

Subject:	New Homes For Neighbourhoods – Rotherfield Crescent – Scheme Approval		
Date of Meeting:	19 September 2018 – Housing and New Homes Committee 11 October 2018 – Policy, Resources & Growth Committee		
Report of:	Executive Director Economy, Environment & Culture		
Contact Officer:	Name:	Jo Thompson	Tel: 01273 291466
	Email:	Jo.thompson@brighton-hove.gov.uk	
Ward(s) affected:	Patcham		

FOR GENERAL RELEASE**1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND POLICY CONTEXT**

- 1.1 Building new homes on council land is a council priority and essential if City Plan housing targets are to be met and the city's housing crisis tackled. The council's New Homes for Neighbourhoods (NHFN) programme addresses this undersupply by identifying suitable vacant land and infill sites to develop new homes across the city. To date, 159 council homes for affordable rent have been completed under the New Homes for Neighbourhoods programme, 12 are on site and will be completed in May 2019, with over 100 more homes in the pipeline.
- 1.2 The Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Design Competition held in 2015/16 was one of a number of pilot projects identified in the Small Site Strategy (agreed by Housing Committee, March 2014) to deliver housing units on the smaller sites within the NHFN programme. The Rotherfield Crescent scheme on the former garages site is one of four designs which have been taken forward for further design development work.
- 1.3 The design proposals and scheme costings for the Rotherfield Crescent site drawn up by the architects, Innes Associates, were presented to Members at the Housing and New Homes Committee meeting on 15 November 2017. At this meeting, members expressed concerns about the scheme costs presented in the Part 2 report. They felt that the costs were high and that officers should explore ways in which these costs could be reduced through identifying possible savings. It was consequently decided that the report be deferred for consideration at a future Housing & New Homes Committee.
- 1.4 This report presents five options for consideration by members. It identifies a preferred option (Option 1) and recommends that this is taken forward to the detailed design stage.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS:

2.1 That the Housing & New Homes Committee note the options and associated risks presented in paras 4.1-4.2. of this report.

2.2 That the Housing & New Homes Committee agrees Option 1 and approves:

- i. The proposed scheme of four new council homes at Rotherfield Crescent, Brighton under the New Homes for Neighbourhoods programme;
- ii. The procurement of a development partner and professional services for the delivery of the project and give delegated authority to the Executive Director, Environment, Economy and Culture in consultation with the Executive Director, Finance and Resources to award the contract following completion of the procurement process;
- iii. The scheme rent levels at 37.5% of Living Wage, in line with the New Homes Rent Policy;

2.3 That the Housing and New Homes Committee recommend to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee to:

- iv. Appropriate the Rotherfield Crescent former garages site for planning purposes and delegate authority to the Executive Director of Environment, Economy and Culture to appropriate for housing once the development is complete.

3. CONTEXT/ BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The site

3.1 The site is located on Housing Revenue Account (HRA) land at the centre of a ring of houses on the Hollingbury Estate and comprises an area of approximately 1,175 sq m (see Appendix 1). It slopes significantly from the highest point in the south-eastern corner to the lowest in the north-western, a difference of approximately 3.5m. The elevated position and separation of properties provides attractive views over the A27 towards Saddlescombe and the wider landscape of the South Downs National Park. Access to the site is along a 40m track from an existing junction with Rotherfield Crescent between numbers 59 and 61 Rotherfield Crescent.

3.2 There are 10 garages on the site which are owned by the council, the majority of which are in a dilapidated state and are unused. The site also provides access to nine privately-owned garages at the rear of some of the surrounding properties. Consultation with garage owners has revealed that these are principally used for general storage purposes rather than for cars. Due to its unkempt appearance and hidden away location, the site has attracted anti-social behaviour such as fly tipping in the past.

Proposed new homes and construction

3.3 The development proposed by Innes Associates is for the demolition of the existing council-owned garages and the construction of four family houses, of which three are 3-bedroom and one is 2-bedroom. The Original Scheme Briefing Note is included at Appendix 2.

Member feedback from 15 November 2017 committee meeting

3.4 Officers have reviewed the minutes of the Housing & New Homes Committee meeting held on 15 November 2017 in order to ensure that the concerns expressed by Members have been adequately addressed. Since the meeting, the design has been amended and value engineered to take on board Members concerns about costs (see Appendix 3). Innes Associates and their Cost Consultants (Millbridge Group) have reviewed the previous scheme costs and identified the following savings:

- Changes to Gross Internal Area (GIA) from 320m² to 300m² (reducing allowances for finishes/ M&E and effecting changes to the fabric elsewhere);
- Reduced area and allowance for windows;
- Removal of communal building;
- Reduced allowance for external works and landscaping;
- Saving in PV allowance and foundations, due to the omission of the communal building. PVs still retained on housing units;
- Rationalisation of external surfaces across the whole site and reduction in lighting;
- Reduction in cost overall leading to a review of the estimated contract period and a reduction in preliminaries;
- Single ply roof (£120/ m²) instead of the previous green roof (£220/ m²). However, officers would need to make sure that this revised specification will meet planning requirements. If the Local Planning Authority insists, it may be possible to consider a basic sedum roof (£180/ m²); and
- Allowance for kitchens has been reduced.

3.5 This value engineering exercise has realised a saving of 15% (£178,000) on total scheme costs from £1.215M to £1.037M. A report providing a detailed breakdown of costs has been sent to all Members and briefings have also been offered to run through the report in more detail.

3.6 The savings which have been achieved are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1 – Scheme cost comparisons between original and revised scheme

Cost area	Estimate £'000 Original Scheme	Estimate £'000 Revised Scheme	Estimate £'000 Savings
Base cost	558	516	42
Demolitions and alterations	28	28	0
Renewables	33	28	5
External works	205	128	77
Preliminaries, overheads	140	134	6

Cost area	Estimate £'000 Original Scheme	Estimate £'000 Revised Scheme	Estimate £'000 Savings
and profit			
Design/ construction contingency	63	42	21
Tender price inflation	77	67	10
Total build cost	1,104	943	161
Fees (Professional, Planning, Building Regs, specialist surveys etc.) at 10%	111	94	17
Total Scheme Costs	1,215	1037	178

- 3.7 This translates into a base cost of £129k per unit or total build cost per unit of £236k which is a saving of £40k per unit on the original scheme. A more detailed breakdown of some of the main savings which have been made is contained in Table 2, this doesn't include savings on Preliminaries, overheads and profit or Design and Construction contingency.

Table 2 – Scheme savings

Cost Item	Original Scheme	Revised Scheme	Saving
External works and landscaping	£205,000	£128,000	-£77,000
Communal building	£23,840	£0 (omitted)	-£23,840
Changes in roof design	£62,900	£44,625	-£18,275
Reduced allowance for kitchen units	£70,000	£60,000	-£10,000
Window design simplified and size reduced	£52,075	£47,100	-£4,975
Saving in PV allowance due to omission of communal building	£4,500	£0 (omitted)	-£4,500

- 3.8 All of the savings detailed in Tables 1 and 2, have been achieved without fundamentally compromising the design of the scheme which, the majority of residents adjoining the site, liked.

Independent Review of Revised Costs

- 3.9 The revised scheme drawings and associated costs produced by Innes Associates (the architects) were independently reviewed by the council's cost consultants under its City Build partnership (Potter Raper). The pricing and apportionment of costs differ slightly, as do the inclusions for risk items

(asbestos, contamination, boundary treatments etc.). However, Potter Raper consider that the magnitude of costs provided by Millbridge appear to be accurate for the works described in their cost report.

- 3.10 As part of their remit to identify further savings, Potter Raper requested prices from a modular construction contractor, without revealing the details of the site or the design team in order to preserve the “cleanliness” of possible future tender procedures.

Modular/ Volumetric Contractor Costings

- 3.11 The modular supplier’s cost estimate for the construction of the scheme is approximately £789k, excluding professional fees and other costs associated with those works that they would not be asked to complete i.e. allowances for preliminaries, external works, substructure, demolitions, risk and PV systems, plus M&E services, sanitary ware etc. Once these additional costs are taken into account, Potter Raper estimate that the total scheme costs for a modular scheme are likely to be in the region of £1.2M, which is very similar to Innes Associates’ total scheme costs reported at Housing Committee in November 2017. It may be possible to identify some additional savings by looking at different cladding options, the removal of non-standard items such as roof-lights etc. alongside savings made due to the shorter construction programme associated with modular construction. However, a modular scheme, even with revisions, is unlikely to match the level of savings achieved by Innes Associates’ value engineered scheme.

Conclusion

- 3.12 The independent review carried out by Potter Raper provides reasonable assurance for the revised scheme costings provided by Millbridge Group on behalf of Innes Associates, which realised a saving of 15% (£178,000) on total scheme costs. Officers would therefore recommend to Members of Housing & New Homes Committee that they approve the value engineered scheme and the package of associated design changes outlined in para 3.3.
- 3.13 There has already been positive feedback from residents and garage owners on the proposed scheme through the council’s pre-application consultation process, as evidenced in para 5.3 of this report. At the time that this consultation was conducted, residents were very concerned about the anti-social behaviour which was taking place in the space such as fly-tipping, drinking, drug taking etc. They felt that the development of the site was a positive thing which would not only overcome these issues but would also improve the visual appearance of the site which has become overgrown and unsightly. If approved, Innes Associates will prepare a planning application for submission in the Autumn of this year.

Financial modelling

- 3.14 Financial modelling of the latest design has been undertaken and the rent levels should be decided by Members in line with the New Homes Rent Policy report which was approved by Housing & New Homes committee in November 2017.

- 3.15 The size and mix of the houses at Rotherfield Crescent, Brighton is based on the council's Affordable Housing Brief. The modelling includes an allowance for achieving equivalent of Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 for energy and water, site abnormalities, infrastructure and external works.
- 3.16 The revised development costs modelled have been estimated by Innes Associates Quantity Surveyor and are still subject to planning approval, therefore costs and funding are only indicative at this stage. Any significant variations to the proposed capital scheme and funding will be reported back to Policy, Resources & Growth Committee in accordance with council's standard financial procedures.
- 3.17 Table 3 provides a summary of the viability modelling results for each of the rent options considered for Rotherfield Crescent. This demonstrates that a return is provided by the LHA rents and 37.5% of Living Wage rents whilst a significant subsidy would be required if 27.5% Living Wage rents and social rents were to be considered. As the estimated surplus is lower for the living wage rents the sensitivity to changes in the construction cost would be greater.

Table 3 – Financial Viability results

Rent Option	LHA	37.5% Living Wage	27.5% Living Wage	Social
2 Bed weekly rent	£197.55	£161.44	£118.39	£87.42
3 Bed weekly rent	£229.58	£188.34	£138.12	£98.78
Net Present Value (NPV) of cash flows Subsidy / (Surplus)	(£0.329m)	(£0.103m)	£0.171m	£0.382m
Pay back period	28.6 years	43.9 years	60+ years	60+ years

Note: Living Wage hourly rates are assumed to be in line with OBR forecast for 2019; actual rent figures would be set according to the rates or valuation prevailing close to letting of the homes concerned.

Appropriation

- 3.18 Land appropriation in this context means transferring the use of land from one purpose to another. Under S122 of the Local Government Act 1972, the council has the power to appropriate land for planning purposes. Under Section 203 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 where land is held for planning purposes and work is done in accordance with planning permission, third party rights are overridden. The benefit of appropriating this site for planning purposes is to protect the council from the risk of the development process being stopped once it has started. The rights of third parties whose private interests may be affected by development are protected to the extent that they have a right to compensation against the local authority.
- 3.19 The appropriation for planning will take place immediately if the recommendation at 2.3 iv is approved.

3.20 Once the site has been developed, the council will need to appropriate the site for housing and it is therefore proposed that authority is granted to the Executive Director Economy, Environment & Culture. That second appropriation will take place when the Executive Director Economy, Environment & Culture executes an “Appropriation Memo”. The site will be available for housing use.

Procurement

3.21 The original procurement strategy for these sites aimed to appoint a single development partner to take them forward. However, extensive soft-market testing, in early 2013, revealed a lack of interest amongst potential partners (including Registered Providers, developers and large construction firms) in some of the smaller sites that often had specific issues and site constraints to overcome.

3.22 Informal discussions with smaller builders and architect practices, revealed an interest amongst these companies in working with the council to deliver housing on these smaller sites. The RIBA Design Competition was felt to offer the best opportunity for the engagement of these smaller practices in bringing forward these sites for development. The conclusion of the RIBA Competition in June 2016, led directly to the selection of two architectural practices to take forward their design proposals for four sites, including Rotherfield Crescent.

3.23 Now that the detailed design for the Rotherfield Crescent site is nearing completion, procurement options are being reviewed for the delivery of the homes. One option is for the architects (Innes Associates) to lead on the procurement of the main building contractor on behalf of the council and in adherence to the council’s Contract Standing Orders. Prior to this, an independent Cost Consultant/ Clerk of Works would be appointed to oversee all stages of the project’s delivery. A significant part of their role will be to scrutinise the scheme costs both at the design and construction stages in order to identify cost savings and ensure value for money is achieved, whilst still meeting the council’s required standards.

4 ANALYSIS & CONSIDERATION OF ANY ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS

4.1 The five options for the site have been evaluated in Table 4:

Table 4 – Option analysis

Options	Advantages	Risks
<p>Option 1 – Value engineer scheme A comprehensive review of the costs of the scheme, including the choice of materials etc (as detailed in the body of this report)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent review of cost • Keep design, but reduce costs • Work to date would not be abortive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not deliver an acceptable level of savings for Members • Some proposed changes may compromise design
<p>Option 2 – Radical re-design of scheme</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential to further reduce costs for project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional design fees and delay to the delivery of the

Options	Advantages	Risks
e.g. by in-house or other architects		scheme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May not deal with all site constraints • Large savings are unlikely given the significant site constraints • Residents already consulted on design
Option 3 – Community Housing development of site H&NH Committee considered a report on Community Housing at its March 2018 meeting. This option would entail working with the Community Housing Hub to bring the site forward in a similar way to the Plumpton Road project with the site sold or leased to the Community Land Trust or a Housing Co-op	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of site passed to partner who will need to resolve issues and complexities • Provide a development opportunity for community housing sector • Potential to use existing design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May be costly and difficult for community housing to develop • Potential loss of control over nominations to homes • This option would not contribute to the use of RTB receipts, further increasing the pressure on the need to spend them.
Option 4 – Disposal of site This was suggested as a possible option at the H&NH Committee meeting on 15 November 2017.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The responsibility for the future redevelopment of this constrained site would pass to a developer • This could be a capital receipt for the HRA and would contribute to the funding of capital expenditure incurred 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional costs would be incurred through the valuation and marketing of the site (circa £1.5K). • There would be abortive design and professional fees • The value of the land may be suppressed by the significant constraints of the site i.e. the access rights over the land of existing garage owners (10 in total) • The site would likely be used for storage, parking or a single 'luxury' home with no affordable housing • This option would not contribute to the use of RTB receipts further increasing the pressure on the need to spend them
Option 5 – Do nothing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No further cost associated with this site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing is not delivered on this site • The site may be used for fly-tipping and anti-social behaviour and blight the local area • The existing garage structures may fall further into disrepair and require demolition or remedial works for Health & Safety reasons • This option would not contribute to the use of RTB receipts further increasing the pressure

Options	Advantages	Risks
		on the need to spend them

- 4.2 The Options analysis undertaken in Table 4, demonstrates that Option 1 has least risk associated with it and would ensure continuity in the delivery of this constrained small site.

5 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT & CONSULTATION

- 5.1 Local ward councillors for the Rotherfield Crescent site have received regular briefings updating them on progress in relation to the different stages of the project. The five shortlisted design proposals for the site which made it through the technical assessment were displayed at a public exhibition held in The Old Boat Corner Community Centre, Carden Avenue, Brighton, BN1 8GN. Local residents were asked to score and comment on the design proposals either at the public exhibitions or online through the council's consultation portal. The results of this consultation were analysed by officers and RIBA Competitions and formed a percentage of the overall marks. These scores, together with those of the expert Panel, were used to select the winning designs for each of the sites.
- 5.2 Since then, the successful architects for the site, Innes Associates, have been working on a more detailed design in preparation for the submission of a planning application in Autumn 2018. As part of the pre-planning application process, the proposal was submitted for formal pre-application advice from the Local Planning Authority (LPA). Feedback from the LPA was broadly positive on the detailed design of the scheme. In addition to this consultation, the council's Project Manager and architects consulted all of the neighbours whose garages are adjacent to the boundary of the site, in order to establish their views on the latest emerging designs. In total, seven visits to garage owners were undertaken in their own homes. The results of this consultation are summarised below:

Positive comments from garage owners

- Liked the design and felt it responded well to its context;
- Felt that the landscape proposals were creative and would vastly improve their outlook;
- The choice of materials (i.e. brick, wood etc.) were sympathetic to the environment;
- Liked the sustainability measures that had been integrated within the design i.e. sedum roofs, photovoltaic panels, water butts etc.
- Surveillance would be enhanced by bringing development into an area which was run down and overgrown;
- Tidying up of the area would reduce the likelihood of rodents which are currently a problem in the locality;
- Proposed development would deter anti-social behaviour i.e. fly-tipping, young people gathering behind garages to drink, take drugs etc.
- Access to their garages would be improved by the proposal; and
- Good choice of low maintenance materials for the access road and turning area.

Negative comments from garage owners

- The proposal would partially obscure views of the South Downs and city;
- Greater potential for noise generated by new neighbours i.e. from children playing outside etc.
- Development would exacerbate parking problems in the area; and
- Concerned that there may be potential for some overlooking into their gardens.

Suggestions for improvements to the scheme

- Remove the grass strips integrated within the design of the access road i.e. which would become overgrown over time.
- Introduce some demarcation of the access road which would indicate pedestrians have priority;
- Consider replacing the existing fencing on one side of the access road with a brick wall to mitigate against strong winds (access road is a wind tunnel); and
- Replace the proposed trees with shrubs or dwarf varieties to reduce the impact on key views of the South Downs and the city.

5.3 The results of this consultation with garage owners have been used to inform the current design. If Members agree to take forward the Preferred Option (Option 1), Innes Associates will be holding a Public Exhibition to consult on the latest design with all residents in the locality. Feedback from the Exhibition will enable them to make any final adjustments to the scheme ahead of the submission of a planning application, anticipated in Autumn 2018 if the project is approved.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 If approved, this proposal will deliver four family homes (3 x 3 bed and 1 x 2 bed) for the council to let within affordable rent levels to applicants from the Homemove register. This fits with the council's Housing Strategy 2015 objectives to increase housing supply and prioritise support for new housing development that delivers a housing mix the city needs, with a particular emphasis on family and affordable rented housing. This scheme will also help to achieve the council's aim to deliver at least 500 new homes on council land under the New Homes for Neighbourhoods programme.

7. FINANCIAL & OTHER IMPLICATIONS:

Financial Implications:

7.1 The financial viability modelling sets out to show whether a given scheme can pay for the initial investment itself by using the new rental stream only (net of service charges, management, maintenance, and major repairs and voids costs) over a 60 year period. It also assumes that 30% of the investment costs are met from retained Right to Buy (RTB) Receipts. Assessing the project viability over a

60 year period not only matches the life of the asset but also reduces the need to use existing tenant's rents to support the project.

- 7.2 Following the review of costs by Innes Associates, the total estimated costs for this scheme is £1.037m; this includes all construction works, allowances for contingency, inflation and professional fees. In accordance with the RTB pooling policy signed in 2012, 30% of the cost of this scheme can be funded from RTB receipts leaving a net investment requirement from the HRA, which at this stage is assumed to be funded by borrowing supported by the new net rental income stream.
- 7.3 Current forecasts for the use of RTB receipts in 2019/20 include the development at Rotherfield Crescent, any delay to the scheme would have a negative impact on their use and would increase the risk of not achieving the required expenditure.
- 7.4 In accordance with the new rent policy, four rent levels have been modelled for this scheme. Affordable rents capped at LHA rates, 37.5% of Living Wage rents, 27.5% of Living Wage rents and target social rent. Service charges are not applicable for this scheme as the proposal is for the development of four houses, whilst the maintenance of the communal gardens will be carried out by the tenants themselves. A summary table of the viability modelling is shown at 3.13 of the main report.
- 7.5 The impact of using current LHA rates for the assumed rental income results in a surplus of £0.331m at today's value. The payback period, i.e. time taken for the future rental income to repay the initial investment, net of RTB receipts is 28.6 years. This level of rent therefore supports a viable project over a 60 year period. It would require an increase in construction costs of an estimated 59% before the scheme is no longer viable, so requiring subsidy from existing tenants' rents.
- 7.6 The impact of using the current 37.5% of Living Wage rents results in a surplus of £0.103m at today's value. The payback period for Living Wage rents is 43.9 years. This level of rent therefore supports a viable project over a 60 year period. It would require an increase in construction costs of an estimated 19%, before the scheme is no longer viable and so requiring subsidy from existing tenants' rents.
- 7.7 The scheme is not viable when modelled using 27.5% of Living Wage Rents or target social rents. The table at paragraph 3.17 shows that setting rents at these levels would result in a subsidy requirement of £0.171m or £0.382m respectively from the HRA at today's value.
- 7.8 The projected surplus from the options modelled would allow the HRA more funds to invest in their current tenant's homes or use to contribute to building much needed affordable housing. The LHA rent option represents the highest surplus to reinvest, with a lower sensitivity risk in relation to the construction costs. However setting rents at 37.5% of the Living Wage rate as per the table in paragraph 3.13 would provide a reasonable balance between the rent charged whilst still resulting in a viable scheme.
- 7.9 There is sufficient budget set aside for the development at Rotherfield Crescent

in the current HRA capital investment programme, approved for the four design competition sites at Policy, Resources & Growth committee (PRG). The remaining three sites will be reported to Housing & New Homes committee and subsequently PRG for scheme approval and, where necessary, for budget approval.

- 7.10 Any significant variations to the costs at Rotherfield Crescent will be reported in accordance with the council's standard financial procedures and reported through PR&G.
- 7.11 Any decision around the borrowing requirement for this project will be made in consultation with the council's Treasury Management team to ensure that it is undertaken in accordance with the council's borrowing strategy, authorised borrowing limits and prudential indicators.

Finance Officer Consulted: Craig Garoghan/ Monica Brooks Date: 28/08/18

Legal Implications:

- 7.12 Under section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972, a principal council, such as the council, may appropriate land belonging to it for any purpose for which it is authorised by statute to acquire land. The council is authorised to acquire land by the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 provided that it thinks that the acquisition will facilitate the carrying out of development, re-development or improvement on or in relation to the land but a local authority must not exercise the power unless it thinks that the development is likely to promote or improve the economic, social or the environmental well-being of their area. The reasons that the development is in the economic and social interests of the area are set out in the body of this report. The council has powers under the Housing Act 1985 to purchase land for housing and is therefore able to appropriate for housing once the development is complete.
- 7.13 Policy Resources and Growth Committee has delegated powers to manage corporately held property and is the proper committee to authorise the appropriation for planning purposes, and the later appropriation for housing purposes.

Lawyer Consulted: Liz Woodley

Date: 09/08/18

Equalities Implications:

- 7.14 An increase in housing supply will expand the provision of new, well designed homes to local households registered in need. The new development of four family homes with a shared central garden area will create a safe environment, which is designed to encourage social integration, irrespective of the race, religion, age, disability, gender etc. of tenants who occupy the development.

Sustainability Implications:

- 7.15 The development is intended to be sustainable and comply fully with relevant BHCC planning policies. Simple sustainability strategies have been deployed to

reduce the demands on non-renewable energy sources and on the main drainage systems. These include:

- building fabric insulation increased to level above Building Regulations to reduce heat loss; and the
- use of soakaways for storm water drainage (both roof and landscape run-off).

Crime & Disorder Implications:

- 7.16 The new homes will be designed having heed to the requirements outlined in the police Secured by Design guidance. Disused garage sites, such as the Rotherfield Crescent site, are unattractive and often used for anti-social behaviour and fly-tipping etc. If approved, the new housing development will increase surveillance and reduce the opportunity for crime and disorder.

Risk and Opportunity Management Implications:

- 7.17 There are a number of risks associated with developing new homes on small, challenging sites of this kind. These risks are considered in the Options analysis contained in Table 2, para 4.1 of this report.

Public Health Implications:

- 7.18 Energy efficient homes which are easier and cheaper to heat will help support the health of households. Family homes can be let to households which are currently overcrowded. The two bedroom house would be suitable for applicants with young children, those with very limited mobility or downsizers.

Corporate / Citywide Implications

- 7.19 The New Homes for Neighbourhoods programme of building new homes on council land supports the council's priorities for the economy, jobs and homes. The development of new housing has a strong economic multiplier impact on the local economy, estimated at over £3 of economic output for every £1 of public investment, creating jobs and supply chain opportunities.
- 7.20 Every new home built on small sites helps meet the city's pressing housing needs and deliver the first priority in the council's Housing Strategy 2015 of improving housing supply. New homes also help bring benefits to the council in the form of new council tax income.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Appendices:

1. Site Plan
2. Original Scheme Briefing Note – 17 November 2017
3. Rotherfield Crescent Revised Scheme – September 2018

Background Documents:

1. Housing & New Homes Committee Report – Rotherfield Crescent – 15 November 2017