

# Tendring Colchester Borders Garden Community Member Steering Group

**14 August 2024**

## NOTES & ACTIONS

**Present:**

Cllr David King, Cllr Lee Scott, Cllr Mike Bush  
 Colchester City Council: Lindsay Barker  
 Essex County Council: Matthew Jericho, Chris Downes  
 Tendring District Council: Gary Guiver, Lisa Hastings, Hayley Sargent  
 TCB Team: Amy Lester, Paul Wilkinson, Judith Robinson

**Apologies:**

Colchester City Council: Andrew Weavers  
 Essex County Council: Jonathan Schifferes  
 TCB Team: Rob Smith, Catherine Gardner

	Item	Action	When
<b>1</b>	<p><b>Assurance Review of Tendring Colchester Borders Project</b></p> <p>Cllr King opened the meeting</p> <p>Assurance Review – Cllr King noted that he would prefer there to be no amber items.</p> <p>Amy provided a quick overview and shared slides.</p> <p>Amy talked through risk register slide, focusing on mitigation measures.</p> <p>Opened for discussion –</p> <p>Audit – Cllr King raised about item 3 delivery; it was correct to put this right. He felt that the focus had been on the DPD and that had necessitated time away from Members, but going forward we needed more regular meetings even if these were shorter in length. Cllr Mike Bush agreed.</p> <p>Cllr King - What is meant by Management comments? – Amy has already fed back (Officers comments) on all matters raised but explained that we can add further comments from today if necessary. Amy noted also a couple of errors, that needed correcting.</p> <p>Cllr King asked that it was captured where all efforts have been focused. Ideally, we should get re-audited as appropriate to move everything to green.</p>		
<b>2</b>	<p><b>Review of Risk Register</b></p> <p>It was asked where we have changed since last time.</p> <p>Amy – brought to attention the section to the left on the slide - some items have been raised as importance and risk and some are now lower in risk. General project resourcing has remained the same.</p>		

	<p>Cllr Scott – infrastructure could reference external sources and refer to the importance of Section 106 negotiations. Resourcing comms and engagement, HIF were raised.</p> <p>Cllr Bush – agree with Cllr Scott – recognise those 2 points are high risk and how we are addressing it. What are the mitigation measures that need to be in place. Cllr King agreed.</p> <p>Lisa – expressed her support that we have gone back to risk register and may well need a separate conversation.</p> <p>Cllr King – looking at this with a critical eye. The link road is only partly covered through HIF funding – this needs to be clear.</p> <p>Cllr King – interested in the funding balance for the link road work. Currently in red, lots of unknowns.</p> <p>Amy - Ongoing discussions with Latimer, this has to be secured at planning app stage. In terms of costings, it's not quite the right time and detail not available to us yet, Essex are doing some work on this. Also, we are in regular contact with Homes England and the Dept to try and identify new funding streams.</p> <p>Cllr King said that he understands – but needs more assurance. We need to look at how best to present the work ongoing.</p> <p>Cllr Bush – Stewardship – this needs to be in there early. We don't want this to be developer led. Cllr King agreed that this should be included.</p> <p>Cllr Scott – It is vital that there is regular liaison with Govt, white paper and the possible implication due in Oct/Nov. 2. We would respect a 'ball park figure' of costs, however we are going to need an indication soon.</p> <p>Chris – we don't yet know what HIF funding we'll have left over.</p> <p>Lisa – a timeline for risks might be helpful.</p> <p>Lindsay – agree with Mike about the stewardship, We are working on this as a separate workstream. We'll have a discussion in Steering Group and the mitigation and then share that back to Cllr Scott and Cllr Bush.</p> <p>Infrastructure piece – it won't be long before we get a sense of what is left in the HIF and we need to be sensitive about this to ensure we get the best result. A point to refer to with Jonathan Schifferes, as he'll know more detail – developer led scheme for 2<sup>nd</sup> phase?? DPD is written in that it will fall to them, we need an early conversation how they might go about getting costs for the junction</p> <p><b>ACTION:</b></p> <p>Cllrs would like to see a wider risk register and for it to be reviewed at each MSG. Before the next meeting would like to see more specific actions on this matter. Layers below this top-level what details can be provided to offer assurances that this is going in the right direction. Need to address each of the amber risks – what is happening? and to provide confidence to members.</p>	<p><b>TCB Project Team Officers</b></p>	<p><b>By next MSG</b></p>
<p><b>3</b></p>	<p><b>Programme budget &amp; resources</b></p>		

<p>Gary guided everyone through the paper and slides on screen. Moving into different phase of project. Updated project timescale. Moving now on the pre app work.</p> <p>The underspend is due to not needing additional resources yet and Latimer pause on pre app work.</p> <p>Gary talked through the structure slide – thinking ahead to pre app and planning apps. What do we need to manage going forward. Maintain current arrangement with members, joint committees and steering group.</p> <p>Orange items – additional posts for consideration, navigate people through DM process</p> <p>Yellow items – additional resource and expertise to be brought in as and when, particular when we get to more detail. Appendix C (table) itemises some of those additional expertise .</p> <p>Forecast slide – includes 20% contingency. Shortfall of £25k (might be pessimistic), planning fees and PPA are based on assumptions, if these were downgraded then there would be a larger deficit. It may be that councils will keep contributing in 2025/26 and/or other external options. Some Essex colleague have raised concerns about costs included in the PPA, we need to discuss with Latimer to stretch their PPA budget accordingly.</p> <p>Mindful we have had a change in Govt and the focus on increasing housing.</p> <p>Bullet points slide –</p> <p>Cllr Scott – couple of points, he attended a recent call with Leaders which indicated that they may look to bring housing forward where possible. Therefore GC fits well with Govt plans. He asked if the extra officers were fully funded in the budget? and was <b>happy for CCC to continue to hold the budget.</b></p> <p>Cllr Bush – reiterated there are so many unknowns, the budget is a forecast and feels sound and structure looks well thought out. Govt ambitions to accelerate new housing, can it fit with what we are doing, we may have to adapt. We could fall behind and under resourced. <b>Happy for CCC to continue to hold the budget.</b> Emphasised that we continue to monitor closely. Principles are a sound platform to work from.</p> <p>Cllr King – What investment can we expect in our region from Govt? The team structure looks sensible.</p> <p>Cllr Bush – suggest as we move forward is there a scrutiny mechanism at key points, so we can review if potential alarm bells. Cllr King – agree this should be a matter of routine.</p>		
--	--	--

	<p>Lindsay – agree and also about contributions, mindful about position of all Councils. So far contribution has been strong. Future funding may be needed.</p> <p>Gary went back to the budget forecast slide – in response to Cllr Scott’s point for additional posts they are taken into account in forecast figures, yes funded based on the figures but with the caveat that there is a risk if we don’t achieve the applications fees and PPA as per slide. Endorsed Lindsay’s comment that we need to review if Councils need to be prepared in 2025/26 that a contribution may be required. The profile we are working to is that the Councils contribution goes down over time, and other funding increases. We’d like to keep on the table the possibility that we may need to come back and ask for a contribution. Sometimes it is difficult to reinstate a budget once it’s been removed.</p> <p>Cllr Bush – good point made, agree sometimes difficult to reinstate budget once removed. Maybe to put money back into the forecast to offer as a consideration, Cllr King agreed.</p> <p>Cllr King – what conversations are happening with developer about the application fees – Gary advised we have a current idea of the fees for a development of this size. But there are proposals about possible changes to these fees, there is a question mark but this is what we know now. PPA contribution based on a discussion what they think their budget is for this. We need to discuss further with Latimer about this and what this should cover, currently not covered in full by Latimer.</p> <p>Cllr Scott – it would be in Latimers interest and regarding funding for 2025/26 there is justification to look at this.</p> <p>Cllr King proposes that the authorities should have a contribution for 25/26. All agreed. <b>ACTION</b></p> <p>Budget should be a standing item going forward <b>ACTION</b></p>	<p>JR</p> <p>JR</p>	<p><b>Contributions to be added to forecast COMPLETE</b></p> <p><b>By next MSG</b></p>
<p><b>4</b></p>	<p><b>Matters relating to TCBGC Joint Committee</b></p> <p>Gary advised that shortly the agenda for meeting 5 Sept will be distributed, this will cover the need to go out to consultation on the inspector’s modifications for the DPD, also at this meeting there is a need to elect a new chair. Members need to think about this – members will pick this up separate.</p> <p>5<sup>th</sup> Sept – Leaders meeting too</p>		

<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>Paul – mentioned A133 section 3 presentation 1 month ago, work starting to get more intense and will be lane closures. Starts in next couple of weeks.</p> <p>Cllr Bush – raised that the comms is important, is this out to the public domain? Paul agreed to reiterate this to the team and is aware of engagement and comms to public about the construction and likely disruption. <b>ACTION</b></p>	<p><b>PW</b></p>	<p><b>ASAP</b></p>
<p>Next meeting: TBC</p>			