## Council



St Edmundsbury BOROUGH COUNCIL

Title of Report:	Brownfield Land Register: Constitutional Amendments				
Report No:	COU/SE/18/006				
Report to and dates:	St Edmundsbury Council		20 February 2018		
	Forest I Council		21 February 2018		
Portfolio holder:	Carol Bull Portfolio Holder for Future Governance <b>Tel:</b> 01953 681513 <b>Email</b> : carol.bull@stedsbc.gov.uk				
Lead officer:	Leah Mickleborough Service Manager – Democratic Services / Monitoring Officer Tel: 01284 757162 Email: leah.mickleborough@westsuffolk.gov.uk				
Purpose of report:	This report proposes necessary amendments to the Constitution in order to assign responsibility for brownfield land register management.				
Recommendation:	It is <u>RECOMMENDED</u> that Council agrees the amendment to the scheme of delegation as set out in paragraph 1.5 of Report No: COU/SE/18/006, and authorises the Monitoring Officer to make the necessary constitutional amendments.				
<b>Key Decision:</b> (Check the appropriate box and delete all those that <u>do not</u> apply.)	Is this a Key Decision and, if so, under which definition? Yes, it is a Key Decision - □ No, it is not a Key Decision - ⊠				
Consultation:		The proposals in this report have been subject to consultation with the Joint Constitution Review Group			
Alternative option(s):		It is a statutory requirement for the Council to manage a brownfield land register. If this decision is not delegated, all entries in the register would require Council authorisation.			

Implications:				
Are there any final	ncial implications?	Yes 🗆 No 🖂		
If yes, please give	details	•		
Are there any staft	fing implications?	Yes 🗆 No 🖂		
If yes, please give		•		
Are there any ICT	implications? If	Yes 🗆 No 🖂		
yes, please give de	tails	•		
Are there any lega	l and/or policy	Yes 🛛 No 🗆		
implications? If yes, please give		This report ensures compliance		
details		with The Town and Country		
		Planning (Brownfield Land		
		Register) Regulations 2017		
Are there any <b>equality</b> implications?		Yes 🗆 No 🖂		
If yes, please give		•		
Risk/opportunity assessment:		(potential hazards or opportunities affecting		
		corporate, service or project objectives)		
Risk area	Inherent level of	Controls	Residual risk (after	
Risk area	risk (before			
	<b>risk</b> (before controls)	Controls	<b>Residual risk</b> (after controls)	
Risk area Failure to ensure adequate	risk (before		Residual risk (after	
Failure to ensure adequate management of the	<b>risk</b> (before controls)	Controls Ensuring effective	Residual risk (after controls)	
Failure to ensure adequate management of the register could result	<b>risk</b> (before controls)	Controls Ensuring effective and clear decision	Residual risk (after controls)	
Failure to ensure adequate management of the register could result in challenge to	<b>risk</b> (before controls)	Controls Ensuring effective and clear decision	Residual risk (after controls)	
Failure to ensure adequate management of the register could result in challenge to decisions, and loss of	<b>risk</b> (before controls)	Controls Ensuring effective and clear decision	Residual risk (after controls)	
Failure to ensure adequate management of the register could result in challenge to	<b>risk</b> (before controls)	Controls Ensuring effective and clear decision	Residual risk (after controls)	
Failure to ensure adequate management of the register could result in challenge to decisions, and loss of public confidence /	risk (before controls) Low	Controls Ensuring effective and clear decision	Residual risk (after controls)	
Failure to ensure adequate management of the register could result in challenge to decisions, and loss of public confidence / reputation	risk (before controls) Low	<b>Controls</b> Ensuring effective and clear decision making mechanisms	Residual risk (after controls)	
Failure to ensure adequate management of the register could result in challenge to decisions, and loss of public confidence / reputation Ward(s) affected Background pape (all background pape	risk (before controls) Low : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	Controls Ensuring effective and clear decision making mechanisms All	Residual risk (after controls)	
Failure to ensure adequate management of the register could result in challenge to decisions, and loss of public confidence / reputation Ward(s) affected Background pape	risk (before controls) Low : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	Controls Ensuring effective and clear decision making mechanisms All	Residual risk (after controls)	
Failure to ensure adequate management of the register could result in challenge to decisions, and loss of public confidence / reputation Ward(s) affected Background pape (all background pape	risk (before controls) Low : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	Controls Ensuring effective and clear decision making mechanisms All	Residual risk (after controls)	
Failure to ensure adequate management of the register could result in challenge to decisions, and loss of public confidence / reputation Ward(s) affected Background pape (all background pape published on the w	risk (before controls) Low : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	Controls Ensuring effective and clear decision making mechanisms All	<b>Residual risk</b> (after controls)	

## **1.** Key issues and reasons for recommendation

- 1.1 Recent regulations (The Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Register) Regulations 2017) require local authorities to set up and manage registers of brownfield sites within their areas, which may ultimately be suitable for residential development.
- 1.2 The register is kept in two parts; the first part simply lists those sites that may be suitable for development in that they are of sufficient size, there is no legal impediment to development, the owner / developer intends to seek to develop the site, and development is achievable within the next 15 years. If the site meets the criteria, it is included on the list.
- 1.3 The second part of the register includes those brownfield sites we would wish to allocate for residential development which, according to the regulations, means by virtue of the inclusion, the site has "permission in principle" to develop housing on it. The regulations are not clear in defining what permission in principle means. Prior to entering properties on this part of the register, the Council must undertake a formal notice period and consultation requirements, including engagement with local communities.
- 1.4 The first part of the register is process driven; if the site meets specific criteria, then it must be included on the register, and specific information must be placed on the register. However, there is a judgement as to whether or not land should be included in the second part of the register and be given permission in principle.
- 1.5 Given this, officers propose that "management of the brownfield land register under The Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Land Register) 2017" is added to the responsibilities of the Assistant Director (Planning and Regulatory Services). This will mean that the officers have responsibility for general management of the register, but, in the event that a ward member or Parish Council raises concern regarding the proposal to include a site in the second part of the register, it will be referred to the Delegation Panel to consider and potentially to the Development Control Committee to determine.