
NOTICE OF MEETING

CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, REGENERATION & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

TUESDAY, 27 JANUARY 2015 AT 5.00 PM

CONFERENCE ROOM A - CIVIC OFFICES

Telephone enquiries to Vicki Plytas 02392 834058
Email: vicki.plytas@portsmouthcc.gov.uk

CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, REGENERATION & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
Councillor Luke Stubbs (Conservative)

Group Spokespersons

Councillor Ben Dowling, Liberal Democrat
Councillor Aiden Gray, Labour
Councillor Steve Hastings, UK Independence Party

(NB This Agenda should be retained for future reference with the minutes of this meeting.)

Please note that the agenda, minutes and non-exempt reports are available to view online on the Portsmouth City Council website: www.portsmouth.gov.uk

Deputations by members of the public may be made on any item where a decision is going to be taken. The request should be made in writing to the contact officer (above) by 12 noon of the working day before the meeting, and must include the purpose of the deputation (for example, for or against the recommendations). Email requests are accepted.

AGENDA

- 1 Apologies for Absence**
- 2 Declarations of Members' Interests**

3 Measuring the concentration of houses in multiple occupation (HMOs)
(Pages 1 - 6)

This report is written in response to a suggested amendment to the city council's approach to measuring the concentration of HMOs in the area surrounding a property that is the subject of a planning application for use as a Class C4 HMO, mixed C3 / C4 or an HMO in *sui generis* use. This approach is currently detailed in the city council's adopted "Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)" Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

The report sets out the potential implications of the suggested amendment.

RECOMMENDED that the method of measuring the concentration of HMOs should remain unchanged to ensure that the council retains a robust and replicable approach.

4 Portsmouth Plan Review (Pages 7 - 12)

The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet Member approval to review the Portsmouth Plan and to note the timescales involved.

RECOMMENDED that the Cabinet Member approves a review of the Portsmouth Plan.

5 Monitoring of 2014/15 Cash Limits and Capital Programme for the Period to 30 September 2014 (Pages 13 - 24) (INFORMATION ONLY ITEM)

The purpose of this report is to inform the Cabinet Member of:

- i) The forecast revenue expenditure for the year compared with the cash limited budget.
- ii) The forecast capital expenditure against the capital programme for the Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development (Excluding the Port) Portfolio.

RECOMMENDED that the Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development:

- i) **Notes the forecast revenue expenditure for the year compared with the cash limited budget.**
- ii) **Notes the forecast capital expenditure against the capital programme for Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development (Excluding the Port).**

Members of the public are now permitted to use both audio visual recording devices and social media during this meeting, on the understanding that it neither disrupts the meeting or records those stating explicitly that they do not wish to be recorded. Guidance on the use of devices at meetings open to the public is available on the Council's website and posters on the wall of the meeting's venue.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3



Agenda item:

Title of Meeting: Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development

Date of meeting: 27 January 2015

Subject: Measuring the concentration of houses in multiple occupation (HMOs)

Report by: City Development Manager

Wards affected: All

Key decision (over £250k): No

Full Council Decision: No

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 This report is written in response to a suggested amendment to the city council's approach to measuring the concentration of HMOs in the area surrounding a property that is the subject of a planning application for use as a Class C4 HMO, mixed C3 / C4 or an HMO in *sui generis* use. This approach is currently detailed in the city council's adopted "Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)" Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).
- 1.2 The report sets out the potential implications of the suggested amendment.

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. **the method of measuring the concentration of HMOs should remain unchanged to ensure that the council retains a robust and replicable approach.**

3. Background

- 3.1 On 1st October 2010, the Government amended the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (1995) so that changes of use from a C3 dwellinghouse to a C4 HMO would not require planning permission.
- 3.2 On 1st November 2011, Portsmouth City Council introduced an Article 4 Direction which has the effect that, as an exception to the national development control, throughout the city permission is required for all changes of use from

Class C3 to Class C4. In addition, a new policy was introduced to explain the basis on which applications for such permission would be considered by the council.

- 3.3 The basis of the council's policy was a need to support 'mixed and balanced communities': to ensure that a range of households continue to be accommodated throughout the city and that the future supply of family housing is not jeopardised by unchecked conversion to shared accommodation (HMOs).
- 3.4 This new policy was the subject of public consultation and now forms policy PCS20 (Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)) of the Portsmouth Plan, the city's adopted Core Strategy.
- 3.5 The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was also produced setting out in detail how the policy would be applied. This is via a "threshold approach" whereby if the concentration of HMOs within a 50 metre radius of the 'application property' already exceeds 10%, or if granting the planning application would tip the concentration over 10%, the council will seek to refuse planning permission for the new HMO use.

4. Proposed policy amendment

- 4.1 It has been suggested that the method of measuring the concentration of HMOs be amended to a street-by-street basis instead of the existing 50 metre radius measurement around the application property. The 10% threshold value would be maintained.
- 4.2 It is our understanding that some residents consider that the city council does not currently capture enough properties in the HMO count to be representative of 'their community'.

5. Development of existing policy

- 5.1 Prior to the public examination of the Portsmouth Plan, the city council defined the relevant assessment area surrounding the application property as street frontage lying within 100 metres either side of the application property. Properties within 100 metres were identified and the percentage of those in HMO use was calculated. This method however proved complex and involved significant 'judgements' as to which properties to include, particularly in the case of non-uniform street patterns. It was also problematic for applicants who wanted to assess the existing concentration of HMOs surrounding a property prior to submitting an application for a new HMO use.
- 5.2 To ensure that the method for calculating the existing percentage of HMOs was clear and straightforward for applicants to understand and replicate, a simple 'fixed' radius approach was proposed.

- 5.3 Different options relating to the 'length' of this radius were explored in terms of the number of properties captured using each measurement. For example, based on a traditional terraced street layout in the city, an area with a radius of 25 metres captured approximately 33 properties, a 50 metre radius captured 93 properties and a 100 metre radius captured 301. Clearly the number of properties captured would vary depending on the density of the existing development surrounding the application site.
- 5.4 It was considered that a 50 metre radius provided an appropriate spatial level at which the existing percentage of HMOs could be assessed and that it would capture a 'manageable' number of properties in the surrounding area for applicants, local residents and the local planning authority to consider in terms of their existing use. Assessing the number of properties captured by the 100 metre radius (301) would clearly be a more time consuming / resource intensive exercise and while the 25 metres radius captured 33 properties in a terraced street layout, lower density development may significantly reduce this number to a point where the balance of uses in the area cannot be properly gauged.

6. Other councils' policy approaches

- 6.1 Portsmouth was one of the first authorities to introduce an Article 4 Direction in relation to HMOs as well as being a forerunner in developing HMO planning policy. The success of our approach has seen many authorities replicating our policy rationale, however, the way in which a 'community' has been defined does vary across authorities with some approaches appearing to be overly complex.
- 6.2 For example, Bath & North East Somerset Council apply their HMO policy in two stages. Firstly, if an application for a change of use to an HMO is in or within 50 metres of a Census Output Area that has 25% or more of properties in HMO use, the application will be subjected to a second test. At this stage if 25% or more of the households within 100 metres of the application property are already HMOs, then the council will seek to refuse the application. In all other circumstances the application would be approved, subject to other material considerations¹.
- 6.3 York City Council take a similar approach to Bath & North East Somerset where applications for a change of use to an HMO are only supported where the 'neighbourhood area' concentration of HMOs is under 20% of properties, and where less than 10% of properties within 100 metres of the street length on either side of the application property are HMOs. A neighbourhood area is defined as a 'cluster' of between 5 and 7 Census Output Areas, capturing between 625 and 875 households².

¹ Houses in Multiple Occupation in Bath SPD (Bath & North East Somerset Council 2013)

² Controlling the Concentration of HMOs SPD (City of York 2014)

- 6.4 Oxford City Council seeks to refuse permission for changes of use to a HMO where the threshold of properties in use as HMOs within 100 metres of the street length on either side of the application property exceeds 20%³.
- 6.5 Southampton City Council maintain a similar policy approach to Portsmouth in that they seeks to refuse permission for new HMOs where there is already in excess of 20% of households in HMO use within a 40 metre radius of the application property⁴.

7. Potential impacts of amendments:

- 7.1 It is considered that seeking to respond to concerns that have been expressed by introducing a street-based calculation would be difficult to justify. As discussed in the research report that supports the city council's HMO SPD⁵, it is extremely difficult to capture a 'community' in spatial terms. The existing 50 metre radius approach is intended to be *indicative* of the balance of residential uses in the local community. This fixed measure offers a consistent approach and is readily replicable. In contrast, given the variety of street layouts / lengths in the city (for example London Road contains over 600 properties while Bush Street West has only one property), a street based measurement would capture significantly different numbers of properties in the case of individual planning applications. In addition, while it may be the case that some residents may identify their entire street as a 'community', others may not. Some residents may consider the occupants of houses in a number of streets grouped in a locality surrounding their property as their 'community'. It is therefore considered that the proposed street-based measure may not provide a consistent approach to implementing the policy, which can be readily justified. The current measure has been supported in a number of appeal decisions.
- 7.2 By not maintaining a consistent spatial catchment, the introduction of the suggested amendment could lead to 'clustering' of HMOs on one section of a street. This could become particularly prevalent on longer streets and lead to an imbalanced and disproportionate impact upon one section of a street over another.
- 7.3 The proposed street measure would also mean more case-by-case judgements on the part of planning officers as to which properties to include, for example at junctures where roads merge (such as between Kings Road / Elm Grove and Victoria Road South / Victoria Road North) or in the case of corner plots. Such subjectivity would make the street-based approach difficult for applicants and residents to replicate as well as potentially 'weakening' the council's decisions in respect of planning applications for HMO use.
- 7.4 The existing SPD has proven to be highly robust with regards to planning appeals. It is considered that the proposal to amend the existing SPD, without a

³ Sites and Housing Plan DPD 2011-2026 (Oxford City Council 2013)

⁴ Houses in Multiple Occupation SPD (Southampton City Council 2012)

⁵ Shared housing in Portsmouth: An assessment of demand, supply and community impacts (PCC 2012)

substantial evidence base, would undermine the established position and jeopardise success in future appeals. In doing so, it would increase the likelihood of the city council losing more planning appeals for applications for change of use to an HMO.

8. Conclusion:

- 8.1 In comparison with other authorities who apply thresholds of 20-25% of properties as HMOs, the city council seeks to attain the lowest concentration of HMOs (10%). The approach has proven to be highly robust in the face of planning appeals. It is considered that amending the SPD measurements without sufficient rationale would jeopardise the city council's strong policy position, making it more difficult to control new HMOs.
- 8.2 As the proposal would constitute an amendment to the city council's adopted HMO SPD, public consultation would be required. It is considered likely that the proposed street-based measure would be subject to challenge from landlords / agents who, while initially finding the existing approach difficult to understand, have become familiar with its requirements. While this is not a reason not to seek an amendment, it is difficult to justify why the council would seek to amend the HMO SPD in this way given that the document has been proven to be robust.

9. Equality impact assessment (EIA)

- 9.1 An EIA is not required.

10. Legal comments

- 10.1 The policy and the SPD have been adopted, and are robust, because they are established on a sound evidence base; that the policy and the SPD are robust is reflected in comments by Planning Inspectors who have refused relevant appeals. Changing to street-based approach is not an amendment that properly could be recommended without further investigation of an evidence base to justify such a change. To make a substantial amendment to the measures in the SPD without establishing an appropriate evidence basis for supporting such a change, would expose council decisions to refuse specific applications to an increased risk of successful challenge on appeal.

11. Head of Finance comments

- 11.1 There are no cost implications resulting from the approval of the recommendation contained in this report. There will, however, be increased costs associated with the alternative proposals discussed.

.....
Signed by: Claire Upton-Brown, City Development Manager

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/
rejected by

.....
Signed by:

Date



Title of meeting:	Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development
Date of meeting:	27 th January 2015
Subject:	Portsmouth Plan Review
Report by:	City Development Manager
Wards affected:	All
Key decision:	No
Full Council decision:	No

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet Member approval to review the Portsmouth Plan and to note the timescales involved.

2. Recommendations

The Cabinet Member is recommended to:

- 1. approve a review of the Portsmouth Plan**

3. Background

- 3.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that all local authorities should produce a local plan and that it should be kept up to date. The Portsmouth Plan was adopted in January 2012 and it is considered that it now needs to be reviewed. The reasons for a review are:
- a new PUSH Spatial Strategy is being developed which will set out new development targets (i.e. housing targets) and the Portsmouth Plan will need to be updated to reflect the new strategic direction;
 - to reflect and deliver the growth objectives of the Local Economic Partnership (LEP) as set out in the Strategic Economic Plan and Growth Deal;
 - to respond to the release of public land locally;
 - to include additional policies to fully reflect national policy as set out in the NPPF;
 - changes to national policy mean that some of our existing policies need to be updated;

- to create a single plan for Portsmouth that clearly sets out a vision and a delivery strategy.

Content of the Portsmouth Plan

- 3.2 The proposal is to provide a full review of the Portsmouth Plan and bring together key strategic policies from other strategies such as the Local Transport Plan, Health and Wellbeing Strategy, Anti-Poverty Strategy, Effective Learning and Education Strategy. The plan would set a shared direction of travel to achieve our ambitious growth plans and provide a co-ordinated approach. It will show how through the development of our city we can achieve many different aims the council has, such as regenerating the city, improving economic growth and job provision, boosting culture and tourism, valuing our heritage, creating a healthy and sustainable environment, ensuring access to education and ensuring that we provide enough of the right type of good quality housing to meet the different needs of our population.
- 3.3 The plan would set out how key development sites in the city can be delivered - setting out the type of uses to be developed on site and the infrastructure needed to ensure the site can be delivered. There would also be specific policies to ensure that corporate objectives can be met. The plan would also include a section of infrastructure setting out what infrastructure is needed to ensure that development can be supported, when the infrastructure is needed and how and by whom it will be delivered. Identifying key infrastructure requirement within a statutory plan can lend more weight to funding bids.
- 3.4 The plan would be in three sections - a strategic framework outlining the future of the city, detailed policies to achieve council priorities and sites for development, and a delivery strategy.

Process for reviewing the plan

- 3.5 In preparing a new plan for Portsmouth it is necessary to follow set legal procedures. The plan needs to be supported with a robust evidence base, has to go through two rounds of public consultation and has to go through an independent public examination where it must be found sound or it cannot be adopted by the council. Essentially the review of the Portsmouth Plan can be broken down into six stages:

Stage 1:

- gather evidence on the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the city. For example, such evidence could include an assessment of the development needs and capacity in Portsmouth, a transport strategy to set out how additional development could be supported, research into the function and future of our town centres, an infrastructure strategy and an assessment of the impact on the environment.
- Informal engagement with stakeholders to identify the most pressing issues for the city that a plan should address. Stakeholders could include members,

the university, local businesses, Shaping Portsmouth, PUSH, LEP, nature conservation partners and local interest groups.

Stage 2:

- Continue evidence gathering
- Produce policy options to tackle the issues identified and to deliver on corporate objectives.
- Consult on the options

Stage 3:

- Analyse the consultation responses
- Produce a draft plan
- Formal consultation on the draft plan (for a period of 6 weeks minimum)

Stage 4:

- Analyse the consultation responses and make changes to the plan as necessary
- Submit the revised plan to the Planning Inspectorate for an independent examination.

Stage 5 - Examination in Public.

Stage 6 - Adopt the new plan.

Possible timing for producing the plan

- 3.6 Stage 1 - December 2014 - September 2015
Stage 2 - September 2015 - December 2015
Stage 3 - December 2015 - June 2016
Stage 4 - June 2016 - December 2016
Stage 5 - March 2017
Stage 6 - April / May 2017.

4. Reasons for recommendations

- 4.1 To ensure that the council has an up to date plan for the city that can direct and deliver corporate objectives and the future growth of the city.

5. Equality impact assessment (EIA)

- 5.1 An EIA is not required, as this report is largely for information, setting out an intention and timetable to review the Portsmouth Plan.

6. Legal Implications

6.1 The Council is obliged by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to keep its local plan under review, including any changes which it is considered may occur in relation to other relevant matters (such as those identified above at paragraph 3.1) and the effect such changes are likely to have on the development or planning of the area. The report identifies significant matters where the impact of changes on the local plan should be assessed and the plan reviewed accordingly. The recommendation accords with that statutory duty. The public consultations and examination in public will all be conducted to accord with current statutory provisions and regulations, and with the Statement of Community involvement.

7. Finance Comments

- 7.1 There will be a financial cost associated with the examination stage of the revised plan (not due until March 2017). This was £40,859 in 2012 when the last examination was carried out and this is the basis for the estimate of the cost that will be incurred in Stage 5 of the planned work. The charge may vary depending upon the length of time required to carry out the examination.
- 7.2 A programme manager will also be needed to undertake some of this work and is likely to be employed for an 8 month period starting from December 2016 / January 2017. Previously this has been done on a consultancy basis at a cost of £5,000.
- 7.3 These costs will be met from existing budget resources.

.....
Signed by: Claire Upton-Brown, City Development Manager

Appendices:

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
None.	

The recommendation(s) set out above were approved/ approved as amended/ deferred/
rejected by on

.....
Signed by:

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 5

Agenda item:

Title of meeting: Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development

Date of meeting: 27 January 2015

Subject: Monitoring of 2014/15 Cash Limits and Capital Programme for the Period to 30 September 2014

Report by: Strategic Director and Head of Finance & S151 Officer

Wards affected: All

Key decision: No

Full Council decision: No

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Cabinet Member of:
- i) The forecast revenue expenditure for the year compared with the cash limited budget.
 - ii) The forecast capital expenditure against the capital programme for the Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development (Excluding the Port) Portfolio.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development:
- i) Notes the forecast revenue expenditure for the year compared with the cash limited budget.
 - ii) Notes the forecast capital expenditure against the capital programme for Planning, Regeneration and Economic Development (Excluding the Port).

3. Information requested

3.1 Cash Limit 2014/15

	£'000	
Controllable Cash Limit 2014/15 - Income Target	(627)	
Outturn 2014/15		% of Budget
Controllable Cash Limit 2014/15 - Income Target	(627)	100
Forecast net income to 31March 2015	(848)	135
Forecast over achievement of income	(221)	35

An analysis of the Portfolio's expenditure to the 30th September 2014 is attached at Appendix A. This indicates that the income received by the Portfolio will exceed expenditure by £221,000 as a result of higher than anticipated income received by the Planning Development and Control Service and underspending in the Building Control Service.

3.2 Details of these variances are below;

3.2.1 Planning Development and Control - (£206,000) (increased income received)

The additional income forecast is as a result of;

3.2.1.1 S106 Monitoring Fee

Income of £82,680 is currently included in the revenue income, this will be transferred to the balance sheet instead of the Portfolio reserve as it represents income received to monitor specific schemes. In this case the funding relates to the proposed Blade building, Tipner and the St Mary's Hospital developments.

3.2.1.2 CIL Admin Element

When a development physically begins, an invoice is raised for the CIL contribution. Payments are usually received in instalments and need to be applied to the revenue account in the year in which they are received rather than the year in which the invoice is raised.

It was initially anticipated that this income would be held on the Portfolio reserve, however, an earmarked reserve will now be set up so that the income can be separately identified and applied. The balance of this was £99,000 in September 2014.

3.2.1.3 **Planning Fee Income**

As at Q2, the planning fee income was forecast to be £66,000 less than budgeted. The shortfall is being offset by underspending of £93,000 on the agency staff budget.

3.2.2 **Building Control - £15,000 (Underspend)**

Savings have been realised as a result of staff vacancies. This is, however, being offset by the reduced level of income being generated by the service.

4. An analysis of the Portfolio's capital expenditure to 30th September 2014 is attached at Appendix B. There are no overspends forecast in the capital programme.

CAPITAL

The revised 2014/15 capital estimates for this Portfolio are summarised at Appendix B. A brief description and status of each scheme is included below.

1. **City Centre Regeneration - Environmental Enhancements**
(Total Scheme Budget £703,781 - Spend to Date £673,588)
2. **City Centre Regeneration - Branding and Marketing**
(Total Scheme Budget £20,000 - Spend to Date £5,772)
3. **City Centre Interim Works**
(Total Scheme Budget £250,000 - Spend to Date £129,379)
4. **Southsea Shopping Centre**
(Total Scheme Budget £655,401 - Spend to Date £607,147)

There has been no activity on any of the above schemes this year to date and as a result they are currently under review to determine whether they will continue to form part of the Capital programme.

**5. North End Shopping Centre Regeneration
(Total Scheme Budget - £400,000 - on target)**

Overview of scheme

Regeneration of shopping area.

Progress

All capital and remedial works to the road and pavement surfacing have been done and the final invoice is due.

Completion date

Due to complete 2014/15

6. Palmerston Road (Total Scheme Budget £500,000 - on target)

Overview of scheme

Palmerston Road improvements.

Progress

The commuted sum for future maintenance is still to be agreed. This will inform the final cost of the scheme.

Completion date

Agreement on commuted sum should be reached in 2014/15.

**7. Investment Portfolio - Enabling and Infrastructure Works
(Total Scheme Budget £100,000 – Inactive)**

Overview of scheme

Deposit for right to purchase of land.

Progress

Scheme is inactive.

Completion date

Scheme will only proceed if a decision is taken to go ahead and buy the land in order to extend the road.

This scheme is currently under review to determine whether it will continue to form part of the Capital programme.

**8. Relocation of TIC to D Day Museum
(Total Scheme Budget £98,000 - Spend to Date £61,321)**

Overview of scheme

Relocation of TIC to D Day Museum.

Progress

Final path works to the front of the building were delayed as a result of the 2014 commemorations, these are now being progressed.

Completion date

Works will be completed in 2014/15.

**9. City Centre Road Road Upgrade
(Total Scheme Budget £16,000,000 - on target)**

Overview of scheme

Development of Northern Quarter road upgrade.

Progress

This scheme is closely linked to Northern Quarter Plan and will form part of the discussions currently taking place with regard to the revised future development of this area.

Completion date

Unknown at present.

**10. Enterprise Centre Dilapidations
(Total Scheme Budget £40,000- Spend to Date £nil)**

Overview of scheme

Capital works to improve dilapidations on the Enterprise Centres.

Progress

The scheme has not yet commenced.

Completion Date

Unknown at present.

11. Horsea Island Bridge
(Total Scheme Budget £34,999,500 - on target)

Overview of scheme

Building of bridge for Horsea Island Bridge Link

Progress

Scheme is at a preliminary stage. This scheme is proposed to be amalgamated with the City Deal project, as part of the Capital Programme refresh, currently underway.

Completion Date

Unknown at present.

12. Cosham High Street
(Total Scheme Budget £200,000-on target)

Overview of scheme

Cosham High Street improvements.

Progress

Scheme is practically complete, the commuted sum figure is still to be agreed.

Completion date

March 2015

13. Dunsbury Hill Farm Access Road
(Total Scheme Budget £9,690,000 - on target)

Overview of scheme

Scheme is to build an Access Road to facilitate the development of future Dunsbury Hill Farm development.

Progress

Project is at the preliminary stage.

Completion date

Due to complete 2015/16.

14. City Deal
(Total Scheme Budget £124,217,000)

Overview of scheme

Development of City sites funded by City Deal.

Progress

Project is currently at the preliminary stage. It is proposed to amalgamate the Horsea Island Bridge scheme into this scheme as part of the current Capital Programme refresh.

Completion date

Unknown at present.

.....
Signed by (Head of Service):

Appendices:

Appendix A - Revenue Budget
Appendix B - Capital Expenditure

Background list of documents: Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972

The following documents disclose facts or matters, which have been relied upon to a material extent by the author in preparing this report:

Title of document	Location
Portfolio Net Requirement	

The recommendation set out above were approved/approved as amended/deferred/rejected by the Cabinet member for PRED on the 7 October 2014.

This page is intentionally left blank

PLANNING REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO

APPENDIX A

REVENUE MONITORING TO 30 SEPT 2014

No.		Budget Profile	Actual	Variance vs. Profile		Total	Forecast	Variance vs. Total Budget	
		To End September 2014	To End September 2014	To September 2014	To September 2014	Budget	Year End Outturn	£	%
		£	£	£	%	£	£	£	%
1	Planning Management & Administration	35,520	32,568	(2,952)	(8.3%)	70,955	70,955	0	0.0%
2	Planning Development Control	(3,897)	(261,387)	(257,490)	(6607.4%)	(8,815)	(214,815)	(206,000)	(2336.9%)
3	Planning Policy	184,357	136,485	(47,872)	(26.0%)	367,892	367,892	0	0.0%
4	Building Regulations & Control	(11,580)	(52,629)	(41,049)	(354.5%)	(23,167)	(38,167)	(15,000)	(64.7%)
5	Economic Regeneration and Service Plan	168,480	74,807	(93,673)	(55.6%)	371,869	371,869	0	0.0%
6	Tourism	192,962	206,727	13,765	7.1%	291,666	291,666	0	0.0%
7	Economic Development, Business and Standards			0	-	247,564	247,564	0	0.0%
8	Enterprise Centres	(14,800)	(233,200)	(218,400)	(1475.7%)	(281,657)	(281,657)	0	0.0%
9	PCMI	39,640	157,600	117,960	297.6%	43,733	43,733	0	0.0%
10	Community Learning	(6,500)	(62,678)	(56,178)	(864.3%)	0	0	0	0.0%
11	Administrative Buildings	1,299,924	985,973	(313,951)	(24.2%)	2,000,220	2,000,220	0	0.0%
12	Guildhall	250,642	297,462	46,820	18.7%	501,280	501,280	0	0.0%
13	Property Portfolio	(2,251,170)	(2,039,441)	211,729	9.4%	(4,208,440)	(4,208,440)	0	0.0%
TOTAL		(116,422)	(757,713)	(641,291)	(550.8%)	(626,900)	(847,900)	(221,000)	35%

This page is intentionally left blank

APPENDIX B

PLANNING, REGENERATION & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO

Item No.	Description of Scheme	Identified Source of Finance	Accrued Expenditure to the 31st March 2014	Total Project Budget	Expenditure on Fixed Assets to the 30th September 2014	Forecast Total Capital Expenditure	Forecast Total Expenditure	Variance Actual Expenditure compared to Total Budget		Variance Forecast Total Expenditure compared to Total Budget	
1	City Centre Regeneration - Environmental Enh.	CorpRsv B OC	430,551 0 243,037	430,551 0 273,230	0 0 0	430,551 0 273,230	430,551 0 273,230				
	Sub Total		673,588	703,781	0	703,781	703,781	30,193	4%	0	0%
2	City Centre Regeneration - Branding & Marketing	OC	5,772	20,000	0	20,000	20,000				
	Sub Total		5,772	20,000	0	20,000	20,000	14,228	71%	0	0%
3	City Centre Interim Works	CorpRsv	129,379	250,000	0	250,000	250,000				
	Sub Total		129,379	250,000	0	250,000	250,000	120,621	48%	0	0%
4	Southsea Shopping Centre	CorpRsv UB	602,870 7,000	630,401 25,000	0 0	630,401 25,000	630,401 25,000				
	Sub Total		609,870	655,401	0	655,401	655,401	45,531	7%	0	0%
5	North End Shopping Centre Regeneration	CorpRsv OG	370,399 21,020	400,000	0	400,000	400,000				
	Sub Total		391,419	400,000	0	400,000	400,000	8,581	2%	0	0%
6	Palmerston Road Improvements	CorpRsv	318,130	500,000	390	500,000	500,000				
	Sub Total		318,130	500,000	390	500,000	500,000	181,480	36%	0	0%
7	Investment Portfolio - Enabling and Infrastructure Works	CorpRsv	3,284	100,000	0	100,000	100,000				
	Sub Total		3,284	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	96,716	97%	0	0%
8	Relocation of TIC (nr Blue Reef) to D Day Museum	CorpRsv	61,321	98,000	0	98,000	98,000				
	Sub Total		61,321	98,000	0	98,000	98,000	36,679	37%	0	0%
9	Northern Quarter Road Upgrade	OC CorpRsv CP(DFT)IT UB CIL S106(ST) S106(EW)	575,000 4,302,662 568,467 8,291 723,022 6,000,000 161,386 392,485	575,000 4,302,662 568,467 4,000,000 6,000,000 161,386 392,485	240,525 0 0 0 0 0 0	575,000 4,302,662 568,467 4,000,000 6,000,000 161,386 392,485	575,000 4,302,662 568,467 4,000,000 6,000,000 161,386 392,485				
	Sub Total		731,313	16,000,000	240,525	16,000,000	16,000,000	15,028,162	94%	0	0%
10	Enterprise Centre Dilapidations	RCCO	0	40,000	0	40,000	40,000				
	Sub Total		0	40,000	0	40,000	40,000	40,000	100%	0	0%
11	Horsea Island Bridge Link	OC	302	34,999,500	0	34,999,500	34,999,500				
	Sub Total		302	34,999,500	0	34,999,500	34,999,500	34,999,198	100%	0	0%
12	Cosham High Street	CP(DFT)IT	32,007	200,000	819	200,000	200,000				
	Sub Total		32,007	200,000	819	200,000	200,000	167,174	84%	0	0%
13	Dunsbury Hill Farm - Access Road	CorpRsv OG(DCLG)CD CP(DFT)IT S106(OS) RCCO OC UB	0 280,294 0 0 0 0 0	50,000 300,000 294,485 105,515 0 6,540,000 2,400,000	0 0 176,907 29,916 0 0 0	50,000 300,000 294,485 105,515 0 6,540,000 2,400,000	50,000 300,000 294,485 105,515 0 6,540,000 2,400,000				
	Sub Total		280,294	9,690,000	206,823	9,690,000	9,690,000	9,202,883	95%	0	0%
14	City Deal	OG(DCLG)CD CorpRsv OC CIL S106(EW) UB	92,745 0 22,000 0 0 0	49,857,000 4,296,000 10,189,000 48,653,000 11,222,000	0 0 0 0 0	49,857,000 4,296,000 10,189,000 48,653,000 11,222,000	49,857,000 4,296,000 10,189,000 48,653,000 11,222,000				
	Sub Total		114,745	124,217,000	0	124,217,000	124,217,000	124,102,255	100%	0	0%
	Grand Total		3,351,423	187,873,682	448,557	187,873,682	187,873,682	184,073,701	98%	0	0%

This page is intentionally left blank