



Public Document Pack

North Devon Council
Brynsworthy Environment Centre
Barnstaple
North Devon EX31 3NP

K. Miles
Chief Executive.

POLICY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Policy Development Committee will be held in the Barum Room - Brynsworthy on **THURSDAY, 9TH DECEMBER, 2021 at 6.30 pm.**

(NOTE: A location plan for the Brynsworthy Environment Centre is attached to the agenda front pages. From the 7 May 2021, the law requires all councils to hold formal meetings in person. The council is also ensuring that all venues used are Covid secure and that all appropriate measures are put in place. There are a limited number of spaces available for members of the public to attend. Please check the Council's website for the latest information regarding the arrangements that are in place and the requirement to book a place 2 working days prior to the meeting [Taking part in meetings \(northdevon.gov.uk\)](https://www.northdevon.gov.uk))

Members of the Policy Development Councillor D. Spear (Chair)
Committee

Councillors Campbell, Bulled, Hunt, Jenkins, Luggar, Mackie, Roome, Walker and York

AGENDA

1. Apologies
2. To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 18th November 2021 (attached). (Pages 7 - 16)
3. Items brought forward which in the opinion of the Chair should be considered by the meeting as a matter of urgency.
4. Declarations of Interest.
(Please telephone the Corporate and Community Services team to prepare a form for your signature before the meeting. Interests must be re-declared when the item is called, and Councillors must leave the room if necessary).
5. To agree the agenda between Part 'A' and Part 'B' (Confidential Restricted Information).

PART 'A'

INTERNAL ITEMS

6. **Informal Housing Panel.**

Presentation by the Head of Planning, Housing and Health.

- (a) Report by Head of Planning, Housing and Health (to follow)
- (b) Notes of the meeting held on 21st October 2021 (attached). (Pages 17 - 36)
- (c) Notes of the meeting held on 25th November 2021 (to follow).

7. **Work programme 2021/22.** (Pages 37 - 40)

To consider the work programme (attached).

If you have any enquiries about this agenda, please contact Corporate and Community Services, telephone 01271 388253

1.12.21



North Devon Council protocol on recording/filming at Council meetings

The Council is committed to openness and transparency in its decision-making. Recording is permitted at Council meetings that are open to the public. The Council understands that some members of the public attending its meetings may not wish to be recorded. The Chairman of the meeting will make sure any request not to be recorded is respected.

The rules that the Council will apply are:

1. The recording must be overt (clearly visible to anyone at the meeting) and must not disrupt proceedings. The Council will put signs up at any meeting where we know recording is taking place.
2. The Chairman of the meeting has absolute discretion to stop or suspend recording if, in their opinion, continuing to do so would prejudice proceedings at the meeting or if the person recording is in breach of these rules.
3. We will ask for recording to stop if the meeting goes into 'part B' where the public is excluded for confidentiality reasons. In such a case, the person filming should leave the room ensuring all recording equipment is switched off.
4. Any member of the public has the right not to be recorded. We ensure that agendas for, and signage at, Council meetings make it clear that recording can take place – anyone not wishing to be recorded must advise the Chairman at the earliest opportunity.
5. The recording should not be edited in a way that could lead to misinterpretation or misrepresentation of the proceedings or in a way that ridicules or shows a lack of respect for those in the recording. The Council would expect any recording in breach of these rules to be removed from public view.

Notes for guidance:

Please contact either our Corporate and Community Services team or our Communications team in advance of the meeting you wish to record at so we can make all the necessary arrangements for you on the day.

For more information contact the Corporate and Community Services team on **01271 388253** or email **memberservices@northdevon.gov.uk** or the Communications Team on **01271 388278**, email **communications@northdevon.gov.uk**.

North Devon Council offices at Brynsworthy, the full address is:
Brynsworthy Environment Centre (BEC), Roundswell,
Barnstaple, Devon, EX31 3NP.

Sat Nav postcode is EX31 3NS.

At the Roundswell roundabout take the exit onto the B3232, after about ½ mile take the first right, BEC is about ½ a mile on the right.

Drive into the site, visitors parking is in front of the main building on the left hand side.

On arrival at the main entrance, please sign in using the Track and Trace App and follow the signage and instructions in order to access the Meeting Rooms. Alternatively, dial 8253 for Corporate and Community Services if you have any problems.



This page is intentionally left blank

NORTH DEVON COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of Policy Development Committee held at Barum Room - Brynsworthy on Thursday, 18th November, 2021 at 10.00 am

PRESENT: Members:

Councillor D. Spear (Chair)

Councillors Bulled, Campbell, Mackie, Walker and York

Officers:

Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive, Head of Governance and Accountancy Services Manager.

Also Present:

Councillors Pearson and L. Spear.

Members of the public attended the meeting virtually.

26. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hunt, Jenkins, Luggar and Roome.

27. TO APPROVE AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 9TH SEPTEMBER 2021 (ATTACHED).

RESOLVED, that the minutes of the meeting held on 9th September 2021 (circulated previously) be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

28. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

Councillor Pearson declared a personal interest in item 6 on the agenda as a member of the Save our Hospitals group.

29. NHS BILL

The Chair welcomed Tim Golby, Locality Director for Northern Devon Local Care Partnership. Representing the Health and Care System to the meeting.

The Locality Director for Northern Devon Local Care Partnership outlined his role and background to the Committee.

He highlighted the following points to the Committee:

- On 6 July 2021, the Health and Care Bill was published with proposals to promote more joined-up services and to ensure more of a focus on improving health through Integrated Care Systems rather than simply providing health care services.
- It contained new powers for the Secretary of State over the health and care system, and targeted changes to public health, social care, and quality and safety matters.
- The Bill proposed substantial changes to how the NHS in England was organised. There were proposals to abolish Clinical commissioning groups and introduce new Integrated Care Boards (ICBs).
- The Bill had not yet been approved, and as such the system was preparing to implement changes as the Bill made its way through parliament.
- Integrated care systems (ICSs) were new partnerships between the organisations that met health and care needs across an area, to coordinate services and to plan in a way that improved population health and reduced inequalities between different groups.

He added that in Devon they had been building the foundations towards an ICS for the past four years. This work included the following:

- Built strong partnerships between organisations –including joint posts between the NHS and local authorities.
- Established a new collaborative agreement between three of the hospital providers.
- Merged two of the CCGs to enable them to commission services more effectively across the whole county.
- Forged strong links with their Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) partners.

He explained that the Integrated Care System in Devon would be led by the NHS Devon Integrated Care Board and the Devon Integrated Care Partnership that was currently being developed.

Each ICS would have a Partnership at system level established by the NHS and local government as equal partners.

The Partnership would operate as a forum to bring partners together across the ICS area to align purpose and ambitions with plans to integrate care and improve health and wellbeing outcomes for their population. The partnership role would include:

- Bringing together NHS, local government and others to integrate care and improve health and wellbeing.

- Development of an Integrated Care Strategy.
- Must include local authorities in Integrated Care System area and local NHS, but wider membership for local determination.
- Chaired jointly selected by NHS and local authority.
- Role in hearing lived experiences, building on existing engagement.

He added that this also included the collaboration of the NDDH and R&DE hospitals to form an integrated Health Partnership.

He outlined the benefits of an integrated care system, as follows:

- Setting strategic objectives and outcomes to improve the health and wellbeing of the Devon population.
- Determining the allocation of resources to “places” through Local Care Partnerships.
- Ensuring that health inequalities were addressed across Devon.
- Seeking to influence the application of resources from areas outside health and social care that have a direct impact of the health and well-being of the population (such as housing, employment and education).
- Supporting the spread and adoption of best practice.
- Assuring delivery of expected improvements in outcomes, within their resources and to agreed performance, quality and regulatory standards.
- Ensuring active and effective stakeholder engagement and public participation at system level.

He explained how the Integrated Care System would work and explained that it worked on three tiers, which would work together at different levels with the majority of the work delivered locally.

There were 31 neighbourhoods of 20,000–60,000 people, which was defined by their Primary Care Networks (PCNs) which were groups of 3-6 local GP practices that worked together. At that level, general practice would be strengthened by working together in PCNs.

Local Care Partnerships – There were five locations with populations between 160,000 – 370,000. At that level, health and social care would work together more closely. A sixth Local Care Partnership would be focused on Mental Health.

There was one system with a population of 1.2 million. At that level, strategic planning and improvements could take place for the benefit of all as well as having an overview of system finance and performance.

The Integrated Care System in Devon was a partnership of health and social care organisations working together with local communities. The partnerships did not end at their borders. Collaborative provision and commissioning in physical and mental

health included longstanding relationships with the Cornwall and the Isles of Scilly ICS and at a regional level.

One Northern Devon was a partnership of public and voluntary sector partners working together to improve wellbeing in North Devon and Torridge.

The aim was to reduce health inequalities through co-ordination of the activity of all partners involved in the wider determinants of health and an approach that was person-centred and place-focussed.

There was a programme of activity coordinated by the One Northern Devon Board around health and wellbeing.

One Northern Devon had a 10 year wellbeing strategy agreed with all partners in 2020.

One Northern Devon strategy was aligned to Devon Health and Wellbeing strategy and developing Devon Long Term Plan.

Work streams were already in place led by range of partners (not just NHS).

He explained that they were currently working towards the following:

- The safe and legal transfer for CCG functions and establishment of ICS governance.
- Refresh of and engagement on Devon's Long Term Plan.
- Support to the development of Local Care Partnerships to enable delegations from System to Plan at an appropriate and realistic pace.
- Sustaining and supporting the Health and Care workforce.
- Integrating our infrastructure (digital, estates, workforce, finance).
- Broadening their professional leadership and inputs beyond the emphasis on 'clinical' to greater inclusion of multi-professional expertise.

The Chair invited each member of the public attending the meeting virtually to introduce themselves.

In response to a number of questions, the Locality Director for Northern Local Care Partnership advised the following:

- There would still be a National Health Service in place from February 2022 and that would not change. The service would continue to be free at the point of delivery. However, there was currently a

shortage of healthcare workers to undertake the workload. The aim of the Integrated care system was to provide an holistic service across the country.

- Primary Care Networks (PCNs) were groups of 3-6 local GP practices working together. An appointed Clinical Director would ascertain what could be delivered together through their work with individual practices and would allow them to work together for mutual benefit.
- Acknowledged the pressure that the primary care sector was currently under and explained that the objective of the Bill was to bring coherence to the planning of services. The intention of the Bill was to be a devolution to local communities to assist and shift working within the policy framework that already existed.
- The whole package of terms and conditions of employment for healthcare workers was currently being reviewed and salaries would form part of that review.
- Decisions taken in relation to infrastructure and tendering were overseen by Devon County Council, Plymouth City Council and Torbay Council, who were all fully engaged in the consultation process. He added that he would feed back the question of District Council's involvement as consultees to Devon County Council.
- He explained that his role was to work as a local officer within a set policy and to deliver what he could at local level within that policy.
- In terms of the procurement process and what could be done to make it more transparent, he explained that they were looking to collaborate to provide services at local level.
- One of the main issues with attracting people to roles within the healthcare provision in the North Devon area was the levels of pay and the high living costs. Many roles were filled by people who were already based in the area. In order to attract people to come and work within the local area, the right package needed to be presented and this would involve a review of values and terms and conditions to address a shortage in all areas of the healthcare system.
- He agreed that even the prices of affordable homes were too high for local people to afford and that it would add to the recruitment problem.
- One North Devon was funded through partnerships working together and investing in schemes from the Care budget.
- The systems for mental health, disability and autism would be incorporated into one single county wide system with the work being done at county level through the partnership trust. He advised that he could report back to the Committee in relation to timescales.
- Questions related to pay and working conditions would need to be put to the local MP for political representation at national government level and then onto the pay body responsible.

The Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive added that raising salaries alone wasn't going to solve the problem and that the provision of key worker housing was a vital element to ensuring the supply of affordable property. He explained that

the Council was already engaged in the early stages of facilitating Housing forums with key stakeholders to start to address the challenge.

The Chair added that the Council was working hard to solve the housing problem within the North Devon area.

Questions from members of the public:

Sue Matthews, representing the Save our Hospitals Group addressed the Committee.

She requested clarification in relation to the payment of health and social care people of Devon in an expanding population and how could services be delivered without rationing?

The Locality Director for Northern Local Care Partnership advised that they were currently looking at different models for support and care. He added that one option was a greater support in the community rather than within the acute system. This would involve looking at a best fit model for support services within Devon, rurality was also an issue in Devon and an example of this was the current requirement for many people to travel long distances for medical appointments.

Dr Finola O'Neil addressed the Committee.

She requested clarification as to whether there was a plan in place for diagnostic facilities and a method to escalate issues to government that could not be addressed at local level?

The Locality Director for Northern Local Care Partnership advised that the Nightingale Hospital in Exeter was to be re-purposed to as a diagnostic centre to address the backlog of waiting patients.

Elisabeth McElderry addressed the Committee regarding the regional structure overarching seven ICS's in North Devon.

She questioned how independent North Devon would be in making its own decisions?

The Locality Director for Northern Local Care Partnership advised that services would operate within the parameters set by the Secretary of State.

He added that he was happy to attend a future meeting of the Committee if required.

The Chair thanked the Locality Director for Northern Devon Local Care Partnership for his attendance at the meeting.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the presentation be noted;

- (b) That the members of the public provide their email addresses and that the presentation be circulated to them;
- (c) That the Locality Director for Northern Devon Local Care Partnership be invited to attend a future meeting of the Committee; and
- (d) That the minutes of the meeting be made available to the Local MP for North Devon.

Councillor Spear declared a personal interest as an owner of rental property.

Councillor Walker declared a personal interest as a PPG member at Fremington Medical Centre.

30. PERFORMANCE AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT QUARTER 2 2021-22

The Committee considered a report by the Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive to the Strategy and Resources Committee of 1st November 2021 together with minute extract regarding Performance and Financial Management Quarter 2 2021/22.

The Accountancy Services Manager outlined the report and drew the Committee's attention to the following points:

- The revenue budget for 2021/22 was approved at Council on 24th February 2021 at £13,639,000.
- As at 30th September 2021, the latest forecast net budget was £13,617,000, which produced a forecast budget surplus of £22,000. Details of which were shown in Appendix A of the report – Variations in the Revenue Budget.
- There was still pressure on the 2021/22 budget due to the Covid-19 pandemic with continued additional costs being incurred and forecast decline in core income sources.
- Included within the approved budget the Council factored in a government grant in relation to Covid-19 pressures of £536,710 and also budgeted for £375,000 of additional costs and reduced income, these were already incorporated into Appendix A of the report together with the latest forecast for each service area.
- The above grant of £536,710 was approved and received and the Council were also anticipating £80,000 re-imburement for Q1 loss of Sales, Fees and charges, from the continued Government 75% income reimbursement scheme, this was an estimate as the scheme was extended to include the period April to June 2021 only.
- At the end of 2020/21 the Council placed £375,000 into a Covid Budget management reserve to help mitigate any further adverse variances due to the pandemic in 2021/22, this future protection was still available if required.
- As at 31st March 2021 the Collection Fund reserve balance was £9,810,252. This earmarked reserve was created to deal with the timing impacts of the

Collection Fund (Business Rates), which ensured the revenue budget was not unduly affected in the year the taxes were collected. Collection Fund deficits/surpluses were reversed out to bring the revenue account back to the budgeted figure for the year; the deficits/surpluses were recovered/distributed in the following financial years. This reserve included an £8,660,000 balance that would be utilised in 2021/22 and 2022/23 to mitigate timing differences of business rate reliefs awarded in 2020/21 that from an accounting perspective impact over the next two financial years; thus leaving the fund reserve with a residue balance of £1,150,000 protection against future volatility.

- An additional provision had been included within the forecast figures shown in Appendix A for the National Pay Award potentially being settled higher than the original 1% budgeted amount. Negotiations were ongoing between the Unions and the Employers and the Council would reflect the outcome of those discussions within the next report.
- The 2021/22 Capital Programme was attached to the report as “Appendix D – Capital Programme 2021/22”.
- The Budget and Financial Framework report to Full Council 24th Feb 2021 outlined the Capital Programme for the 2021/22 financial year of £22,419,916. Project underspend of £917,121 were bought forward from 2020/21 year and further variations of £1,479,065 were approved as part of the performance and financial management report to Strategy and Resources Committee, to produce a revised 2021/22 Capital Programme of £24,816,102.
- Overall variations of £4,213,427 were proposed to the 2021/22 Capital Programme as detailed within the report.
- The revised Capital Programme for 2021/22 taking into account the budget variations above was £29,029,529.
- Actual spend on the 2021/22 Capital Programme as at 30th September 2021 was £4,292,304.
- The overall Capital Programme for 2021/22 to 2024/25 was £46,151,018 and was broken down as follows:
 - 2021/22 £29,029,529
 - 2022/23 £9,692,423
 - 2023/24 £6,717,192
 - 2024/25 £711,874

RESOLVED that the decisions and recommendations of the Strategy and Resources Committee be endorsed.

31. MID YEAR TREASURY MANAGEMENT REPORT 2021-22

The Committee considered a report by the Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive to the Strategy and Resources Committee of 1st November 2021 together with minute extract regarding the Mid-Year Treasury Management Report 2021/22.

The Head of Governance outlined the report and drew the Committee’s attention to the following points:

- The Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) was approved by Full Council on 24th February 2021.

- The previously approved TMSS required revision in light of economic and operational movements during the year. He outlined the proposed changes as set out in table 4.1 of the report.
- The forecast Capital Financing Requirement had increased by £6.2m from the original budget. The main reason for this increase was the additional capital budget of £9m for the acquisition of a strategic asset, offset by £1.4m slippage on the new Leisure Centre budget and £1.2m slippage on the Watersports Centre budget. These two budgets had been re-profiled into the 2022/23 capital programme.
- The Council's forecast capital financing requirement (CFR) for 2021/22 was £23.6m. The CFR denoted the Council's underlying need to borrow for capital purposes. If the CFR was positive the Council may borrow from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB), or the market (external borrowing), or from internal balances on a temporary basis (internal borrowing). The balance of external and internal borrowing was generally driven by market conditions.
- At present, the Council had projected total external borrowing of £17.5m and utilising £6.1m of cash flow funds in lieu of borrowing (internal borrowing). This was a prudent and cost effective approach in the current economic climate but would require ongoing monitoring of economic conditions.
- Debt rescheduling opportunities had been very limited in the current economic climate and following the various increases in the margins added to gilt yields which had impacted PWLB new borrowing rates since October 2010. No debt rescheduling had therefore been undertaken to date in the current financial year.
- It was a statutory duty for the Council to determine and keep under review the affordable borrowing limits. During the half year ended 30th September 2021, the Council had operated within the treasury and prudential indicators set out in the Council's Treasury Management Strategy Statement for 2021/22. The Chief Finance Officer reported that no difficulties were envisaged for the current or future years in complying with these indicators.
- The Council held £40m of investments as at 30 September 2021 (£22.8m at 31 March 2021) and the investment portfolio yield for the first six months of the year was 0.05% against the benchmark 7 day LIBID of -0.08%.
- The Council's budgeted investment return for 2021/22 was £35,000. As at 30th September 2021 £9,375 investment interest was earned in the half-year period. Although investment returns had been low; using the cash flow balances for internal borrowing had reduced the borrowing costs on the expenditure budget.
- The cash position included the residual balance of business support grants due to be repaid to central government shortly, this was currently estimated at £16m.

RESOLVED that the decisions and recommendations of the Strategy and Resources Committee be endorsed.

32. WORK PROGRAMME 2021-2022.

The Committee considered the Work Programme for 2021/22 (circulated previously).

Following invitation from the Chair, the Corporate and Community Services Officer advised that the meeting of Thursday 9th December 2021 currently had no scheduled items for consideration at that meeting.

She added that the second informal meeting of the Housing Panel was scheduled to be held virtually on Thursday 25th November 2021 at 6.30pm and following that meeting it was proposed that a report of its findings together with recommendations be presented to the Committee on Thursday 9th December 2021.

In response to a question regarding the format of the informal meeting on 25th November 2021, the Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive advised that the aim of the meeting was to identify an action plan that could be progressed, costed effectively by the Council and identify those issues which would require escalation to government level with a set timeline and targets.

Councillor Walker requested that an item related to strategic transport for the North Devon area be added to the work programme for consideration at a future meeting.

The Chair added that he would like to add an item in relation to the Biosphere to the work programme for consideration at a future meeting.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the work programme for 2021/22 be noted; and
- (b) That the requested items in relation to strategic transport and the Biosphere be added to the list on the work programme of items for future consideration by the Committee.

Chair

The meeting ended at 11.28 am

NOTE: These minutes will be confirmed as a correct record at the next meeting of the Committee.

Informal Housing Panel meeting with stakeholders held on Thursday 21st October 2021

The Leader welcomed everyone to the meeting and outlined purpose of the meeting

1. The most appropriate and cost-effective additional actions for us to pursue in the short, medium and long term to reduce the impacts of the housing crisis; and
2. Identify areas where we the Council be asking Government to change policy or revise their current level of funding.

Setting the scene

The Head of Planning, Housing and Health welcomed everyone and explained that the exercise was a rapid house needs to assessment to action and pursue short, medium and long term solutions and to seek to identify requests of government and to develop additional activity to those that the Council already delivered support to together with gaining additional knowledge to enable the development of ideas and initiatives going forward.

He added that the focus of the meeting would be spilt into two sessions, with session one focussing on the current situation and session two exploring issues around housing supply and increase in the future. He advised that the timeframe for the meeting was two hours.

Session one: Focus - the housing needs of our current population, housing standards and how we could better use our existing housing stock.

North Devon Housing Crisis – Mark Johnson:

Mark Johnson gave an introduction explaining how the North Devon Housing Crisis Group was founded together with their aspiration to provide everyone with a safe comfortable home to live in. He added that the group had been working with local landlords and agents to rent long term to local people. They had also been providing information forums in relation to dealing with Section 21 notices.

Providing an emotional support network.

Lobbying for manifesto for change, which covered local and central government.

He outlined the group's manifesto for both central and local government, as outlined below:

Central Government:

- Allow local authorities to borrow to build social housing without restriction and prioritise use of all local authority and Government owned land for this purpose.
- End "Right to buy", at least, until the housing crisis was solved and then

- ensure all receipts from any sales were spent on building social housing.
- Remove the tax advantages currently given to Furnished Holiday Lets and treat all income on same basis as Assured Short hold Tenancy Lets.
- Remove the 100% small business rates relief for holiday homes.
- Properly regulate by law Furnished Holiday Lets to the same standards of safety and compliance as Assured short hold Tenancies.
- Introduce a tax on properties left empty for longer than 18 months of 5% of property value per annum to make leaving properties empty economically unviable.
- Introduce a tax on 2nd homes occupied for less than 90 days per annum of 3% of property value per annum to force owners to either rent out or sell.
- Introduce a tax on property developer land banks, held without development, to encourage building not speculating.
- Make “affordable housing” be calculated using local, not national salary levels. Double the required percentage level for these developments from 10% to 20% in housing shortage areas.
- Reform tenancy laws to create a long-term rental model similar to that in Germany to allow tenants security of tenure and long-term landlords security of income.
- Until the current housing crisis was solved, introduce a temporary ban on all new house sales to anyone who is not primarily resident or purchasing to let on assured short hold tenancy in areas within x miles of coast or within National Park or Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Local Government:

- Introduce a licensing scheme for furnished holiday lets and allow regulation of the number of properties in any one area by the local authority.
- Require change of use for any property being converted from a permanent residence to a holiday let.
- Write to all holiday homeowners to inform them that if they use domestic rubbish collection, they would immediately be liable for Council Tax and that the local authority would inform HMRC that they were no longer a Furnished Holiday Let for tax purposes.
- Increase Council Tax to 200% for second homes.
- Implement a substantial percentage requirement for affordable rental housing for all new developments.
- All new builds to be covenanted to make all future sales to be as primary residence in perpetuity.
- Actively promote fund and encourage the setting up of Community Land Trusts to build local homes for local residents on long term tenancies at affordable social rent levels.
- Build any social housing possible now using fastest construction methods possible including modular homes. Prioritise use of any council owned land to this purpose.
- Identify all empty properties and how long they have been empty. Requisition all those homes empty for longer than 12 months; offer requisitioned homes to homeless and those on priority waiting lists;

empty properties were to be offered cheaper to tenants that could renovate homes themselves.

- Review all current housing regulations to look for powers the council had to maximise available homes for rent.

The Chair and other officers thanked Mark for his representation.

Encompass – Claire Fisher CEO:

Claire Fisher gave an introduction explaining how Encompass was established and operated and provided the following representation:

- Encompass Southwest was a registered housing charity working across Northern Devon since 1996.
- For many years they had been told “ the average person was only two pay cheques away from homelessness’, can’t help thinking that with the current housing landscape this should actually read ‘the average person was only one landlord decision/second home or holiday let away from homelessness’.

We were starting to see a shift in the housing landscape, there was an emerging group of people who were facing homelessness whom did not necessarily fit into the traditional model of homelessness, and these included:

- Those people working but unable to afford to buy a property so rely solely on the rental market.
- Young families on low income who were just about keeping their heads above water, suddenly were at risk of drowning.
- Young people under the age of 25 were being pushed further away from the housing market or even being able to rent a bedsit.

Even people who have an AST were now living in uncertainty about landlords selling up or moving over to holiday lets/Airbnb.

It is important to start with the meaning of ‘homelessness’ – homelessness doesn’t just mean rough sleeping, homelessness meant people without a permanent home.

This could mean living in cramped and unstable temporary accommodation such as hostels, bed and breakfasts or sofa-surfing. Could also include internal issues such as; poor mental health, drug and alcohol dependencies, physical health, relationship breakdowns, money and debt worries and childhood trauma and the external issues which include; the removal of the Universal Credit uplift, increase in National Insurance and increased rents what you had was the ‘Perfect Storm’ and something of a tornado causing destruction and devastation to many local people with the potential to catapult them into homelessness.

The majority of Encompass work was focused around those people who were often considered vulnerable and whom were often furthest away from any real sustainable housing solutions, with the ‘perfect storm’ pushing them further away than ever before.

Impacts at local level:

- Their supported accommodation was starting to silt up, with often no or very little options for move on.
- Rise in rents for one bedroom flats making them unaffordable for anyone claiming local housing allowance.
- Housing First clients waiting six months to find suitable accommodation.
- The vulnerable becoming more vulnerable and being pushed further away from sustainable housing solutions.

The question now had to be what they were doing to ease the suffering for many of the people they supported. A problem with such devastating effects required not one but many solutions, if ever there was a time to really think 'outside of the box' then this was it.

Here were just some of our blue sky ideas which they had started to implement locally;

- Encompass taking on the tenancies for one bed accommodation units and subletting to their clients.
- Working with national social investors to give us access to greater accommodation (Resonance).
- Working in partnership with Collyers to find new ways of encouraging landlords to rent directly to Encompass.
- Host family and lodging schemes.

More than ever it was a time to experiment, to do nothing was not an option, there was a huge emphasis to work together to find solutions, share ideas and resources.

What was required from the local and national government:

- Support to bring empty properties back into use, working more collaboratively with local landlords and housing charities.
- More social/affordable housing – truly affordable housing for local people.
- Incentives to landlords and social landlords to house people with complex needs.
- More housing first style accommodation.
- To support a trauma informed approach to housing to reduce the number of evictions.
- Local authority leading on a Landlords Forum for North Devon.
- Working with national social investors such as resonance.

The Chair and Head of Planning, Housing and Health thanked Claire for her representation.

Salvation Army – Mark Read:

The Head of Planning, Housing and Health welcomed Mark Read from the Salvation Army to the meeting.

Mark Read gave an introduction explaining how the Salvation Army provided support for homelessness and those precariously housed together with support to the foodbank and provided the following representation:

As a Church Leader representing Ilfracombe he was involved in housing justice work and supported individuals with their individual housing requirements. He added that he had spoken to a group of people directly affected and met with JM to discuss their concerns.

He added that vulnerable members of our society had often been exposed to trauma in childhood or other adverse childhood experiences, which in turn led to substance abuse, alcohol dependency and mental health issues. As a result of these early experiences many people were deprived of the means to succeed or manage the childhood trauma, which impacts upon them greatly and Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMO) were often their only option generally of very poor quality.

He highlighted some of the issues experienced by individuals and gave examples as follows:

- Often just one room, which was just big enough to lie down in but unable to lock the door.
- Properties were often hot during the summer months and cold during the winter months.
- Individuals often find themselves in situations that do not benefit their health or their safety.
- Addresses in certain areas were often red flagged by employers.
- A noticeable loss of good landlords who had moved into the holiday let sector.
- Issues with the process and policies for assessing who qualified for support and the people who had previously had interventions but now no longer qualified for support.
- The miss guided belief that if they made themselves homeless they would qualify for greater assistance, when in actual fact more often than not those people slip through the net.
- They had a contribution to make to the community if they were given the opportunity.

He added that there was requirement to look at alternative models of housing together with alternative providers and the options available. He stated that the “one size fits all” model was not fit for purpose and that the Council had an opportunity to lead.

The Head of Planning, Housing and Health commended Mark in relation to the clarity of the feedback that he had provided.

Evidence form Colleyers: Representation read by the Service Lead – Housing Advice and Homelessness, North Devon Council:

Demand for rental property had never been higher. As one example the company put on two bed terraced house in Bramble Path, Landkey for one day and ended up with 36 applications.

Happy for you to pass on the feedback on what we're trying to do to help. Ultimately they were trying to help raise awareness, advise landlords appropriately to try and select tenants who would be wanting long term rentals. Most of which they had been doing for a little while anyway, but more so now that they had a lot of selection when it came to applicants.

Ultimately they needed more landlords to buy properties to rent out on a long term basis, although whether that required some form of stamp duty discount or another form of encouragement/incentive to get landlords to buy more. The issue they could see with that was, that would be seen as 'the greedy landlords would be getting a discount/break when buying more property and getting richer', rather than providing much needed rental housing in the area.

The holiday rental market was obviously another angle to attack to a certain degree, because ultimately North Devon was a tourist area and that should be seen as a positive. However there was no doubt that the volume of properties being rented as holiday lets was affecting the AST rental market, and, without any safety regulations which was concerning. So, we would definitely agree that the air bnbs/holiday lets needed stronger safety measures put in place, etc gas safety, electric safety, etc.

Evidence submission from North Devon Homes - Martyn Gimber:

North Devon Homes (NDH) was a registered housing (HA) association and charity, whose vision was "Working together to create communities where people want to live". They owned and managed the majority of affordable stock in North Devon and housed 10,000 customers (1 in 10 people in North Devon) across 3,300 homes.

They were an independent community landlord run by a board of trustees and regulated by the Regulator of Social Housing and the Charity Commission.

Their charitable objectives were about alleviating poverty and provision of affordable housing in North Devon. Everything they did was about delivering and furthering those objectives and any surplus or profit made on their activities was 100% re-invested back into North Devon with housing related schemes for the benefit of local people. They aimed to protect and improve the social housing assets they had and utilised a mix of public, private and their tenant rent money to invest in the homes they held, build new homes and where they could provide local jobs and invest in building skills and capacity for the future. They wanted to ensure that they built "communities" not just houses and that they invested and nurtured communities by going above that of other landlords who might just see homes as units or commodities.

NDH was an Investment Partner with Homes England and had developed various schemes of new build and regeneration schemes as small as two units up to major schemes with values of £70m across North Devon. They used a blend of public and private finance to help deliver new housing and work through Advantage South West, their procurement chain partnership (25% owned by NDH) to help manage the supply chain and divert resources and help to harness the local supply chain. They had a profitable subsidiary, Anchorwood Limited, which gifted all its profits back to NDH. This was an ethical developer which was able to compete with private sector developers to try and capture profit and use it to fund new affordable housing.

The company prided themselves on their low cost per unit, £2,900; high customer satisfaction, 91%; and low rents (including service charges) compared to their peers and landlords. They strove to ensure that they balanced the choices on value for money between rent cost and quality. They ensured that they invested in quality and safety compliance for their homes. This approach kept them independent and, therefore, made NDH best placed to directly serve the community that they represented.

They were the only locally based registered Housing Association operating in the North Devon area. Other Registered Providers who operated in North Devon manage their stock remotely and sent resources or skills into North Devon to support their stock. NDH preferred to use local people and local contractors to ensure they kept as much impact locally, which they could from an efficiency quality and environmental perspective. They invested £20m locally every year from a revenue point of view, and £20m of capital investment pa.

They directly employed 137 highly skilled staff and ensure that they had a motivated team to deliver housing and related services for North Devon. Their team was capable, dependable, had a good track record and was directly accountable to their customers, community and stakeholders. They cared about their reputation and the community that they lived in. They employed many more contractors and local businesses to help them to deliver their aims and they understood housing and the communities that they served. Many of their staff had been with the company for 20 years and know their customers well.

The housing stock was transferred from the local authority (LA) for £44m in 2000. NDH had private finance loans secured against the assets of £120m and had to ensure that they complied with their funders' requirements under the terms of their loan agreements. They had paid over £8m in Right to Buy (RTB) receipts since 2000, passing these to the LA under a RTB sharing agreement.

They had invested £75m in planned repairs upgrades and regeneration to bring the stock up to date and had a funded 35-year business plan based on future rental income and growth. They aimed to deliver at least 100 additional social rented homes a year.

The more successful they were, the more homes and investment they could deliver into the heart of the community. They could deliver more much more but they needed to work in partnership to leverage this further.

They knew that housing was so much more than just a roof over your head: health, well-being and economic drivers being critical for the local area, sustaining villages and our rural communities. They provided elderly and vulnerable customer support as well as youth teams to help some of the most vulnerable across their communities in North Devon.

Affordability was a critical issue in North Devon, with low average wages and very high house prices. The ratio of 15 times the average wage to house price was one of the highest in England and it was getting bigger every year. There was a chronic supply problem, exacerbated by many years of under investment from successive governments; lack of inward support to support affordable housing schemes due to planning issues; as well as local objection to anything being built, making the delivery of any housing challenging and sometimes controversial.

Access to affordable homes was almost impossible for many with many young people not registering as they had lost hope of ever being housed. This meant that the true extent of the problem needed to be more fully understood. They also knew that they needed housing to help key workers move to the area to support their businesses. Not all inward migration was negative as a local economy they desperately needed key skills and younger more economically active people to help come in and sustain the area and villages. They knew that a lot of the existing population was elderly, with a high proportion aged over 65, and they knew that would be a drain on local resources - with housing and support being a critical factor. Many schools, large employers and critical services report that even if they could attract staff, they had nowhere to live, and that key worker accommodation was a huge hidden housing problem for the area.

Their stock in trade as an affordable housing provider was delivering quality homes, ensuring compliance and delivering responsive repairs. The homes they managed were affordable and of excellent quality, supported by a 24-hour repair service from their own team. They did their own repairs and self-sustained their business as much as they could.

About half of the rent they collected went on planned repairs and investment and was spent mostly with local businesses.

They managed and owned 3,300 homes with 13,900 bed-spaces. They estimated that 10,000 of these bed spaces were occupied.

So in crude terms they had 70% occupancy of bed-spaces.

Many social rented homes were under-occupied and people could be persuaded to move on if they had some grants or incentives to offer them. Moving from social housing at £100 p.w. to a private let at £300 p.w. It is interesting that the social

housing had got a stigma when it was, in fact, the premium housing product and should be cherished and invested in. But, sadly, it was in very short supply.

The private sector was changing rapidly and they were seeing more and more people displaced as the likes of AirBnB took hold and owners saw they could make more money on short term lets, or cash in and sell for second homes, as people migrate or local people try and get on the housing ladder.

Across their stock they saw 250 customers turnover each year and this was largely driven by deaths and property exchanges. Many people wanted to transfer from other HA landlords into NDH as the service that they offered was generally perceived as better and as they were locally based. They were not a remote call centre in Aylesbury or somewhere where customers had to wait five days for a van to be sent to do a repair from the south east.

In North Devon in 1980 there were 7,500 affordable homes before the advent of Right to Buy. Those homes represented about 15% of the physical housing stock at that time. The number of affordable homes in North Devon is now about 4,400 (8% of all stock). This gap of 3,000 is pretty much what they thought the demand level for affordable still was; and a functioning housing market needed around 15% deemed affordable higher in low wage areas such as North Devon.

The 3,000 homes that were required also had to fit future housing need and refined to fit post-pandemic change in housing requirements and demography. Family make-ups are changing and they were seeing more single people requiring housing. The housing needed had to cross a broad range of tenure types and sizes. In the 1950s they built rows and rows of the same type and size of family housing – these were now the “under-occupied” homes that they see generations later. Under-occupied, hard to heat, and sitting on a large footprint.

15% affordable was a good yardstick to ensure a fully functioning and flexible market to deal with economic fluctuations.

So, the social housing stock in North Devon was in good condition, whereas the private rented accommodation was often poor condition and expensive. People were trapped in private rent. Even if they wanted to get out, they couldn't because they were losing savings or a high proportion of their income to expensive private landlords, sometimes paying for very poor quality housing.

They estimated that of the 3,000 affordables that were needed, there should be a mixture of Social, Affordable, SO, First Time buyer / Discounted Homebuy, Key worker and Self Build.

NDH could deliver 100 additional social rented, and many more if they could deliver more market sale to help subsidise the provision of social rented or affordable. Finance was available and there were many investors looking toward longer-term deals. There was a worry that some of the private non-social housing investors and profit making entrants were pushing up S106 and land prices exponentially and making the ability of the social landlords to deliver or find schemes even harder.

Those new “for profit” entrants were being encouraged in by current policy and, in our view, this was short term / opportunistic and was damaging supply.

Land availability was an issue. It took them on average 8.5 years from first seeing an opportunity to turning the key in the front door. Delivery of affordable homes took a huge amount of investment, took a lot of time and effort, absorbed huge overheads and carried significant risk. Very often this had to be underwritten by the tenants of the HA whose rents were contributing to the procurement and subsidy of those new homes. As the timescales exceed four years very often, political or local pressure or objections occur so that schemes were rarely delivered easily or quickly.

They could change that by having a much longer strategic plan with clear priorities, identifying shared sites with LA or government; developing an investment plan to help us scale up supply with a mixture of public and private finance and base delivery on a range of housing need areas and demands to lessen the risks and to *create communities where people want to live.*

2 Summary:

A The housing needs of our population:

- As set out above, they concluded that compared to national averages and local need there was under-provision of affordable housing in North Devon to meet local need.
- They suggested that the Local Authority worked with North Devon Homes to reduce barriers to supply; contributing more proactively to infrastructure and reducing requirements for S106, CIL and other payments that could be put more meaningfully into increasing the supply of affordable housing for local people.
- Planning for affordable housing could be prioritised and local planners could work to support and facilitate provision in a different way.
- It would be helpful if cross-tenure schemes that support increased affordable housing could also be prioritised in this way.
- If there were a clear local housing strategy that declared the needs, the mix, the type and the location of housing that the local community required to thrive, they could be a more proactive partner in this respect.
- With capital investment, vision and long-term commitment, they could work on better longer term managed temporary accommodation to meet local need.
- The LA could release ransom strips and land to facilitate more and quicker supply.
- Members could support and champion housing – historically some ward members had opposed developments that were required.
- Right to buy receipts received by the LA could be reinvested in a replacement affordable property programme.

- They could work together to support the aspirations of a local housing strategy, formally or informally seeking and progressively working to secure inward capital investment and grant to provide better affordable housing.
- The LA could work to support those customers impacted by the welfare reform cuts, targeting the local hardship fund that had been announced to those in receipt of benefit and whose accommodation was at risk. Universal Credit cuts would impact NDH customers, taking nearly a million pounds out of household budgets in North Devon in the coming 12 months.

B Housing Standards on existing stock

- Housing built with public grant was already required to be built to standards which could be different and ordinarily exceed any other standards and requirements. Local systems and assessment could recognise this better
- Regeneration and, specifically, carbon reduction would be progressive national agendas and they could support and inform the LA's work in that respect.
- They could, with support, be more progressive and responsive in how they developed and supported skills in the local economy that private landlords and private owners could conceivably benefit from those skills.
- They could work to be part of a wider partnership that linked the future skills, to employment opportunity, housing standards in a way that would develop and ease local labour supply for the retrofit skills that would be required.
- They could extend their Disabled Facilities Grants support to other areas with a clear forward order commitment.

The Chair thanked Martin for his representation.

The Head of Housing, Planning and Health added that the officers had been given a vast amount of information from the various stakeholders and that he hoped that session two would be as productive.

Discussions and outcomes from session one:

- Roy Tomlinson – Empty homes action, quick win not clear if empty home identified where does it get sent to at NDC?

The Head of Planning, Housing and Health, North Devon Council advised that when empty properties were reported to the Council via the website they were reviewed by the housing Sector renewal team. He added that it was right to acknowledge that the Council was not currently proactive in bringing empty homes back into use. The Council was however currently working on policies to support interventions.

Claire Fisher added that Encompass were working with North Devon Homes to bring empty properties back into use.

Councillor Lofthouse explained that empty properties could also be reported to the local Ward Members.

The Chair advised that the number of empty properties listed on the Council tax base were as follows:

- October 2020 – 689 empty properties.
- October 2021 – 454 empty properties.

Mark Johnson questioned whether the reduction in empty properties was as a result of them being utilised as holiday lets instead? He added that he had spoken with Colleyers and was astounded by the number of Air B&B properties.

In response, the Chair requested evidence to support his claim. However, without the figures he was able to provide this.

Session two: Focus - further opportunities to increase housing supply to address household growth and the historic under supply of housing.

1. Head of Quality, Perrigo, UK - Caroline Norfolk-Shaw:

Wrafton Laboratories employed 530 members of staff and was a long established local business of 50 years. The company took their responsibilities as an employer very seriously and that was key to securing the future of the business within the local area.

The company had experienced difficulties in the recruitment and retention of employees, which was largely due to the lack of available accommodation for employees within the technical roles. This shortfall had been addressed via the backfilling of vacancies via agency staff. The house price to wage ratio for the area was ludicrous and many people could not afford to live in the area. There have also been instances where graduates had moved back with their parents, as they were unable to afford their own property. The impact of high house prices within the north Devon area was not just affecting individuals but also the organisations that sought to employ them.

2. Homes England – Rosa Payne:

A very powerful and interesting session.

Homes England had evidence of a loss of rental properties to AirB&B, which had been obtained from RightMove data, follows:

- From the last week of August 2021 there were 60% less properties for rental than there were in August 2019.
- In October 2021 there were 55% less properties.

Sarah Bentley added that there was also an impact in the loss of AirB&B properties to owners that since the first lockdown in March 2020 now had the

means to be able to work from home and had relocated to the area on a full time basis.

3. Financial Director EMEA. Tdk-Lambda - Alan Dykes:

TDK Lambda had been an employee within Ilfracombe for 60 years, when the business was first established it employed 15 people with a figure of 300 for the current workforce. The company was part of an international group and remained competitive within the market place and other locations around the world. Locally there had been recruitment issues and historically it had always been difficult to recruit people beyond Bristol owing to the lack of available housing within the North Devon area.

Tdk-Lambda had links to Petroc and provided training opportunities to students within the company. Roles related to IT, finance and engineering were all held by employees outside of the county, as it was difficult to attract them to settle into the area because of the high house prices, which had often led to vacancies which could not be filled. The company had established a recruitment centre in Bristol but this in turn had moved the intellectual heart of the company further up the motorway.

20% of the working population of the 5,000 that were employed created a huge challenge to house the workforce within a reasonable commute. This failure to recruit to positions within the Ilfracombe area moves elements of the business out of Ilfracombe. He highlighted Cornwall as an example with many beautiful properties located next to the sea that were not occupied by local people because the high property prices had forced them to move further in land.

He raised the following points:

- Questioned why the Council gave rates advantages to empty homes and added that this needed to be reviewed.
- Requested that when a builder sought approval for development land there should be encouragement or incentive to build out and not sit on their plans for the site.

The Leader thanked Alan for his representation to the panel.

The Head of Planning, Housing and Health acknowledged the workforce deficits together with the challenges within the private sector, which also existed in equal measure within the public sector.

4. Pearce Construction – Paul Knox:

Paul Knox addressed the panel advising that he had joined the company 27 years ago as an apprentice. The last Council houses were built by the company in the 1980s and more recently for NDH in the early 2000s. The

company did not have a land bank and were currently working towards the net zero challenge.

He explained that consultees were a big problem for the company if there was no response within the statutory period and emphasised the requirement to develop a flexible policy as one size doesn't fit all.

5. Representations of Louise Sharman (Director) and Peter How (Managing Director) Chichester Homes.

The following points were raised:

Chichester Homes was a local housing developer.

Very buoyant local market, but becoming more concerned re. inflation and any rise in interest rates.

Considered that some developers had always had tendency to land bank/sit on option agreements. Buoyant market over past 12 months, together with knowledge North Devon Council did not have 5 year land supply, which had increased demand to secure land. Landowners also wanting to take advantage.

There was already skill shortage in industry – made worse by BREXIT/Covid – 19.

Also now had supply chain issues (linked to BREXIT, Covid-19, Suez Canal) which were bringing about an approximate three month delay in completions. Cost of materials had increased significantly due to supply verses demand.

The North Devon 'housing market bubble' was also associated with a general market correction, properties in North Devon had been historically undervalued.

The Government's "Help to Buy Scheme" had given opportunity but potentially inflated prices in more desirable locations. The potential benefit of the scheme was now reduced (first time buyers only, more properties > SW price cap) and was due to end in March 2023.

What next?

Current sales – 40% of purchases out of area, historically that was 20 – 30%.

The lack of 'churn' was a major risk to the wider market.

Local land owners' expectations were becoming increasingly unrealistic but the company's target profit margins were broadly consistent irrespective of the market.

Local developers' contribution to the wider economy highlighted (as an employer, Chichester had 20 employees but engaged with many local professionals and trade sub-contractors, also utilised the services of North Devon Council's Building Control service etc).

Efficiency of supplying new homes

For sites without any prior planning approval, the time between 'deal with landowner' to 'bucket in ground' was taking minimum of two years.

The complexity of development was not widely appreciated, e.g. issues re. ecology and biodiversity archaeology, drainage and flood risk. Also, added time. This could also encourage bad practice.

A feeling that some pre-commencement conditions were adding unnecessary delays in developments. Conditions were often repeated and could have been dealt with more efficiently during the application process. More flexibility in the system would help.

Members appear to be under more pressure to 'call in' applications if they do not have community support. A sense that members were identifying questionable planning considerations to bring applications to committee.

Statutory determination periods for validated larger planning applications was unrealistic and invariably missed.

Pre-application advise time delays were common.

But – recognition that many delays were caused by the lack of feedback from statutory consultees.

Frustration re. current S106 process. A feeling of unnecessary re-submission of information, also delays and errors by legals were common. Even when s106 agreed, delays of 6 – 8 weeks for it to be signed by all parties – delays normally by North Devon Council and Devon County Council (not developer/land owner).

Concern re. the integrity of viability assessments. Having built out a number of policy compliant sites, the process must have integrity and be fair to all parties. Were S106 contributions in their entirety now realistic to encourage development without need for viability? North Devon Council's insistent on social rent verses affordable rent did not help. Viability process obviously added more time delays.

Concern re. future loss of efficiency of the DM service due to the need for North Devon Council to resource appeals.

Positive recognition of the competency of many North Devon planning officers.

Believe efficiency would increase if there was greater continuity in the case officer for specific applications and more personalised contact.

6. North Devon Homes – Martyn Gimber:

The market value of our assets was £300m but we can't borrow against all of that, so had capacity of £150m. We were £125m drawn and have £25m capacity to help support schemes. It was important for the organisation to support growth and stem any RTB or sales with new homes as the overheads became more expensive and the aim was to deliver 100 new homes a year.

In order to do this, there was a requirement to be continually adding new properties that had higher capital values to the balance sheet, to help increase their asset value and create uncharged security against which they could borrow future funds to help facilitate future growth. As the time lag between schemes could be 8.5 years, ensuring future capacity required long term planning and capital finance planning.

Affordable homes required a subsidy of £50k per unit and social rented a subsidy of around £75k per unit to stack up versus social. Either way, without any grant existing customers (very often the poorest section of society) were subsidising new provision.

Landlords that hold stock in North Devon may have benefitted from generous grant and subsidies to procure homes with the assistance of the Local Authority in the past. These mortgages would have been paid off and they would be re-mortgaged to provide that landlord with funds to invest in its chosen area of operation and in areas where development was easier. Many schemes that had been developed over the years in North Devon were providing the security for investment in other Local Authority areas or, worse still, the landlord had decided it was no longer viable to manage a stockholding in North Devon and sold off the units. North Devon Homes tried to buy them back to keep them available for local people but this was North Devon money being used to buy back assets which should really be kept and used for the people of North Devon.

Although the current plans indicated a minimum of 100 affordable homes and 100 market sale, North Devon Homes could do more and had identified a pipeline of 1,000 homes. The speed of delivery would depend on planning, market sale and whether they could attract grant or other funding. Working with the Local Authority and others, to bring those opportunities forward.

Delivering new affordable required significant subsidy as social rents of £100 pw or affordable of 125 per week, meant that the NPV of each unit was around £50K or £75K, depending on rent. Each home costed around £150k, meaning that grant of between £75-£100k was needed.

Cheap or zero cost land enables North Devon Homes to build affordable. Where there was public land, or where the Local Authority held ransom strips or covenants over land that they had, these could be released to help them to deliver more homes. They could then borrow against them to provide even more homes and on and on we go. There had to be a wider view on "value" rather than just the concentration on

cost or land price – this overruled many decisions and had led to many sites not being developed and used as income generators rather than assets to unlock housing provision.

In terms of their existing sites, they had attracted many grants and inward investment to regenerate Forches, Woodville and Pill Gardens over the years. They wanted to do some similar work at Slade Valley, Ilfracombe and at other estates that badly need a review and refresh, to provide modern, more adaptable housing to help them to manage the future housing requirements of our communities and the next generation.

North Devon Homes would do this by using modern methods of construction (MMC) through ASW and would build skills and apprenticeships as they went. This wider approach was a key component of their activities and was why they were fundamentally different to other RP or profit providers.

There were many changes to Planning and Community Investment Levy on the way, with much more flexibility on offer, but they needed to be ready strategically to understand where investment was needed and get a number of oven-ready schemes lined up. North Devon Homes had a lot of zero carbon and energy efficiency work to do as well, and there were grant monies available. They must work together to try and get the maximum impact and support projects for the area. This required clear plans, prioritised schemes and good understanding of what needed to be done.

North Devon Homes could do so much more to tackle the housing crisis with the use of new homes bonus being channelled into housing, RTB receipts and the increase in values in the market being used to provide new homes, use of market sale homes activity to cross subsidise the provision of affordable homes. We have developed a viable method of building high quality homes and using the profit to directly subsidise new affordable homes. This is innovative and works really well through our ethical developer and subsidiary Anchorwood Limited. We can scale this up and use the inherent inefficiency and dis-functional high market values we see in North Devon as a way to help solve the crisis we all face.

7. Representation received from Councillor Eric Ley

- Councillor Eric Ley sent his apologies for the meeting, owing to the bad weather earlier in the week he had no internet connection so was unable to join the meeting evening.

He had requested that the following be raised in his absence:

- There was a requirement to implement into policy a rule for new open market dwellings to have a primary residential condition attached to them. This is something that the Exmoor National Park Authority had been doing this for several years and it appears to be at least 90% effective in stopping second homes/air B & B and holiday lets.

Discussions and outcomes from session 2:

- Councillor Biederman questioned what powers local authorities had in relation to an owner that did not wish to utilise their empty property together with what the maximum figure was for housing benefit?

JM advised that there were specific regulatory provisions within the Housing Act 2004 regulatory framework, which included various interventions that could be utilised in a situation of that nature. He added that he did not have the housing benefit information to hand.

- The Leader requested clarification re. Modular Passive Housing and how it could be incorporated into future plans?

Martyn Gimber advised that this was all part of building a better partnership with the advantage within the Southwest. He added that this area of work had been established about 20 years ago and some work had already been undertaken by NDH within that area.

Rosa Payne advised that 60% of new housing would be modular built adding that as a company they were getting prepared for that and had been working closely with Pearce Construction to develop the skills to deliver such homes within the construction industry.

Martyn Gimber added that there were experimental units within Lynton and Lynmouth and South Molton with new methods of heating and culture change. They were currently working on a specification for new homes to ensure that they met current and future specifications.

In terms of supply and balance sheets, it was not possible to build all of the new supply without the sufficient funds to do so. The company had currently allocated £25m to develop new communities/properties but had to have the funds to meet the demand. They were currently using housing to secure future loans, which also involved reviewing properties that required investment now to enable them to then borrow against in five to ten year's time. The company had a £300m market value asset base to support future programmes and explore opportunities going forward for development areas around Slade in Ilfracombe and would be interested in speaking to the representatives from Perrigo and Tdk-Lambda to discuss opportunities with local partners and key worker accommodation.

There were also opportunities in town centres such as Ilfracombe and Barnstaple for permitted development rights to unlock some interesting units for housing.

Councillor Patrinos questioned the next steps for NDC.

Councillor Spear added that the meeting had been one of the most important and that he hoped that the Council could move forward and evaluate the situation. He thanked the Clerk and Officers together with the representations from invited guests.

The Head of Planning, Housing and Health added that it was important to incorporate the Notice of Motion from Councillor Tucker to Full Council on 29th September 2021 into the findings report from the meeting. There was an incredible amount of rich information contributed by the stakeholders and there was now an important amount of work to be undertaken to capture all of the representations that had been made. He advised that there would be a subsequent work shop with the Members to critically appraise the information and produce recommendations, which would then be taken through the Council's Committee process.

The Leader thanked Head of Planning, Housing and Health and his team for their continued hard work to ensure that residents within the North Devon community were sufficiently housed. He also passed on his thanks to Councillor Topham in her role as Lead Member for Housing.

In response to a question regarding feedback form the meeting to the stakeholders. The Head of Planning, Housing and Health advised that the recording and notes taken at the meeting would be analysed and at the current moment in time it would be unrealistic to promise any deadlines as it was a very complex piece of work and as such needed to be undertaken correctly.

The Chief Executive provided reassurance that as this process had not been undertaken before, the officers would need to consider the best way to progress the findings of the meeting. He added that as such there might be a second informal meeting held to discuss the outcomes of the first meeting and the very last thing that the Council would wish to do would be to exclude stakeholders from the process.

Councillor Topham added that she had found the meeting extremely informative and was very interested to hear the different perspectives from local businesses and thanked the stakeholders for their contributions to the meeting.

The Leader thanked all of the speakers, officers and Members for their contribution to the meeting. He added that the Council would ensure that this was progressed as efficiently and swiftly as possible.

Meeting ended at 20.49.

This page is intentionally left blank

Date of Publication

NORTH DEVON COUNCIL
Policy Development Work Programme
For period December 2021 - March 2022

Committee/Date	Description of Decision	Contact Officer
December 2021		
Policy Development Committee 9 December 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings of the informal Housing Panel meetings 	
January 2022		
Policy Development Committee 6 January 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Service Plans - To be considered at this meeting 	Jon Triggs, Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive
February 2022		
Policy Development Committee 10 February 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance and Financial Management Quarter 3 of 2021/22 	Jon Triggs, Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive
Policy Development Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of Charges & Fees for 2022/23 	
Policy Development Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revenue Budget 2022/23, Capital Programme & Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022-2026 	

Page 37

Agenda Item 7

Committee/Date	Description of Decision	Contact Officer
Policy Development Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2022/23 	
Policy Development Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10-Year Capital Strategy 2022-2032 	
March 2022		
Policy Development Committee 17 March 2022	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Items for this meeting? 	Jon Triggs, Director of Resources and Deputy Chief Executive
Potential future items for discussion		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Locality Director for Local Care Partnership 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic Transport 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> North Devon Biosphere 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fair funding for Education 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management of the Taw and Torridge Estuaries 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air Quality and Climate Change 	

Committee/Date	Description of Decision	Contact Officer
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age Concern and the elderly - provisions in supporting charities. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road Network and infrastructure. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open parks and refuse collections 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socioeconomic development - Restorative environments and development of an arts corridor along the North Devon Link Road 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Devon/Torridge Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Biosphere Reserve. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Health Service 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Farming and allied services 	

This page is intentionally left blank