

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
HELD ON THURSDAY 23 JANUARY 2014 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors

Todd, R. (Chairman)
Gamble, B. (Vice-Chairman)

Anslow, C.	Kraujalis, J.T.
Alcott, G.	Stretton, Mrs. Z.P.
Davies, D.N.	Sutherland, M.
Dixon, D.I.	

14. Apologies

No apologies were received.

15. Declarations of Interests of Members in Contracts and Other Matters and Restriction on Voting by Members

No Declarations of Interests were made in addition to those already confirmed by Members in the Register of Members' Interests.

16. Community Infrastructure Levy: Draft Charging Schedule

Consideration was given to the consultation document in respect of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Draft Charging Schedule (Item 3.1 – 3.9 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Members received a presentation from the Planning Projects Officer about the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule consultation, which covered the following:

- Overview of the CIL – why it was introduced and what the purpose of it was;
- Proposed Charges and Policies;
- Infrastructure Needs;
- Cannock Chase Council's Infrastructure Needs;
- CIL Receipts and Funding Gaps;
- Parish/Non-Parish Funds;
- CIL Proposals in other parts of the West Midlands;
- Responses to Consultations;
- Next Steps.

Cllr Gamble queried if Parish/Town Councils met the required criteria to receive

25% of CIL receipts in their area, did relevant projects have to be completed within a five year period?

The Planning Projects Officer replied that the councils were required to report annually on progress of developments, and if the work was not complete within five years the CIL money would have to be returned.

Councillor Davies queried if the provision of S106 monies and CIL funds could run in tandem?

The Planning Projects Officer replied that they could, but in such circumstances the Council would have to determine if discretionary CIL relief could be provided.

The Planning Projects Officer then explained it was intended to submit the draft Charging Schedule to Cabinet in June 2014 for consideration, which would be then followed by a consultation period and an independent examination. Subject to the results of the examination, the aim was to have the final Charging Schedule approved by Council before the end of 2014, so that charging could commence from early 2015.

Councillor Davies raised concern the proposed charges would make developments not viable for developers.

The Planning Projects Officer replied that it would have to be proven during the public examination stage of the consultation process that the rates proposed would not put a brake on developments in the area. Currently, developments of one to nine dwellings were not required to pay any S106 monies, so the CIL charges would enable a fairer funding system. Land values also had to be taken into consideration as local authorities in areas with greater land values (such as Birmingham and Solihull) were proposing higher CIL charges.

Councillor Kraujalis raised concern that in non-parished areas of the District, residents would not get a say in how the 15% share of CIL funding attributable to their area should be spent.

The Planning Projects Officer replied that a consultation process could be set up to deal with this issue, but this would have to be determined by the Council.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration sought the Committee's view as to whether a policy of providing discretionary relief from CIL charges to developers who were required to pay out both S106 and CIL monies should be adopted by the Council?

Councillor Sutherland replied that he would like to see flexibility in the system in respect of both S106 and CIL monies.

Councillor Gamble replied that introducing a discretionary relief could be considered an incentive to encourage developers to stay in the area.

Councillor Kraujalis replied there was a need to ensure firm evidence was in place as to why discretionary relief should be provided.

The Planning Projects Officer reported that a developer would need to provide details of relevant infrastructure costs which could be independently audited.

Councillor Alcott commented that there was a need to make sure a balance was in place between provision of S106 and CIL monies so that the process could not be manipulated by developers.

Councillor Kraujalis raised concern that the District could lose out on social housing provision if developers state they can't afford S106 and CIL monies.

The Planning Projects Officer replied that the Council would need to take a policy decision that provision of social housing was a priority and consider any associated CIL costs accordingly.

The Planning Projects Officer then advised that if a long-term development project was planned to take place over a certain time period or be over a particular size, consideration could be given to allow CIL payments to be made in instalments.

Councillor Davies replied that this would make sense for developers to protect them against potential financial hardship in the future.

Councillor Sutherland queried that as the Council was not currently achieving its target of provision of 20% social housing, was there flexibility in the proposals so that developments of between 12%-15% social housing could be considered?

The Head of Planning and Regeneration replied that through the Council's Local Plan 20% was considered to be achievable, but the Council had to be prepared to reconsider if costs involved in individual schemes made this figure difficult to achieve.

The Planning Projects Officer commented that for developments already underway which included provision of social housing at a figure lower than 20%; a review could be undertaken whereby the 20% could be met in later years.

Councillor Stretton raised that inclusion of retirement homes developments in the schedule should be considered, as most were ran as businesses nowadays rather than charitable organisations.

RESOLVED:

That when Cabinet consider the Draft Charging Schedule, they be advised that:

- (A) The Committee is satisfied with the proposed charges and types of development to be included in the CIL Charging Schedule, but request that the inclusion of retirement homes be considered as one of the development types and what charge should be levied, if any.
- (B) The policy of discretionary relief from CIL charges be supported.
- (C) Payment of CIL charges by instalments be supported.

- (D) That in the operation of the CIL policy the provision of affordable housing is considered a priority for the Council.

17. Draft National Policy Statement for Road and Rail Networks, 2013

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Planning & Regeneration (Item 4.1 – 4.9 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Head of Planning and Regeneration sought the Committee's views on the draft response to the Governments consultation and in particular on the draft response of not supporting the building of new road alignments and links.

Members considered the Districts interest in seeing the M6 Toll connected to the M54 as well as the benefits brought to the District from past local road building and considered that the response on this item should be amended to make it more balanced.

Councillor Sutherland commented that in respect of the Strategic Rail Freight Interchange, the Council should push for development of the Pentalver Mid-Cannock site.

RESOLVED:

That it be recommended to the Portfolio Leader for Economic Development and Planning that:

- (A) The Department for Transport (DfT) be informed that the Council broadly supports the Draft National Policy Statement for the National Road and Rail Networks (NN NPS), in terms of additional investment in the rail network, the transfer of freight from road to rail including the development of a network of Strategic Rail Freight Interchanges and continued investment in road infrastructure including existing routes and pinchpoints:
- (B) That the draft response to the consultation questions detailed in Appendix 1 to the report be approved (subject to an amendment being made in respect of building of new road alignments and links) and submitted to the DfT by 26 February 2014.

18. Assisted Areas Map 2014 – 2020

Consideration was given to the consultation document in respect of the Assisted Areas Map (AAM) 2014-202 (Item 5.1 – 5.3 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager advised Members that in 2000-2007 only one District ward was included in the AAM, no wards were included in the AAM for the period 2007-2013, and concerns had been raised the same issue would arise for the period 2014-2020. Due to changes in the way the map was produced however, it was pleasing to note that three wards were to be included in the latest version.

Members were also advised that the intervention rate for eligible schemes in the

new AAM, which was due to come into effect from 1 July 2014, would be limited to 10% compared to 15% at present.

RESOLVED:

That the Council should support the inclusion of the three wards within Cannock Chase District (Cannock East, Cannock South and Norton Canes) in the draft Assisted Areas Map, and acknowledge the role of the Stoke and Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership in achieving this positive position.

The meeting closed at 5:30pm

CHAIRMAN