an economic uplift where common sense would indicate a further uplift is necessary. The online Planning Practice Guidance does not state that it is an ‘either/or’ approach in terms of applying uplifts in response to market signals, employment trends and affordable need. Additionally, the SHMA appears to be internally inconsistent as the Strategic Outline Case is referenced which indicates that the new jobs are going to be delivered from 2026 which is just over halfway through the plan period, not ‘at the very end’ as referenced in the quote above.

Affordable Housing

23. In addition to the modest uplift for market signals and the lack of any uplift for future jobs growth, it is noted that the SHMA does not propose an uplift to the OAN to address affordable need. This should be reviewed in light of the commentary throughout the Draft Local Plan of a ‘severe lack of affordable housing’ (para 49) and the high ratio of lower quartile house prices to lower quartile earnings (para 183).

Proposed Allocations and site selection methodology

24. This section of the response focusses predominantly on the proposed site allocations and supporting evidence base and relate predominantly to questions 15 and 16. Although the site allocations appear to be presented as options they are not truly options since they do not

provide comparative levels of growth and all appear to be required to meet the Housing requirement.

25. Three sites appear to be proposed for allocation in relatively close proximity to Bromsgrove;
 - Proposed site allocation 4 west of Dickens Heath-700 dwellings
 - Proposed site allocation 13 (Christmas tree farm) south of Shirley - 600 dwellings
 - Proposed site allocation 12- Dog Kennel Lane east of Dickens Heath- 850 dwellings

Site allocation 4, in particular, abuts the District and County boundary. With Majors Green lying in Bromsgrove District already abutting the boundary to the west, this allocation would result in the coalescence of settlements contrary to purpose 2 of the function of Green Belts as set out in Paragraph 80 of the NPPF.

26. Turning now to the Green Belt Assessment carried out in July 2016. Site 4 lies part in 'refined parcels' RP70 and 71 which achieve above average scores of 8 and 7 respectively. Whilst it is stated that the assessment is 'policy off' it is apparent certain assumptions are made as relative importance to different areas of the Green Belt such as the several references being made to the 'vital' or 'strategic' " Meriden Gap"

"this Assessment has been carried out using an entirely 'policy off' approach in order to assess the strategic performance of the land designated as Green Belt within the Borough"

27. Further references to this study are then found in Topic Paper 4 which examines 'Options for Growth and Site Selection' December 2016, for example,

Page 76...

Area F - South of Shirley between Tanworth Lane and the Borough Boundary

373. **Accessibility** -This area is generally accessible, with most sites being of medium to high accessibility in the Accessibility Mapping study.

374. **Green Belt** - The eastern part of this area performs moderately in the GBA with scores of 6, with the western part of the area, parcel 70, being moderate to high. Development in some areas could lead to the loss of the gaps between the urban area and Dickens Heath.

375. **Constraints & Opportunities** - This area is largely constraint free, although there is a Local Wildlife Site towards Whitlock's End. The draft LCA identifies the sensitivity of this area to pressure for development close to the urban edge of Solihull and Dickens Heath.

376. **Capacity** - The area presents an opportunity for significant growth.

377. **Deliverability** – The SHELAA indicates generally good marketability/viability for sites assessed in this area.

378. **Conclusion** - The moderate impact on the Green Belt and the medium to high accessibility indicate that this land is suitable for consideration for growth, although any development would need to ensure that meaningful gaps to settlements are retained. Where impact on Green Belt is more than limited, this is balanced by the higher accessibility that the area has.

No further information is provided on how 'meaningful gaps' will be achieved. In para 374, parcel 70 is referred to as being 'moderate to high' but this transfers to 'moderate' impact on the Green Belt in the conclusion.

28. It is also interesting to note that the Landscape Character Assessment carried out again in December 2016, identifies this area LCA 2 'Southern Countryside'. What it concludes (page

22 onwards) is that this area has a very low landscape capacity to accommodate new development with visual sensitivity in the area being high.

29. In terms of infrastructure, updated evidence is found in the evidence document "Solihull Connected Transport Strategy 2016 Delivery Plan 2016-2036." Improvements to infrastructure in the vicinity of all 3 sites appear to be:

- 28. Jct 4 M42 (Blythe Valley) capacity improvement
- 32. A34 Stratford Road high quality multi modal route enhancements including Shirley Centre
- 34. Local Stations multi modal interchange and access improvements

BDC have concerns regarding the trip movements associated with the 3 proposed site allocations potentially amounting to over 2000 dwellings in close proximity to Bromsgrove district and impacts on wider transport network.

30. Also of concern, as voiced in previous responses to the Solihull Plan, is the impact on other components of infrastructure in terms of schools, GP surgeries, for example, in the nearby settlements in Bromsgrove. Although it is noted in the accessibility study carried out again in December 2016, this does not fully cover infrastructure outside the Borough. It is noted that for shops and GP surgeries this extended 800m beyond the Borough boundary but schools are limited to those within the Borough.

Conclusions

31. Bromsgrove District Council has concerns about the Draft Solihull Local Plan review as expressed above. The most significant one being the lack of full or evidence based consideration of the wider housing needs of the Greater Birmingham Housing Market Area. At the moment the Council is concerned that SMBC may not be able to meet its duty to cooperate as prescribed in the Localism Act. Full engagement in the work of the GBHMA would help to satisfy this requirement.

32. The other concerns relate to the allocation of sites in the vicinity of Bromsgrove District. We believe that the proposed allocation in relation to site 4 does not comply with national green belt policy. We also do not consider that at this stage the evidence base being used to support the 3 allocations, is complete or consistent. This leaves the Council with unanswered questions as to the impact on Bromsgrove District of developing these areas.

Officers from the Council will be more than willing to meet with SMBC representatives to try and ensure that the issues outlined above are addressed in later iterations of the Draft Local Plan review.

Yours faithfully,



Ruth Bamford

Agenda Item 5

Head of Planning and Regeneration
Bromsgrove and Redditch Councils

Third Stage Consultation on Mineral Local Plan Response

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Kit Taylor
Portfolio Holder Consulted	Yes
Relevant Head of Service	Ruth Bamford
Wards Affected	All Wards
Ward Councillor Consulted	N/A
Non-Key Decision	Yes

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

- 1.1 Worcestershire County Council, as the Minerals Planning Authority is producing a Minerals Local Plan. The Third Stage Consultation on the emerging Minerals Local Plan (MLP) for Worcestershire runs until 8 March 2017. The consultation document includes policies on the location of sites for mineral extraction, requirements for mineral extraction applications, preferred areas and specific sites identified for mineral extraction, strategic corridors where mineral extraction in principle is accepted, and Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) and Mineral Resource Consultation Areas (MRSAs) where any non-exempt development will be required to conduct a Mineral Resource Assessment to determine whether development will have an unacceptable impact on the mineral resources in the County.
- 1.2 This report explains the recommendations for a formal response from Bromsgrove District Council on the emerging MLP.
- 1.3 As the Council does not meet until after the closing date for responses, it is proposed that once considered by the Cabinet the draft response is submitted to the County Council pending formal agreement by the Council.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That the content of the report be noted;
- 2.2 That Cabinet recommends to Council that the draft Officer response to the Mineral Local Plan for Worcestershire as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, be agreed as the Council's formal response.

3. KEY ISSUES

Financial Implications

- 3.1 No financial implications are envisaged at this stage.

Legal Implications

- 3.2 No legal implications are envisaged at this stage.

Service / Operational Implications

- 3.3 Worcestershire County Council (WCC), as the Minerals Planning Authority is producing a Minerals Local Plan. This is the third stage consultation where WCC have proposed strategic corridors, MSAs and MRCAs as well as development management policies for minerals developments.
- 3.4 There are three strategic corridors proposed within Bromsgrove District. The North East Worcestershire strategic corridor is wholly within Bromsgrove District. Along with the Salwarpe Tributaries Strategic Corridor, these two strategic corridors surround Bromsgrove Town. A small section of the North West Worcestershire strategic corridor is within Bromsgrove District to the west of Hagley.
- 3.5 The strategic corridors have been determined using geological data and Landscape Character Types. The strategic corridors do not take into account constraints or the existing built environment.
- 3.6 Any windfall sites which come forward within the strategic corridors across the County which contribute to the quality, character and distinctiveness of the strategic corridor they are within, will be granted planning permission, provided the applications also adhere to the development management policies. Therefore, although the strategic corridors cover large portions of the County, this will not result in minerals development over the whole of the strategic corridors.
- 3.7 The development management policies include the requirements for mineral workings. These policies include requirements for extraction near to heritage assets; impacts on air quality; transport requirements and restoration; and biodiversity enhancement post extraction.
- 3.8 WCC has identified MSAs which correspond to the key and significant resources within the County. The guidance requires the MSAs to reflect the existing resources. The MRCAs are areas which WCC can identify from the MSAs. WCC has identified these areas by buffering out from the boundaries of the MSAs by 250 meters. Non-mineral developments (which are not exempt) which come forward, must produce a Mineral Resource Assessment and consult with WCC on the proposal.
- 3.9 There are a number of discrepancies with the MSAs and MRCAs boundaries which need further clarification.
- 3.10 The MLP does not include information on how WCC will work with the Borough, District and City Councils when assessing proposed development sites within MRCAs.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

None

4. RISK MANAGEMENT

There are no risks envisaged at this stage.

5. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Consultation Response

6. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Worcestershire County Council Minerals Local Plan Third Stage Consultation

http://www.worcestershire.gov.uk/downloads/file/7615/minerals_local_plan_third_stage_consultation

7. KEY

MLP – Minerals Local Plan

MSA – Mineral Safeguarding Area

MRCA - Mineral Resource Consultation Area

WCC – Worcestershire County Council

AUTHOR OF REPORT

Name: Isabel Roberts

E Mail: Isabel.roberts@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk

Tel: 01527 881 603

This page is intentionally left blank

Minerals Local Plan 3rd Consultation Response from Bromsgrove District Council

1. Overview

- 1.1 Worcestershire County Council (WCC) is the Minerals Planning Authority in Worcestershire and is required to produce an up to date Minerals Local Plan. The emerging Minerals Local Plan (MLP) is at its third stage consultation and will replace the existing county of Hereford and Worcester Minerals Local Plan 1997 (MLP 1997).
- 1.2 Bromsgrove District Council (the Council) welcomes an updated Minerals Local Plan for the county, however, has some concerns with regards to the impact on existing and future development in the District.

2. Strategic Corridors

- 2.1 The Council finds the concept of strategic corridors an interesting and acceptable proposition. The strategic corridors are determined by the location of mineral resources and landscape character types and do not take into account constraints, such as heritage assets or existing built development or allocated sites.
- 2.2 The Council believes further emphasis of minerals development within the Green Belt should be further emphasised to ensure that it is understood that minerals extraction itself is not inappropriate in the Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

3. Development Management policies

- 3.1 The Council welcomes Policy MLP12: Adequate and Diverse Supply of Building Stone which allows for small local quarries to supply stone for the repair and maintenance of historic buildings. It encourages WCC to emphasise the importance of allowing small stone mining operations to open for relatively small amounts of local stone for use on historic buildings in the County.
- 3.2 Policy MLP23: Historic Environment explains that developments must have regard to the historic environment. However, the Council are concerned that the policy wording of part a) uses the phrase 'unacceptable harm'. This wording does not reflect the NPPF and the Council believes it should, as the NPPF wordings are established measures of the impact on heritage assets.

3.3 Policy MLP23 could also provide a distinction between nationally designated heritage assets and locally designated heritage assets as to the level of harm a particular heritage asset or its setting may sustain before being detrimental.

4. Mineral Safeguarding Areas and Mineral Resource Consultation Areas

4.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that Minerals Planning Authorities adopt appropriate policies as well as define MSAs and MRCAs. Paragraph 8.4 of the MLP explains the types of development which are exempt from Policies MLP27 and MLP28. The exempt development includes allocated sites in Local Plans and Neighbourhood Plans, minor development within the curtilage of existing buildings, demolition of buildings, replacement dwellings Certificates of Lawfulness and Listed Building consent among others.

- define Minerals Safeguarding Areas and adopt appropriate policies in order that known locations of specific minerals resources of local and national importance are not needlessly sterilised by non-mineral development, whilst not creating a presumption that resources defined will be worked; and define Minerals Consultation Areas based on these Minerals Safeguarding Areas;

National Planning Policy Framework (2012) Paragraph 143

4.2 The Council would suggest further exempt development from mineral safeguarding requirements to include rural exception sites and infill development of a small number of new dwellings to ensure these types of development remain viable.

4.3 The Council understands that the extents of the Mineral Safeguarding Areas (MSAs) are determined by the extent of mineral resources. The Mineral Resource Consultation Areas (MRCAs) are proposed to be determined through adding a 250m buffer from the boundary of the MSAs which alone is a crude tool, as it does not take into account other constraints and considerations.

4.4 There are a number of discrepancies which the Council will be happy to discuss with WCC to find a reasonable and mutually acceptable resolution. However, as drafted, the Council does not support the MSAs and MRCAs, especially with regards to some of the building stone MSAs and MRCAs and MRCAs for other types of minerals where they overlap with existing built development.

4.5 The Council would welcome further information as to how proposed future allocations may be located within MRCAs, and the steps and interactions WCC would wish to undertake to ensure that the MRCAs do not blight land for future development.

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET

1st March 2017

FINANCE MONITORING REPORT 2016/17

Relevant Portfolio Holder	Councillor Geoff Denaro, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Enabling Services
Relevant Head of Service	Jayne Pickering, Executive Director Finance and Corporate Resources
Non-Key Decision	

1. SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

To report to Cabinet on the Council's financial position for Revenue and Capital for the period April – December 2016 (Quarter 3 – 2016/17)

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 That Cabinet note the current financial position on Revenue and Capital as detailed in the report.

3. KEY ISSUES

- 3.1 This report provides details of the financial information across the Council. The aim is to ensure officers and members can make informed and considered judgement of the overall position of the Council. The report reflects the financial position across the Strategic Purposes to enable Members to be aware of the level of funding attributed to these areas.
- 3.2 This report includes both a summary for revenue and capital expenditure with a summary for the Council followed by the departmental analysis of expenditure detailed appendices showing the areas that link to the Strategic Purposes.

CABINET

1st March 2017

**Revenue Budget summary
Financial Year 2016/17 – Overall Council**

3.3 Internal recharges have not been included in these figures to allow comparison for each service area. However Support costs have been included

Strategic Purpose	Original Budget £'000	Latest budget £'000	Budget to date £'000	Actuals to date £'000	Variance to date £'000	Projected Outturn £'000	Projected Variance £'000
Keep my place safe and looking good	4,948	5,220	2,993	2,939	-55	5,182	-61
Help me run a successful business	-592	-613	-467	-448	19	-594	19
Help me be financially independent	263	263	1,080	1,045	-34	212	-51
Help me to live my life independently	593	593	393	328	-65	532	-60
Help me find somewhere to live in my locality	1,082	1,091	724	662	-62	1,034	-58
Provide Good things for me to see, do and visit	1,388	1,831	850	834	-16	1,797	-35
Enable others to work/do what they need to do (to meet their purpose)	5,783	5,882	4,221	4,171	-50	5,813	-68
Totals	13,465	14,267	9,793	9,530	-264	13,975	-314
Corporate Financing	274	274	137	-197	-334	-60	-334

Financial Commentary:

There are a number variances within the third quarter of 2016/17. In particular there have been two large planning applications fees received and are included within 'Keep my place safe and looking good'. In addition there has been an increase in lifeline customers which has led to additional income being received within the strategic purpose 'Help me to live my life independently'. The variance in Enabling is mainly due to salary vacancies and additional income received.

As shown above the original budget as agreed in February 2016 has been shown in the table above for comparison purposes. A breakdown at appendix 2 shows the movements in budget to quarter 3 to enable members to identify the changes over the last 9 months from the original budget estimates.

CABINET

1st March 2017

It is projected that there will be a saving on Minimum Revenue provision (MRP) £100k which is due to slippage within the capital program 2015/16. We have also received a payment from the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Pool following the distribution of the 2015/16 Levy payments of £234k.

**Capital Budget summary
Financial Year 2016/17 – Overall Council**

Strategic Purpose	Annual budget £'000	Budget to date £'000	Actuals to date £'000	Variance to date £'000	Projected Outturn £'000	Projected Variance £'000
Keep my place safe and looking good	3,309	2,285	1,454	-831	1,516	-1,793
Help me be financially independent	17	13	10	-3	10	-7
Help me to live my life independently	1,103	827	730	-97	766	-337
Help me find somewhere to live in my locality	29	29	40	11	40	11
Provide Good things for me to see, do and visit	6,321	4,774	4,072	-702	6,188	-133
Enable others to work/do what they need to do (to meet their purpose)	114	86	34	-52	59	-55
Totals	10,893	8,014	6,340	-1,674	8,579	-2,314

Financial Commentary:

The majority of capital projects are currently in progress. However there is one significant variance to report in this third quarter. In 'Keep my place safe looking good' the capital scheme for additional for Fleet replacement has had a delay from the suppliers and will be delivered in early 2017/18.

CABINET

1st March 2017

4. TREASURY MANAGEMENT

- 4.1 The Council's Treasury Management Strategy has been developed in accordance with the Prudential Code for Capital Finance prudential indicators and is used to manage risks arising from financial instruments. Additionally treasury management practices are followed on a day to day basis.
- 4.2 The Council receives credit rating details from its Treasury Management advisers on a daily basis and any counterparty falling below the criteria is removed from the list of approved institutions.
- 4.3 Due to market conditions the Council has reduced its credit risk for all new investments by only investing in the highest rated instruments and has shortened the allowable length of investments in order to reduce risk.
- 4.4 At 31st December 2016 short term investments comprised:

	31st December 2016 £'000
Deposits	9,500
Total	9,500

Income from investments and other interest

- 4.5 An investment income target of £93k has been set for 2016/17 using a projected return rate of 0.5%. During the past financial year bank base rates have remained 0.25% and current indications are projecting minimal upward movement for the short term.

5. REVENUE BALANCES

5.1 Revenue Balances

The revenue balances brought forward at 1st April 2016 were £4.160m.

Legal Implications

None.

CABINET

1st March 2017

Service/Operational Implications

All included in financial implications.

Customer / Equalities and Diversity Implications

None as a direct result of this report

7. RISK MANAGEMENT

7.1 Risk considerations covered in the report. There are no Health & Safety considerations

8. APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Strategic Purposes
Appendix 2 – Revenue Reconciliation

9. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Available from Financial Services

AUTHORS OF REPORT

Name: Kate Goldey – Business Support Senior Accountancy Technician
Email: k.goldey@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk
Tel: (01527) 881208

This page is intentionally left blank

Please note figures have been rounded.

Keep my place safe and looking good.

Department		Annual budget £'000	Budget to date £'000	Actuals to date £'000	Variance to date £'000	Projected Outturn £'000	Projected Variance £'000
BDC Reg Client	Exp	508	371	355	-16	492	-16
	Inc	-100	-75	-75	-0	-100	0
	Net	408	296	280	-16	392	-16
Bereavement Services	Exp	351	258	254	-4	357	6
	Inc	-388	-271	-260	11	-381	6
	Net	-36	-13	-6	7	-24	12
Building Control	Exp	465	371	349	-21	472	-15
	Inc	-514	-388	-318	69	-420	94
	Net	-49	-17	31	48	52	79
Climate Change	Exp	21	16	18	3	24	3
	Inc	0	0	-6	-6	-6	-6
	Net	21	16	12	-4	18	-3
Community Safety	Exp	567	326	308	-17	548	-19
	Inc	-50	-37	-32	5	-45	5
	Net	517	288	276	-12	503	-14
Core Environmental Operations	Exp	443	312	377	65	476	33
	Inc	-248	-171	-244	-73	-291	-43
	Net	195	141	133	-8	184	-10
Core Waste	Exp	3,256	2,270	2,286	17	3,239	-17
	Inc	-1,906	-1,679	-1,683	-4	-1,871	35
	Net	1,349	590	603	13	1,368	19
Development Control	Exp	1,270	894	882	-12	1,265	-4
	Inc	-503	-377	-390	-12	-532	-29
	Net	766	516	492	-24	734	-33
Engineering	Exp	636	477	525	48	697	61
	Inc	-509	-507	-557	-51	-592	-83
	Net	127	-29	-32	-3	105	-22
Environmental Health / Protection / Enforcement	Exp	534	278	241	-38	488	-46
	Inc	-189	-142	-121	21	-169	20
	Net	345	136	119	-17	319	-26
Highways	Exp	0	0	3	3	3	3
	Inc	-7	-5	-7	-2	-8	-1
	Net	-7	-5	-4	1	-5	2
Land Drainage	Exp	13	0	0	0	13	0
	Inc	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net	13	0	0	0	13	0
LSP/P'ships	Exp	56	43	49	6	64	8
	Inc	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net	56	43	49	6	64	8
Pest & Dog control	Exp	102	77	77	0	102	-0
	Inc	-50	-38	-38	-0	-50	-0
	Net	52	39	39	0	52	-0
Place Teams	Exp	0	0	1	1	1	1
	Inc	0	0	-5	-5	-5	-5
	Net	0	0	-4	-4	-4	-4
Public Conveniences	Exp	1,932	1,367	1,369	2	1,909	-23
	Inc	-1,064	-798	-836	-38	-1,089	-26
	Net	868	569	533	-36	819	-49
Strategic Housing	Exp	99	61	62	1	102	3
	Inc	-0	-0	0	0	0	0
	Net	98	61	62	1	102	3
Strategic Housing	Exp	18	14	18	5	18	0
	Inc						
	Net	18	14	18	5	18	0

	Inc	-11	-8	-11	-3	-11	0
	Net	7	5	7	2	7	0
Strategic Planning	Exp	329	247	243	-4	324	-5
	Inc	-0	0	-20	-20	-26	-26
	Net	329	247	223	-23	298	-31
Town Centre Development	Exp	115	81	242	161	288	174
	Inc	-37	-28	-179	-151	-193	-156
	Net	78	53	63	10	95	17
Transport	Exp	478	357	334	-23	452	-26
	Inc	-493	-370	-347	23	-468	25
	Net	-15	-13	-13	-1	-16	-1
Trees & Woodland Management	Exp	373	276	269	-7	365	-9
	Inc	-277	-208	-200	8	-267	10
	Net	97	69	69	1	98	1
Waste Management Policy	Exp	10	7	11	3	13	3
	Inc	-9	-7	-4	3	-4	5
	Net	1	0	6	6	9	8
Totals:		5,220	2,993	2,939	-55	5,182	-61

Financial commentary:

Within Building Control Income is underachieved this is partly due to market competition.

Development Management has received additional income due to two large planning applications being received - Foxlydiat Lane and Perryfelds Lane.

BDC Reg Client have a saving in the current and future years due to additional licensing income and further efficiencies within Worcester Regulatory Services

Help me run a successful business

Department		Annual budget £'000	Budget to date £'000	Actuals to date £'000	Variance to date £'000	Projected Outturn £'000	Projected Variance £'000
Business Development - Business	Exp	18	14	62	48	69	51
	Inc	-1	-1	-48	-48	-48	-47
	Net	17	13	13	0	21	3
Car Parks / Civil Enforcement	Exp	610	469	391	-78	551	-59
	Inc	-1,236	-927	-814	113	-1,131	105
	Net	-626	-458	-423	34	-581	46
Economic & Tourism Development	Exp	276	207	119	-88	161	-115
	Inc	-109	-82	-4	78	-15	94
	Net	167	125	115	-10	146	-21
Licenses (all)	Exp	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Inc	-171	-147	-153	-6	-180	-9
	Net	-171	-147	-153	-6	-180	-9
Totals:		-613	-467	-448	19	-594	19

Financial commentary:

There is an overall shortfall in income from Car Parking some of this is a result from the recent temporary closures of Hanover Street and Station car parks. There has been a noticeable reduction in income on the Recreation Road South car-park.

Help me to be financially independent

Department		Annual budget £'000	Budget to date £'000	Actuals to date £'000	Variance to date £'000	Projected Outturn £'000	Projected Variance £'000
------------	--	------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------

Revenues & Benefits	Exp	16,805	13,031	13,050	19	16,754	-51
	Inc	-16,542	-11,951	-12,005	-53	-16,542	0
	Net	263	1,080	1,045	-35	212	-51
Totals:		263	1,080	1,045	-35	212	-51

Financial commentary:

Variance is due to savings being met within the Compliance team.

Help me to live my life independently

Department		Annual budget £'000	Budget to date £'000	Actuals to date £'000	Variance to date £'000	Projected Outturn £'000	Projected Variance £'000
Community Safety - lifeline	Exp	232	174	166	-8	224	-7
	Inc	-230	-223	-274	-51	-280	-51
	Net	2	-49	-108	-59	-56	-58
Community Transport / Dial a ride	Exp	27	20	21	1	33	5
	Inc	0	0	-7	-7	-8	-8
	Net	27	20	14	-6	25	-2
Disabled Facilities grants	Exp	563	422	422	-0	563	0
	Inc	0	0	-0	-0	0	0
	Net	563	422	422	-0	563	0
Totals:		592	393	328	-65	532	-60

Financial commentary:

The Lifeline team has been working to attract new customers and has achieved additional income this has been reflected in the budgets for 2017/18.

Help me to find somewhere to live in my locality

Department		Annual budget £'000	Budget to date £'000	Actuals to date £'000	Variance to date £'000	Projected Outturn £'000	Projected Variance £'000
Housing Strategy & Enabling	Exp	1,124	748	703	-45	1,089	-35
	Inc	-233	-175	-191	-16	-255	-23
	Net	891	574	512	-62	834	-58
Private Sector Housing	Exp	200	150	150	-0	200	0
	Inc	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net	200	150	150	-0	200	0
Totals:		1,091	724	662	-62	1,034	-58

Financial commentary:

There is a saving on Housing strategy due to the disabled facilities grant management fees being paid from the capital scheme due to increased funding now given. There are also some salary savings due to temporary vacancy.

Provide things for me to do, see and visit

Department		Annual budget £'000	Budget to date £'000	Actuals to date £'000	Variance to date £'000	Projected Outturn £'000	Projected Variance £'000
Business Development - Cultural	Exp	41	27	25	-3	31	-10
	Inc	-31	-23	-17	6	-19	11

	Net	10	4	7	3	11	1
Community Cohesion (older and young people) social inclusion	Exp	29	22	2	-20	3	-26
	Inc	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net	29	22	2	-20	3	-26
Cultural Services	Exp	249	187	200	13	249	-0
	Inc	-26	-19	-28	-8	-28	-2
	Net	223	168	172	5	221	-2
Grants & Donations	Exp	108	81	81	-0	108	0
	Inc	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net	108	81	81	-0	108	0
Parks & Green Space	Exp	437	162	147	-15	403	-34
	Inc	-95	-75	-57	18	-57	38
	Net	342	87	90	3	346	4
Shopmobility	Exp	6	4	4	0	6	0
	Inc	0	0	-0	-0	0	0
	Net	6	4	4	-0	6	0
Sports Services	Exp	1,169	529	496	-33	1,152	-17
	Inc	-55	-45	-19	26	-50	5
	Net	1,113	484	477	-7	1,102	-11
Totals:		1,831	850	834	-16	1,797	-35

Financial commentary.

The over spend on the Business Development Budget relates to the difficulties we are facing with the selling of roundabout sponsorship opportunities in some areas. There is a saving on cultural services due to the Museum being sold, these costs have been offered as saving within the 2017/18 onwards budget round. There is a saving in community Cohesion as the project Trunk has now finished.

Enable others to work/do what they need to do (to meet purpose)

Department		Annual budget £'000	Budget to date £'000	Actuals to date £'000	Variance to date £'000	Projected Outturn £'000	Projected Variance £'000
Accounts & Financial Management	Exp	507	340	321	-19	479	-28
	Inc	0	0	15	15	0	0
	Net	507	340	336	-4	479	-28
Business Development	Exp	569	399	593	194	842	273
	Inc	-46	-34	-168	-134	-227	-181
	Net	523	365	425	60	615	92
Central Overheads	Exp	1,246	900	898	-2	1,245	-0
	Inc	-3	-2	-2	1	-3	0
	Net	1,243	898	896	-1	1,243	-0
CMT	Exp	397	298	298	0	398	1
	Inc	-148	-111	-110	0	-148	-0
	Net	250	187	188	1	250	0
Communications	Exp	153	115	90	-25	125	-28
	Inc	-63	-47	-44	3	-59	5
	Net	90	67	45	-22	66	-24
Corporate	Exp	157	98	110	11	173	16
	Inc	-0	-0	-2	-2	-2	-2
	Net	156	98	107	9	171	15
Corporate Administration / Central Post Opening	Exp	205	154	165	11	212	7
	Inc	-5	-4	-3	0	-5	0
	Net	201	150	161	11	208	7
Customer service centre	Exp	337	253	240	-13	308	-30
	Inc	-42	-31	-31	0	-42	0
	Net	296	222	209	-13	266	-30
Democratic Services & Member Support	Exp	571	428	416	-12	559	-12
	Inc	-167	-125	-136	-11	-178	-10

	Net	403	303	280	-23	381	-22
Election & Electoral Services	Exp	519	361	220	-140	331	-188
	Inc	-340	-255	-95	160	-140	200
	Net	179	106	125	20	191	12
Emergency Planning / Business Continuity	Exp	14	10	10	-0	14	0
	Inc	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Net	14	10	10	-0	14	0
Equalities	Exp	49	37	32	-4	42	-7
	Inc	-19	-14	-12	2	-16	3
	Net	30	22	20	-2	26	-4
Human Resources & Welfare	Exp	249	187	91	-96	213	-36
	Inc	0	0	53	53	0	0
	Net	249	187	144	-43	213	-36
ICT	Exp	1,853	1,331	1,311	-20	1,813	-40
	Inc	-766	-575	-564	11	-755	11
	Net	1,087	756	747	-9	1,058	-28
Land Charges	Exp	71	53	52	-2	73	2
	Inc	-170	-128	-91	37	-110	60
	Net	-99	-74	-39	35	-37	62
Leisure & Cultural Mgt	Exp	99	74	74	-0	99	-0
	Inc	-50	-37	-37	0	-49	1
	Net	50	37	37	-0	50	0
Policy	Exp	145	108	66	-42	89	-56
	Inc	-67	-50	-48	2	-44	23
	Net	78	58	18	-40	45	-33
Printing & Reprographics	Exp	178	134	124	-9	167	-11
	Inc	-72	-54	-53	1	-71	2
	Net	106	79	71	-8	96	-9
Professional Legal Advice & Services	Exp	515	393	396	3	501	-14
	Inc	-269	-189	-185	5	-262	7
	Net	247	204	211	7	239	-7
SMT	Exp	355	266	267	1	356	1
	Inc	-144	-108	-108	-0	-144	-0
	Net	211	158	159	0	212	1
Transformation	Exp	127	95	67	-28	80	-46
	Inc	-64	-48	-47	1	-54	10
	Net	63	47	20	-27	27	-36
Totals:		5,882	4,221	4,171	-50	5,813	-68

Financial commentary:

There is a saving within Accounts and Financial Management due to a vacant post. This will be looked at within service review.

Business Development is showing an overspend due expenditure still being incurred on the Burcot Lane Council house.

Communications has a saving for current year and future years due to a review of the Together Bromsgrove magazine. The Better Bromsgrove once launched and in circulation is hoped will generate more income.

The savings shown on Customer Services are due to vacant posts.

The overspend in Elections relates to claims that have been submitted to the Electoral Claims Unit at the Cabinet Office, these have not yet been agreed therefore it isn't possible to accurately report until outturn and also Electoral Registrations accounts are not yet finalised although predicting a saving of circa £10,000.

There are some underspends within Human Resources due to salary vacancies and other service budgets.

Within Land Charges there is a variance due to under achieved income for search fees due to a reduction in house sales which is also compared to figures at this time in the previous year. If this trend continues it is predicted that there would be an under achievement of approx £60k by outturn - future years have been amended to reflect this trend.

Policy underspend at this quarter are due to monies not yet spent on IT GIS project/Tender work and an apprentice this may result in some savings by year end.

There are some salary savings within Business Transformation and ICT some of these posts are unlikely to be filled by the end of the financial year.

This page is intentionally left blank

BROMSGROVE 2016/17	Appendix 2
	2016-17
	£000
Departmental Expenditure (Starting Position)	11,381
Incremental Progression/Inflation on Utilities	281
Unavoidables	507
Savings and Additional income	-401
Release of reserves no longer required	-553
Release of reserves to fund shortfall	-296
Net Service Expenditure	10,918
Add back original transfer to reseves	-222
Add back release of reserves no longer required	553
Add back release of reserves to fund shortfall	296
Add back capital charges that are removed	1,886
Changes to Council Tax Admin Subsidy and Cost of Collection - below the line	35
Total Services/Original Budget	13,466
Use of Community Safety reserve	131
Use of the PCC CCTV reserve	13
Use of Grant from balances	3
Use of Sports Development	91
Use of Arts Development reserve	30
Transfer to Building Control reserve	-9
Revenue contribution to capital - Environmental services	-14
Changes to Depreciation	556
Total Revised Budget	14,267

This page is intentionally left blank