



The Growth Fund 2008–2011  
**Consultation**





The Growth Fund 2008–2011  
**Consultation**

Department for Communities and Local Government  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London  
SW1E 5DU  
Telephone: 020 7944 4400  
Website: [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

© Crown Copyright, 2008

*Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.*

*This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.*

Any other use of the contents of this publication would require a copyright licence. Please apply for a Click-Use Licence for core material at [www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/click-use/system/online/pLogin.asp), or by writing to the Office of Public Sector Information, Information Policy Team, Kew, Richmond, Surrey TW9 4DU

e-mail: [licensing@opsi.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@opsi.gov.uk)

If you require this publication in an alternative format please email [alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:alternativeformats@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

Communities and Local Government Publications  
PO Box 236  
Wetherby  
West Yorkshire  
LS23 7NB  
Tel: 08701 226 236  
Fax: 08701 226 237  
Textphone: 08701 207 405  
Email: [communities@capita.co.uk](mailto:communities@capita.co.uk)  
Online via the Communities and Local Government website: [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk)

May 2008

Product Code: 08HGP05221

ISBN: 978 1 8511 2953 9

# Contents

<b>The Growth Fund</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Consultation Questions</b>	<b>6</b>
Section 1 – Moving to a programme-based fund	6
Section 2 – Creating Programmes of Development	7
Section 3 – Assessing Programmes of Development	9
Section 4 – Calculating Growth Fund Allocations	12
Section 5 – Supporting Housing Growth in London	14
Section 6 – Monitoring and Support Arrangements	17
<b>Consultation Process</b>	<b>19</b>
Section 7 – How to respond to the consultation	19
Section 8 – What will happen next?	19
Section 9 – The Consultation Criteria	20
<b>Annex A</b> – Existing guidance on developing a Programme of Development	22
<b>Annex B</b> – Explanation of Programme of Development Appraisal Methodology	31

# The Growth Fund

In line with the principles of the Local Government White Paper, during 2007/08 Communities and Local Government reviewed how funding support for Growth Areas and Growth Points was delivered, in order to better align it with the development of Local Area Agreements and the Local Performance Framework.

The £732m Growth Fund was announced in December 2007 to support the delivery of infrastructure in local areas over the CSR07 period. It builds on the experience of both the Growth Areas Fund and the Growth Point Fund to provide a new way in which to fund growth which will better serve the needs of local areas. The key elements of the new system are:

- From 2008/09 instead of providing ringfenced funding for individual projects the Growth Fund will provide unringfenced block funding to local authorities and their partnerships.
- As an unringfenced grant, with the exception of reflecting the split between capital and revenue there will be no grant conditions about how or when it is spent. It will be for local authorities to prioritise how the funding is used in their area with performance monitored through the indicators in the Local Performance Framework.
- In order to determine funding allocations all eligible local authorities or local partnerships were invited to submit a Programme of Development during the summer of 2007.
- Programmes of Development are documents that set out local areas plans and ambitions for growth, including a trajectory for housing delivery and the infrastructure needed to support it, identified resources and an assessment of the extra funding needed to deliver.
- Funding decisions were based around the assessment of the Programmes of Development against the key criteria set out in the guidance, the number of homes to be delivered by 2016, and the scale of the key infrastructure challenges at the location.

As this is a new funding system, and particularly since it is the first time local authorities and partnerships had been invited to submit a Programme of Development as the basis for funding decisions, allocations were only confirmed for 2008/09, with indicative allocations for 2009/10 and 2010/11. This consultation is an opportunity to test the new funding system with stakeholders during the first year of operation to enable the system, where possible, to be improved even further for 2009/10 and 2010/11. It also enables us to take account of the creation of the new Homes and Communities Agency and the opportunities this offers for a more strategic and integrated approach to government support for housing development and regeneration.

Subject to the decisions taken following the consultation, the guidance for local areas will be updated based on the responses received, and areas will be commissioned to prepare and submit updated Programmes of Development, taking account of the updated guidance. More details of the proposed timetable for this work are set out in Section 8 (What will happen next?). The timetable in Section 8 is written on the assumption that we will continue with a programme-based multi-year scheme.

# Consultation Questions

## Section 1 – Moving to a programme-based fund

1. In line with the principles of the Local Government White Paper, during 2007/08 Communities and Local Government reviewed how funding support for Growth Areas and Growth Points was delivered, in order to better align it with the development of Local Area Agreements and the Local Performance Framework.
2. For 2008/09 the decision was taken to move from funding schemes on an individual project basis to funding them on a programme basis with an unringfenced block grant and to move in future to multi-year allocations. This raises a range of issues, upon which your views are sought.
3. Two benefits of providing a programme based multi-year allocation is the increased flexibility of funding through the provision of unringfenced grant and the increased certainty which it provides for places through multi-year allocations, which is particularly important to the delivery of housing growth and the associated infrastructure. However, it also creates a number of potential risks for local authorities. Firstly, if a poor Programme of Development is submitted by an authority, then the place in question would in effect suffer a detriment over a longer period of time, than if yearly allocations were made. Secondly, as allocations are announced at the start of the multi-year period there is unlikely to be any opportunity to alter allocations to reflect any unexpected changes involving particular local authorities in later years.
4. In practice, we would envisage the multi-year allocations being announced on a provisional basis, with provisional allocations for later years being confirmed and paid annually. We also anticipate that the Secretary of State will adopt a policy of only altering provisional allocations in exceptional circumstances. This is consistent with the approach which has been taken in relation to the local government finance settlement (including both Formula Grant and Area Based Grant).

### **Question 1**

Do you agree with the move to providing multi-year allocations?

(The remainder of the consultation document is written on the assumption that we will continue with a programme-based multi-year approach).



## Section 2 – Creating Programmes of Development

### ***Guidance on Programmes***

5. During summer 2007, guidance was issued to all local authorities eligible for support from the Growth Fund along with their delivery vehicles inviting them to draw up a Programme of Development in order to bid for funding. Programmes of Development were designed to provide an overview of the growth ambitions and the needs of local areas upon which funding decisions could be made. The final version of the guidance is attached at Annex A. As the results of the Comprehensive Spending Review 2007 were not available until October, there were aspects of the new funding system that we were unable to finalise prior to issuing the guidance. The guidance was therefore part of developing the process and was revised over the summer in line with emerging decisions, issues, and questions raised by locations in developing their Programmes.
6. Support and advice on preparing the Programmes was available from both the Government Offices and the Housing and Growth Programmes team at Communities and Local Government. Since then, legislation has been introduced to create the Homes and Communities Agency, with a remit which includes providing advice and support for local authorities and we expect that the agency will play the leading role in providing this support on preparing Programmes in future.
7. Prior to inviting refreshed Programmes to be submitted for funding for 2009/10 and 2010/11 we will be revising the guidance and it would be helpful to have views on how the guidance can be improved, and what additional support would be helpful.

### **Question 2**

How can we improve the guidance on preparing Programmes of Development?

- a) What areas within the guidance do you need further clarity on?
- b) What elements of the guidance do you feel do not add value to the Programmes?
- c) Are there areas of activity not requested in the guidance that would add value to the Programmes?

### **Question 3**

How much time will you need to update and resubmit your Programme of Development (e.g. six weeks/three months)?

## Question 4

What support from the Homes and Communities Agency, Communities and Local Government and/or the Government Offices would you find useful when developing your Programmes?

### *Working in Partnership*

8. The ability to work in partnership is a key requirement of successful growth. With the move to providing unringfenced block funding to local authorities, it was important that Programmes of Development incentivised partnership working and presented a prioritised overview of the plans and projects for an area. Therefore local partner organisations in the Growth Areas and Growth Points, like green infrastructure providers, who had previously been able to bid for funding independently, were asked to co-ordinate their requirements through the Programme of Development for the appropriate location. This approach has in turn enabled a much greater degree of local devolution, as the local partnerships are able to prioritise how the total of growth funding awarded to their area will be spent.
9. We are not just looking to see partnership working within a local authority area but also to encourage further partnership working across local authority boundaries to ensure that resources from the Growth Fund are targeted to best effect. We are therefore proposing that for 2009/10 and 2010/11 all Programmes of Development should be focused around a strategically significant town or city identified for growth within the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). Local authorities in the Growth Areas and Growth Points would therefore be expected to work together on a Programme of Development focused on a strategically significant town or city (or groups of towns or cities) identified for growth within the RSS.
10. As part of the consultation we would therefore welcome views on how successful the co-ordination role of the local authorities has been in the delivery of the Programmes of Development and ideas for how further partnership working across local authority areas might enable greater targeting of growth funding in future.

## Question 5

How successful has the co-ordination role of the local authorities been in the delivery of the Programmes of Development?

## Question 6

Do you agree that for 2009/10 and 2010/11 all Programmes of Development should be focused around a strategically significant town or city identified for growth within the RSS?

## Section 3 – Assessing Programmes of Development

11. Once the Programmes of Development had been submitted to Communities and Local Government on 1 October 2007, they were assessed jointly by the Housing and Growth Programmes team and the Government Offices. The guidance highlighted six key criteria on which funding allocations would be based:
  - i. Scale of housing growth challenge and timing of delivery
  - ii. Robustness of the local delivery mechanisms and partnerships arrangements
  - iii. Effectiveness of partnership with the private sector
  - iv. Need for public intervention
  - v. Overall soundness of the package
  - vi. Total funding available to the Department
12. These key criteria were translated into a series of questions for the assessment process, shown in Table 1 below. There were two entry questions; whether there was sign off by each participant local authority, and whether there were target dates for outline planning permission on key sites. These questions were made pass/fail questions due to their importance to delivery. Where a Programme did not pass these questions at the outset we went back to the local authority (LA)/local delivery vehicle (LDV) to request the appropriate information to satisfy these questions.
13. The remaining questions were each scored out of five and summarised to give an overall score for the Programme. Where further information was required we went back to the LA/LDV to request it. Further details can be found in the full Programme of Development Appraisal Methodology at Annex B.
14. Prior to inviting refreshed Programmes to be submitted for funding for 2009/10 and 2010/11 we are reviewing the assessment process and would welcome views on the types of questions that should be included, and the type of data that should be used. To date Programmes of Development have included an element of assessment based on past performance. We are proposing to make this a more prominent part of the assessment process, particularly in relation to the outcome of previous projects, and will update the guidance on Programmes of Development to take account of this.
15. With the exception of the Government Offices and the Greater London Authority (GLA) in London, we did not invite other Government agencies or departments to comment on the proposals in the Programmes of Development to inform the assessments for 2008/09. In future, we would expect the primary advice to come from the Homes and Communities Agency as it will be expected to work with local authorities to develop support for Growth Areas and Growth Points and to become Government's main source of advice on the delivery of housing growth.

<b>Table 1 – Questions for the assessment of Programmes of Development</b>
<b>Criteria</b>
Entry Questions
Has the Programme of Development been signed off by each participant local authority?
Does the Programmes of Development include defined target dates for the grant of outline planning permission for major/key sites identified to be brought forward within 2008/09 – 2010/11 to secure the delivery of the proposed housing trajectory? (or where no major/key sites are due is it explicit how delivery of the proposed housing trajectory for 2008/09 – 2010/11 will be secured?)
Section A -Scale of challenge and timing
What is the level of overall net additions to 2016/17?
What is the level of percentage uplift compared to previously planned figures at RPG 2003 (or equivalent)?
What is the level of predicted net additions over the CSR period (2008/09 – 10/11) as a percentage of total net additions to 2016/17?
Section B- Robustness of the Local Delivery Mechanisms & Partnership Arrangements
How robust are the local delivery mechanisms and structures to support growth?
Section C-Effectiveness of partnership with private sector
How effective are working arrangements with the private sector, including developer contributions and tariffs?
Section D-Need for public intervention (jointly represents scale of challenge with Section A)
What is the scale of key infrastructure works and challenges required to support growth?
What degree of prioritisation of projects is there in selecting infrastructure projects?
To what extent does the Programme successfully make a strategic case for the investment of Growth Fund monies in the area?
Section E-Overall soundness of the package
Is there a high level vision and objectives for growth linked to their plans for delivery?
Has the effect of growth on transport been considered and have the appropriate agencies been engaged?
Has the effect of growth on the environment been considered and have the appropriate agencies been engaged?
What level of environmental aspirations are expected to be delivered? (e.g. Code for Sustainable Homes)
What level of commitment is there to the provision of green infrastructure?
What measures are being taken to ensure that good design is embedded in the growth plans?
Does the Programme fit with strategic local requirements? (e.g. HMA's, planning targets)

### ***Improving the assessment questions***

#### **Question 7**

How can we improve the assessment questions to better reflect the Programmes?

- a) Are there any assessment questions that you do not feel are relevant?
- b) Which elements from the Programmes of Development do you not feel are adequately represented in the assessment questions?

#### **Question 8**

Which sections of the assessment do you feel are the most important elements for funding decisions?

#### **Question 9**

Do you agree that a question should be included under section D to determine what other sources of public expenditure are supporting the projects?

#### **Question 10**

We are proposing to introduce an additional entry question on whether the Programme of Development is focused around a strategically significant town or city identified for growth within the RSS. Do you agree with this approach?

### ***Types of Information***

#### **Question 11**

To make the scale of challenge section more robust we are proposing to include, under section A, an additional question to consider the scale of growth relative to the size of the area. How do you think this criterion would be best evaluated, and what weight should be applied to it?

#### **Question 12**

In line with the guidance, for 2008/09 we used draft RSS housing targets to 2016/17, (or for the Growth Points their proposals where these were ahead of the draft RSS) to determine the overall level of net additions. Should we continue to measure net additions on this basis or should we use a different measure? (e.g. local plan numbers/projected completions from the housing trajectory)

### Question 13

A local area's affordable housing strategy is important in terms of creating sustainable growth. We are therefore proposing to take this into account when allocating growth funding to a place. Do you agree with this approach, and if so, how do you think it should be used, and what weighting should be applied?

#### *Past Performance*

### Question 14

What factors should be used to measure past performance, and when should it be measured from?

- a) Should we use the national indicators from the Local Performance Framework related to housing and planning?
- b) How should we measure the successful delivery of infrastructure to support housing growth?
- c) What account should we take of the delivery of commitments outlined in previous Programmes?

## Section 4 – Calculating Growth Fund Allocations

16. Prior to 2008/09, the Government had provided funding to enable growth on a project specific basis. The funding allocations under the Growth Areas Fund and the Growth Point Fund were ring fenced to specific projects, with payments made in arrears upon the receipt of a grant claim form for works carried out.
17. Eligible growth locations who submitted bids to the Growth Fund for the 2008–2011 periods did so, on a different basis. In a move away from the individual funding of projects, local areas were invited to submit a Programme of Development to set out local areas plans and ambitions for growth over the CSR07 period, including a trajectory for housing delivery and the infrastructure needed to support it, identified resources, and an assessment of the funding needed to deliver it.
18. In December 2007, the Housing Minister announced individual Growth Fund allocations for local areas that submitted Programmes of Development for the 2008–11 period. The announcement confirmed individual allocations for 2008–09, and indicative allocations for 2009–11.
19. Unlike the project funding allocated previously, the block grant is un-ringfenced, so local areas are free to allocate the resources as they see fit, with the exception that capital must be used for capital expenditure. The grant is paid in full in advance of works being completed. All appraisal, monitoring, financial management, governance and audit of individual projects being the responsibility of the lead authority for the payment of grant.

### ***Funding Methodology***

20. The strategic methodology adopted to calculate individual funding allocations for Programmes of Development consists of three key elements, which are as follows:
- The net housing additions to 2016/17:  
Programmes of Development are assessed on the level of net housing additions that they will be contributing towards the achievement of the Government's Growth objective of delivering 240,000 additional homes a year by 2016.
  - The assessment of the Programme of Development:  
The quality of the proposal, as assessed and scored by Communities and Local Government and the relevant Government Office, is taken into account. This consultation is considering the criteria that are used to carry out this assessment, on which your views are sought under Section 3.
  - The scale of challenge:  
In recognition of the fact that local areas who face significant challenges in terms of infrastructure and what they are trying to deliver will require a higher level of funding, the scale of challenge is taken into account. The scale of challenge is assessed and scored against a set of criteria as part of the assessment process, on which again your views are sought under Section 3.
21. We are seeking views on proposals that an additional factor should be introduced to take into account the past performance of a bidding place. This would result in the assessment of past performance, as detailed in section 3 of this consultation document, directly influencing the level of funding allocated to a place. Further to question 13, we would welcome views on the possibility of adding an element on affordable housing to the net additions section of the methodology.
22. The results of this consultation will be used to update the existing methodology, which will then be used alongside updated Programmes of Development to re-calculate the indicative allocations and confirm the level of Growth Funding that local areas will receive during the 2009–11 period.

### **Question 15**

Do you agree that past performance should be included as a fourth key element in the funding methodology?

If so, what weight should be applied to it?

## Question 16

Do you think that the level of affordable housing proposed in a Programme of Development should be incorporated into the main methodology by being considered alongside the 'net housing additions to 2006/17' section?

## Section 5 – Supporting Housing Growth in London

23. London is a critical player in the delivery of housing growth nationally. The London Plan aims to deliver at least 305,000 homes over the 10 year period 2007 to 2016. Much of this growth is to take place in the 12 London boroughs that form the London part of the Thames Gateway and the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough growth areas. As a result since 2003/04 these boroughs have been eligible for support towards the delivery of infrastructure from either the Growth Areas Fund (now the Growth Fund) or the Thames Gateway Fund.

<b>Thames Gateway Boroughs</b>	<b>London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough Boroughs</b>
LB Barking & Dagenham	LB Enfield
LB Bexley	LB Hackney
LB Greenwich	LB Haringey
LB Havering	LB Redbridge
LB Lewisham	LB Waltham Forest
LB Newham	
LB Tower Hamlets	

24. Eligibility for the Growth Areas Fund was extended in 2006/07 to include the London Opportunity Boroughs of Barnet, Brent and Islington. The target to deliver 200,000 additional homes by 2016 established in the Sustainable Communities Plan covered both the Growth Areas and London, recognising London's critical role in delivering housing growth nationally. These three boroughs were given access to support in recognition of their capacity and willingness to deliver levels of growth significantly above the then London Plan housing targets.
25. Since the last round of allocations from the Growth Areas Fund in 2006/07:
- new housing targets have become effective in London following the Early Alterations to the London Plan;
  - the Greater London Authority Act 2007 has given the Mayor responsibilities among others relating to housing strategy, funding recommendations for the Regional Housing Pot and determination of strategic planning applications.



London borough housing strategies and other housing plans must be in general conformity with the Mayor's housing strategy;

- in line with the establishment of the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA), the announcement of a London HCA Board, a local sub-committee of the HCA to be chaired by the Mayor and responsible for helping to deliver affordable housing in London and the South East (details of the relationship between the HCA and the Mayor have yet to be finalised); and
- Communities and Local Government have implemented the new funding system for the Growth Fund.

26. In light of these changes we are reviewing the arrangements for supporting housing growth in London.

### ***Role of the Mayor***

27. The Mayor and the Greater London Assembly give London a governance structure very different from the rest of England. With the Mayor taking on responsibility for the statutory London Housing Strategy, chairing the London HCA Board and having powers to determine strategic planning applications, the Mayor and his relevant agencies, particularly Transport for London and the London Development Agency, are key players in the delivery of housing growth in London. Recognising this role, the Mayor was invited to comment on the strategic fit of the Programmes of Development with his plans and strategies for the 2008/09 allocations. For 2009/10 onwards we want to consider what role the Mayor should play in decisions on the allocation of the Growth Fund in London.
28. We are not proposing to create a top slice of the Growth Fund for London upon which the Mayor could make recommendations. One of the key principles behind the Growth Fund is that all places are compared equally against the total available funding to ensure that funding is directed to best effect.

## **Question 17**

What role should the Mayor have in decisions on Growth Fund allocations in London for 2009/10 and 2010/11?

- a) Should the Mayor be invited to continue to comment only on the strategic fit of Programmes of Development in London?
- b) Should the Mayor be invited to work with Communities and Local Government and the Government Office for London on the assessment of Programmes of Development which feed into the allocation system?
- c) Should the Mayor be invited to commission the Programmes of Development in London, working in partnership with the local authorities, agreeing content and co-ordinating their submission to Communities and Local Government, to ensure that the Programmes of Development represent both the strategic and local requirements for growth?

### ***Role of Transport for London and the London Development Agency***

29. Under the new funding system for the Growth Fund from 2008/09, as we moved from funding specific projects to providing block funding to local authorities, all non-LA organisations who were previously eligible to bid for funding directly (e.g. green infrastructure providers) were asked to work with the relevant local authority on their projects for inclusion in the Programme of Development. Transport for London and the London Development Agency had previously bid for funding directly but for 2008/09 were asked to work with the relevant local authorities.
30. Transport for London and the London Development Agency are both pan-region organisations which sit under the governance structure of the Mayor. Often their infrastructure investment priorities cut across more than one local authority boundary. Under the Growth Fund, they must work with local authorities to agree priorities for funding locally. In recognition of their strategic infrastructure role, it may however be more efficient to enable Transport for London and the London Development Agency to bid directly for funding for strategic projects alongside the Growth Area authorities.

### **Question 18**

In recognition of the different governance arrangements in London compared to other parts of England and the pan region nature of these two bodies should the Mayor, on behalf of Transport for London and the London Development Agency, be eligible to submit a Programme of Development covering the London Boroughs in the London-Stansted-Cambridge-Peterborough (LSCP) Growth Area and the Opportunity Boroughs to bid for funding directly from the Growth Fund from 2009/10 onwards, or should priorities for funding continue to be decided at the local level?

This would be dependant on the Mayor not having a role in the assessment of Programmes of Development as proposed above, which could cause a conflict of interest.

### ***Reviewing the London Opportunity Boroughs***

31. There are currently 18 boroughs in London that are not eligible for support from the Growth Fund. Now that the new housing targets from the Early Alterations to the London Plan have become effective we are reviewing eligibility for those boroughs not currently included in the Thames Gateway or LSCP growth areas for funding support from the Growth Fund. We propose to do this by reviewing the eligibility criteria for the London Opportunity Boroughs to ensure that support is directed to those with high housing targets.
32. We are proposing that the criteria for the London Opportunity Boroughs should be based on:

- the percentage increase in the annual monitoring target in the London Plan Early Alterations compared to the annual monitoring target in the London Plan 2004; and
  - a minimum level of annual housing supply.
33. Subject to the decisions taken following the consultation, any 'new' Opportunity Boroughs created will be able to apply for funding from the Growth Fund in 2009/10 and 2010/11 and from the second round of the Community Infrastructure Fund. Further details on accessing the Community Infrastructure Fund can be found on the Communities and Local Government website, [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk).
34. Please note that levels of housing growth for London Boroughs can be found in the London Plan, and in line with PSA Delivery Agreement 20, to 'Increase long term Housing Supply and Affordability'; any new locations for growth will need to be agreed with the Department for Transport.

### Question 19

Do you agree with the above proposed criteria for the London Opportunity Boroughs? And if so:

- a) What level of percentage increase should be used? (e.g. 25% or 30%)
- b) What level of annual housing supply should be used as a minimum? (e.g. 1000 or 1500)
- c) What additional or other criteria should be considered?

## Section 6 – Monitoring and Support Arrangements

35. Communities and Local Government and the Government Offices will no longer monitor progress on individual projects as under the previous system but will instead monitor performance overall through the indicators in the Local Performance Framework. As allocations from the Growth Fund from 2008/09 onwards are now unringfenced local areas will be free to use their allocation as and when they see fit. It will be the sole responsibility of local areas to manage and monitor their projects and spend, and to deal with financial management questions according to their own financial and accounting policies.
36. Communities and Local Government and the Government Offices will continue to provide support and advice to Growth Areas and Growth Points, to help address barriers to delivery and share best practice. But, as indicated above, the primary source of advice will in future come from the Homes and Communities Agency. This is explained in more detail below.
37. The Housing and Regeneration Bill, currently going through Parliament, provides for the creation of the Homes and Communities Agency which from April 2009 will bring together the functions currently undertaken by

the Housing Corporation, English Partnerships, and certain Communities and Local Government delivery functions, including delivery support in the Growth Areas and the Growth Points. Fulfilling its objective of becoming the 'best delivery partner' for local authorities, it will work with local authorities to develop support for the Growth Areas and the Growth Points and will become Government's main source of advice on the delivery of housing growth. Responsibility for selecting and assessing growth areas will remain with the Department and with Ministers.

38. The Homes and Communities Agency will be looking to have a 'single conversation' with local authorities across the range of their housing and regeneration ambitions, not just housing growth, to develop a holistic approach to support and investment in local areas. More information on how this relationship will operate will be developed in line with the passage of the Housing and Regeneration Bill through parliament.

# Consultation Process

## Section 7 – How to respond to the consultation

Please send your response no later than 7 July 2008 to:

Tim Coburn  
Housing and Growth Programmes Team  
Department for Communities and Local Government  
2/H9 Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London  
SW1E 5DU

Or by email to [timothy.coburn@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:timothy.coburn@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

If you have any queries regarding the consultation please email the above address or contact Tim Coburn on 020 7944 3727.

Representative groups are asked to include a summary of the people and organisations they represent in their reply.

Information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be published or disclosed in accordance with the access to information regimes (these are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA) and the Environmental Regulations 2004).

If you want the information that you provide to be treated as confidential, please be aware that, under the FOIA, there is a statutory Code of Practice with which public authorities must comply and which deals, amongst other things, with obligations of confidence. In view of this it would be helpful if you could explain to us why you regard the information you have provided as confidential. If we receive a request for disclosure of the information we will take full account of your explanation, but we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances. An automatic confidentiality disclaimer generated by your IT system will not, of itself, be regarded as binding on the Department.

## Section 8 – What will happen next?

A summary of responses, including the next steps, will be published on the Communities and Local Government website at [www.communities.gov.uk](http://www.communities.gov.uk); within six weeks of the close of the consultation.

Once received, all responses to this consultation will be collated and fully considered. Decisions will then be taken about how best to proceed with the allocation of the Growth Fund in future years.

If it is decided to continue with a programme-based multi-year scheme responses to the consultation will be used to update the assessment process and funding methodology. Once this exercise is complete, revised guidance on how to bid for growth funding will be published. We hope to publish the updated guidance in the summer 2008, at which time we will commission refreshed Programmes of Developments, which dependent on the outcome of the consultation local areas will have a minimum of six weeks to re-submit. Based on this timetable, we hope to be in a position to confirm the 2009–11 allocations, for which indicative figures were announced in December 2007, by autumn 2008. Some change to these figures may well occur as a result of the refreshed Programmes and the updated assessment. The following timetable provides a more specific overview:

<b>Table 2 – Consultation Timetable</b>	
12 May	Consultation published
7 July	Closing date for consultation
July	Communities and Local Government to analyse responses
End July	Earliest possible date for response to consultation, revised guidance and to commission refreshed Programmes of Development
8 September	Earliest possible deadline for refreshed Programmes of Development
Autumn	Funding decision likely to be announced

Communities and Local Government will publish a revised version of the funding methodology and the appraisal form (current version attached at Annex B) with the final updated version of the Programme of Development guidance, in line with the timetable detailed above.

## Section 9 – The Consultation Criteria

The Government has adopted a code of practice on consultations. The criteria below apply to all UK national public consultations on the basis of a document in electronic or printed form. They will often be relevant to other sorts of consultation.

Though they have no legal force, and cannot prevail over statutory or other mandatory external requirements (e.g. under European Community Law), they should otherwise generally be regarded as binding on UK departments and their agencies, unless Ministers conclude that exceptional circumstances require a departure.

- 1. Consult widely throughout the process, allowing a minimum of 12 weeks\* for written consultation at least once during the development of the policy**
- 2. Be clear about what your proposals are, who may be affected, what questions are being asked and the timescale for responses**
- 3. Ensure that your consultation is clear, concise and widely accessible**

- 4. Give feedback regarding the responses received and how the consultation process influenced the policy**
- 5. Monitor your department's effectiveness at consultation, including through the use of a designated consultation co-ordinator**
- 6. Ensure your consultation follows better regulation best practice, including carrying out an Impact Assessment if appropriate**

The full consultation code may be viewed at  
[www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/regulation/Consultation/Introduction.htm](http://www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/regulation/Consultation/Introduction.htm)

Are you satisfied that this consultation has followed these criteria? If not, or you have any other observations about ways of improving the consultation process please contact:

Communities and Local Government Consultation Co-ordinator – Albert Joyce,  
Zone 6/H10,  
Eland House,  
London,  
SW1E 5 DU

or by e-mail to: [Albert.Joyce@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:Albert.Joyce@communities.gsi.gov.uk)

\* Please note that given the nature of this consultation, an eight week response time has been set.

# Annex A – Existing guidance on developing a Programme of Development

## Guidance for growth points and growth areas producing a programme of development to access future housing growth funding

### Introduction

1. This guidance note seeks to assist local authorities and local delivery vehicles in the growth points and growth areas to produce their *Programmes of Development*. It builds on support and advice provided by Government Offices.
2. The *programme* is intended to perform a number of functions: that of project management tool to guide the local delivery of an increased supply of housing; as a means of articulating key infrastructure needs to support this growth; and as a basis for bidding for housing growth funding from the Department for Communities and Local Government to help deliver this programme. Many locations are already using a similar document and this guidance builds on our experience of best practice around the growth areas.
3. We anticipate that these *programmes* will be produced for the key growth locations in the growth areas and for the growth points, with authorities working together with local and regional partners where appropriate to ensure that cross-boundary needs are addressed. The *programmes* should present a strategic view of the actions necessary to deliver growth in each area, and can draw upon as well as inform the more detailed infrastructure planning that needs to underpin the production of Local Development Frameworks. Hence this note supports the direction of travel indicated by the Planning White Paper of May 2007: sections 8.26–8.29 refer.
4. This note also aligns with recent policy developments regarding design quality and the need to eliminate poor development and make good and very good development the norm, as set out in Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3).
5. The *programme* should be owned by the lead authority/partnership of authorities or the local delivery vehicle and should bring together the key



partner organisations to ensure local buy-in and reduce the risk of future delay to the delivery of the housing trajectory through, for example, a failure for infrastructure to keep pace with housing growth.

6. It should be focused on the delivery of a housing growth trajectory, based on (draft) regional spatial strategy housing provision targets (or growth point commitments of October 2006 where higher) with phased supporting infrastructure, including social and green infrastructure projects, clearly anticipated and planned for.
7. The *programme* should be a living document which adapts to changing local circumstances and priorities, providing a focus for all the organisations involved in the development of the growth location.
8. The note also draws on recent departmental thinking regarding appropriate methods for transferring funding from Central Government to local authorities and seeks to align with the principles of the Local Government White Paper of October 2006, by moving away from project-based funding to a lighter-touch funding relationship based on local determination, the local authority as place-shaper and the achievement of agreed outcomes.
9. Subject to Ministerial approval and the outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review, it is intended that from 2008/09 onwards, housing growth capital and revenue support to local authorities will generally be un-ringfenced and awarded as block funding on the basis of the content of the programmes of development. Funding will no longer be awarded on or linked to specific projects but will be based on an overall assessment of the Programmes of Development. It will be for local authorities to prioritise how the funding is spent. Therefore, while the principle remains that the *programme* needs to be designed to be fit for purpose locally as a means to guide delivery, there is a need for standard information to be provided across authorities to enable Government to assess need and deliverability, and to allocate funds fairly and transparently.
10. Under this new block funding regime, all appraisal, monitoring and audit of individual projects will be the responsibility of the lead authority. It is anticipated that, following on from the publication of the Local Government White Paper, local authorities will be subject to monitoring against around 200 national indicators, and data will be collected from these to inform progress and record performance. Further announcements will be made about the national indicators and about the process for local and central government to agree place-specific priority indicators. We consider that data on housing supply and determination of large-scale planning applications provided via the new Local Government Performance Management system would provide useful indicative performance information about growth outcomes. In addition an important source of information will be publicly available data e.g. on the grant of planning permission for major sites.
11. Where a local delivery vehicle exists we would expect them to co-ordinate the production of the programme for their growth location. In the rest of the growth areas, we would expect local authorities to group together

to co-ordinate a *programme* around the major centre for growth. In the growth points, the partnership working and the evidence base submitted to Government in 2006 presents a sound base on which to build the programme of development.

NOTE: In June 2007 the Government published a consultation paper on the creation of a new national housing and regeneration agency, including proposals to transfer a number of Communities and Local Government functions including growth delivery and programmes to the new agency. Consultation on the proposals, which will require legislation, closed on 10 September.

## Timetable and funding allocation criteria

12. Full and final *programmes* should be submitted to the Housing and Growth Programmes team at the Department for Communities and Local Government **by midday on Monday 1 October** – contact details below. Please be sure to copy your Government Office contact into any correspondence you send to the Housing and Growth Programmes team.
13. We will then consider the programmes together with colleagues at the Government Offices and where appropriate other interested parties including in London the GLA/LDA. Please ensure we have a key contact for the Programmes of Development as we may come back for additional information if required. We will advise ministers on appropriate funding allocations based on the following six key criteria:
  - i. Scale of challenge and timing of delivering the housing growth (e.g. total housing provision proposed, percentage uplift on previous provision, proportion of development to be on previously developed land, cross-boundary working) and when the main funding is required (e.g. in the coming two years or further ahead);
  - ii. Robustness of the local delivery mechanisms and partnership arrangements;
  - iii. Effectiveness of partnership with the private sector (e.g. agreeing s106, work on a tariff approach);
  - iv. Need for public intervention, as demonstrated by proposed projects, engagement of other public bodies and potential sources of funding support;
  - v. Overall soundness of the package (cohesiveness, comprehensiveness, evidence of project prioritisation);
  - vi. Total funding available to the Department – to be settled through the Comprehensive Spending Review.
14. Final decisions on the operation of the new funding system are subject to Ministerial approval and we will provide more detail on arrangements in September. However, in advance of this, where Programmes of Development are being submitted on behalf of a partnership of local authorities (or via

an LDV) it should include details of which local authority will act as the lead authority for the payment of grant and describe the mechanism the partnership will use to determine how to distribute the funding. All Programmes of Development should be signed off by the Chief Executives of the local authorities included in the bid.

15. As we are no longer providing funding for individual projects but intending to provide unringfenced block funding based on the sum of the information provided in the Programmes of Development, it will be for the local authority or the partnership of local authorities where appropriate to determine how to invest funding locally.
16. Total housing growth funding is expected to be announced as part of CSR07 in October. We are aiming to reach funding decisions based on Programmes of Development in December.

## Content of the *programme*

17. We have previously said that the programme of development should be built around three core elements: the rationale for growth; a housing trajectory; and details of infrastructure dependencies, including potential candidate projects for Communities and Local Government-funding. This note expands on this to set out some more key pieces of information which we will need to see in order to assess the need for funding.

### ***Vision and rationale for growth***

18. The *programme* should give a broad overview of the vision and rationale for the development of the growth location in order to put the trajectory and projects into context. This should align with the existing or emerging strategic planning context, and for the growth points will build on the growth proposals submitted to Government last year. In London we will expect *programmes* to have regard to the London Plan and the Mayor's strategies and to be in line with the emerging North London Development and Investment Framework.
19. There are various ways this can be presented and authorities are encouraged to be innovative in their presentation of the vision which the trajectory will deliver. Examples of draft programmes which illustrate a number of approaches being undertaken around the growth points have been circulated around that group and can be obtained from Government Offices. Publications and strategies on the websites of growth area local delivery vehicles can also offer inspiration: links to their websites can be found below. While we encourage sharing of experience however it is important to recognise that an approach which suits one place might be less appropriate for another.
20. We would expect the *programme* for each growth point and growth area location to include the following elements. Note that this is not intended to duplicate the content of Core Strategies or statutory planning documents, nor

to prejudice their production, the emphasis should be on the broad context for growth and existing/emerging options for addressing it:

- Level of proposed housing provision to 2016 and beyond (from the draft RSS/ RSS proposed changes/NGP commitment of October 2006), with a brief outline of the planning context which underpins this ambition;
- A map of the growth location showing key sites and areas for development, including key infrastructure schemes (existing and future, including green infrastructure) where these are known – this can be indicative;
- Descriptions of key sites or areas for development, (where necessary these can be options or broad directions of growth) setting out the key challenges to each; the proposed strategy to tackle these challenges; and an indication if development briefs or masterplans exist or are planned for the sites or areas.
- Relationship with other key strategies, such as the local transport plan, community and economic strategies, health, design, leisure, green infrastructure or cultural strategies;
- A statement on design and environmental aspirations for new development and how these will be realised, including standards or targets to be achieved; this should include an indication of what local design skills resource is available to the partner organisations;
- Consideration of soft demand management measures for transport infrastructure;
- An assessment of the impact on existing, or need for new, major water-related infrastructure, relating to i.a. water supply, sewage treatment and flood risk management;
- Existing (or proposed) delivery structures: e.g. dedicated local delivery vehicle; partnership of local authorities; joint planning unit; infrastructure delivery board.

### ***Housing growth trajectory***

21. Annex A contains detailed guidance on producing a housing growth trajectory. The trajectory needs to be split down into the key sites or areas for development, with clear and realistic phasing to enable cross-reference to infrastructure provision and potential capital projects for this Department and other agencies to fund. The key role of the trajectory is to demonstrate when and where the level of housing supply **previously committed to** will be delivered, to the degree that this is known, and the timing of investment/ infrastructure needed to support that growth. For the New Growth Points, this means that it should demonstrate that the level of housing development signed up to in October 2006 is deliverable.
22. This should be provided within the *programme* in the form of a bar chart for ease of reference including plan, monitor and manage lines. The more detailed table underpinning the chart can be supplied in an annex if needs be.
23. It should also contain realistic target dates (format – month/year) for the grant of outline planning permissions on your major sites in your housing trajectory

within the next 3 years. This will support the demonstration of the deliverability of your housing trajectory.

### ***Presentation of infrastructure projects***

24. If the *programme* is to be used to guide the delivery of housing at the growth location then an indication of all infrastructure dependencies relating to the delivery of the proposed growth should be included, with clear references to the phasing in the housing growth trajectory. How widely to cast the net in terms of infrastructure needs and projects to be included will depend on how the growth location intends to use the document. Clearly it is the projects for which growth funding is being requested from this Department which are of particular interest to us, but an indication of total need at the growth location will be helpful and a comprehensive approach should assist you in planning for the housing growth and related development.
25. Projects should be split into three phases:
  - i. Projects underway or planned for 2007/08 which support delivery of the programme;
  - ii. Medium-term projects for 2008/09–10/11: to include candidate projects for Communities and Local Government funding;
  - iii. Longer-term projects for post 2011: outline of key infrastructure necessary to support delivery of the trajectory.
26. Naturally more information can be provided at this stage on the medium-term projects than those phased for 2011/12 onwards. It would help us if you could present the medium-term projects in table form, to include the following information for each:
  - Project title;
  - Likely lead organisation;
  - Short description of project objectives, including an indication of how this will assist delivery of the housing growth trajectory;
  - Estimate of cost, per financial year and split between revenue and capital;
  - Requested contribution from Communities and Local Government, per financial year;
  - The reason why a financial contribution from Communities and Local Government is required;
  - Potential other funding sources, particularly where any funding is already secured, including any private sector funding;
  - Timeframe for delivery.
27. We do not need to have any more detailed information on specific projects than this. What we need to understand is the infrastructure pressures facing the growth location which might be expected to slip through the funding net of other public agencies or which might not attract developer contributions. We do not however want to see a long “wish list” of potential projects: we

do want to see a realistic presentation of smaller-scale infrastructure projects which support the delivery of housing in sustainable, prosperous and cohesive communities. All elements should be presented in project specific terms. Please do not include general funds for specified purposes (e.g. strategic greenspace provision) unless this can be broken down to demonstrate all the elements within the project that add up to the funding required.

28. Highlighting other potential funders will not be interpreted as a lesser need for a contribution from this Department: rather it will be interpreted as evidence of a holistic approach being taken to planning for the sustainable development of the growth location. Furthermore it should help you in approaching those organisations for funding in the future.
29. It is also vital that these projects are prioritised in some way, again as evidence of a comprehensive approach being taken and of local buy-in and support for the approach set out in the *programme*. Where there are multiple authorities engaged in the growth partnership then to prioritise projects now will assist delivery when/if funding is allocated for the 2008/09 financial year.
30. As announced on 23 July in the Housing Green Paper *Homes for the Future: more affordable, more sustainable* the Community Infrastructure Fund will continue with £300m to support transport schemes related to housing growth in the Growth Areas, Growth Points and Eco-towns for the 2008/09 – 2010/11 period. Announcements on how to access CIF will be made in the Autumn.
31. Although CIF will not be distributed based on the Programmes of Development, it would be helpful to highlight in the Programmes of Development any schemes that your partnership may consider putting forward for CIF. These should be small/medium scale transport schemes with **a strong link** to the provision of additional housing numbers, not currently prioritised for funding or where housing development would be accelerated by funding the project early.
32. We are **not** asking local authorities (or LDVs) to choose between bidding for growth funding or CIF. As we intend to move to a system of unringfenced block funding local authorities/partnerships will be able to prioritise which projects actually receive funding out of the Programmes of Development. Projects highlighted as potential CIF schemes will therefore not be removed from the assessment of funding based on the Programmes of Development. Funding decisions will be based on all the evidence provided. The purpose of highlighting potential CIF schemes is to provide us with an indication of scale in relation to CIF prior to the bidding process.
33. For examples of the kind of projects which we might like our funding to support you should visit the Department's website which shows case studies from around the growth areas: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/housing/housingsupply/growthareas/growthareasby/>. You should also speak to your Government Office for guidance on the appropriateness of specific projects to be included. However, an important element of the new funding regime is that we will not be looking closely at specific project proposals: the basic principle to follow is that the works will help speed up or support the delivery of increased levels of housing in well-designed, sustainable and cohesive communities.

## Green Infrastructure

34. Under GAF 2 10% of funding was ringfenced for the provision of green infrastructure and green infrastructure providers were able to bid directly to Communities and Local Government for grant in aid. We continue to attach importance to the provision of green infrastructure in line with agreed green infrastructure strategies, however, under the new funding system, and in line with the Local Government White Paper, this ringfence will no longer apply and only bodies who are local authorities, UDCs or statutory bodies that can receive grant in aid will be able to receive housing growth funding. Green infrastructure providers should work with local authorities/partnerships to ensure green infrastructure is properly reflected in local authorities' Programmes of Development. Green infrastructure is still a key priority for sustainable growth but this reflects that we are moving to a system where funding is delivered through local authorities in their role as place shaper.

## Eco-developments

35. We are keen to encourage exemplar schemes which will help lead the design of new housing to achieve targets for sustainability and zero-carbon and will be ready to recognise pioneering schemes of this type in discussions on funding. A description of objectives in this area is set out in the Eco-towns prospectus.

## Design

36. Good design is central to delivering sustainable growth. It may be helpful to consider using the 'Building for Life' benchmark. This is a government-endorsed benchmark for well designed housing and neighbourhoods. It is a cross-cutting tool for assessing design quality at both a planning stage and after completion, based on 20 easy to understand questions. Further information can be found at [www.buildingforlife.org](http://www.buildingforlife.org).

## Web references

37. Web addresses for existing local delivery vehicles:
- Cambridgeshire Horizons: [www.cambridgeshirehorizons.co.uk](http://www.cambridgeshirehorizons.co.uk)
  - Opportunity Peterborough: [www.opportunitypeterborough.co.uk](http://www.opportunitypeterborough.co.uk)
  - West Northants Development Corporation: [www.wndc.co.uk](http://www.wndc.co.uk)
  - Renaissance Bedford: [www.renaissancebedford.org.uk](http://www.renaissancebedford.org.uk)
  - Harlow Renaissance: [www.harlowrenaissance.co.uk/index.htm](http://www.harlowrenaissance.co.uk/index.htm)
  - Milton Keynes Partnership: [www.miltonkeynespartnership.info](http://www.miltonkeynespartnership.info)
  - North Northants Development Company: [www.nndev.co.uk](http://www.nndev.co.uk)

Aylesbury Vale Advantage: [www.aylesburyvleadvantage.co.uk](http://www.aylesburyvleadvantage.co.uk)

Ashford's Future: [www.ashfordsfuture.org](http://www.ashfordsfuture.org)

## Contacts

38. For more guidance please contact your Government Office in the first instance.
39. Full drafts and final submissions of the programme of development should be sent electronically to the relevant email address at the Department: [growthareas@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:growthareas@communities.gsi.gov.uk) or [newgrowthpoints@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:newgrowthpoints@communities.gsi.gov.uk), copied to your Government Office contact.
40. Contacts at the Department for Communities and Local Government:
  - General Issues: Susan Candlish – [susan.candlish@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:susan.candlish@communities.gsi.gov.uk)
  - Growth Areas: Robert Cayzer – [robert.cayzer@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:robert.cayzer@communities.gsi.gov.uk)  
Walter Bernard – [walter.bernard@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:walter.bernard@communities.gsi.gov.uk)
  - New Growth Points: David Waterhouse – [david.waterhouse@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:david.waterhouse@communities.gsi.gov.uk)  
Tim Hayward – [tim.hayward@communities.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:tim.hayward@communities.gsi.gov.uk)



# Annex B – Explanation of Programme of Development Appraisal Methodology

## Scoring the Programmes of Development

The appraisal template for the Programmes of Development has been based around the six key criteria from the guidance issued to all Growth Area and Growth Point LAs and LDVs.

- vii. Scale of housing growth challenge and timing of delivery
- viii. Robustness of the local delivery mechanisms and partnerships arrangements
- ix. Effectiveness of partnership with the private sector
- x. Need for public intervention
- xi. Overall soundness of the package
- xii. Total funding available to the Department

Each Programme of Development is scored using the appraisal template and the score will form the basis for allocations. The process is as follows:

- Each programme is marked separately by Communities and Local Government and by the relevant Government Office. To ensure consistency at moderation stage a moderation box is provided on the template to record whether an appraiser has commented on a draft of the Programme. The GLA provided comments on strategic fit of the Programmes in London.
- The two entry questions, on whether there is sign off by each participant local authority and whether there are targets dates for outline planning permission on key sites, are pass/fail questions due to their importance to delivery. Where a Programme does not pass these questions at the outset the appraisers will go back to the LA/LDV to request the appropriate information to satisfy these questions. The intention is to ensure that all bidders have included this information as part of the Programme.
- With the exception of Section A, a score of 1–5 will be given against each question on the appraisal template where:
  - 1 = it does not contain information relating to this condition or attempts to address this condition but does not provide requisite detail
  - 2 = it addresses condition, but is incoherent/inconsistent/vague/lacks sufficient detail
  - 3 = it partly fulfils condition, but is lacking in major detail

4 = it mostly fulfils condition, but is lacking in minor detail

5 = it fulfils condition absolutely

- Guidance is given in the template on the issues that appraisers should look for when giving a score of 5 for a question. Before giving a score of 1 against a question, appraisers should offer the LA/LDV the opportunity to provide more information on the point.
- The comments column is used to demonstrate the reason for the score given per question, pointing to evidence in the Programme of Development.
- Once the appraisers have assessed a programme, the scores from Communities and Local Government and the Government Office are compared and moderated jointly by the appraisers for consistency of scoring to create final scores for each question. Communities and Local Government and GOs work in region based teams for the assessment to ensure consistency of scoring across regions.
- As a further moderation measure, at least one programme from each region (11% of Programmes) will be compared to ensure consistency of scoring across the board by a moderator who has not taken part in the individual assessments. This moderator will also compare the scores for Section D on each Programme due to the importance of this element in the allocation process.
- The appraisal template is attached below.

## Determining funding recommendations

- The central criteria for determining funding recommendations is the scale of challenge as represented by overall levels of housing numbers (Q1) and the need for public intervention (Section D). Housing numbers will be the total net additions for the period from the draft RSS or Growth Point proposals where higher. Section D will be scored as other questions in the appraisal through a score of 1–5. Due to the importance of Section D in determining funding recommendations the moderator will compare all scores for Section D to ensure consistency.
- Each question (with the exception of Q1 and Section D) is weighted to reflect the importance of each question to the criteria in the assessment, giving a final score for the whole assessment out of 200. So, for example, high priority questions might score out of 30 (so scores would be multiplied by 6) whereas low priority questions might be out of 5. Details on the weightings per question can be found below.
- Funding is initially split by the proportion of overall housing delivery (Q1 – whole figure rather than banded score). For example, if a location is delivering 7% of overall housing delivery this would equate to 7% of the available funding. The final weighted scores from the Programmes of Development are then used to moderate the initial funding split according to their performance. For example, if a location scored 120 out of 200 (e.g. 60%) their funding would be adjusted to 60% of the initial split.

- This process makes an element of the funding available to be redistributed. It is redistributed on the basis of the scores for the need for public intervention, Section D, on a proportional basis. This gives the funding recommendation.
- This funding recommendation is moderated against the funding amount requested to guard against any anomalies (e.g. the funding allocation being higher than required from the Programme). As a transitional measure in moving to the new funding system, any remaining funding from the moderation process is redistributed to cushion those areas who would otherwise receive more than a 25% reduction in their average level of grant compared to GAF2. Where no area is in this position redistribution is again based on the scores for section D. The final figures are submitted as recommendations to Ministers.

## Rationale for methodology

Our criteria for the distribution of funding based on the Programmes of Development were that:

- Scale of challenge and the need for public intervention were the most important criteria that should be reflected in the distribution of funding
- Locations should be fairly rewarded or penalised based on their scores in the Programmes of Development
- Funding should enable growth

Scale of challenge and need for public intervention were considered to be the most important criteria in the distribution of funding because they have the most direct impact on a) local costs of growth and b) what public funding was needed to support those costs, which is the purpose of this funding. The 4 questions out of the 15 selected for the appraisal template that most directly link to scale of challenge and need for public intervention are Q1 on the overall amount of housing delivery and Section D on the scale of key infrastructure works and the need for public intervention.

In selecting the method of allocation, we were keen to ensure that the scores from the Programmes of Development were fairly reflected in the distribution of funding so that places that scored well on their programmes received a higher allocation in comparison to a similar location who scored poorly. This would need to be balanced against the risk of certain locations scoring so poorly that their allocation no longer provided an incentive to growth.

## Appraisal Template for Programmes of Development – October 2007

Growth Location:			
LA's in partnership:			
Region:			
Delivery Mechanism (e.g. LDV):			
Lead authority:			
	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>2009/10</b>	<b>2010/11</b>
Funding Requested: Capital			
Revenue			

	<b>Name</b>	<b>Commented on draft (Y/N)</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Commented on draft (Y/N)</b>
CLG Assessors				
GO Assessors				
Process Moderator				

<b>Entry Question</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>
Has the Programme of Development been signed off by each participant local authority?	
Does the Programmes of Development include defined target dates for the grant of outline planning permission for major/key sites identified to be brought forward within 2008/09 – 2010/11 to secure the delivery of the proposed housing trajectory? (or where no major/key sites are due is it explicit how they will secure the delivery of the proposed housing trajectory for 2008/09 – 2010/11?)	

Section A		Scale of Challenge and Timing	
	Figure	Banding	Band
1.	<b>Net Additions</b>  (Growth Areas 2001/02 – 2016/17 Growth Points 2007/08 – 2016/17)	0–5000 = 1 5001 – 15,000 = 2 15,001 – 30,000 = 3 30,001 – 50,000 = 4 Over 50,000 = 5	
2.	<b>Percentage uplift by 2016/17 from RPG 2003 (or equivalent)</b>  (Growth Areas 2001/02 – 2016/17 Growth Points 2007/08 – 2016/17)	0–20% = 1 21–40% = 2 41–60% = 3 61–80% = 4 Over 80% = 5	
3.	<b>Predicted Net Additions (2008/09 – 10/11) as a percentage of total net additions to 2016/17</b>	0–5% = 1 6–10% = 2 11–20% = 3 21–30% = 4 Over 30% = 5	

Section B		Robustness of the Local Delivery Mechanisms & Partnership Arrangements	
	Scoring System	Comments	Score
4.	<b>Robust delivery mechanism/structure</b>  Does PD explain existing <u>or</u> <u>proposed</u> delivery mechanisms (responsible officers/committees, identified resources, LDV), do these function effectively, with buy in from all partners, particularly developers and private sector? Are sufficient resources identified?	Score 1–5  5 = single local authority/ comprehensively developed partnership with formalised feed-in mechanism from all regional partners. Good record of decision-making and delivery to date. High level sign-off for Programme	

Section C		Effectiveness of partnership with private sector	
	Scoring System	Comments	Score
5.	<b>Effectiveness of partnership with private sector</b>  Are private sector orgs (developers, businesses) engaged in delivering growth? Are they supporting projects e.g. funding/contributions in kind? Is there a sound s106 process in place?	Score 1–5  5 = comprehensive system of private sector involvement and engagement, funding and in kind contributions achieved, private sector supporting the delivery of key projects, sound S106 process or tariff approach in place	

Section D		Need for public intervention		
		Scoring System	Comments	Score
6.	<p><b>Scale of key infrastructure works</b></p> <p>(How difficult prioritised works during the 3yr period are)</p>	<p>Score 1–5</p> <p>5 = difficult brownfield decontamination/large scale transport projects/ river improvements etc.</p>		
7.	<p><b>Degree of prioritisation of projects</b></p> <p>Have projects been prioritised to reflect those which support the delivery of housing in a sustainable way and demonstrating a comprehensive approach to delivery?</p>	<p>Score 1–5</p> <p>5 = high prioritised list. Priority projects have match funding where appropriate, are well prepared and ready to go – and will deliver housing.</p>		
8.	<p><b>Is the strategic case for large levels of investment made?</b></p> <p>Are they effectively drawing together resources from other sources i.e. mainstream public funding, own assets, private sector? Are they being innovative to address funding issues? Is it clear that the proposals in the Programme cannot be funded from other sources, are necessary, and will provide value for money?</p>	<p>Score 1–5</p> <p>5 = clear demonstration of need for public sector intervention, funding necessary and able to deliver high impact sites (e.g. large scale housing) and/or difficult sites (including brownfield) and would assist creation of sustainable communities. Projects appear, on evidence available, to demonstrate high value for money for the tax payer.</p>		

Section E		Overall soundness of the package		
		Scoring System	Comments	Score
9.	<p><b>Vision &amp; Objectives</b></p> <p>Is there an agreed vision and set of objectives for delivering on growth?</p>	<p>Score 1–5</p> <p>5 = clearly defined and adopted vision and objectives, with key milestones, local buy in, masterplans for growth supported by local agencies</p>		
10.	<p><b>Considered effect on transport</b></p>	<p>Score 1–5</p> <p>5 = coherent strategies to deal with transport growth, including both private and public transport. Highways Authority and DfT consulted.</p>		

11.	<b>Considered effect on environment (inc water supply, flooding, sewerage, biodiversity, waste etc.)</b>	Score 1–5 5 = studies conducted, and strategies to deal with growth created, working with Environment Agency and Natural England, including addressing where appropriate flood risk, sustainable drainage, water demand, habitat protection, waste		
12.	<b>Environmental aspirations</b>	Score 1–5 5= commitment to reach Code for Sustainable homes level 3 in the next 3 years/large scale flagship environment projects. Central part of Programme, referred to at all levels.		
13.	<b>Green Infrastructure Commitment</b>	Score 1–5 5= strategy for the provision of green infrastructure, working with partners like NE and local providers		
14.	<b>Design aspirations</b>	Score 1–5 5 = commitment to reach Building for Life gold standard or equivalent own measure supported by CABE, design champion or design skills resources identified, adopted design code prioritising good design		
15.	<b>Fit with strategic local requirements (e.g. HMA's, planning targets etc.)</b>	Score 1–5 5 = Programme is strategic fit with regional and local strategies and plans, including RSS, RES.		

<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>Score</b>
Section A	
Section B	
Section C	
Section D	
Section E	
Total	

Record of additional information provided to support assessment

## Weightings

The set of weightings below have been identified by weighing up the relative importance of the individual questions and the criteria for assessment. Scale of challenge and consequently the need for public intervention (A & D) are seen as most important, followed by delivery mechanisms (B), overall soundness (E) and partnership with the private sector (C). Weightings have been used to highlight the importance of certain questions within the appraisal against these criteria.



Section	Q. No	Question Subject	Weighting	Reason for Weighting
A	1	Net Additions	N/A	N/A
	2	Percentage uplift by 2016/17 from RPG 2003 (or equivalent)	7.5%	Medium/Low – reflects scale of challenge but not high weighting as overall net additions more important
	3	Predicted net additions (2008–10/11) as a percentage of total net additions to 2016/17	7.5%	Medium/Low – reflects scale of challenge but not high weighting as overall net additions more important
B	4	Robust delivery mechanism/structure	30%	High – central to ability to deliver growth
C	5	Effectiveness of partnership with private sector	15%	Medium/High – important to delivery, particularly for ability to lever in additional funding but not as important as robust delivery mechanisms
D	6	Scale of key infrastructure works	N/A	N/A
	7	Degree of prioritisation of projects	N/A	N/A
	8	Is the strategic case for large levels of investment made?	N/A	N/A
E	9	Vision & Objectives	2.5%	Low – important to support delivery but will not prevent housing growth
	10	Considered effect on transport	10%	Medium – consideration of transport impacts must happen to enable growth
	11	Considered effect on environment	10%	Medium – consideration of environmental impacts must happen to enable growth
	12	Environmental aspirations	5%	Low/Medium – demonstrates commitment to sustainability, included in appraisal to incentivise activity but will not prevent housing growth
	13	Green Infrastructure Commitments	2.5%	Low – demonstrates commitment to sustainability, included in appraisal to incentivise activity but will not prevent housing growth
	14	Design aspirations	7.5%	Medium/Low – demonstrates commitment to sustainability, higher weighting to further incentivise design issues to improve performance
	15	Fit with strategic local requirements	2.5%	Low – important that growth fits with strategic requirements but will not prevent housing growth

ISBN 978 1 8511 2953 9

ISBN 978-1-8511-2953-9



9 781851 129539