

From: Angela Wakefield
Sent: 01 July 2020 14:48
To: James Abbott <james.abbott@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Cc: Sal Khan <sal.khan@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Mark Rizk <mark.rizk@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Executive Decision Records

From: Cllr R G W Grosvenor
Sent: 01 July 2020 11:29
To: Angela Wakefield <angela.wakefield@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Andy O'Brien <andy.o'brien@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Cc: Cllr P Walker <Paul.Walker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr S Hussain <syed.hussain@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr J Jones <Jacqui.Jones@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr G Hall <Greg.Hall@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr C Whittaker <Colin.Whittaker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr B Toon <Beryl.Toon@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Ackroyd <patricia.ackroyd@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr M Shrive <Mandy.Shrive@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr A J Legg <alison.legg@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr M T Fitzpatrick <michael.fitzpatrick@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr D Florence-Jukes <Deneice.Florence-Jukes@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Executive Decision Records

Angela / Andy, all members on copy of this email have agreed that they would like the decision attached called in. Attached are email confirmations from each councillor with their agreement to this. I understand that Cllr Whittaker and Cllr Florence-Jukes have emailed you directly Angela.

I also want to highlight comments made by Cllr Fitzpatrick in his email to me which expressed a request that this call in be dealt with on its own not as part of a bigger agenda and that he was concerned that the appendices referred to in the EDR were not made available as part of the EDR but members had to request these.

We understand that the reasons for call in have to be in accordance with those quoted in Article 11.2 of the constitution and in terms of those reasons :

- a. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome); There is a stated "Funding viability gap" which has been described as the difference between delivering affordable housing as compared to market housing. This gap has been valued , by developer assigned analysis, of £242,522. This decision is to contribute £240,000 of that which equates to 98.96% of the funding gap. We do not believe that the council's response to this funding gap is proportionate given that the whole development will also deliver private commercial use which will generate profit for the developer of which we are unaware. In essence this £240K could therefore be said to helping to contribute to developer profit on this development. On social housing development the developer returns a yield of 4.5% and the purpose of this 240K is to push the yield to 6.5%, this is based on the independent advice sourced by the developer only . So the 106 contribution effectively increases developer yield by almost 50%, based on a valuation which is not council derived.
- b. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);

There is no evidence provided as to the deadline for use of this 106 funding. It could in fact be relatively urgent and so this is forcing the council to “use it or lose” it and in so doing making a hasty decision .

- c. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
For this valuation the council is relying solely on the analysis the developer has sourced , not through any council independent valuation. Before agreeing to allow £240,000 of public funding for this development we believe that the council should consult with its own valuation in order to determine best value for money for its residents.
- d. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
We do not see evidence that wider consultation of members has taken place in advance of this decision either in terms of funding or additional uses of the site.
- e. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;
In not seeking additional valuation we do not feel the council is being open in its decision making
- f. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;
It has not been made clear who the developer is and whether or not they have an existing or previous development link to ESBC or Burton Upon Trent. We feel that in not disclosing the developer in this decision that there is no openness here.
- g. 11.2.7 a consideration of other options;
There is no evidence that other options have been considered in this decision making (for example but not limited to)
 - 1. Could the whole site not be made available for affordable housing
 - 2. Could the developer not agree to accommodate more of the funding gap than 1.04%
 - 3. Given the council’s previous aspiration to provide elderly accommodation could this whole site not been made available for that purpose.
 - 4. Could the council not fund purchase of the site itself for development purposes

Thank you

Councillor R Grosvenor

From: Monica Henschcliffe

Sent: 26 June 2020 17:07

To: DL Councillors-All <DLCouncilors-All@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Cc: Andy O'Brien <andy.o'brien@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Heads of Service

<HeadsofService@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Angela Wakefield <angela.wakefield@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>;

Andrea Davies <andrea.davies@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: Executive Decision Records

Dear all

I attach a key decision which may be called in. The "Call-in" must only be used where Members have evidence which suggests that the Cabinet or Deputy Leader did not take the decision in accordance with the principles set out in Article 11.2 of the Constitution (Principles of decision making).

The decision will come into force, and may be implemented, on the expiry of three working days from the date of this email unless a valid request to call in the decision is made within that time.

A valid request to call in a decision shall:

- (a) be in writing or by email;
- (b) state the decision which the members wish to call in;
- (c) state the reason(s) why they wish to call in the decision (having regard amongst other things to the criteria set out in the call in procedure adopted by Council);
- (d) be signed by any ten Members of the Council.

The decision should be self-explanatory but if you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely
Monica

From: Cllr A J Legg
Sent: 30 June 2020 13:39
To: Cllr R G W Grosvenor <richard.grosvenor@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Call in

Dear Richard

Under the current restrictions I would have to support councillor Grosvenors call in of the EDR

Kind regards

Alison

From: Cllr R G W Grosvenor
Sent: 30 June 2020 10:47
To: Cllr J Jones <Jacqui.Jones@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr G Hall <Greg.Hall@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr C Whittaker <Colin.Whittaker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Walker <Paul.Walker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr B Toon <Beryl.Toon@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Ackroyd <patricia.ackroyd@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr M Shrive <Mandy.Shrive@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr S Hussain <syed.hussain@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr A J Legg <alison.legg@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Subject: Call in

All thank you for expressing concerns with the recent EDR for the development of the old Burton Mail site and for agreeing to support call in for the reasons listed below. I've also attached the two appendices that were referred to on the EDR but not originally circulated

Under the current Covid 19 restrictions the call in process has required a change. Whereby previously members would need to sign a document the monitoring officer has now explained that "In the current circumstances it will be sufficient to type the relevant members' names on the request, with supporting evidence attached in the form of emails from each of the members concerned, recording their reasons for the call in and their confirmation that their typed name on your document should be regarded as their electronic signature in this instance"

Call in needs to be sent before close on Wednesday therefore please could you agree by return email that the following constitutes your reasons for call in and that by including your name on the call in note it can be regarded as your electronic signature. Thank you in advance. Given that trying to encompass additional reasons would mean sending additional emails to all concerned again until we get a full list!, I have tried to cover everything discussed with all of you on the phone. If it is called in then we can explore further in scrutiny.

- h. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is a stated "Funding viability gap" which has been described as the difference between delivering affordable housing as compared to market housing. This gap has been valued , by developer assigned analysis, of £242,522. This decision is to contribute £240,000 of that which equates to 98.96% of the funding gap. We do not believe that the council's response to this funding gap is proportionate given that the whole development will also deliver private commercial use which will generate profit for the developer of which we are unaware. In essence this £240K could therefore be said to helping to contribute to developer profit on this development. On social housing development the developer returns a yield of 4.5% and the purpose of this 240K is to push the yield to 6.5%, this is based on the independent advice sourced by the developer only . So the 106 contribution effectively increases developer yield by 50%, based on a valuation which is not council derived.
- i. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is no evidence provided as to the deadline for use of this 106 funding. It could in fact be relatively urgent and so this is forcing the council to "use it or lose" it and in so doing making a hasty decision .
- j. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
For this valuation the council is relying solely on the analysis the developer has sourced , not through any council independent valuation. Before agreeing to allow £240,000 of public funding for this development we believe that the council should consult with its own valuation in order to determine best value for money for its residents.
- k. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
We do not see evidence that wider consultation of members has taken place in advance of this decision either in terms of funding or additional uses of the site.

- l. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;
In not seeking additional valuation we do not feel the council is being open in its decision making

- m. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;
It has not been made clear who the developer is and whether or not they have an existing or previous development link to ESBC or Burton Upon Trent. We feel that in not disclosing the developer in this decision that there is no openness here.

- n. 11.2.7 a consideration of other options;
There is no evidence that other options have been considered in this decision making (for example but not limited to)
 - 5. Could the whole site not be made available for affordable housing
 - 6. Could the developer not agree to accommodate more of the funding gap than 1.04%
 - 7. Given the council's previous aspiration to provide elderly accommodation could this whole site not been made available for that purpose.
 - 8. Could the council not fund purchase of the site itself for development purposes

Councillor Richard Grosvenor

From: Cllr B Toon
Sent: 30 June 2020 19:07
To: Cllr R G W Grosvenor <richard.grosvenor@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Call in

Yes I am happy for my name to be included for the reasons given in the email sent please accept this as my signature.

Regards
Cllr B Toon

From: Cllr R G W Grosvenor
Sent: 30 June 2020 15:50
To: Cllr B Toon
Subject: Re: Call in

Are you happy for name to be included and the reasons given ?

From: Cllr B Toon
Sent: 30 June 2020 14:25:25
To: Cllr R G W Grosvenor
Subject: RE: Call in

Dear Richard,

I am in full support of you for calling in this EDR , I am most concerned about it and glad others are to .

Regards

CLL Beryl Toon.

From: Cllr R G W Grosvenor

Sent: 30 June 2020 10:47

To: Cllr J Jones <Jacqui.Jones@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr G Hall <Greg.Hall@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr C Whittaker <Colin.Whittaker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Walker <Paul.Walker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr B Toon <Beryl.Toon@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Ackroyd <patricia.ackroyd@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr M Shrive <Mandy.Shrive@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr S Hussain <syed.hussain@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr A J Legg <alison.legg@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: Call in

All thank you for expressing concerns with the recent EDR for the development of the old Burton Mail site and for agreeing to support call in for the reasons listed below. I've also attached the two appendices that were referred to on the EDR but not originally circulated

Under the current Covid 19 restrictions the call in process has required a change. Whereby previously members would need to sign a document the monitoring officer has now explained that "In the current circumstances it will be sufficient to type the relevant members' names on the request, with supporting evidence attached in the form of emails from each of the members concerned, recording their reasons for the call in and their confirmation that their typed name on your document should be regarded as their electronic signature in this instance"

Call in needs to be sent before close on Wednesday therefore please could you agree by return email that the following constitutes your reasons for call in and that by including your name on the call in note it can be regarded as your electronic signature. Thank you in advance. Given that trying to encompass additional reasons would mean sending additional emails to all concerned again until we get a full list!, I have tried to cover everything discussed with all of you on the phone. If it is called in then we can explore further in scrutiny.

- o. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome); There is a stated "Funding viability gap" which has been described as the difference between delivering affordable housing as compared to market housing. This gap has been valued , by developer assigned analysis, of £242,522. This decision is to contribute £240,000 of that which equates to 98.96% of the funding gap. We do not believe that the council's response to this funding gap is proportionate given that the whole development will also deliver private commercial use which will generate profit for the developer of which we are unaware. In essence this £240K could therefore be said to helping to contribute to developer profit on this development. On social housing development the developer returns a yield of 4.5% and the purpose of this 240K is to push the yield to 6.5%, this is based on the independent advice sourced by the developer only . So the 106 contribution effectively increases developer yield by 50%, based on a valuation which is not council derived.
- p. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);

There is no evidence provided as to the deadline for use of this 106 funding. It could in fact be relatively urgent and so this is forcing the council to “use it or lose” it and in so doing making a hasty decision .

- q. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
For this valuation the council is relying solely on the analysis the developer has sourced , not through any council independent valuation. Before agreeing to allow £240,000 of public funding for this development we believe that the council should consult with its own valuation in order to determine best value for money for its residents.
 - r. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
We do not see evidence that wider consultation of members has taken place in advance of this decision either in terms of funding or additional uses of the site.
 - s. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;
In not seeking additional valuation we do not feel the council is being open in its decision making
 - t. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;
It has not been made clear who the developer is and whether or not they have an existing or previous development link to ESBC or Burton Upon Trent. We feel that in not disclosing the developer in this decision that there is no openness here.
 - u. 11.2.7 a consideration of other options;
There is no evidence that other options have been considered in this decision making (for example but not limited to)
9. Could the whole site not be made available for affordable housing
 10. Could the developer not agree to accommodate more of the funding gap than 1.04%
 11. Given the council’s previous aspiration to provide elderly accommodation could this whole site not been made available for that purpose.
 12. Could the council not fund purchase of the site itself for development purposes

Councillor Richard Grosvenor

From: Angela Wakefield

Sent: 01 July 2020 14:49

To: James Abbott <james.abbott@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Cc: Sal Khan <sal.khan@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Mark Rizk <mark.rizk@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: Call -In ref 1999:20

From: Cllr C Whittaker
Sent: 30 June 2020 13:17
To: Angela Wakefield <angela.wakefield@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Cc: Monica Henchcliffe <monica.henchcliffe@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Subject: Call -In ref 1999:20

Dear Angela

I wish to put my name to the above call-in for the reasons stated below. I believe the decision is not in the interest of this Authority and does not represent value for money.

- v.
- w. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is a stated "Funding viability gap" which has been described as the difference between delivering affordable housing as compared to market housing. This gap has been valued , by developer assigned analysis, of £242,522. This decision is to contribute £240,000 of that which equates to 98.96% of the funding gap. We do not believe that the council's response to this funding gap is proportionate given that the whole development will also deliver private commercial use which will generate profit for the developer of which we are unaware. In essence this £240K could therefore be said to helping to contribute to developer profit on this development. On social housing development the developer returns a yield of 4.5% and the purpose of this 240K is to push the yield to 6.5%, this is based on the independent advice sourced by the developer only . So the 106 contribution effectively increases developer yield by 50%, based on a valuation which is not council derived.
- x. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is no evidence provided as to the deadline for use of this 106 funding. It could in fact be relatively urgent and so this is forcing the council to "use it or lose" it and in so doing making a hasty decision .
- y. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
For this valuation the council is relying solely on the analysis the developer has sourced , not through any council independent valuation. Before agreeing to allow £240,000 of public funding for this development we believe that the council should consult with its own valuation in order to determine best value for money for its residents.
- z. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
We do not see evidence that wider consultation of members has taken place in advance of this decision either in terms of funding or additional uses of the site.
- aa. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;
In not seeking additional valuation we do not feel the council is being open in its decision making
- bb. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;

It has not been made clear who the developer is and whether or not they have an existing or previous development link to ESBC or Burton Upon Trent. We feel that in not disclosing the developer in this decision that there is no openness here.

cc. 11.2.7 a consideration of other options;
There is no evidence that other options have been considered in this decision making (for example but not limited to)

13. Could the whole site not be made available for affordable housing
14. Could the developer not agree to accommodate more of the funding gap than 1.04%
15. Given the council's previous aspiration to provide elderly accommodation could this whole site not been made available for that purpose.
16. Could the council not fund purchase of the site itself for development purposes

Regards

Cllr Colin Whittaker(Abbey Ward)

From: Angela Wakefield

Sent: 01 July 2020 14:49

To: James Abbott <james.abbott@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Cc: Sal Khan <sal.khan@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Mark Rizk <mark.rizk@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: FW: Call In

From: Cllr D Florence-Jukes

Sent: 01 July 2020 11:27

To: Cllr R G W Grosvenor <richard.grosvenor@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Angela Wakefield <angela.wakefield@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Call In

Morning Richard

I can confirm that I am in support of this call in for the reasons as stated, I have copied Angela into this email to confirm I wish to be a signatory.

Regards

Deneice Florence-Jukes

Cllr Deneice Florence-Jukes
Independent Councillor For Horninglow
Ward
East Staffordshire Borough Council

Tel: 07443 045 755

From: Cllr R G W Grosvenor

Sent: 01 July 2020 10:03

To: Cllr D Florence-Jukes <Deneice.Florence-Jukes@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: Call In

Deneice thank you for expressing concerns with the recent EDR for the development of the old Burton Mail site and for agreeing to support call in for the reasons listed below.

Under the current Covid 19 restrictions the call in process has required a change. Whereby previously members would need to sign a document the monitoring officer has now explained that “In the current circumstances it will be sufficient to type the relevant members’ names on the request, with supporting evidence attached in the form of emails from each of the members concerned, recording their reasons for the call in and their confirmation that their typed name on your document should be regarded as their electronic signature in this instance”

Call in needs to be sent before close today so I will send it in just after lunch. With your name I have 12 people now. Therefore please could you agree by return email that the following constitutes your reasons for call in and that by including your name on the call in note it can be regarded as your electronic signature. Thank you in advance. Given that trying to encompass additional reasons would mean sending additional emails to all concerned again until we get a full list!, I have tried to cover everything discussed. If it is called in then we can explore further in scrutiny.

- dd. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is a stated “Funding viability gap” which has been described as the difference between delivering affordable housing as compared to market housing. This gap has been valued , by developer assigned analysis, of £242,522. This decision is to contribute £240,000 of that which equates to 98.96% of the funding gap. We do not believe that the council’s response to this funding gap is proportionate given that the whole development will also deliver private commercial use which will generate profit for the developer of which we are unaware. In essence this £240K could therefore be said to helping to contribute to developer profit on this development. On social housing development the developer returns a yield of 4.5% and the purpose of this 240K is to push the yield to 6.5%, this is based on the independent advice sourced by the developer only . So the 106 contribution effectively increases developer yield by 50%, based on a valuation which is not council derived.
- ee. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is no evidence provided as to the deadline for use of this 106 funding. It could in fact be relatively urgent and so this is forcing the council to “use it or lose” it and in so doing making a hasty decision .

- ff. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
For this valuation the council is relying solely on the analysis the developer has sourced , not through any council independent valuation. Before agreeing to allow £240,000 of public funding for this development we believe that the council should consult with its own valuation in order to determine best value for money for its residents.
- gg. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
We do not see evidence that wider consultation of members has taken place in advance of this decision either in terms of funding or additional uses of the site.
- hh. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;
In not seeking additional valuation we do not feel the council is being open in its decision making
- ii. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;
It has not been made clear who the developer is and whether or not they have an existing or previous development link to ESBC or Burton Upon Trent. We feel that in not disclosing the developer in this decision that there is no openness here.
- jj. 11.2.7 a consideration of other options;
There is no evidence that other options have been considered in this decision making (for example but not limited to)
17. Could the whole site not be made available for affordable housing
18. Could the developer not agree to accommodate more of the funding gap than 1.04%
19. Given the council's previous aspiration to provide elderly accommodation could this whole site not been made available for that purpose.
20. Could the council not fund purchase of the site itself for development purposes

Councillor Richard Grosvenor

Councillor Richard Grosvenor

From: Cllr G Hall
Sent: 30 June 2020 16:42
To: Cllr R G W Grosvenor <richard.grosvenor@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Call in

I agree the reasons outlined below constitute my reasons for call in.
By including my name on the call in note I am content that can be regarded as my electronic signature in this instance.

Greg Hall

Member for Bagots Ward

From: Cllr R G W Grosvenor

Sent: 30 June 2020 10:47

To: Cllr J Jones <Jacqui.Jones@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr G Hall <Greg.Hall@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr C Whittaker <Colin.Whittaker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Walker <Paul.Walker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr B Toon <Beryl.Toon@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Ackroyd <patricia.ackroyd@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr M Shrive <Mandy.Shrive@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr S Hussain <syed.hussain@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr A J Legg <alison.legg@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: Call in

All thank you for expressing concerns with the recent EDR for the development of the old Burton Mail site and for agreeing to support call in for the reasons listed below. I've also attached the two appendices that were referred to on the EDR but not originally circulated

Under the current Covid 19 restrictions the call in process has required a change. Whereby previously members would need to sign a document the monitoring officer has now explained that "In the current circumstances it will be sufficient to type the relevant members' names on the request, with supporting evidence attached in the form of emails from each of the members concerned, recording their reasons for the call in and their confirmation that their typed name on your document should be regarded as their electronic signature in this instance"

Call in needs to be sent before close on Wednesday therefore please could you agree by return email that the following constitutes your reasons for call in and that by including your name on the call in note it can be regarded as your electronic signature. Thank you in advance. Given that trying to encompass additional reasons would mean sending additional emails to all concerned again until we get a full list!, I have tried to cover everything discussed with all of you on the phone. If it is called in then we can explore further in scrutiny.

- kk. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is a stated "Funding viability gap" which has been described as the difference between delivering affordable housing as compared to market housing. This gap has been valued , by developer assigned analysis, of £242,522. This decision is to contribute £240,000 of that which equates to 98.96% of the funding gap. We do not believe that the council's response to this funding gap is proportionate given that the whole development will also deliver private commercial use which will generate profit for the developer of which we are unaware. In essence this £240K could therefore be said to helping to contribute to developer profit on this development. On social housing development the developer returns a yield of 4.5% and the purpose of this 240K is to push the yield to 6.5%, this is based on the independent advice sourced by the developer only . So the 106 contribution effectively increases developer yield by 50%, based on a valuation which is not council derived.
- ll. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is no evidence provided as to the deadline for use of this 106 funding. It could in fact be relatively urgent and so this is forcing the council to "use it or lose" it and in so doing making a hasty decision .
- mm. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;

For this valuation the council is relying solely on the analysis the developer has sourced , not through any council independent valuation. Before agreeing to allow £240,000 of public funding for this development we believe that the council should consult with its own valuation in order to determine best value for money for its residents.

nn. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;

We do not see evidence that wider consultation of members has taken place in advance of this decision either in terms of funding or additional uses of the site.

oo. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;

In not seeking additional valuation we do not feel the council is being open in its decision making

pp. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;

It has not been made clear who the developer is and whether or not they have an existing or previous development link to ESBC or Burton Upon Trent. We feel that in not disclosing the developer in this decision that there is no openness here.

qq. 11.2.7 a consideration of other options;

There is no evidence that other options have been considered in this decision making (for example but not limited to)

21. Could the whole site not be made available for affordable housing

22. Could the developer not agree to accommodate more of the funding gap than 1.04%

23. Given the council's previous aspiration to provide elderly accommodation could this whole site not been made available for that purpose.

24. Could the council not fund purchase of the site itself for development purposes

Councillor Richard Grosvenor

From: Cllr J Jones

Sent: 30 June 2020 13:27

To: Cllr R G W Grosvenor <richard.grosvenor@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: Re: Call in

Please take this as my support for this call in based on the reasons given in the email below. For the purpose of this call in my typed name on the call in can be taken as my electronic signature

Jacqui Jones

Councillor for Needwood Ward

From: Cllr R G W Grosvenor

Sent: 30 June 2020 10:47:03

To: Cllr J Jones; Cllr G Hall; Cllr C Whittaker; Cllr P Walker; Cllr B Toon; Cllr P Ackroyd; Cllr M Shrive;

Cllr S Hussain; Cllr A J Legg

Subject: Call in

All thank you for expressing concerns with the recent EDR for the development of the old Burton Mail site and for agreeing to support call in for the reasons listed below. I've also attached the two appendices that were referred to on the EDR but not originally circulated

Under the current Covid 19 restrictions the call in process has required a change. Whereby previously members would need to sign a document the monitoring officer has now explained that "In the current circumstances it will be sufficient to type the relevant members' names on the request, with supporting evidence attached in the form of emails from each of the members concerned, recording their reasons for the call in and their confirmation that their typed name on your document should be regarded as their electronic signature in this instance"

Call in needs to be sent before close on Wednesday therefore please could you agree by return email that the following constitutes your reasons for call in and that by including your name on the call in note it can be regarded as your electronic signature. Thank you in advance. Given that trying to encompass additional reasons would mean sending additional emails to all concerned again until we get a full list!, I have tried to cover everything discussed with all of you on the phone. If it is called in then we can explore further in scrutiny.

- rr. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is a stated "Funding viability gap" which has been described as the difference between delivering affordable housing as compared to market housing. This gap has been valued , by developer assigned analysis, of £242,522. This decision is to contribute £240,000 of that which equates to 98.96% of the funding gap. We do not believe that the council's response to this funding gap is proportionate given that the whole development will also deliver private commercial use which will generate profit for the developer of which we are unaware. In essence this £240K could therefore be said to helping to contribute to developer profit on this development. On social housing development the developer returns a yield of 4.5% and the purpose of this 240K is to push the yield to 6.5%, this is based on the independent advice sourced by the developer only . So the 106 contribution effectively increases developer yield by 50%, based on a valuation which is not council derived.
- ss. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is no evidence provided as to the deadline for use of this 106 funding. It could in fact be relatively urgent and so this is forcing the council to "use it or lose" it and in so doing making a hasty decision .
- tt. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
For this valuation the council is relying solely on the analysis the developer has sourced , not through any council independent valuation. Before agreeing to allow £240,000 of public funding for this development we believe that the council should consult with its own valuation in order to determine best value for money for its residents.
- uu. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;

We do not see evidence that wider consultation of members has taken place in advance of this decision either in terms of funding or additional uses of the site.

vv. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;

In not seeking additional valuation we do not feel the council is being open in its decision making

ww. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;

It has not been made clear who the developer is and whether or not they have an existing or previous development link to ESBC or Burton Upon Trent. We feel that in not disclosing the developer in this decision that there is no openness here.

xx. 11.2.7 a consideration of other options;

There is no evidence that other options have been considered in this decision making (for example but not limited to)

25. Could the whole site not be made available for affordable housing

26. Could the developer not agree to accommodate more of the funding gap than 1.04%

27. Given the council's previous aspiration to provide elderly accommodation could this whole site not been made available for that purpose.

28. Could the council not fund purchase of the site itself for development purposes

Councillor Richard Grosvenor

From: Cllr M T Fitzpatrick

Sent: 30 June 2020 21:27

To: Cllr R G W Grosvenor <richard.grosvenor@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Call in

Dear Richard

Please add my name to the call in request for the reasons listed below. I do, on this occasion, believe that this EDR should be looked at by the appropriate scrutiny committee. I would hope it would come to a meeting called for this specific purpose and so not restrained by the a weighty agenda. I do wonder why the appendices mentioned in the EDR were not circulated to members so they could properly consider whether call in might be useful.

Kind regards

Mick

Cllr M T Fitzpatrick

From: Cllr R G W Grosvenor
Sent: 30 June 2020 13:00
To: Cllr M T Fitzpatrick <michael.fitzpatrick@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: Call in

Hi Mick , got your message. Here is the email below with reasons and the appendices attached. Number 1 doesn't really say much. Number two is the valuation from the developer, it's not a council valuation. Concern for me is we are funding additional profit for the developer really. The valuation says the affordable development will return yield of 4.5% but they recommend that the developer needs 6.5% , so the 240K is all about giving the developer another 2% yield as far as I can see..... anyway here you go take a look at the reasons below as well...

From: Cllr R G W Grosvenor
Sent: 30 June 2020 10:47
To: Cllr J Jones <Jacqui.Jones@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Greg Hall Cllr (greg.hall@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk) <greg.hall@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr C Whittaker <Colin.Whittaker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Walker <Paul.Walker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr B Toon <Beryl.Toon@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Ackroyd (patricia.ackroyd@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk) <patricia.ackroyd@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr M Shrive <Mandy.Shrive@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr S Hussain <syed.hussain@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr A J Legg (alison.legg@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk) <alison.legg@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>
Subject: Call in

All thank you for expressing concerns with the recent EDR for the development of the old Burton Mail site and for agreeing to support call in for the reasons listed below. I've also attached the two appendices that were referred to on the EDR but not originally circulated

Under the current Covid 19 restrictions the call in process has required a change. Whereby previously members would need to sign a document the monitoring officer has now explained that "In the current circumstances it will be sufficient to type the relevant members' names on the request, with supporting evidence attached in the form of emails from each of the members concerned, recording their reasons for the call in and their confirmation that their typed name on your document should be regarded as their electronic signature in this instance"

Call in needs to be sent before close on Wednesday therefore please could you agree by return email that the following constitutes your reasons for call in and that by including your name on the call in note it can be regarded as your electronic signature. Thank you in advance. Given that trying to encompass additional reasons would mean sending additional emails to all concerned again until we get a full list!, I have tried to cover everything discussed with all of you on the phone. If it is called in then we can explore further in scrutiny.

- yy. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is a stated "Funding viability gap" which has been described as the difference between delivering affordable housing as compared to market housing. This gap has been valued , by developer assigned analysis, of £242,522. This decision is to contribute £240,000 of that which equates to 98.96% of the funding gap. We do not believe that the council's response to this funding gap is proportionate given that the whole development will also deliver private commercial use which will generate profit for the developer of which we are unaware. In essence this £240K could therefore be said to helping to contribute to developer profit on this development.

On social housing development the developer returns a yield of 4.5% and the purpose of this 240K is to push the yield to 6.5%, this is based on the independent advice sourced by the developer only . So the 106 contribution effectively increases developer yield by 50%, based on a valuation which is not council derived.

zz. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is no evidence provided as to the deadline for use of this 106 funding. It could in fact be relatively urgent and so this is forcing the council to “use it or lose” it and in so doing making a hasty decision .

aaa. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
For this valuation the council is relying solely on the analysis the developer has sourced , not through any council independent valuation. Before agreeing to allow £240,000 of public funding for this development we believe that the council should consult with its own valuation in order to determine best value for money for its residents.

bbb. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
We do not see evidence that wider consultation of members has taken place in advance of this decision either in terms of funding or additional uses of the site.

ccc.11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;
In not seeking additional valuation we do not feel the council is being open in its decision making

ddd. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;
It has not been made clear who the developer is and whether or not they have an existing or previous development link to ESBC or Burton Upon Trent. We feel that in not disclosing the developer in this decision that there is no openness here.

eee. 11.2.7 a consideration of other options;
There is no evidence that other options have been considered in this decision making (for example but not limited to)

29. Could the whole site not be made available for affordable housing

30. Could the developer not agree to accommodate more of the funding gap than 1.04%

31. Given the council’s previous aspiration to provide elderly accommodation could this whole site not been made available for that purpose.

32. Could the council not fund purchase of the site itself for development purposes

Councillor Richard Grosvenor

From: Cllr M Shrive

Sent: 30 June 2020 20:04

To: Cllr R G W Grosvenor <richard.grosvenor@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Call in

Hi Richard

I can confirm all the reasons outlined in the email below constitutes my reasons for call in on the issues highlighted in relation to the redevelopment of the old Burton Mail offices. Please accept my name as my signature

Mandy Shrive

From: Cllr R G W Grosvenor

Sent: 30 June 2020 10:47

To: Cllr J Jones <Jacqui.Jones@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr G Hall <Greg.Hall@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr C Whittaker <Colin.Whittaker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Walker

<Paul.Walker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr B Toon <Beryl.Toon@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Ackroyd

<patricia.ackroyd@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr M Shrive <Mandy.Shrive@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr S

Hussain <syed.hussain@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr A J Legg <alison.legg@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: Call in

All thank you for expressing concerns with the recent EDR for the development of the old Burton Mail site and for agreeing to support call in for the reasons listed below. I've also attached the two appendices that were referred to on the EDR but not originally circulated

Under the current Covid 19 restrictions the call in process has required a change. Whereby previously members would need to sign a document the monitoring officer has now explained that "In the current circumstances it will be sufficient to type the relevant members' names on the request, with supporting evidence attached in the form of emails from each of the members concerned, recording their reasons for the call in and their confirmation that their typed name on your document should be regarded as their electronic signature in this instance"

Call in needs to be sent before close on Wednesday therefore please could you agree by return email that the following constitutes your reasons for call in and that by including your name on the call in note it can be regarded as your electronic signature. Thank you in advance. Given that trying to encompass additional reasons would mean sending additional emails to all concerned again until we get a full list!, I have tried to cover everything discussed with all of you on the phone. If it is called in then we can explore further in scrutiny.

- fff. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is a stated "Funding viability gap" which has been described as the difference between delivering affordable housing as compared to market housing. This gap has been valued , by developer assigned analysis, of £242,522. This decision is to contribute £240,000 of that which equates to 98.96% of the funding gap. We do not believe that the council's response to this funding gap is proportionate given that the whole development will also deliver private commercial use which will generate profit for the developer of which we are unaware. In essence this £240K could therefore be said to helping to contribute to developer profit on this development. On social housing development the developer returns a yield of 4.5% and the purpose of this 240K is to push the yield to 6.5%, this is based on the independent

advice sourced by the developer only . So the 106 contribution effectively increases developer yield by 50%, based on a valuation which is not council derived.

ggg. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);

There is no evidence provided as to the deadline for use of this 106 funding. It could in fact be relatively urgent and so this is forcing the council to “use it or lose” it and in so doing making a hasty decision .

hhh. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;

For this valuation the council is relying solely on the analysis the developer has sourced , not through any council independent valuation. Before agreeing to allow £240,000 of public funding for this development we believe that the council should consult with its own valuation in order to determine best value for money for its residents.

iii. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;

We do not see evidence that wider consultation of members has taken place in advance of this decision either in terms of funding or additional uses of the site.

jjj. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;

In not seeking additional valuation we do not feel the council is being open in its decision making

kkk. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;

It has not been made clear who the developer is and whether or not they have an existing or previous development link to ESBC or Burton Upon Trent. We feel that in not disclosing the developer in this decision that there is no openness here.

lll. 11.2.7 a consideration of other options;

There is no evidence that other options have been considered in this decision making (for example but not limited to)

33. Could the whole site not be made available for affordable housing

34. Could the developer not agree to accommodate more of the funding gap than 1.04%

35. Given the council’s previous aspiration to provide elderly accommodation could this whole site not been made available for that purpose.

36. Could the council not fund purchase of the site itself for development purposes

Councillor Richard Grosvenor

From: Cllr P Ackroyd

Sent: 30 June 2020 16:32

To: Cllr R G W Grosvenor <richard.grosvenor@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Call in

Hi Richard

I can confirm that I agree with the reasons detailed below for the call in and that my name can be added to the list for call in, with this email being considered as my electronic signature.

Best wishes

Patricia Ackroyd

Patricia Ackroyd

Councillor for Branston

Deputy Mayor, ESBC

01283 536263

From: Cllr R G W Grosvenor

Sent: 30 June 2020 10:47

To: Cllr J Jones <Jacqui.Jones@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr G Hall <Greg.Hall@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr C Whittaker <Colin.Whittaker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Walker <Paul.Walker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr B Toon <Beryl.Toon@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Ackroyd <patricia.ackroyd@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr M Shrive <Mandy.Shrive@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr S Hussain <syed.hussain@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr A J Legg <alison.legg@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: Call in

All thank you for expressing concerns with the recent EDR for the development of the old Burton Mail site and for agreeing to support call in for the reasons listed below. I've also attached the two appendices that were referred to on the EDR but not originally circulated

Under the current Covid 19 restrictions the call in process has required a change. Whereby previously members would need to sign a document the monitoring officer has now explained that "In the current circumstances it will be sufficient to type the relevant members' names on the request, with supporting evidence attached in the form of emails from each of the members concerned, recording their reasons for the call in and their confirmation that their typed name on your document should be regarded as their electronic signature in this instance"

Call in needs to be sent before close on Wednesday therefore please could you agree by return email that the following constitutes your reasons for call in and that by including your name on the call in note it can be regarded as your electronic signature. Thank you in advance. Given that trying to encompass additional reasons would mean sending additional emails to all concerned again until we get a full list!, I have tried to cover everything discussed with all of you on the phone. If it is called in then we can explore further in scrutiny.

mmm. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);

There is a stated "Funding viability gap" which has been described as the difference between delivering affordable housing as compared to market housing. This gap has been valued, by developer assigned analysis, of £242,522. This decision is to contribute £240,000 of that which equates to 98.96% of the funding gap. We do not believe that the council's response to this funding gap is proportionate given that the whole development will also deliver private commercial use which will generate profit for the developer of which we are unaware. In essence this £240K could therefore be said to helping to contribute to developer profit on this development. On social housing development the developer returns a yield of 4.5% and the purpose of this 240K is to push the yield to 6.5%, this is based on the independent advice sourced by the developer only. So the 106 contribution effectively increases developer yield by 50%, based on a valuation which is not council derived.

nnn. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);

There is no evidence provided as to the deadline for use of this 106 funding. It could in fact be relatively urgent and so this is forcing the council to "use it or lose" it and in so doing making a hasty decision.

ooo. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;

For this valuation the council is relying solely on the analysis the developer has sourced, not through any council independent valuation. Before agreeing to allow £240,000 of public funding for this development we believe that the council should consult with its own valuation in order to determine best value for money for its residents.

ppp. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;

We do not see evidence that wider consultation of members has taken place in advance of this decision either in terms of funding or additional uses of the site.

qqq. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;

In not seeking additional valuation we do not feel the council is being open in its decision making

rrr. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;

It has not been made clear who the developer is and whether or not they have an existing or previous development link to ESBC or Burton Upon Trent. We feel that in not disclosing the developer in this decision that there is no openness here.

sss. 11.2.7 a consideration of other options;

There is no evidence that other options have been considered in this decision making (for example but not limited to)

37. Could the whole site not be made available for affordable housing

38. Could the developer not agree to accommodate more of the funding gap than 1.04%
39. Given the council's previous aspiration to provide elderly accommodation could this whole site not been made available for that purpose.
40. Could the council not fund purchase of the site itself for development purposes

Councillor Richard Grosvenor

From: Cllr P Walker

Sent: 30 June 2020 17:16

To: Cllr R G W Grosvenor <richard.grosvenor@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr J Jones <Jacqui.Jones@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr G Hall <Greg.Hall@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr C Whittaker <Colin.Whittaker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr B Toon <Beryl.Toon@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Ackroyd <patricia.ackroyd@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr M Shrive <Mandy.Shrive@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr S Hussain <syed.hussain@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr A J Legg <alison.legg@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Call in

Hi

I can confirm all the reasons outlined in the email below constitutes my reasons for call in on the issues highlighted in relation to the redevelopment of the old Burton Mail offices. Please accept my name as my signature

Paul Walker

Councillor for Shobnall Ward

From: Cllr R G W Grosvenor

Sent: 30 June 2020 10:47

To: Cllr J Jones <Jacqui.Jones@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr G Hall <Greg.Hall@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr C Whittaker <Colin.Whittaker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Walker <Paul.Walker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr B Toon <Beryl.Toon@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Ackroyd <patricia.ackroyd@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr M Shrive <Mandy.Shrive@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr S Hussain <syed.hussain@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr A J Legg <alison.legg@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: Call in

All thank you for expressing concerns with the recent EDR for the development of the old Burton Mail site and for agreeing to support call in for the reasons listed below. I've also attached the two appendices that were referred to on the EDR but not originally circulated

Under the current Covid 19 restrictions the call in process has required a change. Whereby previously members would need to sign a document the monitoring officer has now explained that "In the current circumstances it will be sufficient to type the relevant members' names on the request, with supporting evidence attached in the form of emails from each of the members concerned, recording their reasons for the call in and their confirmation that their typed name on your document should be regarded as their electronic signature in this instance"

Call in needs to be sent before close on Wednesday therefore please could you agree by return email that the following constitutes your reasons for call in and that by including your name on the call in note it can be regarded as your electronic signature. Thank you in advance. Given that trying to encompass additional reasons would mean sending additional emails to all concerned again until we get a full list!, I have tried to cover everything discussed with all of you on the phone. If it is called in then we can explore further in scrutiny.

ttt. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is a stated "Funding viability gap" which has been described as the difference between delivering affordable housing as compared to market housing. This gap has been valued , by developer assigned analysis, of £242,522. This decision is to contribute £240,000 of that which equates to 98.96% of the funding gap. We do not believe that the council's response to this funding gap is proportionate given that the whole development will also deliver private commercial use which will generate profit for the developer of which we are unaware. In essence this £240K could therefore be said to helping to contribute to developer profit on this development. On social housing development the developer returns a yield of 4.5% and the purpose of this 240K is to push the yield to 6.5%, this is based on the independent advice sourced by the developer only . So the 106 contribution effectively increases developer yield by 50%, based on a valuation which is not council derived.

uuu. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);
There is no evidence provided as to the deadline for use of this 106 funding. It could in fact be relatively urgent and so this is forcing the council to "use it or lose" it and in so doing making a hasty decision .

vvv. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
For this valuation the council is relying solely on the analysis the developer has sourced , not through any council independent valuation. Before agreeing to allow £240,000 of public funding for this development we believe that the council should consult with its own valuation in order to determine best value for money for its residents.

www. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;
We do not see evidence that wider consultation of members has taken place in advance of this decision either in terms of funding or additional uses of the site.

xxx.11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;
In not seeking additional valuation we do not feel the council is being open in its decision making

yyy. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;
It has not been made clear who the developer is and whether or not they have an existing or previous development link to ESBC or Burton Upon Trent. We feel that in not disclosing the developer in this decision that there is no openness here.

zzz.11.2.7 a consideration of other options;

There is no evidence that other options have been considered in this decision making (for example but not limited to)

41. Could the whole site not be made available for affordable housing
42. Could the developer not agree to accommodate more of the funding gap than 1.04%
43. Given the council's previous aspiration to provide elderly accommodation could this whole site not been made available for that purpose.
44. Could the council not fund purchase of the site itself for development purposes

Councillor Richard Grosvenor

From: Cllr S Hussain

Sent: 30 June 2020 20:35

To: Cllr R G W Grosvenor <richard.grosvenor@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr J Jones <Jacqui.Jones@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr G Hall <Greg.Hall@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr C Whittaker <Colin.Whittaker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Walker <Paul.Walker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr B Toon <Beryl.Toon@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Ackroyd <patricia.ackroyd@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr M Shrive <Mandy.Shrive@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr A J Legg <alison.legg@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Call in

Hi

I can approve all the reasons sketched in the correspondence below establishes my elucidations for call in on the topics emphasised in relation to the redevelopment of the old Burton Mail offices. Please agree to take my name as my signature. Assuredly, gravity of the choice in this matter that respites upon the shoulder and the scruples of every single councillor as the custodian of tax payers.

Syed Hussain
Councillor for Anglesey Ward

From: Cllr R G W Grosvenor

Sent: 30 June 2020 10:47

To: Cllr J Jones <Jacqui.Jones@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr G Hall <Greg.Hall@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr C Whittaker <Colin.Whittaker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Walker <Paul.Walker@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr B Toon <Beryl.Toon@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr P Ackroyd <patricia.ackroyd@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr M Shrive <Mandy.Shrive@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr S Hussain <syed.hussain@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>; Cllr A J Legg <alison.legg@eaststaffsbc.gov.uk>

Subject: Call in

All thank you for expressing concerns with the recent EDR for the development of the old Burton Mail site and for agreeing to support call in for the reasons listed below. I've also attached the two appendices that were referred to on the EDR but not originally circulated

Under the current Covid 19 restrictions the call in process has required a change. Whereby previously members would need to sign a document the monitoring officer has now explained that "In the current circumstances it will be sufficient to type the relevant members'

names on the request, with supporting evidence attached in the form of emails from each of the members concerned, recording their reasons for the call in and their confirmation that their typed name on your document should be regarded as their electronic signature in this instance”

Call in needs to be sent before close on Wednesday therefore please could you agree by return email that the following constitutes your reasons for call in and that by including your name on the call in note it can be regarded as your electronic signature. Thank you in advance. Given that trying to encompass additional reasons would mean sending additional emails to all concerned again until we get a full list!, I have tried to cover everything discussed with all of you on the phone. If it is called in then we can explore further in scrutiny.

aaaa. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);

There is a stated “Funding viability gap” which has been described as the difference between delivering affordable housing as compared to market housing. This gap has been valued , by developer assigned analysis, of £242,522. This decision is to contribute £240,000 of that which equates to 98.96% of the funding gap. We do not believe that the council’s response to this funding gap is proportionate given that the whole development will also deliver private commercial use which will generate profit for the developer of which we are unaware. In essence this £240K could therefore be said to helping to contribute to developer profit on this development. On social housing development the developer returns a yield of 4.5% and the purpose of this 240K is to push the yield to 6.5%, this is based on the independent advice sourced by the developer only . So the 106 contribution effectively increases developer yield by 50%, based on a valuation which is not council derived.

bbbb. 11.2.2 proportionality (i.e. the action must be proportionate to the desired outcome);

There is no evidence provided as to the deadline for use of this 106 funding. It could in fact be relatively urgent and so this is forcing the council to “use it or lose” it and in so doing making a hasty decision .

cccc. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;

For this valuation the council is relying solely on the analysis the developer has sourced , not through any council independent valuation. Before agreeing to allow £240,000 of public funding for this development we believe that the council should consult with its own valuation in order to determine best value for money for its residents.

dddd. 11.2.3 due consultation and the taking of professional advice from officers;

We do not see evidence that wider consultation of members has taken place in advance of this decision either in terms of funding or additional uses of the site.

eeee. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;

In not seeking additional valuation we do not feel the council is being open in its decision making

ffff. 11.2.5 a presumption in favour of openness;

It has not been made clear who the developer is and whether or not they have an existing or previous development link to ESBC or Burton Upon Trent. We feel that in not disclosing the developer in this decision that there is no openness here.

gggg. 11.2.7 a consideration of other options;

There is no evidence that other options have been considered in this decision making (for example but not limited to)

45. Could the whole site not be made available for affordable housing

46. Could the developer not agree to accommodate more of the funding gap than 1.04%

47. Given the council's previous aspiration to provide elderly accommodation could this whole site not been made available for that purpose.

48. Could the council not fund purchase of the site itself for development purposes

Councillor Richard Grosvenor