

Public Document Pack



County Hall
Rhadyr
Usk
NP15 1GA

Wednesday, 7 March 2018

Notice of meeting

Economy and Development Select Committee

Thursday, 15th March, 2018 at 10.00 am

The Council Chamber, County Hall, Rhadyr, Usk. NP15 1GA

AGENDA

THERE WILL BE A PRE MEETING FOR MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE 30 MINUTES PRIOR TO THE START OF THE MEETING

Item No	Item	Pages
1.	Apologies for absence.	
2.	Declarations of Interest.	
3.	To confirm the minutes of the previous meeting.	1 - 10
4.	Public Open Forum.	
5.	Sale of County Hall Cwmbran.	11 - 24
6.	Monmouthshire Local Development Plan Review.	25 - 42
7.	Marketing Monmouthshire for Business - verbal update by the Chair of the Economy and Development Select Committee.	
8.	List of actions arising from the previous meeting.	43 - 44
9.	Economy and Development Select Committee Forward Work Planner.	45 - 46
10.	Council and Cabinet Business Forward Work Programme.	47 - 50
11.	Next meeting.	
	Thursday 26 th April 2018 at 10.00am.	

Paul Matthews

Chief Executive

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
CYNGOR SIR FYNWY

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMITTEE IS AS FOLLOWS:

County Councillors:

P. Pavia
J. Becker
D. Blakebrough
A. Davies
D. Dovey
M. Feakins
R. Roden
B. Strong
A. Watts

Public Information

Access to paper copies of agendas and reports

A copy of this agenda and relevant reports can be made available to members of the public attending a meeting by requesting a copy from Democratic Services on 01633 644219. Please note that we must receive 24 hours notice prior to the meeting in order to provide you with a hard copy of this agenda.

Watch this meeting online

This meeting can be viewed online either live or following the meeting by visiting www.monmouthshire.gov.uk or by visiting our Youtube page by searching MonmouthshireCC.

Welsh Language

The Council welcomes contributions from members of the public through the medium of Welsh or English. We respectfully ask that you provide us with adequate notice to accommodate your needs.

Aims and Values of Monmouthshire County Council

Our purpose

Building Sustainable and Resilient Communities

Objectives we are working towards

- Giving people the best possible start in life
- A thriving and connected county
- Maximise the Potential of the natural and built environment
- Lifelong well-being
- A future focused council

Our Values

Openness. We are open and honest. People have the chance to get involved in decisions that affect them, tell us what matters and do things for themselves/their communities. If we cannot do something to help, we'll say so; if it will take a while to get the answer we'll explain why; if we can't answer immediately we'll try to connect you to the people who can help – building trust and engagement is a key foundation.

Fairness. We provide fair chances, to help people and communities thrive. If something does not seem fair, we will listen and help explain why. We will always try to treat everyone fairly and consistently. We cannot always make everyone happy, but will commit to listening and explaining why we did what we did.

Flexibility. We will continue to change and be flexible to enable delivery of the most effective and efficient services. This means a genuine commitment to working with everyone to embrace new ways of working.

Teamwork. We will work with you and our partners to support and inspire everyone to get involved so we can achieve great things together. We don't see ourselves as the 'fixers' or problem-solvers, but we will make the best of the ideas, assets and resources available to make sure we do the things that most positively impact our people and places.

Monmouthshire Scrutiny Committee Guide

Role of the Pre-meeting

1. Why is the Committee scrutinising this? (background, key issues)
2. What is the Committee's role?
3. What outcome do Members want to achieve?
4. Is there sufficient information to achieve this? If not, who could provide this?
5. Discuss the committee's approach:
 - Agree the order of questioning and which Members will lead
 - Agree questions for officers and questions for the Cabinet Member

Questions for the Meeting

Scrutinising Performance

1. How does performance compare with previous years? Is it better/worse? Why?
2. How does performance compare with other councils/other service providers? Is it better/worse? Why?
3. How does performance compare with set targets? Is it better/worse? Why?
4. How were performance targets set? Are they challenging enough/realistic?
5. How do service users/the public/partners view the performance of the service?
6. Have there been any recent audit and inspections? What were the findings?
7. How does the service contribute to the achievement of corporate objectives?
8. Is improvement/decline in performance linked to an increase/reduction in resource? What capacity is there to improve?

Scrutinising Policy

1. Who does the policy affect ~ directly and indirectly? Who will benefit most/least?
2. What is the view of service users/stakeholders? Do they believe it will achieve the desired outcome?
3. What is the view of the community as a whole - the 'taxpayer' perspective?
4. What methods were used to consult with stakeholders? Did the process enable all those with a stake to have their say?
5. What practice and options have been considered in developing/reviewing this policy? What evidence is there to inform what works?
6. Have all relevant sustainable development, equalities and safeguarding implications been taken into consideration? For example, what are the procedures that need to be in place to protect children?
7. How much will this cost to implement and what funding source has been identified?
8. How will performance of the policy be measured and the impact evaluated.

Questions for the Committee to conclude...

Do we have the necessary information to form conclusions/make recommendations to the executive, council, other partners? If not, do we need to:

- (i) Investigate the issue in more detail?
- (ii) Obtain further information from other witnesses – Executive Member, independent expert, members of the local community, service users, regulatory bodies...
- (iii) Agree further actions to be undertaken within a timescale/future monitoring report...

Public Document Pack Agenda Item 3

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Economy and Development Select Committee held at The Council Chamber, County Hall, The Rhadyr, Usk, NP15 1GA. on Thursday, 25th January, 2018 at 10.00 am

PRESENT: County Councillor P. Pavia (Chair)
County Councillor D. Blakebrough (Vice Chair)

County Councillors: J. Becker, A. Davies, D. Dovey, M. Feakins, R. Roden and B. Strong

Also in attendance County Councillors: A. Easson, R. Harris and V. Smith

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Kellie Beirne	Chief Officer, Enterprise
Cath Fallon	Head of Economy and Enterprise
Mark Hand	Head of Planning, Housing and Place-Shaping
Martin Davies	Planning Policy Manager
Jill Edge	Senior Planning Policy Officer
Dave Loder	Finance Manager
Paula Harris	Democratic Services Officer
Richard Williams	Democratic Services Officer

GUEST: Deborah Perkin – Brecon Beacons National Park

APOLOGIES:

County Councillor: A. Watts

1. Welcome

On behalf of the Select Committee, the Chair welcomed to the meeting, Deborah Perkin, Business and Communities Champion at the Brecon Beacons National Park. Ms. Perkin was in attendance as an observer of the meeting.

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest made by Members.

3. Confirmation of minutes

The Economy and Development Select Committee Minutes dated 30th November 2017 were confirmed and signed by the Chair.

4. Public Open Forum

There were no members of the public present.

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Economy and Development Select Committee held at The Council Chamber, County Hall, The Rhadyr, Usk, NP15 1GA. on Thursday, 25th January, 2018 at 10.00 am

5. Revenue and Capital Monitoring 2017/18 Outturn Statement - Period 2

Context:

To scrutinise the revenue and capital outturn positions based on activity data at month 7.

Recommendations proposed to Cabinet:

- Members consider the forecast net revenue outturn overspend of £62,000.
- That Cabinet requires Chief Officers to continue to work to reduce the £1.333m over spend on services, using measures such as a moratorium on non-essential spend and the freezing of vacant posts other than where recruitment is considered essential.
- Members consider the forecast capital outturn spend, the levels of capital slippage proposed and the levels of capital receipts to assist with capital programme funding, primarily the Future Schools Tranche A considerations.
- Members note that the low level of earmarked reserves, which will severely reduce the flexibility the Council has in meeting the financial challenges of reducing settlements and consequent need to re-design services.
- Members note the significant and continued forecast reduction in the overall school balance at the end of 2017/18 and supports the continuing work with schools to ensure that the Council's Fairer Funding scheme requirements are met and that the overall schools balance reverts to a positive position at the earliest opportunity.
- Members note the significant over spend on services and consider recurrent and new pressures that need to feature in the draft revenue budget proposals currently out for consultation.

Member Scrutiny:

- The Enterprise Directorate overspend position, when adjusted for reserve movements, comes down to £279,000.
- The Enterprise Directorate comprises of the following departments, namely: Business Growth and Enterprise, Planning Housing and Place Shaping, Tourism Leisure & Culture, Governance Democracy and Support and Public Protection. Some of these departments have a specific aim around enterprise development and income generation but other departments do not share the same end point. The Enterprise Directorate, in recent years, has been required to make significant efficiency savings and provide income generation. The areas of pressure are mainly around some of the income generating services.

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Economy and Development Select Committee held at The Council Chamber, County Hall, The Rhadyr, Usk, NP15 1GA. on Thursday, 25th January, 2018 at 10.00 am

- The events held last summer were meant to generate income and the major event put on did generate some income. However, it was unfortunate that the smaller events put on to accompany the major event lost money. The reason for the loss was due to unforeseen circumstances. A comprehensive review of that function is being undertaken. The results of this independent review will be available in due course and will be scrutinised by the Select Committee at a future meeting.
- The £279,000 overspend will be balanced at year end. A recovery plan has been established to ensure the budget will be balanced.
- In response to a Select Committee Member's question regarding net Council fund surplus, it was noted that these figures were not cumulative.
- A part of the benefit of having an Alternative Delivery Model will be the recruitment from outside of the Authority, the establishment of a Board that has the relevant experience and the commercial acumen.
- Next year, the Authority has set itself a target of delivering a £500,000 saving in terms of procurement. Currently, due diligence and options analysis are being undertaken, which shows exactly where and in what service areas the Authority needs to target efficiency savings in the future.
- The review of the Authority's procurement procedure is still in the early stages. However, there are eight areas that require reviewing. Support from the Select Committee in taking this matter forward would be beneficial with a view to producing a procurement plan. When the plan is completed, it will be presented to the Select Committee for scrutiny.
- Since the dispatch of this agenda, it was noted that due to the adverse weather conditions in December 2017, the Authority's winter maintenance costs have increased. This is being monitored with a view to addressing these additional costs.
- In response to a question regarding Capital receipts in relation to the former County Hall Cwmbran, Coed Glas Abergavenny, the Magor buildings and the Morrison's development Abergavenny, it was noted that a report regarding the Former County Hall site at Cwmbran will be presented to a future Select Committee meeting. A brief summary regarding the former County Hall site and the Morrison's development will also be circulated to the Select Committee.
- The Outdoor Education Service has incurred a £41,000 loss, due to Torfaen County Borough Council and Blaenau Gwent County Borough Council withdrawing from the partnership. However, the bottom line trading activity is unaffected as a substantial reserve has been built up around this service. It will require the activation of an Alternative Delivery Model (ADM) in order to resolve this issue.

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Economy and Development Select Committee held at The Council Chamber, County Hall, The Rhadyr, Usk, NP15 1GA. on Thursday, 25th January, 2018 at 10.00 am

- In response to a question raised regarding the marketing of Hilston Park, it was noted that predominantly, the service in how it is constructed and paid for is tailored for schools providing an outdoor education experience. The Authority is constrained how it can market this service to the private sector, as the service is occupied by schools Monday to Friday. Hilston Park does generate sustainable sources of income but there is a recognition that, as an Authority, we could develop this site further.

Committee's Conclusion:

- The Select Committee recognises the tough financial position that the Authority is experiencing.
- The Enterprise budget has been scrutinised in detail.
- The Select Committee recognised the challenges surrounding events management and we want to ensure that this is an important element of our revenue offer as a Council and we welcome the independent review of the summer's events that were held in 2017.
- In terms of the Alternative Delivery Model (ADM), it is important that there will be strong commercial acumen which will maximise the Authority's revenue potential.
- With regard to procurement, a promising start has been made with the establishment of the workshops. When the procurement plan is finalised, it will be presented to the Select Committee for scrutiny.
- Additional pressures are broadly comparable to last year. The re-design of budget lines are progressing.
- Adequate flow of information is required to ensure proper scrutiny may be achieved.

6. Presentation regarding the City Deal - Strategic Investment Proposal for Caldicot Town Centre

Context:

To receive a presentation and scrutinise the Caldicot Town Centre Investment Proposal.

Key Issues:

To maximise opportunities associated with:

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Economy and Development Select Committee held at The Council Chamber, County Hall, The Rhadyr, Usk, NP15 1GA. on Thursday, 25th January, 2018 at 10.00 am

- The abolition of the Severn Bridge Tolls.
- Monmouthshire's enviable centrality.
- Close proximity to the high growth border areas of Bristol and Gloucester in the South West and the 'Midlands Engine' in the North East.
- New funding opportunities i.e. Targeted Regeneration Investment Programme (TRIP).

Member Scrutiny:

- The Select Committee was pleased that this proposal was progressing.
- Lead officers are working closely with the Planning and Highways departments.
- In terms of market needs analysis, there is the specific work in Caldicot but there is a future economies analysis also being undertaken.
- The proposal is being moved forward via three projects, i.e., a residential scheme, the cross scheme and then the enterprise scheme.
- Talks have been held to improve the offer in the Hub.
- The three schemes will allow officers to be specific in terms of what is required. This will then be fine-tuned with a view to establishing funding streams.
- Post Brexit, access to European funding will no longer be available. However, the UK Government Industrial Strategy has £4.6 Billion available annually, with an additional £2.4 Billion that has been announced for research and development capacity. This money is allocated via a challenge focus, i.e., by identifying how an Authority might solve a significant problem that it faces in the future. Therefore, on the back of the City Deal, the Authority has an opportunity to be more ambitious. A report can be brought to a future Select Committee meeting outlining the industrial strategy and progress in respect of the City Deal and the opportunities that are likely to arise in the near future.
- Existing Section 106 funding is already available for this proposed scheme, which is being used to secure some match funding. When new schemes come forward in Caldicot, Section 106 funding may be secured for further assistance for this project.
- With the upcoming removal of the Severn Bridge tolls, it will be necessary to re-purpose Monmouthshire's towns.
- An extensive transport study has been undertaken using Rural Development Programme (RDP) funding and the interim report has recently been received. This report refers to transport across the whole of the County and how the Authority can optimise its transport options. A short briefing note will be produced in the coming days.

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Economy and Development Select Committee held at The Council Chamber, County Hall, The Rhadyr, Usk, NP15 1GA. on Thursday, 25th January, 2018 at 10.00 am

- An area being focussed on is the establishment of a commercial strategy which will give the Authority the ability to acquire assets which may be sold on to produce commercial yield. This plan will cover commercial opportunities as well as asset opportunities for the Authority as a corporate landlord.
- Within the Local Development Plan (LDP) there are acres of employment land allocated and the needs of the industries coming forward are being looked at.

Committee's Conclusion:

- The Select Committee welcomes the Caldicot Town Centre Investment Proposal.
- The Select Committee would welcome future engagement in respect of this proposal.
- Further engagement work is required with businesses and local retailers, which is in hand.
- There is a close link with the future Local Development Plan (LDP) and the Commercial Development Plan which will be important to match the needs of those looking at Monmouthshire as a place to develop their businesses.
- The re-purposing of the town centres needs to incorporate a cultural change and not just be a cosmetic change.
- Transport networks are key to the proposed scheme with a view to linking Monmouthshire's towns together, as well as encouraging others outside of Monmouthshire to come into the County in a sustainable manner.

7. Pre-Decision Scrutiny - Section 106 Procedure Note and Policy Guidance

Context:

To receive a presentation by the Head of Planning, Housing and Place Shaping and to scrutinise the changes to processes for negotiating Section 106 planning obligations and their subsequent implementation and monitoring. Specifically, the following documents:

- Procedures for the Development, Monitoring and Control of Section 106 Schemes.
- Policy Guidance: Approach to Planning Obligations – Residential Development.

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Economy and Development Select Committee held at The Council Chamber, County Hall, The Rhadyr, Usk, NP15 1GA. on Thursday, 25th January, 2018 at 10.00 am

- Recreation and Public Open Space Developer Contributions Charging Schedule.

Key Issues:

It is a legal requirement (as set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010) that a planning obligation may only constitute a reason for granting permission for the development if the obligation is:

- (a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- (b) directly related to the development; and
- (c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development.

The specific contents of Section 106 agreements vary from one development to another but in general terms the types of provisions contained in them can cover the following matters:

- Affordable Housing.
- Education.
- Recreation and Open Space:
 - Children's Play (generally on site).
 - Adult recreation (generally off-site financial contributions).
- Green Infrastructure.
- Travel.
 - Highway infrastructure works necessary for the development to go ahead.
 - Sustainable transport contributions – walking, cycling, public transport.

Member Scrutiny:

- An all member Seminar is being held at County Hall, Rhadyr, Usk on 1st February 2018 regarding Section 106 Contributions Planning Policy Guidance. This will then be presented to Cabinet on 7th March 2018 to seek approval of the document.
- In terms of the pooling restriction, by being specific with requests for Section 106 funding, the Authority is less likely to come up against the pooling restriction. The CiL regulations are being reviewed and as part of the review the pooling restriction might be removed. If so, this would be helpful. CiL is in the process of being devolved to Welsh Government.
- Section 106 Funding can only be asked for the scale of a project. However, five separate requests might not be enough to fund the project. This is a challenge, as the Authority would then be required to fund the remainder of the project.

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Economy and Development Select Committee held at The Council Chamber, County Hall, The Rhadyr, Usk, NP15 1GA. on Thursday, 25th January, 2018 at 10.00 am

- In response to a question raised regarding potential payment following arbitration, it was noted that this process is reviewed by the District Valuation Service, rather than going to arbitration. The Developer only pays for demonstration of their case.
- With regard to off-site Adult leisure recreation contributions, it is necessary to identify what the community priorities are from the out-set. Consultation with the Community Cluster areas will also take place to identify some of the priorities. The implementation of place plans are in the initial stages of development in which town and community councils are being encouraged to produce plans for their areas. The place plans will be required to align with the Local Development Plan (LDP). However, it was noted that the current LDP is under review.
- In response to a question raised regarding the proposed Alternative Delivery Model (ADM) for leisure services and whether this might have an effect on drawing down Section 106 funding, it was noted that Newport City Council had recently changed leisure services provision via an ADM. Practice here has not changed. However, discussions will need to be undertaken regarding how Section 106 funding might be delivered under an ADM within Monmouthshire.
- The Section 106 Group comprises of cross party membership chaired by The Head of Planning Housing and Place Shaping. County Councillor D. Blakebrough expressed an interest in joining the group.
- The District Valuation Service is consulted, as an independent body, with regard to how much Section 106 Funding a developer should provide the Authority. The District Valuation Service will look at land transactions and sales figures for the area and scrutinise build costs.
- The Authority's threshold of 10 is comparable with nearby Welsh local authorities. One of the main viability challenges is around affordable housing. The Authority's greatest need is to provide social rented properties.

Committee's Conclusion:

- It is correct that the Authority takes a more strategic approach, rather than taking a reactive approach, as taken in the past.
- It is important that engagement is strengthened with Monmouthshire's town clusters.
- The Section 106 Working Group to be enhanced with County Councillor Blakebrough joining the group.
- The development of place plans within Monmouthshire's towns is the way forward.

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Economy and Development Select Committee held at The Council Chamber, County Hall, The Rhadyr, Usk, NP15 1GA. on Thursday, 25th January, 2018 at 10.00 am

8. Economy and Development Select Committee Forward Work Planner

We resolved to receive the Economy and Development Select Committee Forward Work Programme. In doing so, the following points were noted:

- **15th March 2018** - Procurement Workshops – County Councillor Blakebrough to write a summary of progress to date and circulate to the Select Committee. A report on the procurement procedure will be presented to the Select Committee.
- **15th March 2018** - City Deal – The business plan will be signed off in the coming weeks.
- **15th March 2018** - Commercial Development Plan
- Cross Border Authorities – Undertake more reach out work with the proposed removal of the Severn Bridge tolls. A working group to be established to identify key priorities before meeting with cross border authorities. Establish officer interest to facilitate this working group.
- Commercial Development Plan – The Select Committee should have involvement in the development of this unit via workshops.
- Broadband – In February 2018, the Minister is announcing £80 million towards the second phase of superfast broadband. Monmouthshire will not be one of the initial authorities to receive this service. Monmouthshire has some case studies where local solutions have been found to maximise broadband connections. Therefore, there is a case for Welsh Government to provide the Authority with its allocation of funding so that the Authority might find its own solutions to the broadband issues currently being experienced in the County.
- Invite Vivian Collins, Manager for the Superfast Broadband scheme, to a future Select Committee meeting to establish whether Monmouthshire is receiving value for money with regard to its current broadband provision.

We resolved that the Chair:

- Writes to the Deputy Chief Executive to ask if resource can be found to focus on broadband provision within the County for the next two years;
- Asks the Deputy Chief Executive to write to Welsh Government requesting that Monmouthshire County Council receives its allocation of Welsh Government money, as the Authority has the case studies to undertake the required work.
- Invites a representative from Welsh Government and a representative from BT to attend a future meeting of the Select Committee to discuss broadband provision for Monmouthshire.

MONMOUTHSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Economy and Development Select Committee held at The Council Chamber, County Hall, The Rhadyr, Usk, NP15 1GA. on Thursday, 25th January, 2018 at 10.00 am

- writes to the Corporate Director for Enterprise stating that the Select Committee regards the Commercial Development Plan as a key issue and that the Select Committee would be willing to aid in the development of this plan.
- Writes to the Welsh Government Cabinet Secretary for Economy and Infrastructure extending an invitation for him to attend a future meeting of the Select Committee.

9. Council and Cabinet Business Forward Work Programme

We received the Council and Cabinet Business Forward Plan and noted its content.

10. Next Meeting

The next Economy and Development Select Committee meeting will be held in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Rhadyr, Usk, on Thursday 15th March 2018 at 10.00am.

The meeting ended at 12.50 pm.

SUBJECT: Sale of County Hall, Cwmbran
MEETING: Economy and Development Select Committee
DATE: 15 th March 2018
DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED: ALL

1. PURPOSE:

This report is to consider the disposal process and appointment of a preferred bidder of the former County Hall site.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1** That Economy and Development recommend to Cabinet the acceptance of a “subject to contract” basis the offer for the purchase of Monmouthshire County Councils 50% share of the freehold interest in the former County Hall Site to the preferred bidder.

3. KEY ISSUES:

- 3.1** The site is jointly owned by Monmouthshire Council and Torfaen County Council and a Project board was established to manage the disposal of the surplus site. Monmouthshire took the lead on the demolition of the buildings and Torfaen Estates Department has handled the marketing of the site on behalf of the two councils.
- 3.2** There have been two failed attempts to sell the site. The first sale was agreed but subsequently failed as attempts were made to reduce the price to a level that was unacceptable. The second sale was agreed to a bidder that was unable to complete the sale due to financial difficulties.
- 3.3** The Property was placed back on the market in March 2017 and following a two month marketing period six offers were received.
- 3.4** Three bidders were shortlisted and invited to carry out further due diligence on the site which would allow their offer to be further refined. Bidders were allowed access to the site to undertake technical site investigations.
- 3.5** Following a reasonable period the three parties were asked for their “best and final offers”. The preferred bidder was selected from this process following evaluation of the bids by Torfaen Estates department.
- 3.6** The preferred bidder was then allowed a period of time to work with the planners in order to refine the site design and make allowances for the layout including the siting of the

social housing and the exclusion zone around the ancient woodland area. The bidder also further refined the drainage strategies.

- 3.7 The preferred bidders refined the “abnormal costs” which saw them increase significantly most notably following issues with their drainage strategy as a result of consultation with the highways authority and clarification of the section 106 contributions.
- 3.8 Following this work a figure was arrived at which discounted the abnormal costs from the previous offer. Unfortunately this figure was below the price expectations which the councils had for the site. Further negotiations were undertaken with the preferred bidder to bring the land value in line with Council expectations and as a result the offer has been revised to a level that both Councils can agree.

4. OPTIONS APPRAISAL

- 4.1 Withdraw the site from the market – This would result in the site being land banked for a period of time to allow the market conditions to improve, particularly given its proximity to the new hospital facility. Given the uncertainties around timescales and the uplift in value that had been negotiated this option was discounted.
- 4.2 Withdraw from the preferred bidder and re-market the site – Given that the site had already been presented to the market on two separate occasions, it was considered that this was unlikely to yield any significant uplift in value and potentially blight the site in the short term. In addition Torfaen LPA are intending to introduce CIL which has the potential to reduce the receipt further.
- 4.3 Proceed with the disposal of the site to the preferred bidder – given that the land value has now been negotiated to a level that is comparable to other local transactions, this was determined to be the preferred option as it would enable both councils to realise a capital receipt and enable the provision of housing within the Torfaen area.

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA

- 5.1 See appendix 1

6. REASONS:

- 6.1 The site is a key site within Torfaen’s LDP and has been surplus since the building was demolished in 2013 following the vacation from the building in March 2012.
- 6.2 The capital receipt from the sale is earmarked to the Council’s 21st century school programme. The offer from the preferred bidder has been made subject to planning consent, however they are will not commence this process until such time both Councils have agreed to accept the offer.
- 6.3 It is intended that an overage clause will be included within the documentation to safeguard any subsequent uplift in value as a result of increasing unit numbers.

7. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

7.1 The sale of the asset will generate a capital receipt of £2,900,000, which will be shared equally between both parties following the deduction of costs which will be realised at the point of contractual completion following the grant of planning consent.

8. WELLBEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS IMPLICATIONS (INCORPORATING EQUALITIES, SUSTAINABILITY, SAFEGUARDING AND CORPORATE PARENTING):

9. CONSULTEES:

Head of Commercial and Integrated Landlord Services
Head of Operations
Cabinet Member for Resources

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS:

10.1 Previous Economy and Development Select Committee Minutes – [Click Here](#)

11. AUTHOR:

Ben Winstanley MRICS
Estates Manager

12. CONTACT DETAILS:

Tel: 01633 644965
E-mail: benwinstanley@monmouthshire.gov.uk

Evaluation Criteria – Cabinet, Individual Cabinet Member Decisions & Council

Title of Report:	
Date decision was made:	
Report Author:	

What will happen as a result of this decision being approved by Cabinet or Council?

Disposal of the former County Hall asset.

12 month appraisal

Was the desired outcome achieved? What has changed as a result of the decision? Have things improved overall as a result of the decision being taken?

What benchmarks and/or criteria will you use to determine whether the decision has been successfully implemented?

The site has been sold, Capital Receipt realised.

12 month appraisal

Paint a picture of what has happened since the decision was implemented. Give an overview of how you fared against the criteria. What worked well, what didn't work well. The reasons why you might not have achieved the desired level of outcome. Detail the positive outcomes as a direct result of the decision. If something didn't work, why didn't it work and how has that effected implementation.

What is the estimate cost of implementing this decision or, if the decision is designed to save money, what is the proposed saving that the decision will achieve?

It will realise a capital receipt of £1,450,000 less disposal costs.

12 month appraisal

Give an overview of whether the decision was implemented within the budget set out in the report or whether the desired amount of savings was realised. If not, give a brief overview of the reasons why and what the actual costs/savings were.

Any other comments

This page is intentionally left blank



<p>Name of the Officer completing the evaluation</p> <p>Ben Winstanley</p> <p>Phone no: 01633 644965</p> <p>E-mail: benwinstanley@monmouthshire.gov.uk</p>	<p>Please give a brief description of the aims of the proposal</p> <p>To dispose of the former County Hall in Cwmbran.</p>
<p>Name of Service</p>	<p>Date Future Generations Evaluation form completed</p>

Page 17





NB. Key strategies and documents that may help you identify your contribution to the wellbeing goals and sustainable development principles include: Single Integrated Plan, Continuance Agreement, Improvement Plan, Local Development Plan, People Strategy, Asset Management Plan, Green Infrastructure SPG, Welsh Language Standards, etc


1. Does your proposal deliver any of the well-being goals below? Please explain the impact (positive and negative) you expect, together with suggestions of how to mitigate negative impacts or better contribute to the goal.

Well Being Goal	Does the proposal contribute to this goal? Describe the positive and negative impacts.	What actions have been/will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
<p>A prosperous Wales Efficient use of resources, skilled, educated people, generates wealth, provides jobs</p>	<p>The sale will enable the development of housing including Social Housing in the area.</p>	
<p>A resilient Wales</p>		

Well Being Goal	Does the proposal contribute to this goal? Describe the positive and negative impacts.	What actions have been/will be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Maintain and enhance biodiversity and ecosystems that support resilience and can adapt to change (e.g. climate change)		
A healthier Wales People's physical and mental wellbeing is maximized and health impacts are understood	The development provides open space for recreation.	
A Wales of cohesive communities Communities are attractive, viable, safe and well connected	The development will provide social housing.	
A globally responsible Wales Taking account of impact on global well-being when considering local social, economic and environmental wellbeing	N/A	
A Wales of vibrant culture and thriving Welsh language Culture, heritage and Welsh language are promoted and protected. People are encouraged to do sport, art and recreation	N/A	
A more equal Wales People can fulfil their potential no matter what their background or circumstances	N/A	

2. How has your proposal embedded and prioritised the sustainable governance principles in its development?

Sustainable Development Principle	Does your proposal demonstrate you have met this principle? If yes, describe how. If not explain why.	Are there any additional actions to be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
 <p>Long Term</p> <p>Balancing short term need with long term and planning for the future</p>	<p>The sale will generate a capital receipt that is currently earmarked for investment in the 21st Century Schools program.</p>	
 <p>Collaboration</p> <p>Working together with other partners to deliver objectives</p>	<p>The site has been disposed of in collaboration with Torfaen Council.</p>	
 <p>Involvement</p> <p>Involving those with an interest and seeking their views</p>	<p>The planning process will engage with interested stakeholders.</p>	
 <p>Prevention</p> <p>Putting resources into preventing problems occurring or getting worse</p>	<p>None to note</p>	

Sustainable Development Principle	Does your proposal demonstrate you have met this principle? If yes, describe how. If not explain why.	Are there any additional actions to be taken to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
 <p>Considering impact on all wellbeing goals together and on other bodies</p>	None to note	

3. **Are your proposals going to affect any people or groups of people with protected characteristics?** Please explain the impact, the evidence you have used and any action you are taking below. For more detailed information on the protected characteristics, the Equality Act 2010 and the Welsh Language Standards that apply to Monmouthshire Council please follow this link: <http://hub/corporatedocs/Equalities/Forms/AllItems.aspx> or contact Alan Burkitt on 01633 644010 or alanburkitt@monmouthshire.gov.uk

Protected Characteristics	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Age	None to note		
Disability	None		
Gender reassignment	None		
Marriage or civil partnership	<i>None</i>		

Protected Characteristics	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on the protected characteristic	What has been/will be done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Pregnancy or maternity	<i>None</i>		
Race	<i>None</i>		
Religion or Belief	<i>None</i>		
Sex	<i>None</i>		
Sexual Orientation	<i>None</i>		
Welsh Language	<i>None</i>		

4. Council has agreed the need to consider the impact its decisions has on important responsibilities of Corporate Parenting and safeguarding. Are your proposals going to affect either of these responsibilities? For more information please see the guidance <http://hub/corporatedocs/Democratic%20Services/Safeguarding%20Guidance.docx> and for more on Monmouthshire's Corporate Parenting Strategy see <http://hub/corporatedocs/SitePages/Corporate%20Parenting%20Strategy.aspx>

	Describe any positive impacts your proposal has on safeguarding and corporate parenting	Describe any negative impacts your proposal has on safeguarding and corporate parenting	What will you do/ have you done to mitigate any negative impacts or better contribute to positive impacts?
Safeguarding	<i>None</i>		
Corporate Parenting	<i>None</i>		

5. What evidence and data has informed the development of your proposal?

Page 22

- A marketing exercise.
- Technical reports.
- Other transactional data within the area.

6. SUMMARY: As a result of completing this form, what are the main positive and negative impacts of your proposal, how have they informed/changed the development of the proposal so far and what will you be doing in future?

None

7. ACTIONS: As a result of completing this form are there any further actions you will be undertaking? Please detail them below, if applicable.

What are you going to do	When are you going to do it?	Who is responsible	Progress

8. MONITORING: The impacts of this proposal will need to be monitored and reviewed. Please specify the date at which you will evaluate the impact, and where you will report the results of the review.

The impacts of this proposal will be evaluated on:	
--	--

Page 23

VERSION CONTROL: The Future Generations Evaluation should be used at the earliest stages of decision making, and then honed and refined throughout the decision making process. It is important to keep a record of this process so that we can demonstrate how we have considered and built in sustainable development wherever possible.

Version No.	Decision making stage	Date considered	Brief description of any amendments made following consideration
1	<i>E&D select 15/03/2018</i>		<i>This will demonstrate how we have considered and built in sustainable development throughout the evolution of a proposal.</i>

This page is intentionally left blank

<p>SUBJECT: MONMOUTHSHIRE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW REPORT</p> <p>MEETING: ECONOMY AND DEVELOPMENT SELECT COMMITTEE</p> <p>DATE: 15 MARCH 2018</p> <p>DIVISION/WARDS AFFECTED: ALL</p>
--

1. PURPOSE:

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to inform the Economy and Development Select Committee of the consultation feedback on the LDP draft Review Report.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 2.1 That the Economy and Development Select Committee notes the consultation replies.

3. KEY ISSUES:

Background

- 3.1 LDP review is the task of evaluating the extent to which an adopted LDP is functioning effectively. The Regulations allow for a 'selective review' to look at part(s) of a LDP, or a 'full review', which looks at the entire LDP. There is a statutory requirement to undertake a full LDP review every four years after adoption (February 2018 for Monmouthshire).
- 3.2 A full review of the LDP commenced in 2017, with the publication of the Draft Review Report. This was considered at an all Member seminar on 30th November 2017, facilitated by the Economy and Development Select Committee, which requested that the consultation responses be reported back to the Committee.
- 3.3 The Draft Review Report was endorsed by Cabinet in December 2017 for 8 week consultation. This consultation period has now closed, responses have been considered and incorporated into the final Review Report as appropriate.
- 3.4 A table summarising the consultation replies broken down by the question being answered is attached at **Appendix 1**. The full consultation responses can be viewed grouped by representor via this link [LDP Draft Review Report Consultation Responses - Representor Order.pdf](#) to enable each representor's comments to be read in context.
- 3.5 A high level summary of consultation responses is provided below:

Question 1: Do you agree that the main issues that should be considered in the full LDP Review have been identified?

- Agree: 18 respondents
- Disagree: 12 respondents
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 5 respondents

The main issues cited by those disagreeing relate to the need for additional housing (market and affordable); the need for infrastructure to align with growth; the impact of the Severn Bridge toll removal on house prices, the accessibility of buying a house, and demand for housing/desirability of the County as a place to live; and the over-reliance of the current LDP on strategic housing sites. All of these matters would be considered as part of the new LDP.

Question 2: Do you agree that the existing LDP vision, issues and objectives remain relevant for a revised Plan?

- Agree: 15 respondents
- Disagree: 5 respondents
- Neither Agree nor Disagree: 13 respondents

The comments provided by those respondents who 'disagreed' did not generally disagree with the relevance of the existing vision, issues and objectives but rather considered that they would need to be reviewed as part of the new LDP and its strategy. This would be a natural part of the thought and decision-making process that would stem from commencing a new LDP.

Question 3: Do you agree that the adopted LDP Spatial Strategy is functioning effectively?

- Agree: 6 respondents
- Disagree: 17 respondents
- Neither Agree or Disagree: 9 respondents

The significant majority of respondents who 'disagreed' refer to the current LDP's over-reliance on strategic sites combined with a lack of flexibility in terms of housing numbers resulting in the lack of a five year housing land supply; the corresponding need for additional smaller sites accessible to other developers; and a lack of housing around main and minor villages. One respondent opposes any additional development sites. One respondent highlighted the failure to adequately assess and meet Gypsy and Traveller needs. Again, these are all matters for consideration as part of a new LDP.

Question 4: Do you agree with the findings of the LDP policy review?

- Agree: 13 respondents
- Disagree: 16 respondents disagree
- Neither Agree or Disagree: 8 respondents

The majority of comments made related to the housing provision, spatial strategy and affordable housing policies reiterating those comments reflected above. The second highest topic in terms of number of comments related to employment allocations and their relationship with commuting, growth sectors and City Deal, as well as the importance of tourism in Monmouthshire. Most other comments seek tweaks to policies which would not in themselves justify revising the LDP, but revision provides an opportunity for such changes to be made if required. Two representors object to the suggested deletion of Policy SD3, which officers consider unnecessarily duplicates but does not properly reflect national flooding policy in TAN15,

Question 5: Do you agree that the LDP needs to be revised? If so, should this be via a short form or full revision?

- Short Form: 11 respondents support a short form revision of the LDP
- Full Revision: 28 respondents support a full revision of the LDP

Next steps

3.6 The Review Report provides an overview of the issues that have been considered as part of the full review process and subsequently identifies the changes that are likely to be needed to the LDP, based on evidence. It has been informed by the findings of preceding AMRs, significant contextual changes and updates to the evidence base, and consultation responses.

3.7 Based on the evidence contained in the Review Report, it is concluded that the LDP should be revised and that this should take the form of a full revision procedure. Key reasons for reaching this conclusion include:

- The inability to meet the adopted LDP's housing requirement and the resulting failure to maintain a 5 year housing land supply indicates that either additional housing sites are required or the level of housing growth required by the Plan's strategy will need to be reconsidered;
- The need to reassess all undelivered housing allocations to determine whether they remain viable and deliverable which could result in existing allocations being removed from the LDP and new sites added. The LDP's reliance on strategic sites suggests that the spatial distribution of housing growth will need to be reconsidered;
- The extent of updates required to the evidence base for an extended Plan period, including updated needs and land requirements, could result in significant changes to the Plan;
- Wider contextual matters that have occurred since the Plan's adoption, including the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal and announcement to abolish the Severn Bridge Tolls need to be fully considered.

3.8 The potential cumulative changes required to the LDP as a consequence of these factors could result in a Plan that is distinctly different to the one adopted. Accordingly, it is considered that the full revision procedure would be the most appropriate means of revising the LDP. Importantly, the full revision procedure would enable a comprehensive reconsideration of the Plan's strategy, having regard to an extended Plan period and the wider context including the Cardiff Capital Region City Deal and Future Monmouthshire aspirations, together with the economic opportunities associated with the abolition of the Severn Bridge Tolls.

3.9 The recommendation to commence preparation of a new LDP for Monmouthshire will be considered by Council on 19th March 2018.

4. OPTIONS APPRAISAL

4.1 Not applicable. The purpose of this report is simply for the Economy and Development Select Committee to note the consultation feedback received.

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA

5.1 Not applicable. The purpose of this report is simply for the Economy and Development Select Committee to note the consultation feedback received.

6. REASONS:

6.1 Not applicable. The purpose of this report is simply for the Economy and Development Select Committee to note the consultation feedback received.

7. RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

7.1 The consultation was undertaken using existing budgets and staffing resource.

8. WELL-BEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS IMPLICATIONS:

8.1 Not applicable. The purpose of this report is simply for the Economy and Development Select Committee to note the consultation feedback received. These matters will, however, be pertinent to work on a new LDP.

8.2 There are no safeguarding or corporate parenting implications arising directly from this report.

9. CONSULTEES

- Colleagues within and working closely with the planning service have been engaged via officer working groups.
- SLT
- Cabinet
- An all Member Seminar was held on 30 November 2017 to seek views on the extent to which the current LDP is successfully delivering on its vision, strategy and objectives.
- Awareness of the Draft Review Report consultation and potentially forthcoming LDP revision was raised with other MCC services via SMT and via attendance at all Town and Community Council Cluster meetings and Bryn-y-Cwm Area Committee in January 2018.
- All parties identified as statutory consultees on the LDP and all parties who requested to be kept informed on LDP matters (433 people/organisations) were consulted on the Draft Review Report.

10. BACKGROUND PAPERS:

- Monmouthshire Adopted LDP (February 2014)
- Monmouthshire Local Development Plan Annual Monitoring Reports, 2014-15, 2015-16, 2016-17

Appendix 1: Summary of representations made on Draft Review Report ordered by question

11. AUTHORS & CONTACT DETAILS:

Mark Hand (Head of Planning, Housing and Place-Shaping)

Tel: 01633 644803.

E Mail: markhand@monmouthshire.gov.uk

Rachel Lewis (Planning Policy Manager)

Tel: 01633 644827

E Mail: rachellewis@monmouthshire.gov.uk

Appendix 2: Draft Review Report Consultation - Summary of the Key Issues Raised

A summary of the key issues raised in relation to the questions on the Draft Review Report consultation is provided below. The full consultation report on the Draft Review Report, incorporating MCC's responses and recommended changes to the Review Report, can be viewed via the following link: [LDP Draft Review Report Consultation Responses - Representor Order.pdf](#)

Table 1: Question 1 Do you agree that the main issues that should be considered in the full LDP Review have been identified?

- **Agree:** 18 respondents agree that the main issues have been identified
- **Disagree:** 12 respondents do not agree that the main issues have been identified
- **Neither Agree or Disagree:** 5 respondents neither agree or disagree that the main issues have been identified

Issue Raised	Representor	Change to Review Report (RR)
Agree that the Main issues have been identified		
Key policy indicators relating to housing provision have been considered, clear references to dwelling completions, affordable housing completions, housing land supply, the delivery of strategic housing sites and the fact they are not being achieved. Agree with most recent AMR to continue with an early review as a result of the need to address the shortfall in the housing land supply and facilitate the identification /allocation of additional housing land.	9.1, 13.1, 21.1, 23.1, 28.1, 30.1, 31.1, 47.1, 48.1, 50.1, 51.1, 52.1	No change.
Do not Agree that the Main issues have been identified		
More detail is required on infrastructure, highways and traffic.	1.1	No change. These matters will be considered as part of the LDP revision.

Issue Raised	Representor	Change to Review Report (RR)
Removal of Severn Bridge Tolls will result in additional pressure for additional housing, house prices and population in Monmouthshire.	1.1, 15.1, 20.1, 24.1, 34.1, 36.1, 37.1, 39.1, 45.1, 56.1	No change. These matters will be considered as part of the LDP revision.
Full revision needed as soon as possible, cannot afford to wait for joint working due to lack of completions since adoption. Need to ensure a continued deliverable 5 year supply of housing on suitable, deliverable sites.	12.1, 47.1	No change.
Further explanation required regarding joint working with neighbouring authorities and the production of Strategic Development Plans.	15.1, 39.1	Amendment to the RR to further address issues of joint working.
The DRR does not fully acknowledge that the adopted LDP placed an over-reliance on strategic site allocations, which have a long lead in period before development can take place.	20.1, 47.1	Amendment to RR to acknowledge an overreliance on strategic sites and lack of flexibility in the adopted LDP.
Need to extend the current plan period, the implications arising from this should be identified as a main issue. The plan period is not fully addressed, the Council should elaborate on the reason for selecting 2036 at the end of the plan period.	20.1, 23.1, 39.1	RR to be amended to clarify the proposed plan period.
More explanation and consideration of population and household projections should be provided.	20.1, 26.1, 34.1, 37.1, 46.1, 53.1	No change. These matters will be considered as part of the LDP revision.

Table 2: Question 2 Do you agree that the existing LDP vision, issues and objectives remain relevant for a revised Plan?

- **Agree:** 15 respondents agree that the existing LDP vision, issues and objectives remain relevant for a revised Plan
- **Disagree:** 5 respondents do not agree that existing LDP vision, issues and objectives remain relevant for a revised Plan
- **Neither Agree or Disagree:** 13 respondents neither agree or disagree that the existing LDP vision, issues and objectives remain relevant for a revised Plan

Issue Raised	Representor	Change to Review Report (RR)
Agree that the existing LDP vision, issues and objectives remain relevant for a revised Plan.		
The current LDP objectives and the Local Well-Being Plan objectives are complimentary to the seven goals of the Well-Being of Future Generations Act.	11.2, 40.2	No change
Support the LDP Spatial Strategy for focusing development within the three main market towns followed by Severnside Settlements.	12.2, 15.2	No change.
Do not agree that the existing LDP vision, issues and objectives remain relevant for a revised Plan.		
Need to add more flexibility into the Spatial Vision of the Plan, should be more focus on delivering housing outside the main towns to ensure continuity of supply and a range of sites to aid wider housing delivery.	9.2	No change. These matters will be considered as part of the LDP revision.
Since adoption of the LDP there have been a number of important contextual changes at a national, regional and local level that need to be considered in the vision, issue and objectives.	23.2, 36.2	As above.
The current housing supply position should also be reflected in the vision/issues and objectives. The failure to balance housing supply with demand has resulted in a worsening in the affordability of housing.	23.2	As above.
There are emerging issues which should be added that could influence the vision, issues and objectives, specifically, any impact as a result of the Severn Tolls abolition.	22.2, 23.2, 48.2, 52.2	As above.

Table 3: Question 3 Do you agree that the adopted LDP Spatial Strategy is functioning effectively?

- **Agree:** 6 respondents agree that the strategy is working
- **Disagree:** 17 respondents do not agree that the strategy is working
- **Neither Agree or Disagree:** 9 respondents neither agree or disagree with the functioning of the strategy

Key Issues Raised	Representor	Change to Review Report (RR)
Agree that the Strategy is Working		
Support strategy of focusing development in 3 main towns but additional sites needed which accord with this strategy	12.3, 15.3, 16.3, 47.3	Amend RR to make a recommendation on whether the strategy needs revising and, if so, the form the revision should take.
Spatial strategy is robust and effective	22.3	As above.
Strategy functioned effectively directing growth to higher order settlements. New strategy should continue to allow for housing growth in Severnside settlements to ensure alignment between economic and housing strategies (links to CCR City Deal and tolls)	45.3	As above.
Disagree that the Strategy is Working		
Strategy not working due to failure to make adequate assessment of need for gypsy traveller pitches and allocation of sites to meet existing need	4.3	As above.
Strategy failed due to overreliance on delivery of strategic sites and insufficient flexibility to allow for other sources of housing to come forward – led to shortfall of completions.	3.2, 13.3, 21.3, 40.3	As above.
Undelivered housing allocations need to be re-assessed to ensure they remain viable and deliverable	3.2, 13.3, 21.3, 34.2, 36.3	As above.
Need for greater flexibility and additional site allocations. Scope for increased delivery / small-medium size developments in Rural Secondary Settlements and Rural settlements.	23.3, 40.3, 42.2	As above.
Strategy should be reviewed in light of extended plan period and contextual changes since LDP adoption (aspirations and opportunities associated with CCR City Deal and Tolls)	23.3, 36.3, 53.3, 56.3	As above.

Key Issues Raised	Representor	Change to Review Report (RR)
Strategy should be re-assessed to include release of land outside settlement limits/ potential de-allocation of green wedge land.	36.3	As above.
60% AH contribution for main village sites should be reconsidered as too high (a reduction would improve viability of such sites and enable more to come forward)	3.2, 26.3, 42.3	As above.
Strategy too reliant on larger main town developments. Should consider development of smaller 'secondary' and 'rural' areas,	11.3	As above.
Level of housing growth needs to be reconsidered – 2014 projections cannot be relied on; factor in current undersupply due to allocated sites not coming forward at expected rates.	12.3, 15.3	As above.
Level of housing growth should not be reduced to past build rates (due to lack of 5 year supply against residual method)	20.3, 47.3	As above.
No justification in reviewing deliverability of outstanding strategic allocations	16.3	As above.
Oppose any additional sites – existing sites should be retained and reviewed properly	26.3	As above.
Strategy should be refined to encourage growth in a range of settlements including settlements where there has been no housing provision. There may have been changes to settlements that would have improved their level of sustainability e.g. Llanover – now a village shop	46.3	As above.
Strategy should include minor villages (up to 15 dwellings with focus on AH)	50.3	As above.
Strategy too focused on Severnside at expense of other areas e.g. Usk, which are suitable for additional development	51.3	As above.
Appropriate amount of development should be considered in rural areas to fulfil housing need (current strategy failed to detriment of rural locations)	52.3	As above.

Table 4: Question 4 Do you agree with the findings of the LDP policy review?

- **Agree:** 13 respondents agree with the findings of the LDP policy review
- **Disagree:** 16 respondents disagree with the findings of the LDP policy review
- **Neither Agree or Disagree:** 8 respondents neither agree or disagree with the findings of the LDP policy review

Main Issues Raised	Representor	Change to Review Report (RR)
<p>Policy S1 Spatial Distribution of New Housing Provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four representors consider that undelivered sites need to be de-allocated, and additional sites allocated. • Two representors consider that the spatial strategy is too reliant on housing in the main towns/Sevenside. • Other representors consider that this emphasis on the main towns is correct. • One representor considers that Sevenside had a disproportionate level of growth. • Five representors consider that there is scope for additional housing development in Rural Secondary Settlements or villages, with one representor referring to the requirement in TAN2 to ensure that all communities, both urban and rural, have sufficient good quality housing for their needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9.4, 13.4, 15.3, 16.4 • 11.3, 40.3 • 12.2, 20.2 • 20.2 • 23.3, 40.3, 42.1, 46.4, 52.3 	<p>Comments noted. Policy amendments will be considered as part of the LDP revision.</p>
<p>Policy S2 Housing Provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four representors consider that undelivered sites need to be de-allocated, and additional sites allocated. • One representor seeks a transparent dialogue before any sites are deallocated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 9.4, 13.4, 15.3, 16.4 • 45.4 	<p>As above.</p>
<p>Policy S3 Strategic Housing Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five representors consider that the LDP is overly reliant on strategic housing sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 13.4, 20.1, 21.3, 40.3, 47.5 	<p>RR amended to acknowledge the overreliance on strategic housing sites in the adopted LDP. Policy amendments will be considered as</p>

Main Issues Raised	Representor	Change to Review Report (RR)
		part of the LDP revision.
<p>Policy S4 Affordable Housing Provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One representor considered that affordable housing policies would benefit from clearer explanation. • One representor stresses the importance of affordable housing and considers that some employment allocations could be revised to allow affordable housing allocations. • Two representors reiterate the need for affordable housing requirements to be looked at flexibly and to be based on viability evidence. • One representor expresses concern that affordable housing requirements might be reduced. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.4 • 7.5 • 9.4, 21.4 • 28.4 	Comments noted. Policy amendments will be considered as part of the LDP revision.
<p>Policy S9 Employment Sites Provision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One representor considers that employment allocations should be revised to reflect e-commerce. • One representor requests the allocation of good quality, accessible employment sites in Abergavenny to reduce the need to travel. • One representor requests a revision of employment allocations to maximise the benefits from City Deal and changes to the Severn Bridge tolls. • One representor considers that small scale employment allocations should be made in minor villages. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7.6 • 33.2 • 36.3 • 48.4 	As above.
<p>Policy S11 Visitor Economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One representor supports the policy's aim to encourage tourism. • One representor considers that allocations for larger facilities is needed in addition to promoting sustainable tourism such as glamping. • One representor considers that the existing policy is overly restrictive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30.2 • 36.4 • 48.2 	As above.
<p>Policy S13 Landscape, Green Infrastructure and the Natural Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One representor seeks clarification of this policy in particular with regard to how it affects development viability. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 34.3 	As above.

Main Issues Raised	Representor	Change to Review Report (RR)
<p>Policy H8 Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One representor cautions against confusion need for pitches with demand. • One representor does not agree that Policy H8 is functioning effectively and argues that the 2009 needs assessment needs to be revised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.2 • 4.4 	As above.
<p>Policy RET1 Primary Shopping Frontages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One representor supports a review of this policy to ensure designations are up to date and appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30.2 	As above.
<p>Policy SD1 Renewable Energy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One representor considers that renewable energy should be supported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 30.2 	As above.
<p>Policy SD2 Sustainable Construction and Energy Efficiency</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One representor suggests that this policy may no longer be a planning function so should be reviewed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.3 	As above.
<p>Policy SD3 Flood Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two representors object to the deletion of this important policy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24.6, 26.6 	As above.
<p>Policy LC6 Green Wedges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two representors consider that Green Wedges should be reviewed to allow additional housing growth. • One representor considers that Green Wedges should become Green Belt to be strengthened. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16.4, 47.3 • 26.6 	As above.
<p>Policy M2 Minerals Safeguarding Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One representor considers that mineral safeguarding areas should be reviewed to ensure they are fit for purpose. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 16.4 	As above.

Main Issues Raised	Representor	Change to Review Report (RR)
Policy MV1 Proposed Developments and Highway <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One representor considers this policy needs to be strengthened to ensure sustainable development is accompanied by infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 26.6 	As above.
Policy MV2 Sustainable Transport Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One representor suggested performance under this policy has probably improved but a detailed analysis could explore the scope for greater effectiveness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 37.4 	As above.
Policy MV6 Canals and Redundant Rail Routes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One representor considers that the benefit of this policy is limited due to its limited scope and that a strong canal-related policy should replace it, emphasising the multiple benefits of the Mon-Brecon Canal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6.1 	As above.
Heritage Policies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One representor considers that heritage policies will need to be reconsidered in light of the Historic Environment Act. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 49.1 	As above.
Policy DES1 General Design Considerations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One respondent questions if this policy is functioning entirely effectively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 34.3 	As above.
Policy DES2 Areas of Amenity Importance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One representor expresses concern that open spaces are being reviewed but they will be more important if extra development is to be proposed. One representor welcomes this review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 28.4 34.3 	As above.
Policy SAH11 Main Villages <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two representors considers that policy amendments are needed to make SAH11 Main Village sites viable and deliverable. One representor would welcome the reconsideration of sites for affordable housing if other constraints have been overcome. One representor strongly objects to any additional development sites main villages. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.5, 9.3 5.1 26.6 	As above.

Table 5: Question 5 Do you agree that the LDP needs to be revised? If so, short form or full revision?

- **Short Form:** 11 respondents support a short form revision of the LDP
- **Full Revision:** 28 respondents support a full revision of the LDP

Main Issues Raised	Representor	Change to Review Report (RR)
Support a Short Form Revision		
SFR to enable Policy SAH11 to be revised (ensure main village allocations are viable and deliverable)	3.5	RR to be amended to make a recommendation on whether or not a LDP revision should take place and, if so, whether it should be a short form or full revision.
SFR to enable housing supply situation to be addressed	32.5, 40.5	As above
SFR unlikely to require substantial allocations of new housing land or a new spatial strategy, it may enable some other revisions and would avoid a policy vacuum. Provides breathing space for regional /interregional needs to be assessed. Comments on joint plans but notes that given political and practical challenges of collaborative working do not consider that a joint plan could be adopted in time to avoid a policy vacuum. SFR would allow time to progress on SDP providing context for a joint LDP. Concern that joint plan would be less tuned to needs of Monmouthshire’s towns/countryside and residents would have less influence on policies and proposals.	37.5	As above
SFR would allow for some critical new ‘local’ policies to be put in place quickly and would avoid a potential policy vacuum after 2021.	55.4	As above

Main Issues Raised	Representor	Change to Review Report (RR)
Support a Full Revision		
Full revision to ensure all housing needs, including G/T, are addressed	4.5	As above
Full revision needed to meet WG regulations, ensure provision made to extend the plan period. Existing strategy is not working, need for updated housing requirements and land allocations to end of revised plan period.	9.5, 13.5, 21.5	As above
Full revision needed to ensure strategies and policies are kept up-to-date based on latest evidence to support the future supply of housing.	12.5, 15.5, 45.5	As above
Full review should commence as soon as possible – MCC cannot afford to wait for joint working on a joint plan given current housing land supply situation	15.5	As above
Full review needed to take account of contextual, legislative and policy changes that have occurred e.g. CCR City Deal (economic opportunities)	16.5, 23.5, 24.5, 39.5	As above
Main towns should remain focus of revised strategy	21.5	As above
Full revision would ensure all matters are properly considered.	22.5	As above
Full revision would ensure LDP considers and addresses all factors (not just housing supply). This is important given interaction between housing supply and other aspects of the LDP e.g. policies (including spatial strategy, economic aspirations, infrastructure requirements and environmental/ landscape designations). Consequences of the level of change required justifies full revision.	23.5, 47.5	As above
Full revision – enable new, deliverable, viable housing allocations	34.5	As above
Full revision – enable significant changes to the level and spatial distribution of growth over a longer plan period. Extended plan period and associated land requirements will result in substantial changes to the strategy.	36.5	As above
Full revision required to address shortfall in housing land supply and to identify additional sites. Level and distribution of growth must have regard to contextual matters such as tolls, CCR City Deal (align with economic aspirations for the region). Full revision needed in addition to progressing a SDP.	53.5	As above

Table 6: Question 6 Other Comments on the Draft Review Report

Main Issues Raised	Representor	Change to Review Report (RR)
Consider opportunities associated with the removal of the Severn Bridge Tolls	1.8	No change. This matter will be considered and addressed as part of the LDP revision.
Should not rely solely on the 2011 and 2014 projections. A wide range of factors should be taken into consideration in considering growth options, including the opportunities associated with the abolition of Severn Bridge Toll and CCR City Deal.	9.6, 13.6, 21.6, 22.6, 23.6	As above.
Ensure Welsh Water are consulted to ensure the provision of foul drainage to mains public sewer on allocated sites is feasible within their AMP programme. Consider whether SFCA is required.	10.4, 35.1	As above.
Further consideration should be given to the potential for preparing a joint plan.	14.1	Review Report to be amended to further address this issue.
Suggest that an urban capacity study is carried out to consider capacity of growth of main towns and identify appropriate 'preferred directions' for future housing development – could inform the candidate site assessment process.	20.6	No change. This matter will be considered and addressed as part of the LDP revision.
Consider that preparation of a joint plan with neighbouring authorities would not be efficient or appropriate at the present time as it would delay provision of appropriate plan-led controls in place to guide local development. A SDP would provide the suitable regional tier of plan and would allow for further collaborative working.	22.6	No change.
Suitability of some housing sites needs to be reassessed.	28.6	No change. This matter will be considered and addressed as part of the LDP revision.
Community involvement in the revision process, including housing growth and site selection, is very important. Role of place plans and town teams should be recognised.	29.1, 33.6	As above.
Any new housing growth must be matched by growth in infrastructure.	29.1	As above.

Main Issues Raised	Representor	Change to Review Report (RR)
A number of representors are seeking to promote sites.	9, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 47, 48, 50, 51, 52	As above.

This page is intentionally left blank

Economy and Development Select Committee

Action List

25th January 2018

Minute Item:	Subject	Officer	Outcome
5.	Revenue and Capital Monitoring 2017/18 Outturn Statement - Period 2	Kellie Beirne / Debra Hill-Howells	A brief summary regarding the former County Hall site and the Morrison's development to be circulated to the Select Committee.
7.	Pre-Decision Scrutiny - Section 106 Procedure Note and Policy Guidance	Mark Hand	County Councillor Blakebrough to be invited to join the Section 106 Working Group.
8.	Economy and Development Select Committee Forward Work Planner	County Councillor Blakebrough	Procurement Workshops – County Councillor Blakebrough to write a summary of progress to date and circulate to the Select Committee.
		Hazel Ilett / Paula Harris	Cross Border Authorities – A working group to be established to identify key priorities before meeting with cross border authorities. Establish officer interest to facilitate this working group.
		County Councillor Pavia / Paula Harris	Write to the Deputy Chief Executive to ask if resource can be found to focus on broadband provision

			within the County for the next two years.
		County Councillor Pavia / Paula Harris	Ask the Deputy Chief Executive to write to Welsh Government requesting that Monmouthshire County Council receives its allocation of Welsh Government money, as the Authority has the case studies to undertake the required work.
		County Councillor Pavia / Paula Harris	Invite a representative from Welsh Government and a representative from BT to attend a future meeting of the Select Committee to discuss broadband provision for Monmouthshire.
		County Councillor Pavia / Paula Harris	Write to the Corporate Director, Enterprise stating that the Select Committee regards the Commercial Development Plan as a key issue and that the Select Committee would be willing to aid in the development of this plan.
		County Councillor Pavia / Paula Harris	Write to the Welsh Government Cabinet Secretary for Economy and Infrastructure extending an invitation for him to attend a future meeting of the Select Committee.

Monmouthshire's Scrutiny Forward Work Programme 2017

Economy Select Committee				
Meeting Date	Subject	Purpose of Scrutiny	Responsibility	Type of Scrutiny
15th March 2018	Sale of County Hall	Oversight of this report requested by Members prior to a council decision.	Roger Hoggins	Pre-decision Scrutiny
	Local Development Plan Review	Reporting back following consultation, ahead of a decision to be taken by Council on 19 th March to commence a new LDP.	Mark Hand	Policy Development
	Marketing Monmouthshire for Business	First meeting Update ~ verbal feedback	Chair Councillor Paul Pavia	Working Group
CROSS BORDER VISIT Page 45 eBC	Meet border/neighbouring English councils	Discussion on issues that cross county boundaries to explore any synergies/learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Affordable housing, transport ✓ Impact of the removal of the Severn Tolls ✓ Tourism and enterprise 	Kellie Beirne Mark Hand	Action Learning
26th April 2018	Abergavenny Outdoor Structure *TBC*	Contact Cllrs Woodhouse and Powell if deferring.	Rachael Rogers	Pre-decision Scrutiny
7th June 2018				
19th July 2018				

Monmouthshire's Scrutiny Forward Work Programme 2017

Future Meeting Items:

Agreed Scrutiny Focus for 2017-18:

- Affordable housing, transport and the LDP
- Impact of the removal of the Severn Tolls
- City Deal and the regional agenda (business plan sign off February 2018)
- Tourism and enterprise

- **ICT in Schools** ~ scrutinise jointly with CYP Select ~ Post Evaluation Review to return. Joint scrutiny of the outcomes for young people: Implementing the technology → delivering the teaching and learning → digital attainment levels.

Work Programme Items for circulation:

Agreed for the following reports to be emailed as opposed to tabled (unless requested by members):

- **Velethon Report for 2017 when available**
- **I County Strategy 2** ~ revised strategy to incorporate digital maturity and culture ~ October
- **People Strategy** ~ corporate strategy for staff ~ October
- **Information Strategy** ~ linking 3 strands: information governance, data insight and digital data ~ October
- **Employability Grant** ~ October
- **'Inspire Programme' Extension** ~ October

Cabinet, Council and Individual Cabinet Member Decisions (ICMD) Forward Plan

Monmouthshire County Council is required to publish a forward plan of all key decisions to be taken. Council and Cabinet items will only be considered for decision if they have been included on the planner no later than the month preceding the meeting, unless the item is considered urgent.

Committee / Decision Maker	Meeting date / Decision due	Subject	Purpose	Author	Date item added to the planner	Date item originally scheduled for decision
Cabinet	05/09/18	Regional Safeguarding Board Annual Report		Claire Marchant		
Cabinet	04/07/18	Youth Enterprise - European Structure Fund (ESF) Programmes - Inspire2Work extension		Hannah Jones		
Cabinet	04/07/18	Chief Officer Annual Report		Claire Marchant		
Council	21/06/18	Safeguarding Evaluative Report		Claire Marchant		
Council	10/05/18	Safeguarding Review		Claire Marchant		
Council	10/05/18	Childrens Services Report		Claire Marchant		
ICMD	09/05/18	Supporting People contract procurement exemptions		Chris Robinson	15/02/18	
Cabinet	02/05/18	Adoption of Road Safety Strategy		Paul Keeble		
Council	19/04/18	Chief Officer Report CYP		Will Mclean	25/01/18	
Council	19/04/18	Sale of old County Hall Site		Roger Hoggins	16/02/18	
Cabinet	11/04/18	VAWDASV		Joe Skidmore	08/02/18	
Cabinet	11/04/18	S106 Procedure Note and S106 Guidance Note		Mark Hand	Ca	
Cabinet	11/04/18	Welsh Church Fund Working Group	The purpose of this report is to make recommendations to Cabinet on the Schedule of Applications 2017/18, meeting 6 held on the 22nd February 2018	Dave Jarrett		
Cabinet	11/04/18	Crick Road Business Case		Claire Marchant		
Cabinet	11/04/18	Tree Policy		Roger Hoggins	19/02/18	
Cabinet	11/04/18	Disposal of County Hall		Roger Hoggins		
Cabinet	11/04/18	Civil Parking Enforcements		Paul Keeble		07/03/18
Cabinet	11/04/18	Kerbcraft Update	DEFERRED TO APRIL			07/03/18
Cabinet	11/04/18	The Knoll, Section 106 funding, Abergavenny	DEFERRED TO APRIL	Mike Moran		07/03/18
Cabinet	11/04/18	Chippenham Mead Play Area	DEFERRED TO APRIL	Mike Moran		07/03/18
ICMD	28/03/18	Section 106 Major Maintenance Capital for the repairs to the footbridge over the Gavenny at Penyval,		Nigel Leaworthy		
ICMD	28/03/18	Operational Changes to Trading Standards		Gareth Walters/Sara Jones	27/02/18	
ICMD	28/03/18	Staffing Restructure of SCH Workforce Development Team		Sian Sexton	05/03/18	
ICMD	28/03/18	Children with Disability - Hierachy Update		Claire Robins	05/03/18	
ICMD	28/03/18	Children's Services Business Support Team - Hierachy Update		Claire Robins	05/03/18	
ICMD	28/03/18	Social Care & Health - Business Support Post		Claire Robins	05/03/18	

ICMD	28/03/18	Adoption of highway management plan including appointment of Highway Asset inspector and changes to Asset Planning Officer posts		Paul Keeble		
Council	19/03/18	LDP		Mark Hand		
Council	19/03/18	City Deal Business Plan		Paul Matthews		
ICMD	28/03/18	Property Maintenance Framework Agreement		Phil Kenney/P Murphy	06/03/18	
ICMD	14/03/18	2nd Phase Families Support Review		Claire Marchant		
ICMD	14/03/18	Future of Melin Private Leasing Scheme		Ian Bakewell	15/02/18	
ICMD	14/03/18	Award Garden Waste Contract		Carl Touhig		
ICMD	14/03/18	\$106 Transport Projects		Richard Cope		
Cabinet	07/03/18	2018/19 Education and Welsh Church Trust Funds Investment and Fund strategies	To present to Cabinet for approval the 2018/19 Investment Fund Strategy for Trust Funds for which the authority acts as sole or custodian trustee for adoption and to approve the 2017/18 grant allocation to LA beneficiaries of the Welsh Church Fund	Dave Jarrett		
Cabinet	07/03/18	EAS Business Plan		Will Mclean		
Cabinet	07/03/18	Review of Additional Learning Needs and inclusion services	To seek cabinet approval to commence the statutory consultation process associated with proposed changes to ALN and Inclusion Services	Matthew Jones		
Cabinet	07/03/18	Turning the World Upside Down	DEFERRED	Claire Marchant		
Cabinet	07/03/18	Proposed changes to the schools mfunding formulafor the funding of building maintenance costs	To seek approval to reduce the funding of building maintenance costs for our new schools	Nikki Wellington		
Cabinet	07/03/18	Whole Authority Risk Assessment		Richard Jones		
Cabinet	07/03/18	Replacement document management system for revenues		Ruth Donovan		
Cabinet	07/03/18	Corporate Parenting Strategy		Claire Marchant		
Council	01/03/18	Council Tax Resolution 2018/19		Ruth Donovan		
Council	01/03/18	Approval of public service board well-being plan		Matt Gatehouse		
Council	01/03/18	Area Plan - Population Needs Assessment		Claire Marchant		
Council	01/03/18	Pooled fund for care homes		Claire Marchant		
Council	01/03/18	Social Justice Policy	ITEM DEFERRED	Cath Fallon		
Council	01/03/18	Treasury Strategy		Peter Davies	08/02/18	
ICMD	28/02/18	Charges in relation to the delivery of the auths private water supply responsibilities		Huw Owen		
ICMD	28/02/18	Gypsy and Traveller Pitch allocation policy report		Steve Griffiths		
ICMD	28/02/18	Fixed Penalty Notice charges for fly tipping offences		Huw Owen/Sara Jones		
ICMD	28/02/18	Re-designation of Shared Housing		Ian Bakewell/Greenland		
ICMD	28/02/18	Restructure of Mental health Social Work Staffing		John Woods	08/02/18	
ICMD	28/02/18	Staffing Restructure of Adult Disability Service		John Woods	08/02/18	

ICMD	28/02/18	Removal of under 18 burial charges		Deb Hill Howells		
ICMD	28/02/18	Recruitment for Maternity Cover: Development Management Team		Phil Thomas	08/02/18	
Cabinet	28/02/18	Borough Theatre		Tracey Thomas	19/02/18	
Cabinet	28/02/18	Final Budget Proposals		Peter Davies		
Council	15/02/18	Pay Policy		Sally Thomas		
Council	15/02/18	Corporate Plan		Kellie Beirne		
Council	15/02/18	Active Travel Plan and Civil Parking Enforcement		Roger Hoggins		
ICMD	14/02/18	Development Management Enhanced Services proposals		Phil Thomas		
ICMD	14/02/18	Residents only parking permit scheme Usk View, Merthyr Road, Abergavenny		Paul Keeble		
ICMD	14/02/18	Usk in Bloom		Cath Fallon		
ICMD	14/02/18	Loan to Foster Carers		Jane Rodgers		
ICMD	14/02/18	Public Health Wales Act - Intimate Piercing		David Jones		
ICMD	14/02/18	Personal Transport Budgets		Roger Hoggins		
ICMD	14/02/18	All Wales Play opportunities grant		Matthew Lewis/Cllr Greenland		
ICMD	08/02/18	Fixed Penalty Notice charges for fly tipping offences		Huw Owen		03/01/18
ICMD	31/01/18	Staffing changes in Policy and Governance		Matt Gatehouse		
ICMD	31/01/18	Seasonal Garden Waste Collections		Carl Touhig		
Cabinet	29/01/18	ADM		Kellie Beirne		
Cabinet	29/01/18	Corporate Plan		Kellie Beirne		
Council	18/01/18	Council Tax Reduction Scheme 2018/19		Ruth Donovan		
Council	18/01/18	Response to Older Adults Mental Health Consultation		Claire Marchant		
ICMD	17/01/18	Supporting People Programme Grant Spendplan 2018-19		Chris Robinson		03/01/18
ICMD	17/01/18	Trainee Accountant Regrade		Tyrone Stokes		
ICMD	17/01/18	Local Government (Wales) Act 1994 The Local Authorities (Precepts)9wlaes) Regulations 1995		Joy Robson/Mark Howcroft		
Cabinet	10/01/18	Welsh Church Fund Working Group	The purpose of this report is to make recommendations to Cabinet on the Schedule of Applications 2017/18, meeting 5 held on the 14th December 2017	Dave Jarrett		
Cabinet	10/01/18	Re-Use Shop at Ilanfoist Household Recycling Centre		Roger Hoggins		
Cabinet	10/01/18	Budget Monitoring Report	The purpose of this report is to provide members with information on the forecast outturn position of the authority at end of month reporting for 2016/17 financial year	Joy Robson/Mark Howcroft		
Cabinet	10/01/18	Chepstow Cluster - proposed distribution of Section 106 monies	To agree the distribution of section 106 to the cluster	Nikki Wellington		
Cabinet	10/01/18	Management of obstructions in the public highway		Roger Hoggins		

This page is intentionally left blank