



Please ask for Rachel Appleyard  
Direct Line: 01246 34 5277  
Email [committee.services@chesterfield.gov.uk](mailto:committee.services@chesterfield.gov.uk)

The Chair and Members of Cabinet

12 October 2020

Dear Councillor,

Please attend a meeting of the CABINET to be held on TUESDAY, 20 OCTOBER 2020 at 10.30 am, the agenda for which is set out below.

This meeting will be held virtually via Microsoft Teams software, for which members of the Cabinet and others in attendance will receive an invitation. Members of the public will be able to access the meeting online by following the link [here](#).

AGENDA

Part 1(Public Information)

1. Declarations of Members' and Officers' Interests relating to items on the Agenda
2. Apologies for Absence
3. Minutes (Pages 3 - 6)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 29 September, 2020.

4. Forward Plan

Please follow the link below to view the latest Forward Plan.

[Forward Plan](#)

5. Delegation Report (Pages 7 - 10)

Items Recommended to Cabinet via Cabinet Members

Deputy Leader

6. Council Plan - Delivery Plan 2020/21 half year performance report (Pages 11 - 52)

Cabinet Member for Economic Growth

7. Planning for the Future - Planning White Paper Response (Pages 53 - 82)

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'R. Smith', written in a cursive style.

Local Government and Regulatory Law Manager and Monitoring Officer

## CABINET

Tuesday, 29th September, 2020

Present:-

Councillor P Gilby (Chair)

Councillors Serjeant  
Blank  
T Gilby  
Holmes

Councillors J Innes  
Mannion-Brunt  
Sarvent

Non-voting Members D Collins

\*Matters dealt with under the Delegation Scheme

175 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' AND OFFICERS' INTERESTS  
RELATING TO ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

No declarations of interest were received.

176 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ludlow.

177 **MINUTES**

**RESOLVED –**

That the Minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 8 September, 2020 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

178 **FORWARD PLAN**

The Forward Plan for the four month period 1 October, 2020 to 31 January, 2021 was reported for information.

**\*RESOLVED –**

That the Forward Plan be noted.

179 **MINUTES OF THE SHEFFIELD CITY REGION MAYORAL COMBINED AUTHORITY BOARD**

Minutes of the meeting of the Sheffield City Region Mayoral Combined Authority held on 27 July, 2020 were reported for information.

**\*RESOLVED –**

That the Minutes be noted.

180 **CHESTERFIELD BOROUGH COVID19 STRATEGIC AND COMMUNITY RECOVERY APPROACH**

The Executive Director and Assistant Director - Health and Wellbeing submitted a report setting out a proposed strategic approach to support the borough in recovering from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The approach included three key elements; one of these, the economic recovery plan, had been approved by the Joint Cabinet and Employment and General Committee on 14 July, 2020. The remaining two elements outlined in the report were:

- a proposal to adopt four targeted recovery priorities to support the overall recovery; and
- a proposal to endorse a community recovery approach, focussed on working with partners across the borough in supporting and promoting community wellbeing.

The four targeted recovery priorities, detailed in paragraph 4.8 of the officer's report, would provide key focus for the council's activities and help to address the widening inequalities in society. The priorities would be adopted and embedded across the organisation as part of the delivery of council services.

The 'Chesterfield community recovery approach – supporting and promoting community wellbeing', attached at Appendix A of the officer's report, provided information on the significant partnership work that was carried out during the initial response stages of the pandemic, and set out the longer term impact areas for the recovery work to directly focus on.

The Council would work in partnership with the Chesterfield Strategic Community Wellbeing Coordination Group to develop more detailed work programmes, considering the delivery mechanisms and future resource requirements.

The report sought approval for an allocation of £30k from the council's budget risk reserve to create an emergency community wellbeing fund that could be targeted at supporting communities, either directly by the council or through partner agencies.

**\*RESOLVED –**

1. That the following four targeted recovery priorities to support the overall COVID-19 recovery process across the borough be approved;
  - **Partnership and collaboration**; having a relentless focus on developing and delivering services and activities with our partners to deliver better outcomes for communities across Chesterfield;
  - **Social Connectedness**; supporting and promoting activity that tackles loneliness and social isolation, including tackling digital exclusion;
  - **Young people**; prioritising young people in everything we do, seeking out opportunities to support our young people to be the best that they can be;
  - **Carbon reduction**; taking positive steps to deliver a green recovery.
2. That the Council actively promotes these targeted recovery priorities with partners, as well as adopting and embedding them across the organisation as part of the delivery of Council services.
3. That the 'Chesterfield community recovery approach – Supporting and promoting community wellbeing'; as set out in Appendix A of the officer's report, including support for a direct focus on key impact areas and the cross-cutting commitments and enablers set out in paragraphs 4.14 and 4.15 of the officer's report, be endorsed.
4. That it be noted that, as work is progressed with partners in developing activities and work programmes to deliver against the targeted recovery priorities and the community recovery approach, it

is anticipated that further resources will be required and, if so, 3 further reports will be presented to Cabinet for consideration and approval.

5. That the allocation of £30,000 to create an emergency community wellbeing fund that can be targeted at supporting communities, either directly by the council or through partner agencies, including the voluntary and community sector, to assist in managing the ongoing response and recovery associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, be approved.
6. That use of the Council's budget risk reserve to fund the £30,000 emergency fund be approved.

## **REASON FOR DECISIONS**

The unprecedented impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the borough has led to the Council putting in place response and recovery activities to support its residents, business and communities. This report seeks to set out both a strategic and a community recovery approach to support this critical work going forward.

## CABINET MEETING

20 October 2020

## DELEGATION REPORT

### DECISIONS TAKEN BY LEAD MEMBERS

#### Leader (Joint Board with NEDDC and Bolsover DC)

Decision Record No.	Subject	Delegation Reference	Date of Decision
<b>52/19/20</b>	<b>Internal Audit Consortium - Annual Report 2019/20</b>	<b>LC060L</b>	<b>22 September 2020</b>
<p>Decision</p> <p>That the annual report of the Internal Audit Consortium be approved.</p>			
<p>Reason for Decision</p> <p>To enable the Joint Board to consider and approve the 2019/20 Annual Report of the Internal Audit Consortium.</p>			
<b>53/19/20</b>	<b>External Review of Internal Audit</b>	<b>LC060L</b>	<b>22 September 2020</b>
<p>Decision</p> <p>That the Joint Board note the report.</p>			
<p>Reason for Decision</p> <p>To consult members on the format of the external review of internal audit that is required by the Public Sector Internal Audit Standards.</p>			

Decision Record No.	Subject	Delegation Reference	Date of Decision
<b>54/19/20</b>	<b>Update on the Derbyshire-wide Building Control Partnership</b>	<b>LC060L</b>	<b>22 September 2020</b>
<p>Decision</p> <p>That the update on the Derbyshire-wide Building Control Partnership be noted.</p>			
<p>Reason for Decision</p> <p>To enable the Joint Board to consider an update on the Derbyshire-Wide Building Control Partnership.</p>			

### **Cabinet Member for Business Transformation and Customers**

Decision Record No.	Subject	Delegation Reference	Date of Decision
<b>55/19/20</b>	<b>Discretionary Test and Trace Support Payments Scheme</b>	<b>CB000L</b>	<b>09 October 2020</b>
<p>Decision</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That Chesterfield Borough Council's Local Authority Discretionary Test and Trace Support Payments scheme be approved and implemented from 12 October, 2020.</li> <li>2. That the Assistant Director – Customers, Commissioning and Change, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business Transformation and Customers and Arvato's Head of Operations, be granted delegated authority to complete regular reviews the scheme and revise the scheme criteria where necessary.</li> </ol>			
<p>Reason for Decision</p> <p>To enable the Council to implement a Discretionary Test and Trace Support Payment scheme, which will benefit eligible local people who have to self-isolate and who do not meet the criteria of the national Test and Trace Support Payment scheme.</p>			

This page is intentionally left blank

## For Publication

### Half year performance report – Council Plan Delivery Plan 2020-21 (J040)

<b>Meeting:</b>	Cabinet
<b>Date:</b>	20 October 2020
<b>Cabinet portfolio:</b>	Deputy Leader
<b>Directorate:</b>	Policy and Communications

#### **1.0 Purpose of the report**

- 1.1 To report and enable challenge of progress on the Council Plan Delivery Plan for 2020/21 during quarters 1 and 2.
- 1.2 To highlight the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on priority areas and enable re-scheduling of priorities where appropriate.

#### **2.0 Recommendations**

- 2.1 That members note the significant achievements against the priority areas within the Council Plan Delivery Plan and the contributions made by staff during the Covid-19 pandemic.
- 2.2 That Corporate Management Team leads for all amber rated milestones meet with relevant key officers to develop improvement strategies to support further progress in quarters 3 and 4.
- 2.3 That the milestones rated as red for delivery are re-assessed in light of the Covid-19 impact and resource reprioritisation and then considered for inclusion in 2021/22 delivery plan.

#### **3.0 Reasons for recommendations**

- 3.1 To progress delivery of the Council Plan Delivery Plan for 2020/21 and maximise positive outputs and outcomes for our communities.

## **4.0 Report details**

### 4.1 Background

The Council Plan 2019 – 2023 was agreed by Council in February 2019. The plan identifies the Council’s key priorities, objectives and commitments over a four year period. In order to track and challenge progress across the four years, annual delivery plans are developed. This report highlights performance during quarters 1 and 2 (April – September 2020).

### 4.2 Covid-19 impact

The World Health Organisation declared the outbreak of Covid-19 to be a public health emergency of international concern on 30 January 2020 and on 11 March 2020 declared Covid-19 a global pandemic.

- 4.3 The Covid-19 pandemic brought fast moving and unprecedented challenges to communities and organisations. Chesterfield Borough Council had to quickly reprioritise to ensure core services could be delivered, while supporting additional emergency planning, community response and economic measures.

- 4.4 Staff across the Council were re-deployed to support key Covid-19 response activities including ensuring key services such as the crematorium could be maintained but also to support new areas of work including business grant allocations, food and medicine deliveries, supporting testing facilities, town centre ambassadors and supporting the community and voluntary sector volunteering programmes. This re-prioritisation of resources and Covid-19 related safety measures including social distancing have had a significant impact on the Council’s ability to deliver on elements of the delivery plan for 2020/21. This impact has now been assessed alongside the performance progress with some recommendations being made regarding re-prioritisation and deferral.

### 4.5 Overall performance and Covid-19 impact

Appendix 1 shows the progress made on the 41 milestones being tracked during 2020/21 as well as the Covid-19 impact.

4.6 63% of milestones within the delivery plan for 2020/21 have been impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic to a medium to high extent. Despite this 46% of the milestones remain on target for delivery by the end of March 2021. A further 24% are currently rated as amber for delivery with actions being put into place to improve where possible. 30% of milestones are rated as red and there is certainty that delivery will not be possible during 2020/21.

#### 4.7 Making Chesterfield a thriving borough

47% of the milestones remain on target for delivery in 2020/21. Despite the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic excellent progress has been achieved on key projects including:

- Construction has started on the Northern Gateway enterprise centre
- First phase of commercial development at Waterside
- Seeking to maximise Staveley Town Deal potential
- Successfully bidding for £2.4 million in external funding to help secure maximum benefits from HS2 for Chesterfield communities and businesses
- Progressing ambitious plans for the Heart of Chesterfield project including securing a further £650k in external funding to support market improvements
- Refreshing the skills action plan and activities to ensure it responds to the significant employment and skills challenges emerging from the pandemic, in particular for young people

4.8 There are instances where the milestone will be delivered in terms of Council activity but will not be as successful in terms of outcomes due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. A good example of this is continuing to support the delivery of the Elder Way development. While Chesterfield Borough Council and Destination Chesterfield continue to support the developers Jomast to market the development and secure interest, the pandemic has had a negative impact in converting interest into tenancies due to market confidence particularly in the hospitality and leisure sectors. This is a key issue identified within our economic recovery plan which includes a range of activities aimed at providing support and boosting confidence for both

customers and businesses with a particular focus on town centre recovery.

4.9 There are a number of milestones that due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic will not be achievable during 2020/21:

- HS2 and you programme - The HS2 and you programme was paused from March 2020 due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on school provision. Conversations with schools have indicated that they will require a significant amount of recovery and catch up time for students and that they may not be able to re-join the programme until 2021
- Visitor economy action plan delivery - Progress on the preparation of the Visitor Economy Action Plan has been delayed as other projects have been prioritised, most notably in relation to the Council's response to the Covid-19 pandemic. The Covid-19 pandemic has had a major impact on the visitor economy, with sectors such as leisure, hospitality and retail disproportionately affected by lockdown and the continuation of social distancing measures. The delay in preparing the Action Plan provides an opportunity to better understand the potential longer-term impacts of Covid-19 on the visitor economy and appropriately respond to these within the Action Plan
- Deliver a programme of Borough wide events - The events programme has been critically impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic. Major events for 2020/21 have been cancelled due to social distancing requirements. Teams across the Council have worked hard to provide alternative digital provision with a range of activities for residents of all ages to try. Social media, print and web campaigns have also been launched to support the key aim of economic recovery of our High streets as part of our economic recovery plan
- Further develop the visitor offer at the Pomegranate and Winding Wheel Theatres - Expanding the visitor offer will not be possible during 2020/21 due to the social distancing guidance and recovery period required for core provision
- Deliver new business units at Calow Lane - Progress in the development of the business units at Calow Lane have been impacted by Covid-19 pandemic reprioritisation. Economic Development resources have been focused on economic recovery planning and ensuring key live projects such as the Northern Gateway Enterprise Centre can continue and operate safely within the new health and safety and social distancing guidelines

4.10 The milestones detailed at 4.9 will need to be re-assessed in light of the Covid-19 impact and reprioritisation and considered for inclusion in the 2021/22 delivery plan.

4.11 Improving quality of life for local people

73% of the milestones remain on target for delivery in 2020/21. Many of these milestones aligned with key activity required to ensure a resilient and effective community response during the pandemic. Strong progress has been achieved on key milestones including:

- Rough sleepers strategy - The Covid-19 pandemic has placed an absolute focus on rough sleeping. The Getting everyone in and Keeping Everyone In requirements have improved access to support and accommodation
- Assess private sector stock condition survey and develop a costed action plan for improvement – the stock condition survey has been completed. Further work is now being undertaken to determine investment priorities
- Deliver year 2 of the five-year housing environmental schemes programme – improvement works at Grangewood are now complete. Phase 1 at Barrow Hill is complete with phase 2 progressing on time and within budget
- Deliver year 1 of the climate change plan – significant progress against key areas including housing capital programme priorities, energy efficiency, tree planting etc.
- Plan and deliver with the Equality and Diversity Forum four equality and diversity events - Following successful virtual meetings of the Equality and Diversity Forum, virtual events are now being planned for late autumn and winter 2020/21 as well as a significant research project linked to the 2021 Census
- Implement the Derbyshire Care Leaver Offer - Core elements of the Care Leaver Offer are now in place including council tax support, housing policy changes and key worker activity plus enhanced leisure provision
- Armed Forces Covenant action plan – Core elements now in place including revised leave policy for reservists, attained the Bronze Award in the Ministry of Defence's Employer Recognition Scheme, service concessions etc.

4.12 There are two milestones that due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic will not be achievable during 2020/21:

- Develop and deliver schemes and trials to increase recycling rates - Maintaining core services has been key during the Covid-19 pandemic. Despite the challenges waste and recycling services have continued to perform well. We have not had the capacity to develop new schemes and trials during this period
- Plan and deliver the 2020/21 local democracy programme - The local democracy programme was paused from March 2020 due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on school provision. Conversations with schools has indicated that they will require a significant amount of recovery and catch up time for students and that they may not be able to re-join the programme until 2021

4.13 The milestones detailed at 4.12 will need to be re-assessed in light of the Covid-19 impact and reprioritisation and considered for inclusion in the 2021/22 delivery plan.

4.14 Provide value for money services

18% of the milestones remain on target for delivery in 2020/21. One of which, the ICT improvement programme, has been fundamental to enabling services to continue during the Covid-19 pandemic. We have also successfully transitioned Kier from the Arvato/Kier public private partnership contract early and plans are in place to return all services to the Council in early 2021.

4.15 55% of the milestones in this priority area are rated as amber. This is mainly due to delays caused by the re-prioritisation required for Covid-19 or the fluid situation emerging around impact and recovery for instance the impact on the Council's medium-term financial plan. These areas are being prioritised for effort in the second half of the year.

4.16 There are three milestones that due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic will not be achievable during 2020/21:

- Review the Council's commercial approach, services and investment portfolios and deliver actions resulting from the review - Covid-19 has had a major impact on the Council's commercial activity. As the short, medium and longer terms impacts emerge this will inform the review and help to develop our future approach
- Develop our future ICT Strategy for 2022/2023 onwards - Maintaining the progress on the current ICT programme has been the priority. This has enabled rapid transformation to enable

services to keep running during the pandemic. The medium and long-term impacts of the pandemic will have a major influence on the future ICT programme

- Complete the Investor in People Assessment improving silver scores in key areas - Full Investors in People assessment was due to take place in January 2021, however due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic this has been delayed until 2022. Current Silver IIP status will be extended by a strategic review in January 2021 and also provide focus areas for the full assessment in 2022

4.17 The milestones detailed at 4.16 will need to be re-assessed in light of the Covid-19 impact and reprioritisation and considered for inclusion in the 2021/22 delivery plan.

## **5.0 Alternative options**

5.1 No alternative options have been identified.

## **6.0 Implications for consideration – Council Plan**

6.1 The Delivery Plan for 2020/21 contributes to the overall delivery of the Council Plan 2019 – 2023. The performance progress and Covid-19 impact and response will be considered during the next review of the plan in February 2021.

## **7.0 Implications for consideration – Financial and value for money**

7.1 Progressing several of the milestones within the delivery plan are critical to delivering the medium term financial plan and ensuring financial sustainability.

## **8.0 Implications for consideration – Legal**

8.1 No legal considerations have been identified.

## **9.0 Implications for consideration – Human resources**

9.1 Human resource re-prioritisation to key areas during the Covid-19 pandemic had a significant impact on delivery of several milestones including the People Plan and the full investors in people assessment.

## 10.0 Implications for consideration – Risk management

Description of the Risk	Impact	Likelihood	Mitigating Action	Impact	Likelihood
Failure to make sufficient progress on plan delivery	H	H	Assessment of Covid-19 impact.  Re-prioritisation of priorities and resources.	M	M
Failure to complete projects on time/budget/to quality standards.	H	H	Performance management framework has helped to identify at risk areas due to Covid-19 pandemic and other issues. Plans in place to improve performance or re-prioritise.	M	M
Core services unable to identify contribution to the corporate priorities	H	H	Performance management framework has helped to identify at risk areas due to Covid-19 pandemic and other issues. Plans in place to improve performance or re-prioritise.	M	M

## **11.0 Implications for consideration – Community wellbeing**

11.1 Key areas of activity within the improving quality of life priority contribute significantly to community wellbeing and have continued to be prioritised during the Covid-19 pandemic.

## **12.0 Implications for consideration – Economy and skills**

12.1 Re-prioritisation of activity has focused on securing economic recovery and maximising the benefits of schemes, external funding and skills opportunities.

## **13.0 Implications for consideration – Climate Change**

13.1 The Climate Change Action Plan is one of the key priorities for delivery within the delivery plan. Progress has been maintained despite the challenges of the Covid-19 pandemic.

## **14.0 Implications for consideration – Equality and diversity**

14.1 Individual milestones are assessed for their equality and diversity impact. Overall the delivery plan makes a significant positive impact for the community including people with protected characteristics.

### **Decision information**

<b>Key decision number</b>	<b>Non-key 182</b>
<b>Wards affected</b>	<b>All</b>

### **Document information**

<b>Report author</b>
Donna Reddish – Assistant Director Policy and Communications
<b>Background documents</b>
These are unpublished works which have been relied on to a material extent when the report was prepared.
None
<b>Appendices to the report</b>



## Council Plan Delivery Plan 2020/21

### Delivery progress – April to September and COVID-19 impact

#### Making Chesterfield a thriving borough

Key milestones for 2020/21

	Milestone	Potential Covid-19 impact	RAG for delivery	Progress
TB1	Complete and open the Northern Gateway Enterprise Centre	L		<p>Robert Woodhead Ltd have been appointed as the main contractor to deliver the construction of the Northern Gateway Enterprise Centre. Building work commenced in April 2020. The delivery programme has been impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic mainly through supply chain shortages and challenges around a Covid-19 secure workplace. The latest forecast shows a likely completion date of May 2021, this continues to be regularly reviewed in line with the latest guidance and the availability within the supply chain.</p> <p>Photographs and videos of the build progressing are available via the council's website. A walkthrough video has also been developed to give potential tenants a flavour of what the new enterprise centre will have to offer. Find out more <a href="#">here</a>.</p>

				<p>A marketing strategy has been developed, with the new Centre adding to the Enterprise Chesterfield brand.</p> <p>The new building has been designed to have sustainability principles at its heart, minimising its impact on the environment.</p>
TB2	Progress the land assembly plan for the next phase of the Northern Gateway	<b>M</b>		<p>We continue to work with a range of partners and key stakeholders to explore ways to bring forward sites allocated for housing in the recently adopted Local Plan. This includes land assembly to progress the next phase of the Northern Gateway which includes significant housing numbers. It is too early to understand the full impact of Covid-19 on housing delivery and the housing market but this is being kept under review with plans and actions being adjusted accordingly.</p>
TB3	Continue to support the delivery of the Elder Way development	<b>H</b>		<p>Chesterfield Borough Council and Destination Chesterfield continue to support the developers Jomast to market the development and secure interest. Prior to the Covid-19 pandemic there had been significant interest in the remaining units at the Elder Way development and progress was being made to secure tenants.</p> <p>The Covid-19 pandemic has had a negative impact in converting interest into tenancies due to market confidence particularly in the hospitality and leisure sectors. Our economic recovery plan includes a range of activities aimed at providing support and boosting confidence for both customers and businesses with a particularly focus on town centre recovery.</p>

				<p>The £1.8m investment in public real works on Elder Way and Packers Row will be a big boost to this activity. A Contractor has been appointed and work is due to get underway within the next month with a completion of Spring 2021.</p>
TB4	Waterside – commence construction of commercial development at Basin Square	<b>L</b>		<p>The first development in the Basin Square area will begin in October 2020, following the securing of the main contractors Britcon. The build period is expected to take nine months, this is however regularly reviewed in line with the latest guidance and availability of supplies.</p> <p>Chesterfield Borough Council is working closely with Britcon to maximise the impact of the local labour clause and to support local supply chains.</p> <p>Other elements of the Waterside scheme also continue to progress. There is interest in the multi-storey car park proposed for the site with terms agreed with an operator. Progress is also being made with a hotel operator.</p>
TB5	Complete consultation, develop and adopt the HS2 station masterplan	<b>M</b>		<p>Key elements of the HS2 station masterplan are now starting to be completed including the strategic review for the transport strategy and the station layout.</p> <p>The masterplan is currently being finalised following an initial consultation phase with key partners and stakeholders. A report will</p>

				<p>be considered by Cabinet in the autumn requesting permission to start the formal planning process of consultation and engagement.</p> <p>Chesterfield Borough Council has secured external funding to support key strands of the masterplan delivery. This includes £2.4 million from D2N2 LEP to deliver a number of activities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a transport and accessibility study and preliminary designs for the highway layout</li> <li>• site wide ground investigations</li> <li>• Delivery Strategy for the proposed multi-storey car park and transport hub</li> <li>• A public realm strategy and design work towards the new pedestrian and cycle infrastructure including a new bridge</li> </ul> <p>Consultation plans may be impacted by further Covid-19 related restrictions.</p>
TB6	Progress key site acquisition strategy to maximise HS2 benefit	L		<p>The £2.4 million D2N2 LEP funding is also being used to progress the acquisition, demolition and site assembly of the former Chesterfield Hotel. This includes the submission of a planning application for a mixed use development on the site. The legal agreement to secure the site is currently progressing.</p>
TB7	Progress year 2 of the HS2 and you programme	H		<p>The HS2 and you programme was paused from March 2020 due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on school provision. Conversations with schools have indicated that they will require a significant amount of recovery and catch up time for students and</p>

				<p>that they may not be able to re-join the programme until 2021. Meanwhile work is being undertaken to develop an online provision.</p> <p>This activity will need to be deferred until 2021/22.</p>
TB8	Deliver year 1 of the Visitor Economy Action Plan	<b>H</b>		<p>Progress on the preparation of the Visitor Economy Action Plan has been delayed as other projects have been prioritised, most notably in relation to the Council's response to the Covid-19 pandemic. However, work on the Strategy and Action Plan has now restarted and a key project milestone, the preparation of the 'Chesterfield Visitor Economy Audit' was completed in August 2020. The Strategy and Action Plan itself will now be completed in 2020/21, with year 1 delivery in 2021/22.</p> <p>The Covid-19 pandemic has had a major impact on the visitor economy, with sectors such as leisure, hospitality and retail disproportionately affected by lockdown and the continuation of social distancing measures. The delay in preparing the Action Plan provides an opportunity to better understand the potential longer-term impacts of Covid-19 on the visitor economy and appropriately respond to these within the Action Plan.</p> <p>Although the completion of the Strategy and Action Plan has been delayed, there has been substantial progress on a number of projects and initiatives that will support the growth of the visitor economy, including Re-opening the High Street Safely funding, Peak Resort,</p>

				Northern Gateway and the Revitalising the heart of Chesterfield projects.
TB9	Deliver a programme of Borough wide events	<b>H</b>		<p>The events programme has been critically impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic. Major events for 2020/21 have been cancelled due to social distancing requirements including Medieval Fun Day, Walking Festival, 1940s market, Motor Fest, Fireworks extravaganza and the Christmas Lights switch on.</p> <p>Teams across the Council have worked hard to provide alternative digital provision with a range of activities for residents of all ages to try. Social media, print and web campaigns have also been launched to support the key aim of economic recovery of our High streets as part of our economic recovery plan.</p>
TB10	Re-launch the Town Centre Forum to increase engagement and activity to promote and support the Chesterfield Town Centre economy	<b>L</b>		<p>This will form a key part of our economic recovery plan. An engagement officer is currently being recruited to re-launch the forum and increase engagement activity with the business community including town centre traders and retailers.</p>
TB11	Support the development of Peak Resort and Adrenaline World, maximising the benefit for	<b>L</b>		<p>Chesterfield Borough Council continues to support the development of Peak Resort scheme which will provide significant employment opportunities for our communities. The scheme will benefit the local community by providing additional services and facilities as well as providing jobs through construction and operations on the site and opportunities for the wider supply chain and business community.</p>

	Chesterfield's economy			<p>Adrenaline World construction is underway and will provide a variety of activities including zip lines, climbing walls and a ninja course.</p> <p>Another key part of the development is the Gateway at Peak to provide environmentally friendly tourism opportunities into Chesterfield, North Derbyshire and the Peak District. The developer Milligan Retail are working in partnership with the Council, University of Derby and the Peak District National Park Authority to develop the gateway proposition and business case.</p>
TB12	Consider the options for the refurbishment of the George Stevenson Memorial Hall and progress to design phase if viable	L		<p>Due to the Covid-19 pandemic the options development stage was paused however this has now re-started and will be completed during 2020/21. This sector has however been significantly impacted by the Covid-19 pandemic and will require significant support to enable recovery. Alongside the options, a robust business case will need to be developed and considered before potentially progressing to the design phase in 2021/22 if refurbishment is viable.</p>
TB13	Develop schemes and initiatives including the town investment plan to maximise the Staveley Town Centre Deal potential	L		<p>A number of Staveley Town Board meetings and workshops have taken place. The key activity has been developing the vision for Staveley. Further stakeholder engagement is taking place to sharpen the vision and start to develop the Staveley Investment Plan.</p> <p>A Staveley Town Deal Manager has been appointed to lead on the development of the Investment Plan and to facilitate the Staveley Town Board. A key early priority was the completion of the bid for</p>

				<p>£500k of accelerator funding from Government to develop the plans further. We are currently awaiting the outcome of this bid.</p> <p>The Staveley Town Board are preparing and aiming to submit the Town Investment Plan to Government in October 2020. The plan will include a number of business cases for key strategic projects that will support the delivery of the Staveley Town Deal vision and transform Staveley's economic growth prospects with a focus on employment opportunities, improved transport, skills and culture.</p> <p>Stakeholder and public consultation plans are now in place and activities are being developed to ensure that young Staveley residents can also engage in the activities and contribute to future plans.</p> <p>The Investment Plan will enable the draw down of further funding for the projects and activities.</p> <p>In addition, we are actively engaging with D2N2 and the other town deal areas in Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire to collaborate and learn from best practice.</p>
TB14	Further develop the visitor offer at the Pomegranate and Winding Wheel Theatres	<b>H</b>		<p>Focus during 2020/21 so far has been around re-opening the theatres as a Covid-19 secure venue to ensure the safety of customers and staff. The Pomegranate Theatre has returned as a cinema and the Winding Wheel can now accept bookings for meetings and activities.</p>

				<p>Limited live performance activity is also starting. All activities have to be carefully risk assessed to ensure safety.</p> <p>Expanding the visitor offer will not be possible during 2020/21 due to the social distancing guidance and recovery period required for core provision. This situation will however be kept under review as more is known about the medium and long term impacts for the sector.</p>
TB15	Conduct research and develop options for alternative usage of retail space in the town centres	L		<p>Research has continued alongside scenario planning and mitigating the impact on town centres following the Covid-19 pandemic. This activity is more important than ever as we seek to understand the impact and prospects for the retail, leisure, hospitality, tourism and service sectors.</p>
TB16	Progressing the Heart of Chesterfield programme including commencement of the Market reconfiguration project	M		<p>The revitalising the Heart of Chesterfield programme comprises of three key scheme elements: the reconfiguration of the outdoor market; infrastructure to support events and activities and the provision of enhanced public realm linked to the Northern Gateway development.</p> <p>Although the Covid-19 pandemic has adversely impacted on the timescale for scheme completion, progress has continued to be made. Additional funding of £650k from the D2N2 LEP was approved in August 2020. This funding will enable an upgrade of the market reconfiguration works (£350k) and an extension of the public realm works scheduled for Elder Way to be extended to Packers Row (as far as the junction with High St).</p>

				<p>Bentley Project Management were appointed at the beginning of 2020 to support delivery of the project. The design work will not only consider a scheme in relation to the available project funding (£1.15m) but also a more ambitious proposal that could form the basis of future scheme delivery. The deadline for scheme delivery is November 2021.</p> <p>The public realm element of the scheme has continued to progress with the appointment of the contractor for works delivery and the securing of DCC Highway Authority construction approval. Construction works will now commence in October 2020 with practical completion in Spring 2021.</p>
TB17	Develop and adopt a long-term parking strategy including electric vehicle charging	<b>M</b>		<p>Development of the parking strategy is underway, however specific aspects of delivery and improvement have already been progressed.</p> <p>A total replacement of the now obsolete parking equipment is underway. This will deliver new technology (mirroring Saltergate Multi storey car park) enabling customers to purchase weekly, monthly and annual permits directly from the pay stations on site as well as online.</p> <p>Pay by phone has also been launched for surface pay and display sites. This allows users to download an App to their smartphone, register and pay for their parking.</p>

				<p>We are working with Derbyshire County Council and AECOM to assist in the delivery of a vehicle management system for Chesterfield to improve traffic flow into Chesterfield via the A61 corridor and it's arterial routes. This will benefit parking end users as the system will detail the available spaces at our 5 key car parks, Saltergate, Beetwell St, Holywell Cross, Rose Hill and Soresby Street). The electronic signs will be placed on strategic routes into the town centre to inform customers of each car parks status and sign post customers better to our facilities.</p> <p>We have installed 23 EV chargepoints throughout the town centre in conjunction with Derbyshire County Council and Chargemaster, using central government funding this has seen around £100K in infrastructure investment at no cost to the Council, with a 10 year agreement in place to maintain and upgrade these at no additional cost.</p> <p>Further work is now planned to utilise additional central government funding to install EV chargepoints in residential areas in Chesterfield where off street parking to charge vehicles is a challenge and barrier to potential purchasers of electric vehicles. The intention will be to identify suitable off street and on street sites where demand is high. This will be a joint project with Derbyshire County Council and Chargemaster and follow a similar model to the town centre scheme. A project Sponsor to manage and take the scheme forward is being sought.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				Structural repairs to Beetwell Street Multi-Storey car park have been completed and have led to increased capacity.
TB18	Deliver new business units at Calow Lane	<b>H</b>		<p>Progress in the development of the business units at Calow Lane have been impacted by Covid-19 pandemic reprioritisation. Economic Development resources have been focused on economic recovery planning and ensuring key live projects such as the Northern Gateway Enterprise Centre can continue and operate safely within the new health and safety and social distancing guidelines.</p> <p>Progress has however been made including the completion of a full desktop study into the site and its suitability for development. The next stage will include commissioning a design team to prepare a planning application for the proposed units on site.</p> <p>It has also been prudent to pause this project to review the impact of Covid-19 on our commercial property portfolio. Our portfolio is still performing well but it is too soon to know the longer term impacts of the pandemic on commercial lettings.</p> <p>This activity will be reviewed and considered for inclusion in 2021/22 plans dependent on commercial lettings impact.</p>
TB19	Refreshing the skills action plan to include harder to reach young people including care	<b>M</b>		<p>The Covid-19 pandemic has impacted upon the timescales in refreshing the Skills Action Plan which is now expected in November. The pandemic has significantly impacted young people, the employment landscape and the ability of our training and education</p>

	<p>leavers, apprentice town and annual skills conference support</p>			<p>partners to deliver. Given the nature of the impact and continuing levels of uncertainty around the opening of schools and other education establishments, it is important that the refresh of the skills action plan is done through a Covid-19 lens and to recognise that we are still assessing the likely outcomes.</p> <p>Alongside this and as part of the economic recovery planning process, activities contained within the skills action plan have been assessed against the Recovery Plan Objectives. This has enabled us to incorporate initial thoughts within the Economic Recovery Plan where we have identified which of the current activities within the skills action plan can positively support the Chesterfield Covid-19 response and where additional value can be added through new activity to support the Council’s response.</p> <p><b>Young people and Careers (including supporting harder to reach)</b>          New activities, include the establishment of a Chesterfield provider network (April 20) and the delivery of virtual skills and careers platform <a href="#">My Future</a> (Aug 20). These activities recognise the likely surge in unemployment, in particular amongst 18-24 year olds, the impact Covid-19 has had on young people ability to engage with employers, training providers and careers guidance and the need for a co-ordinated response to the challenge presented by Covid-19.</p> <p><b>Higher Level Skills</b>          Covid-19 has highlighted that more highly skilled workforces with strengths in digital, leadership and management are more resilient</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>and better able to adapt to challenging labour market conditions. In recognition of this, the skills action plan will continue to focus on increasing higher level skills in Chesterfield with a commitment to formalise and strengthen our partnerships with our Higher Education partners. This will be achieved through the commissioning of joined up feasibility study to develop a memorandum of understanding with our HE partners.</p> <p><b>Local Labour Activity</b> A key objective within the skills action plan is to continue to maximise the number of training, employment and supply chain opportunities for local people arising from new development secured through local labour agreements. This will continue to be a priority and an Apprentice Resource is currently being recruited to support the delivery of the skills action plan and strengthen local labour and supply chain activity.</p> <p><b>Apprentice Town</b> As part of the government's response to the Covid-19 pandemic a number of measures have been announced to incentivise employers to take on apprentices and engage in other work-based programmes for 18 - 24-year olds. Increased marketing resource and new video and social media assets will be used to extend the reach of the Apprentice Town initiative which will be re-launched in September.</p> <p><b>Annual Skills and Employability Conference</b></p>
--	--	--	--	---

				Continuing social distancing restrictions mean that it unlikely that the annual skills and employability conference will take place in its usual format in 2020/21 (usually delivered in February). Instead, we are looking at how it could be delivered virtually and how the My Future Virtual Platform could be utilised in a virtual event.
--	--	--	--	---

### Improving the quality of life for local people

Key milestones for 2020/21

	Milestone	Potential Covid 19 impact	RAG for delivery	Progress
QL1	Develop, agree and implement the Rough Sleepers Strategy	L		<p>The Rough Sleepers Strategy was agreed March 2020.</p> <p>The Covid-19 pandemic has placed an absolute focus on rough sleeping. The Getting everyone in and Keeping Everyone In requirements have improved access to support and accommodation for rough sleepers.</p> <p>Delivery of 'wrap around' intensive support workers to develop a relationship with people and a different offer of accommodation has been developed. Funding has been secured for the "Keeping</p>

				<p>Everyone In” recovery project to provide wrap around support across Derbyshire.</p> <p>CBC are the lead authority and the SLA with P3 and Pathways. The service will be fully operational from 1st October 2020, although:</p> <p>The Housing First Scheme has been developed and is now becoming operational which will result in 7 units of supported accommodation for people with complex needs.</p> <p>Funding has been acquired to enable the recruitment of a Link Officer with Probation Services to enable a joined up approach to dealing with people being released from prisons and those that have offending history. The post will be recruited by Probation but largely based within the council’s homeless prevention team.</p> <p>Funding has been allocated through the Better Care Fund to enable the recruitment of a specialist Mental Health Housing Options worker based within P3 to work alongside the Keeping Everyone In Service.</p> <p>The Next Steps Accommodation funding bid to MCHLG has been successful, £152K awarded to Derbyshire, 72% of what was asked for, which will deliver</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A contribution to the Housing First scheme</li> <li>• Private Rented Support packages to support access into homes and work with landlords</li> <li>• 2 additional workers for Keeping Everyone in</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Winter provision support</li> </ul> <p>Critical partnerships have been developed across Derbyshire and with statutory agencies. The prospectus for the next element of the funding is expected in October 2020 and preparations are in place to apply for further funding for accommodation and support services.</p> <p>The focus and investment in services due to Covid-19 have enabled a step change in the delivery of the strategy.</p>
QL2	Assess private sector stock condition survey and develop a costed action plan for improvement	L		<p>Derby City Council have completed the draft stock condition survey on our behalf. The survey has highlighted that there are significant challenges with the private sector stock condition and we are awaiting the county wide overview to consider if there is a similar issue across Derbyshire.</p> <p>To enable us to be as informed as possible in terms of the private sector housing stock in Chesterfield, we have signed up to a further project which naturally leads on from the stock condition survey. This project is a Health Impact Assessment regarding our private sector housing, which should be complete towards the end of this financial year which will inform any correlations between poor housing and ill health and from that we will determine investment priorities going forward within the action plan.</p>
QL3	Deliver year 2 of the five-year housing	L		<p>The environmental works for phase 1 at Barrow Hill have been completed within the allocated budget. Phase 1 included 15 new</p>

	<p>environmental schemes programme</p>			<p>roofs, 20 new sets of windows, landscaping around 6 blocks of flats and 30 additional parking spaces. Planning permission for phase 2 of the Barrow Hill project was granted in December 2019. The Principal Designer and Contractor have been appointed for phase 2 and are on site delivering the scheme.</p> <p>The £4.4 million regeneration scheme at Grangewood has now been completed. As part of the project, Birchwood Court, Grangewood Court, Longcroft Court, Thorntree Court and Stockwell Court have all undergone extensive internal and external improvements. This included fully redecorating the communal areas including the upgrade of lighting and electrical installations to make the areas lighter and brighter for residents, fitting new secure entrance doors to all blocks, and the installation of new fire rated doors to each individual flat. The external render and roof coverings on each block of flats have also been replaced and concrete repairs have been carried out on communal stairwells to ensure the safety of all residents and visitors. In response to the climate emergency that was declared last July, the council is committed to ensuring that its existing housing stock is as energy efficient as possible. As part of this commitment, the windows and insulation in each property and all communal areas have also been upgraded to improve the thermal efficiency of the homes.</p> <p>Landscaping works have been completed across the whole estate with existing footpaths being renewed to help improve access around the estate and to each property. Improvements have also been made</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				to street lighting to help create a brighter space for residents and visitors. Fencing has been installed to enclose each of the outside communal areas to ensure that local families have an outdoor space that they can enjoy safely. Bike racks are currently being installed to support sustainable travel options.
QL4	Deliver year 1 of the climate change plan	<b>M</b>		<p>We have successfully recruited to the Climate Change Officer role with the postholder starting in October 2020. The postholder will lead and facilitate the Council's response to the Climate Change agenda with a key focus on internal and external stakeholder engagement and collaboration.</p> <p><b>Homes and buildings</b> The Housing Capital Programme includes significant investment in improving thermal/energy efficiency of existing housing stock which will deliver over £13 million of improvements by March 2023. This will also deliver major benefits for our tenants in terms of warmer homes with lower energy bills and as a result make a significant contribution to tackling fuel poverty.</p> <p><b>Power and electricity</b> Chesterfield Borough Council is now on a fully renewable energy plan for all our electrical energy needs. The Council is committed to move to energy efficient LED lighting and installation across premises has started.</p> <p><b>Transport</b></p>

				<p>We are developing the brief for the commissioning of a strategic assessment of integrated transport within the borough. Our approach will incorporate the learning during the Covid-19 pandemic. Engagement with taxi firms including City Taxis has started to encourage a move towards electric vehicles and the infrastructure needs to support this. Work continues to inform the transition of fleet vehicles to electric in readiness for contract renewal. Prior to the pandemic testing had been taking place to move from a hybrid mayoral car to fully electric. This work will be picked up again once safe to do so.</p> <p><b>Industry and business</b></p> <p>Climate Change and sustainability are forming a key part of discussions and actions regarding the wider economic recovery following the Covid-19 pandemic for Chesterfield and Derbyshire as a whole. The council will continue to play a key role in these discussions to help shape the direction of recovery. This is illustrated through the construction of a new enterprise centre on the Holywell Cross roundabout, seeking to put new jobs, with better access by public transport, back into the town centre. Similarly, we are seeking to make the area around the railway station a future focus for a sustainable community, with homes and jobs delivered on rejuvenated former industrial sites, and greater choice for non-car based travel. Destination Chesterfield and Business Support have been supporting businesses in the transition to increased working from home where possible and have been enabling a host of online seminars to boost sustainable business.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p><b>Agriculture and land use</b> We have and will continue to work with Derbyshire County Council to establish our approach to friendly road verges. Changes are being applied to cutting schedules to reflect these. Our tree planting programme which will see a minimum of 1000 new trees planted each year for the duration of the current Climate Change Action Plan has started with the next tranche of planting to take place in October 2020. 1000 new trees have already been planted so far in the financial year 2020/ 21.</p> <p><b>Waste and consumption</b> Our new waste contract has inbuilt significant opportunities for securing environmental improvements as technology develops. We are committed to driving improvements in environmental performance across our own fleet and with our contractors. There have been a number of exciting trials taking place around the country to develop and test the technology and practices to enable the electrification of larger fleet vehicles such as bin lorries without compromising the level of service required. Alongside our waste and recycling partners we have been learning from these trials and investing in a range of improvements including newer, more efficient bin lorries with electric mechanisms used to lift the bins to reduce miles per gallon and have introduced a number of hybrid vehicles. Investment has also taken place on in-cab technology which improves communication between the Council and Veolia to reduce the number of missed collections and return visits required.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>Improves route optimisation and fully digitalises the reporting and recording system.</p> <p><b>Engagement and Communication</b>  Last year we engaged over 900 children in our local democracy programme and had planned for more opportunities during 2020/21. The theme for the year was planned around Climate Change. Unfortunately, due to the Covid-19 pandemic we are unable to deliver this programme this year but are in talks with schools, special schools and college to bring it back even bigger and better for 2021. Ours campaigns during the Covid-19 pandemic have included key climate change messaging. Campaigns included shop local, cycle week, reusable face coverings etc. continuing the theme of reduce, re-use and recycle. This will continue into future campaigns.</p> <p><b>Policy and general areas</b>  Reports from October 2020 will include climate change impacts for key decisions. The revised Community Infrastructure Levy policy provides a key source of community funding to support local sustainable initiatives and programmes, supporting the building of capacity from within our communities.</p> <p>CBC continues to work with DCC and all neighbouring districts and boroughs, this collaboration and co-operation is seeing the development of a low carbon homes seminar later this year in partnership with low carbon homes, building on the events they are running in areas including Birmingham, Manchester, Leeds and</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				Liverpool. Collective outputs from this are being developed but are likely to include:
QL5	Develop plans to focus housing service investment to improve affordable warmth and contribute to reducing climate change impact	L		The Housing Capital Programme includes significant investment in improving thermal/energy efficiency of existing housing stock which will deliver over £13 million of improvements by March 2023. This will also deliver major benefits for our tenants in terms of warmer homes with lower energy bills and as a result make a significant contribution to tackling fuel poverty.
QL6	Develop and deliver schemes and trials to increase recycling rates	H		Maintaining core services has been key during the Covid-19 pandemic. Despite the challenges waste and recycling services have continued to perform well. However we have not had the capacity to develop new schemes and trials during this period and we expect this to be a challenge for the remainder of 2020/21.  We hope to resume recycling improvements during 2021/22 subject to Covid-19 pressures reducing.
QL7	Deliver year 1 of the Parks and Open Spaces Strategy	H		The development of the Parks and Open Spaces Strategy is now at the draft stage and is being presented at Wellbeing Scrutiny Meeting on October 1 <sup>st</sup> . It will then move into the consultation phase, the delivery of which is very dependent on any second wave of the pandemic.
QL8	Plan and deliver the 2020/21 local democracy programme	H		The local democracy programme was paused from March 2020 due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on school provision. Conversations with schools has indicated that they will require a

	with a climate change theme			<p>significant amount of recovery and catch up time for students and that they may not be able to re-join the programme until 2021.</p> <p>The Climate change local democracy programme has however been developed and will only require minor updating for 2021/22.</p>
QL9	Plan and deliver with the Equality and Diversity Forum four equality and diversity events	<b>M</b>		<p>Four face to face events during 2020/21 will not be possible due to social distancing measures.</p> <p>Following successful virtual meetings of the Equality and Diversity Forum, virtual events are now being planned for late autumn and winter 2021/21 as well as a significant research project linked to the 2021 Census.</p>
QL10	Implement the Derbyshire Care Leaver Offer	<b>L</b>		<p>Core elements of the Care Leaver Offer are now in place including council tax support, housing policy changes and key worker activity plus enhanced leisure provision. Further work is currently taking place around the promotion of foster caring opportunities and improving apprenticeship and work experience opportunities for care leavers.</p>
QL11	Deliver year 1 of the Armed Forces Covenant action plan	<b>M</b>		<p>Key elements of the plan have been delivered including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appointing an Armed Forces Champion</li> <li>• Providing member and officer representation and engagement at Derbyshire Covenant Partnership</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Working with Derbyshire County Council, Derby City Council and Derbyshire Districts to establish an officer working group to progress covenant actions</li><li>• Promoting services, information, events etc. aimed at or of benefit to the armed forces community via our website and social media accounts</li><li>• Supporting the Derbyshire Covenant Partnership project aiming to identify the size and needs of the Armed Forces Community within Derbyshire- awaiting Derby University report</li><li>• Attained the Bronze Award in the Ministry of Defence's Employer Recognition Scheme</li><li>• Amended annual leave policy to include up to 10 days paid leave days per calendar year to undertake reservist duties</li><li>• Introduced concessions available at Queen's Park Sports Centre and the Healthy Living Centre, Staveley for active armed forces members and flexible terms for membership</li></ul> <p>The Covid-19 pandemic has however presented some challenges. Prior to the pandemic we had been successfully working with the Department for Work and Pensions and Job Centre Plus to deliver the veterans hub. The veterans hub is open to all members of the armed forces including serving, retired, veterans, and reservists. The regular hub sessions focus on health wellbeing, re-employment, volunteering etc. Due to social distancing and shielding this service has not been possible to undertake safely during the pandemic. Alternative options are currently being considered.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				Recognition of the Armed Forces Community is also a key part of the plan. The Covid-19 pandemic impacted significantly on our plans for VE and VJ day celebrations with activities moved to digital platforms. We are currently developing plans for Remembrance Sunday and the 11 <sup>th</sup> hour ceremony.
--	--	--	--	---

### Providing value for money services

Key milestones for 2020/21

	Milestone	Potential Covid 19 impact	RAG for delivery	Progress
VFM 1	Deliver the Council's Medium-Term Financial Plan and actions for 2020/21 including the business plans for leisure and venues	<b>H</b>		Medium term financial strategy has been adjusted to reflect impact of Covid-19 pandemic. Analysis for increased costs and income loss to date has been undertaken and all government returns to access additional funding have been completed on time.  All business plans and income targets are being reviewed in light of Covid-19 pressures.
VFM 2	Develop the Council's Organisational Development approach further to ensure	<b>M</b>		Organisational development principles developed to align people, systems and processes, resources, strategy and decision making.

	alignment of key strategies, plans, programmes and functions			Officer working group established to develop formal proposals for consideration.
VFM 3	Review the Council's commercial approach, services and investment portfolios and deliver actions resulting from the review	<b>H</b>		Covid -19 has had a major impact on the Council's commercial activity. As the short, medium and longer terms impacts emerge this will inform the review and help to develop our future approach.
VFM 4	Successfully return Arvato and Kier services	<b>L</b>		This milestone is partially complete with the successful return of Kier services in September 2020 and plan progressing for the return of remaining Arvato services in January 2021.
VFM 5	Deliver the activities identified in the Council's Asset Management Strategy and Plan for 2020/2021	<b>H</b>		<p>A draft Asset Management Strategy has been drafted however this is being reviewed in light of the Covid-19 pandemic impacts.</p> <p>As part of the strategy development an Asset Management Delivery Plan was developed and contained all the ongoing asset related priority actions and outputs. The Covid-19 pandemic has led to a number of these actions being delayed and revised due to capacity and re-prioritisation. This includes the One Public Estate led review of the Depot.</p> <p>A number of key renovation works have been completed and the three year asset disposal programme has also continued with a number of substantial capital receipts being achieved.</p>

				The plan will continue to be co-ordinated and managed through the AMG and will be further updated for consideration / approval once the Asset Mgt. Strategy (2020-23) has been approved.
VFM 6	Complete the second year of the ICT improvement programme.	L		<p>ICT improvement programme continues to deliver at pace and remains on budget and within project timescales despite the challenges of Covid-19. Some key achievements so far this year include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full Microsoft teams rollout enabling virtual working and collaboration and virtual committee meetings</li> <li>• Office 365 rollout progressing well – improving security , resilience and scalability</li> <li>• COINS system PDA roll out is underway enabling 115 employees to access key systems remotely while out on site, increasing productivity, efficiency and communication</li> <li>• Progressed single sign on across multiple systems - Single sign on improves the end user experience when accessing corporate applications. It removes the need for them to enter multiple different user names and remember different passwords and enter them each time they open a new application</li> <li>• Internet reliance improvements</li> <li>• Cloud migration and the retiring of legacy servers – 4 more servers retired</li> <li>• Telephony upgrade rollout – including soft phones enabling vastly improved agile working</li> </ul>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Customer Relationships Management system now live in customer services – My Chesterfield account launch imminent enabling end to end digital access to services, self service and increased access channels for residents</li> </ul>
VFM 7	Develop our future ICT Strategy for 2022/2023 onwards	<b>H</b>		Maintaining the progress on the current ICT programme has been the priority. This has enabled rapid transformation to enable services to keep running during the pandemic. The medium and long-term impacts of the pandemic will have a major influence on the future ICT programme so this activity will need to span into 2021/22.
VFM 8	Further develop the performance management framework to include key organisational health check measures to support service improvement	<b>M</b>		This activity has been paused due to the focus on Covid-19 response and recovery. Plans are in place to provide some focus for this activity in the second half of 2020/21 so that it is in place for 2021/21 delivery.
VFM 9	Achieve customer services excellence accreditation	<b>M</b>		Progress has continued to build on the successful assessment last year. Maintaining core services has however been the priority during the Covid-19 pandemic alongside new demands such as business grants and business rate changes. Progress is currently being reviewed for this project.
VFM 10	Deliver the 2020/2021 activities identified in	<b>H</b>		The year one action plan of the People Plan outlined 28 activities to be completed in the first year and of these 17 have been achieved

	the People Plan 2019 – 2023			<p>and 5 partially achieved despite the impact of Covid-19. Key progress has been made on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Reviewing and embedding the competency framework</li><li>• Succession planning</li><li>• Change management training</li><li>• Engaging and training staff in new ways of working</li><li>• Developing a mentoring programme</li><li>• Managers seminars</li><li>• Apprenticeship programme</li><li>• Improving performance metrics</li><li>• Supporting Arvato/Kier transition</li></ul> <p>The Human Resources/ Learning and Development team have had to respond quickly and effectively to a range of demands during the Covid-19 pandemic in addition to learning plan priorities including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Supporting the supply of volunteers to the Proact Stadium to act as marshals for the local testing station</li><li>• Development and implementation of a suite of guidance notes for managers to support during the pandemic</li><li>• Development of a communication survey and recommendations to improve communication with employees during the pandemic leading to the implementation of a weekly manager e-bulletin</li><li>• Close liaison with unions with additional bi-weekly meetings to ensure a collaborative approach taken to all workforce matters</li><li>• Development and implementation of an average pay scheme to ensure staff were not impacted upon financially due to lack of availability of work</li></ul>
--	-----------------------------	--	--	---

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-ordination of the claims under HMRC furlough scheme</li> <li>• Support for the rollout of Microsoft Teams and UCOne telephony systems</li> <li>• Active role on the resources task and finish group ensuring return to work protocols and Covid-19 secure processes in place</li> </ul>
VFM 11	Complete the Investor in People Assessment improving silver scores in key areas	<b>H</b>		Full Investors in People assessment was due to take place in January 2021, however due to the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic this has been delayed until 2022. Current Silver IIP status will be extended by a strategic review in January 2021 and also provide focus areas for the full assessment in 2022.

This page is intentionally left blank

## For publication

### **'Planning for the Future' Response to Government Consultation on Planning Reform**

---

Meeting:	Cabinet
Date:	20 <sup>th</sup> October 2020
Cabinet portfolio:	Economic Growth
Report by:	Strategic Planning & Key Sites Manager

---

## **For publication**

---

### **1.0 Purpose of report**

- 1.1 To report on the government's consultation on changes to the planning system and agree the council's response.

### **2.0 Recommendations**

- 2.1 To agree the response set out in appendix A as the Council's response to the Government White Paper 'Planning for the Future'.
- 2.2 To authorise the Strategic Planning Manager, in consultation with the Assistant Director for Economic Development and Cabinet Member for Economic Growth, to make such changes and additions to the response as are necessary to ensure a comprehensive response to the consultation.

2.3 For the Council's Strategic Planning and Key Sites Manager to submit the response electronically before 11:45pm on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2020.

### 3.0 **Background**

3.1 On the 6<sup>th</sup> August 2020 the Government published a White Paper, "Planning for the Future", to consult on changes to the Planning system.

3.2 The White Paper sets out the basis of a comprehensive review of the planning system that would affect all parts of the current system and presents the most significant changes for a generation.

3.3 Responses to the consultation must be submitted by 29<sup>th</sup> October 2020.

### 4.0 **Summary of proposed changes**

4.1 The proposals cover all aspects of the planning system. The following is a high-level summary of the proposed changes.

4.2 Throughout the Paper there is an emphasis on increasing the digitisation of planning and the availability of data and documents, and greater engagement with communities.

4.3 The White Paper proposals is structured around three 'pillars':

1. Planning for Development
2. Planning for Beautiful and Sustainable Places
3. Planning for Infrastructure and Connected Places

#### **Pillar 1 – Planning for Development**

4.4 The proposals place an emphasis on plan making rather than 'discretionary' decision taking. It retains Local Plans at the

heart of the system, which should be visual and map based and supported by a new standard template (not available at this time). Plans should be significantly shorter in length and limited to no more than setting out site or area-specific parameters and opportunities.

- 4.5 Local authorities and the Planning Inspectorate will be required through legislation to meet a statutory timetable (of no more than 30 months in total, or 42 if you have a recently adopted plan) for key stages of the process, and there will be (currently unspecified) sanctions for those who fail to do so. New Plans should be in place by 2023. In reality, once the time for consultation and examination of the Plan is taken out, LPAs will only have 18 months to engage with communities and draw up the Plan. Plans will continue to be reviewed every five years.
- 4.6 The current system of 'Tests of Soundness' and Sustainability Appraisal would be replaced with a single 'Sustainable Development Test' (detailed of which are unspecified) and simplified and standardised evidence requirements.
- 4.7 The 'Duty to Co-operate', which currently guides interaction between LPAs on strategic cross boundary issues would be removed, but no indication is given of any mechanism to replace this or address strategic planning issues.
- 4.8 All land within an LPA area will need to be identified in one of three categories in the Plan:
- **Growth** – Land suitable for substantial development
  - **Renewal** - existing built areas where smaller scale development is appropriate
  - **Protected** – Areas where Stringent development controls will be in place to ensure sustainability

- 4.9 **Growth** areas will include sites for comprehensive development, including new settlements and urban extensions, and areas for regeneration such as urban or industrial regeneration sites. National legislation will set out a definition of 'substantial development' but no indication is given in the paper of where this threshold would be set.
- 4.10 These areas would effectively have outline approval for development granted upon adoption of the Plan. The Plan will be able to set out suitable uses within these zones and design codes, based on a national model (which has not been published at this time). Developments would be brought forwards by Reserved Matters submissions or Local Development Order. Applications for uses not allowed by the Plan would need to submit a planning application as normal.
- 4.11 **Renewal** areas will cover densification and infill of residential areas and town centres. There will be a presumption in favour of development in these zones for the uses specified in the Plan. There will be a new permission route (details of which are currently unavailable) giving automatic consent for pre-specified development types that meet design and other prior approval requirements and a faster planning application process for other types of development.
- 4.12 **Protected** zones will include Green Belt (the Paper does not set out any changes to the Green Belt regime), open countryside that is not zoned for 'Growth', national and local wildlife and landscape designations, areas at risk of flooding, and Conservation Areas. The Local Plan will set out what was development is acceptable in these areas.
- 4.13 Local Plans will no longer contain detailed development control policies, which will instead be covered by a revised National Planning Policy Framework.

- 4.14 The range of planning applications considered by councils will be significantly reduced. Planning application time limits should be a deadline, with no extensions of time and proposals to refund fees or automatically grant consent if they are not determined in this time frame. This will be supported by an improved validation process.
- 4.15 The information required to support applications should be reduced to a single planning statement of no more than 50 pages, with more standardisation of supporting technical information (eg: flood risk, highways impact and heritage assessments).
- 4.16 Planning authorities will be encouraged to make more use of design codes, accompanying Local Plans.

## **Pillar 2 - Planning for Beautiful and Sustainable Places**

- 4.17 The White Paper envisages a 'fast track for beauty'. The government will publish a National Model Design Code (which will also formalise the role of the Manual for Streets) and LPAs will be encouraged to develop Local Design Codes with input from the community. Schemes which comply with local design codes should have swift approval and masterplans and site-specific design codes could be required by condition of permission in principle granted in Local Plans.
- 4.18 It will be possible to redevelop existing dwellings through permitted development (possibly involving some prior approval process). The Paper proposes pre-approval of "popular" and "replicable" designs (although no further detail is given on this, it is not clear for example who would prepare these designs).
- 4.19 Sustainable design for housing is largely left to the Future Homes standard, which is to be progressed through the

Building Regulations. There is no reference to an equivalent for non-residential buildings.

### **Pillar 3 - Planning for Infrastructure and Connected Places**

- 4.20 The Paper proposes removing Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations and replacing them with a single, nationally set levy based on development value. This would only be paid by development over a nationally set threshold (CIL is currently liable on all development). There would be more flexibility than currently around funding.
- 4.21 Affordable housing would be paid for out of this levy rather than secured directly through development. A proportion of the levy would also be used to fund plan making.

### **5.0 Implications of the White Paper and proposed response.**

- 5.1 The proposed response to the consultation is set out in Appendix A to this report.
- 5.2 Overall, the White Paper is characterised by a lack of detail on key points. For example, no indication is given of how the new 'Sustainable Development Test' for Local Plans would look, the Model Design Codes or how the new Levy would be calculated. This makes it difficult to comment on how the proposals might work. There is also a reliance on further information to be provided to make the system work, such as a new NPPF, model design codes, model local plan and evidence templates, standardise templates or technical information etc, and progress on other areas of guidance and legislation like the Future Homes Standard and Environment Act. Given the pressures currently on government, this does raise concerns over whether all the elements needed for the proposed system can be in place in a timely manner.

## **Pillar 1 – Planning for Development**

- 5.3 The White Paper maintains an emphasis on Local Plans being produced by Local Authority's, which is welcome. The role of Plans is strengthened, with them becoming able to establish the principle of development, removing the need for the submission of outline planning applications for development that accords with the Plan but retaining the role of LPAs in determining the principle of development outside the Plan proposals. This does have implications for the structure and resources allocated to Local Plan preparation (addressed below).
- 5.4 That Local Plans will need to identify all land with their boundaries for one of the 'zones' is welcomed in principle as it will provide certainty for the community and developers. The success or otherwise of the zoned approach will depend on the level of local flexibility that LPAs have to set out details such as suitable uses and conditions within the proposed zones, and the resource available to prepare, for example, site-specific masterplans and design codes.
- 5.5 The zones also do not reflect the full range of roles that Local Plans currently undertake. While it is proposed that Plans will no longer contain development control policies, with these being set at a national level, there is a risk of this resulting in bland policies that do not reflect local circumstances. They also do not reflect one of the other key tasks of Local Plans in safeguarding land for infrastructure (such as roads, schools or, specific the Chesterfield, the canal) – whilst the 'Protected' zone may provide a route to do this it would be better if this role was explicitly set out.
- 5.6 The timescales proposed (30 months/ 2.5 years) for preparation of Local Plans are very tight compared to the borough's successful experience in preparing Local Plans, which typically have taken 3-5 years. Whilst this may be

mitigated somewhat by not having to prepare Development Control policies, it is the process of site selection and allocation and community engagement that is the most intensive. Coupled with proposals for greater levels of engagement and the need to prepare more detailed design codes, the resourcing of this stage of plan making will need further consideration.

- 5.7 The paper does not give any details of the proposed 'Sustainable Development Test' that would replace the current Tests of Soundness and Sustainability Appraisal of Local Plans. It is therefore not possible to assess the possible implications of this other than to welcome any simplification of the current SA process, which is costly, time consuming and replicates process already undertaken in plan preparation.
- 5.8 The Paper proposes removing the legal Duty to Co-operate, which is currently the only formal mechanism for strategic planning, but does not propose a replacement, instead asking for suggestions from consultees.
- 5.9 It is proposed that the response supports the retention of the plan led system, but seeks further detail on how key aspects should operate and asks that council's should be allowed to tailor individual zones to local needs and that the potential for overlap between 'Protect' and 'Renewal' areas be considered.

## **Pillar 2 Planning for Beautiful and Sustainable Places**

- 5.10 This section feels poorly developed with little in the way of details of how the mechanisms will operate. There are no details of the National Model Design Code or the extent or operation of permitted development.
- 5.11 No indication is given of how "popular and replicable" designs would be established or who would prepare them.

- 5.12 With any attempt to define 'beauty' in the built environment there is a risk of ending up with proposals that are the least offensive to the largest number of people, and stifling genuine innovation in design and technologies. Establishing a 'fast track' for 'beautiful' buildings also ignores the need to properly consider other aspects of buildings, such as amenity, highways and sustainability, which must be given time for proper consideration.
- 5.13 It is disappointing that the Paper leaves sustainable construction to the Future Homes standard (it is unclear when this standard will come into force), given that the Code for Sustainable Homes had originally envisaged that by 2020 new homes would be net zero carbon. There is also no information provided on how commercial and non-residential development will be expected to address climate change.
- 5.14 The proposed response is that the extension of permitted development rights is not welcomed, given the failures of the approach that have already been demonstrated, that further detail is needed on all aspects of this pillar, and that there should be a clear targeted commitment to reaching zero-carbon development for all forms of development (not just residential).

### ***Pillar 3 - Planning for Infrastructure and Connected Places***

- 5.15 There are a number of concerns over the proposals for changes to the infrastructure funding regime. The Council implemented CIL in 2016. The Council's CIL was set locally and only charged on housing and town centre uses, reflecting the marginal viability of some commercial uses, and was set at zero for the Staveley Corridor Strategic site in recognition of the abnormal cost of this regeneration scheme.
- 5.16 It is surprising that the white paper proposes a further review of the system of developer contributions, given the relatively

recent independent CIL Review Group's 2016 CIL Review that fed into the 2017 Housing White Paper.

- 5.17 Funding affordable housing through the new infrastructure levy immediately raises questions of prioritisation, where affordable housing competes with other strategic infrastructure necessary to support new growth and development for funding from the same pot. The White Paper's conclusion that there will sufficient money in the pot for affordable housing needs to be supported by further evidence to demonstrate that this will be the case and satisfy concerns that there may be shortfalls in infrastructure provision as a result of competing interests in areas like Chesterfield where viability is known to be marginal.
- 5.18 Legal agreements are used to secure more than just developer contributions, and so it is likely that they will still be needed in some form.
- 5.19 The most immediate concerns relate to viability. Under the new proposals, site viability would not be taken into account. There is therefore a question over how the rate could reflect local circumstances, including the benchmark land values used to judge what is necessary to encourage a willing landowner to make their site available for development. The new Levy will be calculated based on the final value of a development (or an assessment of the sales value where the development is not sold). Consequently, it would appear that it would not take into account the often higher costs of delivering brownfield or other sites with larger abnormal costs. This is a critical issue for areas like Chesterfield where the local plan allocates strategic regeneration sites such as Staveley & Rother Valley Corridor which have acknowledged viability issues.
- 5.20 Setting the Levy nationally is fraught with difficulty. There are risks with setting the levy either too high or too low. If the levy

is set too high, it may prevent development coming forward in certain locations. If the levy is set at a low level such that it captures all but the most unviable developments, this could result in development 'under-paying', resulting in necessary infrastructure being unable to be provided.

- 5.21 The reality is that not all developments deliver uplift in land value. Developers in locations with no uplift may benefit from falling beneath the minimum threshold proposed but the effect would be that local authorities in such areas, potentially including Chesterfield, would have less levy revenue to direct towards providing necessary infrastructure. It would be more appropriate to consider whether a national fund should be providing this investment in areas that do not generate the additional values but do need investment in strategic infrastructure.
- 5.22 Given the required focus on identifying deliverable sites to meet local housing requirements, the lack of viability testing might make it difficult to rely on housing yield from more challenging, less viable sites (such as those requiring costly on-site infrastructure) and focus on easier, but potentially less sustainable options. If the Levy is based on final development value this would appear to raise the potential that high quality design would have to pay more than a poorer quality scheme, introducing an undesirable and unintended disincentive to raise design standards (contrary to the stated and welcome objective on design elsewhere in the white paper).
- 5.23 As currently applies with CIL, the proposed new rate would be based on the applicable rate plus indexing, on the date of planning permission being granted. However, whereas CIL is payable within a set timescale of commencement, the new levy would not be payable until occupation. ('Occupation' would need be defined in legislation to avoid the extensive legal debates and costly delays.) Whilst this would introduce a delay in receipt of CIL revenues on each development, it would

overcome current difficulties on certain schemes where smaller developers have reported difficulties in payment of CIL in advance of receipts from sales.

- 5.24 Clarification is needed on whether the value will be fixed when an implementable permission is granted or on the date the local plan is adopted and granted outline planning permission.
- 5.25 The suggested response is that any levy should continue to be set locally to ensure it reflects local viability and sales issues. If set nationally, a proportion of the levy above a set threshold in high value areas should be set aside to support the development of low viability sites and locations.

## 6.0 **Resources**

- 6.1 The Paper is clear that it still expects Local Planning Authorities to remain at the heart of the reforms and that planning departments will need the right people with the right skills and necessary resources. Planning departments will be expected to be outward looking and engaging pro-actively with developers and local communities. This latter element is already a strength in the borough with regular engagement with developers (including through our Housing Delivery Manager) and a focus on delivering growth.
- 6.2 However, with the clear shift of emphasis towards the development of clear local plans and design codes it will be necessary to look at the structure of the department and the skills available and consider whether there are gaps that need to be addressed or strengthened, and whether a refocusing of roles will be needed.
- 6.3 There will need to be an investment of time and resources in developing the ICT functions of the Planning Teams. The Strategic Planning Team already has significant skills in GIS but this is limited by the lack of a Corporate approach to mapping

and spatial information; and increased use will need to be made of the capabilities of existing systems such as idox in recording spatial and development information. The government is working with pilot LPAs on developing the digital approach, such as Hackney in London, and these experiments will need to be monitored closely.

- 6.4 The Paper proposes that each LPA should have a Chief Officer for Design and Place Making, and this proposal will need to be monitored through the process of the White Paper moving into legislation.

## 7.0 **Financial Implications**

- 7.1 Planning is currently funded through a combination of planning fees (Development Management) and general funding (Strategic Planning), plus a small contribution towards the administration of CIL from the CIL receipt (5%).
- 7.2 The White Paper proposes that the cost of operating the new planning system should be principally funded by the beneficiaries of planning gain – landowners and developers – rather than the national or local taxpayer. Whilst the principal of this is sound, the mechanisms set out are weak and poorly thought through.
- 7.3 It should also be noted that, as Local Plans will be expected to grant permission in principle, the Council is effectively being asked to cover the costs of preparing and determining an outline planning application for all allocated sites as part of preparing their Local Plan. Costs that would normally be borne by a developer/landowner (in less time than a developer would usually take). Estimates from the Impact Assessment prepared by the Government for implementation of Permission in Principle in 2017 showed the typical cost of preparing and submitting a full planning application at approximately £25,000 for a minor site, including fee costs.

The cost for full planning permission for a major site (based on 100 dwellings) was approximately £40-£50,000. On top of this the council would not receive the current fee income that would be received from outline or permission in principle applications.

- 7.4 Although the local setting of planning fees has been repeatedly considered by government, the Paper proposes that planning fees would continue to be set nationally, which is disappointing and does not reflect the varying costs of dealing with different applications in varying locations (such as areas with complex issues such as the legacy of mining and heavy industry such as Chesterfield).
- 7.5 It is proposed that a 'small' proportion of the income from the new approach to development contributions should be earmarked for the preparation and review of Local Plans and Design Codes. The proportion is not set out in any detail, or any confirmation as to whether this will be expected to cover the full costs of plan preparation. This is a significant concern as is far from clear whether the new levy would result in a greater or lesser capture of development value than CIL. Given the costs of preparing the level of detail in Local Plans set out in the White Paper it is highly unlikely that this would be the case. This appears to present significant dilution of the role of the proposed levy and leave council's covering the costs of operating the system. There is a significant risk that the levy would either not provide enough to support the Strategic Planning function, or that the need to fund Strategic Planning would result in insufficient funding being available to deliver essential infrastructure.
- 7.6 An alternative would be planning fees for the technical design/reserved matters stage should be set at a higher level that reflects the additional costs of plan making activity. This would to an extent cover the fact that LPAs are effectively taking on the burden of preparing outline planning

permissions for landowners/ developers, with a significant saving in costs to them. An alternative would be to allow Council's to place a charge on land relating to the costs of preparing allocations, that could be recouped when land is sold.

7.7 The Council may also need to reconsider its current position of not charging for pre-application advice.

7.8 It is important to recognise that front loading community engagement and preparing design codes and conditions for areas zoned for Growth and Renewal, if it is to be effective and successful, is likely to require significant investment in time, money and resources, including site investigations and technical studies. An option could be to work with landowners and developers promoting sites to commission and carry out such studies, but this comes with the risk of the plan making process being captured or appearing to be captured by the interest of those most able to fund such work.

## 8.0 **Legal Implications**

8.1 The reforms would require a complete overhaul of the legislative and policy framework underpinning the planning system, with new primary and secondary legislation and a complete overhaul of the NPPF.

## 9.0 **Equalities and Diversity**

9.1 As part of the consultation the Government is also seeking comments on whether the proposals would have a negative impact assessment on groups or individuals with protected characteristics but has not published an equalities impact assessment at this stage.

## 10.0 **Recommendations**

- 10.1 To agree the response set out in appendix A as the Council's response to the Government White Paper 'Planning for the Future'.
  - 10.2 To authorise the Strategic Planning Manager, in consultation with the Assistant Director for Economic Development and Cabinet Member for Economic Growth, to make such changes and additions to the response as are necessary to ensure a comprehensive response to the consultation.
  - 10.3 For the Council's Strategic Planning and Key Sites Manager to submit the response electronically before 11:45pm on 29<sup>th</sup> October 2020.
- 11.0 **Reasons for recommendations**
- 11.1 To respond to the consultation within the required timescale.

<b>Glossary of Terms</b>	
LPA	Local Planning Authority
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy
EiP	Examination in Public
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
PPG	Planning Practice Guidance
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
DtC	Duty to Co-operate
PIP	Permission in Principle
LDO	Local Development Order

### **Decision information**

<b>Key decision number</b>	Non key 183
<b>Wards affected</b>	<b>All wards</b>

### **Document information**

<b>Report author</b>	<b>Contact number/email</b>
<b>Alan Morey</b>	<a href="mailto:Alan.morey@chesterfield.gov.uk">Alan.morey@chesterfield.gov.uk</a> <b>01246959707</b>
<b>Background documents</b>	
These are unpublished works which have been relied on to a material extent when the report was prepared.	
<a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-future">https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-future</a>	
<b>Appendices to the report</b>	
Appendix A	Proposed Response to Consultation Questionnaire

## APPENDIX A

### Consultation Questionnaire and Draft response (Responses in *italics*)

# Pillar One – Planning for Development

**Q1. What three words do you associate most with the planning system in England?**

**Q2. Do you get involved with planning decisions in your local area?**

Yes X

No

**Q2 (a) If no, why not?**

Don't know how to

It takes too long

It's too complicated

I don't care

Other (please specify)

*Local Planning Authority*

**Q3. Our proposals will make it much easier to access plans and contribute your views to planning decisions. How would you like to find out about plans and planning proposals in the future?**

Social media

Online news

Newspaper

By post

Other (please specify)

*NA*

**Q4. What are your top three priorities for planning in your local area? (Please select only three answers)**

Building homes for young people

Building homes for the homeless

Protection of green spaces

The environment

Biodiversity and action on climate change X

- Increasing the affordability of housing X
- The design of new homes and places
- Supporting the high street
- Supporting the local economy X
- More or better local infrastructure
- Protection of existing heritage buildings or areas
- Other (please specify)

**Q5. Do you agree that Local Plans should be simplified in line with our proposals?**

- Yes
- No
- Not sure X

Supporting statement

*Chesterfield Borough Council supports the clear emphasis on Local Plans and the intention that they should be clear, and map and web based. More information is needed to comment in detail, for example of standard templates for Local Plan and evidence.*

*The Paper is unclear on role of plans beyond allocating development, for example in safeguarding land for infrastructure, this should either be available as a further purpose/ zone or explicitly a possible function of the "protection" zone. There should be scope for variations in proposals for land within the same broad zone – for example it should be possible to zone one 'growth' area for housing and another for employment?*

*The paper suggests that the zones would be exclusive. However, there is likely to be an overlap between some of the functions described under 'Protect' such as Conservation Areas', and locations where the 'Renewal' zone would be appropriate, particularly around town centres. Consideration should be given to the potential to overlap such areas, or for 'protect' areas to exclude functions such as Conservation Areas, which are covered by other legislation and guidance that must be applied regardless.*

*Further information is required on the threshold for 'substantial development' for 'Growth Zones'. This should be set low enough to capture most potential greenfield sites. It may be appropriate to set the threshold low but with a sliding scale on the level of supporting information required for different levels of development, or alternatively to allow Local Planning Authorities to determine what is 'substantial' growth in their own areas, taking account of the size and scale of existing settlements in their areas.*

*Clarity is required on whether Local Plans can include multiple zones of the same type, with different guidance on acceptable uses, conditions, design codes etc.*

**Q6. Do you agree with our proposals for streamlining the development management content of Local Plans, and setting out general development management policies nationally?**

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure X

Supporting Statement

*In principle, the Examination in Public process already prevent LPAs from repeating national policy set out in the NPPF in Local Plans. Setting Development Management policies at national level could result in bland identikit policies that do not reflect local circumstances. LPAs should continue to have the ability to make the case for the need for limited specific local policies with this being tested at Local Plan Examination stage. Examples may include local thresholds for assessment of landscape or retail impact, which are already allowed for under the existing NPPF and will vary depending on sensitivity of landscape, size of settlement etc.*

*Further comment needed from Development and Conservation Manager*

**Q7(a) Do you agree with our proposals to replace existing legal and policy tests for Local Plans with a consolidated test of “sustainable development”, which would include consideration of environmental impact?**

Yes

No

Not Sure X

Supporting Statement

*The current Tests of Soundness have functioned effectively, but the SA process is overly complicated and bureaucratic, and a simpler system would be welcomed. However, as no detail is provided on how the proposed Sustainable Development Test would operate has been provided it is impossible to say whether we agree with it at this stage.*

**Q7.(b) How could strategic, cross-boundary issues be best planned for in the absence of a formal Duty to Cooperate?**

Yes

No

Not Sure X

Supporting Statement

*Whilst flawed, the Duty to Co-operate does at least provide a legal basis for ensuring co-operation on Strategic Planning and Cross Boundary issues. It is not acceptable to remove the Duty without a replacement system being in place. Given the tight timescales proposed for the preparation of Local Plans it is clear that a return to a system of strategic plans informing Local Plans (akin to the Structure Plan) is not appropriate or possible. A restructure of the Duty to Co-operate with clear limits on the issues to be considered and legally binding timescales for parties to respond within the context of the Local Plan process should be considered – with a process for rapid arbitration in the event of disputes, possibly overseen by the Planning Inspectorate as part of the EiP process.*

**Q8.(a) Do you agree that a standard method for establishing housing requirements (that takes into account constraints) should be introduced?**

Yes X

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*We agree that a standard method, as operated at present, is useful. However, we do not agree with the operation of a system partially based on a fixed percentage of growth above existing dwelling numbers (see response to Q8(b)).*

*Local Planning Authorities should retain the ability to put forward alternative approaches where they can be justified by local evidence and circumstances, with them tested during the EiP process, as is allowed under the current system.*

**Q8.(b) Do you agree that affordability and the extent of existing urban areas are appropriate indicators of the quantity of development to be accommodated?**

Yes

No X

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*Chesterfield Borough Council has concerns about the use of the existing urban area as an indicator of the quantity of development to be accommodated, if this is on the basis of a fixed percentage of existing housing stock (as proposed in the recent consultation on changes to the current system, which recommended an 05% baseline). A stock-based approach artificially inflates housing need without taking local economic factors (such as employment growth) into consideration. The borough welcomes an aspirational approach to housing growth but is concerned that inflating housing targets*

may lead to unsustainable patterns of growth without addressing other fundamental underlying issues.

The council is of the view that a more nuanced approach to Housing Delivery Test repercussions is required if housing requirements are to include the stock element. It would be more appropriate to use a multiplier in cases where growth aspirations call for a further increase in housing supply than generated by the 10 year projection figures alone. The council considers that any multiplier should take the capacity of the market to deliver homes into account.

It is important that affordability is also taken into account, but this should be considered on the basis of an affordability ratio adjustment which incorporates changes over time (10 years is suggested as a reasonable timescale) as this will ensure a level of responsiveness to changes in local circumstances and avoid the vulnerability of any formula to anomalies. In a relatively small borough such as Chesterfield, house prices in a given year could be skewed by the bulk completion of (for example) a block of 1 bedroom flats or development with a large proportion of large detached properties in a particular desirable setting, or by figures affected by the current pandemic.

**Q9(a). Do you agree that there should be automatic permission in principle for areas for substantial development (Growth areas) with faster routes for detailed consent?**

Yes

No X

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

Permission in Principle has seen poor take up amongst developers, in part due to the reluctance of banks to lend on the basis of PiP. Whilst the establishment of the principle or development upon adoption of a Local Plan is welcomed, there should be clear guidance on the minimum level of supporting information required for the principle of development to be established, to provide certainty for communities and developers that areas zoned for growth can be delivered.

There is a significant issue in this proposal in that it passes the responsibility, and therefore costs, of effectively preparing Permission in Principle/ Outline Planning Permission/ Local Development Order onto the Local Authority. There are significant costs associated with this, financially and in terms of staff resources and time (the government's own Impact Assessment of costs associated with PiP showed the typical cost of preparing and submitting a full planning application at approximately £25,000 for a minor site, including fee costs. The cost for full planning permission for a major site (based on 100 dwellings) was approximately £40-£50,000. A recent study into the costs of preparing LDOs for significant employment sites in the borough indicated costs of up to £50,000). Unless LPAs are to be properly funded and recompensed for these costs this risks allocations for Growth being skewed towards sites with existing developer interest who are willing to undertake the required investigations.

**Q9(b). Do you agree with our proposals above for the consent arrangements for Renewal and Protected areas?**

Yes

No X

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

Insufficient clarity is provided for the consent arrangements within these zones. They are too broad and the processes by which consent will be achieved are too vague. By their nature, existing urban areas and previously developed sites will have the most complex issues in terms of impact on amenity, highway operation and safety, ground conditions, design and character and impact upon local facilities, infrastructure and amenities. In an area such as Chesterfield Borough this can also include coal mining and flood risk within established urban areas.

Whilst it may be beneficial to establish the principle of development for a range of uses within such areas, any assessment of detailed impact needs to retain wide flexibility to considered site specific issues.

**Q9(c). Do you think there is a case for allowing new settlements to be brought forward under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects regime?**

Yes

No X

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*Where new settlements are zoned within Local Plans, the decision making should remain with the relevant LPA, particularly if the Local Plan will establish the principle of development, which will reduce the scope for dispute.*

**Q10. Do you agree with our proposals to make decision-making faster and more certain?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*Further response to be provided by Development Management and Conservation Manager.*

**Q11. Do you agree with our proposals for digitised, web-based Local Plans?**

Yes X

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*We support web-based plans in principle. However, the proposals are short on detail about the form this should take or how it will be achieved. It is likely to take significant investment in time and resources. A comprehensive study should be undertaken of the requirements of this approach and the costs and timescales and sufficient New Burdens Funding must be provided to ensure that this is established within the required timescales.*

**Q12. Do you agree with our proposals for a 30 - month statutory timescale for the production of Local Plans?**

Yes

No

Not Sure X

Supporting Statement

*It is not clear how the proposed timescales have been arrived at. In principle we would support statutory timescales but these should be based on a proper assessment of the work required – at present the timescales appear to be arbitrary. LPAs are effectively being asked to identify, prepare, assess and determine planning applications (through PiP or LDO) within the proposed timescale (12 months for preparing a plan), as well as preparing design codes and significantly increasing public engagement. A proper study should be undertaken looking at the realistic timescales and resource requirements of preparing Local Plans at this level of detail and the results used to inform the statutory timescales.*

*Keeping to any statutory timescale will require a number of measures to be in place, including: Proper funding of the process; a legal duty on related bodies (such as Highways Authorities, and Statutory Consultees) to provide evidence and respond within set timescales.*

*It is unclear how the timetable would deal with issues such as purdah periods for elections. If the timetables are to be achieved, plan preparation may need to be given clear exemption from purdah restrictions or allowance made to add this time to the statutory timetable. For example, preparation of the most recent Chesterfield Borough Local plan was affected by purdah periods for the Brexit referendum, two General Elections, Police and Crime Commissioner and Local Elections.*

*A clear discrepancy exists between the proposed timescale and the proposal that Local Plans will be in place by 2023. 30 months is 2 ½ years (or 42 months (3 1/2 years where a recently adopted Local Plan is in place). Even if primary legislation and all the supporting templates etc were in place by mid 2021 this would give barely two years to complete the process.*

**Q13. (a) Do you agree that Neighbourhood Plans should be retained in the reformed planning system?**

Yes X

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

**Q13 (b) How can the neighbourhood planning process be developed to meet our objectives, such as in the use of digital tools and reflecting community preferences about design?**

*Chesterfield Borough has not seen any Neighbourhood Plans prepared so no comment is provided.*

**Q14. Do you agree there should be a stronger emphasis on the build out of developments? And if so, what further measures would you support?**

Yes X

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*Greater scope should be available to LPAs to step in where allocated sites are not being brought forwards, including availability of funding to purchase and prepare land for development, with the costs subsequently recouped by selling on the land for development. There should be a standing principle around the use of CPO to purchase allocated land where the landowner/developer has failed to progress the site despite a Local Plan allocation.*

*Under the current system LPAs are already involved in supporting landowners in bringing sites forwards, frequently committing significant financial and staff resources in supporting landowners (Chesterfield Borough Council is, for example, currently involved in supporting development of a town centre site for 50 dwellings, which has included undertaking site investigations, and is providing masterplanning and landscape assessment support to another for 270 dwellings). Mechanisms to allow these costs, usually born by a landowner or developer in preparing a planning application, to be set as a charge against the land when sold, would provide a mechanism to fund Local Plan preparation and ensure those costs are born by the landowner/developer.*

# Pillar Two – Planning for Beautiful and Sustainable Places

**Q15. What do you think about new development that has happened recently in your area?**

Not sure/indifferent

Beautiful/well-designed

Ugly/poorly-designed

Other (please specify)

**Q16. Sustainability is at the heart of our proposals. What is your priority for sustainability in your area?**

Less reliance on cars X

More green/open spaces

Energy efficiency of new buildings

More trees

Other (please specify)

**Q17. Do you agree with our proposals for improving the production and use of design guides and codes?**

Yes

No

Not Sure X

Supporting Statement

*Whilst supporting in principle the use of design guides and codes, much of the detail is left for later publication (for example a national standard template for design codes). The effectiveness of design codes can be extremely variable, and more clarity is needed.*

*Their preparation is also costly in time and resources and there needs to be a clear mechanism for funding this work and recovering the cost from landowners/developers if they are not simply to become developer led tick box exercises.*

*Sufficient flexibility should be built into the national codes to allow for local distinctiveness if Design Codes are going to be effective and supported by the Local Community.*

**Q18. Do you agree that we should establish a new body to support design coding and building better places, and that each authority should have a chief officer for design and place-making?**

Yes X

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

**Q19. Do you agree with our proposal to consider how design might be given greater emphasis in the strategic objectives for Homes England?**

Yes X

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

**Q20. Do you agree with our proposals for implementing a fast-track for beauty?**

Yes

No X

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*The proposals are vague and lack any clarity or rigor. Whilst supporting 'beauty' in the built environment in principle, the proposals risk of creating standards that are the least people will find offensive to the most people and stifling genuine innovation. They also assume appear to prioritise beauty above other factors such as sustainability of location, impact on highways and amenity, suitability of sites in terms of ground conditions and flood risk etc. all of which require proper consideration and risk being downplayed in favour of one aspect.*

*The proposal to use standard pattern books is also concerning, as it suggests a 'one size fits all' approach that may result in forms of development that are inappropriate to the location in which they are built.*

# Pillar Three – Planning for Infrastructure and Connected Places

**Q21. When new development happens in your area, what is your priority for what comes with it?**

More affordable housing

More of better infrastructure (such as transport, schools, health) X

Design of new buildings

More shops and/or employment space

Green space

Don't know

Other (please specify)

**Q22. (a) Should the Government replace the Community Infrastructure Levy and Section 106 planning obligations with a new consolidated Infrastructure Levy, which is charged as a fixed proportion of development value above a set threshold?**

Yes

No

Not Sure X

Supporting Statement

*More information is needed on how the national levy would operate.*

*The most immediate concerns relate to viability. Under the new proposals, site viability would not be considered. There is therefore a question over how the rate could reflect local circumstances, including the benchmark land values used to judge what is necessary to encourage a willing landowner to make their site available for development. The new Levy will be calculated based on the final value of a development (or an assessment of the sales value where the development is not sold). Consequently, it would appear that it would not take into account the often higher costs of delivering brownfield or other sites with larger abnormal costs. This is a critical issue for areas like Chesterfield where the local plan allocates strategic regeneration sites such as Staveley & Rother Valley Corridor which have acknowledged viability issues.*

*Any Levy should continue to be assessed and implemented locally (see response to question 22(b)).*

*The proposals do not take account of the wider role of S106 beyond securing funding for infrastructure, which is only one of the four purposes of planning obligations set out in the regulations, the others being:*

- a) restrict the development or use of the land in any specified way*
- b) require specified operations or activities to be carried out in, on, under or over the land*
- c) require the land to be used in any specified way*

*These have been used for a wide range of purposes including the long term maintenance and management of the Green Infrastructure, the management of land (or provision of replacement land) for the purposes of biodiversity and habitat, limiting the range or timings of activities for protect amenity and others. They are also used to ensure that infrastructure directly related to development (whether on or off site) is secured and provided in a timely manner. If S106 is to be dropped, alternative arrangements should be put in place to achieve these aims.*

**Q22. (b) Should the Infrastructure Levy rates be set nationally at a single rate, set nationally at an area-specific rate, or set locally?**

Nationally at a set rate

Nationally at an area specific rate

Locally X

*Setting the Levy nationally is fraught with difficulty. There are risks with setting the levy either too high or too low. If the levy is set too high, it may prevent development coming forward in certain locations. If the levy is set at a low level such that it captures all but the most unviable developments, this could result in development 'under-paying', resulting in necessary infrastructure being unable to be provided.*

*The reality is that not all developments deliver uplift in land value. Developers in locations with no uplift may benefit from falling beneath the minimum threshold proposed but the effect would be that local authorities in such areas, potentially including Chesterfield, would have less levy revenue to direct towards providing necessary infrastructure. It would be more appropriate to consider whether a national fund should be providing this investment in areas that do not generate the additional values but do need investment in strategic infrastructure.*

*Given the required focus on identifying deliverable sites to meet local housing requirements, the lack of viability testing might make it difficult to rely on housing yield from more challenging, less viable sites (such as those requiring costly on-site infrastructure) and focus on easier, but potentially less sustainable options. If the Levy is based on final development value this would appear to raise the potential that high quality design would have to pay more than a poorer quality scheme, introducing an undesirable and unintended disincentive to raise design standards (contrary to the stated and welcome objective on design elsewhere in the white paper).*

*As currently applies with CIL, the proposed new rate would be based on the applicable rate plus indexing, on the date of planning permission being granted. However, whereas CIL is payable within a set timescale of commencement, the new levy would not be payable until occupation. ('Occupation' would need be defined in legislation to avoid the extensive legal debates and costly delays.) Whilst this would introduce a delay in receipt of CIL revenues on each development, it would overcome current difficulties on certain schemes where smaller developers have reported difficulties in payment of CIL in advance of receipts from sales.*

*Clarification is needed on whether the value will be fixed when an implementable permission is granted or on the date the local plan is adopted and granted outline planning permission.*

**Q22. (c) Should the Infrastructure Levy aim to capture the same amount of value overall, or more value, to support greater investment in infrastructure, affordable housing and local communities?**

Same amount overall

More Value]

Less Value

Not sure

Supporting Statement

*If set nationally it is impossible at this stage to predict if it would capture more or less value locally. Ideally the Levy should capture greater value but to do this it should be set locally.*

**Q22. (d) Should we allow local authorities to borrow against the Infrastructure Levy, to support infrastructure delivery in their area?**

Yes X

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*In principle LPAs can already borrow against future CIL receipts but rarely done due to uncertainty and variability of CIL income and the impact of changes to legislation. This would not change under a nationally set regime. To enable borrowing against future income the Govt should provide some surety that, in the event that the anticipated income is not forthcoming.*

**Q23. Do you agree that the scope of the reformed Infrastructure Levy should capture changes of use through permitted development rights?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*The Government's introduction of permitted development rights (PDR) which allow the conversion of, for example, office space to residential has been widely criticised, in part due to the ability for new residential development permitted under PDR to avoid developer contributions to necessary supporting infrastructure and affordable housing. However, the proposals would bring into line the costs associated with providing infrastructure to support housing coming forward under PDR. Further amendments to the existing CIL Regulations may be required in order to capture this in advance of the new Infrastructure Levy regime taking effect.*

**Q24. (a) Do you agree that we should aim to secure at least the same amount of affordable housing under the Infrastructure Levy, and as much on-site affordable provision, as at present?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*Further comment to be provided by the Council's Housing Team for the Cabinet Meeting.*

**Q24. (b) Should affordable housing be secured as in-kind payment towards the Infrastructure Levy, or as a 'right to purchase' at discounted rates for local authorities?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*Further comment to be provided by the Council's Housing Team for the Cabinet Meeting.*

**Q24. (c) If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, should we mitigate against local authority overpayment risk?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*Further comment to be provided by the Council's Housing Team for the Cabinet Meeting.*

**Q24. (d) If an in-kind delivery approach is taken, are there additional steps that would need to be taken to support affordable housing quality?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*Further comment to be provided by the Council's Housing Team for the Cabinet Meeting.*

**Q25. Should local authorities have fewer restrictions over how they spend the Infrastructure Levy?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*Yes in principle, but the White Paper is recommending no ring fencing. If the Levy is to be used to deliver infrastructure needed to support growth and affordable housing, some limits will still be required to prevent LPAs being overwhelmed by requests for funding that exceed the capacity of the levy and to ensure it remains ring fenced for infrastructure to support growth and does not become a replacement for falling revenue income.*

**Q25 (a) If 'yes', should an affordable housing 'ring-fence' be developed?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*Yes, with the caveats set out above that we do not believe Affordable Housing should be delivered through the proposed levy.*

**Q26. Do you have any views on the potential impact of the proposals raised in this consultation on people with protected characteristics as defined in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010?**

Yes

No

Not Sure

Supporting Statement

*Whilst welcoming the emphasis on digital planning in principle, it must be recognised that this method of communication is not available or suitable to all and is likely to have an adverse impact upon some groups with protected characteristics unless alternative mechanisms are in place, otherwise the proposals risk locking some groups out of the process. By way of example, the council currently encourages electronic engagement with the Local Plan process, but approximately 50% of our Local Plan notifications are still currently sent by physical post.*

*The council also has significant concerns over whether the proposals to deliver affordable housing through the proposed levy will deliver an appropriate level of affordable housing. If this delivers a lower level of affordable housing this is likely to have a greater impact on those protected characteristics covering age and disability in particular.*