

Oversight and Governance
Chief Executive's Department
Plymouth City Council
Ballard House
Plymouth PLI 3BJ
T 01752 305155
www.plymouth.gov.uk/democracy
Published 20/10/21

Delegated Decisions

Delegated Executive/Officer Decisions

Delegated Executive and Officer decisions are published every Wednesday and are available at the following link - https://tinyurl.com/ms6umor

Cabinet decisions subject to call-in are published at the following link -http://tinyurl.com/yddrqll6

Notice of call-in for non-urgent decisions must be given to the Democratic Support Unit by 4.30 pm on Wednesday 27 October 2021. Please note – urgent decisions and non-key Council Officer decisions cannot be called in. Copies of the decisions together with background reports are available for viewing as follows:

- on the Council's Intranet Site at https://modgov/mgDelegatedDecisions.aspx
- on the Council's website at https://tinyurl.com/jhnax4e

The decisions detailed below may be implemented on Thursday 28 October 2021 if they are not called-in.

Delegated Decisions

- I. Councillor Nick Kelly, The Leader:
 - 1.1. Kings Tamerton Land Release Funding

(Pages I - 24)

EXECUTIVE DECISION

made by a Cabinet Member



REPORT OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY BY AN INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER

Executive Decision Reference Number - L16 21/22

| Deci | sion | | | | | |
|------|--|----------|----------|--|--|--|
| ı | Title of decision: Kings Tamerton Land Release Funding | | | | | |
| 2 | Decision maker (Cabinet member name and portfolio title): Councillor Nick Kelly, Leader of the Council | | | | | |
| 3 | Report author and contact details: Liz Dunster, Housing Delivery Officer Tel: 4169 liz.dunster@plymouth.gov.uk | | | | | |
| 4 | Decision to be taken: | | | | | |
| | Approve the Business Case | | | | | |
| | Allocate £600,000 for the project into t | he Cap | ital Pro | gramme funded by LRF | | |
| | In the event that the Council decides th | at it wi | ll procu | re the works itself: | | |
| | Authorise the procurement process | | | | | |
| | Delegate the award of the contract to t Infrastructure | he Serv | rice Dir | ector for Strategic Planning and | | |
| 5 | Reasons for decision: To enable the a | | | Release Funding grant to be spent in | | |
| 6 | Alternative options considered and | l rejec | ted: | | | |
| | Not to spend the grant – this would result in the site remaining unviable for development and the funding being returned to MHCLG | | | | | |
| 7 | Financial implications and risks: None as this is grant funding with no revenue implications which will be returned should the scheme not progress | | | | | |
| 8 | Is the decision a Key Decision? (please contact <u>Democratic</u> | Yes | No | Per the Constitution, a key decision is one which: | | |
| | Support for further advice) | | | in the case of capital projects and contract awards, results in a new | | |

July 2019 OFFICIAL

| | | | | commitment to spend and/or save in excess of £3million in total | | |
|------|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | | | in the case of revenue projects when the decision involves entering into new commitments and/or making new savings in excess of £1 million | | |
| | | | | is significant in terms of its effect on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the area of the local authority. | | |
| | If yes, date of publication of the notice in the Forward Plan of Ke | N/A | | | | |
| 9 | Please specify how this decision is linked to the Council's corporate plan/Plymouth Plan and/or the policy framework and/or the revenue/capital budget: | e Plymou 2014-2 deliver 2034, c Policy l includir a requi numbe afforda | The Kings Tamerton site is allocated for housing in the Plymouth and South West Devon Joint Local Plan 2014-2034. Policy SPT3 of the JLP makes provisions to deliver at least 19,000 new homes in Plymouth by 2034, of which 4,550 should be affordable. In addition, Policy DEV7 requires a broad range of housing including specialist housing to meet needs; and there is a requirement to deliver at least 30% of the total number of dwellings on qualifying development as affordable housing units. | | | |
| | | and asp suppor Counci Emerge | It also supports our response to the climate emergand aspiration to be a Carbon Neutral City by 203 supporting and accelerating the delivery of the Council's Carbon Reduction Plan and City's Climat Emergency Action Plan by enabling the development zero-carbon housing. | | | |
| 10 | Please specify any direct environmental implications of th decision (carbon impact) | e pionee carbon model | Working with PEC Homes this project proposes to pioneer the Energiesprong approach to net-zero carbon homes to provide a replicable and scalable model for achieving this aim and aligns with our ambitions to do so by 2030. | | | |
| | | | | that this scheme will achieve carbon ,000kg of CO ² pa. | | |
| Urge | ent decisions | | | | | |
| 11 | Is the decision urgent and to be implemented immediately in the interests of the Council or the public? | Yes | | (If yes, please contact Democratic Support (democraticsupport@plymouth.gov.uk) for advice) | | |
| | | No | X | (If no, go to section 13a) | | |
| I2a | Reason for urgency: | | | | | |

| I2b | Scrutiny Chair Signature: | | | Date | | | | |
|------|---|--|---------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| | Scrutiny Committee name: | | | | | | | |
| | Print Name: | | | | | | | |
| Cons | sultation | | | | | | | |
| 13a | • | er Cabinet members' | Yes | X | | | | |
| | portfolios aff decision? | ected by the | No | | (If no go to secti | on 14) | | |
| I3b | Which other Cabinet member's portfolio is affected by the decision? | | | Councillor Mrs Vivien Pengelly, Cabinet Member for Homes and Communities | | | | |
| 13c | Date Cabinet member consulted 5.10.21 | | | | | | | |
| 14 | | Has any Cabinet member leclared a conflict of interest in | | | If yes, please discus Monitoring Officer | | | |
| | relation to th | | No | X | Troineoring Officer | | | |
| 15 | | orate Management | Name Anthony Payn | | | | | |
| | Team member has been consulted? | | Job title | | Director for Place | | | |
| | | | Date consulted | | 12.10.21 | | | |
| Sign | -off | | _ | | | | | |
| 16 | Sign off code departments | s from the relevant consulted: | | ocratic S datory) | Support | DS55 21/22 | | |
| | | | Finan | ce (mar | ndatory) | pl.21.22.108 | | |
| | | | Legal (mandatory) | | | LS/37317/AC/4/10/ 21 | | |
| | | | Human Resources (if applicable) | | | N/A | | |
| | | | Corpo applie | • | operty (if | N/A | | |
| | | | Procu | ırement | (if applicable) | N/A | | |

| Ар | Appendices | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|----|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 17 | Ref. | Title of appendix | | | | | | | | | |
| | Α | Briefing report for publication (mandatory) | | | | | | | | | |
| | В | Equalities Impact Assessment (where required) | | | | | | | | | |
| | С | Business Case | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cor | fiden | tial/exempt information | | | | | | | | | |
| 18a | Ba Do you need to include any confidential/exempt information? | | | | Yes | | If yes, prepare a second, confidential ('Part II') briefing report and indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part I of | | | | |
| | | | No | X | Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box in 18b below. | | | | | | |

| | | | Exemption Paragraph Number | | | | | |
|------|--|---|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | I | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| I 8b | Confidential/exempt briefing report title: | | | | | | | |

(Keep as much information as possible in the briefing report that will be in the

public domain)

Background Papers

Please list all unpublished, background papers relevant to the decision in the table below.

Background papers are <u>unpublished</u> works, relied on to a material extent in preparing the

report, which disclose facts or matters on which the report or an important part of the work is based. If some/all of the information is confidential, you must indicate why it is not for publication by virtue of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 by ticking the relevant box.

| Title of background paper(s) | Exemption Paragraph Number | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Cabinet Member Signature

| 20 | I agree the decision and confirm that it is not contrary to the Council's policy and budget framework, Corporate Plan or Budget. In taking this decision I have given due regard to the Council's duty to promote equality of opportunity, eliminate unlawful discrimination and promote good relations between people who share protected characteristics under the Equalities Act and those who do not. For further details please see the EIA attached. | | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Signature | | N. Kelly | Date of decision 20 October 2021 | | | | | |
| Print Name Councillor Nick Kelly, Leader of Plymouth City Council | | | | | | | | |



Part I Briefing Report
Land Release Funding for
Land at Kings Tamerton





Background

The site has been allocated for housing for many years. It was marketed under Plan for Homes in 2013 but there was no interest from the market due to the topography and the high cost of infrastructure required to get onto the site which is in a low value area.

In January 2017 we received a proposal from Land Developments (SW) Ltd who were prepared to cover the upfront cost of the access infrastructure in return for being given part of the site for market housing. They submitted a planning application in November 2019 but had to withdraw the application due to lack of funds to complete legal work and went into Receivership in January 2021.

PCC had already been in talks with PEC Homes about a community led scheme on part of the site and following the withdrawal of Land Developments, PEC Homes agreed to take the lead on replanning the site and submitting an outline application for the whole site.

Land Release Fund

The Housing Delivery Team were successful in a bid for Land Release Funding for this site. £600,000 was awarded by MHCLG to cover the cost of works to make the site viable for release for the delivery of housing. To meet the conditions of funding the site must be 'released' by 31 March 2023. We intend to transfer the freehold of the site to PEC Homes by this date to meet one of the definitions of 'release'.

Recommendations

Approve the Business Case

Allocate £600,000 for the project into the Capital Programme funded by LRF

In the event that the Council decides that it will procure the works itself:

- Authorise the procurement process
- Delegate the award of the contract to the Service Director for Strategic Planning and Infrastructure

Reasons for Recommendation

That the works be added to the Capital Programme to enable the spend of the grant and that a grant agreement be entered into with PEC Homes in order that the necessary works can be included in the procurement of a contractor for the wider housing development.

If the works are not added to the Capital Programme the funding will need to be returned. Entering into a grant agreement with PEC Homes will result in the works and associated project management being carried out for a lower cost than if the works were to be procured separately by the council.

If the Council decides not to enter into the grant agreement with PEC Homes then it may itself procure the works.

Alternative Options

- I. Return the funding to MHCLG
- 2. Procure the works separately this would result in higher capital and revenue costs as it would not benefit from the economies of scale involved in being tendered as part of a larger development and would require significant Officer time and a Project Manager. This could mean insufficient works are able to be carried out to make the housing development viable.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT BUSINESS CASE



Land Release Fund grant spend on Land off Coombe Way, Kings Tamerton

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This business case relates to a Council owned site off Coombe Way, Kings Tamerton which aims to deliver up to 70 net-zero carbon homes including at least 40 affordable community-led homes, under the Plan for Homes initiative. It is also a flagship scheme for innovation under the Climate Emergency Action Plan (CEAP), pioneering a new approach to the delivery of low carbon homes, incorporating Modern Methods of Construction (MMC). It aims to provide a replicable and scalable model, creating the catalyst for a future pipeline of net-zero carbon homes across the city.

In February 2021 Plymouth City Council was successful in securing £600,000 of Land Release Funding (LRF) from MHCLG to support the provision of infrastructure costs to unlock the site to enable the delivery of the homes.

The LRF funded works will enable the provision of infrastructure to include access, sustainable drainage solutions and water utility connection.

The site at Kings Tamerton, Plymouth, PL5 2HB is allocated for housing in the Joint Local Plan (JLP). The extent and nature of the infrastructure works required to open the site for development has resulted in the site being unattractive to the market. Without the funding to pay for the infrastructure required, the site will remain undeveloped, constraining the economic and physical growth of the city and missing the opportunity to meet identified housing needs. Officers are certain that this development would not be deliverable without the direct intervention of the Council.

Key Risks

- Planning permission for the proposed development is not yet granted, although the
 principle of housing development has been established by the allocation of the site
 in the JLP. Failure to secure planning permission could result in delays in releasing
 the land.
- Inability to secure sufficient additional funding for the proposed redevelopment leading to delays in releasing the site.

In both scenarios the LRF monies can be returned to MHCLG, should either occur.

| SECTION I: PROJECT DETAIL | | | | | |
|---|----------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| Project Value (indicate capital or revenue) | £600,000 | Contingency (show as £ and % of project value) | 0 | | |
| Programme | Housing | Directorate | Place | | |
| Portfolio Holder | Cllr Vivien Pengelly | Service Director | Paul Barnard | | |
| Senior Responsible Officer (client) | Neil Mawson | Project Manager | To be confirmed | | |
| Address and Post Code | PL52HB | Ward | St Budeaux | | |

Current Situation: (Provide a brief, concise paragraph outlining the current situation and explain the current business need, problem, opportunity or change of circumstances that needs to be resolved)

The Kings Tamerton site is allocated for housing in the JLP. The project is also a priority for delivery under the Plan for Homes initiative. The project will release land for housing with a view to delivering at least 40 affordable homes, exceeding our planning policy requirement and our low carbon and bio-diversity policies.

The proposed 70 net-zero carbon homes will far exceed current standards on energy and sustainability to help meet our ambition for greener homes to contribute to the Council's CEAP carbon neutrality target for the city. In order to achieve this goal Plymouth Energy Community Homes (PEC Homes) propose to pilot the 'Energiesprong' approach to net-zero carbon and will employ Modern Methods of Construction (MMC).

Despite being allocated in the JLP, there is no market interest in the site due to a combination of high abnormal infrastructure costs and low sales values. The Council was successful however in securing £600,000 of Land Release Fund from MHCLG to carry out works to enable the delivery of housing on the site.

We intend for the grant funding to be spent on the infrastructure costs necessary to bring the land to the point of release to a developer.

Conditions of funding for the LRF grant require sites to be released by the end of March 2023. Officers have confirmed with the funder that the project will achieve this milestone when planning permission is obtained and the transfer of the land is complete.

Various site surveys have been undertaken in support of an existing planning application that has identified site constraints and opportunities, and the infrastructure required and costed to prepare the whole site for the design and delivery of 70 homes, at least 40 of which will be net-zero carbon and affordable.

The proposed delivery strategy will then be for PEC Homes to deliver the 40 homes of phase 1. The delivery strategy for phase 2 is yet to be decided.

Proposal:

Although the site is allocated for housing in the JLP, feasibility work shows significant infrastructure costs need to be met from public subsidy to unlock the site for viable development, which would not be funded by the private sector.

Without the infrastructure, the supply of the proposed sustainable homes will remain locked. The LRF funded works will support the provision of infrastructure to include creating an access road onto the site, sustainable drainage solutions and utility connections. This is proposed to be a gas free development, so no gas connection costs will be required in this case.

The £600,000 of funding already secured is expected to enable groundworks to provide level platforms and an access road from the highway together with associated drainage and utilities.

| Milestones and Date: | | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|--|
| Contract Award Date | Start On Site Date | Completion Date | | | | |
| 31/03/22 | 31/05/22 | 30/09/22 | | | | |

SECTION 2: PROJECT RISK, OUTCOMES AND BENEFITS

Risk Register: The Risk Register/Risk Log is a master document created during the early stages of a project. It includes information about each identified risk, level of risk, who owns it and what measures are in place to mitigate the risks (cut and paste more boxes if required).

| Potential R | Risks Identified | | | Likelihood | Impact | Overall Rating |
|--|--|---|--|------------|--------|-------------------|
| Risk | • • • | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | oposed development is n delays in releasing | Medium | High | High |
| Mitigation | PCC site plann scale of the pre existing planning recommendati planning delive Risk management with the Plannia application pro LRF funded schemission is recommended. | ning statement supposed developing application the on for approvaling. The process the ing Authority the process to de-risk the neme will not contot granted. In the open of granted, and the open of granted. | that gives comfort on applicant has engaged | Low | High | Medium |
| Risk | • | | iding for the proposed vs in releasing the site. | Medium | High | Medium |
| redevelopment leading to delays in releasing the site. Mitigation The LRF contributes to the cost of infrastructure provision. PEC Homes have secured £180,000 Homes England Community Housing Fund to support feasibility work, develop the delivery model and to secure planning. Homes England Housing Investment team have agreed an in principle grant rate to support delivery of the affordable homes. Risk management process: LRF funded infrastructure works will not commence unless the development can be fully funded. In this scenario the LRF monies can also be returned. | | Medium | High | Medium | | |
| Calculated rate (Extent of fin | isk value in £ nancial risk) | £0 | | | | |

Outcomes and Benefits

List the outcomes and benefits expected from this project.

(An **outcome** is the result of the change derived from using the project's deliverables. This section should describe the anticipated outcome)

(A **benefit** is the measurable improvement resulting from an outcome that is perceived as an advantage. Benefits are the expected value to be delivered by the project, measurable whenever possible)

| Benefits are the expected value to be delivered by the | , , , |
|--|---|
| Financial outcomes and benefits: | Non-financial outcomes and benefits: |
| | |
| Increased value of PCC owned land once | Enables affordable, eco-friendly housing |
| funding has been used to create infrastructure | development, providing housing for people in |
| to unlock the site. | need and reducing fuel poverty. |
| A | |
| Ability for a viable housing development to | Enables provision of improved greenspace and |
| come forward as planned increasing Council | community facilities along with improved access |
| Tax income. | to existing greenspace, contributing to wellbeing |
| The project demonstrates its role of driving | This project supports and enables the delivery of |
| economic growth, providing an estimated 156 | an exemplar net-zero carbon development of a |
| jobs and supporting green recovery. It is a | range of 70 mixed tenure family homes. Our key |
| significant opportunity to increase local spend | drivers are the high demand for housing, |
| with consultants, contractors, local SME | particularly affordable family homes, and |
| contractors and a Registered Provider to | achieving carbon savings in buildings to meet |
| maximise the Plymouth pound. For every £IM | |

spent on construction locally there is a £3M improvement in the local economy.

This project will help build Plymouth's expertise in the green sector recovery and create upskilling opportunities; supporting the transition into clean growth to expand and level up economic opportunity for new jobs, training, building skills and future talent. Delivering local work will help improve talent retention and in attracting and training new workers to fill skills gaps.

Plymouth's CEAP target of net zero emissions by 2030.

Infrastructure provision will result in improvements to walking/cycling connectivity in conjunction with citywide improvements. A focus on the sustainable design and liveability of the new homes will help increase people's capacity to work from home in order to support economic performance and help tackle fuel poverty. Decent housing improves mental and physical health and children in decent housing perform better at school; this project will deliver on these aims.

The development will also provide improved pedestrian and cycling access both into and around the site. It also links to the proposed adjacent new Nature Reserve and improved surrounding greenspace totalling 27.90 ha.

| Low Carbon | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|--|--|
| What is the anticipated impact of the proposal on carbon emissions | This project will enable the delivery of an exemplar net-zero carbon development of a range of at least 40 affordable family homes, a first step towards achieving carbon savings in residential buildings. A third of UK's carbon emissions come from the energy required to heat and power its homes and so to combat climate change we have to find a way to de-carbonise housing. Working with Plymouth Energy Community (PEC) Homes, this project proposes to pioneer the Energiesprong approach to delivering net-zero carbon homes to provide a replicable and scalable model for achieving that. This aligns with our ambitions to be carbon neutral as a city by 2030. | | | |
| How does it contribute to the Council becoming Carbon neutral by 2030 | It is calculated that this scheme will achieve of 322,000kg of CO ² pa | carbon savings | | |
| Have you engaged with Pro | curement Service? | No | | |
| Procurement route options considered for goods, services or works | Option 1: PCC enter into grant agreement with procure the infrastructure works Option 2: PCC procure the works directly | PEC Homes to | | |
| Procurement's recommended route. | Option I as this would enable economies of scale due to the works being procured as part of the wider development | | | |
| Who is your Procurement Lead? | N/A | | | |
| Which Members have you engaged with and how have they been consulted (including the Leader, Portfolio Holders and Ward Members) | Cllr Vivien Pengelly, Portfolio Holder for Homes briefed in Portfolio Holder meetings | and Communities | | |

SECTION 4: FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT

FINANCIAL ASSESSMENT: In this section the robustness of the proposals should be set out in financial terms. The Project Manager will need to work closely with the capital and revenue finance teams to ensure that these sections demonstrate the affordability of the proposals to the Council as a whole.

| CAPITAL COSTS AN | CAPITAL COSTS AND FINANCING | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-------|---------|---------|-------|-------|----------------|---------|
| Breakdown of project costs including fees | Prev. Yr. | 21/22 | 22/23 | 23/24 | 24/25 | 25/26 | Future Yrs. | Total |
| surveys and contingency | £m | £m | £m | £m | £m | £m | £m | £m |
| Levelling | | | 250,000 | 0 | | | | |
| Access road and infrastructure | | | 50,000 | 300,000 | | | | |
| Total capital spend | | | 300,000 | 300,000 | | | | 600,000 |

| Provide details of proposed funding: Funding to match with Project Value | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|
| Breakdown of proposed funding | Prev. Yr. £m | 21/22 £m | 22/23 £m | 23/24 £m | 24/25 £m | 25/26 £m | Future Yrs. £m | Total £m |
| As above | 600,000 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| Total funding | 600,000 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | 600,000 |

| Which | |
|-------------|---|
| external | |
| funding | |
| sources bee | n |
| explored | |

Plymouth City Council was allocated £600,000 of LRF to support the provision of infrastructure costs to unlock the site.

The LRF funded works will support the provision of infrastructure to include site levelling, access road and associated sustainable drainage solutions and utility connections.

Are there any bidding constraints and/or any restrictions or conditions attached to your funding

Annex A: Conditions of Funding

This funding will be awarded pursuant to a Section 31 Grant Determination with the condition that the grant may be used only for the purposes that a capital receipt may be used for, in accordance with regulations made under section 11 of the Local Government Act 2003.

This funding will be awarded on the condition that the LRF scheme meets all of the Gateway Criteria set out on page 7 the "One Public Estate and Land Release Fund September 2020 Prospectus." For ease, these criteria are repeated here:

- The land to which the bid relates is fully owned by the local authority. For schemes of mixed land ownership funding would only be available to support work that delivers local authority land release:
- The project must be undertaking capital works on council-owned land only:
- Funding must enable the release of the land for housing by end March 2023 or earlier, and must address market failure;
- The works for which funding is sought are deliverable and within a timeframe that will enable the land to be released in time:

- The project must not exceed an intervention level of £15,000 per housing unit of central government investment into the scheme;
- The project must provide a Benefit Cost Ratio of 1.5 or higher, based on the LRF Technical Annex.

If, after the award of funding and before the release of land, the scheme is no longer able to meet these criteria, MHCLG will consider whether it can continue to support the project. If MHCLG determines that it can no longer support the project, it will request the return of funding.

Future monitoring and assurance

The Council will obliged to report on the progress of the LRF supported scheme, three times a year – or as otherwise determined – by MHCLG and OPE, through its OPE partnership.

The Council's project leads for the LRF schemes are expected to report on the six key milestones as detailed below within each such tri-annual report, as well as provide a narrative on the project's key risks/issues to delivery.

The six milestones are:

1. Procurement of infrastructure works: contractor commencement date

This relates to the specific works funded by the LRF award. E.g. decontamination, utility or infrastructure provision. The date entered should be the date on which tenders are issued.

2. Commencement of LRF funded works date

I "37.5 OPE 2020 prospectus_v09a.pdf" 09/09/2020, Local Government Association. Reference code (37.5), page 7.

https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/37.5%20OPE%20202 0%20prospectus v09a.pdf

2 LRF Technical Annex.

https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/Copy%20of%20LRF2 Tech Annex.xlsx

This refers to the first of the funded works, if multiple. LRF funded works defined as above.

3. Completion of LRF funded works date (last of the funded works, if multiple)

Definition of LRF funded works as above.

4. Date land is to be released

Land counts as released when:

- a) An unconditional contract, development agreement or building license with a private or partner is signed, or a freehold or leasehold transfer takes place
- b) Land has transferred to a development vehicle owned, or partly owned, by the local authority; or

| | c) The point at which development begins on site if (a) and (b) have not happened. |
|--------------------------|---|
| | 5. Expected start on site (new homes) |
| | a. Homes England defines a start as an excavation for strip or trench foundations or for pad footings; digging out and preparation of ground for raft foundations; vibroflotation, piling, boring for piles or pile driving; or draining work specific to the scheme. |
| | 6. Expected development end date (final housing unit completion). |
| | All partnerships are assigned dedicated OPE Regional Programme Managers. Any changes to plans and/or project outputs must be agreed in writing by programme partners, the OPE Regional Team and MHCLG. |
| Tax and VAT implications | There is no option to tax on this site |
| Tax and VAT reviewed by | Sarah Scott |

| REVENUE COSTS AND IMPLICATIONS | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Cost of Developing the Capital Project (To be incurred at risk | Cost of Developing the Capital Project (To be incurred at risk to Service area) | | | | |
| Total Cost of developing the project | None for PCC if procured as part of wider development. Should PCC procure directly then Officer time will be capitalised | | | | |
| Revenue cost code for the development costs | N/A | | | | |
| Revenue costs incurred for developing the project are to be included in the capital total, some of the expenditure could be capitalised if it meets the criteria | N/A | | | | |
| Budget Managers Name | N/A | | | | |

| Ongoing Revenue Implications for S | ervice Ar | rea | | | | | |
|---|--------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|----------------|
| | Prev. Yr. | 21/22 £ | 22/23 £ | 23/24 £ | 23/24 £ | 25/25 £m | Future Yrs. |
| Service area revenue cost | | | | | | | |
| Other (eg: maintenance, utilities, etc) | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| Loan repayment (terms agreed with Treasury Management) | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| Total Revenue Cost (A) | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| Service area revenue benefits/savings | | | | | | | |
| Annual revenue income (eg: rents, etc) | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |
| Total Revenue Income (B) | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 |

| Service area net (benefit) cost (B-A) | | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | £0 | |
|--|-------------------------------|------------------|--|--------------|----|----|------------------|-----|--|
| Has the revenue cost been budgeted for or would this make a revenue pressure | | N/A | | | | | | | |
| Which cost centre would the revenue pressure be shown | | N/A | N/A Has this been reviewed by the budget manager | | Y | /N | | | |
| Name of b | udget man | ager | N/A | | | | | | |
| Loan value | £ | Interest Rate | S | Tern Year | N/ | A | Annual Repaym | ent | |
| Revenue code for annual repayments | | N/A | | | | | | | |
| Service area or corporate borrowing | | N/A | | | | | | | |
| Revenue in by | Revenue implications reviewed | | N/A | | | | | | |

Version Control: (The version control table must be updated and signed off each time a change is made to the document to provide an audit trail for the revision and update of draft and final versions)

| Author of Business Case | Date | Document Version | Reviewed By | Date |
|-------------------------|------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------|
| Liz Dunster | 08/07/2021 | v 1.0 | Emmanuelle Marshall | 09/07/2021 |
| Liz Dunster | 02/09/2021 | v 2.0 | Neil Mawson | 03/09/2021 |
| Liz Dunster | 13/09/2021 | V3.0 | Neil Mawson | 13/09/2021 |

SECTION 6: RECOMMENDATION AND ENDORSEMENT

Recommended Decision

It is recommended that the Leader of the Council:

- Approves the Business Case
- Allocates £600,000 for the project into the Capital Programme funded by LRF
- In the event that the Council decides that it will procure the works itself:
 - Authorises the procurement process
 - Delegates the award of the contract to the Service Director for Strategic Planning and Infrastructure

| Cllr Nick Kelly, Leader | | Service Director | | |
|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|------------|--|
| Either email dated: | Date: 20/10/2021 | Either email dated: | 12/10/2021 | |
| Or signed: | | Signed: | | |
| Date: | | Date: | | |
| | | Service Director | | |
| | | Anthony Payne | | |
| | | Either email dated: | 12/10/2021 | |
| | | Signed: | | |
| | | Date: | | |

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Place Directorate, Strategic Planning and Infrastructure, Housing



STAGE I: WHAT IS BEING ASSESSED AND BY WHOM?

| What is being assessed - including a brief description of aims and objectives? | We are conducting this equality impact assessment of a housing development scheme. Kings Tamerton is a Plymouth City Council (PCC) led project to deliver 68 net-zero carbon homes including 38 affordable community-led homes. It aims to be a flagship scheme for innovation and to pioneer a new approach to net-zero carbon homes, incorporating Modern Methods of Construction. It will provide a replicable and scalable model and be the catalyst for a future pipeline of net-zero carbon homes across the city. | |
|--|--|--|
| Author | Emmanuelle Marshall/Liz Dunster | |
| Department and service | Place Directorate, Strategic Planning and Infrastructure, Housing | |
| Date of assessment | June 2021 (as part of business case for the development) | |

STAGE 2: EVIDENCE AND IMPACT

| Protected characteristics (Equality Act) | Evidence and information (e.g. data and feedback) | Any adverse impact See guidance on how to make judgement | Actions | Timescale and who is responsible |
|--|---|--|---------|----------------------------------|
| Age | Age has a significant impact on people's ability to secure a home. Rising house prices, a shortage of properties and changes to housing benefit are making it hard for young people to get on to the housing ladder or achieve independence. This means they are now more likely to live with parents or remain in the private rented sector. This could lead to younger people putting off having children or taking second jobs to help save for their own home. | The scheme is unlikely to have an adverse impact on these protected categories. It is anticipated to have a marginally positive impact on the less well off, as 55% of the housing on offer is for affordable homes, in excess of the minimum standard. The scheme will also increase the overall housing stock of the city, | N/A | N/A |

Version 2, February 2015 OFFICIAL

| _ |
|---------------|
| Ų |
| ЭÇ |
| æ |
| ١, |
| $\frac{1}{8}$ |

| | Housing for older people is also a concern with the Centre for Ageing Better highlighting that more than two million older people live in homes that endanger their health and wellbeing and do not meet basic government standards. | possibly bringing a level of remediation to housing shortages. It will also increase the quality of the housing stock on offer. | | |
|--------------------|--|--|-----|-----|
| Disability | In Plymouth, a total of 31,164 people (from 28.5 per cent of households) declared themselves as having a long-term health problem or disability in the 2011 Census. 10 per cent of our population have their day-today activities limited a lot by a long-term health problem or disability (2011 Census). People with disabilities aged 16 to 64 years in the UK were less likely to own their own home (40.9 per cent) than other people (53.4 per cent), and more likely to have rented social housing (at 24.9 per cent compared with 7.8 per cent) (year ending June 2020). Although the gap in non-decent accommodation has closed over recent years, one in three households with a person with a disability still lives in non-decent accommodation. One in five people with disabilities requiring adaptations to their home believe that their accommodation is not suitable. | The scheme is unlikely to have an adverse impact on these protected categories. Our policy is that 20% of the housing will be accessible to people with limited mobility. | N/A | N/A |
| Religion or belief | The impact of religious beliefs on people's ability to secure housing are not widely studied and relatively little is known. The 2011 census recorded that Christians are the largest faith community in the city. The majority of people identify themselves with some religion. Islam is the religion with the second largest number of followers and there are small but significant numbers of Buddhists, Hindus, Sikhs, Jews and Ba'hai. Other belief systems with small numbers of followers include Humanists, Pagans and Spiritualists. | The scheme is unlikely to have an adverse impact on these protected categories. | N/A | N/A |

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT Page 2 of 7

| Sex - including marriage, pregnancy and maternity | 50.3 per cent of the Plymouth population are female and 49.7 per cent are male. In the UK, according to a 2017 study by the Women's Budget Group, women's housing situation differs from that of men, and is generally less good. No region in England is affordable to rent in the private market on women's median earnings. As for buying property, the median home in England costs over 12 times women's median wages (8 times for men). 67% of adults in households accepted as statutorily homeless are women [1], reflecting their risk of loss of secure housing, and their responsibility for caring for children. 60% of adults in households claiming housing benefit are women [2] reflecting women's lower incomes. 57% of adults in social renting are women, [3] reflecting women's lower incomes. [1] MHCLG livetable 780 for 2017/18. Only 'experimental' data are available for 2018/19. Calculation assumes couple household claimants include an equal total number of men and women, and exclude 'other' households [2] Department of Work and Pensions (2018) Housing Benefit Caseload Statistics: data to May 2018 [3] MHCLG livetable FA1221(S108) for 2017/18 | The scheme is unlikely to have an adverse impact on these protected categories. | N/A | N/A |
|---|---|---|-----|-----|
| Gender reassignment | There are no official estimates for gender reassignment at either national or local level. However, in a study funded by the Home Office, the Gender Identity Research and Education Society (GIRES) estimate that between 300,000 and 500,000 people aged 16 or over in the UK are experiencing some degree of gender variance. Reports from the Out Youth Group in Plymouth show a steady increase in transgender members, particularly transgender men. | The scheme is unlikely to have an adverse impact on these protected categories. | N/A | N/A |

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT Page 3 of 7

| | The impact of gender reassignment on people's ability to secure housing is not well known. Trans people experience a lot of social stigma and discrimination. They may be vulnerable to harassment and 'hate crime' in their communities. Trans people may experience poverty due to discrimination in employment or lack of economic support from family or friends. 25 per cent of trans respondents surveyed in Scotland in 2007 stated that they had previously had to move out of their home due to the transphobia from families, flatmates or neighbours. 4 per cent of | | | |
|------|--|---|-----|-----|
| | the respondents were homeless at the point of survey [1] [1] Scottish Transgender Alliance (2008) Transgender experiences in Scotland, Edinburgh, Scottish Transgender Alliance | | | |
| Race | There is some evidence of the impacts of race on people's ability to secure accommodation. Whilst the proportion of Plymouth residents that are White British remains higher than the UK average, it is decreasing. At the time of the 2001 census, 97 per cent of Plymouth's population was White British. By 2011 this had decreased to 93 per cent. Local population growth between the 2001 and 2011 census had been driven by migration from outside the UK (63 per cent), most commonly from newly admitted EU countries. Our ethnic minority communities are very diverse. The Polish, Chinese and Kurdish communities are amongst the largest. We have a small resident Gypsy and Traveller community. We are also a dispersal area for asylum seekers and around 300 people will be accommodated in the city at any given time. Asylum seekers within the city are accommodated in | The scheme is unlikely to have an adverse impact on these protected categories. | N/A | N/A |

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT Page 4 of 7

supported accommodation provided by the Home Office.

In 2016 to 2018, 17% of households (3.9 million) in England lived in social housing (they rented their home from a local authority or housing association)

Black African (44%), Mixed White and Black African (41%) and Black Caribbean (40%) households were most likely to rent social housing out of all ethnic groups

Indian (7%), Chinese (10%), and White Other (11%) households had lower rates of renting social housing.

Across most income bands, White British households were less likely to rent social housing than households from all other ethnic groups combined.

As a group, ethnic minority households are also more likely to rent privately than White British households.

Housing quality varies between ethnic groups. Across all socio-economic groups, age groups, most regions and income bands, and regardless of whether they owned or rented their home, White British households were less likely to be overcrowded than households from all other ethnic groups combined.

In 2017/18, there were 2.4 homeless households for every 1,000 households in England.

In Plymouth in 2019/20, of the 294 households that were decided as being in statutory homeless, 271 were White, 9 from Black ethnic groups, 4 from Asian ethnic groups, 4 Mixed ethnic background, 5 were from other ethnic groups, while the ethnicity was unknown for 1 person.

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT Page 5 of 7

| Sexual orientation - including civil partnership | Figures from the annual population survey have revealed that the number of people identifying as lesbian, gay or bisexual in the UK has increased from 1.6% in 2014 to 2.2% in 2018, an increase of more than a third. The Office of National Statistics said that those "in their late teens and early 20s are more likely to identify as LGB than older age groups," while "more than two-thirds of the LGB population are single and have never married or entered into a civil partnership. | The scheme is unlikely to have an adverse impact on these protected categories. | N/A | N/A |
|--|---|---|-----|-----|
| | Relatively little is known about the challenges LGB people face in relation to housing. In 2007 Stonewall commissioned a poll which revealed 20 per cent of LGB people expected to be treated less favourably than a straight person when applying for social housing. | | | |

STAGE 3: ARE THERE ANY IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FOLLOWING? IF SO, PLEASE RECORD ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN

| Local priorities | Implications | Timescale and who is responsible |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Celebrate diversity and ensure that Plymouth is a welcoming city. | Positive implications as the site is community-led and the tenure mixed. | |
| Pay equality for women, and staff with disabilities in our workforce. | None | |
| Supporting our workforce through the implementation of Our People Strategy 2020 – 2024 | None | |
| Supporting victims of hate crime so they feel confident to report incidents, and working with, and through our partner organisations to achieve positive outcomes. | None | |

EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT Page 6 of 7

| U |
|----------|
| Ø |
| Ó |
| Θ |
| 2 |
| (.) |

| Plymouth is a city where people from different backgrounds get along well. | Positive implications as the site is community-led and the tenure mixed. | |
|--|--|--|
| Human rights Please refer to guidance | We have considered human rights implications and have found that the decision is compliant with the Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA). | |

STAGE 4: PUBLICATION

Responsible Officer: Anthony Payne

Date: 12/10/2021

Strategic Director for Place

This page is intentionally left blank