Monday, 7 November 2022



MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL DECISIONS NOTICE

DECISIONS BY THE MID SUFFOLK CABINET CALL IN DEADLINE 5:00PM ON 16 NOVEMBER 2022

The following decisions have been taken by the Cabinet and will come into effect on 17 November 2022 unless the call-in procedure is activated. For clarity, where an item is 'to be noted', 'received' or recommended to Council for a decision, this is deemed not to be a formal Executive decision and so the call-in provisions will not apply.

MCa/22/25 TENANT ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

It was RESOLVED: -

That Cabinet approved Option 1 -The strategy in its current form and acknowledged the changing landscape of social housing regulation in terms of the significance of good tenant engagement.

REASON FOR DECISION

The strategy has been co-designed with tenants through a consultation exercise with the Tenant Board, the wider tenant population, portfolio holding members and some key staff.

It is important for the councils to have a Tenant Engagement Strategy to set out how we, as a landlord, ensure that tenants are given a wide range of opportunities to influence and be involved in the formation of their landlord's housing-related strategic priorities. This includes decision making about how services are delivered, performance scrutiny and the management of their homes as required in the Regulator's Tenancy Involvement and Empowerment consumer standard.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected:

1.1 Option 2 – To do nothing,

Any Declarations of Interests Declared: None

Any Dispensation Granted: None

MCa/22/26 COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) - CIL EXPENDITURE PROGRAMME NOVEMBER 2022

It was RESOLVED: -

1.2 That the CIL Expenditure Programme (November 2022) and accompanying technical assessment of the CIL Bids – M21-09, M22-06, M22-12, M22-15, M22-05 and M22-09 (forming Appendices, A and B) and which include decisions on these CIL Bid for Cabinet to make be approved and noted (delegated decision only) as follows: -

Decisions for Cabinet to make: Ringfenced Infrastructure Fund (Walsham-le-Willows, Badwell Ash, Thurston, Elmswell, Woolpit, Tostock and Rattlesden) and Strategic Infrastructure Fund

| CIL Bid, Location and Infrastructure Proposed | Amount of CIL Bid and total cost of the Infrastructure | Cabinet Decision |
|---|---|---|
| , | cost of the Infrastructure Amount of CIL Bid £1,781,462.00 | Recommendation to Cabinet to approve CIL Bid M21-09 for £1,214,468.96 from the Ringfenced Fund (Walsham-le-Willows, Badwell Ash, Thurston, Elmswell, Woolpit, Tostock and Rattlesden) and £566,993.04 from Strategic Infrastructure |
| | Suffolk County Council borrowing £18,011 | Fund |

Decisions for Cabinet to make: Local Infrastructure Fund

| CIL Bid, Location and | Amount of CIL Bid and total | Cabinet Decision |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| Infrastructure Proposed | cost of the Infrastructure | |
| | | |

| M22-06 | Amount of CIL Bid | Recommendation to |
|------------------------|--|---|
| EYE | £100,000.00 | Cabinet to approve CIL Bid M22-06 for £100,000.00 from the Local Infrastructure Fund (CIL Funding is subject to other funding being secured) |
| Play Facilities | Total costs of the project | |
| | £150,000.00 | |
| | Other funding sources are | |
| | MSDC Capital Grant £25,000.00 | |
| | Eye Town Council £5,000.00 | |
| | Community Development Fund MSDC £20,000.00 (unsecured) | |
| M22-12 | Amount of CIL Bid | Recommendation to |
| OLD NEWTON | £67,914.00 | Cabinet to approve CIL Bid M22-12 for |
| Village Hall Extension | Total costs of the project | £67,914.00 from the Local Infrastructure |
| | £90,552.00 | Fund |
| | Other funding sources are | |
| | S106 funding £861.57 | |
| | Capital Grants MSDC £21,776.43 | |
| M22-15 | Amount of CIL Bid | Recommendation to |
| WETHERDEN | £18,375.63 | Cabinet to approve CIL Bid M22-15 for £18,375.63 from the Local Infrastructure |
| Play Area | Total costs of the project | |
| | £33,375.63 | Fund |
| | Other funding sources are | |
| | Wetherden Parish Council £15,000.00 | |

Decisions for Cabinet to note: Local Infrastructure Fund

| CIL Bid, Location and | Amount of CIL Bid and | Cabinet Decision |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Infrastructure Proposed | total cost of the | |
| | Infrastructure | |
| | | |

| M22-05 EYE Moors Woodland Footpath | Amount of CIL Bid £5,000.00 Total costs of the project £13,000.00 Other funding sources are | Recommendation for Cabinet to note the delegated decision for CIL Bid M22-05 for £5,000.00 from the Local Infrastructure Fund |
|------------------------------------|---|--|
| | Suffolk County Council and Eye Town Council £2,000.00 | |
| M22-09 | CLA Charitable Trust £6,000.00 Amount of CIL Bid | Recommendation for |
| METFIELD | £8,788.97 | Cabinet to note the delegated decision for CIL Bid M22-09 for £8,788.97 |
| Play Area | Total costs of the project £11,718.63 | from the Local Infrastructure Fund |
| | Other funding sources are | |
| | MSDC Locality fund £2,000 | |
| | Metfield Parish Council £125.67 | |
| | S106 funding £803.99 | |

1.2 Cabinet also noted and endorsed this CIL Expenditure Programme which includes the position in respect of approved CIL Bids from Rounds 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 (September 2022) - (Appendix A Section B) together with details of emerging infrastructure /CIL Bids (Appendix A Section C).

REASON FOR DECISION

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) monies have been collected since the implementation of CIL on the 11th April 2016. The CIL Expenditure Framework was originally adopted in April 2018 and reviewed with amendments adopted in the March 2019, April 2020, 23rd and March 2021. They were further reviewed, and changes were adopted in July 2022 by Mid Suffolk and in October 2022 by Babergh. The CIL Expenditure Framework requires the production of a CIL Expenditure Programme for each District and contains decisions for Cabinet to make or note on CIL Bids for CIL expenditure. These decisions relating to the expenditure of CIL monies form one of the ways in which necessary infrastructure supporting growth is delivered.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected:

There is a diverse spectrum of approaches to CIL expenditure across the country from Unitary Authorities who have absorbed CIL into their individual Capital Programmes to others who ringfence all funds to be spent locally. A range of different approaches was identified in Appendix A of the Framework for CIL Expenditure report provided to Cabinet's on the 5th and 8th of February 2018 and discussed in full during the workshops with the Joint Member advisory panel. Members adopted the documents set out in paragraph 1.1 above by Council decision in April 2018 which were subsequently reviewed and adopted on the 19th March 2019 (Babergh) and 18th March 2019 (Mid Suffolk) and further reviewed for the third time and adopted by both Councils on the 20th April 2020 and 23rd March 2021 (Babergh) and 25th March 2021(Mid Suffolk) respectively. The fourth review took place in June 2022 and Mid Suffolk and Babergh approved the changes on the 21st July 2022 and on the 6th October 2022 respectively.

Any Declarations of Interests Declared: None

Any Dispensation Granted: None

MCa/22/27 ELMSWELL EXEMPLAR HOUSING SCHEME

It was RESOLVED: -

That Cabinet: -

- 1.1 Approved option 1 namely to appoint Mid Suffolk Growth Limited (MSGL) to deliver the scheme on behalf of the Council for the market and affordable units
- 1.2 Delegated the negotiation and conclusion of the Development and Funding Agreements to the Deputy CEO, the Section 151 Officer, and Portfolio Holder for Asset and Investment
- 1.3 Approved delivery of the affordable housing on site in accordance with the Affordable Housing Strategy and in consultation with the Housing Portfolio
- 1.4 Approved the use of the capital funding within the MTFS for the delivery of the market homes.

REASON FOR DECISION

To enable and support the delivery of housing within the district and support the Councils aspiration to deliver low carbon homes to meet the targets set out in the Carbon Reduction Management Plan

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected:

1.1 Option 1 – Appoint Mid Suffolk Growth Limited (MSGL) to deliver a market and affordable housing scheme.

Initial design and feasibility work has been undertaken by the design team within MSGL to establish whether an exemplar low carbon scheme could be delivered on

the site at Church Road in Elmswell. MSGL were provided with a brief from Housing seeking an updated view on a previous masterplan for the site, to bring the design in line with the Council's aspirations for exemplar low carbon homes and sustainable place making through the Council's own developments.

The initial design work has concluded that an exemplar scheme of circa 50 homes is achievable and would deliver new affordable and market housing that showcases the Councils new design guide and specification, providing high quality sustainable new homes for residents. There is need for affordable homes within Elmswell, this is a large site, so it is appropriate to have a balance of tenures, using affordable rented, affordable home ownership properties and market homes to deliver a sustainable scheme and community.

By entering into a Development Agreement with MSGL to deliver the scheme the Council will have access to the technical and professional design team required to progress the scheme through design, planning and ultimately to delivery.

The scheme will be funded partly through the General Fund (GF) and partly though the Housing Revenue Account (HRA).

There is £7m within the GF MTFS capital programme for the market housing element of the scheme, and £7m within the HRA capital programme for the affordable homes.

The market homes will be profit generating which will enable those funds to be reinvested across the district, it is anticipated the market homes will deliver circa 5% profit overall.

The affordable homes will be delivered in line with the updated Affordable Housing Strategy.

MSGL was set up to enable the Council to deliver more new housing in line with the aspirations of the Council on the type of new homes they wish to deliver, in this case an exemplar low carbons scheme. Other partners may not wish to develop this scheme to this high standard, favouring a higher profit margin, so MSGL is the preferred delivery option for this scheme.

Appendix A shows the site location

Appendix B shows the artist impression of how the site could look once completed

1.2 Option 2 – Disposal of the Land

This land is owned by the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and therefore it has a primary function to deliver new homes.

In some circumstances HRA land can be disposed of on the open market, this would have to be approved by the Secretary of State.

Land would have to be defined as being "surplus" meaning that it is not required to deliver more homes or is not capable of delivering homes.

As the land is suitable for housing, and in an area that has demand for new homes, the land is not deemed to be surplus, and therefore it is not appropriate to dispose

of the land to be used for other purposes.

Elmswell is a sustainable location for both market and affordable homes with good transport links and local amenities. Part of the design work will be to establish with Strategic Housing an appropriate mix of tenure based on current data available at that time.

1.3 Option 3 – Do Nothing

This is not a viable option. The land can support a low carbon exemplar scheme that will enhance the local area and provide much needed homes as well as offering a unique offer to the market in terms of high-quality low carbon homes with special attention to place making design and integration into the existing settlement

The recommended option to enable housing delivery is Option 1. This will deliver high quality low carbon homes and support the delivery of Mid Suffolk's newly adopted design guide and support further housing delivery within the district

Any Declarations of Interests Declared: Councillor Richardson declared an Other Registrable Interest due to being a Director of Mid Suffolk Growth Limited for which he had received dispensation and was therefore able to debate and vote on the item.

Any Dispensation Granted: Yes