

# AGENDA



For a meeting of the
<b>COMMUNITIES POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUP</b>
to be held on
<b>THURSDAY, 23 MARCH 2017</b>
at
<b>2.30 PM</b>
in
<b>WITHAM ROOM - COUNCIL OFFICES, ST. PETER'S HILL, GRANTHAM. NG31 6PZ</b>
Beverly Agass, Chief Executive

Group Members:	Councillor Duncan Ashwell, Councillor Ashley Baxter, Councillor Barry Dobson, Councillor Mike Exton, Councillor Breda Griffin, Councillor Charmaine Morgan, Councillor Brian Sumner, Councillor Mrs Andrea Webster (Chairman) and Councillor Ray Wootten
Executive Member(s):	Councillor Frances Cartwright, Executive Member Governance Councillor Nick Craft, Executive Member Environment Councillor Linda Wootten, Executive Member Housing
Support Officer:	Anita Eckersley      Tel: 01476 40 60 80 (ext. 6517) E-mail:                      a.eckersley@southkesteven.gov.uk

**Members of the Group are invited to attend the above meeting to consider the items of business listed below.**

- 1. COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**
- 2. MEMBERSHIP**

The Group to be notified of any substitute members.

- 3. APOLOGIES**

*Your council working for you*

**4. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

Members are asked to disclose any interests in matters for consideration at the meeting.

**5. ACTION NOTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 27 JANUARY 2017**

**(Enclosure)**

**6. UPDATES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

**7. FEEDBACK FROM THE EXECUTIVE**

**8. DEVELOPMENT OF THE LINCOLNSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL JOINT HEALTH AND WELLBEING STRATEGY - ENGAGEMENT PLAN**

Report ENV655 of the Business Manager Environmental Health.

**(Enclosure)**

**9. THE GOVERNMENT'S HOUSING WHITE PAPER 2017**

Report SEG 40 of the Executive Manager Development and Growth.

**10. WORK PROGRAMME**

- Homelessness Bill
- Hare Coursing
- Town & City Centres – East Midlands in Bloom

**(Enclosure)**

**11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS, WHICH THE CHAIRMAN, BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, DECIDES IS URGENT**

## MEETING OF THE COMMUNITIES POLICY DEVELOPMENT GROUP

FRIDAY, 27 JANUARY 2017

2.30 PM



---

### GROUP MEMBERS PRESENT

Councillor Ashley Baxter  
Councillor Barry Dobson  
Councillor Mike Exton (Vice Chair)  
Councillor Breda Griffin

Councillor Charmaine Morgan  
Councillor Robert Reid  
Councillor Brian Sumner  
Councillor Mrs Andrea Webster  
(Chairman)

### EXECUTIVE MEMBER

Councillor Bob Adams, Leader of the Council, Executive Member Growth  
Councillor Teri Bryant, Executive Member Finance & IT  
Councillor Mrs Frances Cartwright, Executive Member Governance

### OFFICERS

Strategic Director Environment and Property (Tracey Blackwell)  
Business Manager Legal and Democratic Services (John Armstrong)  
Business Manager Environment Health (Anne-Marie Coulthard)  
Business Manager Environment (Mark Jones)  
Business Manager Housing (Lisa Barker)

---

### 38. MEMBERSHIP

The PDG was notified that Councillor Robert Reid and Councillor Brian Sumner would be substituting for Councillor Duncan Ashwell and Councillor Ray Wootten for this meeting only.

### 39. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ray Wootten and Councillor Duncan Ashwell.

Apologies for absence were also received from Councillor Linda Wootten, Executive Member Housing and Councillor Nick Craft, Executive Member Environment.

*Your council working for you*

#### **40. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

No interests were disclosed.

#### **41. ACTION NOTES FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 18 NOVEMBER 2016**

The Leader reminded Members that the notes from the PDGs were for recording actions only.

The action notes from the meeting held on 18 November 2016 were noted.

#### **42. CORPORATE ENFORCEMENT POLICY**

The Business Manager – Legal & Democratic Services presented report number LDS198 on the changes to the Corporate Enforcement Policy and other policies. The purpose of the report was to provide Members with an awareness of the revised draft Corporate Enforcement Policy (CEP) and of the changes to other policies that required updating.

Members of the PDG were being asked to consider the draft revised Corporate Enforcement Policy (CEP) and make a recommendation to the Executive Member for Governance to approve the adoption of these policies.

The PDG was informed that the Corporate Enforcement Policy (CEP) provided a single over-arching policy containing key factors and principles common to all aspects of enforcement undertaken by the Council. The aim was for a consistent approach that would ensure good practice when enforcement activities were undertaken. Fair and effective enforcement was essential to protect economic interests, public health and safety and the environment. The Corporate Enforcement Policy (CEP) was supported by a number of service specific policy documents that set out greater detail in respect of the enforcement practice for each particular service area. This would ensure consistency across all services as well as with the Corporate Enforcement Policy (CEP). Each service enforcement policy included a reference to the Corporate Enforcement Policy (CEP) as well as updated web links to all the relevant policies, regulations and procedures.

The review of these policies also reflected the changes in the organisational structure in respect of the Neighbourhood Team as well as the changes of remit within the wider Environmental Services Team. As a result of this it had been considered appropriate to have one service specific enforcement policy that covered Environmental Services and Waste and Recycling. This change was reflected in the Environmental Services Enforcement Policy.

Service specific policies covered were:

- Development Management

- Building Control
- Environmental Services
- Debt and recovery
- Waste and Recycling

Members discussed the following:

Whether there was a swifter way of undertaking an enforcement and what legal impact the enforcements had;

The consistency of enforcements and the public perception of whether the same process had been followed for a listed building or a private dwelling. (An example was provided)

That there did not appear to be much weight around conservation areas in the table on page 8 of the draft Management Enforcement Policy and whether this should be included

The consistency around Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) and trees being cut down without permission – how was this enforced; how would a tree that had been cut down be replaced, would it be replaced by an established tree or a sapling;

Whether fines and cautions had any impact; that cautions did carry some status as they would remain on a person's record which could be used against them should a further offence be committed and how this was applied to companies who may potentially commit a breach of the law;

The procedure used for dealing with the pursuit of enforcements; whether there were specific timelines and how these were monitored; how much evidence was required and how this could affect the timelines

Whether satellite dishes were included in any of the categories of enforcement;

#### **Action Notes:**

Consideration is given to the inclusion in the Development Management Enforcement Policy of a separate heading for conservation area into the column that is entitled "Type of Breach" in the priorities table at page 8 of the policy, and

That the Members of the Communities PDG are provided outside the meeting with information regarding the timelines when dealing with enforcement issues.

#### **Recommendation:**

That the Communities PDG recommends that after taking into account the

action note above regarding inclusion of the conservation areas in the Enforcement Policy, the Corporate Enforcement Policy (CEP) and associated service Enforcement Policies as outlined in the appendices are approved and adopted by the Executive Member for Governance.

#### **43. CAR PARKING STRATEGY**

Members were informed that the Car Parking Strategy required further work and would need to take into consideration the new recently proposed projects; the Garden Village, an outlet park in Grantham and the Barracks. These potential projects were not known about when the Communities PDG Working Group initially undertook the review of the Car Parking Strategy. A new strategy would need to look at providing effective support for economic growth in the District.

Members had an in depth discussion about the areas they wished to have included in the scoping for the new review:

When scoping for a working group or summit it would be important to take into account the work already undertaken by the Communities PDG Car Parking Working Group, and build on this;

Members also discussed the potential benefits from the inclusion of a wider group of councillors in order to gain greater insight to the issues for the District. It was also thought important to consider more comprehensive views on:

On and off Street parking

The impact of store parking

The inclusion of car parking clauses in new developments

The potential for park and ride

Economic viability and increasing capacity to help encourage and welcome visitors to the District

Consideration of other potential major changes in the district; an awareness of the impact of a potential for unitary authorities and who would have responsibility for operating the car parks;

Issues around school related parking;

Alternative approaches to managing the utilisation of car parking including the use of mobile phones;

The consistency of approaches throughout the District;

Charging mechanisms, mobile charging which would enable people running late to update their tickets through their phones, and

Blue Badge holders; consistency throughout the district; whether 2 hour free parking was sufficient; should it be extended or should there be a charge for parking.

**Recommended:**

That further work is undertaken to review the Council's Car Parking Strategy.

**44. INTEGRATION SELF ASSESSMENT (INTEGRATING HEALTH AND SOCIAL CARE)**

The Business Manager Environmental Health presented report number ENV651 on the Integration Self-Assessment (integrating Health and Social Care). Members were being asked to undertake an exercise to identify the top three priority areas where they felt additional focus by the Lincolnshire Health and Wellbeing Board might help accelerate the integration of commissioning and provision of services. The three priority areas for improvement would need to be fed back to the Executive Member Environment and then to the Lincolnshire County Council Public Health by 31 January.

Members were informed of the Government's ambition for health and social care to be integrated by 2020. Local areas would be "graduated" from the Better Care Fund (BCF) once more transformative integration had been demonstrated. The BCF was a single pooled budget allocated to Local authorities and used by both the NHS and Local Government through the Health and Wellbeing Boards to encourage closer working arrangements and provide more focussed and integrated health and care services that centred on wellbeing.

A small number of (up to 10) Graduation Pilots were available and would be selected for 2017/18. Lincolnshire County Council had approved the submission of an application for pilot graduation status. The criterion for selection was set out in the report circulated with the agenda.

A self-assessment exercise had highlighted a number of areas where wider partners and stakeholders felt improvements were required. As a partner organisation, the Health and Wellbeing Board was asking for the top three areas to be identified where Members felt were a priority and would support the development of an Improvement Plan and accelerate integration of commissioning and provision of services.

Eight areas for ranking had been identified:

1. Shared Commitment

2. Shared leadership
3. Shared accountability
4. Getting it done
5. Shared vision
6. Shared decision making
7. Shared systems – models
8. Shared systems – enablers

Issues raised by Members were:

Whether this was part of the STP recently presented by the NHS at a meeting of Council. Members were informed that the Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STP) were the overarching plans of the NHS which was not directly related to the issue under discussion today. The issue being considered today was about the effectiveness of partnership working within the Health and Wellbeing Board;

The focus must be mindful of a joined up approach between social services and hospitals;

Patient need: ensuring that patients' needs were being met when they were discharged from hospital; patients were transferred into a safe environment; a better understanding of the medication requirements for patients especially during transition from hospital to their place of care; better monitoring of patients when leaving hospital; a better health care path for each patient.

That although housing was included in the Health and Wellbeing Strategy it was not a primary focus; that planning and the location of developments was also an element that affected health and may need to be highlighted more in the strategy;

Members were then asked to identify their three preferences by allocating stickers to three of the eight main areas set out on a display board.

Members preferences had ranked the areas as follows:

Joint 1 <sup>st</sup>	Getting it done in Lincolnshire
	Shared commitment in Lincolnshire
3 <sup>rd</sup>	Shared vision in Lincolnshire
4 <sup>th</sup>	Shared decision making in Lincolnshire
Joint 5 <sup>th</sup>	Shared Systems (models) in Lincolnshire
	Shared Accountability in Lincolnshire
	Shared Leadership in Lincolnshire
8 <sup>th</sup>	Shared Systems (enablers) in Lincolnshire

#### **Action Note:**

That these preferences would be shared with the Executive Member Environment and then sent to Lincolnshire County Council Public Health by



the Business Manager Environmental Health by 31 January 2017.

#### **45. INTEGRATED NEIGHBOURHOODS TEAM UPDATE**

The Business Manager Neighbourhoods presented report number ENV652 on the implementation of the Neighbourhoods Team. At a previous meeting Members had requested further information on the recently formed Neighbourhoods Team and the report outlined the reasons for the changes and the progress made to date.

A presentation was given on the Neighbourhoods Initiative which outlined the reasons why a Neighbourhoods Team had been established. The main aims were to ensure the delivery of SKDC's priorities, to align resources in line with business need and provide customers with easier access to services. The challenge had been how to merge the delivery of some of these services that would create efficiencies and improvements and provide a much improved customer service.

Some of the issues that had been integrated so far were dog fouling; abandoned vehicles, fly tipping, bonfires and hoarding.

The team had been created from people with the right skills and experience from across these services. New links and customer access routes were developed which meant that increased flexibility from staff was required along with new ways of working and significant levels of training. A new mobile IT support platform was developed which enhances the online reporting facility and enables immediate mobile updates to officers and notification of incidents on a live system.

The next stage was to look at the potential of assisting other services, such as planning enforcement and grounds maintenance. The team had a broad range of skills and experience that could be utilised. There was the potential for building knowledge and being the "eyes and ears" for such things as housing issues and empty properties.

Some specific geographical areas had been identified that required further consideration where there were regular and ongoing problems with fly tipping, highway issues and general ground maintenance such as weeds. Consideration was being given to allocating focus days on specific issues and locations.

Members discussed the potential for the Neighbourhood Services to liaise with the County Council Trading Standards team. Members also raised concerns about the impact of housing conditions and fly tipping / mis-presentation of waste in key gateways into Grantham such as the route from the railway station to the town centre.

A request was made by a Member to receive a list of the work undertaken and if there were issues with persistent offenders.

In conclusion, Members were informed that the system CIVCA had been up and running for 18 months and that customer complaints were run through this system.

**Action Point:**

Members welcomed the work being undertaken by the Neighbourhoods Team, and

Members would be provided outside the meeting with a list of the types of issues addressed by the Neighbourhoods Team.

**46. SUPPORTED HOUSING - CONSULTATION ON FUNDING PROPOSALS**

The Business Manager Housing presented report number BMH117 on the Governments Consultation with respect to proposals for future funding of Supported Housing. The report outlined the background to the Consultation and contained a number of questions to assist in the preparation of a response to Government.

The definition of the term Supported Housing encompassed a wide range of accommodation including Sheltered Housing.

Supported housing played a crucial role in supporting people to live independently. Funding for supported housing was complex and came from a variety of sources. Housing Benefit played a significant role as it helped meet the eligible housing-related costs.

Following recent Government legislation and announcements, doubt had been cast over the sustainability of Supported Housing of which there were three main elements.

**The Welfare Reform and Work Act:** This provided for social and affordable rents but was to be reduced by 1% per year between 2016 and 2019. Supported Housing was exempt from this rent decrease but doubt was still there in respect of the long term sustainability of some schemes.

**Housing Benefit:** The Government was proposing to cap Housing Benefit to the level of the Local Housing Allowance from 2018. If applied to Supported Housing schemes, where rents and service charges were high, it would remove the entitlement of residents to full housing benefit and render some schemes unviable.

**Universal Credit:** This was based on the premise that housing benefit would cover only the core housing costs with additional funding being available for housing support. Further announcements were expected. Universal credit was typically paid on a monthly basis which in itself created challenges for short

term accommodation such as homeless hostels and refuges.

The Government statement made in September 2015 gave a commitment to reviewing the funding for supported housing. The proposal was for a new system to be implemented from 1 April 2019 but the Local Housing Allowance (LHA) cap would not apply to Supported Housing until then. From 2019, it was proposed to introduce the LHA cap to Supported Housing and Sheltered Housing although some accommodation forms such as some refuges would be exempt. The 1% rent reduction required would apply to Sheltered Housing between 2017 and 2019. The key elements of the statement were:

- Core housing costs (rent and service charges) would continue to be funded through housing benefit or universal credit up to the level of the applicable Local Housing Allowance rate with a top up from the local authority (top tier).
- To enable the top up to happen there would be a transfer of funds from DWP to DCLG who would then allocate funds to local authorities based on a mechanism yet to be determined. Government was committed to ensuring that the devolved administrators received a level of funding in 2019/20 equivalent to that which would otherwise have been available through the welfare system.
- The top up would be ring fenced and only available to pay for Supported Housing costs.
- The shared accommodation rate would not apply to people under the age of 35 living in the supported housing sector the one bedroom rate would apply instead.

Members were informed of the main three ways that these Government proposals would impact on the Council. These being: Sheltered housing; Temporary accommodation and, partner provision of temporary accommodation and supported housing in the district including domestic abuse services which were county wide. It was noted that some of the Housing Associations had highlighted potential shortfalls.

Top tier authorities were well accustomed to commissioning however there would need to be an agreed and clear commissioning framework to enable the views and priorities of district councils to be properly considered. The current arrangements for working with the county on the commissioning and management of support housing would need to be better developed.

Across all schemes, there were concerns regarding the future development of supported housing schemes given their reliance on revenue funding through the benefits system and county council commissioning processes.

There were 12 questions in the report for Members to consider.

Members discussed the following issues:

Budget and funding reductions since Public Health had been moved to local authorities;

Top funding and how this would be distributed fairly nationally;

The methodology of how local authorities would decide to allocate funding;

The manner and speed in which the Council had been asked to look at this Consultation;

The need for a joined up connected approach and examples could be provided;

How the changes were already impacting on Housing Associations such as Housing 21;

That the 'Supporting People' funding had initially been ring fenced but this had subsequently been removed which meant the money could be open to funding for other areas;

That although the pressures might not be so bad for Councils in a good position, the additional pressures would have a significant impact for Councils that were already struggling, and

That individual Members could respond direct in addition to commenting on the consultation at this meeting.

**Recommended:**

That the Business Manager Housing will compile a response which would be circulated to Members of the PDG for their comments before being submitted to the Government.

**47. WORK PROGRAMME**

Wyndham Park would be an item on a future Agenda.

The review of the HRA Business Plan would be aligned to the completion of the Review of the Housing Strategy.

## REPORT TO COMMUNITIES P.D.G.

**REPORT OF:** Business Manager Environmental Health

**REPORT NO:** ENV655

**DATE:** 23 March 2017

<b>TITLE:</b>	Lincolnshire County Council Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy – Engagement Plan	
<b>KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:</b>	No	
<b>EXECUTIVE MEMBER: NAME AND DESIGNATION:</b>	Cllr Nick Craft - Environment	
<b>CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	Anne-Marie Coulthard x6319	
<b>INITIAL IMPACT ANALYSIS:</b>  Equality and Diversity	Carried out and Referred to in paragraph (7) below  N/A	Full impact assessment Required:  N/A
<b>FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT:</b>	This report is publicly available via the Your Council and Democracy link on the Council's website: <a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk">www.southkesteven.gov.uk</a>	
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>	None	

## **1. RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 1.1 It is recommended that members note the Lincolnshire Health and Wellbeing Board Engagement Plan in respect of the of the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Lincolnshire due to be published in 2018.

## **2. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 2.1 To inform members of the proposed Engagement Plan for the Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Lincolnshire.

## **3. DETAILS OF REPORT**

- 3.1 The Lincolnshire Health and Wellbeing Board (LHWB) is under a statutory duty to produce a Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JHWS). Part of this duty is to develop an approach to engagement which enables people who live and work in Lincolnshire an opportunity to input into the Strategy and Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) which provides the evidence to support the prioritisation of health needs.

- 3.2 Principles for LHWB communications with stakeholders are proposed, the LHWB want to:

- understand local need to ensure that services delivered are appropriate and effective;
- work with other organisations and the public to identify the key issues and needs of the community on an ongoing basis so we can all tackle them together;
- involve people in Lincolnshire so that they may inform our local priorities in order that we can work to improve the health and wellbeing of the local community and reduce health inequalities.

- 3.3 A series of engagement events based on the evidence of the JSNA are proposed to enable the LHWB to identify health and wellbeing priorities which will form the basis of the next JHWS strategy. A three stage engagement process is proposed:

1. Nominated lead officers from organisational members of the LHWB to review JSNA evidence and draft priorities for inclusion in the next JHWS. The LHWB has been requested to nominate a lead officer from each representative organisation on the LHWB to undertake this exercise. A verbal update will be provided to Members on these nominations during the meeting.
2. A number of public engagement events will be undertaken across the county, with those attending asked to undertake a similar prioritisation exercise as stage 1. LCC Health Scrutiny Committee will review the initial work and feedback to the LHWB.
3. Discussion and moderation of the prioritisation will be undertaken by LHWB members and wider invited stakeholders at an informal LHWB session.

- 3.4 Detailed timescales can be found in Appendix 1; Lincolnshire County Council report “Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy – Engagement Plan” presented to the Lincolnshire Health and Wellbeing Board on 7 March 2017

#### **4. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 This report is for information only

#### **5. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 No resource implications are expected

#### **6. RISK AND MITIGATION**

Risk has been considered as part of this report and any specific high risks are included in the table below:

<b>Category Risk</b>	<b>Action / Controls</b>
N/A	

#### **7. ISSUES ARISING FROM IMPACT ANALYSIS**

- 7.1 N/A

#### **8. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 None

#### **9. COMMENTS OF FINANCIAL SERVICES**

- 9.1 There are no financial implications arising from this report.

#### **10. COMMENTS OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

- 10.1 The production of the JHWS is a legal requirement under the Health and Social Care Act 2012. The responsibility for producing it rests with the Health and Wellbeing Board for Lincolnshire.

#### **11. COMMENTS OF OTHER RELEVANT SERVICES**

- 11.1 N/A

#### **12. APPENDICES:**

- 12.1 Appendix 1 - Lincolnshire County Council report “Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy – Engagement Plan” presented to the Lincolnshire Health and Wellbeing Board on 7 March 2017

## LINCOLNSHIRE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Open Report on behalf of Tony McGinty, Interim Director of Public Health

Report to	<b>Lincolnshire Health and Wellbeing Board</b>
Date:	<b>07 March 2017</b>
Subject:	<b>Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy – Engagement Plan</b>

### Summary:

The purpose of this report is to ensure that the Lincolnshire Health and Wellbeing Board (LHWB), as part of delivering its statutory requirements to produce a Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JHWS), has a clear and unambiguous plan which sets out how it will engage with people that live and work in Lincolnshire.

### Actions Required:

The Lincolnshire Health and Wellbeing Board is requested to:

- Receive and consider this report and agree the approach to engagement and development of the JHWS for Lincolnshire.
- Nominate a lead officer from each of the representative organisations on the LHWB to undertake the prioritisation of Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) evidence.
- Agree to report back to respective Boards and Management Teams, where appropriate, on the progress and approach being taken to the development of the JHWS.



## 1. Background

The purpose of this report is to ensure that the LHWB, as part of delivering its statutory requirements to produce a JHWS, has a clear and unambiguous plan which sets out how it will engage with people that live and work in Lincolnshire.

A review of the JSNA for Lincolnshire has been undertaken and is due to be published in the Spring 2017. Alongside this work, the LHWB has also agreed an approach to developing the next JHWS for Lincolnshire (due to be published in 2018), which will take evidence from the JSNA and prioritise the health needs it wishes the health and care community to tackle over the course of the five years from 2018 onwards.

### Stakeholder consultation

Local Authorities and Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) have equal and joint duties to prepare a JSNA and JHWS through the Health and Wellbeing Board. In March 2013, the Department of Health published 'Statutory Guidance on Joint Strategic Needs Assessments and Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategies', which identifies the partners who 'must' be involved in producing the JSNA and JHWS as well as the partners who 'should' be involved in this process.

Based on this statutory guidance, the LHWB needs to develop an approach to engagement which enables people who live and work in Lincolnshire an opportunity to have an input into the JSNA and JHWS for Lincolnshire.

### Community engagement

In preparing the next JHWS, the proposed approach is to hold a series of engagement events that will enable the LHWB to identify health and wellbeing priorities, based on the evidence in the JSNA, that will form the basis for the next JHWS for Lincolnshire.

It is proposed that this engagement is staged, with the work undertaken to develop the new JHWS grouped into three key stages:

1. Initial work undertaken by nominated lead officers from organisational members of the LHWB across 4 - 6 workshops to review all the JSNA evidence and draft the priorities for inclusion in the next JHWS. As part of this phase, the LHWB is requested to **nominate a lead officer from each of the representative organisations on the LHWB to undertake the prioritisation of JSNA evidence.**
2. In order to ensure the inclusion and engagement of wider stakeholders in the prioritisation process, a number of public engagement events will then take place across the county. Evidence from the JSNA will be thematically presented, with those attending undertaking a similar prioritisation exercise to identify the key JSNA priorities. At this stage there will also be a progress report presented to Health Scrutiny Committee to allow them to review the initial prioritisation work and feedback their response to the LHWB.
3. Following this, discussion and moderation of the prioritisation will take place by LHWB members & wider invited stakeholders at an informal LHWB Board session.

Recognising that engagement mechanisms need to be inclusive to ensure that the 'voice' of more marginalised individuals is captured, it is proposed that a reference group/s of under-represented individuals/groups are held as a means of 'checking back' and verifying the outcome of the prioritisation exercise.

The above approach will be led and supported by the Public Health Division of the Adult Care and Community Wellbeing Executive Director area within the Council.

### Communications

There are multiple partnerships and Boards that need to be identified and included as stakeholders in this review. It is requested that as part of the communication by the LHWB that **members of the LHWB agree to report back to respective Boards and Management Teams, where appropriate, on the progress and approach being taken to the development of the Strategy.** A mapping of existing networks and Boards, and ways to communicate with them, will also be undertaken as part of developing a detailed delivery plan for the engagement.

The following bullet points form the proposed principles of all LHWB communications with stakeholders. In producing a JHWS for Lincolnshire, the LHWB want to:

- understand local need to ensure that services delivered are appropriate and effective;
- work with other organisations and the public to identify the key issues and needs of the community on an ongoing basis so we can all tackle them together;
- involve people in Lincolnshire so that they may inform our local priorities in order that we can work to improve the health and wellbeing of the local community and reduce health inequalities.

### Next Steps and Timescales

Action	Timescale
Initial nomination of lead officers from each member organisation of the LHWB to undertake the prioritisation scoring (across 4-6 workshops)	April - June 2017
Wider stakeholder engagement in the prioritisation process, including feedback from a working group with Health Scrutiny Committee Members	June – July 2017
Discussion/moderation of prioritisation by the LHWB at an informal session	July 2017
Reference group/s of under-represented individuals/groups as a means of checking back and verifying	July – Aug 2017
Report the final proposed outcome and draft structure of the JHWS to the LHWB	September 2017
Allocated theme lead organisations to draft the JHWS	Oct - Dec 2017
Finalise and sign off of JHWS for Lincolnshire 2018 – 2023	Jan - Mar 2018

## **2. Conclusion**

In undertaking engagement on the development of the JHWS, the LHWB will be able to demonstrate it has taken account of the views of people who live and work in Lincolnshire and that the process has been undertaken in an open and transparent way.

## **3. Consultation**

This is not a consultation item.

## **4. Appendices**

None

## **5. Background Papers**

No background papers within Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972 were used in the preparation of this report.

This report was written by David Stacey, who can be contacted on 01522 554017 or [david.stacey@lincolnshire.gov.uk](mailto:david.stacey@lincolnshire.gov.uk)

<b>REPORT TO COMMUNITIES AND GROWTH PDGs</b>
--

**REPORT OF:** Executive Manager Development and Growth

**REPORT NO:** SEG 40

**DATE:** 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2017 and 30<sup>th</sup> March 2017

<b>TITLE:</b>	The Government's Housing White Paper 2017	
<b>KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:</b>		
<b>EXECUTIVE MEMBER0: NAME AND DESIGNATION:</b>	Councillor Linda Wootten Executive Member Housing	
<b>CONTACT OFFICER:</b>	Paul Thomas Executive Manager Development and Growth e-mail – <a href="mailto:p.thomas@southkesteven.gov.uk">p.thomas@southkesteven.gov.uk</a> Tel: 01476 406162	
<b>INITIAL IMPACT ANALYSIS:</b>  Equality and Diversity	Not required	
<b>FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT:</b>	This report is publicly available via the Your Council and Democracy link on the Council's website: <a href="http://www.southkesteven.gov.uk">www.southkesteven.gov.uk</a>	
<b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b>	The Housing White Paper, February 2017 <a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/housing-white-paper">https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/housing-white-paper</a>	

## **1. RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **1.1 That Members of the Communities and Growth PDGs:**

- a) Recognise the work that is already progressing in respect of planning for sustainable housing delivery
- b) Provide feedback on the questions raised in this report to inform a response to the Housing White Paper, before the 2<sup>nd</sup> May deadline.

## **2. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT**

- 2.1 To provide a summary of the contents of the Government's Housing White Paper (the White Paper).
- 2.2 To provide evidence of what the Council is already doing, in respect of the emerging policies within the White Paper.
- 2.3 To consider the emerging thoughts and ideas that have come from the recent Housing Summits, particularly in respect of whether they align with the emerging policies in the White Paper
- 2.4 To provide information relating to the content of the White Paper

## **3. DETAILS OF REPORT**

### **An Overview**

- 3.1 The purpose of the 2017 White Paper is to address the present blockages to housing supply. This problem is the basis of England's "broken housing market", leading to:
  - a) The inaccessibility of home ownership for young people;
  - b) Increasing rents in the private rented sector, linked with problems of exploitation and abuse of new and existing tenants, and
  - c) Negative economic impacts caused by the lack of affordable housing close to jobs, and the sub-optimal contribution of the construction sector.
- 3.2 The White Paper expresses the view that solutions to the housing supply problem are linked with an ability to deal with three problems:
  - a) 40% of local planning authorities (LPAs) do not have a plan that meets the projected growth in households in their area. According to the White Paper, one of the most significant reasons for this is the local response to public attitudes about new housing, leading to them 'ducking difficult decisions and not planning for the homes their area needs'.

**The White Paper suggests that solutions** lie in changes to the existing planning system (see detail below).

- b) The pace of development is too slow – more than a third of new homes that were granted planning permission between 2010/11 and 2015/16 have yet to be built. In the White Paper, the government recognises that there are many reasons for this – but that one may be speculation regarding a rise in land values.

**The White Paper suggests that solutions** once again lie in changes to the existing planning system and associated powers for local authorities to unblock stalled development (see detail below).

- c) The very structure of the housing market makes it hard to increase supply. The reference here is to the dominance of the market by 10 large housebuilding firms – together building around 60% of new private homes. Linked with this are the especially low productivity within the construction sector.

**The White Paper suggests that solutions** lie in the provision of support for housing associations to build more, options for LAs to build again, encouragement of institutional investment in the private rented sector and the promotion of more modular and factory built homes (see detail below).

### **The Response of the Sector**

- 3.3 Much has been written, by the housing and development industries, about the content of the White Paper. The common view is that the White Paper is ‘more evolution than revolution’; consolidating and improving existing ideas rather than introducing new ones. Major and potentially controversial changes such as increasing flexibility on green belt land and enhanced rights for existing private renters have been resisted, as have possible measures to tackle land availability and pricing, and thereby land-banking. Despite encouraging councils to build, funding is not made available in pursuit of this objective (eg by relaxing borrowing rules or allowing local authorities to retain 100% of receipts from the sale of council houses).
- 3.4 Specific criticism has been levied at the White Paper for failing to address the “huge lack of retirement property in the UK” and for being insufficiently flexible in their definition of affordable rent (at 20% of market rent, as opposed to a relationship with income). Other observations relate to specific policy proposals. For example, the proposal to increase planning fees by 20% from July has been welcomed – but commentators argue that councils should have the ability to set fees to recover costs so that council taxpayers no longer subsidise planning.
- 3.5 Several housing association and local authority sector commentators have welcomed a return to a strategy that talks about homes for rent and for sale; that speaks of housing associations, local authorities and small to medium enterprises (SMEs) as key players and seeks to call to account those who fail to support development.

### **Developing an SK response**

- 3.6 Government is presently consulting on the White Paper. It is doing so via 40 web-based questions linked to specific proposals within the document. It is important for local authorities to consider a formal Member-led response to this consultation.
- 3.7 In considering a response, it is important that we recognise – and highlight – the work that we are already doing in respect of our housing delivery agenda.

3.8 Our progress is set-out in the second column of the table below.

3.9 It is also important to consider how the policy ideas contained within the White Paper align with the emerging themes and ideas that have been developed through our recent Housing Summits. These summits have generated circa 250 comments, ideas and questions. However, until a new Housing Strategy has been agreed by Members later this year; the PDGs are asked to consider how much weight should be attributed to these ideas as a response to the Government's Housing White Paper is formed. Likewise, the emerging policies in the White Paper will influence the content of the Council's Housing Strategy.

3.10 The emerging ideas from the Housing Summits are captured in the third column of the table below.

#### 4. **THE 2017 HOUSING WHITE PAPER: DETAILED POLICY PROPOSALS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR SOUTH KESTEVEN**

4.1 The following table contains a list of strategic issues and opportunities that are raised in the White Paper. The list is not comprehensive, and the questions set out in the fourth column are not the same questions that are set out in the Government's consultation.

4.2 Instead, the focus is on policy proposals that are (a) strategic and (b) are relevant to the South Kesteven context.

4.3 The table number column is shaded Yellow and Blue:

G	There are 10 questions that are considered to be most relevant to the Growth PDG
C	There are 8 questions that are considered to be most relevant to the Communities PDG

4.4 Members are asked to consider the questions in the table; focussing at first on those that are highlighted as being most relevant to their respective PDG.

#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
1	<b>Getting plans in place</b>			
1.1	<p><b>Making sure every community has an up-to-date, sufficiently ambitious plan</b></p> <p>The SoS would require LPAs to review local plans and other local development documents at least once every five years.</p> <p>The present Duty to Co-operate would be strengthened: LPAs will be expected to prepare a Statement of Common Ground. The SoS would have power to direct a group of authorities to work together to produce a joint plan.</p>	<p>We currently have a Core Strategy and Sites and Allocations Policy which were adopted in 2010 and 2014 respectively. Our Local Plan is progressing towards submission later this year.</p> <p>We are working closely with all our neighbouring authorities, particularly Rutland, in respect of 'duty to cooperate' and do not currently for-see any issues which would require a strengthening of this approach.</p>		<p>(G1) The White Paper explains the Review from the perspective of updating the evidence-base and making parallel changes to the local plan and development documents. Do Members agree with this approach?</p>
1.2	<p><b>Making plans easier to produce</b></p> <p>Instead of having to produce a Local Plan, an LPA would be required to maintain a set of key strategic policies, with flexibility over whether a plan is produced for that LPA, or alternatively, for a group of authorities. In parallel with this, government will tighten the definition of what evidence is required to support a 'sound' plan.</p>	<p>Our Local Plan Review is progressing with a clear evidence base in support. We have taken advice from peers and independent experts who have advised on the extent of our evidence base in order to put us in the best possible position when we get to examination. Any clarification of the required evidence base would assist with</p>		



#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
	Government are seeking views about the most appropriate and proportionate mechanisms for consultation and engagement.	<p>plan-making.</p> <p>Our current, and scheduled, engagement with members, stakeholders and residents and businesses is designed to ensure maximum possible awareness and understanding of the emerging plan.</p>	Members have expressed a preference for the use of a 'Summit' format to engage with local developers.	
1.3	<p><b>Assessing housing requirements</b></p> <p>Government proposes to introduce a more standardised/consistent approach to assessing housing requirements. From April 2018 the new methodology would apply as the baseline for assessing 5-year housing land supply and housing delivery, in the absence of an up-to-date plan.</p>	We currently have a 5.3 year supply of housing, and have always sought to ensure that the supply of housing is sufficient to meet local need. However, housing delivery has struggled due to factors that are clearly unrelated to the pure supply of housing land.	<p>Housing Need is a key theme in our Housing Summits, with specialist housing, creating quality places and non-traditional methods of delivery sub-themes within it.</p> <p>This area is a key theme in our emerging Housing Strategy, recognising our aging population and need for affordable 'extra care' developments.</p>	(C1) Special needs housing is a priority within SK. Is this new duty a sufficient response by government to the policy and financial issues underlying this priority?
1.3	LPA's will be expected to have clear policies for addressing the housing requirements of special needs groups.			
1.4	<p><b>Digital planning: making plans &amp; proposals more accessible</b></p> <p>The government is considering opportunities to prescribe open data standards for local plans and</p>	We are currently reviewing the data which we hold and are considering how we might make		

#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
	use digital tools to support better plan-making.	it more accessible.		
1.5	<p><b>Making land ownership and interests more transparent</b></p> <p>The government is driving improvements to the Land Registry with a view to achieving transparency on land ownership and control. This work will assess how land and property data can be made more openly available to the benefit of developers, home buyers and others.</p> <p>It is also government's intention to improve the transparency of contractual arrangements used to control land.</p>	<p>We are working with the Land Registry to ensure that our data is fit for purpose.</p> <p>This is a known issue in the district, with key sites subject to legal agreements that aren't always easily accessible.</p>	<p>There have been suggestions through the Housing Summits that the Council should take a more proactive approach to land acquisition. In this respect; the more accessible and transparent the information available, the quicker and easier this process should be.</p>	
2	<b>Making enough land available in the right places</b>			
2.1	<p><b>The identification and use of suitable land and bringing brownfield land back into use</b></p> <p>LPAs would be required to demonstrate that they have a clear strategy to maximise the use of suitable land in their area so that it is clear how much development can be accommodated. Unless it can be justified for planning reasons, their identified housing</p>	<p>Our emerging Local Plan will contain policies to ensure the appropriate use of brownfield land, and we have already seen commissioned work in Grantham and Stamford help to support major sites coming forward primarily around the periphery of the settlements' edges.</p>	<p>There is a keenness to make the best use of all land that is available.</p>	

#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
	requirement should be accommodated. This is particularly the case for suitable brownfield land.			
2.2	<p><b>Improving local authorities' role in land assembly and disposal</b></p> <p>Government proposes that all LPAs can dispose of land with the benefit of planning consent which they have granted to themselves. This can be used to provide certainty for developers purchasing land from public bodies to develop new homes. Government recognise that the present requirement to dispose of publicly owned land for best considerations often delays disposals. They therefore propose to enable disposal by LPAs of such land for less than best consideration, up to a financial threshold.</p>	We have engaged with recent Government initiatives which seek to maximise the use of public land (such as the One Public Estate programme and the Accelerated Construction Initiative).	Through the Summits, there has been a keenness expressed for the Council to take a more proactive role in enabling development through the use of its assets (provided that those assets are not being fully utilised and are not considered to have more preferable use)	(G2) This power is presently unavailable to SKDC except in partnership with LCC. Would Members welcome this simplification? Might it make a difference to the Council in being proactive in developing public land?
2.3	<p><b>Regenerating housing estates</b></p> <p>LPAs will be encouraged to consider the social and economic benefits of estate regeneration when preparing plans and granting planning permission.</p>		The importance of 'place making', primarily through environmental improvements, has been recognised through the Housing Summits.	
2.4	<p><b>Supporting rural communities</b></p> <p>Complementing the presumption</p>	The emerging Local Plan will		

#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
	<p>for development on brownfield land, LPAs will be expected to have policies that support the development of small 'windfall' and undeveloped sites – particularly through Neighbourhood Plans and LDPs.</p> <p>At least 10% of the sites allocated for residential development should be sites of half a hectare or less.</p> <p>LPAs will also be expected to give much stronger support for 'rural exception sites' that provide affordable homes for local people.</p>	<p>contain a policy on this.</p> <p>We have positively engage with communities in respect of Neighbourhood plans.</p>	<p>The Summits recognised the contribution to housing delivery that is made by smaller developers/builders, and there has been a suggestion that larger sites might be divided-up to encourage more SME builders.</p>	<p>(G3) Will these policies support rural growth and sustainability in SK?</p>
2.5	<p><b>A new generation of new communities</b></p> <p>In addition to creating institutional and financial mechanisms in support of approved Garden Towns &amp; Villages, government are interested in ideas around the use of LDOs or Development Corporations to bring forward additional garden cities/ villages.</p>	<p>The designation of Spitalgate Heath as a Garden Village is evidence of our engagement in Government-initiated efforts to deliver high quality places more quickly.</p>	<p>Views expressed through the Housing Summits were that the Garden Village should be an exemplar that should set the quality expectation for all of the new housing delivered in the district.</p>	
3	<b>Strengthening neighbourhood planning and design</b>			
3.1	<p>The White Paper sets out a range of detailed measures to further support neighbourhood planning,</p>		<p>The importance of high quality design (both inside and outside) is a common theme in many of the</p>	<p>(G4) Do Members support the strengthening of requirements for neighbourhood and local plans to set out</p>

#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
	and strengthen the ability of communities to influence the design of what gets built in their areas.		key areas discussed through the Housing Summits.	clear design expectations?  (G5) Do Members agree that design should not be used as a reason to object to development where it accords with clear design expectations set out in statutory plans?
3.2	<p><b>Using land more efficiently for development</b></p> <p>The Government proposes to make it clear that plans and individual development proposals should make efficient use of land and avoid building at low densities – especially in high demand/ urban areas. This is subject to design, accessibility and infrastructure capacity issues.</p> <p>This will include a review of the nationally described Space Standard and how it is used in planning.</p>		There have been discussion in the Housing Summits regarding the importance of high quality design and of respecting the character of existing settlements. Some areas of the district will have a higher density than others.	<p>(G6) Might higher density development be appropriate/desirable in certain areas of the district?</p> <p>(G7) What are Members' views on the potential reduction of the current Space Standard?</p>
4	<b>Providing greater certainty</b>			
4.1	<p><b>Five-year land supply</b></p> <p>At present, an authority which cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of land against the housing target in its plan is vulnerable to the plan being undermined. This means the local authority can lose a significant degree of control over where new housing is built,</p>	We currently have a 5.3 year supply of housing (with a 5% buffer), and have always sought to ensure that the supply of housing is sufficient to meet local need. However, housing delivery has struggled due to factors that are clearly unrelated to the pure	The need for certainty in housing delivery has been recognised through the Housing Summits.	

#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
	<p>because in these circumstances the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies.</p> <p>The government propose giving LPSs the opportunity to have their housing land supply agreed on an annual basis and fixed for a 1-year period. LPAs who wish to do this will need to provide for a 10% buffer on their 5-year land supply.</p> <p>Guidance will set out more detail on how the 5-year land supply should be calculated. Drafts should be published for consideration by the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	supply of housing land.		
4.2	<p><b>Deterring unnecessary appeals</b></p> <p>The government proposes to introduce a capped fee for making a planning appeal. It is seeking views on the level(s) of such fees.</p>			
4.3	<p><b>Increasing planning fees</b></p> <p>LPAs will be able to increase fees by 20% from July 2017 if they commit to invest the additional fee income in their planning department.</p>	The Council has already accepted this initial fee increase and is developing plans for how this additional 20% can be invested to ensure delivery of housing at the right speed.	One of the points made through the Housing Summits is the cost of pre-application advice. If pre-application fees were reduced/removed, could it act as a boost to development?	(G8) Whilst this new approach may be welcomed, do Members share some commentators' view that councils should have the ability to set fees to recover costs so that council taxpayers no longer have to subsidise planning?
4.4	<b>Addressing skills shortages</b>			

#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
	<p>Government intends to change the way it supports training in the construction sector, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A review of the purpose of the Construction Training Board;</li> <li>• The launch of a new route into construction in September 2019 and</li> <li>• Work to challenge house builders and other construction companies to invest more in training.</li> </ul>	<p>Our involvement in the Local Enterprise-wide skills review and close working relationship with the colleges and universities in the area will ensure that we are well-placed to influence and support emerging policies and practices.</p>	<p>The Summits have recognised the importance of construction skills and working in partnership with local colleges to create a local skills base that ensure the economic benefit of housebuilding is maximised locally.</p>	<p>(C2) Do Members consider that this is a sufficient response by government? Will it help with construction-related skills shortages in South Kesteven?</p>
5	<b>Ensuring infrastructure is provided in the right place at the right time</b>			
5.1	<p>Support strategic infrastructure investment (with LPA's expected to identify development opportunities that such investment offers at the time funding is committed)</p>	<p>We are already doing this with the Grantham Southern Relief Road – with the potential realisation of additional sites expected to contribute to the cost of infrastructure delivery.</p>	<p>The importance of infrastructure (community, as well as transport) has been recognised.</p>	
6	<b>Holding developers and local authorities to account</b>			
6.1	<p><b>Greater transparency through the planning and build out phases</b></p> <p>The White Paper proposes various changes to data collection, collation and analysis such that better information on delivery, build-out rates and the development pipeline is available.</p>	<p>This is a known issue in respect of our housing delivery figures; the returns received from NHBC often capture housing completed 9 months previously.</p>		<p>(G9) Would Members support the creation of a universal housing database that all developers/builders/local authorities are required to contribute to?</p>

#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
6.2	<p><b>Sharpening local authority tools to speed up the building of homes</b></p> <p>Through the White Paper, the government suggest that the realistic prospect that housing will be built on a site should be taken into account in the determination of planning applications for housing on sites where there is evidence of non-implementation of earlier permissions for housing development.</p> <p>Government is considering encouraging local authorities to shorten the timescales for developers to implement a permission for housing development from three years to two years, except that this impacts upon scheme viability.</p>		<p>Through the Summits, Members have raised the question of 'who is the consent being approved to' – differentiating between those that want a consent to increase the land value and those that want the consent in order to build-out a scheme.</p> <p>The length of consents has been raised through the Housing Summits; although there is an acceptance that to shorten the period of consent too much may negatively impact on the likelihood of development.</p>	
6.3	<p><b>Improving the completion notice process</b></p> <p>The Government wants to ensure that local planning authorities have more effective tools to deal with circumstances where planning permission has been commenced, but no substantive progress has been made to build homes.</p>		<p>Members were keen that Government targeted builders who land-banked; requiring them to deliver within a specified time frame, or land would lose its consent or revert to LA ownership.</p>	



#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
6.4	<p><b>The housing delivery test</b></p> <p>Government is proposing to introduce a new housing delivery test that will highlight whether the number of homes being built is below target, provide a mechanism for establishing the reasons why, and where necessary trigger policy responses that will ensure that further land comes forward.</p> <p>Where under-delivery is identified, the Government proposes a tiered approach to addressing the situation. Proposed penalties vary according to the percentage difference between delivery and the LPA's housing requirement and over time. The strongest penalty is an application of a presumption for development.</p>		<p>Housing delivery is a key aspect of the emerging Housing Strategy, and a more thorough understanding of the issues with achieving housing targets can only help.</p>	<p>(G10) However, do Members think that such a test is reasonable and fair? Should more focus be put on establishing reasons for projected under delivery well in advance or potential under-achievement?</p>
7	<b>Affordable housing</b>			
7.1	<p><b>Changing the definition of affordable housing</b></p> <p>Perhaps the most notable change in policy; the government are proposing to considerably widen the definition of affordable housing. In this context, the government also propose to:</p>	<p>Our delivery of Affordable Housing last year was well above target (160 units against a target of 100) however, uncertainty around Starter Homes has meant that affordable housing numbers</p>	<p>The importance of a range of affordable housing options has been recognised through the Housing Summits.</p>	<p>(C3) The White Paper is positive about private renting – a shift away from the previous government's focus on owner-occupation. But there is nothing in the proposals about social renting. A serious increase in social rented supply would</p>

#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduce a combined household income eligibility cap of £80,000 (£90,000 for London) on Starter Homes. Increase repayment periods from five to fifteen years;</li> <li>• Introduce a definition of affordable private rented housing, which is a particularly suitable form of affordable housing for Build to Rent Schemes;</li> <li>• Provide for a transition period to enable the development of new policies and a partial review of local plans. The new definitions would come into force on April 2018.</li> </ul>	for 16/17 are currently below the target of 60 units.		<p>need new funding beyond the modest increase in the Affordable Homes Programme. Options for financing this would include lifting bars on HRA borrowing and 100% recycling of proceeds from the Right to Buy. What are Members' views about these issues?</p> <p>(C4) Commentators agree that the income cap will mean that Starter Homes in higher value areas will remain largely out of reach. On the other hand, the increase in repayment periods is welcomed, with some suggesting that this should mean that Starter Homes are used to sustain an increase in home ownership rather than just providing short-term investment opportunities. What are Members' views?</p>
	<p><b>Increasing delivery of Affordable Home ownership products</b></p> <p>Abandon the proposed statutory requirement for Starter Homes. Instead they require LPAs to deliver Starter Homes as part of a mixed package of affordable housing of all tenures that can respond to local needs and local markets;</p>	<p>Starter Homes were initially proposed as 20% of the total number of houses to be delivered on a site over 10 houses. The uncertainty around the mechanism for delivering starter homes caused an understandable nervousness in the housing market and many affordable housing development stalled.</p>		<p>(C5) What are Members' views on the change in approach to starter home delivery?</p>

#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
	For all individual sites of 10 units or more, require local authorities to secure a minimum of 10% of all new homes as affordable home ownership products. Government are consulting on whether there should be exceptions to this rule (eg Build to Rent schemes; proposals for special needs housing).	The proposed 10% affordable housing quota is considerably below the current 35% policy requirement in South Kesteven.		(C6) Whilst the affordable housing quota will be formally established in the emerging New Local Plan, what are Members' views on this proposed minimum requirement?
	<p><b>A fairer deal for renters and leaseholders</b></p> <p>Government takes the view that renters' upfront costs need to be clarified and costs controlled. Accordingly, they propose to consult about the proposal to ban lettings fees to tenants.</p> <p>Banning orders for the worst landlords will be introduced. Local authorities will be able to issue fines as well as prosecute.</p>		This is an idea that emerged during the first Housing Summit.	
8	Diversifying the market			

#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
8.1	<p><b>SMEs and investors</b></p> <p>Government wants to diversify the housing construction market. In pursuit of this objective, they aim to launch a £3 billion Home Building (loan) Fund, targeting SMEs.</p>		<p>The role that small developers play in housing delivery has been recognised though the Housing Summits.</p>	<p>(C7) Do Members support measures to encourage a larger contribution by SMEs?</p>
8.2	<p><b>Housing associations</b></p> <p>The White Paper speaks very positively about the role of housing associations in delivering housing supply. In pursuit of an objective to enhance their contribution, the government proposes to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set out a rent policy for the period beyond 2020 to help them to borrow against future income. In the meantime the 1% rent reduction will remain in place;</li> <li>• Deregulate housing associations, reinstating its position that housing associations are classified as private sector bodies.</li> <li>• Enhance pressure on housing associations to 'explore every avenue for building more homes'.</li> <li>• Enhance their own efficiency.</li> </ul>		<p>The issue of the 1% rent reduction has been raised through the Housing Summits as a potential blocker to the Council's aspirations to deliver new Housing</p>	<p>(C8) Whilst there is no specific question in the White Paper consultation on the 1% rent reduction; given that it has been raised during the Housing Summit, do Members want to object to the retention of the 1% rent reduction in the Council's formal response to Government?</p>

#	Government's policy proposal	What we are doing already	Emerging themes from the Housing Summits	Questions for Members
	<p><b>Local authorities</b></p> <p>The White Paper also speaks positively about local authorities' contribution to house building. Government have expressed an interest in the scope for bespoke housing deals with authorities in high demand areas.</p> <p>The government has confirmed that it wants to see the extension of the Right-to-Buy to tenants of affordable and social homes built by local authority-controlled companies (LACCs).</p>	<p>We have recently registered the Council's wholly-owned housing company. The initial focus for this company is to bring forward development on under-utilised Council-owned land.</p>	<p>The importance of the role that SKDC plays in all aspects of housing has been a recurring theme through the Housing Summits.</p> <p>The loss of the Council's housing stock through 'right to buy' has been raised as an issue by some Members.</p>	

## **5. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 5.1 We could choose not to respond to the Government's consultation on the White Paper; there are areas within it where there are clear synergies with our emerging Local Plan and developing Housing Strategy. However, there are also areas which have been identified through our Housing Summit, where there are clear disparities with what is being proposed in the White Paper – a response to the consultation will allow these disparities to be highlighted and the Council's own views on the issue to be put across.

## **6. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 It is difficult to assess the full resource implications of the White Paper, and until the proposals are enacted it would be unwise to do so. However, the commentary in the table above includes reference to what resource is currently committed to various areas within the White Paper, and where the resource requirement may increase or decrease.

## **7. ISSUES ARISING FROM IMPACT ANALYSIS**

- 7.1 No formal impact analysis is required in respect of the proposal to consider a response to the White Paper.

## **8. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 There is reference in the table above to the potential impact of some of the proposals in respect of crime and disorder.

## **9. COMMENTS OF FINANCIAL SERVICES**

- 9.1 No formal analysis on the financial impact of the White Paper has been carried out, although comments on the potential resource implications of the proposed legislation are included in the above table.

## **10. COMMENTS OF LEGAL AND DEMOCRATIC SERVICES**

- 10.1 As part of the [White Paper](#), the government is consulting on changes to planning policy and legislation in relation to planning for housing, sustainable development and the environment. Changes are being proposed as part of the Neighbourhood and Planning Bill which is currently being drafted. Amendment of the National Planning Policy Framework is proposed.

## Suggestions for PDGs Work Plan – DRAFT 2016/17

Communities PDG			
PDG	Subject	Detail	Outcome sought
Communities	Wyndham Park Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) Developments	Overview of Heritage Lottery Fund Development Project and future processes	
Communities	Car Parking Strategy <b>ONGOING</b>	Review of the current applications of the South Kesteven Car Park Strategy 2012 – 2017	To consider if the strategy needs to be amended in light of updated national and local issues.
Communities	The Work of the Neighbourhoods Team <b>COMPLETED</b> January 2017	For the PDG to be provided with an overview of the work being undertaken by the New Neighbourhoods Team	
Communities	Integration Self Assessment (Integrating Health and Social Care) <b>COMPLETED</b> January 2017		
Communities PDG – Joint Working Opportunities			
Communities	Tourism Website (This item was consider with the Growth PDG on 9 <sup>th</sup> February )	Development of a website to promote tourism within the district	To align this initiative with our new Economic Development Strategy.
Communities, Growth and Resources PDGs	Review of the Housing Strategy <b>ONGOING</b>	To review progress on key strategic housing issues within the district and update to take into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the emerging local plan,</li> <li>- government policy changes on support for affordable housing, starter homes and specialist housing</li> <li>- changes to the planning system</li> <li>- Developer and RSL strategies</li> <li>- Private rented sector housing issues</li> <li>- Opportunities and changes to resourcing</li> </ul>	Revised Housing Strategy for the District to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- encourage housing delivery in the right places at the right time and most appropriately meeting the needs of the local population</li> <li>- Improvements to private rented sector standards</li> <li>- Appropriate provision of specialist housing to meet the needs of older people and those with</li> </ul>

## Communities PDG

PDG	Subject	Detail	Outcome sought
		mechanisms via the One Public Estate Programme and the Devolution Deal for Greater Lincolnshire	vulnerabilities - Availability of appropriate housing related support services
Communities /Resources (Joint working group?)	Refresh HRA Business Plan	<p>Following the Government's budget policy announcements last year and the emerging legislative changes arising from the Housing and Planning Bill it is necessary to revisit the commitments made within the HRA Business Plan approved in 2014.</p> <p>The cumulative effect of the Government's rent policy changes and the as yet unknown impact of other legislative changes has substantially reduced the Council's short term financial resources , borrowing capacity and ability to meet its repayment of £25 million due in 2019/20. Consideration needs to given to a number of factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ambitions for housing development ,</li> <li>- Repairs and maintenance standards and service offers</li> <li>- Opportunities to reduce running costs and improve efficiency through service transformation</li> </ul> <p>Given the significance of the potential changes it is anticipated that extensive consultation and engagement with service users will form part of this review process.</p>	<p>Revised housing management, repairs and improvement service offer to tenants of Council owned social housing.</p> <p>Redefined investment priorities</p> <p>Revised borrowing strategy</p>