



www.guildford.gov.uk

Contact Officer:

John Armstrong, Democratic Services Manager

15 March 2021

Dear Councillor

Your attendance is requested at a meeting of the **EXECUTIVE** to be held in the Microsoft Teams on **TUESDAY, 23 MARCH 2021** at 7.00 pm.

Yours faithfully

James Whiteman
Managing Director

MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE

Chairman:

Councillor Joss Bigmore ((Leader of the Council and Lead Councillor for Service Delivery))

Vice-Chairman:

Councillor Jan Harwood ((Lead Councillor for Climate Change))

Councillor Tim Anderson, (Lead Councillor for Resources)

Councillor Tom Hunt, (Lead Councillor for Development Management)

Councillor Julia McShane, (Lead Councillor for Community and Housing)

Councillor John Redpath, (Lead Councillor for Economy)

Councillor John Rigg, (Lead Councillor for Regeneration)

Councillor James Steel, (Lead Councillor for Environment)

WEBCASTING NOTICE

This meeting will be recorded for live and/or subsequent broadcast on the Council's website in accordance with the Council's capacity in performing a task in the public interest and in line with the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014. The whole of the meeting will be recorded, except where there are confidential or exempt items, and the footage will be on the website for six months.

If you have any queries regarding webcasting of meetings, please contact Committee Services.

QUORUM 3

THE COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

Vision – for the borough

For Guildford to be a town and rural borough that is the most desirable place to live, work and visit in South East England. A centre for education, healthcare, innovative cutting-edge businesses, high quality retail and wellbeing. A county town set in a vibrant rural environment, which balances the needs of urban and rural communities alike. Known for our outstanding urban planning and design, and with infrastructure that will properly cope with our needs.

Three fundamental themes and nine strategic priorities that support our vision:

- | | |
|---------------------|--|
| Place-making | Delivering the Guildford Borough Local Plan and providing the range of housing that people need, particularly affordable homes |
| | Making travel in Guildford and across the borough easier |
| | Regenerating and improving Guildford town centre and other urban areas |
| Community | Supporting older, more vulnerable and less advantaged people in our community |
| | Protecting our environment |
| | Enhancing sporting, cultural, community, and recreational facilities |
| Innovation | Encouraging sustainable and proportionate economic growth to help provide the prosperity and employment that people need |
| | Creating smart places infrastructure across Guildford |
| | Using innovation, technology and new ways of working to improve value for money and efficiency in Council services |

Values for our residents

- We will strive to be the best Council.
- We will deliver quality and value for money services.
- We will help the vulnerable members of our community.
- We will be open and accountable.
- We will deliver improvements and enable change across the borough.

AGENDA

ITEM NO.

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTEREST

In accordance with the local Code of Conduct, a councillor is required to disclose at the meeting any disclosable pecuniary interest (DPI) that they may have in respect of any matter for consideration on this agenda. Any councillor with a DPI must not participate in any discussion or vote regarding that matter and they must also withdraw from the meeting immediately before consideration of the matter.

If that DPI has not been registered, the councillor must notify the Monitoring Officer of the details of the DPI within 28 days of the date of the meeting.

Councillors are further invited to disclose any non-pecuniary interest which may be relevant to any matter on this agenda, in the interests of transparency, and to confirm that it will not affect their objectivity in relation to that matter.

3 MINUTES (Pages 5 - 8)

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Executive held on 16 February 2021.

4 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

5 EXTENSION OF PRIVATE RENTED SECTOR ENFORCEMENT POWERS *
(Pages 9 - 18)

6 FORMER POND MEADOWS TRAINING CENTRE SITE * (Pages 19 - 30)

7 USE OF RIGHT TO BUY RECEIPTS * (Pages 31 - 50)

8 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

In accordance with Regulation 5 (2) of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 the Council published on 18 January notice of intention to hold part of this meeting in private to discuss Item 9 Ash Road Bridge and Item 10 North Street Redevelopment, Guildford.

The notice included a statement setting out the reasons for these matters to be discussed in private and inviting anyone wishing to make representations in relation to holding part of the meeting in private for this purpose to do so by 12 noon on 11 February 2021 (North Street) and 18 March 2021 (Ash Road Bridge). To date no representations have been received.

The reason for considering these matters in private is due to the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, which is information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The content also contains details of legal advice provided to the Council and is therefore exempt by virtue of paragraph 5 of Part 1 of the Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, which is Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

In order to consider these matters in private, the Executive is asked to consider passing the following resolution:

"That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) and Regulation 5 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, the public be excluded from the meeting for consideration of agenda items 9 and 10 on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 3 and 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act."

Following approval of the resolution to exclude the public, the chairman will ask councillors present to leave the public part of the MS Teams meeting and join a private MS Teams meeting, a link for which will have been circulated to all councillors before the meeting. The webcast will be terminated at this point.

9 ASH ROAD BRIDGE - PROJECT UPDATE * (Pages 51 - 220)

10 NORTH STREET DEVELOPMENT SITE, GUILDFORD * (Pages 221 - 376)

Key Decisions:

Any item on this agenda that is marked with an asterisk is a key decision. The Council's Constitution defines a key decision as an executive decision which is likely to result in expenditure or savings of at least £200,000 or which is likely to have a significant impact on two or more wards within the Borough.

Under Regulation 9 of the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, whenever the Executive intends to take a key decision, a document setting out prescribed information about the key decision including:

- the date on which it is to be made,
- details of the decision makers,
- a list of the documents to be submitted to the Executive in relation to the matter,
- how copies of such documents may be obtained

must be available for inspection by the public at the Council offices and on the Council's website at least 28 clear days before the key decision is to be made. The relevant notice in respect of the key decisions to be taken at this meeting was published as part of the Forward Plan on 2019.

EXECUTIVE

16 February 2021

- * Councillor Joss Bigmore (Chairman)
- * Councillor Caroline Reeves (Vice-Chairman)

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| * Councillor Tim Anderson | * Councillor John Redpath |
| * Councillor Jan Harwood | * Councillor John Rigg |
| * Councillor Julia McShane | * Councillor James Steel |

*Present

Councillors Angela Goodwin, Nigel Manning, Ramsey Nagaty, Maddy Redpath, Deborah Seabrook and Paul Spooner were also in attendance.

EX76 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

EX77 LOCAL CODE OF CONDUCT - DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

There were no disclosures of interest.

EX78 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held 26 January 2021 were confirmed as a correct record. The Chairman signed the minutes.

EX79 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader began by thanking all of those involved in the vaccination programme across the country for managing to hit their targets and outperforming almost every other country in the world with 25% of the population receiving their first injection. The achievement was described as remarkable achievement in terms of the numbers of people and also the quality of service at the vaccination centres.

During half term week the Leader sent a reminder to Guildford residents that Council Wardens had extra food parcels in case anyone needed assistance. The Council was aware that there were many people in newly vulnerable situations and that support was available. Residents were asked not to hesitate to contact the Council if help was needed and contact details were provided.

Guildford residents who had been told by the NHS to self-isolate, could be entitled to a Self-Isolation Payment. There were criteria around receiving this payment, but the Council had funds available and the Leader urged anyone who found themselves in such a situation to visit the Council's website for more information.

The Pop-Up Business School, which would start courses on 22 February, offered support to new and existing businesses and would run until 5 March 2021. The course would offer two sessions a day on Zoom and was free. The Leader invited those with a business idea or opportunity to contact the Council for guidance.

National Census Day would take place on Sunday 21 March. The Census updated our knowledge and understanding of our local communities. The Leader felt it was important that

everyone should take part. There would be more information on the Council's social and more traditional media as the date approached.

EX80 GYPSY AND TRAVELLER TRANSIT SITE PROVISION IN SURREY

The Executive considered a report supporting the provision of a traveller transit site for Surrey. Due to the impact unauthorised encampments made on local communities the Surrey Leaders' Group had identified the need for a transit site for Surrey. The transit site would be a location where unauthorised encampments could be relocated in the short term. It was proposed that a ten-pitch transit site within the county border at a location yet to be confirmed should be built with the financial contributions from the Police and ten of the district and borough councils. The contribution from Guildford would be £127,000. The host borough would not be requested to make a financial contribution and the remediation costs of the site would be met by Surrey County Council (SCC). The site would be acquired by SCC and managed by the SCC Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Team. It was hoped this would provide the pilot for future similar schemes. It was announced that tentative discussions had commenced to consider another site on the other side of the County.

There was no allocated budget for the expenditure. However, the Executive was asked to consider the sum of £115,000 that was designated for Traveller encampments that remained on the provisional capital programme (Scheme PL60(p)) together with a virement of £12,000 taken from the capital contingency fund to make up the total contribution.

Accordingly, the Executive

RESOLVED

- (1) That the provision of a Gypsy and Traveller Transit Site in Surrey, as progressed by the Surrey Leaders' Group, be supported and that the Council commits to a one-off contribution of £127,000 in capital funding for the construction of the site and an annual contribution of £7,500 revenue funding for the maintenance of the site.
- (2) That the £115,000 for Traveller encampments remaining on the provisional capital programme (Scheme PL60(p)) be repurposed and that a virement of £12,000 be taken from the capital contingency fund to increase the budget to £127,000.
- (3) That the provisional budget be transferred to the approved capital programme.

Reason:

To enable Surrey County Council to build a 10-pitch transit site that will enable the Police to invoke their section 62A powers under the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 and help manage unauthorised encampments across the county.

EX81 COLLABORATION BY COUNCILS IN SURREY

In response to the Surrey County Council (SCC) announcement that it intended to submit a case for change to Government for a single unitary council the leaders of the eleven district and borough councils each expressed views that a single unitary model was not supported. It was agreed that the districts and boroughs would collectively explore other options for local government in Surrey and KPMG was appointed to produce a report setting out various models for discussion. The KPMG report had two parts, options for unitary councils and options for closer collaboration between councils.

Since Government had not opted to take forward the SCC proposal in its White Paper it was suggested that it would be advantageous to seek closer collaborative working with Waverley Borough Council (WBC). Continued reduced funding from central government had been

compounded by the Covid pandemic to present both councils with a critical medium-term financial challenge. In addition to similar budgetary challenges there were at least eight service areas where closer collaborative working could be considered for potential savings. The WBC Executive had considered a similar report on collaboration.

The Joint Executive Advisory Board (JEAB) had considered the recommendations of the KPMG report at its meeting on 15 February 2021 and comments arising from that meeting were set out for the Executive on the Supplementary information Sheet. The Chairman of the JEAB addressed the meeting and summarised the debate from the meeting. The JEAB was in favour of a local government reorganisation of three unitary authorities overall for the County; collaboration with WBC with the assistance of the Local Government Association (LGA) to explore the details, concerns and potential financial savings and an option of possibly including Woking Borough Council in a collaborative partnership in the future.

The Executive received the comments from the JEAB favourably. Merged teams of officers supporting two sets of councillors was a model that had been adopted successfully elsewhere in the country delivering increased resilience and cost savings. Whilst it was noted that the Council had made over £8 million in savings through the Future Guildford transformation project, £6 million was still required in savings over the coming four years in order to maintain current service levels. It was noted that the Council retained just 9% of Council Tax and 5% of Business Rates whilst options to compete commercially were restricted by Government. Closer partnership working could bring substantial financial benefits, whilst protecting public services and keeping them local.

Having considered the report and the comments from the JEAB, the Executive

RESOLVED

- (1) That, in the event of councils in Surrey being invited to make submissions to the Secretary of State in respect of any future local government reorganisation, the three unitary council model set out under Option 3(c) of the KPMG report, be agreed as the Council’s preferred council structure in Surrey.
- (2) That the eight priority areas for closer collaboration identified in the KPMG report be agreed in principle.
- (3) That the range of options for discussion with Waverley Borough Council on greater partnership working be explored.
- (4) That the Council engages with the LGA to undertake an initial scoping study to determine a rough order of magnitude around the potential savings for the various options for collaboration with Waverley Borough Council

Reason:

To help inform future discussions about local government structures and greater collaboration between councils in Surrey.

The meeting finished at 7.31 pm

Signed

Date

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank

Executive Report

Ward(s) affected: All

Report of Director of Service Delivery

Author: Sean Grady

Tel: 01483 444392

Email: sean.grady@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor responsible: Julia McShane

Tel: 01483 837736

Email: julia.mcshane@guildford.gov.uk

Date: 23 March 2021

Extension of Private Rented Sector Enforcement Powers

Executive Summary

The report advises the Executive of new legislative powers to further improve housing standards in the private rented sector, which enable financial penalties to be imposed if electrical safety standards are not met, under the Electrical Safety Standards in the Private Rented Sector (England) Regulations 2020.

The Executive is asked to approve a proposed charging structure for these penalties and to delegate authority to the Head of Environment and Regulatory Services to determine the amount of any financial penalty in accordance with the charging structure. The imposition of a financial penalty is the only enforcement option in relation to these Regulations.

Recommendation to Executive

- (1) That the charging structure for financial penalties imposed in accordance with the powers introduced by Sections 122 & 123 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 ("the Act") and the Electrical Safety Standards in the Private Rented Sector (England) Regulations 2020 ("the Regulations") as set out in Appendix 1 to this report, be approved.
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Head of Environment and Regulatory Services to take all necessary action to implement the charging structure and impose financial penalties in accordance with the Regulations.

Reason for Recommendation:

To enable the Council to exercise the powers introduced by Sections 122 & 123 of the Act to impose financial penalties for failure to comply with the Regulations.

Is the report (or part of it) exempt from publication? No

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The report sets out legislative changes, which affect the private rented sector and recommends the adoption of a charging policy for levying financial penalties in respect of offences.

2. Strategic Priorities

- 2.1 Enabling residents to have access to safe and suitable homes that are compliant with current electrical standards supports the objectives of the current Housing Strategy. Protecting our residents from unsafe housing conditions will inaugurate the community-based aims of the Council's Corporate Plan 2018-2023.
- 2.2 The Council's corporate priorities identify that protecting the most vulnerable and less advantaged residents is essential to the success of the Borough. With additional regulation of the private rented sector the Council will be able to fulfil its priorities by ensuring electrical standards are met in this sector. With an ongoing housing crisis, high property prices and the COVID-19 pandemic more people will turn to the private rental sector as a viable source of housing. The private rental sector provides a place to live for a range of Guildford's' residents including students, key workers, those on low incomes and the most vulnerable.

3. Background

- 3.1 The private rented housing sector has expanded in recent years and now accounts for around 16% of the residential sector in our Borough. This equates to 9,000 dwellings affected by the Regulations. The Electrical Safety Standards in the Private Rented Sector (England) Regulations 2020 are now in force and make available greater powers to local authorities to improve conditions in the private rented sector and drive out "rogue landlords". The regulations came into force on 1 June 2020, they apply to new tenancies from 1 July 2020 and existing tenancies from 1 April 2021.
- 3.2 Prior to the regulations coming into force electrical safety in all privately rented dwellings was only enforced through Part 1 of the Housing Act 2004. The regulations place new duties on private landlords to ensure that electrical safety inspections are routinely undertaken, an Electrical Inspection Condition Report (EICR) is produced, that any serious electrical hazards identified in the EICR are remedied within 28 days of the EICR and written confirmation of remediation is provided to the Council within 28 days of such remediation work being undertaken. The Council has already received 176 notifications of remedial work in a 6-month period, since the Regulations came into force in July 2020.
- 3.3 Under the Regulations the Council may request reports following inspections of properties to ascertain the condition of the electrical installation and confirm the landlord is complying with the Regulations. This is an effective toolkit to ensure current and ongoing electrical safety compliance during property condition investigations.

- 3.4 The Regulations also provide additional protection to tenants and prospective tenants, empowering them with the electrical safety documentation they need to rent a safe home.
- 3.5 The Regulations enable the Council to enforce electrical safety standards in all privately let dwellings, except for the following exemptions: private registered providers of social housing, lodgers, long leases, student halls of residence, hostels and refuges, care homes, hospitals, hospices and other accommodation relating to healthcare provision.
- 3.6 Licensable and unlicensable Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) are also covered by the Regulations, strengthening the regulation of all HMOs.
- 3.7 The Regulations impose a duty on the Council to serve a remedial notice where the local housing authority is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that a landlord has not complied with one or more of their duties under the Regulations. The local housing authority can then undertake the remedial action and recover the costs of taking the action from the landlord and may also impose a financial penalty of up to £30,000 on landlords who are in breach of their duties.
- 3.8 Adopting the framework to issue Civil Penalties Notices (CPNs) will enable the amount of each Penalty Notice issued to be recovered and ring fenced by the authority for further enforcement.
- 3.9 The Regulations allow the Council to impose a financial penalty (“a civil penalty”), where it is satisfied, beyond reasonable doubt that a landlord has breached a duty under the Regulations.
- 3.10 The relevant duties are:
- Failure to ensure national standards for electrical safety are met.
 - Failure to ensure all electrical installations in their rented properties are inspected and tested at least every 5 years.
 - Failure to obtain a report from the person conducting the inspection.
 - Failure to supply a copy of this report to an existing tenant, new tenant, prospective tenant or Local Authority upon request.
 - Failure to carry out the further investigative or remedial works specified in the report
 - Failure to supply written confirmation of the completion of the further investigative or remedial works from the electrician to the tenant and the local housing authority within 28 days of completion of the works.
- 3.11 The charging of a civil penalty is the only option to enforce the above duties. A civil penalty is intended to act as a deterrent to and punishment for non-compliance.
- 3.12 The proposed civil penalties charging structure (See **Appendix 1**) will provide consistency of approach and assist officers to determine the appropriate penalty on a case by case basis. The charging structure has been developed in accordance with the guidance issued to local authorities by Department of Communities and Local Government in April 2017 “Civil Penalties under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 – Guidance for Local Housing Authorities”.

Whilst the guidance does not specifically apply to the Regulations, it contains a useful framework for decision making which could be adopted in respect of these Regulations.

3.13 The charging structure takes into account the following criteria set out in the above-mentioned guidance. These should be considered when determining the appropriate level of penalty:

- a) severity of the offence
- b) culpability and track record of the offender
- c) the harm caused to the tenant
- d) punishment of the offender
- e) deterring the offender from repeating the offence
- f) deterring others from committing similar offences
- g) removing any financial benefit the offender may have obtained from committing the offence.

3.14 Where the person fails to pay the civil penalty, the Council may recover it as if it were an order of the County Court.

3.15 The Regulations enable local authorities to use the money received from civil penalties to support the cost of our Private Sector Housing enforcement work.

4. Use of Civil Penalties

4.1 Investigations and inspections relating to property conditions are undertaken in accordance with the Corporate Regulatory Enforcement Policy approved by the Executive on 2 January 2018. Any subsequent enforcement action will also be taken in accordance with the principles set out in the enforcement policy.

4.2 Civil penalties will also be used for non-compliance with the Regulations, such as not remediating electrical hazards within acceptable timeframes.

4.3 The purpose of the civil penalty is to both act as a deterrent to non-compliance with housing standards and where officers have spent time resolving non-compliance the cost of the investigation can be recovered.

4.4 The use of civil penalties will be utilised for all levels of breaches of duty, where it is appropriate – usually where an informal, proportionate and pragmatic approach to compliance has failed. Where the breach is serious and significant, a penalty will be issued as the only enforcement option. Alternatively, a prosecution could be considered under Part 1 of the Housing Act 2004 where electrical hazards result in an Improvement notice being served. The new regulations allow swifter enforcement and rapid remediation of electrical hazards.

4.5 CPNs that are secured will send a clear message and act as a financial deterrent to others that the Council will act where there is non-compliance with housing law to protect residents.

- 4.6 The Council understands that most landlords and property managers want to comply with the law. The Council will continue to publish information that will support private sector housing duty holders to achieve compliance with the law and help tenants to understand their rights.
- 4.7 The issuing of a CPN will follow the Council's enforcement policy and as such a graduated approach will be taken. The landlord will have received prior warning of their failure to comply that may take the form of an (in)formal warning or Remediation Notice - which will be in addition to the statutory "Notice of Intention to Issue a Civil Penalty".
- 4.8 The person who is served a civil penalty notice can appeal both the amount of penalty and the issuing of the notice to the Residential Property Tribunal.

5. Consultations

- 5.1 The proposed charging structure has been sent for consultation to the HMO (Houses in Multiple Occupation) Stakeholder Group, which has representatives from the University of Surrey, local residents, groups, letting agents, landlords, the Academy of Contemporary Music and the Council. No responses were received to the consultation letter sent.

6. Equality and Diversity Implications

- 6.1 There may be circumstances where officers will be working with landlords and agents for whom English is not their first language. Where necessary, appropriate translation services will be used to ensure the requirements are fully understood. Any equality implications will be taken into account when individual decisions are made to enforce duties under the Regulations or impose financial penalties.

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1 There are no additional resource implications as a result of this legislation.
- 7.2 The amount of a civil penalty is not prescribed and each penalty notice is to be assessed case by case. The framework in **Appendix 1** was generated by the MHCLG and is designed to enable officers to identify the most appropriate level of fee, based on the severity of the offence.
- 7.3 Where a civil penalty charge is recovered, the Council can use the money to fund private sector housing enforcement work and therefore there is no additional expenditure resulting from implementing the new charging structure. However, such charges are unlikely to be regular or significant. These additional funds will enable the authority to continue to enforce housing standards in the borough. CPNs will enable a simple and effective deterrent to those landlords operating outside of the law.
- 7.4 Recovering debt from unpaid CPNs has been covered by the MHCLG guidance for Local Authorities. Where the landlord fails to pay a civil penalty, the local housing authority should refer the case to the county court for an order of that

court. If necessary, the local housing authority should use county court bailiffs to enforce the order and recover the debt.

8. Legal Implications

- 8.1 The Electrical Safety Standards in the Private Rented Sector (England) Regulations 2020 extend the enforcement powers available to the Council to regulate housing conditions in the private rented sector.
- 8.2 The Regulations allow the Council to serve remedial notices where electrical safety standards are not met and the Council may carry out works in default where remedial notices are not complied with.
- 8.3 Failure by private landlords to comply with the duties in the Regulations is not a criminal offence. The Council may however issue a civil financial penalty where it is satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that the duties have been breached. There is a right of appeal against any financial penalties imposed. Implementation of a charging structure will assist the Council to make reasoned decisions which can be defended on appeal.
- 8.4 All enforcement action will be taken in accordance with the Council's adopted regulatory enforcement policy.

9. Human Resource Implications

- 9.1 There are no human resource implications.

10. Summary of Options

- 10.1 The Council has a statutory duty to enforce the Electrical Safety Standards in the Private Rented Sector (England) Regulations 2020 . It now has the option of imposing financial penalties to enforce breaches of landlord's duties under the new regulations. . There is no specific statutory guidance applicable to financial penalties under the Regulations, however officers recommend following the guidance issued in respect of Civil Penalties under the Housing and Planning Act 2016. The following options are available:
 - Option 1 - To implement the civil penalty charging structure, which has been produced in accordance with the statutory guidance.
 - Option 2 - Not to utilise the power to issue civil penalties and to continue without enforcement provisions.
- 10.2 Option 1 is preferred, as imposing financial penalties will be the only method to regulate and enforce the new regulations. The option of issuing penalties will be both proportionate and effective in dealing with breaches. The ability to retain any penalty will help to offset our enforcement costs.

11. Conclusion

- 11.1 The legislation adds to evolving tools that exist to improve housing standards in the private rented sector. It is expected that the majority of landlords in the

Borough will meet their obligations and responsibilities. Where there is non-compliance, officers will continue to use a combination of informal and formal means to secure compliance in accordance with the Council's Regulatory Enforcement Policy.

- 11.2 The new powers will be a useful enforcement option in appropriate circumstances.

12. Background Papers

[Housing and Planning Act 2016](#)

[Electrical Safety Standards in the Private Rented Sector \(England\) Regulations \(2020\)](#)

[Civil Penalties under the Housing and Planning Act 2016 - Guidance for Local Authorities](#)

[Corporate Regulatory Enforcement Policy](#)

13. Appendices

Appendix 1: Housing and Planning Act 2016 Civil Penalties Fee Structure

This page is intentionally left blank

Electrical Safety Standards in the Private Rented Sector (England) Regulations 2020

Civil Penalties – Charging Structure

Factors Select score based on following guidance	Score 10	Score 20	Score 30	Score Selected
Severity of Breach score should reflect the seriousness of breach & if actions were deliberate	Minor breach – isolated incident, unforeseen, possibly some effort made to remove risk.	Moderate severity knowingly committed breach without considering consequences	Severe high risk breach deliberate and flagrant disregard of law	
Previous History previous compliance history & previous willingness to co-operate & comply	No previous history of non-compliance.	Some low level previous history	Previous history of non-compliance & enforcement action	
Deter & Prevent Severity of breach & level of penalty required to prevent recurrence	Penalty will prevent reoccurrence	Penalty likely to deter repetition	Repetition likely unless penalty is very high	
Harm to Tenants impact on tenant, vulnerable group, discrimination etc?	Minor risk of harm to tenants. No vulnerable groups affected	Moderate risk of harm. Vulnerable group may be affected. Possible discrimination.	High level of harm with vulnerable group affected, intentional discrimination.	
Removal of financial benefit Level of financial benefit gained from breach, include asset values and rental income.	Small or no financial gain from non-compliance	Moderate financial gain and income from non-compliance	High financial gain, significant assets & income	
			TOTAL SCORE	

Score	Fee
50-60	£1,000
61-70	£5,000
71-80	£10,000
81-90	£15,000
91-100	£20,000
101-150	£30,000

This page is intentionally left blank

Executive Report

Ward(s) affected: Westborough

Report of Director of Strategic Services

Author: Melissa Bromham, Deputy Head of Asset Management

Tel: 01483 444587

Email: melissa.bromham@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor responsible: Tim Anderson

Tel: 07710 328560

Email: tim.anderson@guildford.gov.uk

Date: 23 March 2021

Former Pond Meadows Training Centre site

Executive Summary

Surrey County Council (SCC) is proposing the re-development of the 'Former Pond Meadows Training Centre' site (shown edged red and coloured blue on the attached plan in **Appendix 2**) to provide a 50-bed extra care facility linked to community use. However, the site is subject to an onerous user covenant, to which Guildford Borough Council (GBC) is the beneficiary. SCC has asked for a deed of release and variation of the user covenant.

SCC is also seeking additional rights in order to bring in new services to the proposed development and to improve the GBC owned access road shown coloured brown on the plan attached in **Appendix 2**.

Officers have obtained an independent valuation from Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) of the proposed amendments. The consideration payable to GBC in return for the deed of release, variation of the user covenant and the additional rights would be £207,500.

SCC is offering to meet GBC's reasonable costs in the transaction but has requested that no further consideration is demanded due to the community benefit of their proposals.

The options that have been considered are to demand the £207,500 capital payment from SCC or agree to assist SCC in their proposals by agreeing to the variation of the user covenant and the grant of additional rights for nil consideration.

Recommendation to Executive

That the Executive:

- (1) Agrees to enter into a deed of release of the restrictive covenant, a variation of the user covenant and grant of additional rights for the land known as the Former Pond Meadows Training Centre.

- (2) Approves the transaction is completed for nil consideration.
- (3) Authorises the Head of Asset Management, in consultation with the Chief Finance Officer, and the Lead Councillor for Finance and Assets, to agree the terms for the deed of release; draft heads of terms set out in Appendix 1 to this report.

Reason for Recommendation:

To allow Surrey County Council to re-develop the subject site to provide a 50-bed extra care facility within the Borough.

Is the report (or part of it) exempt from publication? No

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 Officers request that the Executive decide whether to release an onerous user covenant, to which Guildford Borough Council are the beneficiary, and grant additional rights on the Council's retained land, for nil consideration.

2. Strategic Priorities

- 2.1 The proposed extra care facility will help deliver the following fundamental themes within the Council's Strategic framework:
 - Place-making: by "delivering the Guildford Borough Local Plan and providing the range of housing that people need, particularly affordable homes".
 - Community: by "supporting older, more vulnerable and less advantaged people in our community".
- 2.2 In addition, it will help the vulnerable members of our community in line with one of the Council's values.

3. Background

- 3.1 The Freehold of the subject property is owned by SCC. The property comprises a rectangular and level parcel of land which formerly housed the Pond Meadow training centre. The buildings have all been demolished and the site is now cleared for re-development. The Property is connected to Pond Meadow via a short, narrow drive at the north end of the road, between two houses. This drive is owned by GBC and coloured brown on the plan attached as **Appendix 2**.

The Proposal

- 3.2 SCC is proposing the development of the site for an extra care home linked to community use. We understand that the proposed development is a 50-bed extra care facility, although officers have not been provided with any design details for the proposed development and a planning application has yet to be made. SCC has stated the following:

“Residency of the extra care home will be subject to meeting eligibility criteria, which is to provide 100% regulated rent to some of the most vulnerable and needy Surrey residents, and in doing so relieving pressures of GBC’s housing stock and care in the community requirements. The proposed facility will be part of SCC’s objective to provide 725 extra care units. Residents in the Borough requiring extra care will benefit from the provision of a c. 50 bed home and GBC obtain an additional benefit of the extra care home freeing up social housing within the Borough”.

3.3 GBC sold the subject this land to SCC in 1950. The sale was subject to a covenant regarding the future use and development of the land and the benefit of rights of way, drainage, water, support, light and other easements over the land coloured brown on the plan in **Appendix 2**. The user covenant was amended with effect from 3rd June 1957. SCC now wishes to vary the user covenant again, as well as obtain additional rights in order to facilitate the proposed re-development.

3.4 The existing user covenant is as follows:

SCC covenants to use the land and any building or buildings to be erected thereon for the purpose of a mixed occupation and training centre for defectives under the provisions of the Mental Deficiency Act 1913 as Amended by the Mental Deficiency Act 1927 and the National Health Service Act 1946 or such other additional or amending Act as may from time to time be in force (“the Amended Covenant”).

3.5 The following user covenant is now proposed:

Use for the provision of residential accommodation and care to people in need of care and/or support (other than a use within class C3 (dwelling houses)). Use as an Extra Care, hospital or residential/nursing home.

3.6 SCC is also seeking consent to undertake works to the surface and sub-surface of the GBC owned land coloured brown on the plan in **Appendix 2**, to lay services under the surface, and to seek adoption of the road by the public highway authorities.

3.7 SCC is offering to meet GBC’s reasonable costs but have requested that no further consideration is demanded due to the community benefit of their proposals. Draft heads of terms are attached in **Appendix 1**.

3.8 The Council have obtained an independent valuation from Lambert Smith Hampton (LSH) of the proposed amendment to the covenant and rights. LSH have valued the increase in land value as a result of the amendments at £415,000.

3.9 The way this increase in value is shared between two parties is open to negotiation. However, it is normal for this increase to be shared equally between the parties. On this basis, the consideration payable to Guildford Borough

Council in return for the deed of release, variation of the user clause and grant of additional rights granted would be £207,500.

4. Consultations

- 4.1 Officers have consulted with the Leader of the Council and the Lead Councillor for Resources.

5. Financial Implications

- 5.1 The grant of rights over the Council's land (easements) constitutes a disposal of land under s123 of the Local Government Act 1972. Therefore, the Council has a statutory duty to seek best consideration.
- 5.2 However, in accordance with the General Disposal Consent (England) 2003 (2003 Consent) a Council can consider the disposal of an asset for less than best consideration in certain circumstances.
- 5.3 If the Council agrees to the transaction at nil consideration the Council will be forgoing a potential capital receipt of £207,500.
- 5.4 All reasonable costs associated with the transaction are to be covered by SCC.

6. Legal Implications

- 6.1 The statutory duty to achieve best consideration is not applicable in these circumstances. The modification of a restrictive covenant does not constitute a disposal of land under s123 of the Local Government Act 1972.
- 6.2 The Council, however, has a fiduciary duty owed to local taxpayers to ensure best value.
- 6.3 The grant of rights over the Council's land (easements) constitutes a disposal of land under s123 of the Local Government Act 1972. Therefore, the Council has a statutory duty to seek best consideration.
- 6.4 However, in accordance with the General Disposal Consent (England) 2003 (2003 Consent) a Council can consider the disposal of an asset for less than best consideration in the following circumstances:
- a) The purpose for which the land is to be disposed is likely to contribute to the achievement of any one or more of the following in respect of the whole or any part of its area, or of all or any person resident or present in its area:
 - i. the promotion or improvement of economic wellbeing;
 - ii. the promotion or improvement of social wellbeing;
 - iii. the promotion or improvement of environmental wellbeing.

- b) The difference between the unrestricted value of the land to be disposed of and the consideration or restricted value of the land does not exceed £2,000,000 (two million pounds).

6.5 The grant of the additional rights is vital to facilitate the proposed development. The provision of a new extra care facility will relieve pressures on GBC's housing stock and care in the community requirements and help deliver the Council's strategic objective, as set out in the Strategic framework, to "provide the range of housing that people need" and "support older, more vulnerable and less advantaged people in our community".

6.6 Officers therefore consider that the benefit as outlined above satisfies item ii) of requirement a) of the 2003 Consent.

6.7 In terms of requirement b) LSH note that the difference between the unrestricted value of the land and the consideration is less than £2,000,000.

7. Human Resource Implications

7.1 No human resource implications apply.

8. Equality and Diversity Implications

8.1 This duty has been considered in the context of this report and it has been concluded that there are no equality and diversity implications arising directly from this report.

9. Climate Change/Sustainability Implications

9.1 There are no specific implications as a result of the report, however, a new fit for purpose extra care scheme would support the Council's sustainability agenda and have community benefits.

10. Summary of Options

10.1 Officers believe the Council has three options:

1. Demand that SCC pay £207,500, and ensure the Council obtains best value.
2. Discount the above figure by an amount that is proportionate to the potential service provision savings or benefit to the community. This may be difficult to quantify.
3. Support the scheme and agree to complete the transaction for nil consideration.

11. Conclusion

- 11.1 SCC are proposing a new extra care facility which will be linked to community use. Residency of the extra care home will be subject to meeting eligibility criteria, which is to provide 100% regulated rent to some of the most vulnerable and needy residents. SCC believe that this will also relieve the pressures of GBC's housing stock and care in the community requirements.
- 11.2 The proposed extra care facility will help deliver the following fundamental themes within the Council's Strategic framework:
- Place-making: by "delivering the Guildford Borough Local Plan and providing the range of housing that people need, particularly affordable homes".
 - Community: by "supporting older, more vulnerable and less advantaged people in our community".
- 11.3 The development will help the vulnerable members of our community in line with the Council's values.
- 11.4 The Executive need to decide whether they wish to support SCC proposals by completing the transaction at nil consideration.

12. Background Papers

None

13. Appendices

Appendix 1: Draft Heads of Terms
Appendix 2: Site Plan

Heads of Terms
Deed of Release to Freehold Title SY813536
&
Grant of Additional Rights to Access Route
For
Land & Access
Former Pond Meadow Training Centre
Guildford
GU2 8YG

Between Surrey County Council & Guildford Borough Council

1	Property Address	Former Pond Meadow Training Centre Off Park Meadow Guildford GU2 8YG Freehold Title SY813536
2	Name and Address of Freeholder	Woodhatch Place 11 Cockshot Hill Reigate Surrey RH2 8EF
3	Name and Address of Beneficiary to Restrictions on Freehold Representative Email address:	Guildford Borough Council Millmead House, Millmead, Guildford, Surrey GU2 4BB Mark Appleton Mark.Appleton@guildford.gov.uk
4	Property Description	Land 1.42 acres shown by red verge and blue colour on CM4839
5	Existing Encumbrance to Title SY813536 dated 3 June 1957	Surrey County Council covenants to use the land and any building or buildings to be erected thereon for the purpose of a mixed

		occupation and training centre for defectives under the provisions of the Mental Deficiency Act 1913 as Amended by the Mental Deficiency Act 1927 and the National Health Service Act 1946 or such other additional or amending Act as may from time to time be in force (“the Amended Covenant”)
6	Proposed Encumbrance to Title SY813536 dated 3 June 1957	Use for the provision of residential accommodation and care to people in need of care and/or support (other than a use within class C3 (dwelling houses)). Use as a Extra Care, hospital or residential/nursing home.
7	Existing Rights benefitting the Property	The Property has the benefit of the rights of way, drainage, water, support, light and other easements over the land coloured brown on plan CM4839.
8	Revised Rights Sought to Benefit the Property	<p>SCC to benefit from rights of way and have the right to undertake works to the surface and sub surface of the land coloured brown, lay services under the surface and to seek adoption of the road by public highway authorities.</p> <p>Works will be at Surrey County Council expense and will be subject to Guildford Borough Councils approval not to be unreasonably withheld.</p>
9	Premium	Surrey County Council will pay to Guildford Borough Council a premium of £peppercorn, on the completion of the Deed of Release to Freehold Title SY813536 & Grant of Additional Rights to Access Route
9	Fees	Surrey County Council to meet reasonable surveyor and legal fees of Guildford Borough Council
10	Plan	<p>CM4839</p> <p>Title No SY813536</p> <p>Land edged red coloured Blue</p>

		Access Road shown by brown colour
11	Subject to	Subject to Contract. Subject to all necessary Approvals Processes of both Landlord and Tenant.

This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank

Executive Report

Ward(s) affected:

Report of Director of Resources

Author: Claire Morris

Tel: 01483 444821

Email: Claire.Morris@guildford.gov.uk

Lead Councillor responsible: Tim Anderson

Tel: 07710 328560

Email: tim.anderson@guildford.gov.uk

Date: 23 March 2021

Review of the Use of Right to Buy Receipts and Appropriation of Land into the Housing Revenue Account

Executive Summary

In 2019-20 the Council had to repay Right to Buy (RTB) receipts plus interest to government totalling £2.7million. The reason for the repayment was because the Council did not spend the money on its new build housing investment programme in the HRA within the required time frame. The Council has acquired property to try and mitigate some of the repayment risk however it did not spend enough money on acquisition of property into the HRA to mitigate all of the repayment risk. The Council has seen slippage in the region of 56% to 72% on its Housing Investment Programme (HIP) in recent years which continues into 2020-21.

The HIP is funded 30% through RTB receipts (with the remaining 70% being funded either through HRA reserves or, if necessary HRA borrowing) and as such, any slippage in delivery has a direct impact on the risk of having to repay receipts to government. In order to avoid this risk going forward the Council needs to improve both the monitoring and the delivery of its Housing Investment Programme.

The Executive have set up an Executive working group to consider why RTB receipts needed to be repaid to government, the reporting arrangements around the matter and what can be done to prevent further repayments. Alongside the working group, the Council's internal auditors, KPMG have been asked to carry out an audit of the HRA capital monitoring and specifically the monitoring and use of RTB receipts. The work of the working group is on-going however, this report is an initial report of its findings and presents some immediate actions to be taken.

The council should also consider whether it needs to expand the programme in order to provide scale against the risk of non-delivery. In order to do this, additional resource within the Council's Corporate Programmes team to deliver the projects and further resource within the Housing Strategy team (both funded from the HRA) may be required.

To help spend the RTB receipts in 2020-21, it is recommended that a number of land appropriations from the General Fund into the HRA are urgently agreed. Specifically that land at Guildford Park and Bright Hill is appropriated into the HRA for the purposes of housing development with immediate effect and that once Secretary of State (SoS) approval is provided, that the allotment land at Weyside Urban Village is also appropriated into the HRA for Housing development. The benefit of making these appropriations is that capital expenditure on the projects will become HRA expenditure and RTB receipts can then be used to fund up to 30% of the value of any affordable or social housing produced within the schemes. The appropriations provide an immediate opportunity to expand the Housing Investment programme as well as potentially providing savings to the general fund relating to borrowing costs of the schemes. The report goes on to provide further suggestions as to how the expenditure of RTB receipts can be accelerated, including the consideration of grants to housing associations and whether the council should acquire or develop housing outside of its borough boundary.

Finally it is recommended that the financial monitoring reports to corporate governance and standards committee are updated to incorporate information relating to what expenditure is required on the Housing capital programme in order to utilise all the RTB receipts in each financial year and that the expenditure on the approved capital programme only is measured against the value of expenditure required to ensure that RTB receipts are spent. It is also recommended that the Council re-invigorates the Major Projects Portfolio Board and ensures that funding risks are captured on project risk registers.

Recommendation to Executive

- (1) That the remaining land at Guildford Park car park be appropriated into the HRA with immediate effect
- (2) That the expenditure on the general fund capital programme relating to Guildford Park Car Park be transferred into the HRA following the appropriation
- (3) That no replacement car parking be delivered as part of the Bright Hill Scheme
- (4) That the Bright Hill car park be appropriated into the HRA as soon as possible once an appropriate valuation is received and that the car park be closed for redevelopment once the lease to the hospital expires
- (5) That, once Secretary of State approval and an appropriate valuation is obtained, the allotments site (Plot 1) at Weyside Urban Village be appropriated into the HRA and that the Council commits to delivering Plot 1 at Weyside Urban Village as either a fully affordable or mixed tenure project within the Housing Investment Programme
- (6) That further consideration be given as to whether key sites within the Guildford Economic Regeneration should be appropriated into the HRA for Housing Development in due course
- (7) That the acquisition strategy, as set out in paragraphs 3.31 to 3.33 of the report, be approved.
- (8) That a supplementary estimate of £2.2million, to be funded from HRA reserves, to increase the HRA acquisition budget to £7million for 2021-22 be approved, and that the supplementary estimate be moved straight onto the approved capital programme
- (9) That the HRA acquisition budget of £3million for 2021-22 be moved from the provisional to the approved capital programme
- (10) That the Major Projects Programme Board be re-invigorated in a revised form
- (11) That a Councillor/Officer Housing Working Group be established to monitor delivery of the Housing Investment Programme and to continue to develop the pipeline of projects.

- (12) That a formal Use of Retained Right to Buy Receipts Policy be developed and brought forward for adoption by the Executive at a later meeting
- (13) That further legal advice be sought on the matter of whether granting RTB receipts to local housing associations, other local authorities (without a HRA) or other registered providers is a viable option for the Council and subject to that advice, officers be authorised to enter into discussions with local housing associations to ascertain if there would be a willingness to partner with the Council in this regard.
- (14) That additional resources within the Housing Strategy and corporate Programmes team be approved to accelerate delivery of the Housing Investment Programme
- (15) That officers be requested to consider the logistics and viability of acquiring or developing housing outside of the borough boundary to increase its housing stock within the HRA.

Reasons for Recommendation:

To facilitate the delivery of affordable housing in the borough and try to mitigate the risk of repaying RTB receipts to government in the future

Is the report (or part of it) exempt from publication? No

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to review the use of right to buy receipts and seek Executive agreement to appropriate land owned by the Council in its General Fund, into the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). The land is no longer required for the purpose for which it is held immediately prior to the appropriation and it is the intention of the Council to redevelop the land for the purposes of Housing (residential) led development.

2. Strategic Priorities

- 2.1 The Council's emerging new corporate plan includes a priority to provide affordable housing and jobs through regeneration and to facilitate high quality development of strategic sites. The Council's Corporate Plan 2018-2023 includes a strategic priority under the place making theme to deliver the Guildford Borough Local Plan and provide the range of housing that people need, particularly affordable homes.
- 2.2 In addition the Action Plan in the 2018-2023 Corporate Plan included actions to start delivery of the Slyfield Area Regeneration Plan and to complete the development of the Guildford Park Car Park site.

3. Background

- 3.1 In February 2018, the council received its final report from the LGA Peer review undertaken in the Autumn of 2017. One of the recommendations within the report was to explore how the Council's considerable financial muscle can support delivery of strategic outcomes for the Borough and whether the Housing

Revenue Account Borrowing headroom could be used to stimulate mixed development.

- 3.2 Since the report, the Section 151 officer has been researching how the Council could utilise its HRA more to help finance some of the regeneration schemes of the Council. As well as looking at examples from other Council's, Officers have commissioned two pieces of legal advice and guidance on use of HRA resources and more lately, guidance around appropriation of land between the General Fund and HRA.
- 3.3 Alongside the above research, the council has a significant issue with identifying and then delivering schemes within the Housing Investment Programme (HIP) within the HRA. Whilst schemes on some of the smaller sites have been successful, a number of larger schemes in the Housing Investment Programme in the HRA capital programme have, for various reasons, seen significant slippage in delivery which has resulted in the council needing to repay RTB receipts to government during Quarter 4 2018-19, throughout 2019-20 and is at risk of having to repay further receipts in due course.
- 3.4 In order to understand the reasons why the repayments were necessary, review the monitoring and reporting arrangements and identify actions that will need to be taken to mitigate the impact of further receipts being repaid to government, the Executive have set up a working group. The work of the working group is on-going however, this report is an initial report of its findings so far and presents some immediate actions to be taken.

Review of HRA Housing Investment Programme (HIP) Delivery

- 3.5 Since 2018-19 the slippage in delivery of the HIP has ranged from 56% to 72% causing significant underspends. This slippage in delivery and a low level of additional schemes in the pipeline, has led to the Council being required to return just under £2.7million of receipts from the sale of council houses under the right to buy scheme to the government.
- 3.6 The repayment has occurred because the Council was unable to spend enough money on the HRA housing investment programme or acquire enough property into the HRA within the 3 year time frame required to spend the receipts.
- 3.7 A summary of actual expenditure incurred in comparison to budget for 2018-19 and 2019-20 is shown in the tables below:

Scheme	2018-19			
	TOTAL Budget (Approved & Provisional)	Actual Outturn Spend 31.3.19	Difference	% Slippage
Acquisition of Land & Buildings	2,800	519	-2,281	81%
New Build Programme				
Lakeside Close, Ash	0	25	25	
Guildford Park	4,830	341	-4,489	93%
Appletree pub site	2,476	2,209	-267	
Slyfield Green (Corporation Club)	200	0	-200	
Willow Way	300	179	-121	
Garage sites-	1,100	498	-602	55%
The Homestead	50	329	279	
Fire Station/Ladymead	1,800	643	-1,157	64%
Bright Hill	3,475	0	-3,475	100%
Pipeline projects	0		0	
Redevelopment bid 13	0		0	
Redevelopment bid 14	0		0	
Equity Share repurchases	400	143	-257	
TOTAL Housing Investment Prog (HIP)	17,431	4,885	-12,546	72%

Scheme	2019-20			
	TOTAL Budget (Approved, Provisional & Carry Forwards)	Actual Outturn Spend 31.3.20	Difference	% Slippage
Acquisition of Land & Buildings	2,581	1218	-1,363	53%
New Build Programme	0			
Lakeside Close, Ash	0		0	
Guildford Park	1,106	0	-1,106	100%
Appletree pub site	436	719	283	-65%
Slyfield Green (Corporation Club)	72	61	-11	15%
Willow Way	48	2	-46	96%
Garage sites-	189	79	-110	58%
The Homestead	0		0	
Fire Station/Ladymead	1,257	1,257	0	0%
Bright Hill	500	0	-500	100%
Pipeline projects	575	55	-520	
Redevelopment bid 13	533	0	-533	
Redevelopment bid 14	300	0	-300	
Equity Share repurchases	400	155	-245	
TOTAL Housing Investment Prog (HIP)	7,997	3,546	-4,451	56%

3.8 The above tables are an extract and manipulation of the data included in the regular financial monitoring reports that are presented to corporate governance and standards committee. The data has been manipulated to remove the major repairs programme to existing stock and to bring together the approved and provisional capital programme. As can be seen in the tables, there has been significant slippage in expenditure on projects such as Guildford Park and Bright Hill compared to budget for both financial years. The fact that this slippage was

occurring, that there were delays to the projects and the reasons why, were reported through to councillors at the Major Projects Portfolio Board (MPPB) as part of the summary of progress on projects and at a higher level, the Corporate Governance and Standards Committee through the provision of regular financial monitoring reports.

- 3.9 In addition, there was slippage in excess of 50% on the garage sites and the fire station/Ladymead projects from 2018-19 to 2019-20 although the fire station site was completed in 2019-20. During 2019-20 there was also slippage on the pipeline projects and redevelopment schemes 13 & 14. There was also minimal expenditure on the acquisition of new property into the HRA in 2018-19 (despite having a budget of £2.8million) although this activity increased in 2019-20.
- 3.10 The Housing Investment Programme is funded approximately 30% from Right to Buy (RTB) receipts and 70% from the HRA New Build reserve or other HRA capital receipts reserves; the funding of the HRA capital programme is set out within the Council's budget reports. Under government rules, RTB receipts have to be spent within 3 years and can only fund 30% of the cost of replacement housing, the constraints on use of RTB receipts are also set out in the Council's HRA Budget reports. The Council is required to fund the remaining 70% of the HIP from its own resources. The Council has substantial HRA reserves and also has the ability to borrow within the HRA to finance its 70% share of the HIP. In future there may also be S106 developer contributions which would also be available to help finance the programme. However, any slippage or under delivery of the projects in the HIP has a direct impact on the Council's ability to use its RTB receipts within the 3 year timeframe. If money is not spent on the programme the council is legally obliged to pay RTB receipts to government with interest calculated at 4% above base rate.
- 3.11 It is worth noting that replacement housing has to be additional units only so in cases where the Council may undertake the major redevelopment of existing sites it is only the cost of developing any increase in the overall number of units on site that can be funded through RTB receipts. The cost of replacing the existing units with the same number of units needs to be funded by the Council's own resources. Where the HRA is also delivering market housing the RTB receipts can only be used to fund 30% of the cost of the social or affordable units delivered in a scheme.
- 3.12 In addition to the need to deliver the existing schemes in the HIP, there is some concern that the overall size of the HIP may not be sufficient and requires expansion with new schemes. Expanding the programme should help mitigate the risk of future RTB repayments because there will hopefully be enough schemes moving forward in the programme that delays on any one scheme would not be such a sufficient part of the overall programme that the Council would have to repay receipts to government in future.
- 3.13 Receipts from RTB can also be used to finance acquisition of affordable housing into the HRA or to make grants to Housing Associations and other arm's length organisations to deliver social / affordable housing subject to the grant funding meeting the criteria set out in the RTB retention agreement. It is important to

note however that RTB receipts cannot be passed to an entity such as North Downs Housing, within which the council has a controlling interest.

- 3.14 Existing schemes within the HIP for 2020-21 and 2021-22 are shown in the table below:

Scheme	2020-21			2021-22		
	Approved	Provisional	TOTAL Budget	Approved	Provisional	TOTAL Budget
	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000	£000
Acquisition of Land & Buildings	1,800	0	1,800	1,800	3,000	4,800
New Build Programme						
Lakeside Close, Ash			0	0		0
Guildford Park	0	6,760	6,760	0	14,499	14,499
Fire Station/Ladymead	25	0	25			0
Bright Hill	500	1,500	2,000		4,380	4,380
Weyside Urban Village					3,000	
Various small sites & feasibility/Site preparation	0		0		0	0
Pipeline projects	2,250		2,250	3,325	0	3,325
Redevelopment bid 13	553	3,197	3,750		9,058	9,058
Redevelopment bid 14	250	1,000	1,250		2,500	2,500
Equity Share repurchases	400	0	400	400		400
TOTAL Housing Investment Prog (HIP)	5,778	12,457	18,235	5,525	36,437	38,962

Review of Right to Buy repayment risk for 2020-21 and 2021-22

- 3.15 The total budgets for the Housing Improvement programme are shown above. The total budgets are of sufficient value to ensure that RTB receipts can be fully utilised in each year. Schemes and budgets which are on the provisional programme, whilst in the pipeline, are still awaiting Executive approval of a final business case to commence, as such, the likelihood of them moving forward at pace and being fully spent within the relevant financial year is low, particularly on larger and more complex schemes such as Guildford Park. Funding of the HIP and therefore the monitoring of the use of RTB receipts is currently measured against the total budget for the overall programme. Given recent experience and the time limit within which RTB receipts can be spent, it is now the view of the S151 officer that the Council needs to monitor the use of right to buy receipts against the approved HRA capital programme only. This is because if a scheme is still on the provisional programme then it is not in delivery. Monitoring the level of RTB receipts required to avoid repayment against just the approved capital programme should give us early warning of a repayment risk in the future. This will be included in the regular financial monitoring reports to Corporate Governance and Standards Committee and in the Council's budget reports going forward.

- 3.16 In order to ensure there is no repayment risk of RTB receipts going forward, the Council needs to spend a minimum of £7.1million on affordable or social housing the HIP in 2020-21 and if it did that, it would need to spend a further £5.5million in 2021-22. These figures are taken from the Council's RTB model.
- 3.17 The period 8 financial monitoring reported to Corporate Governance and Standards Committee in January 2021 reported that the Council has spent £3.5million on the HIP up to the end of November 2020. At that point, project managers were reporting that the Council was on schedule to spend £7.4million by the end of the financial year and so was just about on target to ensure sufficient expenditure would be incurred during 2020-21 to avoid having to repay further receipts to government. This position is currently being updated through the period 10 monitoring process which will report the position up to end January 2021 to CGSC in March, but early indications are that, due to low levels of expenditure between November and January, the Council still needs to spend a further £3.7million in 2020-21 to avoid the risk of repayment.
- 3.18 For period 10, Project managers are now reporting that they are likely to spend £5.6million by the end of the financial year against an approved budget of £5.7million (as per paragraph 3.6), which on the face of it doesn't give any cause for concern. However, review of the monitoring report shows that £4.3million (95%) of the expenditure is projected to have been incurred on the acquisition programme and only 5% on the new build development programme whereas the budget had indicated that only 31% should be on acquisition and the remaining 69% of the budget should be on the new build programme. Therefore the slippage on the New Build Programme is continuing.
- 3.19 Comparison of forecasted expenditure to approved budget, however, still doesn't identify a risk that RTB receipts will need to be repaid, the expenditure needs to be compared to what expenditure is required as per the RTB model. It is worth noting that the actual amount that may need to be paid to government is complicated by how many RTB sales there have been in year and the fact that the position is calculated cumulatively. The RTB model itself is a rather complicated spreadsheet and so has not been presented as part of this report. An estimate of expenditure required from the RTB model is not currently stated in the HRA Capital Budget, Capital Monitoring or HRA Capital Outturn reports to CGSC and as far as we can tell, never has been (or at least has not been since 2015 when reporting to the CGSC was introduced). This will be immediately rectified on the Period 10 monitoring report and all reports going forward will now include this information.
- 3.20 The RTB Model shows that the Council needs to spend a minimum of £3.7 million in Quarter 4 2020-21 in order to avoid repayment risk unless the government grants a further extension of time due to COVID. The profile of spend required in 2021-22 and future years on the HIP in order to avoid further repayment risk is as follows:

Year	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	Total
	£	£	£	£	£
2020.21	0	0	0	£3.7million	£3.7million
2021.22	£2.068million	£422,000	£838,000	£2.136million	£5.5million
2022.23	0	£1.769million	£2.236million	£3.301million	£7.306million
2023.24	0	£1.643million	£262,000	0	£1.905million
TOTAL					£14.674million

- 3.21 Given on-going slippage on the new build projects, this target may prove challenging unless the Housing Investment Programme can be accelerated and expanded.

Land appropriations

- 3.22 Under the Section 19(1) of the Housing Act 1985, the Council has the ability to appropriate land between the General Fund and the HRA. Officers have recently commissioned further advice regarding the power of appropriation and the conditions under which it can be used. The conclusion of the advice is that the Council may appropriate land into the HRA if it is no longer required for the purpose for which it was held immediately before the appropriation. In order to appropriate land into the HRA the Council will need a certified valuation and the decision to appropriate land needs to be taken. The Head of Asset Management has delegated authority to take the decision but given its profiles the matter has been referred to the Executive.
- 3.23 The advice confirms that any land can be appropriated into the HRA as long as there is a documented intention to use the land for housing purposes. If land is appropriated into the HRA then all income, expenditure, reserves and borrowing in relation to the land will be accounted for within the HRA from the date of appropriation. As well as appropriating land for housing purposes into the HRA, the Council can also give consideration as to whether the land should be appropriated for planning purposes.
- 3.24 The ability to appropriate land is considered specifically in relation to a number of projects not currently within the HRA below.

Potential solutions for the use of Right to Buy Receipts

Guildford Park Car Park

- 3.25 Land at Guildford Park Car Park was originally held by the Council within the general fund. The site is allocated for housing development within the Council's local plan and has previously been granted planning permission for housing development. One third of the site, specifically relating to the area of the site on

- which affordable housing would be developed has previously been appropriated into the HRA in the financial year 2017-18. The value of the land appropriated at the time was £1million. However, two-thirds of the site currently remains in the Council's general fund. At the time this decision was made, the structure of the project was that the building of the multi-storey car park within the scheme would be paid for by the sale of the market housing being developed. As such the area of land required for the market housing and car park remained within the general fund.
- 3.26 On 26 May 2020 a report on the Parking Study and Impact on Guildford Park Road and Bright Hill Car Parks was considered by the Executive. The study found that the original decision to develop the sites with replacement parking was no longer required and the Executive decided to authorise officers to seek planning permission for a purely residential scheme on the site. The intention for the new scheme is to be a purely housing scheme and the political ambition of the Executive is to maximise the amount of affordable housing that can be provided on site subject to viability constraints. The current target is for officers to submit a revised scheme for planning approval in the Autumn of 2021.
- 3.27 As the project is now an entirely housing project, it is proposed that the remaining land still held in the general fund is now appropriated to the HRA. The existing use value of the whole site was valued at £3.27million in August 2020 so the value of the remaining land to be appropriated would be around £2.18million but this will need to be confirmed by an independent valuer. The value of the land being appropriated is not a cash transaction but will result in an adjustment between the HRA Capital Financing Requirement (CFR) and the General Fund CFR. It is important to note that RTB receipts cannot be used to fund the value of the land transfer or the value of any market housing developed on site. The benefit of making this appropriation now rather than waiting for the new scheme to be submitted for planning permission, is that there is currently £3.44million of expenditure relating to ground works, site preparation and utility diversions which is currently sitting within the general fund capital programme which, once the executive has agreed to appropriate the land, can be moved into the HRA capital programme. Moving this expenditure into the HRA in Q4 2020-21 will mean that the HRA capital programme expenditure in 2020-21 will increase and therefore should substantially mitigate the risk of needing to repay RTB receipts to the government in respect of 2020-21.
- 3.28 Any further expenditure on this project going forward will then be fully accounted for within the HRA, increasing the likelihood of the Council being able to spend sufficient amounts on the Housing Investment Programme moving forward. All expenditure within the HRA on affordable / social housing replacement will reduce the risk of repaying RTB receipts to government.

Weyside Urban Village

- 3.29 As Councillors are aware, this project involves the movement of a sewage treatment works, council owned depot and waste transfer station, the remediation of land and then the development of 1500 homes on the remediated land. The main area of land on which the housing is to be developed is the land currently

occupied by the Thames water however, the land currently occupied by the allotments and the existing Council depot is also scheduled for housing development. The intention to develop Weyside Urban Village is well documented in Council reports and the site is an allocated site in the Council's local plan. The Council has received Homes England funding for the infrastructure phase of the project and as such would not be able to fund the infrastructure phase of the project partially using RTB receipts. However, following completion of the infrastructure phase, the housing development land will be parcelled up into 10 plots. It is proposed therefore that the plot of land relating to the allotments site is appropriated into the HRA for Housing development purposes following approval both of this report and a decision to move the allotments being granted consent by the Secretary of State (SoS). Given that we need SoS approval to move the allotments it is anticipated that the appropriation will not be possible until the Autumn of 2021 at the earliest. Any further expenditure relating to the development of the allotments site at Weyside from that point forward would then also become HRA expenditure and expenditure on provision of affordable housing within the site could be partially funded from RTB receipts.

- 3.30 In order to appropriate the allotments site, a valuation will be required which will result in an adjustment being made between the HRA CFR and the GF CFR. It is also proposed that in due course, once all of the housing development land is assembled and in the Council's ownership that it is appropriated into the HRA.

Bright Hill

- 3.31 Bright Hill is a car park within the general fund which has been allocated for housing development within the Council's local plan. It is a long-standing project of the Council. In the past the scope of the project was to redevelop the land for both housing and replacement car parking. As such, the site has not yet been appropriated into the HRA. As set out in paragraph 3.17 the Executive agreed in May 2020 that replacement parking was not required but that it might be worth providing within the scheme if the cost of doing so had a payback period of less than 10 years. Currently the car park is only being partially utilised due to issues with a retaining wall. Since May 2020 the impact of the Covid pandemic on car parking income and the need for car parking in the town has been substantially reduced. As such, it could be judged that the consideration of replacing the parking if there was a 10-year payback is also no longer required and that the site should be developed purely for housing. If Executive were now to take a clear decision not to replace the parking as part of this report then, although the land is still operating as a car park at the moment, it could be deemed to be no longer required for the purpose of providing car parking into the future and appropriated into the HRA. If the land is appropriated into the HRA then it should be considered whether the car park should be closed once the lease to the hospital expires, this has been discussed with the relevant service leader who has agreed with the proposal.
- 3.32 If Executive wish to appropriate Bright Hill car park into the HRA then a valuation of the land will be required in order to make the necessary adjustments to the HRA and GF CFRs. If the land is appropriated, all future expenditure in relation

to the development will fall on the HRA and expenditure in relation to development of affordable housing units could be partially funded from RTB receipts. The Council currently has a budget of £13.5million on its general fund capital programme which is scheduled to be spent between 2022-23 and 2023-24 which could be moved into the Housing Investment Programme. Investigations as to whether this project could be accelerated so that the expenditure comes forward at an earlier stage could also now be undertaken.

Guildford Economic Regeneration Programme

- 3.33 The above programme is currently being developed and scoped and is at an early stage, however, if as part of this programme residential development is proposed on any council owned land within the red line of the development then it is recommended that officers seek to appropriate the land into the HRA at the earliest opportunity. This may need further evaluation and should be the subject of a further report. However the Executive could provide a clear direction to the project team to investigate which land should be appropriated to the HRA as part of the programme.

Other transfers

- 3.34 The Council should undertake a review of other General Fund Accommodation and consider transferring general fund accommodation to the HRA to allow development for affordable housing. Officers are currently investigating an opportunity to transfer two general fund properties on York Road to the HRA for affordable housing development and will report further on this in due course. In addition, the Operational Asset Service Challenge review currently being worked on by the Council's asset management team may identify further opportunities.

Formalisation of HRA Acquisition Strategy

- 3.35 Since the Acquisition of property into the HRA was started in June 2019 the Council has acquired 15 properties into the HRA. These have been a mixture of buy-backs of previous housing sold under right to buy and also acquisition of affordable housing 'off-plan' from developers. It is proposed that the Council continues with its acquisition strategy and substantially increases the budget for acquisition of property into the HRA as if the new build development programme does slip, acquisition is one of the quickest ways to ensure we can continue to meet the expenditure target in order to mitigate the RTB repayment risk.
- 3.36 The first priority for acquisition should be to negotiate with developers to acquire property for affordable housing available for rent 'off plan' from developments. The Council is in a unique situation to be able to negotiate this it will have an insight as to what developments are coming forward at pre-application stage. It is proposed that as developments come in for pre-application stage advise that the planning team officers should provide the details of the applicants to the housing team so that the housing team can make contact and try to negotiate or influence developers to develop affordable housing for rent rather than affordable housing for sale and to enter into an acquisition agreement with the Council for the council to acquire the property into its HRA. This should be the first priority as buying off planned developments means that the overall amount of affordable

- housing within the borough is increased. Officers are currently investigating this option with a view to estimating the potential supply this could bring.
- 3.37 The second priority for acquisition should be to re-acquire property that has been previously sold under right to buy. This has two advantages:
- The council should already have a first right of refusal to reacquire the property at a discounted price when the property is first sold on.
 - Re-acquiring property may enable the council to increase ownership again over a particular road or area which will then give the council scope to carry out a regeneration of the road or estate to redevelop existing properties that may be coming end of life and to potentially increase the density of housing within the area.
- 3.38 Many other local housing authorities are carrying out 'estate regeneration schemes. One of the Council's pipeline projects currently relates to such a scheme and the Council is actively trying to buy back property which has been formerly sold within the scheme boundary to enable a regeneration scheme to be brought forward.
- 3.39 Finally acquisition of market property into the HRA could be considered but this is likely to be expensive and either unviable or poor value for money over a 30 to 40 year business plan period due to the high value of market property in the borough and the level of affordable rent that can be charged.
- 3.40 The Council has a budget of £1.8million on the 2021-22 HRA approved capital programme and a further £3million on the provisional capital programme to spend on acquisition of property into the HRA. It is proposed that this budget is increased through a supplementary estimate of £2.2million to an overall budget of £7million and the budget is moved from the provisional to the approved capital programme to allow the acquisition programme to continue and be expanded during 2021-22.
- 3.41 Officers have recently been made aware of some software used by other Council's which may help locate suitable properties for acquisition into the HRA taking into account housing need and location of existing HRA property for estate management purposes. Officers are currently investigating whether the software will be of use to aid officers with the acquisition programme.
- 3.42 A further option for consideration is whether the Council would wish to acquire property outside of the local borough boundary into its HRA. Officers have been made aware of a number of London Borough councils that have both acquired and developed housing for affordable rent outside of their borough boundary. Given the value of land within the borough this could be a cheaper option but would involve making a conscious decision to house tenants and people on the Council's housing waiting list outside of the borough which could be controversial.

Consideration of Grants to Housing Associations

- 3.43 Examples from other authorities have now been found where an authority has 'gifted' RTB receipts to another registered provider such as a housing association or another local authority that does not have a HRA but is keen to stimulate delivery of affordable housing. Typically, this has been where a local authority has grant funded the provision of affordable housing with housing associations where the additional funding makes the provision of affordable units for rent viable, and so increased the number of schemes/units. There are examples where other councils have decided not to try and use RTB receipts directly themselves but have invited bids from Housing Associations and other registered providers to use the money on their schemes. Examples include cases where
- a registered provider has a scheme which they can afford to produce shared ownership or affordable rent tenures but the use of RTB receipts allows the provider to deliver the units as social rent over which the Council can then have nomination rights
 - or where the use of RTB receipts will allow a registered provider to deliver more affordable units than the planning policy requirement.
- 3.44 The benefit of considering granting the receipts to a housing association is that at present, housing association tenants do not currently have the right to buy although there are government proposals to potentially change this. It is unclear how much appetite there would be from local Housing Associations for this option however, if it is something that the Executive wish to consider it is proposed that further legal advice on the matter is sought and subject to the outcome of that advice, Officers are authorised to discuss the option with local housing associations.

Constraints on Delivery

- 3.45 One of the constraints on delivery within the HRA is the ongoing Right to Buy, which in turn then creates further receipts and the issues with their use, this includes the fact that the use of the receipts does not allow for replacing losses on a real one for one basis, and there is no protection for high demand stock. There can be problems with trying to keep pace with delivery particularly where there is a limited pool of new schemes, high land values and where the numbers to be delivered will be at the levels proposed. In addition to which if the units can then be sold at a heavy discount there is an impact on viability of development schemes. We need to consider whether, as a sensible investor, if we want to risk an investment in an asset that might have to be sold at a 70 percent discount later. As a result one of the options the Council must consider is whether it wishes to withdraw from the RTB retention agreement with Government due to the issues outlined in spending the receipts and the financial penalty in terms of interest payments for not spending the receipts.

4. Governance and communication arrangements

- 4.1 In previous years, the Council had an internal Housing Working Group, which was an officer only group that used to monitor the delivery of the projects within

the Housing Investment Programme. The group consisted of members of both the Housing and the Finance teams. This group was disbanded around the end of 2017-18 due to the retirement or departure of key members of the group and monitoring meetings were then held between the relevant Director, project managers and members of the Finance team only. As part of these meetings, members of the finance team did report to the Director that repayments of RTB receipts had been necessary, the values involved and discussed options for mitigating the repayments. It is proposed that this working group be reinvigorated with appropriate officers covering housing strategy, housing development, tenant services and the finance team but for it to also include the Lead Councillors for Housing and Finance going forward. It is proposed that the Head of Housing leads the internal officer working group.

- 4.2 At councillor level, as well as regular financial monitoring reports to Corporate Governance and Standards Committee, the monitoring of Housing Investment Programme projects such as Appletree Pub, Bright Hill and Guildford Park sits within the remit of the Major Projects Portfolio Board which is essentially an Executive working group. The MPPB receives a summary update from each project manager relating to brief description of the project and outcomes, the progress on the project, and whether it is on target. The MPPB summary report does not however incorporate key risks identified on projects and it might be useful to do so going forward, particularly as a number of projects are now externally funded or have time limited funding. The risk of project slippage on an individual project funding stream should be captured as a key risk in a project risk register and reported at summary level to the MPPB. Due to the Covid pandemic, the MPPB has not physically or virtually met since March 2020 and the lead councillor for regeneration has expressed a view to revise the format of the board. In order, to help monitor the progress of delivery of the HIP projects going forward it is suggested that a revised MPPB or similar body reconvenes to meet virtually. The Council has recently implemented a new Programme and Project Governance framework and the Housing development team has now formerly moved into the corporate programmes team. As such the governance around projects and reporting to Councillors should already be improved moving forward.
- 4.3 Prior to May 2019 there was also a Planning Policy and Housing Delivery Board which, as part of its remit, covered looking at identifying and evaluating options to increase the delivery of new housing, however the remit of this board was wider than just the Council's Affordable Housing programme. Since May 2019 the board has continued with different membership and its objectives have narrowed to focus on housing delivery to meet the local plan requirements.
- 4.4 Informal one to one meetings are normally held between Directors and their relevant lead councillors. It is understood that meetings were regularly held between the relevant Director for Housing and the Lead Councillor for Housing. Although key individuals have now left the Council, remaining members of the finance team have confirmed that they attended a meeting between key individuals and the relevant Lead Councillor for Housing and another councillor during 2019-20 where the issue of delays to the HRA capital programme and the impact on the use of RTB receipts was discussed. It is understood that the Lead Councillor for Housing was informed that repayments of the RTB receipts were

occurring in 2019-20. However, it is also understood that there had been an intention to write a briefing note on the matter to the council's management team and executive liaison meeting. Unfortunately, due to other issues and priorities, and the departure of key individuals it appears that the briefing note was not produced and as consequence, wider members of the Executive may not have been aware of the issue. That said, in August 2019, a significant discussion took place between Officers and Councillors at the management team / executive liaison meeting in relation to the Guildford Park Car Park scheme, the issues around development of the car park and potential options of how to proceed with the scheme were discussed. Officers recommended the housing part of the scheme proceeded whilst the area related to the car park was redesigned. Prior to the meeting members of the finance team had advised the Housing team to raise the risk of RTB receipt repayments as part of the presentation and briefing provided to the meeting, as one of the reasons why the housing element should continue and not be delayed. Unfortunately, the matter was not included in the presentation however, a number of officer's recall that the matter was raised verbally but have been unable to provide evidence. Councillors present have stated they do not recall the matter being raised and so as there are varying recollections of the discussion, it cannot be categorically proven one way or the other. In future the consequences of underspending on the HRA capital programme in terms of repayment of RTB receipts will be regularly highlighted the Corporate Governance and Standards committee reports and the budget and outturn reports to Executive.

- 4.5 It is worth noting that the repayments to government have been properly accounted for and reported in the Council's Annual Statement of Accounts in line with CIPFA guidance. The Statement of Accounts is presented to Corporate Governance and Standards Committee and externally audited each year. Whilst at the time of writing, the auditors have yet to sign off the 2019-20 accounts for unrelated reasons, there were no issues raised in respect of this matter in the draft audit report presented to Corporate Governance and Standards Committee in November 2020. The transaction for the repayment of the RTB receipts to Government is known in local government accounting terms as a 'below the line transaction' as under accounting regulations it runs through the Council's comprehensive income and expenditure account below the 'Net Cost of Services' (i.e., it is not included in service costs) and then is reversed out through the movement on reserves statement because it isn't a 'real charge on the council tax payer'. As such the transactions are accounted for within the Council's balance sheet codes on the finance system rather than the Council's revenue or capital income and expenditure codes. The accounting treatment is an important factor in understanding why the transactions relating to the repayment of RTB receipts were not naturally shown within the Council's regular financial monitoring reports but are shown in the Council's Statement of Accounts. The regular financial monitoring reports relate to the revenue and capital income and expenditure codes.
- 4.6 In addition, the external auditors also audit the annual (Quarter 4) Housing Pooled Capital Receipts return which is a statutory return which the Council submits to Government reporting the receipts received and the capital expenditure incurred during the period and which calculates the payment (if any) due to government. Again, although the audit report is yet to be finalised for

2019-20 no issues have been raised by the auditors relating to this statutory return. It can be concluded therefore that the repayment transactions are properly accounted for and reported in the Council's statutory accounts and returns.

- 4.7 A small number of examples have been found where other Councils have developed and adopted a formal 'Use of Retained RTB receipts policy'. An example of such a policy from Great Yarmouth Council has been shared with the working group which incorporated many of the ideas and aspects outlined above. It is proposed that the new Head of Housing develops a policy in consultation with the Lead Councillor for Housing and an Executive Advisory Board with the aim to have the policy adopted by Executive by the Autumn of 2021.

5. Key Risks

- 5.1 The key risk has been described in the report – that is that due to on-going slippage and under delivery in the Housing Investment Programme, there remains a significant risk of further repayments to government of right to buy receipts. In order to mitigate this risk delivery of existing programmes needs to be significantly enhanced and the Council needs to identify further housing development schemes to expand its pipeline of projects to ensure the HIP is large enough so that slippage on one scheme doesn't place the council at risk of having to pay further RTB receipts to government.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1 The financial implications are stated throughout the report. The Council needs to significantly enhance the delivery of its Housing Investment Programme, in particular its new build housing projects in order to avoid any further repayments of RTB receipts to government. The Council will need to spend at least £7.1million on its housing investment programme in 2020-21 and a further £5.5million in 2021-22 in order to avoid this risk. The report suggests appropriating further land and projects into the HRA to mitigate the risk. The report also requests that the overall budget for acquisition of property into the HRA is increased to £7million to help mitigate this risk for 2021-22 if expenditure cannot be secured through the development programme.
- 6.2 In order to ensure that the HIP is enhanced and delivered, further staffing resources may need to be included within the Housing Development part of the Corporate Programmes team in order to manage the programme and within the Housing Strategy team on the client side. Any additional resources required can be funded from the Council's HRA budget and may be capitalised against the capital cost of the development projects.

7. Legal Implications

- 7.1 Section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972 ('LGA 1972') provides the Council power to appropriate for any purpose which it is authorised by the LGA 1972 or

any other enactment to acquire land by agreement any land which belongs to the Council and is no longer required for the purpose it was held immediately prior to that appropriation. This include appropriation for planning purposes.

7.2 Section 19(1) of the Housing Act 1985 permits the Council to appropriate land between the General Fund and the HRA. The Council will need a valuation and the decision to appropriate the land by made under officer delegation or the Executive.

7.3 Any land can be appropriated into the HRA as long as there is a documented intention to use the land for housing purposes and all income, expenditure, reserves and borrowing in relation to the land will be accounted for within the HRA from the date of appropriation.

7.4 The Council is permitted by section 24 of the Local Government Act 1988 and section 22 Housing Act 1996 to provide grants to housing associations provided the criteria as detailed in the provisions are met and subsidy (state aid) rules are complied with.

8. Human Resource Implications

8.1 There may be a requirement to increase the number of posts for the Housing Development part of the Corporate Programmes team. This may require the recruitment of additional staffing resources to manage and deliver the programme.

9. Equality and Diversity Implications

9.1 Using RTB receipts to deliver affordable housing is likely to have a positive impact on equality and diversity by enhancing the equality of opportunity in respect of housing services to those with a protected characteristic.

10. Climate Change/Sustainability Implications

10.1 Delivery of the Council's Housing Investment Programme should have a positive impact on climate change and sustainability as housing can be built with sustainable energy efficiency design into the property. This may have a positive benefit for tenants with respect to lower energy usage and costs.

11. Executive Advisory Board comments

11.1 Due to the urgency of the report, the EAB has not been consulted on its content, however it is recommended that proposals for new build housing projects/ schemes are discussed with an EAB as they come forward for approval if possible.

12. Summary of Options

12.1 The Council has three options:

1. Preferred Option: improve delivery and monitoring of the Housing Investment Programme and expand the overall programme. This should ensure that any RTB receipts received will be spent on affordable housing in the borough
2. Do nothing and potentially repay further RTB receipts to government with interest calculated at 4% above base rate
3. Withdraw from the RTB retention agreement and pay 75% of RTB receipts to government when they are received.

13. Conclusion

- 13.1 In 2019-20 the Council had to repay RTB receipts plus interest to government totalling £2.7million. The reason for the repayment was because the Council did not spend the money on its new build housing investment programme in the HRA. The Council has acquired property to try and mitigate some of the repayment risk however was unable to spend enough money on acquisition of property into the HRA to mitigate all of the repayment risk. The Council has seen slippage in the region of 56% to 72% on its New Build Housing Programme in recent years which continues into 2020-21. The New build housing programme is funded 30% through RTB receipts and as such, any slippage in delivery has a direct impact on the risk of having to repay receipts to government. In order to avoid this risk going forward the Council needs to improve both the monitoring and the delivery of its Housing Investment Programme. The council should also consider expanding the programme in order to provide scale against the risk of none-delivery.
- 13.2 To help spend the RTB receipts, it is recommended that a number of land appropriations from the General Fund into the HRA are agreed. Specifically that land at Guildford Park and Bright Hill is appropriated into the HRA for the purposes of housing development with immediate effect and that once SoS approval is provided to move the allotments, that the allotment land at Weyside Urban Village is also appropriated into the HRA.
- 13.3 Finally it is recommended that the financial monitoring reports to corporate governance and standards committee are updated to incorporate information relating to what RTB receipts need to be spent in each financial year and that the expenditure on the approved capital programme only is measured against the value of RTB receipts that need to be spent. It is also recommended that the Council re-invigorates the Major Projects Portfolio Board and ensures that funding risks are captured on project risk registers.

14. Appendices

None.

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 1

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 2

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 3

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 4

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 5

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 6

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 7

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 9

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 10

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 11

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 12

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 13

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 15

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 16

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 9
Appendix 18

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 10
Appendix 2

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 10
Appendix 3

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3, 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Agenda item number: 10
Appendix 4

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank