

SHEFFIELD CITY REGION

HOUSING & RESIDENTIAL OFFER BOARD

Date: Friday 30 January 2015

Venue: Bassetlaw DC, Queen's Buildings, Potter Street, Worksop, S80 2AH

Time: 1400 – 1600

AGENDA

Item	Subject	Method	Lead	Time	Page
1	Preliminary Items				
1.1	Introductions and Apologies	Verbal	Chair	1400	
1.2	Notes of the last meeting held on 11 December 2014		Chair	1405	1 - 8
1.3	Matters arising not elsewhere specified on the agenda	Verbal	Chair	1410	
1.4	Declarations of Interest Related to Agenda Items (note item 2.1)	Verbal	Chair	1420	
2	Substantive/Items for Decision				
2.1	<p>Housing/Residential Offer in the SCR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The vision for SCR's housing/residential offer Supporting economic growth The scale of challenge/opportunity Recent Government announcements and initiatives (the Growth Deal and the Devolution Deal for the SCR) 	<p>Presentation</p> <p>Discussion</p>	<p>Michael</p> <p>Chair</p> <p>Chair</p>	1425	9 - 22
2.2	<p>The Role of the Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Terms of Reference (ToR) Register of Interests Support Arrangements Board members introductions: an opportunity for Board Members to highlight relevant skills and experience 	<p>ToR document</p> <p>Discussion</p>	<p>Chair</p> <p>Michael</p> <p>All</p>	1445	23 - 28

Item	Subject	Method	Lead	Time	Page
2.3	<p>Review of key work carried out by the previous SCR Housing Board (up to the end of December 2014)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief overview of the work programme agreed by the Board in June 2014 • Spatial priorities for Housing Growth – joint work between the 9 Local Authorities, the SCR Team and the HCA • Links to the work of the SCR Infrastructure Advisory Board • Review/take stock and consider any emerging priorities 	<p>Document</p> <p>Presentation</p> <p>Presentation</p> <p>Document</p>	<p>Michael</p> <p>Ed</p> <p>Michael</p>	1505	29 - 38
3	Updates/Standing Items				
3.1	HCA Programme Update - including Housing Zones	Verbal	Rob	1535	
3.2	Report on the Housing Board 'Activity Budget'	Verbal	Michael	1545	
4	Any Other Business				
4.1	Meeting dates and locations for 2015	Verbal	Craig	1550	
4.2	Other items as relevant (to be raised via the Chair)	Verbal	Chair		
<p>DATE, TIME AND LOCATION OF THE NEXT MEETING - TBC (see agenda item 4.1)</p>					



SHEFFIELD CITY REGION JOINT HOUSING AND REGENERATION BOARD MEETING

Thursday 11 December 2014 1000 – 1200
Room 008, Civic Office, Doncaster

Present:	David Armiger	Bassetlaw DC
	Tom Bell	Rotherham MBC
	Scott Cardwell	Doncaster MBC
	Ed Ferrari	SCR
	Cllr Maggie Godfrey	Rotherham MBC
	Michael Hellewell	SCR LEP
	Jane Hunt	HCA
	Cllr Roy Miller	Barnsley MBC
	Cllr Christine Mills	Doncaster MBC
	Georgina Parkin	Sheffield CC
	Rob Pearson	HCA
	Ian Prescott	Barnsley MBC
	Tony Stacey	SYHA
	Norma Swain	Sheffield SCC (minutes)

Apologies:	Simon Carr	Henry Boot
	Cllr Harry Harpham	Sheffield CC
	Cllr Elizabeth Hill	NE Derbyshire
	Howard Mee	Miller Homes
	Ben Still	SCR
	Alan Tomlinson	Bolsover DC
	Mark Whitworth	Sheffield CC

1. Preliminary Items

1.1 Introductions and Apologies

In the absence of Cllr Harry Harpham, Rob Pearson chaired the meeting and thanks were expressed to the Sheffield CC team for the provision of the secretariat function over the last two years.

Everyone was welcomed to the meeting and introductions were made.

1.2 Notes of the last meeting

The notes of the last minuted meeting (19 September 2014) were agreed as a true record with the following clarification.

Page 5, 3rd paragraph. RP clarified that the draft growth strategy was one of the things on district centres that ARUP had worked on.

2.1 ACTION by MH mentioned the opportunity to bid for SEP development funding allocated to SCR. £10k was awarded to support housing activity. Matched with £16k from unallocated Transitional Funding means that there is a small amount of activity budget for SEP development fund and the new Board in January will decide on how to invest.

1.3 Matters arising not elsewhere specified.

There were no matters arising

1.4 Declaration of Interests related to agenda items.

There were no declaration of interests.

2 Updates/Items for Information

2.1 Board Governance Arrangements, Membership and Resourcing and Membership

MH advised that a paper went to the LEP Board last week for endorsement along with Terms of Reference for the new Board. Housing remains an important priority and the CEX agreed that it will be one of the Thematic advisory board for housing requirements. Priorities and key action will be taken forward within the plan along with the other key important boards. MH recapped that the Growth Plan had not done as well as it could have in attracting funding to take forward the SCR housing ambitions. It was agreed that there needed to be in place the right leadership to ensure we achieve our goals for housing and investment. The SCR Housing and SCR Infrastructure boards need to have the right relationship to work together and previous discussions had fed into the recommendations made to CEX on 5 November. The CEX are supportive of the TOR for the new Housing Board, but want to move more quickly to the new Board arrangements.

RP said they were happy with content of the terms of reference going forward which will apply to the first meeting of the new Board and was about having a smaller and more focused Board with membership being agreed at 10 instead of 15. Huw Bowen and Diana Terris will be taking more active roles and Cllr Simon Greaves will be chairing the Board.

A councillor from the South Yorkshire authorities would be invited to be Vice chair. The 4 elected members are to have discussions between themselves to see who should represent SY on this Board.

Private sector expertise will be required across the Thematic Advisory boards. The Housing Thematic Advisory Board will move from 2 – 4 private sector reps. Simon Carr will be invited to the Board. Martin McKervey to give consideration as to who from his group should sit on the Housing Board. There will then be a further two private sector places on the Board for representatives with property expertise, including one for delivery expertise and one with financial and investment expertise. The Board was asked to consider and propose potential representatives who

meet this criteria. There is also a place for a representative from the National Housing Federation in the future. TS explained that of the NHF Board there are only two housing associations operating in South Yorkshire.

ACTION: MH is to write to representatives to inform them of the changes and to think about who is best placed to be on the Board.

CEX are very keen that the work of the Board, actions and priorities are taken through between the meetings and had agreed that more senior housing offices should support the Board.

TS pointed out that there were no private sector representatives attending the meeting today and that previously attendance had not been good, feeling that this is still likely to happen for future meetings.

RP went on to explain the board of which he is a member of which gives ownership to work streams. It is felt that private sector members should have a role specification to clarify the requirements of the Board.

Scott Cardwell explained about the Board he sat on and the way it worked very well. He also attended the infrastructure group.

ACTION: MH to draft a Board vacancy specification so that representatives can be clear from day one.

MH explained that task and finish groups need to be set up and directors that have expertise in taking work forward.

In addition, further resources are likely to be required to progress the Board's workplan.

CEX agreed to consider offering a secondment at no cost from SCR. However, no resource was forthcoming.

Barnsley MBC are currently going through the process of job evaluation to put out a temporary post to the market. The proposal is to be put to the CEX who will decide if it can be resourced from their budgets. RP commented that the HCA can bring in people, but the query was how to access bits of resources to meet the workplan. RP asked if LAs could spare officers for perhaps a couple of weeks to carry out specific tasks.

CM commented that whilst trying to solve the problem for the housing theme board, we should consider how other boards are resourced. MH then explained that some of the other work streams are better resourced.

IP questioned whether the TOR for the officer group will be refurbished. It was felt that they will be refreshed in the coming months.

RP explained that with the Housing Board as one of the Thematic Boards, it is an acknowledgement that it is required but felt that whilst heading in the right direction, housing seems to have been regarded as a secondary thing. TS asked what the salary level will be which was confirmed as £30k

although not permanent. TS suggested it was circulated to the Board so that the vacancy can be executed through their networks. RP added that he didn't feel that only one role would solve the issue as it needs a co-ordination role to take things forward.

MH added that the first meeting will need to understand where it's got to with devolution, moving towards long term ambitions with regard to the SEP work and progress against the workplan agreed in the summer. Need to highlight which activity will require extra resources.

The South Yorkshire secretariat will support the meetings in the future with the new arrangements taking effect from January 2015.

All new arrangements come into effect January 2015.

ACTION: MH to take actions from today's meeting and update the action plan but leave the option to be shaped by the new Board.

2.2 The SCR Devolution Deal for Housing

MH informed the meeting on Manchester's secured devolution deal from the Government which includes housing funding of £300M over 10 years. Following discussions with Government, this is now with Ministers with regard to what devolution deal we get. However, due to confidentiality, MH was restricted in what can be revealed at the moment.

Housing is among a number of areas not successful through the growth deal process. Submitted information with regard to single ring fence for SCR out of existing HCA budget. We also propose a new joint public asset decision making board. National and local assets can be considered alongside each forecast on economic and housing growth. HCA will take on many more assets so they are centrally placed for discussion. Some sites won't be unlocked by loan type funding and a meeting is to be held to discuss some sort of grant funding. RP commented that with the Manchester fund, 80% was recoverable. MH said they wanted a fund that they controlled. Government will retain the risk and the money to go back to treasury. Feedback from the Government about the devolved deal was still awaited and it was hoped to hear by Christmas.

2.3 HCA Update

JH updated the meeting on the paper circulated which summarised the forecast investment for SCR both for this year and going forward.

It is expected that 3000 homes will be delivered up to 2018. SCR were successful in a share of AHP which has been extended to 2020.

Loan and equity funding has been accessed through the HCA team and two are ongoing in the SCR: Sheffield Business Park – work had started, monies drawn down and should be completed by March 2015. Waverley is moving forward with a completion date of March 2015 although this will slip slightly. There is good progress in both employment land and housing being accelerated. There is support for DN7 and due diligence is

still ongoing. DCLG received 6 applications from Local Authorities within SCR. Coalite is currently on the reserve list.

Builders Finance Fund - there are 12 applications shortlisted for due diligence and this fund has now been extended to include micro building sites of 5 – 15 homes which extends eligibility. RP commented that the challenge to Local authorities is for discussions to take place with developers and to develop a strategy.

Housing Zones – there are 3 expressions of interest which HCA are reviewing and DCLG have asked for further clarification. MH asked if anything further needed to be done. List of support has also gone out with positive responses from John Mann at Bassetlaw and Sarah Champion at Rotherham. RP explained that whilst not yet announced it was not a negative thing and it is felt that more time is required to develop the proposition to each of them. It was asked what more can be done to develop the proposition and it was felt that to include a longer timescale would assist. JH felt that it will be in the New Year.

Custom Build – CM commented that Fairgrove are also doing work at Carr Lodge.

Key Strategic Projects – Avenue Coking Works are progressing well with completion by the end of 2015. An indication of the procurement of a housing developer will be announced publicly in the New Year.

Shirebrook had 125 homes with a further 1000 to follow.

Doncaster: Brodsworth plan is not yet finalised which RP said is the biggest challenge at the moment and asked if the plans are right and is anything else required.

Other surplus Government department land is progressing.

Digital Campus – the site is to be transferred to the developer and can be worked on taking them forward.

AMP capacity is high at 96%

Land at Rockingham J36 – agreed land transaction with BMBC with it being transferred to Bansley at nil value.

HCA Staff Resource – Remains committed to SCR and continues to support priority areas of work:

- Avenue, North East Derbyshire
- Staveley, Chesterfield
- Waverley, Rotherham
- Bassingthorpe, Rotherham
- DN7 Doncaster

DCLG had also invited capacity bids to support planning authorities in strategic growth which is being dealt with DCLG direct although this has gone quiet at the moment.

RP explained that Shirebrook had been discussed within phase 2 land with Bolsover and that the area needs to be considered in a strategic manner.

MH queried how Kate Reid reported due diligence. RP explained that she worked out of the Nottingham office but attended joint keep in touch meetings to understand what comes out of the work and feed into this Board. RP agreed a need to think about re-aligning due diligence and report into the right place.

2.4 Joint SCR-NHF Event/Roundtable

TS explained that the event had been organised to get senior people together including house builders and housing associations to discuss on how to double or treble the targets although the prospect of trebling the programme is a really difficult thing to do. This year there were 1300 homes, last year 3200 and the year before 3400, but the decline needs to be reversed in order to treble output. There are only 9 of the top 25 builders working within SCR and it's important to get people talking about why it isn't working and to understand what more can be done.

The seminar was well attended by both Local Authorities and house builders. Also attending were James Newman and Clive Betts and a video from John Mothersole. The presentations were good and useful and the conversations afterwards had been really good which need to be followed up. Attendees had also thought it to have been very useful and a further one will be arranged for June.

Key points:

- Howard Mee had said that they only build out one home every 10 days.
- Sheffield needs to have 60 sites on the go at any time.
- Need to see an increase in volume house builders returning to SCR.
- Need to diversify the offer to customers.
- All said they would like to do more and the suggestion was made to look at other Local Authorities, in particular Wakefield which keeps getting mentioned.
- Planning was talked about extensively with the general feeling that planners are being too unreasonable. If a Local Authority is being difficult then builders will go elsewhere. There are a lot of difficult sites out there as well as brownfield sites and the potential barriers need to be identified. It is hoped that this will get people talking and feed back to the new Board.
- TS said that a lot of publicity had been given to the Manchester Institutional Investment scheme. Matthew Harrison from Great Places had explained that it is at an experimental stage at the moment. Local Authorities are willing to make land available but the cost of developing is £15m with a £1.5m deficiency.

· Rental values don't work in terms of cost. RP said that in the Manchester case there had been 15 years of investment which had changed things round there. Whilst can make a difference in the north, this is only when surrounded by other things that are being changed.

SC commented on how this Board can use this structure to get delivery moving and help raise the profile of housing but also felt that there are other Boards that can help, for example the Investment Advisory Board. RP said that whilst developers only build around 36 per year, there is a requirement of 4000 per year so what help is required to bring those forward? Loan finance needs other mechanisms in areas where growth can occur but is restricted by the planning process and need to do the same to increase housing growth. This needs discussion at Exec level on how teams and resources can be lined up to support growth. RP asked if the developer group could meet more regularly. TS felt that if they are too regular then attendance will be passed down by level of job, adding that the same senior representatives will be attending again because they already have acceptances for 6 months' time. The proposal is to keep future meetings informal as people had engaged with this format.

3. Items for Decision/Steer

3.1 Priority sites for housing growth

At the Board meeting in September, EF presented the work with inputs from the Local Authorities, mapping the information which brings together inputs from every Local Authority to build a much more comprehensive SCR.

The profiles forecast have future prioritisation and will enable discussions with Government regarding devolution to be very clear which may strengthen the position.

This is still a work in progress but provides a picture of where we are at the present time.

EF explained that this is an update on the work initially presented in September of housing priority sites, capacity and deliverability along with unlocking of the sites to accelerate and will focus on the potential.

There are 196 individual sites, ranging from 7 – 3900 dwellings with a potential delivery of 58,533 dwellings over 10 years.

EF outlined the different categorisations of the potential HCA support required highlighting that 1/3 were in the green category with sites that can be delivered within the timeframe. EF also explained the forecast and viability of the sites. RP explained that the request for this information has come from the Infrastructure Board. EF said that this is in the 'ball park' of housing to support 70,000 jobs. A housing prospectus to deliver 70,000 will require 6000 – 10000 dwellings depending on migration to the city region and dependent on the skills required to fill the jobs.

SC commented that a housing led growth results in less aspirational jobs and that the real issue with the local plan is to meet the aspirations from an economic perspective. Planning need to get their heads around it and it is a shared priority to create economic growth and stimulate housing growth. EF commented that it is felt that the numbers for delivery are a worry and that the green sites are as a result of past work. Green sites may not necessarily all come forward to delivery.

RP highlighted the necessity of investment in order to drive the numbers given.

CM commented that the presentation was appreciated, but would want to look into the information in more depth. A lot of housing numbers are related to economic growth within the Sheffield City Region and also demographic change, ie elderly, special needs. There are other factors for different housing needs and need to think about this. Lincolnshire LEP has a Board member to lead on the work with older persons requirements.

EF said there was a local job to be done with regard to specific housing needs, for example reflecting housing market analysis findings. MH explained that this needs to be turned into a specific delivery strategy.

The presentation will be circulated and comments back from the Board welcomed. There is a key role for the Board to ensure delivery on housing for growth sites.

In the pink category there are more sites than the HCA has resources so priorities need to be decided.

Blue sites have the opportunity for match funding on sites but how do we gear up to activate at city region.

Orange and white sites need to be clarified and are long term priorities. Also, how to align housing and wider types of investment.

On viability, we need to capture private expertise members for this Board and how it is fed back to them that this is the right strategy. RP said that this will be fed back to the next Board. MH commented that it is necessary to understand where this Board has got to.

4. Any Other Business **Other items as relevant**

RP expressed thanks to the current Board and looked forward to the work of the new Board.

There being no further business, the meeting closed.

Dates of Future Meetings – 2015

To be confirmed

1.1. Part B – A residential offer that support our economic ambitions

1.1.1. Introduction

SCR partners recognise that providing high quality new and affordable homes in the right place has a key role to play in supporting economic growth¹. As such, an important focus of our SEP is on building more and better homes - ensuring that our residential offer supports our wider economic growth ambitions. In addition to providing new homes, it is important that existing homes and neighbourhoods contribute effectively to the SCR's plans for growth, helping to attract and retain the skilled workforce that is needed.

Current adopted and emerging planning policy documents identify 114,000 planned new homes up to 2026/2031² - at a headline level this equates to c7,000 to 8,000 new homes per year across the SCR. However, this planned number of new homes assumes job numbers remain at the 2010 level and does not take in to consideration the additional new homes needed to support the ambitious level of economic growth that is set out in our Growth Plan.

Early indications from demographic forecasting and household projections work undertaken by Edge Analytics³ suggest that in order to support jobs growth of c70,000 over the next ten years, the SCR will need to provide on average between 7,000 and 10,000 new dwellings per year⁴. The lower figure in this projected range is broadly in line with the level of housing growth that local partners are currently planning for. However, current delivery falls below the existing 'target' and has done so for a number of years, as set out in the following table.⁵

Housing delivery figures (net additional dwellings)	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11	2011/12	2012/13
Barnsley	860	793	1155	920	730
Bassetlaw	359	160	264	303	226
Bolsover	243	199	203	124	120

1 The Northern Way, Residential Futures, 2011

2 Local Planning Frameworks across the 9 local authorities of the SCR cover different time periods, therefore explaining the variation in timescales for housing delivery

3 Edge Analytics, Phase One Report, March 2014

4 It is intended that this initial analysis will be further refined alongside the development of more detailed economic projections

5 Net additional dwellings, taken from individual local authority Completion Monitoring Reports

Chesterfield	64	24	73	51	155
Derbyshire Dales ⁶	170	118	170	132	222
Doncaster	778	224	263	457	316
North East Derbyshire	230	208	142	116	158
Rotherham	703	415	537	696	525
Sheffield	2212	1510	630	447	761
SCR Total	5619	3651	3437	3246	3213

There is a clear challenge and identified need to accelerate housing delivery – which will form a key part of our overall economic vision⁷. In our efforts to realise our aim it is important to ensure that new homes are developed in locations that are well connected to areas of future employment growth⁸, that we focus on increasing the supply of good quality housing (which is vital in attracting high skilled employees) and to ensure that we contribute to the creation of high quality neighbourhoods that provide the services and environment to attract and retain a growing workforce⁹. Central to this will be continued joint work across all of the SCR’s local planning authorities, further demonstrating the local commitment to implementing the ‘duty to co-operate’ through working together to meet our housing requirements as a City Region.

1.1.2. The Economic Challenge

Across the SCR, there are a number of common barriers to accelerating housing growth¹⁰, a summary of which includes:

- Generally across the City Region the value of new homes is low in comparison to national averages and new build costs sit at a level too close to the price point of purchasing an existing property;
- A significant proportion of sites across the City Region are brownfield, which gives rise to high land remediation costs, affecting the attractiveness of sites and schemes (a point covered in more detail throughout the ‘Economic Infrastructure’ content of this Annex);
- A scarcity of available land in either public ownership or in non-green belt that can readily be brought forward to develop new homes on a large scale;

6 These figures exclude housing completions in the Peak District National Park area within the Derbyshire Dales District Council boundary, which totalled 317 during the 2008/09 to 2012/13 period

7 This includes a residential offer within SCR which is attractive to a large proportion of the workforce required to fill the 70,000 additional jobs, including 30,000 higher skilled jobs

8 Connecting people to jobs also forms a key part of our SEP, as evidenced in our LSTF capital and revenue bids.

9 Important as part of the wider SCR ‘offer’ and in supporting our priorities set out in the ‘New Businesses Moving In’ section of this plan

10 Identified through work carried out on behalf of SCR partners by CBRE (February/ March 2014)

- A number of sites require significant investment in on and off site infrastructure, often this often acts as a barrier to bringing forward to the market both housing and employment land (again, a point covered in more detail throughout the ‘Economic Infrastructure’ content of this Annex);
- Legacy land prices, current low land values, lower profitability and marginal viability: all of which constrain the pace of delivery and affect the ranking of SCR schemes pursuing finance through national competitive funding rounds;
- A lack of sites of sufficient scale to access recent national funding initiatives such as the Local Infrastructure Fund (LIF) and Get Britain Building (GBB);
- Low market rents and lack of grant funding impacting on the Affordable Housing Programmes ability to deliver viable projects;
- A higher instance of SME developers active in the City Region, than elsewhere, which typically struggle to access sufficient finance, unlike larger developers who have easier access to corporate facilities and equity.

1.1.3. Interventions

Our ambitious Growth Plan will require an equally ambitious approach to housing, however, there is no quick fix solution. The propositions that form part of our Growth Deal for housing/residential offer are focussed around the following interventions, with each intervention explored in greater detail throughout this section:

- Delivering the SCRIF schemes that enable housing development;
- Government support for accelerated delivery in 2014/15 and 2015/16;
- Establishing an SCR Joint Investment Fund;
- Establishing Housing Growth Zones;
- Developing an SCR Housing Investment Plan, underpinned by a prioritised approach to housing investment.

We clearly set out where Government support and local commitments will help address identified barriers and market failures in the short-term. In the more medium to long-term, we are also clear how a more strategic approach to providing an appropriate residential offer will help us maximise investment from across the public and private sector¹¹, with clear asks of Government in support of this.

1) Delivering the Sheffield City Region Investment Fund (SCRIF) schemes that enable housing development

Detailed information on the SCRIF is set out in the ‘Economic Infrastructure: Transformational City Region Schemes’ section of this Annex. Our formal bid to the LGF

¹¹ In line with the SCR Integrated Infrastructure Investment Plan detailed in the ‘Economic Infrastructure: Overview’ section.

seeks to give certainty to and accelerate the delivery of these priority schemes. In summary, local partners have already undertaken a large amount of work to secure private sector investment across a number of mixed use schemes, in order to address both onsite and offsite infrastructure constraints to development. A large proportion of our SCRIF schemes unlock sites that together have the potential to accommodate over 14,000 new dwellings¹². This further underlines the importance of our LGF bid in supporting wider infrastructure investment (which includes housing), as well as the need for a flexible approach to the investment of national funds in the SCR in order to ensure better alignment to our wider economic priorities.

2) Government support for accelerated delivery in 2014/15 and 2015/16

Whilst some schemes in the SCR have benefitted from some of the products that the HCA has made available nationally to address issues with access to finance, success has been limited, with SCR schemes significantly underrepresented. Our evidence suggests that the market dynamics that prevail in the SCR mean that many schemes would not be considered favourably in a competitive process (often due to scale or timing of nationally-led funding rounds). Furthermore, the larger proportion of SME developers in the SCR are often dissuaded from applying for available funding due to lack of resources, complexity of processes and unrealistic timescales for both application and delivery.

Early indications suggest there are a number of housing schemes across the City Region that are capable of being brought forward rapidly and delivered in financial years 2014/15 and 2015/16. This would however be subject to the availability of funding alongside policy and delivery flexibilities that match the needs and opportunities present across the SCR's housing markets. Set out below is an indication of the priority schemes for 'early delivery' across the SCR:

Scheme location (district)	Potential no. of units	Estimated loan/ equity capital required	Current status
Bentley Bridge (Derbyshire Dales)	60	c£2m	Loan for minor infrastructure and site preparation.
Brookvale South Shirebrook (Bolsover)	630	c£5m	HCA ownership. Marginal viability, but deliverable with

¹² Further detailed information on each of the SCRIF schemes can be found in the 'Economic Infrastructure: Transformational City Region Schemes' chapter.

			intervention.
Dronfield (NE Derbyshire)	48	c£6.5m	Currently pre planning, clear ownership and ability to start with loan finance.
Harworth (Bassetlaw)	250	c£2m	In planning with Persimmon. Loan for infrastructure required.
Howard Street / Doncaster Gate (Rotherham)	234	c£6m	Town centre residential in local authority ownership. Public backed PRS.
Linacre Road (Chesterfield)	300	c£1m	A viable site requires accelerated masterplanning and minor infrastructure/ remediation works.
McCormicks Site (Doncaster)	800	c£10m	Viable, some up front infrastructure required and planning needed.
Seasons (phase 2), Thurnscoe (Barnsley)	254	c£5m	Phase 1 complete. Phase 2 – currently unviable.
Sheffield City Centre (Sheffield)	200	c£15m	Viable mixed use schemes with planning. Access to funding is the issue.

In reviewing this information it is important to note that:

- The number of dwellings and estimated loan/equity capital required is indicative and based on a number of assumptions that would be further tested/appraised as part of any application process.
- The pace of delivery depends on a number of factors, with more information currently available for some schemes than others.
- It is expected that a full business case would provide further details on a range of issues including private sector match, and the key milestones at which funding would be required.
- A number of local authorities have further schemes which are capable of delivery in

the short term, making our proposal one which is both flexible and scaleable.

This indicative list of schemes demonstrates that there is demand for a mix of loan and equity investments which, if made available in the short-term and in a more flexible way, could facilitate the accelerated delivery of c2,500 new homes¹³.

It is clear that the scale and pace of delivery set out above could only be achieved through a more targeted and flexible approach to the market than has been offered by HCA programmes to date. In support of this we have the following clear 'asks' of Government:

- An 'ring-fenced' allocation of up to c£50m in loan or equity funds from existing HCA resources to be made available and 'ring-fenced' for investments in the SCR
- For this 'ring-fenced' allocation to be deployed in line with a wider package of 'policy flexibilities' and support, specifically:
 - Allowing applications for developments on small individual sites, as well as clusters of sites across the SCR that deliver a cumulative impact in terms of net additional dwellings;
 - More realistic timescales for application, start on site and completion, acknowledging the market conditions and the higher proportion of SME developers in the SCR;
 - Flexibility for both private and public sector partners to apply for loan/equity funding;
 - Ability to set an investment level that allows greater flexibility in loan and equity products, such as a higher loan to cost ratio than permitted under schemes such as GBB;
 - Alongside a local staff resource¹⁴, that the HCA provide a dedicated staff resource that covers the whole of the SCR¹⁵ and is focused on streamlining processes in order to accelerate delivery in 2014/15 and 2015/16 (this would also focus on building capacity ahead of the introduction of the proposed JIF)
 - The consideration of how a State Aid Scheme for Housing could be implemented in the SCR in order to address a number of the identified barriers/market failures (in support of both short-term activity and more medium-term activity through the proposed JIF);
 - It is proposed that the £50m is established on a recyclable fund basis but in some cases, with agreement with partners, certain strategic projects may require the fund to take a short term 'hit' in the form of a grant type investment, but within

¹³ In the larger low density schemes it is assumed that development would be phased and hence any loan made would be deployed to successfully deliver a first phase and then recycled within the scheme, where necessary.

¹⁴ Yet to be agreed

¹⁵ Currently HCA Operating Areas do not align to the SCR Functional Economic Area

the wider aim of the JIF (with a portfolio of SCR investments) to cover such 'loses' with gains elsewhere.

3) Establishing an SCR Joint Investment Fund

SCR partners are seeking support from Government to establish a co-designed and co-managed housing investment fund (a joint investment fund or JIF) with the HCA.

In the medium-term this will deliver and accelerate activity in line with the SCR Housing Investment Plan in a way that takes into consideration the conditions and requirements of SCR's housing markets. In particular, it is expected that the 'policy flexibilities' requested in order to accelerate deliver in 2014/15 and 2015/16 would be applied to the JIF.

The main focus of the JIF will be on the delivery of new homes, achieved by prioritising activity on individual and clustered sites that provide the most timely strategic housing opportunities to deliver housing growth. Subject to further work between local partners and the HCA, our headline asks are:

- A devolved package of funding to be made available to the SCR for deployment on a revolving investment basis as either loan or equity, with flexibility to vary the terms by which it is made available to developers according to need. This would require resource to identify the schemes and to work closely with developers to work up investable propositions.
- That funding is provided either through a pooled resource fund jointly by the HCA and SCR partners, or through the recruitment a fund manager to undertake that role¹⁶. This approach would enable the fund to invest as necessary at different stages of the development cycle, to bring schemes forward and to invest only that capital sufficient to make schemes able to access remaining capital from other sources. In this regard and given current market conditions, we see it being successfully deployed in the following principal ways:
 - Loan finance to smaller developers who still struggle to access suitable finance from their banks;
 - Loan or equity to fund the upfront infrastructure requirements necessary to open up new sites where finance for the subsequent housing construction is generally available;
 - Loan or equity to bring forward high density city or town centre schemes not currently fundable potentially linked to private rented sector models.

¹⁶ SCR already have a degree of success in such an approach which makes use of JESSICA and GPF funding to provide the finance required to develop commercial property. It is also intended that the JIF would be underpinned by strong governance as part of the SCR Combined Authority sub-structures

Over the coming months local partners will work with the HCA to agree which programmes and funding would fall within the scope of the JIF¹⁷. To support this joint approach to investment, it is proposed that the value of any HCA assets within the SCR will be captured locally (through the retention of HCA sales receipts) and used as a revenue stream for a specified time period - allowing SCR partners to invest the capital required to unlock key housing sites.

In addition to existing national funding sources, local partners are committed to exploring how funding under local control could be used to complement or increase the levels of investment from other public or private sector partners. This will include continuing work locally to assess if a proportion of the New Homes Bonus could be pooled at a City Region level in order to accelerate activity and contribute to economic growth. The City Region will also make use of its powers and resources to explore innovative ways of establishing the conditions that stimulate private sector investment in housing (e.g. pension funds, remedial site activity, harnessing public sector land).

Furthermore, a number of barriers to housing delivery in the SCR relate to the nature of available sites, with issues of viability and high costs associated with land remediation or infrastructure provision common across a number of strategic housing sites. As part of the development of the JIF, both Government and local partners will need to consider how the market failures resulting from this could best be addressed through upfront funding that has the potential to form part of a recyclable fund, but importantly de-risks key sites for future investment. Any form of grant type investment would be utilised as a tool of last resort and deployed in a targeted way, which would seek to draw on a mix of contributions from both local and national sources of funding.

4) Establishing Housing Growth Zones

The SCR is seeking the necessary powers to create a multi-site, housing-led version of the 'Enterprise Zone'. The purpose of Housing Growth Zones (HGZ) is to address SCR identified barriers to the delivery of new homes in the SCR. HGZs would be made up of a package of incentives (under both local and national control) that aim to stimulate accelerated housing delivery in geographically defined areas of opportunity. In the SCR it is anticipated that HGZs would be focused in locations close to or with strong transport links to areas with the greatest potential for economic growth.

Our evidence¹⁸ suggests that HGZs could have some success in bringing forward schemes that are on the margins of viability attracting developers into the City Region who are not

¹⁷ It is not intended that this fund will cover all HCA activity in SCR. It will seek to focus activity which directly aligns to a residential offer which supports economic growth. Once developed it is anticipated that the fund will form part of the wider SCRIF

¹⁸ Identified through work carried out on behalf of SCR partners by CBRE (February/ March 2014)

currently active and encouraging those who currently operate here to accelerate the pace with which they deliver.

Local partners are keen to work with Government to further explore how this initiative could best support accelerated housing delivery in the SCR. Early work suggests that alignment of the following core incentives could form the basis of HGZs:

- Local flexibility on stamp duty both for land transactions and for the position of bands for house sales;
- Additional resources to support a planning/ investment task force to offer a single point of contact for developers to help accelerate navigation of the local planning system and identification of opportunities including assistance in accessing locally influenced funding sources;
- Streamlined planning controls (though the use of Local Development Orders), simplified Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) and enforcement powers;
- Enhanced or extended tax reliefs for dealing with contaminated land and burdensome infrastructure requirements;
- Potential for pan Local Authority packaging of sites to cross subsidise and achieve housing growth, particularly where HGZ's span local boundaries.

Clearly a number of these incentives are under local control, whilst others would require the support of Government. In particular, a number of the suggested incentives under national control would see an initial reduction in tax receipts. However, the increase in development and take up of new homes will in the medium term result in an increase in tax income, as well as wider economic benefits. The SCR would welcome the opportunity to work with Government to pilot HGZs which offer the most attractive balance of incentives whilst ensuring that we achieve additional housing supply (and not the displacement of investment activity).

5) Developing an SCR Housing Investment Plan, underpinned by a prioritised approach to housing investment

Building on the success of the SCRIF approach¹⁹, local partners are committed to the development of an SCR Housing Investment Plan²⁰. This will articulate the SCR's housing priorities and the investment/activity required to accelerate delivery.

The Plan will provide a focus for private and public sector investment in housing that supports the SCR's economic ambitions and contributes to national housing targets.

¹⁹ See: <http://www.sheffieldcityregion.org.uk/sheffield-city-region-investment-fund/>

²⁰ This will form part of the SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan as described in the 'Economic Infrastructure: Overview' section. Locally this will enable housing, planning and transport investment and interventions to be aligned to the SEP as part of a SCR-wide approach to integrated infrastructure

Underpinned by a prioritised approach to housing investment, it will also be central in identifying a clear pipeline of JIF investments.

Early work on this prioritised approach has been undertaken, consisting of a robust 3 stage appraisal framework that focuses on site identification, site assessment and a quantification of outputs. Local partners are committed to undertaking further work that will conclude in 2014/15, alongside the development of the JIF and HGZ.

In developing this approach, SCR partners have a clear expectation that Government investment in housing in the SCR (through the HCA) will be better aligned with local plans for economic growth, allowing both national and local Government to share in the benefits and the resulting housing and economic growth.

1.2. Enabling Infrastructure: Housing / Residential Offer A summary of our local commitments, asks of Government and bids to the LGF

Projects	What we are doing locally	Formal ask to Government	Bid to LGF
Enabling Infrastructure: Housing/ Residential Offer	<p>The identification of housing schemes for delivery in 2014/15 and 2015/16 that fit with the HCA’s current range of investment products (loans or equity funds), contributing to both local and national targets.</p> <p>The provision of a central SCR resource that will support the delivery of the identified schemes in the short-term.</p> <p>Continued delivery of SCRIF schemes that will unlock the development land to support 14,000 new dwellings.</p> <p>Building on the success of SCRIF, the development of an SCR prioritised approach to housing</p>	<p>In support of accelerated delivery in 2014/15 and 2015/16:</p> <p>A ‘ring-fenced’ allocation of up to c£50m in loan/ equity funding from existing HCA resources to be made available for investments in the SCR and deployed in line with a wider package of ‘policy flexibilities’ and support</p> <p>A dedicated staff resource within the HCA that covers the whole SCR^[1] and is focused on streamlining processes, in order to accelerate</p>	<p>A number of our SCRIF schemes support the delivery of new homes at key locations across the SCR. Our formal bid to the LGF in support of SCRIF is set out in the ‘Economic Infrastructure: Transformational City Region Schemes’ section of this chapter.</p> <p>Our bid for HCA funding in 2014/15 and 2015/16 (along with associated flexibilities) is set out as a ‘formal ask’ to Government.</p>

^[1] Currently HCA Operating Areas do not align to the SCR Functional Economic Area

Projects	What we are doing locally	Formal ask to Government	Bid to LGF
	<p>investment that will inform the development to an SCR Housing Investment Plan in 2014/15.</p> <p>As part of discussions with Government around the development of the JIF, local partners will consider the use of funds and assets under local control in support of our aspiration to move towards a more locally managed and flexible fund that works for housing markets in the SCR.</p> <p>A commitment to work with Government to pilot Housing Growth Zones and achieve the most attractive balance of incentives.</p> <p>In support of the wider priorities of the SEP:</p> <p>A commitment to the local supply chain and workforce (via training and job opportunities) through procurement frameworks (e.g.</p>	<p>delivery in 2014/15 and 2015/16 and build capacity within the SCR to support the delivery of the JIF</p> <p>Commit to working with SCR partners in 2014/15 to develop a JIF that can be deployed in a more flexible way, in order to align with the priorities set out in the SCR Housing Investment Plan.</p> <p>The provision of a State Aid Scheme (national or bespoke to the SCR) that enables us to deliver all of the activity we are promoting</p> <p>As part of the JIF, SCR partners request that HCA assets are considered for investment (alongside funds and assets under local control) in</p>	

Projects	What we are doing locally	Formal ask to Government	Bid to LGF
	<p>procurement enorth and yorbuild and HCA DPP2).</p> <p>Our commitment to the climate change agenda and the use of modern methods of construction when economically advantageous to do so.</p>	<p>order to accelerate housing delivery across SCR</p> <p>A commitment to work with SCR partners to pilot Housing Growth Zones and achieve the most attractive balance of incentives.</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank

The SCR Housing/ Residential Offer Board Terms of Reference

1. Objectives of the Board

- 1.1 The Housing/ Residential Offer Advisory Board (“the Board”) will act as the Sheffield City Region’s (SCR) Thematic Board leading the strategic approach to housing delivery.
- 1.2 The primary focus of the Board is to ensure that the SCR’s residential offer supports its economic ambitions whilst meeting the housing needs of existing residents. However, it is acknowledged that there are a number of wider housing objectives that are a priority for SCR and therefore ‘making the most of existing homes’ and ‘supporting vulnerable households’ also form an important part of the Board’s work.
- 1.3 The Housing/ Residential Offer Advisory Board operates as a key body within the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)/ Combined Authority (CA) Board’s governance structure. On behalf of the LEP Board it will lead the development of the Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) Housing/ Residential programme of work.

2. Role and Remit of the Board

- 2.1 To be effective the Board will be required to facilitate and engage with stakeholder partnerships across a range of partner organisations, including Local Authorities, private sector partners, relevant sector groups (e.g. Property and Construction), key intermediary networks, relevant Government Departments and Agencies (e.g. CLG, HCA), and Registered (housing) Providers.
- 2.2 The members of the Housing/ Residential Offer Advisory Board will collaborate to undertake a range of responsibilities as set out below.
- 2.3 Strategy, policy and planning:
 - Lead, contribute to, review and approve the development of the Housing/ Residential Offer component of the SEP.
 - Act as the custodian of the Housing/ Residential Offer elements of the SEP, including monitoring progress towards key actions
 - Build the case to Government in order to attract further funding, freedoms and flexibilities for SCR in order to accelerate housing delivery.
 - To work closely with developers and investors in order to facilitate housing growth at the scale required to meet SCR’s economic ambitions.
 - To coordinate/ communicate and ensure coherence with key activities of the other relevant boards Thematic Advisory Boards – in particular the Infrastructure Advisory Board (including commissioning activity for other Board to undertake).

- Ensure progress towards developing and operationalising the agreed programme of activity, monitoring key risks and providing updates for the SEP Executive Group/ LEP Board/ CA as required.
- Identify how national or local policy or practice or wider economic events will impact upon the Housing/ Residential Offer priorities within the SEP.
- Identify issues to escalate within SCR governance structures and/ or which may require further negotiations with Government.

2.4 Programmes and Investment:

- Take responsibility for:
 - Ensuring that sites unlocked via other SCR (e.g. SCRIF) or national investment programmes (e.g. HCA investment) are delivering the desired housing outcomes.
 - Ensuring that the emerging SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan (IIP) supports investment in housing and the improvement of SCR's residential offer.
 - Ensuring that Government/ HCA investment in SCR is aligned to the priorities set out in the SCR SEP.
 - Lead the work to ensure that housing delivery in SCR is accelerated – with a particular focus on priority sites/ locations (as determined by the Board).
 - Work with Government to develop a more flexible, strategic and devolved Housing Investment Fund for the SCR.
 - Work collaboratively to explore opportunities to deliver housing investment through alternative sources of finance (e.g. loans, pension funding, private investment, pooled SCR resources).

2.5 Commissioning:

- In carrying out its' functions, the Board will act as a 'commissioning' body, with partner organisations/ other Thematic Boards taking the lead on work areas as appropriate. (e.g. Local Authorities, the HCA, private sector partners).
- The Board will commission (subject to available resources) relevant support and expertise in order to enable Local Authorities to deliver housing at sites of SCR significance.

3. Communication and Networking:

3.1 In pursuit of its objectives the Board will:

- Communicate, represent and disseminate information about the Board's activities to relevant networks and organisations.

- Be an active promoter/ ambassador of housing growth in SCR.
- Facilitate and host stakeholder partnerships that bring together a range of key partners in order to monitor and continually improve the work of the Board.
- Work closely with other local partnerships and boards, including other SCR SEP Thematic Boards - acknowledging at the outset that clear communication with the Infrastructure Advisory Board will be essential.

4. Membership and Chairing Arrangements

4.1 The membership and remit of the Housing/ Residential Offer Board will be reviewed annually (the first meeting under these new Terms of Reference to take place by the end of January 2015).

4.2 Membership of the Board is set out in the table below:

Board Member	Nomination Body
Member of the LEP Private Sector Board (1)	SCR LEP/ CA
Local Authority Leader Representative (1) <i>(Chair of the Board)</i>	SCR LEP/ CA
Local Authority Cabinet Member for Housing (1) <i>(Deputy Chair of the Board)</i>	SCR LEP/ CA (in consultation with all 9 Cabinet Members)
Representative of the SCR Property and Construction Sector Group (1)	SCR Property and Construction Sector Group
Two representatives from the private sector with relevant expertise (e.g. development finance, construction, regeneration, house building, private rented sector, etc...) (2)	Advertised via existing SCR networks and on the SCR website, with positions agreed by the SCR Private Sector Board
A senior Officer from the HCA (1)	HCA North East and Yorkshire & Humber
A representative from the RSL sector (1)	National Housing Federation
Two representatives of the SCR Local Authority Chief Executives Group (2)	SCR Local Authority Chief Executives Group

4.3 Consideration will be given to the geographical balance of the Board with additional members being co-opted if required.

4.4 Each member on the Board will be representative of their organisation and of their membership (where appropriate).

- 4.5 Where Board members attend meetings/ forums where business relating to the Board is discussed, they will make it clear in what capacity they are attending and whose views they are seeking to represent.
- 4.6 Each member on the Board will register any potential conflicts of interest at the point of appointment/ re-appointment. It is the responsibility of Board members to inform the Chair of any changes to interests which may need be declared during a Board Members term of office.
- 4.7 At each Board meeting there will be a standing agenda item where any conflicts of interest related to specific agenda items can be made known and recorded in the minutes/ notes of the meeting.
- 4.8 The Chair of the Board will serve for two years from election (see 6.7).
- 4.9 The Deputy Chair of the Board will serve for two years from election (see 6.7)
- 4.10 Members of the Board will limit the use of substitutes to allow the work of the Board to progress smoothly and with continuity. If a substitute for a member attends more than half of the meetings of the Board in a calendar year the member will be asked to consider their membership of the Board in the light of their individual circumstances.

5. Decision making protocols

- 5.1 No business shall be transacted at a meeting of the Board unless at least 50% of voting members are present.
- 5.2 The Board will endeavour to form a consensus on all relevant matters/ questions/ issues/ recommendations. However, where this is not possible, questions will be decided by a simple majority vote of all voting members present, on the basis of one member one vote). Minority views will be recorded in the formal minutes of each meeting.
- 5.3 In the case of equal votes, the Chair shall have a second or casting vote, subject to the clauses below:
 - In exceptional circumstances, on any decision taken by the Board relating to HCA investments, the HCA representative, or their nominee, shall have the right to refer the decision to the HCA for determination. Where such a referral occurs the matter shall not be decided until it is determined by the HCA.
 - Where the Board seeks to recommend a course of action or decision on the alignment/ investment of other related public sector resources, decisions would remain the responsibility of the respective funding body or decision making body (e.g. the SCR CA).

6. Operating Principles

- 6.1 The Chair of the Board will, in consultation with the SCR Executive Team, determine the agenda for each meeting and an appropriate order of business.
- 6.2 Members of the Board and/ or representative of partner or external organisations are required to liaise with the Board's Secretariat and the SCR Executive Team in order to agree issues to be put to the Chair for consideration as an agenda item at a future Board meeting.
- 6.3 All business and activity related to the objectives, role and remit of this Board will be considered at a scheduled meeting of the Board prior to consideration by/ recommendations progressing to the SCR CA/ LEP. Where this is not possible (i.e. in the case of urgent items) then appropriate action will be taken by the Chair in order to ensure that urgent items are dealt with in a timely and collaborative way (e.g. by consulting with Board Members and key Officers via e-mail). Any decisions taken by the Chair outside of the formal Board meeting cycle will be reported to the Board at the next scheduled meeting.
- 6.4 Meetings will take place at least every 2 months, with meeting dates aligned to ensure that recommendations can be made and issues escalated to meetings of the SCR CA/ LEP in a timely fashion. Additional meetings may be called as necessary.
- 6.5 As a minimum, the CA/ LEP will receive quarterly update reports on the work of the Housing/ Residential Offer Board. Items/ recommendations for decision outside of this quarterly cycle will be referred to the SCR CA/ LEP at the next available SCR CA/ LEP meeting cycle.
- 6.6 Senior Local Authority Officers (as nominated by their Chief Executive) from each of the member Local Authorities will work collectively to support the work of the Board. Up to a maximum of two of these Senior Officers from this informal group will attend meetings of the SCR Housing/ Residential Offer Board in a support/ observation capacity.
- 6.7 Should the Chair of the Board be a Local Authority Leader or Portfolio Holder/ Cabinet Member, the Lead Local Authority Chief Executive cannot be from the same Local Authority.
- 6.8 The secretariat function (e.g. ensuring good governance, arranging meetings, compiling and circulating agendas, recoding and circulating minutes, co-ordination of agreed actions etc...) will be undertaken by the South Yorkshire Joint Secretariat (working to and on behalf of the SCR Executive Team).
- 6.9 The SCR Executive Team will support the Board through:
 - The co-ordination of activity linked to the SCR Growth Plan/ Deal and the emerging SCR Integrated Infrastructure Investment Plan
 - SCR Executive Team Officer and/ or Chief Executive attendance at Board meetings (as appropriate) (please note that the SCR Executive, in common with the Senior Local Authority Officers, will not have a vote)

This page is intentionally left blank

**SHEFFIELD CITY REGION HOUSING AND RESIDENTIAL OFFER BOARD
WORK PROGRAMME – AGREED BY THE BOARD ON 23rd JUNE 2014**

This document provides an update on progress (as at January 2015) towards the various activities agreed by the SCR Housing Board in June 2014. The text in the ‘activity’ column has been shaded in line with the following criteria:

Green: Activity complete and outcomes achieved

Amber: Activity partially complete or ongoing

Red: Little or no progress on this area of work

<p>Work areas</p>	<p>a) <u>Governance:</u> Ensure the SCR Housing and Residential Offer Board becomes a formal part of the emerging SCR governance structures</p> <p>b) <u>Progressing the SCR Growth Deal for housing (including the identification of spatial priority areas for housing growth):</u> Progress actions identified in the SEP/ Growth Deal in order to accelerate and increase housing delivery across the SCR (the following sub actions are set out in sequence/ order of priority in line with the expected next steps required to support further Growth Deal negotiations with Government):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) <i>Ensuring the delivery of SCRIF schemes which support and enable housing delivery</i> ii) Review broad spatial priority areas for housing growth (based on existing/ emerging planning policies) as part of the development of the SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan iii) Identify an initial prioritised list of sites, which could deliver additional housing in the short to medium term iv) Work with the HCA to explore how the schemes identified at b) iii) can be funded v) Develop a case for creating Housing Growth Zones, which provides special incentives that are tailored to unlocking and accelerating housing growth in areas where there is a compelling
--------------------------	---

	<p>economic case for doing so</p> <p>vi) Work with Government to develop a SCR Housing Investment Fund, this will include the development of a robust appraisal and assurance framework <i>which will underpin a more flexible, strategic and devolved approach</i></p> <p>c) <u>Developing a SCR-wide approach across a wide range of housing themes</u> Work together to share resources and learn from good practice across a range of housing themes, with an initial focus on accelerating the delivery of affordable housing</p>
Lead officer(s)	<p>Work areas a) and b) - Michael Hellewell, SCR Executive Team</p> <p>Work area c) – Georgina Parkin (Sheffield CC) and Tom Bell (Rotherham MBC)</p>
Support officers	<p>Barnsley MBC - Ian Prescott/ Sarah Cartwright Bassetlaw DC - Clair Frost Bolsover DC - Sarah Clow Chesterfield BC - James Crouch Derbyshire Dales DC - Robert Cogings Doncaster MBC - Adam Goldsmith NE Derbyshire DC - Karen Perkins/ Rebecca Slack Rotherham MBC - Tom Bell Sheffield CC - Georgina Parkin (currently provides secretariat approach for the Board and Officer Group) The Homes and Communities Agency – Lisa Jones/ Rob Pearson</p>
Private sector/RSL sector involvement	<p>Tony Stacy/Amanda Gerrard (RPs)</p> <p>(further support/ involvement to be agreed alongside a review of current Board arrangements)</p>

Proposed activities:

Activity	What needs to be done?	By whom?	Timescales	Mechanisms and finance needed	List of support needed
<p>Ensure the SCR Housing and Residential Offer Board becomes a formal part of the emerging SCR governance structures</p>	<p>Ensure the SCR Housing and Residential Offer Board becomes a formal part of the emerging SCR governance structures and is able to influence the work of local partners and the decisions of the Combined Authority/ LEP Board (as appropriate):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the Terms of Reference for the SCR Housing and Regeneration Officer Group and Board in order to ensure consistency and alignment to SCR Combined Authority/ LEP Board structures Alignment of key SCR meetings to the Housing and Residential Offer Officers Group and Board in order to ensure recommendations can be taken forward at a SCR level as required As part of the review of Officer support, links with complementary activity undertaken by the SCR Heads of Planning and the Infrastructure Advisory Board will be better aligned/ formalised to supporting the priorities of the 	<p>Michael Hellewell and SCR H&R Secretariat Support (tbc)</p> <p>Michael Hellewell</p> <p>Amy Harhoff (SCR Team)</p> <p>Rob Murfin (SCR HoP)</p>	<p>To be signed off at the SCR meeting cycle in July 2014</p> <p>July/ Aug 2014</p> <p>July/ Aug 2014</p> <p>Ongoing</p>	<p>No additional resources required</p> <p>Will need to consider resource requirements associated with delivering this workplan</p>	<p>Ongoing support from a 'secretariat function', with a recommendation that this is provided by the Chair of the H&R Boards LA</p> <p>Ongoing support/ advice from the H&R Lead LA Chief Executive (Martin Kimber, Rotherham MBC – to be confirmed during July 2014)</p>

	Housing and Residential Offer Board	Group)			
Ensuring the delivery of SCRIF schemes which support and enable housing delivery	<p>Ensuring the delivery of SCRIF schemes which support and enable housing delivery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued negotiation with Government in relation to the competitive funding elements and related 'freedoms and flexibilities' set out in the SCR SEP/ Growth Deal Regular reports and updates from the SCRIF Steering Group to the H&R Officers Group Ensure engagement of H&R Officers/ Board Members in the development of the SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan (informing the next round of SCR infrastructure priorities) 	<p>Michael Hellewell</p> <p>Amy Harhoff (SCR Team)</p> <p>Amy Harhoff (SCR Team)</p>	<p>Summer 2014</p> <p>Ongoing/ as required</p> <p>Ongoing/ as required</p>	No additional resources required	Part of the wider SCR Growth Deal negotiation process
Review broad spatial priority areas for housing growth (based on existing/ emerging planning policies)	<p><i>(the work detailed below will be taken forward as part of the key spatial evidence to support the emerging SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake a review of the previous SCR spatial priority/ planning work undertaken in 2012 in order to understand to what extent the position has changed (e.g. adoption of planning policies, availability of census data, delivery of sites etc...) Review of future housing requirements in the light of the SCR jobs ambition (70,000 by 	<p>SCR Exec Team Co-ordination</p> <p>SCR Exec Team with LA support</p> <p>SCR Exec Team with LA</p>	<p>Ongoing – complete Spring 2015</p> <p>July 2013</p> <p>July 2014</p>	<p>Work will need to be supported by SCR Heads of Planning and the Infrastructure Advisory Board</p> <p>In line with H&R Boards request/ agreement – LAs</p>	<p>Elements of the work to be undertaken as part of the SCR-UoS Research Sabbatical</p> <p>Individual Housing/ Planning Officer support will be</p>
[Priority work for Summer					

<p>2014 to inform further potential Growth Deal negotiations in late 2014]</p>	<p>XXXX)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree the broad spatial priorities areas for housing based on existing/ emerging planning policies • Identify/ quantify any ‘gaps’ which need to be addressed in the more medium term and identify any studies or cross-SCR agreements which may be required to fill these ‘gaps’ • Agree a common approach or methodology for relevant local studies across the SCR in order to ensure a consistent evidence base for future policy development 	<p>support</p> <p>SCR Exec Team with LA support</p> <p>SCR Exec Team with LA support</p>	<p>August 2014</p> <p>Summer 2014</p> <p>In line with timescales for the wider SCR Integrated Infrastructure Plan</p>	<p>agreed to prioritise this work</p>	<p>required throughout</p> <p>All of this work will require support and leadership from SCR Heads of Planning</p>
<p>Identify an initial prioritised list of sites, which could deliver additional housing in the short to medium term</p> <p>Work with the HCA to explore how the prioritised schemes</p>	<p>Drawing on the work undertaken to identify/ agree broad spatial priorities for housing growth (detailed above):</p> <p>Identify specific sites which could deliver additional housing in the short to medium term</p> <p>This work needs to detail which investments could be fully recyclable, and which would require additional funding or support in order to be viable. It will also provide details and of the outputs and financial needs of each prioritised site</p> <p>Identify what further specific technical support/ advice is required from the HCA in addition to that</p>	<p>SCR Exec Team Co-ordination</p> <p>SCR Exec Team with LA support</p>	<p>In line with H&R Boards request/ agreement – LAs agreed to prioritise this work (during August 2014)</p>	<p>The HCA will provide its expertise and access to key teams to support the development of proposals for specific site</p> <p>Further HCA support via the alignment of its investments to</p>	<p>Elements of the work to be undertaken as part of the SCR-UoS Research Sabbatical</p> <p>Individual Housing/ Planning Officer support will be required</p>

<p>identified can be funded</p> <p>[Priority work for Summer 2014 to inform further potential Growth Deal negotiations in late 2014]</p>	<p>already provided</p> <p>The outcomes of this work will inform future bids and 'asks' of Government/ the HCA, as well as further discussions with a range of partners (e.g. Local Authorities, private sector developers/ investors, HCA) on how best to accelerate housing investment/ development</p>		<p>Priority work for Summer 2014 to inform further potential Growth Deal negotiations in late 2014</p>	<p>SCR priorities and through the assessment of policy/ delivery flexibilities in order to accelerate housing delivery</p>	<p>throughout</p> <p>All of this work will require support and leadership from SCR Heads of Planning</p>
<p>Develop a case for creating Housing Growth Zones, which provide special incentives that are tailored to unlocking and accelerating housing growth in areas where there is a compelling</p>	<p>Develop a case for creating Housing Growth Zones, which provide special incentives that are tailored to unlocking and accelerating housing growth in areas where there is a compelling economic case for doing so. It is anticipated that this would draw on the spatial priority/ initial site prioritisation work set out previously.</p> <p>Likely steps for the development of HGZ are set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify common barriers which if removed would allow housing development to be accelerated • Establish appetite at LA level to offer planning incentives (such as LDOs or planning performance agreements) or financial incentives 	<p>Co-ordination by SCR Exec Team</p> <p>Collective and individual LA Officers</p>	<p>Propose this work is put on hold with a review of next steps to be undertaken when the previously identified priority actions are complete</p> <p>Should relevant key</p>	<p>The HCA will provide its expertise and access to key teams to support the development of proposals for specific sites</p>	<p>LEP and CA endorsement required for local core offer and approving HGZ locations</p> <p>SCR Exec Team co-ordination at key stages of the project and ongoing monitoring</p>

<p>economic case for doing so</p>	<p>(such as Council Tax relief or gap grant funding) – noting that the incentives offered need match any barrier or ‘gap’</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build the case for any incentives that would require Government support (where relevant) • Model the impact of a range of incentives on sites proposed as growth zones and build the case for key incentives • Define principles for SCR HGZs, such as Core offer available, incentives rebalance viability, connectivity, deliverability, and housing outputs. • Agree and map HGZs in SCR • Promote zone locations and the core offer linked to the HGZ sites • Monitor and review impact of incentives 		<p>themes/ barriers be identified via the initial prioritisation work this activity could be carried out sooner</p>		
<p>Develop a SCR Housing Investment Fund underpinned by a robust appraisal and assurance framework</p>	<p>Developing a SCR Housing Investment Plan, underpinned by a more robust prioritised approach to housing investment:</p> <p>Develop a headline mechanism for prioritising sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete the criteria work discussed at the March 2014 H&R Board Meeting. • Establish the threshold and set out the 	<p>Arup/ SCR Exec Team</p>	<p>July/ August 2014</p>	<p>No additional resources required above those already allocated from the Transitional Fund</p> <p>Work to be</p>	<p>Critical friend role via UoS Research Sabbatical.</p>

<p>[Work to be undertaken in recognitions of Govt's commitment to working with SCR to develop a more flexible, strategic and devolved Housing Investment Fund]</p>	<p>methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • H&R Board to agree the site selection criteria • Test the tool using a selection of sites from each LA. Test for equity and adjust the tool as required to ensure fairness of opportunity • Build the tool for use when developing SCR plan <p>Identify a pipeline of appropriate sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify sites which have the potential to be on site and delivered by 2018/19 and 2023/24 • Quantify site outputs and investment asks of each proposed site, including which investments could be fully recyclable, and which would require additional funding or support in order to be viable. • Identify the scope of technical support required from the HCA which is in addition to that already provided • Apply site assessment criteria and agree pipeline of schemes which will be supported to apply for investment funding 	<p>TBC/ SCR Exec Team</p>	<p>Late 2014/ early 2015</p>	<p>undertaken in recognitions of Govt's commitment to working with SCR to develop a more flexible, strategic and devolved Housing Investment Fund</p> <p>Resources will be required to undertake site assessments. The scale of these resources is to be defined.</p> <p>The HCA will provide its expertise and access to key teams to support the development of proposals for</p>	<p>Appropriate endorsement of site selection criteria</p>
---	---	---------------------------	------------------------------	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Investment Plan for H&R Board and LEP approval • Work with HCA to explore how schemes can be funded <p>Work with Government to develop and establish a flexible and devolved SCR Joint Investment Fund (JIF):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with HCA to better align future funding programmes to SCR sites • Continue to work with Government and HCA to build the case for a flexible, devolved JIF • Establish and agree fund principles for example deployment of revolving investment, loan or equity, funding terms. • Establish mechanism for fund management/administration including bid appraisals/assurance frameworks and decision making • Agree principles and fund commencement date • Identify the schemes and to work closely with developers to work up investable propositions 	<p>TBC/ SCR Exec Team</p>	<p>Commence initial work November/ December 2014</p> <p>Commence November 2014</p>	<p>specific sites</p> <p>Resources will be required to undertake site assessments. The scale of these resources is to be defined.</p> <p>The HCA will provide its expertise and access to key teams to support the development of proposals for specific sites</p> <p>Resources may be required for additional</p>	<p>Government and HCA engagement</p> <p>HCA expertise to develop site specific proposals</p>
--	--	---------------------------	--	--	--

