

Appendix B

The following two proposals were recommended by the panel. However the Administration felt there were alternative ways of actioning these suggestions. Therefore the two proposals were renegotiated with the panel and agreement was reached with the majority of the panel in favour of the alternative approach.

| Original Proposal | Alternative Action |
|--|---|
| <p>That as part of the regulation of social housing providers by the Tenants Service Agency a requirement is introduced that the providers must demonstrate a commitment to supporting food growing by their tenants</p> | <p>The Tenants Services Authority (the new regulator for social housing) is required by law to perform its functions with a view to achieving a number of objectives, one of which is to encourage registered providers of social housing to contribute to the environmental, social and economic well-being of the areas in which the housing is situated.</p> <p>It follows that the TSA already has authority to encourage social housing providers to promote food growing by their tenants. Therefore this proposal is unlikely to be considered by the LGA or the Secretary of State.</p> <p>As an alternative, and in order not to lose the principle of encouraging food growing, the council proposes to lobby the TSA to introduce new guidance/code of practice for social housing landlords on food growing with tenants.</p> <p>Specifically Housing working with the Food Partnership to generate a case to put to the TSA.</p> |
| <p>That national planning regulations are changed to ensure that all new build and redevelopment of housing and business included space for growing food</p> | <p>Cabinet shares concerns raised by some of the panel members during their debate of the proposal. In particular it shares concerns over the potential negative impact of the proposal on the quantity and quality of new homes built. In addition, it is concerned about the possibly constraints it would introduce to the growth of businesses in the city.</p> <p>Cabinet is of the opinion that planning policy should be flexible and appropriate to the needs of the</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>locality. Moreover, under current national planning policy there is the potential to develop a local policy response to promoting health and well-being in the city which could include food growing.</p> <p>Therefore, as an alternative, and to maintain momentum around promoting food growing in the city, Cabinet commits to including this proposal in the Core Strategy (a document which states how land should be used and developed in the city). The Core Strategy is scheduled for submission to the Planning Inspectorate in late 2009. This would introduce a local planning policy position on food growing in the city regardless of any national planning policy changes.</p> |
|--|---|