

**MINUTES OF  
CHELMSFORD CITY COUNCIL CABINET**

on 16 November 2021 at 7.00pm

Present:

**Cabinet Members**

Councillor S J Robinson, Leader of the Council (Chair)  
Councillor M C Goldman, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Connected Chelmsford  
Councillor M J Mackrory, Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development

**Opposition Spokespersons**

Councillors K Bentley, R Hyland, I C Roberts, M S Steel and R T Whitehead

Also present, in person or remotely: Councillor C K Davidson (Cabinet Member for Fairer Chelmsford) and Councillor R J Moore (Cabinet Member for Greener and Safer Chelmsford) and Councillors W Daden, S Dobson, A Sosin and N Walsh

### 1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Galley, N Gulliver, J A Potter, R J Poulter and M Sismey, Opposition Spokespersons.

### 2. Declarations of Interest

Members of the Cabinet were reminded to declare at the appropriate time any pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests in any of the items of business on the meeting's agenda.

### 3. Minutes and Decisions Called-in

The minutes of the meeting on 12 October 2021 were confirmed as a correct record. No decisions at that meeting had been called in.

### 4. Public Questions

Questions were asked by members of the public on the East Chelmsford Masterplan. The questions and the responses given are recorded under minute number 7.3 below.

## 5. Members' Questions

Councillors who were not members of the Cabinet asked the following questions:

- (a) Councillor N Walsh on the position on the holding of remote or hybrid meetings.

The Cabinet Member for Connected Chelmsford replied that the government, despite strong representations from local authorities and bodies representing them, had failed to bring forward legislation similar to that which had enabled decisions to be made by members at remote or hybrid meetings and which had expired in May 2021. The result was confusion as to how best to maintain the decision-making process during the ongoing pandemic, this meeting being an example of the uncertainty around whether it would be desirable to meet remotely or in person.

The benefits of remote meetings in terms of greater engagement with the public, decreasing the need for travel and the associated carbon emissions, access to information on decisions and reducing the cost of holding meetings had been proven whilst the legislation had been in force. The Cabinet Member urged citizens to write to their Members of Parliament and ask them to support the call for the government to bring forward legislation that would enable local authorities to take decisions in ways that best met their local circumstances and requirements.

- (b) Councillor I Roberts, who sought clarity on the consultation process for planning applications after a number of deadlines had been given for the consultation on the planning application for Strategic Growth Site 10, South Woodham Ferrers.

The Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development was sympathetic to those who had called for more time to respond to the consultation on the very detailed application for the South Woodham Ferrers site, which had followed the normal statutory requirements and practices. It was important to receive the views of local people on the South Woodham Ferrers application and, following a request from South Woodham Ferrers Town Council, the period for comments had been extended to 7 January 2022. It was often the case that responses would continue to be accepted on an application beyond the statutory consultation period but in view of the nature of this application the deadline had been formally extended to enable as many people as possible to comment.

(7.05pm to 7.14pm)

### 6.1 Treasury Management Mid-Year Review (Fairer Chelmsford)

#### Declarations of interest:

None.

#### Summary:

The Cabinet considered a report on the Treasury Management activities undertaken in the first part of 2021-22 and the extent of compliance with the approved Treasury Management Strategy. The Treasury Management and Investment Sub-Committee had concluded that no changes to the Strategy were required ahead of the full, annual review later in the financial year.

### Options

Accept the recommendation in the report or recommend changes to the management of the Council's investments.

### Preferred Option and Reasons

The current investment arrangements met statutory requirements and were satisfactory in the current circumstances.

RESOLVED that the report on the Treasury Management activities in 2021-22 be noted and the Council be requested to review the report and approve the 2021-22 Treasury Strategy without change.

(7.14pm to 7.17pm)

## 6.2 Revenue Monitoring 2021-22 (Fairer Chelmsford)

### Declarations of Interest:

None

### Summary:

The report formed part of the reporting regime by which members and officers monitored the Council's forecast of expenditure and income and compared them with the approved estimates. It identified an expected level of expenditure and income by the Council for the year ending 31 March 2022 and set out actions relating to each of the material variations. The Cabinet was asked to consider the actions relating to the budget variances.

### Options:

Approve or not the actions proposed to address the budget variations.

### Preferred Option and Reasons:

The proposed actions would help ensure, as far as possible, that the Council would have sufficient funds to meet its revenue budget requirements in 2021-22.

RESOLVED that the revenue monitoring report be noted and that Cabinet Members monitor the identified actions.

(7.17pm to 7.20pm)

## 6.3 Capital Monitoring and Update (Fairer Chelmsford)

### Declarations of Interest:

None

### Summary:

The Cabinet received a report on the latest position on the capital programme. The report also provided updates on the approved Capital Schemes and Asset Replacement

Programme to reflect variations in cost and timing which had been identified to date and sought approval for additional budgets.

### Options

Approve or not the variations to Capital Schemes and the Asset Replacement Programme.

### Preferred option and reasons

The Capital Programme as submitted represented new phasing and expenditure required for Capital Schemes and the Asset Replacement Programme.

### Discussion:

Reference was made to the possibility that there may be an overspend on the Theatres Modernisation project. It was asked how much overspend would be tolerated and when tenders were expected to be received. The Cabinet Member for Connected Chelmsford said that design work was still being carried out on the scheme, which would improve access for the disabled to the Theatres and generally improve their facilities. The reference in the report to an overspend was intended to flag the possibility that costs beyond the control of the Council, such as those for materials, may lead to expenditure greater than anticipated. The cost of the scheme would continue to be closely monitored. No date had yet been set for the invitation of tenders.

RESOLVED that

1. The proposed increase of £1.654m in the capital scheme programme, shown in Appendix 1 and detailed in paragraph 6.3 of the report to the meeting, be approved.
2. The proposed changes to the Asset Replacement Programme for 2021-22 and 2022-23, the increase in scheme costs of £82k in 2021-22 and £63k in 2022-23, and the rephasing of spend from 2021-22 of £941k, as shown in Appendix 3 and detailed in paragraphs 7.3 and 7.4 of the report, be approved.

(7.20pm to 7.30pm)

## 7.1 Local Development Scheme (Sustainable Development)

### Declarations of Interest:

None

### Summary:

The Cabinet was requested to consider the revised Local Development Scheme (LDS) which set out the programme of work for the preparation of statutory and non-statutory development plan documents for the period 2021-2025 to be approved for publication.

### Options

1. Approve and publish the revised LDS
2. Approve and publish the revised LDS following amendment
3. Do not approve and publish the revised LDS

### Preferred option and reasons

Option 1 would enable the Council to meet its statutory obligation to review and update its LDS and Local Plan.

### Discussion:

Questions were asked on the following aspects of the LDS:

- With reference to paragraph 5.13, there were six parish SPDs more than 10 years old. It was asked whether they were to be up-dated, whether it was expected that neighbourhood plans would replace them at some point and, if so, when.

The Cabinet Member of Sustainable Development said that as these were Community-led documents undertaken by volunteer groups, the City Council did not set the timetable for them to be updated. In the main they were being replaced by Neighbourhood Plans, but did not have to be. Again, these timetables are driven by the community groups undertaking the work rather than the City Council. The LDS only reported progress.

- With reference to paragraph 6, whether consideration would be given to working on a resident-friendly media release to coincide with the start of the regulation 18 consultation.

The Cabinet was informed that animations and videos had already been identified as being required to support the Local Plan Review and Officers were starting the preparatory work needed for their production. In addition, a Local Plan Communication Plan was being prepared in conjunction with the Council Corporate Communications Team which would maximise the use of different media and engagement methods.

- Whether an assurance could be given that there would be sufficient qualified staff in place at the start of the consultation periods in view of the large volume of submissions expected.

The Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development said that there would be sufficient qualified staff in place going into the consultation period. The Cabinet was also assured that measures were being put in place to address the resource requirements of the Communications Team, for whose work the Cabinet Member for Connected Chelmsford expressed appreciation.

- How many neighbourhood plans, which had been started but appeared to be making little headway, were likely to be adopted by 2025.

The Cabinet was told that the Neighbourhood Plans currently being prepared should all be approved ('made') by 2025. As Community-led Plans, however, their timetables were not controlled by the City Council.

- Whether paragraph 8.8 should this refer to Council and not Cabinet.

It was confirmed that the reference should be to full Council.

- On page 18, whether there would be an appraisal of how the Masterplan process had worked, and what that would that look like. Experience in some cases showed that such plans often did not reflect the Local Plan when it came to numbers of dwellings and this disconnect was exacerbated when outline plans were submitted. For Strategic Growth Site (SGS) 10 the Administration had often said that about 1000 could mean as many as 1200, 20% more houses, and this had given the developer the green light to push for more. Now about 1000 meant 1200 for Countryside/Essex plus the Bellway development, which was expected to be 450+ homes. This was not the only example and it was the view of some that a masterplan should act as a braking mechanism on development, not an accelerator. It was added that, with regard to SGS10, an increase in the number of houses was not being met by a corresponding increase in the infrastructure required to support it, particularly with regard to roads and schools.

The Cabinet Member replied that it had never been possible for the precise housing capacity of sites allocated in Local Plans to be identified at that stage. This was why housing numbers within the adopted Local Plan were framed as 'around' rather than being attributed a precise number. None of the proposals being formulated through masterplans were exceeding the development boundaries set for them on the Local Plan Policies Map and they were being formulated to ensure that they were compliant to policies relating to standards for open space, internal space, cycleway, footway and parking. The size, height, density and massing of development were informed by Local Plan Site Policies and the detailed work and analysis undertaken as part of the masterplan process. In some cases, such as the site at Manor Farm and South Woodham Ferrers, they were greatly exceeding the standards for open space.

This issue also needed to be considered in the context of the City Council's housing requirement set out in the adopted Local Plan. This was a minimum figure which recognised national planning policy requirements to significantly boost the supply of housing to respond to the national housing crisis.

On site SGS10, the infrastructure requirements would be addressed as part of the planning application process and the requirements of the statutory authorities. A case was already being made for the provision of a new primary school as a result of the increase in the number of houses.

The Cabinet was informed that the review of the LDS would enable it to take into account the latest trends and requirements to address issues such as climate change, the need for affordable housing and the creation of employment opportunities.

RESOLVED that the revised Local Development Scheme set out at Appendix 1 of the report to the meeting to come into effect from 17 November 2021 be approved.

(7.30pm to 7.53pm)

## 7.2 Solar Farm Development Supplementary Planning Document (Sustainable Development)

### Declarations of Interest:

None

### Summary:

The report to the meeting set out the proposed changes to the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on Solar Farm Development as a result of feedback received to consultation on it. Once adopted the SPD would provide guidance on preparing, submitting and assessing planning proposals for solar farm proposals and guidance on where solar farms may be most suitable.

### Options

1. Approve and publish the revised SDP
2. Approve and publish the revised SDP following amendment
3. Do not approve and publish the revised SDP

### Preferred option and reasons

Option 1 would enable the Council to apply the requirements of national planning policy and guidance, local planning policies and other relevant strategies to the consideration of solar farm proposals. It would also provide practical advice for solar farm applicants, Council planners, local stakeholders and communities in the consideration of solar farm proposals.

### Discussion:

The SPD was welcomed by those present at the meeting. The Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development said that effective partnerships and consultation arrangements were being developed with neighbouring district councils to enable proper consideration to be given to solar farm proposals that crossed local authority boundaries.

In response to a question about the demographic of those who had responded to the consultation, the Cabinet Member said that whilst only a few comments had been received from individual members of the public, most parish councils, representing the residents of their areas, had responded.

### RESOLVED that

1. The proposed changes to the Solar Farm Development SPD attached at Appendix 2 of the report to the meeting be agreed and it be adopted in accordance with those changes.
2. The Director of Sustainable Communities in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development be authorised to make any subsequent minor textual, presentational or layout amendments to the final version of the SPD.
3. The Director of Sustainable Communities in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Sustainable be authorised to approve the necessary legal and procedural adoption material to enable the adoption of the SPD.

(7.53pm to 8.04pm)

### 7.3 East Chelmsford Masterplan Strategic Growth Site 3a, Manor Farm (Sustainable Development)

#### Declarations of Interest:

None

#### Summary:

The Cabinet considered a masterplan prepared by Hopkins Homes for the East Chelmsford Site Allocation 3a, Manor Farm, in the Local Plan.

The site policy for Strategic Growth Site 3a required the following amount and type of development:

- Around 250 new homes of mixed size and type to include affordable housing.
- A new Country Park.

The core content of the masterplan covered:

- Context and site analysis
- Constraints and opportunities
- Landscape, ecology, heritage and drainage strategy
- Access, movement and connectivity, including the cycling network
- Land use and character zones
- Green infrastructure – creating a network of green corridors
- Country Park

The report to the meeting provided an overview of the masterplan's contents and the process through which it had been produced and consulted on.

#### Options

1. Approve and publish the masterplan
2. Approve and publish the masterplan following amendment
3. Do not approve and publish the masterplan

#### Preferred option and reasons

The masterplan as submitted demonstrated how the requirements of the Local Plan would be delivered on Site 3a - Manor Farm. Its vision was sufficiently ambitious to achieve a high-quality development which was well related to its context. The masterplan layout and other content provided a sound framework to guide successful placemaking and would support the planning application process.

#### Discussion:

Two questions were submitted by members of the public on the masterplan. They related to:



- The proximity of three-storey blocks of housing to Maldon Road, which would be out of keeping with the surroundings, and the disparity of figures for the density of the development given in various documents
- The process by which local residents were notified of the masterplan and consulted on it; the measures that would be taken to ensure that users of cycle route option 4 kept to the cycle path and did not use the river tow path; and the arrangements for the drainage of surface water from the site.

In response to the first question, the Cabinet Member for Sustainable Development said that the site area of the housing development was quite sizable at a total of 30ha. However, Hopkins Homes had acknowledged there were areas within the site which were complete no build zones, for example where the Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) features were located and the location of the gas main and its easements. They had therefore excluded these areas within in their calculations which reduced the site down to a 'gross area' of approximately 20ha. Based on this site area, 340 homes would result in 17 dwellings per hectare (dph) as stated in the masterplan and Hopkin's response document. The 11.18ha stated in the masterplan was the total area of developable parcels alone.

The masterplan identified the densities of the developable parcels and these ranged between 22-38dph which represented a fairly low density scheme particularly in the context that only up to relatively recently Government policy stated that new developments should not be below 30 dph to ensure efficient use of land.

Both the proposed densities and scale took account of the sensitivities of the site, with lower scale and density located in the more sensitive areas such as the transition to the Country Park and around the Bronze Age Monument. Where higher densities and scale were proposed, although contextually, they were not out of keeping, they were where the development was closer to more built-up areas and/or more urban locations such as the settlement of Great Baddow or the A1114 slip road. Also, it should be noted that the development was set in from the boundaries of the site to the north and west due to existing landscaping, which was proposed to be enhanced, and to accommodate the strategic east-west footway/cycle link across the site.

Furthermore, both density and scale were given as a range i.e., 'between' and 'up to'. The masterplan was identifying potential areas for those greater ranges of scale and density but it was through the detailed design that final scale and density would be determined.

On the second question, the Cabinet Member said that the Manor Farm masterplan, prepared by Hopkins Homes, had been on consultation from 23 July 2021 until 3 September 2021. Both the Council and the developer sent out consultation notifications but a decision always needed to be made about the extent of letter notifications. That was why site notices were also used to notify people. Six of those were put around the site and included information on how to make comments. Information was also available on the Council's website and social media feeds. Consultation on this strategic site was also carried out as part of the preparation of the Local Plan.

Section 5.3 of the masterplan provided an analysis of potential cycle route options between the development and the City Centre, setting out the benefits and constraints of these routes with the purpose of identifying the preferred options. It was a high-level analysis

with the detail and any consultation, where necessary, to be addressed at planning application stage.

As set out at page 65 of the masterplan, option 2 was not identified as a preferred route and only the initial part of option 3, where it could connect into the National Cycle Route from Sandford Mill, was identified as a preferred route.

With respect to option 4, this was already National Cycle Route 1, and therefore was an existing and established route. The masterplan showed how the development could connect into it from the site, i.e., into Sandford Mill Lane where the route lay to the east of Manor Farm before continuing north-northwest adjacent to Chelmer Village and into the City Centre.

As set out on page 89 of the masterplan, the development would include a comprehensive SuDS strategy that focused on using natural processes and materials to intercept, guide, filter and absorb surface water from the development. The purpose of SuDS was to appropriately control surface water run-off to prevent the risk of flooding downstream. Policy DM18 of the Chelmsford Local Plan required all major developments to include SuDS.

A member present at the meeting had the following questions on the masterplan:

- Whether it was the policy of the Council to deliver a Local Plan created by the previous Administration, and adopted by the current Administration, that was put to residents as the scope of works needed to delivery Objectively Assessed Housing Need, or whether its purpose was to deliver developer(s) version of the Local Plan
- Whether residents were being properly served if the Council allowed “Developers Greed” and bypass those Local Plan numbers, dismissing residents' concerns and ignoring the impact of a greater number of houses on residents' wellbeing. If allowed the inflated units from 250 to 340 would increase residents' traffic concerns, infrastructure shortfalls (schools / doctors /dentists) and flood risk.

The opinion was also offered that the houses were not being built to serve Chelmsford residents but to import new residents, serving the London overspill and sustain shareholder value, not serve residential amenity. If the increase in dwellings did not benefit and serve residents currently living in the area impacted by the development it should be determined that 250 units was the maximum permitted for development, as per the Local Plan.

The Cabinet took strong issue with the last point. The need for additional housing in Chelmsford was driven by national policy, local demographics, the needs of local people and the demand for more affordable housing. It was not a response to demand for housing from London or elsewhere. A significant proportion of increases in Chelmsford's future population was down to natural change (births compare to deaths), additional household formation (people getting divorced/separated) and hidden households (younger adults staying at parent's homes longer). National data that was used to inform Chelmsford's Local Plan objectively assessed housing number showed migration from London accounted for a small proportion of the overall number. The data showed that 70% of moves in and out of Chelmsford were self-contained within the Local Housing Market Area.

On the other questions asked by the member, the City Council's housing requirement set out in the adopted Local Plan was a minimum figure which recognised national planning

policy requirements to significantly boost the supply of housing to respond to the national housing crisis.

It had never been possible for the precise housing capacity of sites allocated in Local Plans to be identified at that stage. This was why housing numbers within the adopted Local Plan were framed as 'around' rather than being attributed a precise number. The Local Plan allocation at Manor Farm specifically stated that it was likely that the development capacity would be in excess of 250 homes and it was for the masterplan process to inform the process of determining the number.

It was important to make efficient use of land allocated for development in sustainable locations. Masterplans refined housing capacities based on detailed analysis of landscape, heritage and development form. Planning applications then set the precise numbers of homes informed by detailed transport and infrastructure assessments. Whatever the final number, there was a planning policy requirement to provide financial contributions to increase school places and healthcare facilities in the area. There would also be an increase to affordable housing and CIL receipts used to fund new community infrastructure.

Another member expressed concern that the increase in the number of houses for this site over that mentioned in the Local Plan and the presence in the masterplan of dwellings more than two storeys in height would make it difficult for the Planning Committee to approve any planning application as such dwellings were contrary to policies in the Local Plan for sites of this nature.

The Cabinet Member said that the Planning Inspector who had examined the Local Plan had specifically referred to the ability of this site to accommodate more than 250 dwellings. The three-storey elements were very limited in number and location and would help provide variety and a sense of place. Dwellings of that height had been approved as part of other developments in Chelmsford but ultimately all planning applications were determined on their merits and this one would be no exception.

Other questions were asked on:

- The timescales for the Hopkins Homes and Redrow developments. The masterplan for site allocations 3b, 3c and 3d, proposed by Redrow, was approved by Cabinet on 8 June 2021 while the masterplan for site allocation 3a, proposed by Hopkins Homes, was being considered at this meeting. As a lot of the comments and concerns raised by residents would be addressed during the planning stage of the approval process, it was asked how a holistic view of the proposed developments could be taken at the planning approval stage if the two applications did not come forward at the same time.

The Cabinet Member replied that the same City Council and County Council officers were working with both developers to ensure consistency between the masterplans and subsequent planning applications to make sure that a coherent and holistic approach was taken to the East Chelmsford allocation. The developers also had shared infrastructure requirements, including the five-arm roundabout at the junction of Sandford Mill Lane and Maldon Road, for which they intended to submit a joint planning application.

The developers for Manor Farm, Hopkins Homes, had expressed the desire to submit a planning application as soon as possible, i.e., by the end of the year/early January 2022, although timescales would be subject to pre-application discussions. However, based on this it was possible that planning applications by the two

developers would run concurrently allowing a greater public understanding of the aspirations and delivery of the East Chelmsford allocation as a whole.

- The cycle route proposed in the masterplan. The current cycle route, which was identified as cycle route one in the masterplan, was not a safe or adequate cycle route from Great Baddow to the city centre. It was positive to see the mention in the masterplan of a proposed new cycle route from Great Baddow to the city centre, identified as cycle route five. It was important that the developers, Essex County Council and the City Council worked together in ensuring that this proposed route went ahead and that safe connections to current cycle routes were developed and it was asked how this would be ensured.

The Cabinet Member replied that cycling option 5 showed a route northwest through the Country Park which the Council expected to be delivered as part of any planning application and provisions to secure this would either be through condition and/or a S106 agreement. On the areas of the route that fell outside the developer's control, the City Council and Essex County Council continued to have meaningful and progressive discussions on how this may be delivered.

RESOLVED that the masterplan for East Chelmsford Strategic Growth Site 3a, Manor Farm, as submitted to the meeting, be adopted.

(8.04pm to 8.40pm)

## 8. Gambling Act 2005 – Statement of Licensing Principles (Greener and Safer Chelmsford)

### Declarations of Interest:

None

### Summary:

The Cabinet was requested to approve the latest Statement of Licensing Principles under the Gambling Act 2005 before its consideration by Council.

### Options

Recommend the Statement to the Council with or without amendments.

### Preferred option and reasons

Recommend adoption of the Statement as submitted, as it had been the subject of consultation and remains fit for purpose.

RESOLVED that the Council be recommended to adopt the Statement of Licensing Principles under the Gambling Act 2005 submitted to the meeting.

## 9. Reports to Council

The Cabinet was informed that the following items would be the subject of report to the Council:

- Treasury Management Mid-Year Review (Minute Number 6.1)
- Gambling Act 2005 – Statement of Licensing Principles (Minute Number 8)

## 10. Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

## Exclusion of the Public

RESOLVED that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the public be excluded from the meeting for item 11 on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information falling within paragraph 3 of Part 1 of the Schedule 12A to the Act (information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person including the authority holding that information).

### 11.1 Transfer of Land at Generals Lane, Chelmsford (Fairer Chelmsford)

*Public interest statement* It is not in the public interest to release details of this report at present, on the grounds that the report contains information that is commercially sensitive and to place the information in the public realm will be detrimental to the negotiations to be undertaken by the Council.

#### Declarations of Interest:

None

#### Summary:

The report to the meeting sought approval for the transfer of land to Network Rail for the delivery of the new train station at Beaulieu.

#### Options:

Agree or not to the transfer of the land.

#### Preferred option and reasons

The agreed transfer of land to Network Rail would aid in the delivery of the new station, potentially avoiding the delays that would be caused using powers under the Transport and Works Act 1992 to acquire the land.

#### Discussion:

In response to questions at the meeting, the Cabinet Member for Fairer Chelmsford give details of the amount of income expected from the proposed car park and when it was likely to begin to be received.

RESOLVED that the Director of Public Places in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Fairer Chelmsford be authorised to transfer the land referred to in the report to the meeting

and to negotiate and complete all associated licences, contracts and agreements including any minor variations to the terms set out in the report.

(8.44pm to 8.48pm)

## 11.2 Funding of Land Investigation Works at Chelmer Waterside (Fairer Chelmsford)

*Public interest statement* It is not in the public interest to release details of this report at present, on the grounds that the report contains information that is commercially sensitive and to place the information in the public realm will be detrimental to the negotiations to be undertaken by the Council.

### Declarations of Interest:

None

### Summary:

The Cabinet was requested to approve funding for land investigation works at Chelmer Waterside

### Options:

Agree or not to provide the funding.

### Preferred option and reasons

Approval of funding would allow land investigation works to be undertaken to support the development competition process and give confidence to potential partners that the proposed development was feasible.

### Discussion:

Asked whether the cost of the land investigation works would be met by the site developers or the Council, the Cabinet Member for Fairer Chelmsford said that most of the new homes would be built on land owned by the Council. The distinction between the developer and the public purse was not therefore relevant as, at present, the Council was the developer. It intended to appoint a development partner (or "delivery partner") under a competitive process but would still be a co-developer. The cost of the additional reports was normally incurred by either the land owner or the developer. In the case of Waterside, the City Council was the land owner and, until a development partner was appointed, the developer. The Council would not be subsidising private-sector developers: when a development partner was appointed, it would be done on terms that ensured value for money for the Council. It was expected that the costs of the additional reports would return to the Council via the returns made on the development of the Waterside site.

RESOLVED that the budget referred to in the report to the meeting be approved for the land investigation works at Chelmer Waterside and that the use of the funds be subject to the approval of the Director of Public Places.

(8.48pm to 8.55pm)

The meeting closed at 8.55pm

Chair