

EPPING FOREST DISTRICT COUNCIL COMMITTEE MINUTES

Committee: Council Housebuilding Cabinet **Date:** Thursday, 5 March 2015
Committee

Place: Council Chamber, Civic Offices, **Time:** 6.30 - 8.30 pm
High Street, Epping

Members Present: D Stallan (Chairman), R Bassett, Ms S Stavrou, G Waller and A Lion

Other Councillors: Mrs A Grigg, C C Pond, C Roberts, C Whitbread, Mrs J H Whitehouse and J M Whitehouse

Apologies: Councillor W Breare-Hall

Officers Present: A Hall (Director of Communities), P Pledger (Assistant Director (Housing Property)) and J Leither (Democratic Services Assistant)

Also in attendance: D Read (East Thames Group), I Collins (Pellings LLP) and N Penfold (Pellings LLP)

40. SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

The Cabinet Committee noted that Councillor A Lion substituted for Councillor W Breare-Hall at the meeting.

41. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

The Chairman advised the Cabinet Committee that he would stand down as Chairman for Agenda Item 6, Queens Road, North Weald as he was a Ward Member and that Councillor R Bassett would assume the Chairmanship for this item.

42. MINUTES

Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 18 December 2014 be taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

43. PHASE 2 - FUTURE USE OPTIONS

The Assistant Director of Housing (Property) presented a report to the Cabinet Committee, he advised that on 7 January 2015, the Area Planning Sub-Committee (South) considered and refused planning permission for Phase 2 of the Council's Housebuilding Programme at Burton Road, Loughton consisting of 52 new affordable homes for applicants on the Council's housing register. The decision for refusal was recorded as:

'By reason of its bulk, design and density in terms of numbers of dwellings, the proposal would have an overbearing relationship with neighbouring land to the detriment of the visual amenities of the locality'.

In line with the Policy on the Future Use of Development Sites Unsuitable for Development agreed in April 2014, the Cabinet Committee considered the future use of the development site at Burton Road, Loughton. Set out below were a number of options:.

(1) Appeal Against the Planning Decision

Any applicant was entitled to submit an appeal to the Secretary of State against a decision relating to a planning application. The Council had never before appealed against its own decision. However, in this instance, the application for Phase 2 of the Council's Housebuilding Programme was submitted in the name of East Thames Group (ETG), who were the Council's appointed Development Agent and they could be requested to submit an appeal, funded in full by the Council (since it was the Council that funded the Housebuilding Programme).

When submitting an appeal, applicants could ask for the case to be dealt with as a Written Representation, a Hearing or an Enquiry. If the Council were to take any of these appeal options it was important to note that the Council would have to pay for not only the Consultants fees and disbursements to prepare and present the appeal but also the fees associated with defending the appeal. There were a number of differences for each of the appeal processes, which are set out below:

a. Written Representation – Where both the applicant (ETG) and the Council submit a written statement of case including all supporting documentations. The appointed Planning Inspector will then consider the documents, often visiting the site before reaching a decision. This could take between 3 and 6 months from submission before a decision was reached. ETG have estimated the cost of submitting a Written Representation to be around £5,000, and the cost of defending the appeal was estimated to be in the region of £2,500.

b. Hearing – A simple examination of the matters arising under the appeal, normally where evidence did not need to be tested under cross examination. A hearing was normally heard over one day, and was led by the Planning Inspector. This could take between 6 and 9 months from submission before a decision was reached. ETG have estimated the cost of submitting an appeal and attending the hearing to be around £27,500 (excluding VAT and disbursements), and the cost of defending the appeal was estimated to be in the region of £4,500.

c. Public Inquiry – This was similar to a hearing. However, this required the appointment of legal representation in the form of a Barrister on each side for the purpose of cross examination of evidence. This could take between 9 and 12 months from submission before a decision was reached. ETG have estimated the cost of submitting an appeal and attending the Public Inquiry to be around £34,375 plus £15,000 for Legal Representation (excluding VAT and disbursements) and the cost of defending the appeal was estimated to be in the region of £4,500 plus £15,000 for its own legal representation.

The Cabinet Committee did not have delegated authority to submit an appeal, therefore, if the decision of the Cabinet Committee was to appeal, then on a point of

procedure, it must seek the approval of Council. Any appeal must be submitted by 7 July 2015, being 6 months of the decision being reached.

The main risks associated with submitting an appeal was that the Planning Inspector may decide to uphold the decision of the Area Planning Sub-Committee (South), in which case there would not only be a substantial delay in the house-building programme, but there would also be a significant amount of abortive fees. The risk to the Council's reputation over appealing against its own decision should also not be overlooked.

(2) To submit a revised planning application for a scheme consisting of 43 new affordable homes with 100% unallocated parking (Option 1)

Attached to the Agenda at Appendix 1 was a feasibility study, which considered an alternative design for the site based on a 43-home scheme with 100% unallocated parking. Whilst this did address the reasons for refusal, and also addressed objections raised by local residents, in response to the planning application, it was less favourable to the Council's Planning Officers due to the large banks of open parking and its impact on the environment.

The main differences between this design and the original that was refused planning permission was the loss of 3 flats to one end of Block C to create one bank of parking spaces, the removal of the four top-floor flats reducing the overall height to 3-stories and the loss of 2x3 bedroom houses to create a second bank of parking spaces so as to achieve 100% parking across the whole scheme. There was a loss of amenity space as a result of this design change in order to accommodate the additional parking.

The schedule of materials, fenestration and overall elevational treatment would need to be considered in more detail to take account of the design changes.

From the financial Investment Report at Appendix 3 of the Agenda, the Total Scheme Costs for a 43 home scheme was £8.06m, which was made up of £7.2m works costs and £0.86m fees.

The financial target of loan repayment in Year 30 could be achieved providing it received subsidy of £2.24m. The subsidy per unit equates to £52,000.

The additional design fees payable to ETG and their Architects for preparing a revised set of drawings and details and re-submitting the planning application would be £21,550 plus VAT. There were no additional planning application fees if resubmitted before 7 January 2016.

Should this option be agreed by the Cabinet Committee, there would be a resultant loss of HCA Affordable Housing Grant. For estimating purposes, a reduced rate of £12,500 per flat could be assumed. However, this would require negotiating with the HCA.

The Cabinet Committee had already agreed to make a contribution to the NHS for healthcare provision within the District, albeit based on a 52-unit scheme. Should that be reduced to 43 homes as a result of this option then the Council would need to negotiate with the NHS over an alternative amount of financial contribution and enter into a new Unilateral Undertaking.

The main risks associated with this option were that the revised scheme may not be seen as going far enough to overcome the concerns of the Area Planning Sub-

Committee (South) and was once again refused planning permission by the Sub-Committee, resulting in further abortive fees.

(3) To submit a revised planning application, for a scheme consisting of 52 affordable homes and 50% unallocated parking, but reduced in height, scale and massing (Option 2)

Attached at Appendix 2 of the Agenda was a feasibility study, which considered an alternative design for the site based on a reduction in height, scale and massing, yet still achieved 52 new affordable homes and 50% unallocated parking. Whilst this did address the majority of the reasons for refusal, it did not address concerns over density. The scheme does not increase the parking allocation either, although it should be noted that this was not a reason for refusal.

From the Financial Investment Report at Appendix 3 of the Agenda, the Total Scheme Costs for this revised scheme consisting of 52 new affordable homes was £9.26m, which was made up of £8.25m works costs and £1.01m fees.

The financial target of loan repayment in Year 30 could be achieved providing it received subsidy of £2.18m. The subsidy per unit equates to £42,000.

The additional design fees payable to ETG and their Architects for preparing a revised set of drawings and details and re-submitting the planning application would be £21,550 plus VAT. There were no additional planning application fees if re-submitted before 7 January 2016.

Should this option be agreed by the Cabinet Committee, it would mean the existing HCA affordable Housing Grant would remain the same as would the financial contribution to the NHS towards healthcare in the district.

The main risks associated with this option were, again that the revised scheme did not go far enough to overcome the concerns of the Area Planning Sub-Committee (South) and was once again refused planning permission, resulting in abortive fees.

(4) To sell the site for affordable rented housing to a Housing Association in return for a capital receipt

Should the Cabinet Committee opt to sell the site, then one option would be to sell it to one of the Council's Preferred Housing Association Partners, for them to develop the site for affordable housing, from which the Council could obtain nomination rights. This would benefit the Council by way of a capital receipt for the land value, which could be used to fund other Council House-building developments.

The value of the land had not been assessed; therefore, should this option be agreed by the Cabinet Committee, it would mean a separate financial viability study would need to be undertaken to establish a land value and consideration of the most appropriate way to appoint the housing association.

The main drawback was the fact the Council would not retain the affordable rent for the homes that were built, and that a similar number of homes would have to be put into the Council Housebuilding Programme to replace these ones taken out. There was also the consideration that a housing association could submit plans for more homes to be delivered on the site.

Since the Council had secured HCA Affordable Housing Grant for the delivery of affordable housing on this site based on a firm scheme, Officers were also of the

view that this would cause reputational difficulties with the HCA, bearing in mind that this was only the first scheme where grant had been secured, and could result in the not agreeing any future affordable housing grant applications from the Council.

(5) To sell the site for private development in return for a capital receipt

The benefits, drawbacks and risks associated with this option were similar to those above. However, the land value would be higher; no more than 40% affordable homes are likely to be provided; and the potential for a private developer submitting plans for more units on the site was greater.

(6) To divide up the site and sell the land to local residents to extend their private gardens in return for a capital receipt

Whilst this option appears in the policy for the Future Use of Development Sites Unsuitable for Development, in this instance this option was not ideally suited since the site backed on to a row of flat blocks where the gardens were back to back.

Since the land would be sold for private gardens, the value would be very low and reaching agreements with all of the individual occupiers of the flats would be near impossible. The cost of drawing up legal agreements would almost offset any value in the land.

(7) To demolish the garages, re-surface and mark out the land and to leave the site as open car parking for local residents

With Debden Station so close, and with the adjacent shopping parade at Debden Broadway, the land could be utilised as an extension of the "Pay and Display" car park. This would create a revenue income for the Council, but it would require the land to be transferred from the HRA to the General Fund, for an appropriate fee.

Such an option would not provide any much needed affordable housing in the district, and as with selling the site, there was a risk that the HCA would frown upon any future affordable housing grant applications from the Council, as the allocation had been based on a firm bid.

(8) To sell the site to a Town or Parish Council for their own purposes (eg. public amenity space) in return for a capital receipt

Whilst this could be viable option, this was likely to generate a significant capital receipt on the scale of selling to a private developer or an ongoing revenue income similar to what could be realised from car parking charges, and as such was not recommended.

Decision:

(1) That, having considered the options for the future use to be adopted for the development site at Burton Road, Loughton, following the decision of the Area Planning Sub-Committee (South) to refuse planning permission for Phase 2 of the Council's house-building Programme, a revised planning application be submitted for a scheme similar to that previously submitted, consisting of 52 new affordable homes and 50% unallocated parking (shown as Option 2 at Appendix 2 of the report to the Cabinet Committee) but addressing the reasons for refusal by reducing its bulk, altering its design and overall height so as to reduce any impact on the neighbouring land and any detriment of the visual amenities of the locality, all as set out in the

feasibility report at an estimated cost of £9,255,439, which will require an increased subsidy of around £2,184,000 (£42k per unit) based on a 30-year pay-back period.

(2) That a detailed planning application for the scheme be submitted.

(3) That a report be submitted to the Cabinet recommending that priority be given to the provision of an off-street parking scheme in Torrington Drive, Loughton being undertaken, subject to a resident consultation.

(4) That the Director of Neighbourhoods be asked to give consideration to including any new off-street parking spaces being provided as a Residents Parking Scheme.

Reasons for Decision:

The Cabinet Committee had to decide on the future use of the development site at Burton Road since the planning application for Phase 2 of the Council House-building Programme was refused permission at the Area Planning Sub-Committee (South) on 7 January 2015.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

The report set out all of the options that were available, including the advantages, disadvantages and costs for each option.

44. FEASIBILITY STUDIES (REVISED) - CENTRE DRIVE (SITE B), EPPING AND QUEENS ROAD, NORTH WEALD

The Chairman stated that he would stand down as Chairman for item (1) Queens Road, North Weald, and Councillor R Bassett assumed the Chairmanship for this item.

The Assistant Director of Housing (Property) presented a report to the Cabinet Committee. He advised that at the last meeting of the Cabinet Committee on 18 December 2014, it had been decided that the sites at Queens Road, North Weald and Centre Drive, Epping, Site B be deferred for further information and revised feasibility studies.

(1) Queens Road, North Weald

The Assistant Director advised that the revised feasibility study was for 12 x 3 bedroom houses which were 2 stories high and each had 2 car parking spaces. There were also 4 extra visitor car parking spaces on the site.

He reported that no firm costs could be confirmed at this meeting for the re-siting of the substation, but that it had been estimated at £120,000.

Members were concerned that if negotiations with the tenant regarding the re-siting of the substation broke down then the Council, being the owners of the land, could by delegated authority issue a notice of seeking possession to the tenant. Members asked that if negotiations broke down with the tenant and before any firm decisions were made, they would like this item to come back to the Cabinet Committee for further discussion.

(2) Site B, Centre Drive, Epping

The Assistant Director advised that the revised feasibility study was for 1 x 3 bedroom house which was 2 stories high with 3 car parking spaces.

Decision:

That, following consideration of a revised feasibility study and viability assessment for the sites at Queens Road, North Weald and Centre Drive (Site B) Epping, which took account of the Cabinet Committee's comments made at its December 2014 meeting consideration.

(1) Queens Road, North Weald

(a) The revised feasibility study of 12 x 3 bedroom, 2 storey units with a total of 28 car parking spaces be agreed as a viable site to progress to a detailed planning stage;

(b) The terms of any existing licence/lease, allowing access to the allotments, be maintained; and

(c) A further report be submitted to the Council Housebuilding Cabinet Committee should negotiations with the tenant in Queens Road, regarding the re-siting of the substation break down.

(2) Site B, Centre Drive, Epping

The revised feasibility study of 1 x 3 bedroom house, 2 storey's high with a total of 3 car parking spaces be agreed as a viable site to progress to a detailed planning stage.

Reasons for Decision:

At its meeting in December 2014, the Cabinet Committee asked that each of the 2 sites at Queens Road, North Weald and Centre Drive (Site B) Epping sites be revised to provide an alternative mix of dwellings. Each site is presented on its own merits at this stage. However, when each of the feasibility studies have been considered, the Cabinet Committee will then be asked to batch the sites in line with the Policy on Prioritisation of Sites.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

1. Not to progress with any of the schemes presented in the agenda report.
2. To develop the sites with a different number of homes, or with an alternative mix of property types or parking allocation.

45. STREET / BUILDING NAMING - PHASE 1

The Director of Communities presented a report to the Cabinet Committee he advised that in accordance with the Terms of Reference, the names of developments undertaken through the Council House Building Programme would follow consultation with the Parish or Town Councils and Ward Members.

The Director had consulted Waltham Abbey Town Council on the two remaining unnamed developments within Phase 1 and, as requested, they had provided five suggested names for each development, in a ranked order of preference.

The three Ward Members had been consulted on the Town Council's suggestions, and had raised no objections.

It was therefore proposed that the two developments be named in accordance with the Town Council's two most preferred names.

Decision:

That, following consultation with Waltham Abbey Town Council and the three Ward Members, and as suggested by the Town Council:

- (a) The four houses and two duplex flats at the site of the former Red Cross Hall, Roundhills, Waltham Abbey be named "Hockley Court"; and
- (b) The two new houses to the rear of 66-72 Fairways, Waltham Abbey be named "Wood Villas".

Reasons for Decision:

The two remaining un-named developments in Phase 1 of the Council Housebuilding Programme required names. The Cabinet Committee had been authorised by the Leader of the Council to decide the names of new developments.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

The main options appear to be:

- (a) To name the developments after any of the other names suggested by the Town Council; or
- (b) To agree different names proposed by the Cabinet Committee itself.

46. PROGRESS REPORT MARDEN CLOSE, FAVERSHAM HALL AND PHASE 1

The Assistant Director of Housing (Property) presented a report to the Cabinet Committee, he advised that Phase 1, Marden Close and Faversham Hall, were running behind programme for a variety of reasons and asked the Consultants who were overseeing Phase 1, Pellings LLP, to advise the Cabinet Committee of the problems that had been encountered.

Ian Collins from Pellings LLP, advised the Cabinet Committee that the two existing buildings at Marden Close and Faversham Hall were running behind schedule due to the age of the buildings and structural issues which at the time of tender these elements could not be seen and were therefore not able to be factored into the time frame. This scheme was delayed by approximately 4-5 weeks, whereas Phase 1 was delayed due to ground conditions that required the foundations to be piled.

Members expressed concern with this delay and asked for an updated progress report at the next meeting and also if there were any financial penalties for lateness passed on to the Contractors, that a report on the costs be submitted at the next meeting.

Decision:

That the current progress with regard to Marden Close and Faversham Hall, as well as Phases 1 of the Council Housebuilding Programme be noted.

Reasons for Decision:

It was a requirement that the Housebuilding Cabinet Committee received regular updates on progress and monitors expenditure against the House-building budget as delegated by the Cabinet.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

This report is for noting only.

47. FINANCIAL REPORTS

The Assistant Director of Housing (Property) presented a report to the Cabinet Committee, he advised that the schedule set out at Agenda Item 9, Appendix 1 was the current position as at 31 December 2014 with regard to the Right to Buy receipts.

The Assistant Director advised that one of the Cabinet Committee's Terms of Reference was to monitor expenditure on the Housing Capital Programme Budget for the Council Housebuilding Programme, ensuring the use (within the required deadlines) of the capital receipts made available through the Council's Agreement with the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) allowing the use of additional "Replacement Right to Buy (RTB) Receipts" received as a result of the Government's increase in the maximum RTB Discount to be spent on housebuilding.

At its meeting in February 2014, the Cabinet Committee received a suite of detailed financial reports covering all financial issues relating to the Housebuilding Programme. Since progress was on a phase by phase basis and was monitored separately it had been possible to consolidate the detailed financial reports into just 2 appendices.

Appendix 1 (Agenda Item 9) captured the total amount of Replacement Right To Buy Receipts received and available for use for "One-for-One Replacement" on the Council's Housebuilding Programme, as captured on the Pooling Return to the DCLG and when it was required to be spent. It also captured the actual expenditure to date and compared that to the projected future planned expenditure profile.

Appendix 2 (Agenda Item 9) set out the amount and use of financial contributions available to the Council's Housebuilding Programme from Section 106 Agreements, in lieu of the provision of on-site affordable housing on private development sites, and other sources of funding (e.g. sales of HRA land and non-RTB property, and external funding)

This information had been captured and presented for monitoring purposes, therefore it was recommended that the current financial position be noted.

Decision:

- (1) That the current financial position be noted, in respect of:
 - (a) The amount of additional "Replacement Right to Buy (RTB) Receipts" for utilisation under the Government's "one-for-one replacement" scheme that has been received; when it is required to be spent; the actual expenditure to date; and the future planned expenditure profile (Appendix 1); and
 - (b) The amount and use of financial contributions available to the Council's Housebuilding Programme from Section 106 Agreements, in lieu of

the provision of on-site affordable housing on private development sites, and other sources of funding (e.g. sales of HRA land and non-RTB property, and external funding) (Appendix 2).

Reasons for Decision:

The Council's Housebuilding Programme was a high profile, high cost activity. It was therefore essential to ensure that budgets, costs and expenditure were properly monitored, to enable corrective action to be taken at the earliest opportunity, when necessary.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

Not to have regular Financial Reports presented to the Cabinet Committee.

48. PRIORITISATION OF POTENTIAL FUTURE SITES

The Assistant Director of Housing (Property) presented a report to the Cabinet Committee, he advised that at its meeting in February 2014, the Cabinet Committee agreed a Policy on the future prioritisation of development sites based on rotating the developments around the towns/villages where sites were located, so that all areas had the benefit of affordable housing being provided in their area, with priority given to areas in which the highest number of housing applicants lived. The strategy that was agreed took account of:

(a) Towns/villages with sites that could potentially deliver the greatest number of new properties being prioritised in preference to locations where less properties could be delivered; and

(b) Where possible, development packages/phases (i.e. the grouping of sites into one works contract, usually undertaken each year) should generally comprise of sites within the same town/village, in order to reduce the contractor's site set-up costs.

The Assistant Director advised that although the prioritisation of locations had altered slightly in the last 12 months, it was recommended that the Policy on the Prioritisation of Sites, from which future phases, beyond Phase 3, were to be drawn up and be based on the revised ranking table below, with Phase 4 focussing on sites in Ongar and Buckhurst Hill.

Group A (Comprising towns/villages with sites that could potentially deliver 10 or more new homes in total)

Group A (Capacity for 10 or more new homes)				
Priority Order	Location	No. of Housing Applicants	No. of Sites	Max. No. of Properties
1	Loughton	459	16 ^(#)	52 ^(#)
2	Waltham Abbey	413	18	71 ^(*)
3	Epping	102	5	12
4	Ongar	84	2	11
5	Buckhurst Hill	70	5	23
6	North Weald	40	2	16

(*) = Including the Year 1 sites

(#) = Excluding the sites at The Broadway

Group B (Comprising towns/villages with sites that could potentially deliver less than 10 new homes in total)

Group B (Capacity for less than 10 new homes)				
Priority Order	Location	No. of Housing Applicants	No. of Sites	Max. No. of Properties
1	Roydon	23	1	3
2	Nazeing	19	2	7
3	Theydon Bois	16	2	5
4	High Ongar	13	1	2
5	Coopersale	9	3	7
6	Matching Green/Tye	2	1	2

With the locations already agreed by the Cabinet Committee for Phases 1 and 2 as Waltham Abbey and Loughton respectively, Phase 3 was identified in the report on the prioritisation of sites agreed by the Cabinet Committee in February 2014 as being Epping, Coopersale and North Weald. The Cabinet committee considered the feasibility studies for those sites at its meeting in December 2014, and all but three sites were considered viable. However, for two of the sites at Queens Road, North Weald and Centre Drive (Site B), Epping the Cabinet Committee asked that these be redrawn to achieve a different mix of properties, which had been presented and agreed in an earlier Agenda item.

It was therefore recommended that Phase 3 be made up of 35 new homes on the following sites, being approved as viable, based on a total scheme cost of £6,395,477, with a subsidy requirement of £923,600:

- a) Queens Road, North Weald - 12x3-bed 5P houses
- b) Bluemans End, North Weald - 4x3-bed 5P houses
- c) Stewards Green Road, Epping - 4x3-bed 5P houses
- d) Site A Parklands, Coopersale - 2x1-bed 2P flats & 2x2-bed 4P houses
- e) Site C Parklands, Coopersale - 1x2-bed 4P bungalow
- f) Centre Avenue, Epping - 2x3-bed 5P houses
- g) Centre Drive (Site B), Epping - 1x3-bed 5P houses
- h) Site B Springfield, Epping - 2x1-bed 2P bungalows
- i) Site C Springfield, Epping - 2x1-bed 2P bungalows & 2x2-bed 4P houses
- j) 79 London Road, Ongar - 1x3-bed 5P house

Recommended:

(1) That the strategic approach adopted by the Cabinet Committee at its meeting in February 2014 continues for the prioritisation of potential sites;

(2) That, taking account of the strategic approach for the prioritisation of potential sites, and using updated statistics as at February 2015, locations be grouped together into the following two Groups and the Priority Orders shown:

Group A (Locations with sites that could potentially deliver 10 or more homes):

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Location</u>
1	Loughton
2	Waltham Abbey
3	Epping

4	Ongar
5	Buckhurst Hill
6	North Weald

Group B (Locations with sites that could potentially deliver less than 10 homes):

<u>Priority</u>	<u>Location</u>
1	Roydon
2	Nazeing
3	Theydon Bois
4	High Ongar
5	Coopersale
6	Matching Green/Tye

(3) That a review of the priority orders within Groups A and B in (2) above be undertaken by the Cabinet Committee in 3-years' time, having regard to the same strategic approach set-out in the existing Policy on the Prioritisation of sites; and

(4) That, taking account of the priority order agreed by the Cabinet Committee in February 2014, Phase 3 be made up of 35 new homes on the following sites already agreed as viable by the Cabinet Committee at its meeting in December 2014, subject to the two revised feasibility studies at Queens Road, North Weald and Centre Drive (Site B), Epping, considered earlier on the agenda, being agreed, based on a total scheme cost of £6,395,477, with a subsidy requirement of £923,600:

- a) Queens Road, North Weald - 12x3-bed 5P houses
- b) Bluemans End, North Weald - 4x3-bed 5P houses
- c) Stewards Green Road, Epping - 4x3-bed 5P houses
- d) Site A Parklands, Coopersale - 2x1-bed 2P flats & 2x2-bed 4P houses
- e) Site C Parklands, Coopersale - 1x2-bed 4P bungalow
- f) Centre Avenue, Epping - 2x3-bed 5P houses
- g) Centre Drive (Site B), Epping - 1x3-bed 5P houses
- h) Site B Springfield, Epping - 2x1-bed 2P bungalows
- i) Site C Springfield, Epping - 2x1-bed 2P bungalows & 2x2-bed 4P houses
- j) 79 London Road, Ongar - 1x3-bed 5P house

(5) That, subject to the sites listed in Decision (4) above being agreed, each site be progressed to detailed design stage, with planning applications being submitted and, subject to planning approval, tenders to be sought in accordance with the Procurement Strategy for House-building; and

(6) That Phase 4 of the Council's House-building Programme focusses on Ongar and Buckhurst Hill.

Reasons for Decision:

There was a need to review the prioritisation of potential sites for development based on the demand from those registered on the Council's housing waiting list, and also to agree the sites that were to go forward for Phase 3 of the Council House-building Programme.

Other Options Considered and Rejected:

The main alternative options appear to be:

- (a) To adopt a different approach to the prioritisation of sites – of which there are a myriad of alternatives;
- (b) To alter the list of sites proposed for Phase 3; and
- (c) To review the prioritisation of sites in 12-months' time. However, due to the lead-in time to develop the feasibility studies and undertake the legal checks, it makes planning future phases difficult if the priority order changes on an annual basis.

49. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The Chairman advised the Cabinet Committee the dates of the next two meetings would be 16 June 2015 and 14 July 2015 at 6.30pm in the Council Chamber.

50. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

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

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank