Cabinet

Monday 17 July 2017

9.00 am, Colman and Cavell Rooms
South Norfolk House, Cygnet Court, Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XE

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting,
please let us know in advance
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of the Cabinet</th>
<th>Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Fuller (Chairman)</td>
<td>The Economy and External Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr M Edney (Vice Chairman)</td>
<td>Stronger Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Y Bendle</td>
<td>Housing, Wellbeing, Leisure and Early Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Stone</td>
<td>Finance and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr L Hornby</td>
<td>Regulation and Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs K Mason Billig</td>
<td>Environment and Recycling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group Meetings**

Conservatives – 8.00 am, Cabinet Office

Liberal Democrats – 8.15 am, Kett Room

This meeting may be filmed, recorded or photographed by the public; however anyone who wishes to do so must inform the chairman and ensure it is done in a non-disruptive and public manner. Please review the Council’s guidance on filming and recording meetings available in the meeting room.
Agenda

1. To report apologies for absence;

2. Any items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency pursuant to Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act, 1972. Urgent business may only be taken if, "by reason of special circumstances" (which will be recorded in the minutes), the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered as a matter of urgency;

3. To Receive Declarations of Interest from Members (please see guidance – page 6)

4. To confirm the minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 12 June 2017 (attached – page 7)

5. Easton Neighbourhood Plan 2017 – 2042
   Consideration of the Examiner’s Report (report attached – page 18)

   Proposed Revisions to Development Management Policies Monitoring Indicators (report attached – page 47)
7. Performance Risks, Revenue and Capital Budget Position Report for Quarter One 2017/18; (report attached – page 71)

8. Future Management of Streetlights; (report attached – page 124)

9. Proposed Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) (report attached – page 131)

10. Discretionary Rate Relief Guidelines; (report attached – page 137)


12. Housing Renewal Grants and Loans Policy;
   This Policy is scheduled to be considered by the Housing, Wellbeing, Leisure and Early Help Policy Development Committee on September 25th before being brought to the Cabinet meeting scheduled for the 30th October.

   Tony Cooke
   Housing Access and Standards Manager

13. Cabinet Core Agenda (attached – page 166)
14. **Exclusion of the Public and Press;**

To exclude the public and press from the meeting under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended)

15. **Strategic Economic Development and Investment Opportunities**  (report enclosed separately for members)

(NOT FOR PUBLICATION by virtue of Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972)
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

Members are asked to declare any interests they have in the meeting. Members are required to identify the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates.

- In the case of other interests, the member may speak and vote on the matter.
- If it is a pecuniary interest, the member must withdraw from the meeting when it is discussed.
- If it affects or relates to a pecuniary interest the member has, they have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public but must then withdraw from the meeting.
- Members are also requested when appropriate to make any declarations under the Code of Practice on Planning and Judicial matters.
- In any case, members have the right to remove themselves from the meeting or the voting if they consider, in the circumstances, it is appropriate to do so.

Should Members have any concerns relating to interests they have, they are encouraged to contact the Monitoring Officer (or Deputy) or another member of the Democratic Services Team in advance of the meeting.
CABINET

Minutes of a meeting of the Cabinet of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton on Monday 12 June 2017 at 9.00 a.m.

Members Present:

Cabinet: Councillors J Fuller (Chairman) M Edney, L Hornby, K Mason Billig and B Stone

Apologies: Councillor Y Bendle

Non-Appointed: Councillors V Bell, P Broome, M Gray, N Legg and T Lewis

Officers in Attendance: The Director of Growth and Localism (T Horspole), the Head of Environmental Services (B Wade), the Planning Policy Manager (A Nicholls), the Accountancy Manager (M Fernandez-Graham), the Business Improvement Manager (S Pontin), the Business Improvement Programme Manager (A Mewes), the Development Project Manager – Big Sky (S Burrell) and the Senior Governance Officer (S Goddard),

2551 BILL DINNEEN

The Chairman was very sorry to announce that former district and town councillor for Costessey, Bill Dinneen, had passed away.

Cllr V Bell paid tribute to Mr Dinneen and his wife Irene, referring to their work for Costessey, the Town Council and their charity work. Mr Dinneen would be sadly missed by all.

Members wished to forward their sincere condolences to the Chief Executive and her wider family.
2552 MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held 27 March and 21 April 2017, were confirmed as correct records and signed by the Chairman.

2553 PERFORMANCE, RISKS, REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET POSITION REPORT FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2016/17

The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the report of the Accountancy Manager, the Business Improvement Programme Manager and the Senior Governance Officer, which detailed the Council’s performance against strategic measures, and risk and financial positions at the end of the fourth quarter for 2016/17.

Cllr B Stone commended the report to members, explaining that overall, the position at the end of quarter 4 had been very positive. There was a £2.7 million revenue surplus for 2016/17 and the total usable reserves had increased by £3.7 million. The Council continued to proactively manage risks, and performance against indicators continued to be excellent, with only one indicator (LI 1013, CNC Fee earning income) failing to hit target. This, he explained, was due to a fall-off in demand, however, costs and staff vacancies had been managed accordingly to offset this reduction. He also referred to the number of missed bins (LI 263), which had previously been short of target due to the changes to the waste collection rounds, but had improved significantly over the course of the year, reducing to 24, and meeting the target of 30.

The Business Improvement Programme Manager then presented his report, and referred in particular to the areas of good performance in Economic Development, Leisure, Housing, Independent Living, Development Management, Waste, Resources and Staff. The Accountancy Manager briefly outlined the revenue and capital outturn positions.

During discussion, Cllr K Mason Billig referred to LI 262, the cost of waste collection, explaining that she was disappointed that this had not improved further. Members noted that this was due to an increase in contamination charges, and that the Norfolk Waste Partnership was working on a county wide campaign to educate residents further. Members noted that South Norfolk was the top performing Council in the county for dry recyclables.
Referring to the Peer Review recommendations, to adopt more challenging targets, Cllr M Gray suggested that the target for NI 192a, the percentage of municipal waste recycled, should be increased from 44% to 45%. He felt this to be achievable as the Council had already reached 45% on occasions over the course of the year. He also suggested that the target for PL1602, the percentage of Community Action Fund spent, should increase from 95%, to 100%.

Cabinet agreed that the target for CAF spend should be amended to 100%, noting that the CAF Panel was to meet shortly to allocate the funds. With regards to the % of waste recycled, members were reluctant to amend the target at this stage. Cllr Mason Billig explained that performance was seasonal and acknowledged there were times when 45% was achievable. However, to reach an overall average of 45%, the Council would probably need to invest in the recycling of food and nappies. The Head of Environmental Services added that that Council would certainly strive to hit 45%, but stressed that most top performing Councils for recycling, did collect food waste.

The Chairman referred to the roll out of Broadband across the District, and the need to ensure that there was no loss of momentum. He explained that BT has produced a list of those areas which would not be in a position to benefit from an upgrade in services available, and these were those areas where the Council would look to initiate a bespoke approach to find solutions. He agreed with Cllr Lewis, that there was a need to look at all possible solutions to support residents, and in particular local businesses.

The Decision

RESOLVED: 1. To Note:

   (a) The 2017/18 performance for the year and the combined efforts across the Directorates to deliver the vision of the Council (detail contained in Appendix 1).

   (b) The current position with respect to risks and accepts the actions to support risk mitigation (detail contained in Appendix 2 of the report).

   (c) The capital and revenue provisional outturn position and the reason for the variances on the General Fund (detailed in Appendices 3 and 4 of the report).
2. TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL

(d) Approval of the budget virements which exceed £100,000 in accordance with the rules of financial governance.

(e) Approval of the movements in reserves as outlined in Section 2.3.5.

(a) The slippage requests of £785,519 on revenue and £1,937,204 on capital

(b) The amended Capital programme and its financing for the next four financial years as set out in Appendices 7 and 8 of the report.

The Reasons for the Decision

To ensure processes are in place to improve performance, that the management of risks is sound, and that budgets are in place to meet the Council's objectives.

Other Options Considered

None.

2554 TREASURY MANAGEMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2016/17

The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the report of the Accountancy Manager, which reviewed the treasury management activity during the financial year 2016/17, and reported on the prudential indicators as required by CIPFA's Treasury Management Code of Practice.

Cllr B Stone introduced the report, explaining that a reduction in interest rates had resulted in a lower return on cash investments during 2016/17, when compared with the previous year. Turning to investment properties, he advised that on average, these were providing a return of 6.4% gross.
The Accountancy Manager also drew attention to the increase in total investments to £34.3million, as at 31 March 17.

The Decision

RESOLVED: TO RECOMMEND THAT COUNCIL:
(a) Notes the treasury activity between October 2016 and March 2017 and that it complies with the agreed strategy.
(b) Approves the 2016/17 prudential indicators for the latter six months of the year

The Reasons for the Decision

To ensure a balanced portfolio, in terms of risk, rates and liquidity, maximising profits wherever possible.

Other Options Considered

None

2555 THE ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN 2017

The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the report of the Director of Business Development, which presented Cabinet with an updated Asset Management Plan, for approval.

The Accountancy Manager presented the report to members. During discussion, Cllr M Gray suggested that the Plan’s title should refer to the 3 – 5 year planning horizon, on which it was based, and the Chairman agreed that this was a valid point. Members also queried the geographical scope of the Commercial Property Strategy, and Cllr Stone explained that the Strategy acknowledged the need for a changed approach to the acquisition or development of additional property, and this included making investments outside of the District.
The Decision

**RESOLVED:** To approve the draft Asset Management Plan and associated documents attached in Appendices A & B of the report, subject to minor amendment.

The Reasons for the Decision

To ensure a strategic approach to the management of assets.

Other Options Considered

None

2556 COMMERCIALISATION STRATEGY

The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the report of the Director of Business Development, which presented Cabinet with a Commercialisation Strategy, for approval.

Cllr B Stone introduced the report, explaining that this, the Council’s first Commercialisation Strategy, sought to formalise the Council’s commercial approach and direction of travel. This approach would assist in generating profit, as funding from central government continued to reduce.

Members noted that the Strategy had been recommended for approval by the Finance, Resources, Audit and Governance Committee.

Referring to the priorities of the Strategy, the Chairman reminded members that its focus was not solely on financial return, but also on economic growth for the area, for example through the Enterprise Zone.
The Decision

RESOLVED: To approve the Commercialisation Strategy attached at Appendix 1 of the report.

The Reasons for the Decision

To ensure a clear framework on which the Council’s commercial activities can be based.

Other Options Considered

None

2557 CHARGES FOR DEVELOPERS

The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the report of the Business Improvement Manager, and the Head of Environmental Services, which considered the introduction of charges in relation to street naming and numbering, validation of information submitted to support planning applications, and the provision of waste bins to new dwellings.

Officers presented the report, outlining the key issues arising from the proposals. Members’ attention was drawn to the proposed charges that had been set with the aim of covering the costs of the services, but it was noted that they had not been set to make a profit. Members noted that it was likely that there would be an increase in demand for all these services, in the near future.

Referring to the provision of waste bins, the Head of Environmental Services explained that the Council would work closely with developers to ensure a seamless service. Developers had been consulted and there had been a mixed reception to the proposals, but members noted that this practice had been generally accepted in other areas.
With regard to a query concerning the cost of the collection of charges, officers confirmed that although there was no profit to be made, the charges were still worthwhile.

The Decision

RESOLVED: To agree:

1. That for the purposes of street naming and numbering, the Council adopts Sections 64 and 65 of the Town Improvement Clauses Act 1847 and section 17 and 18 of the Public Health Act 1925;

2. The introduction of charges from 1 September 2017 as set out in Appendix 2a of the report;

3. The revisions to the Street Naming and Numbering Policy with effect from 1 September 2017.

4. To recover the cost to independently assess reports submitted during the planning application process.

5. The proposal to charge for the supply of waste collection bins to new residential properties commencing 1 September 2017 along with the policy principles as detailed in paragraph 4.8 of the report. Charges to be agreed by the Director of Growth and Localism in consultation with the Portfolio holder and in accordance with the Charging policy.

The Reasons for the Decision

To help to mitigate against the increasing demand and operating costs of each service

Other Options Considered

To continue to provide these services with no charge.
The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the report of the Planning Policy Manager, which sought Cabinet approval for the Open Space Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), to be issued for public consultation.

The Planning Policy Manager outlined his report, reminding members that following the adoption of the SPD, the Council would not be taking on the future adoption and management of new open spaces or play areas. Members noted that the consultation would go out to all parish councils, adjoining councils and main developers and agents.

The Decision

RESOLVED: To:

1. Agree that a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the ‘Guidelines for Recreation Provision in New Residential Developments’ SPD does not need to be prepared (Appendix 2 of the report);
2. Agree the draft ‘Guidelines for Recreation Provision in New Residential Developments’ SPD (Appendix 3 of the report) for six weeks’ public consultation, likely to commence in June/July 2017;
3. Delegate authority to the Director of Growth and Localism, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economy and External Affairs, to agree any minor changes to the draft SPD prior to consultation;
4. Delegate authority to the Director of Growth and Localism, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economy and External Affairs, to agree appropriate modifications to the draft SPD following public consultation, and to then formally adopt the SPD for decision-making purposes (likely to be in September/October 2017).
The Reasons for the Decision

To replace the Council’s current Supplementary Planning Guidance, to reflect the Council’s agreed policy on adoption and maintenance, adopted Local Plan policy, and to provide up to date guidance on safety and design standards.

Other Options Considered

To make amendments to the consultation document.

2559 STRATEGIC AND ANNUAL INTERNAL AUDIT PLANS 2017/18

The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the recommendations of the Finance, Resources, Audit and Governance (FRAG) Committee, regarding the Internal Audit Charter for 2017/18, the Internal Audit Strategy for 2017/18, the Strategic Internal Audit Plans 2017/18 to 2019/20, and the Annual Internal Audit Plan for 2017/18.

Referring to the success of the Internal Audit Consortium, members paid tribute to the work of the Internal Audit Consortium Manager.

The Decision

RESOLVED: To approve:

a) The Internal Audit Charter for 2017/18;
b) The Internal Audit Strategy for 2017/18;
c) The Strategic Internal Audit Plans 2017/18 to 2019/20; and

The Reasons for the Decision
To ensure appropriate control of governance processes.

Other Options Considered
None.

2560  FUTURE MAINTENANCE AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR PRE-EXISTING COMMUNITY ASSETS
Members noted that a report, if appropriate, would be considered at a future meeting of the Cabinet.

2561  CABINET CORE AGENDA
Members noted the latest version of the Cabinet Core Agenda.

(The meeting concluded at 10.15 am)

__________________________
Chairman

Cab Min 12/06//17CLW
Easton Neighbourhood Plan 2017 – 2042
Consideration of the Examiner’s Report

Report of the Simon Marjoram (Senior Planning Officer)
Cabinet Member: John Fuller, External Affairs

CONTACT
Simon Marjoram, 01508 533810
smarjoram@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1 On 12 June 2017 the Council received the Examiner’s Report into the Examination of the Easton Neighbourhood Plan, which can be viewed in Appendix 1 and here; this report considers the content and recommendations of that Report. The Examiner’s Report concludes that, subject to a number of recommended changes, the Neighbourhood Plan meets the Basic Conditions Tests, and that the modified Plan is suitable to proceed to a local referendum.

1.2 This report recommends that the Examiner’s recommended modifications be made, that the formal Decision Statement be published and that the modified Neighbourhood Plan then proceeds to referendum within the parish of Easton, likely to be held in early September 2017. If the Neighbourhood Plan passes the referendum, then the Plan will be formally ‘made’ and become part of the Development Plan for South Norfolk.

2. Background

2.1 Easton Parish Council has developed the Neighbourhood Plan in the context of South Norfolk Council’s Local Plan policies (including the Joint Core Strategy). The Neighbourhood Plan aims to add further detail and local distinctiveness to the policies of the Development Plan. It should be noted that a number of policies in the existing Local Plan remain relevant, including the strategic allocation for 900 homes and a new village centre; Policy EAS1 in the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (SSAPD). EAS1 includes a number of criteria which will continue to help shape the development of this site. In addition, a number of other South Norfolk Local Plan policies will continue to apply, including the Royal Norfolk Showground (SSAPD COS5), Landscape Character and River Valleys (Development Management Policy 4.5) and Undeveloped Approaches to Norwich (Development Management Policy 4.6).

2.2 In February 2017 Easton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, on behalf of Easton Parish Council, submitted the ‘Examination Version’ of the Neighbourhood Plan, which can be viewed on the Council’s website here. South Norfolk Council made the Neighbourhood Plan available for comment between Monday 27 March and Monday 8 May 2017, alongside various supporting documents. Representations were made by nine organisations, including South Norfolk Council; these representations were then forwarded, along with the Plan and supporting documents, to the appointed Plan Examiner. The Examiner has undertaken an assessment as to whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions tests, which can be summarised as:
Having appropriate regard to national policy;
Contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
Being in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the local area; and
Being compatible with EU obligations (including not having a significant adverse effect on a European site or a European offshore marine site).

2.3 The Examination was carried out by written representations only, with no public hearing required. The Examiner sought clarification from the Parish Council/Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group on various points; the Examiner’s questions and Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group responses can be viewed on the South Norfolk Council’s website here. The Examiner has concluded that, subject to a number of recommended modifications, the Plan meets the requirements of the Basic Conditions tests.

3. Current Position

3.1 The Examiner’s Report (see Appendix 1) was received on 12 June 2017. The report recommends changes to most of the Policies in the Neighbourhood Plan (albeit relatively minor in most cases), as well as various consequential changes to the supporting text. Some of the changes have been recommended in response to the representations made to the submitted plan, including those made by Gladman Developments, Broadland District Council, Norfolk County Council and South Norfolk Council (the latter having been agreed by Cabinet on 21 April 2017). Other changes have been made by the Examiner to ensure that the Policies have the clarity required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

3.2 The specific recommendations made include:
- moving the methods of future open space management from Policy 3 to the supporting text, and rewording to allow for greater flexibility in open space management and to clearly express the Parish Council’s preference for taking on the future management themselves;
- to emphasise that Policy 6 ‘Housing and its Setting’ applies to both the new development on SSAPD allocation EAS1 and also other possible infill developments;
- revisions to the parking standards under Policy 7 ‘Housing Design’, to ensure that development does not become excessively car/parking dominated;
- clarification of the role of landscape buffers around new development under Policy 9 ‘Privacy of Existing Homes’; and
• a replacement for existing Policy 14 ‘Small-scale Employment Opportunities’ to emphasise the key criteria against which employment proposals will be assessed, including respecting their immediate surroundings and the rural character of the Plan area.

4. Proposals

4.1 Officers have assessed the Examiner’s Report and recommend to Cabinet that all of the Examiner’s recommended modifications be made to the Neighbourhood Plan, thus allowing the Plan to progress to the public referendum stage.

4.2 Should Cabinet resolve to continue to proceed with the Neighbourhood Plan and the Examiner’s recommended modifications, the Council will need to publish a Decision Statement on the Plan. This will need to set out South Norfolk Council’s decision on the Easton Neighbourhood Plan and the reasons for making that decision. The Decision Statement will detail the modifications to the policies and the supporting text. Once the modifications have been made to the Plan itself, it will be published on the Council’s website, and this is the version of the Neighbourhood Plan that the referendum will be on.

4.3 A statement about the referendum and the other document specified by the Regulations will also need to be published, which formally starts the referendum process. There need to be at least 28 clear working between the publication of the statement on the website and the date of the referendum itself. The referendum is likely to be held in early September 2017, with the date to be finalised as soon as is practicable.

4.4 The referendum will be for eligible resident within the parish of Easton only and take the form of a yes/no response to the question ‘Do you want South Norfolk Council to use the Easton Neighbourhood Plan to help decide planning applications in the Neighbourhood Area?’. There is no minimum turnout required for the referendum. If more than 50% of those voting vote ‘yes’, South Norfolk Council is required to bring the Neighbourhood Plan into force through a formal resolution at Full Council, although it should be noted that due to change brought in by the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017, if a Neighbourhood Plan passes its referendum, it basically must to be given full planning weight at that point.
5. Risks and implications arising

5.1 A Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening has been undertaken for the plan and agreed with the relevant bodies and the environmental implications of the Easton Neighbourhood Plan have been assessed through a Sustainability Appraisal.

5.2 The Plan is not likely to have any impacts on crime and disorder (the comments of Norfolk Constabulary on this issue have been incorporated into the Plan) nor is it likely to have any impacts on disadvantaged groups.

5.3 As with all Neighbourhood Plans, South Norfolk Council can claim additional funding from the Government now that the Easton Neighbourhood has received a positive recommendation from the Examiner that the Plan is appropriate to proceed to a referendum. However, SNC also needs to pay the Examiner's fees and also pay for and administer the holding of the referendum. The costs are allowed for in the existing budget. Were the Plan to be later ‘made’ (adopted), Easton Parish Council would be entitled to receive 25% of CIL income from new development in the parish, rather than the standard 15%.

5.4 No other particular risks associated with the Neighbourhood Plan are identified.

6. Other options

6.1 Cabinet could decide not to agree with some or all of the Examiner’s recommended modifications. However, the Examiner has recommended these modifications to ensure that the Plan meets the Basic Conditions tests; therefore, not making the recommended changes would necessitate the Plan being returned to a previous stage in the process, entailing additional work and expense, or to abandoning the Plan completely. If the Plan does not proceed to referendum, there is likely to be considerable frustration and disappointment within the Parish Council and the wider Easton community.

7. Recommendation

7.1 Cabinet to agree to:
(a) accept the Examiner’s Report on the examination of the Easton Neighbourhood Plan and the recommended modifications; and
(b) delegate to the Director of Growth and Localism the power to make the modifications recommended by the Examiner and to then progress the modified Easton Neighbourhood Plan to a public referendum.

Appendix 1 – Easton Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2042 – Examiner’s Report
Easton Neighbourhood Plan
2017-2042

A report to South Norfolk District Council on the Easton Neighbourhood Plan

Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
BA (Hons) MA, DMS, MRTPM

Director – Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited
Executive Summary

1 I was appointed by South Norfolk District Council in April 2017 to carry out the independent examination of the Easton Neighbourhood Plan.

2 The examination was undertaken by written representations. I visited the neighbourhood plan area on 23 May 2017.

3 The Plan proposes a series of policies and seeks to bring forward positive and sustainable development in the plan area. There is a very clear focus on promoting sensitive residential development and a new village centre. It also includes several policies on village character and heritage.

4 The Plan has been significantly underpinned by community support and engagement. It is clear that all sections of the community have been actively engaged in its preparation.

5 Subject to a series of recommended modifications set out in this report I have concluded that the Easton Neighbourhood Plan meets all the necessary legal requirements and should proceed to referendum.

6 I recommend that the referendum should be held within the neighbourhood plan area.

Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
12 June 2017
1 Introduction

1.1 This report sets out the findings of the independent examination of the Easton Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2042 (the Plan).

1.2 The Plan has been submitted to South Norfolk Council (SNC) by Easton Parish Council in its capacity as the qualifying body responsible for preparing the neighbourhood plan.

1.3 Neighbourhood plans were introduced into the planning process by the Localism Act 2011. They aim to allow local communities to take responsibility for guiding development in their area. This approach was subsequently embedded in the National Planning Policy Framework in 2012 and which continues to be the principal element of national planning policy.

1.4 This report assesses whether the Plan is legally compliant and meets the Basic Conditions that apply to neighbourhood plans. It also considers the content of the Plan and, where necessary, recommends changes to its policies and supporting text.

1.5 This report also provides a recommendation as to whether the Plan should proceed to referendum. If this is the case and that referendum results in a positive outcome the Plan would then be used to determine planning applications within the plan area and will sit as part of the wider development plan.
2 The Role of the Independent Examiner

2.1 The examiner’s role is to ensure that any submitted neighbourhood plan meets the relevant legislative and procedural requirements.

2.2 I was appointed by SNC, with the consent of the Parish Council, to conduct the examination of the Plan and to prepare this report. I am independent of both the SNC and the Parish Council. I do not have any interest in any land that may be affected by the Plan.

2.3 I possess the appropriate qualifications and experience to undertake this role. I am a Director of Andrew Ashcroft Planning Limited. In previous roles, I have over 30 years’ experience in various local authorities at either Head of Planning or Service Director level. I am a chartered town planner and have significant experience of undertaking other neighbourhood plan examinations and health checks. I am a member of the Royal Town Planning Institute and the Neighbourhood Planning Independent Examiner Referral Service.

Examination Outcomes

2.4 In my role as the independent examiner of the Plan I am required to recommend one of the following outcomes of the examination:

(a) that the Plan is submitted to a referendum; or
(b) that the Plan should proceed to referendum as modified (based on my recommendations); or
(c) that the Plan does not proceed to referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.

The Basic Conditions

2.5 As part of this process I must consider whether the submitted Plan meets the Basic Conditions as set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. To comply with the basic conditions, the Plan must:

- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; and
- contribute to the achievement of sustainable development; and
- be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan in the area; and
- be compatible with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) obligations.

I have examined the submitted Plan against each of these basic conditions, and my conclusions are set out in Sections 6 and 7 of this report. I have made specific comments on the fourth bullet point above in paragraphs 2.6 to 2.10 of this report.

2.6 In order to comply with the basic condition on European Union legislation the Parish Council has prepared a Sustainability Appraisal Report. This report incorporates...
Strategic Environmental Assessment. The report is very comprehensive. It concludes that overall the policies have a positive effect in the short, medium and longer term.

2.7 The Parish Council has undertaken a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening report on the Plan. The screening report concluded that the Plan was not likely to have any significant effect on a European site. This report was updated to take account of the comments of Natural England on the need to assess any likely in combination effects. This is good practice.

2.8 The screening report is comprehensive in its scope. It properly assesses the likely impact of the Plan’s policies on the following European sites:

- the Broadland SPA
- The Broadland Ramsar area
- The Broads SAC
- The Norfolk Valley SAC
- The River Wensum SAC

2.9 Having reviewed the information provided to me as part of the examination I am satisfied that a proportionate process has been undertaken in accordance with the various regulations. None of the statutory consultees have raised any concerns with regard to either neighbourhood plan or to European obligations.

2.10 In a similar fashion I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and that it complies with the Human Rights Act. There is no evidence that has been submitted to me to suggest otherwise. There has been full and adequate opportunity for all interested parties to take part in the preparation of the Plan and to make their comments known. On this basis, I conclude that the submitted Plan does not breach, nor is in any way incompatible with the ECHR.

Other examination matters

2.11 In examining the Plan I am also required to check whether:

- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood plan area; and
- the Plan meets the requirements of Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the Plan must specify the period to which it has effect, must not include provision about development that is excluded development, and must not relate to more than one neighbourhood area); and
- the Plan has been prepared for an area that has been designated under Section 61G of the Localism Act and has been developed and submitted for examination by a qualifying body.

2.12 Having addressed the matters identified in paragraph 2.11 of this report I am satisfied that all of the points have been met subject to the contents of this report.
3 Procedural Matters

3.1 In undertaking this examination I have considered the following documents:

- the submitted Plan.
- the Basic Conditions Statement.
- the Consultation Statement.
- the Sustainability Appraisal Report
- the HRA Screening report.
- the representations made to the Plan.
- the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2011
- the South Norfolk Development Management Policies Document 2015
- the South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document 2015
- the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012).
- Planning Practice Guidance (March 2014 and subsequent updates).
- Relevant Ministerial Statements.

3.2 I carried out an unaccompanied visit to the Plan area on 23 May 2017. I looked at its overall character and appearance and at those areas affected by policies in the Plan in particular. My site inspection is covered in more detail in paragraphs 5.9 to 5.16 of this report.

3.3 It is a general rule that neighbourhood plan examinations should be held by written representations only. Having considered all the information before me, including the representations made to the submitted plan, I was satisfied that the Plan could be examined without the need for a public hearing. I advised SNC of this decision early in the examination process.
4 Consultation

Consultation Process

4.1 Policies in made neighbourhood plans become the basis for local planning and development control decisions. As such the regulations require neighbourhood plans to be supported and underpinned by public consultation.

4.2 In accordance with the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 the Parish Council has prepared a Consultation Statement. This Statement is hugely impressive in its coverage and level of detail. It helpfully reproduces some of the publicity material and includes photographs taken at the various consultation events. It also provides specific details on the consultation process that took place on the pre-submission version of the Plan from October 2016 to December 2016. The Statement helpfully lists the comments that were received on this version of the emerging plan and how they were taken into account in the preparation of the submission plan.

4.3 The Statement sets out details of the consultation events that were carried out generally in relation the Plan. Details are provided about:

- The circulation of newsletters to households and businesses;
- The establishment of a dedicated website
- Regular updates to the Parish Council
- Regular updates in the local community magazine
- Regular open meetings of the Steering Group

4.4 The Statement also sets out details of the consultation events that were carried out in relation to the pre-submission version of the Plan. Information is provided about the delivery of newsletters, the use of social media, alerting those who had asked for regular updates and a specific article in ‘The Grapevine’ magazine. It is encouraging that printed versions of the Plan were made available in the Village Hall, the Beauty Salon, the library, the local school and the fish and chip shop/restaurant.

4.5 It is clear that consultation has been an important element of the Plan’s production. Advice on the neighbourhood planning process has been made available to the community in a positive and direct way by those responsible for the Plan’s preparation.

4.6 The positive approach that was taken to Plan making is reflected in the focused nature of the representations received to the submitted plan (see 4.8 below)

4.7 From all the evidence provided to me as part of the examination, I can see that the Plan has promoted an inclusive approach to seeking the opinions of all concerned throughout the process. SNC has carried out its own assessment that the consultation process has complied with the requirements of the Regulations.
4.8 Consultation on the submitted plan was undertaken by the District Council for a six-week period that ended on 8 May 2017. This exercise generated comments from the following persons and organisations:

- Broadland District Council
- The Broads Authority
- Costessey Town Council
- Environment Agency
- Gladman Developments
- Historic England
- Marlingford and Colton Parish Council
- Norfolk County Council
- South Norfolk Council

4.9 In examining the Plan I have taken account of all the representations received. In some cases, I have highlighted specific representations in this report where it is both appropriate and relevant to do so. I have also taken into account the responses that the Parish Council has provided to my points of clarification. My questions and the responses are available on the South Norfolk Council website.
5 The Plan Area and the Development Plan Context

The Plan Area

5.1 The Plan area covers the parish of Easton. It was designated as a neighbourhood area on 17 April 2015. As the iconic milepost outside St Peter’s Church indicates the village of Easton is 6 miles to the west of Norwich and 10 miles to the east of Dereham. In 2011 the population in the Plan area was 1514 and within 598 households.

5.2 The Plan area sits to the north and west of the greater Norwich area. The parish is bisected by the A47 trunk road. This road runs to the immediate north of the village of Easton itself. The Plan area is extensive in scale. It extends from the bridleway on Ringland Hills to the north to Bawburgh water meadows and Marlingford to the south. Part of the Royal Norfolk Showground lies within the Plan area.

5.3 The village of Easton sits in the heart of the Plan area. Its layout reflects its position on the former main road between Norwich and Dereham. The Showground sits to the immediate east of the village. Pleasant open countryside surrounds the village to its south. Parts of this area are affected by the strategic allocations in the South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document 2015.

Development Plan Context

5.4 The Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk was adopted in 2011. It has provided a robust context within which more detailed policy documents can be produced in South Norfolk. In particular these are South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document 2015 and the South Norfolk Development Management Policies Document 2015. In turn, these documents provide an up-to-date basis against which the submitted Plan has been prepared.

5.5 The Basic Conditions Statement usefully highlights the key policies in the development plan and how they relate to policies in the submitted Plan. Its comprehensive approach is impressive. It provides confidence to all concerned that the submitted Plan sits within its local policy context.

5.6 The South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document 2015 has particular implications for the neighbourhood area. In a general sense Easton is located within the Norwich Policy Area. The Policies Document identifies two specific allocations for Easton as follows:

- **EAS1 Land South and East of Eaton**
  52.6 hectares of land for housing and associated infrastructure

- **EAS2 Easton Gymnastics Club**
  1.4 hectares of land for a new gymnastics centre
5.7 The Plan has been carefully designed to add value to this extensive planning policy context. In doing so it seeks to add appropriate local value and detail to the development plan. In its response to my clarification note the Parish Council has identified the extent to which it has designed its policies to underpin local planning policies on the major strategic developments in the neighbourhood area. Where necessary I reflect this approach in my report and in recommended modifications.

5.8 The submitted Plan has relied on up-to-date information and research that has underpinned existing planning policy documents in the District. This is good practice and reflects key elements in Planning Practice Guidance on this matter.

Site Visit

5.9 I carried out an unaccompanied visit to the Plan area on 23 May 2017. I was fortunate in having chosen a very pleasant day.

5.10 I drove into the Plan from Norwich along the A47 trunk road. This gave me an opportunity to see the Plan area within its wider context in general, and the Norwich Policy Area in particular. I looked initially at the Church. I was able to understand the basis on which Policy 4 had been drafted. The milepost confirmed that I was 8 miles from Norwich.

5.11 I then drove into the heart of the village and turned into Bawburgh Road. I parked in Parker’s Close. Due to the compact nature of the village I was able to complete the majority of the visit on foot. I walked south along Bawburgh Road to understand the relationship of the village to its surrounding countryside. I was also able to see the location of the strategic housing allocation in the development plan. I also saw the modern residential development in Garnett Drive. It had matured very quickly.

5.12 I then walked to Dereham Road and to the Royal Norfolk Agricultural Association Showground to the east. I saw how the Showground sat in relation to the village. I also saw the various employment uses and car showrooms between the Dereham Road and the A47.

5.13 I then headed back towards the village centre. Having seen the fish and chip shop I walked down Marlingford Road so that I could see both the Village Hall and St Peter’s CoE School.

5.14 I then looked at the houses that had been built between the Dereham Road and the A47. I saw that they had used layouts that reflected the limited separation between these two roads.

5.15 I then walked down Dereham Road to look at the buildings occupied by the Diocese of Norwich to the west of the village. I saw that with St Peter’s Church they provided a very pleasant gateway to the village from the west.
5.16 I finished my visit by driving around the Plan area outside the village itself. In particular I ventured to Ringland to the north and Costessey to the east.
6 The Neighbourhood Plan as a whole

6.1 This section of the report deals with the submitted neighbourhood plan as a whole and the extent to which it meets the basic conditions. The submitted Basic Conditions Statement has helped considerably in the preparation of this section of the report. It is a well-presented, informative and very professional document.

6.2 The Plan needs to meet all the basic conditions to proceed to referendum. This section provides an overview of the extent to which the Plan meets three of the four basic conditions. Paragraphs 2.6 to 2.10 of this report have already addressed the issue of conformity with European Union legislation.

National Planning Policies and Guidance

6.3 The key elements of national policy relating to planning matters are set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) issued in March 2012.

6.4 The NPPF sets out a range of core land-use planning principles to underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. The following are of particular relevance to the Easton Neighbourhood Plan:

- a plan led system— in this case the relationship between the neighbourhood plan and the adopted Joint Core Strategy and the South Norfolk Development Plan documents.
- Proactively drive and support sustainable economic development to deliver the homes, business and industrial units, infrastructure and thriving local places that the country needs.
- recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting thriving local communities.
- Always seeking to secure high quality design and good standards of amenity for all future occupants of land and buildings.

6.5 Neighbourhood plans sit within this wider context both generally, and within the more specific presumption in favour of sustainable development, which is identified as a golden thread running through the planning system. Paragraph 16 of the NPPF indicates that neighbourhoods should both develop plans that support the strategic needs set out in local plans and plan positively to support local development that is outside the strategic elements of the development plan.

6.6 In addition to the NPPF I have also taken account of other elements of national planning policy including Planning Practice Guidance and the recent ministerial statements.

6.7 Having considered all the evidence and representations available as part of the examination I am satisfied that the submitted Plan has had regard to national planning policies and guidance in general terms. It sets out a positive vision for the future of the plan area within the context of its historic character. At its heart are a suite of policies
that aim to safeguard its character and appearance and to promote sensitive residential
development. The Basic Conditions Statement is particularly effective in terms of
mapping the Plan policies with the appropriate paragraphs in the NPPF.

6.8 At a more practical level the NPPF indicates that plans should provide a clear
framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made and that they
should give a clear indication of how a decision-maker should react to a development
proposal (paragraphs 17 and 154). This was reinforced with the publication of Planning
Practice Guidance in March 2014. Its paragraph 41 (41-041-20140306) indicates that
policies in neighbourhood plans should be drafted with sufficient clarity so that a
decision-maker can apply them consistently and with confidence when determining
planning applications. Policies should also be concise, precise and supported by
appropriate evidence.

6.9 As submitted the Plan does not fully accord with this range of practical issues. The
majority of my recommended modifications in Section 7 relate to matters of clarity and
precision. They are designed to ensure that the Plan fully accords with national policy.

Contributing to sustainable development

6.10 There are clear overlaps between national policy and the contribution that the
submitted Plan makes to achieving sustainable development. Sustainable
development has three principal dimensions – economic, social and environmental. It
is clear that the submitted Plan has set out to achieve sustainable development in the
Plan area. In the economic dimension the Plan includes policies for a new village
centre (policy 11) and for new employment opportunities (Policy 14). In the social role,
it includes policies for open space management (Policy 3) and enhancing biodiversity
(Policy 5). In the environmental dimension the Plan positively seeks to preserve the
character of the village (Policy 2) and its heritage (Policies 1 and 4).

General conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan

6.11 I have already commented in detail on the development plan context in the wider South
Norfolk District Council area in paragraphs 5.4 to 5.8 of this report.

6.12 I consider that the submitted Plan delivers a local dimension to this strategic context
and supplements the detail already included in the adopted Local Plan. The Basic
Conditions Statement helpfully relates the Plan’s policies to policies in the different
elements of the development plan. I am satisfied that the submitted Plan is in general
conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan.
The Neighbourhood Plan policies

This section of the report comments on the policies in the Plan. In particular, it makes a series of recommended modifications to ensure that the various policies have the necessary precision to meet the basic conditions.

My recommendations focus on the policies themselves given that the basic conditions relate primarily to this aspect of neighbourhood plans. In some cases, I have also recommended changes to the associated supporting text.

I am satisfied that the content and the form of the Plan is fit for purpose. It is distinctive and proportionate to the Plan area. The wider community and the Parish Council have spent time and energy in identifying the issues and objectives that they wish to be included in their Plan. This sits at the heart of the localism agenda.

The Plan has been designed to reflect Planning Practice Guidance (41-004-20140306) which indicates that neighbourhood plans must address the development and use of land.

I have addressed the policies in the order that they appear in the submitted plan.

For clarity this section of the report comments on all policies whether or not I have recommended modifications in order to ensure that the Plan meets the basic conditions.

Where modifications are recommended to policies they are highlighted in bold print. Any associated or free-standing changes to the text of the Plan are set out in italic print.

The initial sections of the Plan (Sections 1-5)

These introductory elements of the Plan set the scene for the policies. They are commendable to the extent that they are proportionate to the Plan area and the subsequent policies.

Section 1 provides very clear context to the neighbourhood planning process. It also provides a useful connection to national legislative requirements. It also describes how the Plan will be monitored and reviewed.

Section 2 identifies a series of policies within which the Plan has been prepared. Its sections 2.5-2.7 are particularly helpful in clarifying the broader planning policy context.

Section 3 sets out a package of information about the Plan area. It addresses its history and its principal buildings. It provides a helpful and concise background to the Plan area to those unfamiliar with its characteristics.

Section 4 sets out important information on the development of the Plan in general, and the formation and membership of the Steering Group in particular. It provides an overlap with the associated Consultation Statement.
7.13 Section 5 then describes the Community Vision and Objectives that have been developed as part of this process. The vision is ‘to allow Easton to develop gradually and grow in a way that retains its natural beauty and character of a rural village to improve the quality of life for all generations’. These then cascade into the various planning policies and their supporting text.

7.14 The remainder of this section of the report addresses each policy in turn in the context set out in paragraphs 7.5 to 7.7 of this report.

Policy 1: Heritage Protection

7.15 This policy gives appropriate protection to heritage assets in the Plan area. Its underlying aim is to protect and enhance the heritage in the Plan area for future generations.

7.16 Historic England comment that the policy could be expanded to include buildings of local interest and non-designated heritage assets. I agree that this would be the case. However, a modification of this nature is not necessary to ensure that the policy meets the basic conditions. Gladman Developments draw my attention to national policy with regards to heritage assets. Whilst I am satisfied that the policy (with appropriate modifications) meets the basic conditions in having regard to national policy I recommend a further modification to the supporting text to clarify its relationship to the NPPF.

7.17 The wording of the first part of the policy does not have the clarity required by the NPPF. In particular, its use of the expression ‘will be expected’ gives no certainty about the outcome of any planning application.

Replace ‘will be expected to’ with ‘should’.
Replace ‘; the building or its’ with ‘and their’
Replace ‘it possesses’ with ‘they possess’ in the final line of the first part of the policy

At the end of the supporting text at the top of page 27 add:
The policy should be read in conjunction with Section 12 of the NPPF which addresses national policy with regard to heritage assets.

Policy 2: Preserve Village Feel

7.18 The policy has two principal objectives. The first is to retain its separate identity. The second is to prevent its coalescence with Costessey. Both of these objectives are appropriate in the context of the Plan area, and the strategic levels of growth planned in local planning policy.

7.19 I recommend a series of modifications to bring the clarity required by the NPPF and to make an appropriate distinction between policy and supporting text. The latter part of the second paragraph of the policy is supporting text rather than policy. In any event it is already adequately covered in the existing supporting text.
In the first part of the policy replace 'will' with 'should'.
Replace the second part of the policy with:
‘New development proposals should safeguard the separation between Easton and Costessey and avoid coalescence between the two settlements.’

Policy 3: Open Space Management

7.20 This policy puts measures in place to ensure that open spaces are managed and maintained in a sustainable and effective way. The policy identifies three options by which this can be achieved (transfer to the Parish Council, transition to SNC ownership and the establishment of a management company).

7.21 I sought clarification on the extent to which the Parish Council has a preference on the different ways of achieving this policy objective. I was advised that its clear preference is for the land concerned to be transferred to the parish Council with commuted sums for projected maintenance costs. SNC has also advised that its emerging policy is to take on responsibility for the maintenance and upkeep of open spaces only in exceptional cases.

7.22 I am satisfied that the objective of the policy is appropriate and reflects the likely need for such arrangements within the Plan area. Nevertheless, I am not satisfied that the policy needs the level of detail that it currently contains. As it has been submitted the level of detail detracts from rather than adds to the clarity required by the NPPF. As the supporting text comments the intent of the policy is to ensure that appropriate measures are in place to ensure the proper maintenance of open space. A policy that lists three alternatives potentially restricts innovation and is overly-prescriptive. On this basis, I recommend that the three current options are deleted from the policy and are included instead in the supporting text. This will also make it more appropriate to identify the Parish Council’s preference for the maintenance regime.

Delete ‘, etc….’ and replace ‘them by having’ with ‘those areas’
Delete a), b) and c)

After the supporting text at the bottom of p27 insert:
‘There are a variety of ways in which management regimes can be applied to open spaces in the Plan area. The three most obvious are [insert a)/b)/c)]. Other options may come forward during the Plan period. The Parish Council’s strong preference is for the first option’.

Policy 4: Church of St. Peter

7.23 This policy sets out to safeguard the integrity and setting of St Peter’s Church. I looked at the Church when I visited the Plan area. I saw its location on the western edge of the village. The policy overlaps with Policy 1. One representation suggests that the policy should be deleted on this basis. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that the approach adopted is sufficiently specific to warrant a separate policy. In any event the deletion of the policy is not required to ensure that the Plan meets the basic conditions.
7.24 As submitted the policy does not have the clarity required by the NPPF. Some elements read as objectives rather than a policy. Other elements simply require an assessment to take place rather than to inform the decision-making process. I recommend a modification to the policy to address these issues.

Replace the policy as follows:
‘The integrity and setting of the Church of St Peter will be safeguarded. Any development proposals in the immediate vicinity of the Church should demonstrate that they have been designed so that they do not generate substantial harm to the setting of the building. Development proposals should ensure that their arrangement of open space and landscaping are designed in a fashion that would protect and enhance the setting of the Church’.

Policy 5: Enhancing Bio-Diversity

7.25 The policy seeks to improve access to the countryside whilst enhancing the rural setting and providing habitats for wildlife. I am satisfied that the approach is both appropriate and relevant to the Plan area.

7.26 I recommend a modification to bring the clarity required by the NPPF. As submitted the policy only requires development to ‘aim to’ improve biodiversity.

Delete ‘aim to’

Policy 6: Housing and Its Setting

7.27 This policy provides an important context for the new residential development that will emerge within the Plan period. In its response to my clarification questions the Parish Council has advised that the policy is intended to apply to all residential development in the Plan area including that which will come forward on the strategic site (EAS1) in the South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document 2015. I recommend that the supporting text is modified to reflect this important point.

7.28 The policy sets out a series of criteria against which proposals for new housing development will be assessed. They include the natural environment, the historic environment, maintaining important trees and hedgerows and controlling flood risk.

7.29 A series of representations have been made on criterion 2 relating to the historic environment. Having considered all the information I am satisfied that the submitted criterion meets the basic conditions. The criterion reflects the representation received from Historic England at the pre-submission phase.

7.30 Criterion 4 addresses the matter of important trees and existing hedgerows. I saw their importance in the local landscape as part of my visit to the Plan area. I recommend a technical modification to the criterion so that it sits within the wider context of the policy. I also recommend the replacement of ‘not normally be permitted’ with ‘not be supported’. As drafted the criterion would not give South Norfolk Council the ability to
address all the material considerations that would apply to applications on a day-to-day basis. I also recommend accordingly the same point with regard to criterion 5.

7.31 I also recommend a technical modification to criterion 6 so that it sits within the wider context of the policy.

In criterion 4 replace ‘seek’ with ‘seeking’ and ‘normally be permitted’ with ‘be supported’
In criterion 4 delete ‘(off-site provision is acceptable)’
In criterion 5 replace ‘normally be permitted’ with ‘be supported’
In criterion 6 replace ‘will enhance’ with ‘enhancing’, ‘reduces’ with ‘reducing’ and ‘promote’ with ‘promoting’.

In the supporting text (headed ‘Intent of Policy 6’) add the following at its end:
‘Policy 6 applies both to any infill developments that may come forward within the village of Easton and the strategic development of EAS1 as identified in the South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document 2015. The various criteria of the policy identify the issues that should be addressed by each and every residential development. In relation to criterion 4 the provision of off-site planting may be acceptable in appropriate locations. This decision will be informed by the associated arboricultural statement and the professional assessment of the application by South Norfolk Council’.

Policy 7: Housing Design

7.32 This policy addresses a series of factors that will influence the design of new housing proposals. They include energy utilisation, street lighting, car parking and the incorporation of recycling facilities. The policy provides a local dimension to design matters addressed both in national and local planning policies.

7.33 I recommend a series of technical modifications that remedy similar issue to those raised in relation to Policy 6.

7.34 The third criterion comments on car parking standards. It has attracted representations both from SNC and the County Council. The Parish Council has also provided helpful commentary on the matter in its response to my clarification questions. In essence, the debate revolves around two related issues – the extent to which policy DM 3.12 of South Norfolk Development Management Policies Document 2015 remains up-to-date as part of the development plan and the way in which off-road parking is delivered and provided.

7.35 On the first point it is a matter of fact that Policy DM 3.12 is part of the development plan. It is also relatively recently adopted. The Notes to that policy identify that it is underpinned by historic County Council parking standards and that SNC is intending to update those standards at some future point. The policy itself adopts a nuanced approach. It seeks to ensure that parking provision reflects the scale and nature of the development concerned. This responds to national policy in the NPPF (paragraph 39).
7.36 In proposing minimum standards for residential development the Parish Council relies on information about high levels of car ownership in the Plan area. Whilst this point is acknowledged by all parties I am not convinced that it necessarily follows that all the occupiers of new dwellings built in the Plan period will have the same level of car ownership. In addition, the range of potential public transportation improvements in the neighbourhood area during the Plan period will provide greater flexibility for residents to use new and improved infrastructure of this nature and therefore reduce their reliance on the private car (see Policy 13 and paragraphs 7.49/7.50 of this report).

7.37 Within the context of the design of Policy DM 3.12 I am satisfied that the application of minimum parking standards for Easton meets the basic conditions. However, I agree with SNC that the minimum standards proposed are excessive and may result in developments that do not make the best and the most appropriate response to urban design and layout issues. On this basis, I recommend modifications to the minimum standards proposed. In the context of minimum standards, a developer could provide additional parking where SNC was satisfied that this would be consistent with good urban design and layout.

7.38 On the second point I recognise that the relationship between new housing and their car parking spaces is an important dimension to a successful urban environment. Nevertheless, I recommend that the positioning of the car parking spaces should have a greater degree of flexibility in order to prevent otherwise acceptable schemes being resisted. I also recommend that this aspect of the policy is incorporated into criterion 4 that addresses garages.

In criterion 3 replace ‘Provide’ with ‘Providing’
In criterion 5 replace ‘Design’ with ‘Designing’

In criterion 3 delete ‘with a minimum…dwelling’ and ‘(adjacent…dwellings)’
In criterion 3 replace the minimum number of parking spaces as follows:
(1 bedroom) 2 with 1
(3 bedrooms) 3 with 2-3
(4 bedrooms) 4 with 3

Replace criterion 4 with:
‘Providing off-road car parking adjacent to or in front of new dwellings or in other adjacent locations that would be accessible to the occupiers of those houses and would be consistent with good standards of urban design. Where garages are provided to meet the standards identified in criterion 3 of this policy they should be located within the curtilage of the dwelling concerned.’

Policy 8: Housing Mix and Character

7.39 This policy sets out to provide guidance on the density, scale, height and layout of new housing development. It does so in a very effective and well-constructed way. In particular its criteria 3 and 4 address the need to provide smaller houses and for developments to integrate into the existing form of the village.
7.40 The policy has regard to national policy and is in general conformity with strategic policies in the development plan. It will contribute to the achievement of both the social and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. It meets the basic conditions.

Policy 9: Privacy of Existing Homes

7.41 This policy sets out to safeguard the amenities of existing residential properties. It aims to ensure that new houses do not overwhelm existing dwellings in the Plan area. SNC has raised the issue of the need for a buffer to screen existing dwellings in the wider context of the policy that will apply in many different circumstances where new development would be adjacent to existing dwellings. The Parish Council has clarified that its requirement for the provision of a screening buffer refers specifically to the delivery of the strategic housing allocation (EAS1) in the Plan area.

7.42 I recommend a modification to reflect this point. Plainly the provision of a buffer will better relate to the potential impact of a strategic housing development as opposed to proposals for infill development adjacent to existing residential development. In doing so I recommend that the policy has two separate parts, and that the policy referring to day-to-day infill development reflects the SNC representation on this policy. That approach will bring the clarity required by the NPPF.

Replace ‘with the provision…and’ with ‘the layout and design of the properties being arranged in a way that would’

Insert an additional part of the policy to read:
‘The development of the strategic residential allocation EAS1 should address its relationship with existing dwellings and should provide a high-quality environment that safeguards the amenities of existing residential properties. Where it is consistent with good urban design that respects the built form of the village, its development should be screened from existing dwellings through the use of landscaped buffers’.

In the supporting text headed ‘Intent of Policy 9’ insert a full stop after ‘enjoyed’.
Replace the remainder of the text with the following:
‘The second part of the policy refers specifically to the development of the EAS1 strategic housing site. Given the scale of that development there are likely to be opportunities to address the residential amenity of existing properties through the use of landscape buffers’.

Policy 10: New Development Roads

7.43 This policy addresses the issue of the design and layout of roads within new developments. The policy reflects the community’s wish to establish best practice on this matter. Plainly it also reflects the scale of the strategic housing development that will come forward within the Plan period. Whilst the policy refers to the County Council’s adoptable standards (and which are addressed by separate legislation) I am satisfied
that the policy is land use in its nature. Plainly the design and layout of all new housing proposals will be addressed as part of the planning process at some point.

7.44 I recommend two modifications to the policy. The first is to clarify the reference to NCC in the policy. The second is to incorporate the second part of the policy into the supporting text. As submitted it largely repeats that already captured in the first part of the policy.

Replace ‘NCC’ with ‘Norfolk County Council’
Delete the second part of the policy.

At the end of the supporting text at the bottom of page 33 add:
‘The policy particularly sets out the need for new development roads to have a sensitive relationship with existing residential development’.

Policy 11: New Village Centre

7.45 This is an important policy in the Plan. It reflects the opportunity that exists to develop a new village centre both in general terms, and to cater for the future residential development in the Plan area.

7.46 I recommend a series of modifications to ensure that the Plan has the clarity required by the NPPF.

Replace ‘Support the’ with ‘Proposals for the’. Add ‘will be supported’ at the end of the first paragraph of the policy.
Replace ‘Including: ’ with ‘Particular support will be given for proposals that incorporate:
Delete the final part of the policy.

Policy 12: Traffic Impact

7.47 This policy requires that certain developments assess the potential impact on the safe and free flow of traffic in the Plan area. Given the scale of development proposed in the Plan area I am satisfied that this policy approach is appropriate.

7.48 I recommend a modification to bring clarity to the proposals to which this policy would apply. Plainly it would be disproportionate for the policy to have universal application.

Replace the initial part of the policy with:
‘Proposals for housing development of ten or more dwellings and for new commercial or recreational development should:’

Policy 13: Connectivity & Sustainable Transport

7.49 This policy sets out to ensure that new development is properly integrated into the existing community and its facilities through the development of footpaths and
cycleways. This policy is particularly important given the levels of planned strategic growth within the Plan period.

7.50 SNC helpfully suggest that the policy should make reference to public transport enhancements. I have incorporated this suggestion into a series of recommended modifications. The modifications are necessary to ensure that the policy has the clarity required by the NPPF. They clarify that the specific facilities at the end of the policy do not exclude transport improvements being made to other facilities where it is appropriate to do so.

At the end of the first sentence replace ‘footpaths and cycleways’ with ‘footpaths, cycleways and public transport improvements’.
In the second sentence insert ‘in particular and’ between ‘and’ and ‘where’.

Policy 14: Small-scale Employment Opportunities

7.51 This policy sets out to encourage local employment opportunities that are appropriate to Easton. There is an ambition to strengthen the local economy and to improve the sustainability of village life. The implementation of this policy will make a significant contribution towards the achievement of the economic dimension of sustainable development in the neighbourhood area.

7.52 Broadland District Council raises a series of comments on this policy. Its principal concern is that several of the components of the policy are ambiguous and may be difficult to apply through the development management process. I have similar concerns about the policy in general, and in particular its reference to ‘small’ commercial and office units. Whilst I recognise that other elements of the policy will need a degree of interpretation during the Plan period its broader intentions are clear. There is an expectation that new employment opportunities are appropriate both to their immediate surroundings and to the wider rural environment within which the Plan sits. I recommend modifications to the policy to address these matters and to ensure that the policy takes on a policy format.

Replace the policy with:

Proposals for new commercial and office units will be supported subject to the following criteria:

- Their size and design respect the immediate surroundings in which they are located;
- They are appropriate to the rural character of the Plan area; and
- They do not have an unacceptable impact on the local environment and the amenities of adjacent residential properties or other land uses.
8 Summary and Conclusions

Summary

8.1 The Plan sets out a range of policies to guide and direct development proposals in the period up to 2042. It is distinctive in addressing a specific set of issues that have been identified and refined by the wider community.

8.2 Following my independent examination of the Plan I have concluded that the Easton Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the basic conditions for the preparation of a neighbourhood plan subject to a series of recommended modifications.

8.3 This report has recommended some technical modifications to the policies in the Plan. Nevertheless, it remains fundamentally unchanged in its role and purpose.

Conclusion

8.4 On the basis of the findings in this report I recommend to South Norfolk Council that subject to the incorporation of the modifications set out in this report that the Easton Neighbourhood Plan should proceed to referendum.

Referendum Area

8.5 I am required to consider whether the referendum area should be extended beyond the Plan area. In my view, the neighbourhood area is entirely appropriate for this purpose and no evidence has been submitted to suggest that this is not the case. I therefore recommend that the Plan should proceed to referendum based on the neighbourhood area as approved by the District Council on 17 April 2015.

8.6 I am grateful to everyone who has helped in any way to ensure that this examination has run in a smooth and efficient manner.

Andrew Ashcroft
Independent Examiner
12 June 2017
Cabinet 17 July 2017
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South Norfolk Council Authority Monitoring Report 2016/17
Proposed Revisions to Development Management Policies Monitoring Indicators

Report of the Planning Policy Manager
Cabinet Member: John Fuller, The Economy and External Affairs

CONTACT
Adam Nicholls (01508) 533809
anicholls@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1 Monitoring of the Local Plan is a very important part of assessing the effectiveness of the policies and implementation of sites allocated for development. The Council undertook monitoring of its newly-adopted Local Plan documents for the first time in 2015/16 using the monitoring frameworks included at the end of each adopted document. In the case of the Development Management Policies document it became apparent that some of the indicators included in the framework were not capable of being monitored as expected. The purpose of this report is to present some modifications to these indicators prior to the commencement of data collection for the 2016/17 Authority Monitoring Report to enable a more meaningful set of monitoring indicators to be used.

2. Background

2.1 The monitoring of adopted Local Plan documents is a vitally important part of the planning system. Without good knowledge of whether current policies are working as effectively as intended, and whether sites allocated for development are coming forward as planned (which is especially important for the Housing Land Supply calculation), the Council (and other stakeholders) will not understand properly key annual performance statistics (such as the amount of employment land permitted, and number of affordable houses delivered). Lack of knowledge also does not help inform the preparation of the next Local Plan (in the Council’s case, the Greater Norwich Local Plan), when key decisions need to be made about whether certain current policies should be effectively “rolled over” largely unchanged or changed significantly to better enable delivery of key objectives.

2.2 Local Planning Authorities must publish information at least annually that shows how the implementation of policies in the Local Plan are progressing and this is done formally through an Authority Monitoring Report (AMR). The requirement to publish an AMR is set out in Section 113 of the Localism Act 2011. Since 2010/11
South Norfolk has produced an AMR jointly with Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and Norfolk County Council to monitor the effectiveness of policies in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS). The latest 2015/16 JCS AMR can be found at https://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Annual_Monitoring_Report_2015-2016.pdf

2.3 Following the adoption of several Local Plan documents in October 2015 (namely the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, the Development Management Policies Document and the Wymondham Area Action Plan) South Norfolk Council embarked on monitoring the policies in these plans for the first time to feed into the 2015/16 JCS AMR, using the monitoring frameworks included at the end of each adopted document. The South Norfolk Council Local Plan Monitoring Report can be found at Appendix G (page 210) of the 2015/16 AMR.

2.4 The Long Stratton Area Action Plan was not formally adopted until May 2016 and so was not included in the 2015/16 monitoring but this document will need to be monitored for the 2016/17 JCS AMR. Data collection and analysis for the 2016/17 document has already begun, to meet deadlines for publication of later in 2017.

3. Current Position/Findings

3.1 When compiling data for the 2015/16 AMR, it became apparent that some indicators included in the Monitoring Framework for the Development Management Policies Document were not capable of being monitored as envisaged. There were different reasons for this: either the data was not currently collected in an appropriate form and there would have been an excessive level of work required to collect it, or the indicators were simply no longer relevant (bearing in mind that the original indicators were drafted in the emerging Local Plan documents in about 2012/13). The current monitoring framework can be found at page 125 of the Development
3.2 It is considered that rather than have a monitoring framework where some of the indicators are not capable of being reported upon and therefore cannot demonstrate whether the policies in the plan are working efficiently, the opportunity should be taken to amend and update the indicators where necessary to produce an up-to-date and more fit-for-purpose framework in time to reflect in the 2016/17 Authority Monitoring Report. Given that key monitoring data has only been collected for the Development Management Policies Document for one year so far, whilst there will be an impact on the consistency and comparability of the data over longer time-frames, it is felt that this will be relatively minor. This is because many indicators are proposed to be left effectively unchanged, and for those proposed to be changed, commentary in AMRs will enable any more significant differences in the quality and/or quantity of the information over time to be put into context.

3.3 It is considered that the indicators presented in the Monitoring Frameworks for the Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document and the Wymondham and Long Stratton Area Action Plans are fit for purpose and therefore no changes are suggested.

4. Proposals

4.1 A number of changes to the Development Management Policies Monitoring Framework have been worked up in consultation with relevant Council officers; these are shown in Appendix 1.
4.2 The main changes suggested are:

- **Change policy titles throughout to reflect the policy titles in the adopted Development Management Policies Document for consistency**

- **DM 1.4 – Environmental quality and local distinctiveness**
  Delete indicator relating to the improvement of heritage assets as difficult to monitor due to the large number and variety of applications coded against this policy and the difficulty in measuring whether a heritage asset has been improved. Need to clarify the indicator relating to conversions to refer to the number of buildings re-used or converted. Delete the indicator relating to the Code for Sustainable Homes as the Code no longer exists.

- **DM 1.5 – Existing Commitments**
  This was a new policy introduced through the examination process so did not have a monitoring indicator. Suggest addition of indicator relating to renewal of applications on committed or allocated sites in the Local Plan

- **DM 3.12 – Parking provision**
  Change wording of current indicator to refer to the number of major applications permitted in accordance with the Council’s car parking standards (Major applications refer to 10+ residential units or 1000 sq m+ of commercial development). The previous indicator refers to all completed developments, which was not monitored last year due to the very significant amount of time it would have taken to compile the information. Monitoring only major applications makes the data more manageable and it is not considered necessary to look in detail at every single small-scale application as it is likely to be the larger developments where any issues with car parking standards are most likely to arise.

- **DM 3.15 – Outdoor play facilities and recreational space**
  Delete original indicators as data not currently collected in that form. It is suggested that the indicator is changed to reflect information about planning obligations secured for open space/play space already
collected for DM 1.2 as this will provide adequate monitoring without the need to implement time consuming new monitoring procedures. It is planned to adopt a revised ‘Guidelines for Recreation Provision in New Residential Developments’ Supplementary Planning Document in September/October 2017 to reflect the Council current policy on adoption and maintenance of open spaces/play areas. From 2017/18 it will be useful to include an additional indicator in the AMR to monitor whether the adoption/maintenance of such spaces is taken on by town/parish councils or management companies.

- **DM 4.6 – Landscape setting of Norwich**
  Add new indicator to look at the amount of Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone lost to development, similar to existing indicator for Strategic Gaps, as it is considered that this will be relatively straightforward to measure and will provide valuable information about the effectiveness of landscape protection on the edge of Norwich.

- **DM 4.8 – Protection of Trees and Hedgerows**
  Delete original indicators as information not currently collected in that form. Add a new indicator referring to number and area of trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders served within the monitoring year, which will be more straightforward to collect.

- **DM 4.10 – Heritage Assets**
  Delete indicator relating to the improvement of heritage assets as difficult to monitor due to the large number and variety of applications coded against this policy and the difficulty in measuring whether a heritage asset has been improved. Suggest addition of new indicators relating to listed building consents granted, conservation areas with appraisals and listed buildings lost and demolished, which will be easier to monitor.

4.4 It should be noted that the Council will also need to monitor the number of Starter Homes and Custom Build/Self Build dwellings granted consent and is currently in the process of sorting out the details of what these monitoring
arrangements will be (in some cases, further legislative details/guidance are still awaited). In addition, a Brownfield Register needs to be finalised and published by the end of 2017.

5. Risks and implications arising

5.1 There will be no financial impact as work on the AMR is covered within the current work and budget of the Planning Policy Team.

5.2 As this is simply adjusting some monitoring indicators, it is considered that there will be no impact on disadvantaged groups.

5.3 There will be no impact on the environment or crime and disorder.

6. Other options

6.1 Cabinet could advise that either no changes, or different changes, should be made to the Development Management Policies Monitoring Framework, but it is felt that the changes proposed are pragmatic and sensible.
7. Recommendation

7.1 Cabinet is recommended to:
   i) Agree the proposed revisions to the Development Management Policies Monitoring Indicators for
      publication on the Council’s website and for use in collecting information for the 2016/17 AMR onwards;
      and
   ii) Delegate authority to the Director of Planning and Environment, in consultation with the Cabinet Member
       for Economy and External Affairs to agree any minor changes prior to finalising the changes.

Appendix 1 – Proposed Revisions to Development Management Policies Monitoring Indicators
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM 1.1 Principle of Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Area Wide Policy No indicator identified</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Ensuring development management contributes to achieving sustainable development in South Norfolk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 1.2 Infrastructure Requirements</td>
<td>Number of planning obligations secured for: - Affordable Housing - Green Infrastructure - Open space/play space - Pedestrian &amp; highway improvements Target: No target identified</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Requirement for infrastructure through planning obligations’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number/percentage of obligations not conforming to full policy position Target: Minimise. Record as percentage of applications</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Small change to wording suggested: Number/percentage of obligations secured not conforming to full policy position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 1.3 Dwellings outside Development Boundaries</td>
<td>Number of planning permissions/units granted outside development boundaries/percentage overall applications units Target: Minimise</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘The sustainable location of new development’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small change to wording of indicator suggested: Number of planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development Management Policies – Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM 1.4</td>
<td>Number of planning permissions granted heritage assets improved</td>
<td>This indicator is difficult to monitor due to the large number and variety of applications coded against this policy. Difficult to measure if heritage assets have been improved.</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Environmental quality and local distinctiveness’ Delete indicator relating to improvement of heritage assets as too difficult to measure. No replacement suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Assets</td>
<td>Number of conversions</td>
<td>It is not clear precisely what this indicator means. More clarity is needed.</td>
<td>Change indicator to: ‘Number of buildings re-used or converted’ with a target of maximise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re Use of Buildings</td>
<td>Number of conversions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Energy</td>
<td>Renewable energy capacity permitted by type</td>
<td>None Indicator already collected for the JCS AMR. Data supplied by Monitoring Officer</td>
<td>Change wording of indicator to reflect wording of JCS Indicator: ‘Sustainable and Renewable energy capacity permitted by type’ with a target of year on year megawatts capacity permitted increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect &amp; Enhance Water Resources</td>
<td>Code for Sustainable Homes</td>
<td>Code for Sustainable Homes no longer exists</td>
<td>Delete indicator as Code for Sustainable Homes no longer exists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target: All new homes CfSH level 4 and level 6 for schemes over 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</td>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>PROPOSED CHANGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 1.5 Existing Commitments</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>This was a new policy introduced through the examination process and so was not included in the original monitoring framework. Add in new indicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>'Percentage of renewal applications on committed or allocated sites in the Local Plan which are permitted' with a target of 100%. Data to be collected by using the RLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 2.1 Employment and Business Development</td>
<td>Number of applications for employment creation. Floorspace by Use type</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change indicator to accord with wording of JCS AMR Indicator: ‘Permitted amount of floorspace and land by employment type’ retain target to maximise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target: Maximise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 2.2 Protection of employment sites</td>
<td>Loss of employment land (m2) to non-employment use other use</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Small change to wording of indicator suggested: Loss of employment land (m2) to non employment use/other uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target: Minimise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 2.3 Working from home</td>
<td>Area Wide Policy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Working at home’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No indicator specified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development Management Policies – Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DM 2.4 Proposals for Town Centre Uses | Percentage of completed town centre uses in identified centres and strategic growth centres Target: JCS target | None                                                                  | Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Location of the ‘main town centre uses’’  
Change indicator to accord with wording of JCS AMR Indicator: ‘Percentage of permitted town centre uses in defined centres and strategic growth locations’ with a target of 100% |
| DM 2.5 Proposals for Town Centre Uses | % of non-A1 use in defined Primary Shopping Areas of Diss and Harleston  
Target: Maximum 40% non-A1 use | None                                                                  | Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Changes of use in the town centres and local centres’  
Change in emphasis of indicator and target to better reflect wording of policy – no change in actual meaning of indicator: ‘The percentage of ground floor units being available for Class A1 use in the defined Primary Shopping Areas of Diss and Harleston.  
Target: At least 60% of ground floor units being available for Class A1 uses in the Primary Shopping Area’ |
|                               | % of ground floor A1 units in the defined Town Centre Area for Diss and Harleston | None                                                                  | Change in emphasis of indicator and target to better reflect wording of policy – no change in actual meaning of indicator: ‘The percentage of ground floor units being available for Class A1 uses in the Primary Shopping Area’ |
## Development Management Policies – Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target: Maximum 50% of number of ground floor non-residential units available for class A1 shop use</td>
<td>through town centre surveys. Data collection to be coordinated quarterly by Planning Policy Team</td>
<td>actual meaning of indicator: *The percentage of ground floor non-residential units being available for Class A1 use in the defined Town Centre Area of Diss and Harleston. Target: At least 50% of ground floor non-residential units to be available for class A1 shop use in the defined Town Centre Area’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 2.6 Proposals for Food, Drink and Hot Food Takeaway</td>
<td>Town Centre Policy No indicator identified</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Food, drink and takeaways’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 2.7 Agriculture and Forestry</td>
<td>Area Wide Policy No indicator specified</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Agricultural and forestry development’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 2.8 Equestrian and Other Small Rural Development</td>
<td>Amount of Equestrian and other small based rural development by location Target: No target identified</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Collected by monitoring policy on Uniform system and looking up detail of applications. Data provided by Monitoring Officer and analysed by Planning Policy Team. The absence of a target is considered appropriate due to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Development Management Policies – Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **DM 2.9 Rural Tourist related development** | Amount of tourist related development  
Target: No target identified | None  
Collected by monitoring policy on Uniform system and looking up details of applications. Data provided by Monitoring Officer and analysed by Planning Policy Team.  
The absence of a target is considered appropriate due to the small number of applications and criteria based nature of policy. | Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Rural tourist and other recreational destinations’ |
| **DM 2.10 Conversion of Buildings in the Countryside** | Area Wide Policy  
No indicator identified | None | Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Conversion and re-use of buildings in the Countryside for non-agricultural use’ |
| **DM 2.11 Agricultural Buildings on the Countryside** | Area Wide Policy  
No indicator identified | None | Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Agricultural and other occupational dwellings in the Countryside’ |
| **DM 2.12 Tourist Accommodation** | Area Wide Policy  
No indicator identified | None | None |
# Development Management Policies – Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM 3.1 Housing Needs</td>
<td>Housing completions by bedroom number</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Meeting housing requirements and needs’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target: Figures within 10% tolerance of the Housing Market Assessment requirements</td>
<td>Indicator already collected for the JCS AMR. Data supplied by Monitoring Officer. Need to clarify what is meant by 10% tolerance of the Housing Market Assessment requirements as this not reflected in AMR</td>
<td>Change indicator to accord with wording of JCS AMR Indicator: ‘(Gross) New house completions by bedroom number, based on the proportions set out in the most recent Sub-Regional Housing Market Assessment’ with a general target of 1 bedroom – 10%, 2 bedroom – 22%, 3 bedrooms – 50% and 4+ bedrooms – 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 3.2 Rural Housing Needs</td>
<td>Number of affordable homes built in the countryside</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Meeting rural housing needs’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target: No target identified</td>
<td>Information for this indicator provided by Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 3.3 Provision of Gypsy and Traveller Pitches</td>
<td>Number of permanent pitches provided</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Sites for Gypsies and Travellers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target: Between 2012 and 2026, 38 pitches</td>
<td>Indicator already collected for JCS – AMR. Data supplied by Monitoring Officer.</td>
<td>Change wording of indicator to read ‘Number of permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches provided’ with a target of 35 pitches between 2014 – 2031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Development Management Policies – Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DM 3.4</strong> Residential Extensions in Settlements</td>
<td>Area Wide Policy No indicator identified</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: <em>‘Residential extensions, conversions within settlements’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DM 3.5</strong> Replacement Dwellings in Settlements</td>
<td>Area Wide Policy No indicator identified</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: <em>‘Replacement dwellings and additional dwellings on subdivided plots within development boundaries’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DM 3.6</strong> Replacement Dwellings in the Countryside</td>
<td>Area Wide Policy No indicator identified</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: <em>‘House extensions and replacement dwellings in the Countryside’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DM 3.7</strong> Residential Annex</td>
<td>Area Wide Policy No indicator identified</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: <em>‘Residential Annexes’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DM 3.8</strong> Design Principles</td>
<td>Percentage of completions scoring Silver standards against Building for Life criteria Target: Maximise</td>
<td>Indicator no longer collected for JCS AMR as now considered to be more of a pre-application tool. Monitoring can give a misleading and overly negative picture.</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: <em>‘Design Principles applying to all development’</em> Delete current indicator as information no longer collected and replace with <em>‘No Indicator and no target identified’</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development Management Policies – Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM 3.9 Advertisements</td>
<td>Area Wide Policy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Advertisements and signs’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No indicator identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 3.10 Promotion of Sustainable Transport</td>
<td>Amount of land protected for future Transport improvements – HA</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Small change to wording of indicator suggested: ‘Amount of land protected for future transport improvements in hectares’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No target identified</td>
<td>Collected by monitoring policy on Uniform system and looking up details of applications. Data provided by Monitoring Officer and analysed by Planning Policy Team.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The absence of a target is considered appropriate due to the small number of applications and the nature of policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 3.11 Site Impacts on Traffic</td>
<td>Area Wide Policy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Road Safety and the free flow of traffic’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No indicator identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 3.12 Parking Provision</td>
<td>Amount of completed development in accordance with the council’s car parking standards (floor area m²)</td>
<td>This indicator was not monitored last year as it would have been a significant piece of work to look in detail at each completed development to see if it met the Council’s car parking standards.</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Provision of vehicle parking’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target: Maximise</td>
<td>Consideration was given as to whether it would be easier to</td>
<td>Change wording of current indicator to read: ‘Number of major applications permitted in accordance with the Council’s car parking standards’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development Management Policies – Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>monitor permitted rather than completed developments but this was still considered to be an overly time consuming piece of work.</td>
<td>standards’ with a target of maximise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Although the Council is normally very firm in applying the County Council’s car parking standards to new developments, there is still benefit in monitoring this policy to ensure that these high standards continue. Rather than trying to monitor every single application, it is considered to be the most effective use of resources to concentrate on larger (“major”) developments as these are most likely to be where any car parking issues arise. Concentrating only on major applications therefore makes the data easier to collect and focuses on the more significant traffic-generating developments.</td>
<td>(Major applications refer to 10+ residential units or 1000 sqm + of commercial development).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 3.13 Amenity</td>
<td>Area Wide Policy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No indicator identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Development Management Policies – Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM 3.14 Pollution, Health and Safety</td>
<td>Number of Air Quality Management Area designations Target: Minimise</td>
<td>This indicator is already monitored for the JCS AMR. Data collection by Monitoring Officer. South Norfolk Council currently does not have any Air Quality Management Areas, so is meeting the target to minimise set out in the Monitoring Framework</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 3.15 Open Space</td>
<td>Area of outdoor playing space provided from developments (HA)</td>
<td>It was not possible to monitor this indicator last year as the information is not currently collected</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Outdoor play facilities and recreational space’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area of open space lost to development (Ha)</td>
<td>It was not possible to monitor this indicator last year as the information is not currently collected</td>
<td>Change indicator to reflect information already collected for DM 1.2 ‘Number of planning obligations secured for open space/play space’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net loss of existing open space (Ha)</td>
<td>It was not possible to monitor this indicator last year as the information is not currently collected</td>
<td>Number/percentage of obligations secured not conforming to full policy position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Add additional indicator from 2017/18 to monitor whether new areas of open space/play areas are being taken on by town/parish councils or management companies).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</td>
<td>ISSUES</td>
<td>PROPOSED CHANGES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 3.16 Improvement of the level of community facilities</td>
<td>Number of changes of use permitted</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change to wording of indicator suggested to give more clarity: ‘Number of applications approved that involved the change of use of a community facility’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target: minimise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 4.1 Renewable Energy</td>
<td>Renewable energy capacity permitted by type</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change wording of indicator to reflect wording of JCS Indicator: ‘Sustainable and Renewable energy capacity permitted by type’ with a target of year on year megawatts capacity permitted increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target: Year on year percentage increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 4.2 Sustainable Drainage</td>
<td>Area Policy</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Sustainable drainage and water management’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No indicator but target given as 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Delete reference to no indicator and target of 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add JCS AMR Indicator: ‘Number of planning permissions granted contrary to the advice of the’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development Management Policies – Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DM 4.3 Domestic recycling facilities | Area Policy              | None                                                                   | Change policy title to reflect DM document:  
*Facilities for the collection of recycling and waste* with a target of zero. Delete reference to no indicator and target of 100%. Add JCS AMR Indicator:  
*Percentage of household waste that is a) recycled and b) composted* with a target of a year on year increase. |
| DM 4.4 Environmental Assets | Hectares of development in Highly sensitive landscapes  
Target: No target identified | None                                                                   | Change policy title to reflect DM document:  
*Natural environmental assets – designated and locally important open space*                                                                 |
| DM 4.5 Landscape Character  | Area Policy              | None                                                                   | Change policy title to reflect DM document:  
*Landscape Character and*                                                                     |
### Development Management Policies – Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM 4.6 Landscape Setting</td>
<td><strong>Area Policy</strong>&lt;br&gt;No indicator identified&lt;br&gt;Target: Minimise impact</td>
<td>None&lt;br&gt;Consider if there is an appropriate indicator to monitor to demonstrate the effectiveness of the policy at enhancing the landscape setting of Norwich.</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document:&lt;br&gt;‘Landscape Setting of Norwich’&lt;br&gt;New indicator proposed:&lt;br&gt;‘Amount of Norwich Southern Bypass Landscape Protection Zone lost to development (ha)’&lt;br&gt;Current target to minimise impact is considered appropriate.&lt;br&gt;Data to be collected by monitoring policy on the Uniform system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM 4.7 Strategic Gap</td>
<td><strong>Amount of strategic gap lost to development (ha)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Target: Zero</td>
<td>Collected by monitoring policy on Uniform system and looking up details of applications. Data provided by Monitoring Officer and analysed by Planning Policy Team.&lt;br&gt;Due to the positive wording of the policy ‘development will be permitted…’ the target of zero is considered to too absolute. A target to minimise impact may be more appropriate due to the small number of applications and the nature of policy.</td>
<td>Change policy title to reflect DM document:&lt;br&gt;‘Strategic Gaps between settlements within the Norwich Policy Area’&lt;br&gt;Amend target to be ‘Minimise Impact’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Development Management Policies – Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DM 4.8 Tree and Hedgerows | Protected trees lost as a result of development | It was not possible to monitor this indicator last year as the information is not currently collected | Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Protection of Trees and Hedgerows’  
New Indicator proposed: ‘Number and areas of trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders served within the monitoring year’ |
| | Target: Minimise | | |
| | Protected Hedgerows lost | It was not possible to monitor this indicator last year as the information is not currently collected. Hedgerows are strictly protected under the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 so it is thought that there is limited benefit in using limited staff resources to collate this information. | Delete indicator. No replacement suggested |
| | Target: Minimise | | |
| DM 4.9 Landscape & Design | Area Policy | None | Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Incorporating landscape into design’ |
| | No indicator identified | | |
| DM 4.10 Heritage | Number of planning permissions granted heritage assets improved | This indicator is difficult to monitor due to the large number and variety of applications coded against this policy. It is difficult to measure if heritage assets have been improved. | Change policy title to reflect DM document: ‘Heritage Assets’  
Delete indicator relating to improvement of heritage assets as too difficult to measure. |
| | Target: Minimise | | |
# Development Management Policies – Monitoring Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>CURRENT INDICATOR/TARGET</th>
<th>ISSUES</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Replace with the following indicator: ‘<strong>Percentage of Listed Building consents granted</strong>’ with a target of maximise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add JCS AMR Indicator: ‘<strong>Percentage of Conservation Areas with appraisals</strong>’ with a target of a year on year increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add JCS AMR Indicator: ‘<strong>Number of listed buildings lost/demolished</strong>’ with a target of none.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Introduction

1.1 This report details the Council’s performance against strategic measures, risk position and financial position for the first quarter of 2017/18, and seeks approval for other consequential matters.

2. Overview

2.1 **Performance**: In February 2017, Cabinet approved the annual Corporate Business Plan for the 2017/18 financial year which included a set of strategic measures aligned to our corporate priorities. These measures are monitored and reported on a quarterly basis to Cabinet. Appendix 1 provides the detailed performance report for quarter 1. The table below provides a summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Indicator</td>
<td>24 Measures met or exceeded the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Indicator</td>
<td>3 Measures are within an acceptable tolerance of target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Indicator</td>
<td>1 Measures did not reach the stretched target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>5 Measures are being ‘baselined’ in order to determine the target.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 **Risk management:** Managers have undertaken a review of all Strategic, Directorate and Operational risks. In light of this, the current organisational capacity position is highlighted below; this demonstrates that at present all risk factors are positive, indicating the Council is proactively managing risks and capable of realising opportunities as they are identified. The table below presents a position that will assist the organisation achieve its ambitious targets for the future. The Strategic Risk Register is outlined in Appendix 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Indicator</th>
<th>Present Position</th>
<th>Present Risk Acceptability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>The Medium Term Financial Strategy agreed in February 2017 shows that the Council's Budget is balanced for 2017/18, 2018/19 and 2019/20 after taking account of income and savings identified in those years. Further work is required to identify measures to balance the budget from 2020/21 onwards.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Delivery</td>
<td>The Council continues to perform strongly against its suite of strategic performance indicators. The year-end position 2016/17 is favourable with only one measure not meeting its target.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal / Compliance</td>
<td>No significant legal / compliance issues have been raised over the past quarter and the status remains the same.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation</td>
<td>The Council continues to retain a good reputation both nationally and regionally. The Council has recently been awarded Investor in People Platinum, one of the top 0.05% of organisations in the UK to achieve the award.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Capacity</td>
<td>This remains strong and the Strategic Leadership Team continues to be in a position to drive the Council forward. It will continue to ensure that the Council has the right skills and resources in place to fulfil the needs of the organisation and make interim appointments where appropriate to ensure service continuity and delivery of key functions.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3 **Revenue Position Quarter One**

The budget for 2017/18 was set by the Council in February 2017.

Owing to the timing of Cabinet, detailed analysis of budgets in this report covers April and May 2017. Initial June figures are consistent with this detailed analysis. The total net budget was (£141,800). The actual total expenditure, net of income and excluding Housing Benefit payments, was (£697,400). This therefore produced a positive variance against the revenue budget of £555,600. The position at the end of May is set out in the graph below.
A more detailed analysis of the main areas of variance by service is attached as Appendix 3. These variances are the direct costs of each service and exclude recharging between services for overheads, depreciation charges and technical financial adjustments required for statutory reporting purposes at the end of the financial year.

2.3.1 Pay and staffing budgets

There are vacancies in several areas across the Council, which include Building Control, HR, Corporate Marketing, Housing and Public Health and Planning. Interim staffing arrangements in these areas did not fully offset the savings from vacancies. The overall position on staffing budgets at the end of May is a positive variance of £244,000. This represents 8.37% of the pay and staffing budget, which is higher than the proportion for quarter 1 last year (4.99%).

2.3.2 Non Pay Budgets

Non-pay budgets were reduced for 2017/18 as part of the 10% challenge on budgets. Overall, there was lower than budgeted non-pay expenditure across the Council resulting in a positive variance of £344,000. This represents 6.55% of the non-pay budget, which is higher than the proportion for quarter 1 last year (6.46%).

Performance for Quarter 1 on payments is shown in the graphs below which show the total value of invoices approved on the finance system but not yet paid (these are referred to as ‘Trade Creditors’). The Council pays most of its suppliers within 30 days. 96% of all undisputed supplier invoices have been paid within 30 days for Quarter 1.
2.3.3 Income Budgets

Income budgets were increased significantly for 2017/18 as part of the 10% challenge on budgets to reflect higher demand and increases to some fees and charges. Overall income was £32,400 lower than budgeted across the Council. This represents 0.39% of the income budget, which is greater than the proportion for quarter 1 last year (0.18%).

Trade Debtors are all invoices raised by the Council and where we are awaiting payment. Performance on overdue invoices for Quarter 1 compared to the same quarter last year is shown in the graph below. These invoices include charges for CNC Building Control, Community Infrastructure Levy, Rent Assisted Deposits and charges for Sewerage Services. £933,810 has been raised in the current financial year in relation to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
2.3.4 Capital Budget and Expenditure Quarter One

The report details the overall position on the Capital Programme. Owing to the timing of Cabinet, detailed analysis of budgets in this report covers April and May 2017. Initial June figures are consistent with this detailed analysis. Expenditure to the end of May was £1.18 million compared to a budget of £1.51 million.

The two graphs below show the variances on the 2017/18 capital programme. The main variances relate to Waste Vehicle Replacements, Aids and Adaptations/Disabled Facilities Grants, Leisure Provision, and Wheeled Bin Replacements. Further details of the variances on individual capital projects are included by relevant theme later in this report and in Appendix 4.
3 Combined Performance, Risk and Financial Commentary by Corporate Priority

3.1 Economic Development

The number of new business start-ups supported (LI 613) was 36 in quarter 1, which indicates that we are on track to meet the year-end target of 75. Many new businesses have been supported from our new business space within Crafton House at Poringland.

Progress with the Norwich Research Park Enterprise Zone is continuing. The current expectation is that the remaining legal documentation will be signed in early July, which will help to mitigate the Strategic Risk associated with the Enterprise Zone (S1). Officers will monitor this closely to ensure that delays are avoided.

In Q1 we have had a total of 47 new apprenticeships placements (EG 1605) available in our local businesses against a year-end target of 70. Relating specifically to our Council, in Q1 we advertised for three additional apprentices. In line with government policy, we are working towards a target of having 12 apprenticeship posts in place in 2017/18.

The amount of external funding identified and brought into the local economy (LI 758) is £300,000, which has exceeded the quarter 1 target of £250,000.
3.2 **Business Rates**

Performance on non-domestic rates collected (BV010) in quarter 1 is up on the same period last year and is better than the quarter 1 target, this is despite quarter 4 being slightly below the target of 98%, owing to one business disputing payment and lodging an appeal. There is an overall positive variance of £95,000 on South Norfolk Council’s share of NNDR (business rates) income. South Norfolk Council’s share of NNDR (business rates) income is slightly higher than anticipated when the budget was set but the levy is calculated to be lower owing to a higher volume and cost of appeals. Income from businesses on the Norwich Research Park Enterprise Zone is included in this variance and this income will need to be transferred to the Enterprise Zone Reserve at year end to cover the costs of further development on the site, with associated borrowing.

3.3 **Market Towns**

The Visitor Economy Initiative (VEI) is being launched officially in July / August 2017. Officers continue to liaise with key stakeholders in order to establish a Wymondham Local Tourism Action Group (L-TAG), and are currently preparing a funding bid to pilot a digital trail in the Town. Waveney Valley L-Tag now has a social media coordinator in place to promote the area. The new Diss Corn Hall partially opened in May 2017 and is expected to be fully open in September 2017 and expenditure on this scheme is exactly in line with budget for quarter 1.

3.4 **Car Parks**

The resurfacing of the Chapel Street Car Park in Diss is complete and the installation of new pay and display machines in all car parks has now commenced.

3.5 **Property Development and Management**

Overall the indicator for percentage of rental income returned from our property investments has exceeded quarter 1 target (LI358), reflecting high levels of occupancy and the lettings at Crafton House. Furthermore, in relation to residential dwelling developed through Big Sky Developments (EG1601a), quarter 1 has seen the progression of phase 2 at Rosebery Park Poringland with 14 units being delivered and sold, whilst marketing for ‘off-plan’ sales continues. Maple Park construction is progressing well, which has led to the reservation of 3 plots.
In line with the capital programme, in May funding of £840,000 was transferred to Big Sky Property Management Ltd (BSPML) to purchase four of the six plots reserved by BSPML for letting on Rosebery Park. Seven affordable homes sales are also secured at this site. Marketing for ‘off-plan’ sales commenced at the end of April 2017 for Maple Park as the show home is now open, with ten plots being retained for rental by BSPML.

The 12 residential properties owned by BSPML are currently all let.

3.6 CNC Building Control

Due to a continuation of the fall-off in demand experienced in 2016/17 and less high value work coming through, CNC Building Control fee earning income (LI 1013) was slightly lower than budgeted in quarter 1. Costs and staff vacancies continue to be managed to offset this drop in demand and the position is therefore a positive variance overall. A new business plan for CNC now includes a revised marketing approach and new website, which is hoped will attract further business.

At its meeting on 27 June 2017, the CNC Board recommended that fees should be increased from 1st September 2017, on the basis of an hourly rate of £70 (compared to the current £60 per hour which was implemented on 1st April 2014). It is recommended that the detailed fees and charges for building control be amended to reflect this new hourly rate and that this task should be delegated to the Director of Business Development in conjunction with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources and the Chair of the CNC Board.
3.7 **Leisure and Recreation**

There has been an overall 3% increase in memberships (HE1601) across the Leisure Centres since April 2017, equating to a net 71 new members, which has exceeded the Q1 target of 2.5%. At Wymondham Leisure Centre, monthly Direct Debit membership has grown by a further 70 net new members in Q1.

Overall leisure centre income was slightly below budget, however income for April to May across all Leisure Centres increased from £316,516 in April/May 2016 to £435,909 in April/May 2017 which is a 37% increase, reflecting continuing increases in memberships. This includes the Hethersett Academy where the arrangement to open sports facilities to the public outside school hours was launched at the end of March. Management of staffing and non-pay costs mean that there is a small positive variance across all Centres in total.

Design work for the refurbishment of Long Stratton Leisure Centre is continuing in line with the overall project plan for this scheme. Planning permission will be sought in quarter 2.

3.8 **Housing**

In quarter 1, 78.72% of households contacting South Norfolk Council because of risk of losing their homes were prevented from becoming homeless (HE 1604). Existing accommodation arrangements being brought to an end accounted for 47% of the overall presentations and remains the main cause of homelessness. Relationship breakdowns accounted for 22% of the total presentations - a complex and difficult issue to prevent. Tenancy sustainment, particularly in the private rented sector is an area we will be seeking to improve with the funding we were awarded as a homelessness prevention trailblazer.
The Trailblazer funding for FIRST has led to a positive variance on the budget for this project, but this is expected to reduce over time as costs are incurred.

As reported to Cabinet in February 2015, £427,267 was transferred to South Norfolk from Broadland District Council to fund Green Deal energy efficiency improvements to homes in the private sector. A total of £422,270 had been spent as at the end of March 2017 and the remaining £4,997 of funding that had been carried forward into 2017/18 has now been spent in compliance with grant conditions.

3.9 Independent Living

In quarter 1, we supported 452 vulnerable people to maintain independence in their own homes (LI 323) which meets the target. As always, we anticipate to see an increase in demand on services and the numbers of vulnerable assists in the winter months. This resulted in expenditure on Disabled Facilities Grant/Aids and Adaptations of a combined total of £62,329, which was granted in April and May 2017/18 to provide 17 grants, compared to 18 grants approved in the same period of 2016/17. Expenditure to the end of May is relatively low compared to the budget to date. The team are confident that there is a sufficient level of activity to commit the full allocation of funding for DFGs in 2017/18 which has increased from £716k in 2016/17 to £781k for 2017/18.
3.10 Early Help

This quarter we have helped 447 families and residents to achieve positive outcomes through our Help Hub service (HE 1607), which exceeded the Q1 target of 250. We continue to see a large increase in requests for support into the help hub demonstrating the strength of the partnership.

3.11 Housing Benefit/Council Tax Support

In quarter 1 the number of days taken to process new claims for Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit (HE1606) was 12.5 days, which does not meet the target of 9 days. Although there is no significant increase in the overall numbers of new claims, we have seen a 2% shift in working age claims over those from pension age. Claims of this type are significantly more complex to assess and require more evidence and information gathering, which take longer to process. This factor has impacted on the average number of days to process as waiting for customers to supply evidence is out of our control. Going forward, we are currently processing new claims at 10 days and with the changes in the way we work having just taken effect are confident that Quarter 2 will show an improvement.

3.12 Development Management

In quarter 1, we have delivered 200 affordable homes (LI 350). The majority of these were Help to Buy, which reflects the development and marketing of homes for first-time buyers on sites throughout South Norfolk by housebuilders. We are on course to achieve the year-end target of 300.
A planning application is still expected to be lodged before the end of 2017 for the Long Stratton bypass. The developer will run a public pre-application consultation in July 2017 in relation to this.

63% of householder applications were determined within six weeks (MI 1037) in quarter 1 and the average number of days to determine these applications was 41 days.

There is a small positive variance on Development Management Budgets to the end of May, with income less than £3k below budget.

3.13 Waste

The cost of waste collection per household (LI 262) for Q1 is £33.89 per household (based on 59,748 households) which is a reduction in cost on last year and considerably under target. This reduction is due predominantly to increased income from garden waste collection. This is a positive result. In addition, for Q1 the number of missed bins per 100,000 collections (LI 263) remains ‘green’ at 29.57 which indicates that the new service continues to be back to pre-switchover levels of reported missed bins.

The amount of municipal waste recycled, reused and composted (NI 192a) is 46.47%. This is better result than Q1 last year which was 45.27%. The strong quarter one performance has been achieved by high kerbside recycling and composting tonnages. This figure could change as residual waste quantities are currently assumed.

Total garden waste fee income in April and May is £1,083k which is lower than the budget of £1,122k resulting in a negative variance, but fee income is £215k higher than the same period last year (£868k), indicating that the price increase has been accepted by most customers.

Against the Vehicle Procurement and Replacement budget for 2017/18, no vehicles have yet been ordered. The vehicle tracking system has been purchased and installed.
3.14 **Resources**

The positive variance against the revenue budget of £555,600 in Q1 is a positive sign of the present strength of the Council’s financial position which needs to be maintained in the future. We recognise there is a strategic risk that the Council is unable to deliver priority services as revenue funding falls short of required income. However, the financial position to the end of May 2017 indicates a positive variance and that the 10% challenge is currently being met.

3.15 **Staff**

The number of working days lost due to short term sickness absence (BV012a) was 0.63 per FTE. The result is under the target for Quarter 1 and less than the figure for the end of Quarter 1 2016-17 (0.81). This is a positive start to the reporting year.

With respect to the Corporate staffing budgets, there is a positive variance of £24,000 in the HR budget owing to recruitment of graduate trainees for the Council being planned for later in the year and lower than budgeted expenditure on corporate training.

3.16 **IT/Digital**

In Q1, 59.50% of our top 10 service requests were made via online webforms (LI 759). Customer self service via webforms continues to increase since the improved website went live.
4 Recommendations

4.1 It is proposed that Cabinet:

a) Notes the 2017/18 performance for the quarter and the combined efforts across the Directorates to deliver the vision of the Council (detail contained in Appendix 1).

b) Notes the current position with respect to risks and accepts the actions to support risk mitigation (detail contained in Appendix 2).

c) Notes the capital and revenue position and the reason for the variances on the General Fund (detail contained in Appendices 3 and 4).

d) Agrees an increase in building control fees for CNC from 1st September 2017, based on an hourly rate of £70, and delegates the detailed amendment of these fees to the Director of Business Development in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources and the Chair of the CNC Board, as outlined in Section 3.6.
## APPENDIX 1 - Quarter 1 performance report 2017-18: Strategic Measures

### Key:
- 😊 = Met or exceeded target
- 😐 = Within acceptable tolerance of target
- 😞 = Stretch target not reached
- 🔍 = The measure is being ‘baselined’ in order to determine the target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
<th>Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI 1013: CNC Building Control fee earning income.</td>
<td>£418,000 😞 £1,770,000</td>
<td>Debbie Lorimer</td>
<td>Due to a continuation in the fall-off of demand that was experienced in 2016/17 as well as having less high value work coming through, CNC Building Control fee earning income is slightly lower than budgeted in Q1. However, costs and staff vacancies continue to be managed to offset this drop in demand and the position is therefore a positive variance overall.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chart Notes:**
- **Result to date:** Orange line
- **Target:** Green line
- **Intervention:** Dotted red line

---
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### APPENDIX 1 - Quarter 1 performance report 2017-18: Strategic Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Year End Target 2017/18</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI 358: % rental income return from property investment.</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>Spencer Burrell</td>
<td>Rental income continues to remain above target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG 1601a: Number of residential dwellings developed through our Big Sky Developments company.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Baseline (Totals shown are multi-year running totals from Q1 2016/17)</td>
<td>Spencer Burrell</td>
<td>Q1 has seen the progression of phase 2 at Rosebery Park Poringland with 14 units being delivered and sold. Maple Park construction is progressing well. Marketing is also progressing with 3 plots now reserved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart for LI 358](chart1.png)

![Bar chart for EG 1601a](chart2.png)
## APPENDIX 1 - Quarter 1 performance report 2017-18: Strategic Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Year End Target 2017/18</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG 1601b: Sq Metre area of commercial space developed through our Big Sky Developments company.</td>
<td>2,438 Baseline (Totals shown are multi-year running totals from Q1 2016/17)</td>
<td>Spencer Burrell</td>
<td>The running total remains as at Q4 at 2438 Sqm area of commercial space developed so far. Marketing of Crafton House continues. The fit out of the final floor plate has secured a further tenant. Construction of the Maple Park commercial building has commenced with the foundations being completed.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Running total chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI 356: Number of SME's provided with advice and guidance in South Norfolk.</td>
<td>371 1,200 (This is a cumulative total for the whole year which will be the sum of each quarter's result)</td>
<td>Mark Stanton</td>
<td>In Q1 there were 371 with the breakdown as follows: 59- Licensing and Food Safety (new) 117- Licensing and Food Safety (existing) 42- Growth Hub interventions. 8- L-Tag meetings 90-Retailer Awards 55- Economic Development Team</td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Quarterly result chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 1 - Quarter 1 performance report 2017-18: Strategic Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
<th>Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI 613: Number of new business start-ups supported in South Norfolk.</td>
<td>36/75</td>
<td>Mark Stanton</td>
<td>In Q1, 36 have been supported for example at workshops or had presentations at Crafton House both by SNC, NWES and the Growth Club.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI 758: External funding identified and brought into the local economy.</td>
<td>£300,000/£1,000,000</td>
<td>Mark Stanton</td>
<td>External funding brought in from two Growing Business fund awards by New Anglia LEP.</td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) TML Precision Engineering Ltd were awarded £180k towards a £900k investment to create 18 new jobs to manufacture air and spacecraft and related machinery.

2) TMO Traffic Highway Ltd were awarded £120K towards a £644,688 investment to create 12 new jobs manufacturing temporary traffic lights.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BV 010: % of non-domestic rates collected.</td>
<td>27.83% / 98.00%</td>
<td>Amanda Adams</td>
<td>Performance is up on the same period last year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI 210: % of food premises which have an FHRS (Food Hygiene Rating Scheme) rating of satisfactory or above.</td>
<td>97.96% / 95.00%</td>
<td>Grizelle Britton</td>
<td>We have continued to provide a flexible service to meet the needs of our businesses and ensure that we obtain a true representation of their working practices. In Q1 we have had to take enforcement action against several businesses which has resulted in a slight drop in the percentage which are satisfactory from Q4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
<th>Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EG 1605: Number of apprenticeship placements available in our local businesses for our young people.</td>
<td>47 (This is a cumulative total for the whole year which will be the sum of each quarter's result)</td>
<td>Mark Stanton</td>
<td>In Q1, there were 47 &quot;new&quot; live opportunities.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Chart EG 1605" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI 1039: % of units liable for business rates occupied.</td>
<td>92.23%</td>
<td>Mark Stanton</td>
<td>Although the percentage of the total number of business units that are occupied has fallen slightly from the previous quarter it does not tell the full story. We are achieving growth as we do have 177 more occupied business units than at the same time last year, and an additional 214 units overall. The occupancy rate is lower than at the end of Q1 last year, but higher than at the same point in each of the preceding three years.</td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Chart MI 1039" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Key:**
- 🍃 = Met or exceeded target
- 😊 = Within acceptable tolerance of target
- 🙁 = Stretch target not reached
- 🕛 = The measure is being 'baselined' in order to determine the target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(NEW) HE 1601: % increase in our Leisure Centre members following the refurbishment of our three Centres.</td>
<td>3.00% 🍃</td>
<td>Steve Goddard</td>
<td>The following statistics expand on the individual centres’ membership performances. <strong>Long Stratton Leisure Centre</strong>: Increased its membership in Q1 by +9 Direct Debit members. We have again revised the fitness class programme, increased Personal training options and as previously mentioned increased general footfall and invested in new equipment to retain and attract customer/members. The new 3G pitch business has slowed in the off season but we continue to increase hirers for Q2/3. The impending refurbishment announcement will generate significant interest in the centre for the year ahead. <strong>Diss Leisure Centre</strong>: Direct Debit membership declined slightly by (-9) in Q1. Diss Leisure Centre’s main income driver is Swim School which has declined slightly by (-13) Direct Debits. New re-invigorated gym competition in the Town has provided customers with alternatives with significant marketing campaigns so we are continuing to focus on our range and options that is the Diss Centre’s unique selling point e.g. swim/gym/aqua classes/PT/sauna and steam for just £27 per month. <strong>Wymondham Leisure Centre</strong>: Has grown its...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chart

[Chart showing the results and targets for different quarters and measures, with a green line for Result to date, a red line for Intervention, and a blue line for Target. The chart shows data from Q1 to Q4.]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
<th>Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Debit membership by a further +70 in Q1 and has increased its monthly Direct Debit membership by a further £2,105 to a record high of just under £66k per month. The centres swim school continues to perform ahead of budget at £27k per month. <strong>Leisure overall:</strong> The Q1 overall growth of fitness direct debit members was +71 (= +3%) which when compared Year to Year is an increase of our overall Direct Debit membership by +28% and crucially our monthly Direct Debit by £18,967 (= £227,604 annualised).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| HE 1603: % of households in temporary accommodation for 8 weeks or less from the date of the homelessness decision to housing solution. | 100% | Tony Cooke | The FIRST Officers are now in post and provide one-to-one support for the tenants in temporary accommodation to follow the individual move-on plans. The close working relationships they have developed both with partners in the hub and with the Housing Options Team has helped ensure that the tenants can navigate the systems and receive the right level of assistance to secure long term sustainable accommodation. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year End</th>
<th>Target 2017/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarter 1 Result / Indicator</td>
<td>Quarter 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year End Target 2017/18</td>
<td>Year End</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100% 70% 75% 80% 85% 90% 95% 100%
70% 75% 80% 85% 90% 95% 100%

Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4

100% Line Chart
- Quarter Result
- Target
- Intervention
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HE 1604: % of households contacting South Norfolk because of risk of losing their homes that are prevented from becoming homeless.</td>
<td>76.72% 🙁</td>
<td>Tony Cooke</td>
<td>Existing accommodation arrangements being brought to an end accounted for 47% of the presentations and remains the main cause of homelessness. Relationship breakdowns accounted for 22% of the presentations - a complex and difficult issue to prevent. Tenancy sustainment, particularly in the private rented sector is an area we will be seeking to improve with the funding we were awarded as a homelessness prevention trailblazer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1605: % of those housed by SNC Housing which are still in there after a 6 month period.</td>
<td>100% 😊</td>
<td>Tony Cooke</td>
<td>125 people found homes through our Home Options scheme in this quarter, 526 over the year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Chart for HE 1604](chart1.png)

![Chart for HE 1605](chart2.png)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
<th>Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HE 1607a: £pounds paid in benefits to people in work</td>
<td>£1,036,487</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Amanda Adams</td>
<td>This new measure reflects the spend in Housing Benefit for Q1. The total spend for 2016/17 was £4,514,820.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1607b: Number of people in work receiving benefits</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Amanda Adams</td>
<td>At Q1, 1318 people are claiming Housing Benefit who are also in work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure Description</td>
<td>Latest Data</td>
<td>Measure Owner</td>
<td>Operational Comments</td>
<td>Chart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BV 009: % of Council Tax collected.</td>
<td>28.81% / 98.50%</td>
<td>Amanda Adams</td>
<td>Council Tax collection has continued to perform well and performance at the end of Q1 is similar to the previous year.</td>
<td>![Chart Diagram]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## HE 1606: Number of days taken to process new claims for Housing Benefit/Council Tax Benefit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quarter 1 Result / Indicator</strong></td>
<td><strong>Year End Target 2017/18</strong></td>
<td><strong>Operational Comments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5 days</td>
<td>9 days</td>
<td>Amanda Adams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there is no significant increase in the overall numbers of new claims, we have seen a 2% shift in working age claims over those from pension age. This impacts the time taken to assess claims as these working age claims have tended to be from those who are in work and are in private rented properties. Claims of this type are significantly more complex to assess and require more evidence and information gathering (so take longer to process). This factor has impacted on the average number of days to process as waiting for customers to supply evidence is out of our control.

In addition, this quarter has included the annual billing exercise which has increased customer contact from residents querying their charge as well as making enquiries about council tax support. The increase in workload in April and May was not processed until June which again impacted on the average days to process. Going forward, we are currently processing new claims at 10 days and with the changes in the way we work having just taken effect are confident that Quarter 2 will show an improvement.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HE 1607: Number of families and residents helped to achieve positive outcomes through our Help Hub service.</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>Mike Pursehouse</td>
<td>For the first half of 2017 we already have had 11,000 calls into the Help Hub (compared to 16,000 last year). We have been successful in giving advice at the initial stage to empower front line staff and residents to support themselves but have still seen an increase in request for support. We will be increasing our social media presence over the next quarter to further encourage self-help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE 1608: Number of residents who are assisted to access support within their community to meet low level need.</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Mike Pursehouse</td>
<td>The new community connectors started in June which means we have a full complement of five full time connectors and one senior connector. Whilst we are slightly below target in this quarter the new connectors are fully trained and will be delivering social prescribing from quarter two.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Chart for HE 1607](chart1.png)

![Chart for HE 1608](chart2.png)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Year End Target 2017/18</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI 323: Increase the number of vulnerable people supported to maintain independence in their own homes, with support from interventions.</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Sam Cayford</td>
<td>Performance is on schedule to meet our target of vulnerable assists for the year. As always we anticipate to see an increase in demand on services and the numbers of vulnerable assists in the winter months. We continue to work with adult social care and health partners to identify opportunities to align our services and contribute to independent living across South Norfolk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Chart showing cumulative result and target over quarters 1 to 4 with intervention points.](chart.png)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
<th>Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI 263: Number of missed bins for all waste per 100,000 collections</td>
<td>Quarter 1 Result / Indicator: 29.57, Year End Target 2017/18: 30</td>
<td>Bob Wade</td>
<td>The number of missed bins for all waste per 100,000 collections for Q1 is within the target and is classed as ‘green’ within the stretch targets. This indicates that the new service continues to be back to pre-switchover levels of reported missed bins.</td>
<td><img src="chart.png" alt="Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI 262: Cost of waste collection per household</td>
<td>£33.89</td>
<td>Bob Wade</td>
<td>The cost of waste collection for Q1 is £33.89 per household (based on 59,748 households) which is a reduction in cost on last year and considerably under target. This reduction is due predominantly to increased income from garden waste collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI 192a: % Municipal waste recycled, reused and composted</td>
<td>46.47%</td>
<td>Bob Wade</td>
<td>This is better result than Q1 last year which was 45.27%. The strong quarter one performance has been achieved by high kerbside recycling and composting tonnages. This figure could change as residual waste quantities are currently assumed. The waste tonnage is projected to be similar to those levels reported for Q1 last year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
<th>Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI 302: % of householder applications determined within 8 weeks or in extension of time</td>
<td>99.43%</td>
<td>Helen Mellors</td>
<td>This relates to 176 applications, 167 (95%) of which were determined in the statutory time period and 8 of which were determined in an extension of time. The average number of days for determining householder applications is 41 days. This is an increase in performance from the previous quarter and from the comparable quarter 2016/17.</td>
<td><img src="chart_l1.png" alt="Chart LI 302" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI 1037: % of householder applications determined within six weeks</td>
<td>63.00%</td>
<td>Helen Mellors</td>
<td>This relates to 176 applications of which 117 were determined in less than 6 weeks. The average number of days for determining householder applications is 41 days. While the average number of days is slightly above the operational target of 40 days the percentage determined in less than 6 weeks has increased from the previous quarter.</td>
<td><img src="chart_m1.png" alt="Chart MI 1037" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
<th>Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MI 1038: % of major applications determined within 13 weeks or in extension of time</td>
<td>100.00% 90.00%</td>
<td>Helen Mellors</td>
<td>This relates to 20 applications, 8 of which (40%) were determined in the statutory time period and 12 of which were determined in an extension of time.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Chart MI 1038" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL 1602: % of Community Action Fund (CAF) spent.</td>
<td>0.00% 90%</td>
<td>Mike Pursehouse</td>
<td>This is only zero in Q1 because the CAF Panel has not yet met. The Community Action Fund has now transferred to the new system and applications will be decided at the CAF Panel to be held in July. Members are now responsible for submitting applications. It is envisaged that the percentage will be high once allocations are made at the Panel meeting.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Chart PL 1602" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
<th>Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LI 350: Number of Affordable homes delivered in the third year of the three year affordable homes target</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Keith Mitchell</td>
<td>45 homes were completed through negotiation with developers under planning policy. The remaining 155 were Help to Buy (equity loan) completions for the second half of 2016/17 reported on the DCLG website in June. The Help to Buy figures reflect the development and marketing of homes for first-time buyers on sites throughout South Norfolk by housebuilders. We are on course to achieve the target.</td>
<td><img src="chart1.png" alt="Line Chart" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PL 1604: % percentage of people applying to register to vote online as opposed to on paper.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Julia Tovee-Galey</td>
<td>More people are generally now doing it online. Overall increase of applications probably attributable to election but also people wanting to be on the register for ID purposes to get loans/mortgages prior to the Summer.</td>
<td><img src="chart2.png" alt="Bar Chart" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Key:
- **Green face:** Met or exceeded target
- **Smiley face:** Within acceptable tolerance of target
- **Yellow face:** Stretch target not reached
- **Gray face:** The measure is being ‘baselined’ in order to determine the target

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
<th>Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BV012a: Working days lost per FTE due to short term sickness absence.</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>Peter Catchpole</td>
<td>The result is under the target for Quarter 1 and less than the figure for the end of Quarter 1 2016-17 (0.81). This is a positive start to the reporting year. HR continue to monitor both short and long term absence cases and are making interventions wherever possible to support the organisation. By working with our new Occupational Health provider, we have had 3 ill-health retirements in this quarter, and continue to see a positive result in resolving some of the longer-term absence and long-term health issues of employees.</td>
<td>![Chart](Cumulative Result, Target, Intervention)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1 - Quarter 1 performance report 2017-18: Strategic Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Description</th>
<th>Latest Data</th>
<th>Year End Result 2017/18</th>
<th>Measure Owner</th>
<th>Operational Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI 759: % of our top 10 service requests made via online web-forms.</td>
<td>59.50%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>Mel Wiles</td>
<td>Customer self service via webforms continues to increase since the improved website went live due to the website’s improved search facility and reduction in telephony contact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Chart**

- **Quarter Result**: The line chart shows the quarter result, starting from Q1 with the value of 45%, and increasing to 59.50% by Q4.
- **Target**: The green line represents the target, which is static at 59.50% for each quarter.
- **Intervention**: The dotted red line shows the intervention, starting from Q1 with the value of 45%, and increasing to 59.50% by Q4.
### Strategic Risk Register

#### Appendix 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Risk/Opportunity</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Commentary (including outcomes / benefits that may be gained)</th>
<th>2017/18 Business Plan Activity</th>
<th>Required/outstanding actions to support risk mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Growth and Localism</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Failure to encourage business growth at Norwich Research Park Enterprise Zone (EZ) means the Council cannot recoup its investment in the site. Parts of the NRP not covered by EZ status fail to attract new growth. Failure of one or both developers to sign the legal documentation for the allocated amount of SNC by the LEPs deadline. Opportunity to take forward a JV building on the NRP EZ with.</td>
<td>Director of Growth and Localism</td>
<td>On 23 May 2016, Cabinet agreed to invest £12.54m to support infrastructure development at Norwich Research Park Enterprise Zone. The accompanying report highlighted the opportunity to: * invest, unlock and enable new development * generate significant economic and financial benefits * accelerate business growth and attraction of inward investment * generate business rates income. Also highlighted were several key risk areas, most notably that the development of the site does not occur, which could ultimately result in the.</td>
<td>• E3 - Delivery of the Greater Norwich City Deal which is centred around the economic growth of the Park and greater levels of commercialisation of NRP research. • Delivery of economic growth within a key growth sector. • Securing new inward investment into the District. • Delivering the Cambridge Norwich Tech Corridor which the NRP EZ forms part of.</td>
<td>• Signing of funding agreement with the New Anglia LEP to determine the terms of allocation of business rates generated in the Enterprise Zone. • Signing of contracts with development partners to establish the terms (including delivery timelines and risk sharing) of the SNC investment and subsequent development and compliance with State Aid Regulations. • Assessment of most advantageous borrowing options for South Norfolk Council at point of borrowing. • Signing ToR for the ‘Operational Partnership Group’ with Enterprise Zone Partners to establish how delivery on the site will be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Risk/Opportunity</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Commentary (including outcomes / benefits that may be gained)</td>
<td>2017/18 Business Plan Activity</td>
<td>Required/outstanding actions to support risk mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA LEP is not taken forward</td>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s investment not being recouped.</td>
<td></td>
<td>monitored and the marketing plans to attract new businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In September 2016, the Memorandum of Understanding with DCLG was signed, demonstrating the Council’s commitment to supporting the Enterprise Zone. The remaining legal documentation is progressing through detailed negotiation with partners on the terms of the deal. These documents are due to be finalised in March 2017.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Delivery of a marketing strategy to maximise opportunities to secure new inward investment to generate the required level of income to repay the loan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SNC’s funding award to Bullen has been split into two phases whereby Phase 1 will deliver the first £3m of infrastructure and if the subsequent award is required by the landowner, this will be conditioned with ensuring that the freehold of Zone 3 land is also owned by Bullens for the purposes of developing out the EZ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Finalising the NRP EZ Site Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial modelling and policy which takes account of the acceptable proportion and best estimates of those EZ based organisations paying reduced business rates</td>
<td></td>
<td>• For new/expanding non-EZ located businesses at NRP, SNC to offer business rate incentives on a case by case basis in line with current policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• For new/expanding non-EZ located businesses at NRP, SNC to offer business rate incentives on a case by case basis in line with current policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Clarification of planning restrictions for this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop and agree terms of the JV package.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop and agree terms of the JV package.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Risk/Opportunity</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Commentary (including outcomes / benefits that may be gained)</td>
<td>2017/18 Business Plan Activity</td>
<td>Required/outstanding actions to support risk mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Growth & Localism   | S2   | Delivery of the Long Stratton Bypass is delayed                                  | Planning Policy Manager/ Director of Growth & Localism | The Greater Norwich City Deal facilitates a commitment to pool CIL to help fund infrastructure across the Greater Norwich area, with the Long Stratton Bypass identified as a key project to be delivered. A multi-year commitment to borrow £10m from the City Deals loan pot to help part-fund the bypass was agreed by the Greater Norwich Growth Board in 2016. Additional funding streams are also being investigated, and the developers/landowners will need to contribute a “substantive” amount of the funding required. The Long Stratton AAP was adopted in May 2016, which adds certainty to the project happening. | E3 – Infrastructure Delivery Programme | • Further discussions with the landowners / developers to progress the proposal to planning application stage are happening regularly. It is anticipated that a planning application will be lodged before the end of 2017, with public pre-application consultation commencing in July 2017 (run by the developers, not the Council).  
• The potential use of a Compulsory Purchase Order to ensure delivery remains an option if progress is insufficiently rapid. Considerable internal resources would need to be deployed if a formal CPO process is required for the Long Stratton bypass and 1800 houses. A significant sum has been earmarked from the Council’s reserves should additional costs be necessary to fund such work.  
• The Greater Norwich Growth Programme for 2016/17 (with a multi-year approach to the Long Stratton bypass) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Risk/Opportunity</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Commentary (including outcomes / benefits that may be gained)</th>
<th>2017/18 Business Plan Activity</th>
<th>Required/outstanding actions to support risk mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>borrowing) was approved by the Greater Norwich Growth Board in Q2 2015/16; this ensures greater certainty that the funding is available to help the delivery of the Long Stratton bypass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Risk/Opportunity</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Commentary (including outcomes / benefits that may be gained)</td>
<td>2017/18 Business Plan Activity</td>
<td>Required/outstanding actions to support risk mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Growth & Localism | S3   | Shortage of 5-year land supply in the Norwich Policy Area results in uncoordinated development across South Norfolk, with pressure to approve housing applications on unallocated sites and housing planning appeals more likely to succeed when applications are refused on land supply grounds | Planning Policy Manager | The Norwich Policy Area (NPA) housing land supply figure for the end of 2015/16 is 4.70 years, partly due to the Greater Norwich councils accepting that there has been persistent under-delivery of housing in the NPA over recent years. Whilst an improvement to the 2014/15 figure of 4.22 years, this means that the Council remains under pressure to approve residential development proposals on unallocated sites | E2 – Adopted Local Plan Delivery and Implementation | • There is a desire not to undermine the spatial approach of the Joint Core Strategy by allowing uncoordinated development on unallocated sites, but planning applications for housing in the NPA need to be considered with regard to the fact that there is not currently a 5-year supply of land (i.e. given greater weight)  
  • South Norfolk, Broadland and Norwich need to continue to work together closely on this matter, particularly in relation to consistency of approach. All Greater Norwich Local Plan documents allocating sites have been adopted, but approving planning |
applications on unallocated sites in the NPA will help add to the housing land supply. Whilst each application must (and will) be considered on its own merits, refusals on such cases need to be particularly robust

- Officers are continuing to work with housebuilders and landowners and undertaking research to identify the reasons why some sites are not progressing as quickly as desirable (a county-wide piece of work is investigating this), and explore whether any assistance (through working with the LEP and exploring the use of the Local Infrastructure Fund to help deliver infrastructure, for example) could help speed up delivery of such sites

- The Greater Norwich Growth Board asked, at their meeting in March 2017, for officers to explore the potential for a new Local Delivery Vehicle (LDV) to assist in the more
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Risk/Opportunity</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Commentary (including outcomes / benefits that may be gained)</th>
<th>2017/18 Business Plan Activity</th>
<th>Required/outstanding actions to support risk mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Development</td>
<td>S4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rapid delivery of infrastructure and housing in Greater Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Officers will continue to ensure all decisions are robust and have defensible reasons for refusal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How we will deliver:** Customer focussed, Can do and collaborative, Business-like, efficient and entrepreneurial - Moving Forward Together

- The Council is unable to deliver priority services as revenue funding falls short of required income

- The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) was updated in February and shows a balanced budget for 2017/18, 2018/19 and 2019/20. Further work is required to identify measures to balance the budget from 2020/21 onwards. The plan contains two major risks, around income.

  - Firstly, it includes reduced revenue income from the New Homes Bonus (NHB) of £807K in the revenue budget of £807,000 in 2017/18

  - BAU Finance: Budget Setting, Monitoring and Reporting and Business Cases

  - BAU: Development of the Leisure Portfolios offering: Ensure residents have access to high quality leisure services across the district and increase

  - BAU: Implementation of increases to fees and charges (2017/18)

  - BAU: Delivery of further property developments (2018/19)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Risk/Opportunity</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Commentary (including outcomes / benefits that may be gained)</th>
<th>2017/18 Business Plan Activity</th>
<th>Required/outstanding actions to support risk mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>compared to the expectation. The reduction up to 2020/21 years is £1.6 million worse than anticipated in the previous MTFS. The actual level of NHB received is dependent on continued delivery of planned housing growth in the District. Secondly, the plan assumes additional efficiencies and income from meeting the 10% challenge and commercialisation, mainly from property development and the leisure service and also from increases to fees and charges. Should the additional income not be achieved, then the funding gap will increase. However, the financial position to the end of May 2017 indicates a positive variance and that the 10% challenge is currently being met.</td>
<td>our leisure offering by identifying additional business opportunities, including the resurrection of the New Diss Leisure Centre project &amp; or temporary dry side unit option</td>
<td>ACTIVITY: Property investment and development activities to maximise income generation to the Council ACTIVITY: Supporting growth: Support growth and local communities by growing and offering services which meet business needs of others ACTIVITY: Build Insight: support Build Insight to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directorate</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Risk/Opportunity</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Commentary (including outcomes / benefits that may be gained)</td>
<td>2017/18 Business Plan Activity</td>
<td>Required/outstanding actions to support risk mitigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Business Development    | S5   | Council assets are not managed effectively and do not support service delivery    | Director of Business Development           | The Council's key operational assets need to be maintained adequately to support effective service delivery. These assets can assist the Council in improving services offered and increasing income generation. The repairs and maintenance of these assets is managed by the services responsible. Technical advice is provided by the Facilities and Technical Services Manager.                                                                                                                                                  | J2 - Ketteringham Depot expansion and upgrade J2 - Leisure Centre Enhancement Programme      | • Acquisition of land for depot enhancement or working with adjoining landowner NCC for joint site – work is continuing a feasibility study funded through the One Public Estate (2017/18)  
  • Delivery of Long Stratton Leisure Centre enhancements (2017/18)  
  • Rationalise floor space at SN House for rental income – Lease of Daniels Room completed in April 2017                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Business Development    | S6   | Property Development activities are not successful and income generation is not realised | Director of Business Development           | • Through the Council’s wholly owned property development company, Big Sky Developments Ltd, the Council is seeking to utilise its own land to develop a range of residential and commercial property. The commercial units will be retained within the Council E5 - Maximise income generation and opportunities of surplus or underutilised land and property assets. Creation and effective management of a broad commercial                                                                                   |                                                                                              | • Maximise opportunities by seeking to gain planning consent for development  
  • Respond to market conditions, supply and demand  
  • Big Sky Property Dev: Up to 20 residential units from development sites let for income generation within 12 months                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Directorate</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Risk/Opportunity</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Commentary (including outcomes / benefits that may be gained)</th>
<th>2017/18 Business Plan Activity</th>
<th>Required/outstanding actions to support risk mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to enable revenue income to be generated from rents. While the majority of the residential homes will be sold to generate profit, it is envisaged that a number will be retained in the Council’s wholly owned property rental company, Big Sky Property Management Ltd. These homes will generate a rental income and the company’s profits will be returned to the Council’s revenue income. • An Expression of interest has been submitted to the Homes and Communities Agency on behalf of all Norfolk and Suffolk authorities in relation to starter home delivery.</td>
<td>property investment portfolio (capital investment) to support economic growth</td>
<td>months’ time. (8 now transferred 2 to be transferred by to BSPM by end of Q2 2017/18, 10 properties at Maple Park to be transferred once construction complete by end Q4 2017/18) • Rosebery Park phase 2 residual build completion of site end July 2017 • land assets in the “call for sites“ phase of the local plan submitted Q2 2016 • Feasibility appraisal of 2 potential development sites to be completed. • Search for additional sites for development in progress (2017/18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 3: Analysis of Major Variances on Service Areas - April & May 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>Direct Budget £</th>
<th>Direct Net Expenditure/ (Income) £</th>
<th>Variance £</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Rates</td>
<td>(501,228)</td>
<td>(596,146)</td>
<td>94,918</td>
<td>There is a positive variance on South Norfolk Council’s share of NNDR (business rates) income. This is due to a higher than expected share of NNDR income for SNC, but a lower than budgeted levy owing to higher than anticipated costs of successful appeals and further amendment of assumptions in the light of actual appeal decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST officers</td>
<td>10,132</td>
<td>(66,737)</td>
<td>76,869</td>
<td>At the time of setting the budget, Trailblazer funding had not been secured. This funding (£96k over 3 financial years) is now in place, which has led to a positive variance on income.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Connectors</td>
<td>(93,698)</td>
<td>(141,108)</td>
<td>47,410</td>
<td>All Community Connectors have now been recruited, however the time take to recruit has led to an £11k positive variance on staffing budgets. The positive variance also includes £34k in grant funding for social prescribing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness, Hostels and Housing Access and Standards Team</td>
<td>78,036</td>
<td>33,336</td>
<td>44,700</td>
<td>Housing benefit income from hostels is greater than budgeted. The council has received an additional Flexible Homelessness Grant which had not been secured when the budget was set. There is a vacant senior management post and a housing officer post which are expected to be filled later in the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Revenue (2016/17)</td>
<td>Revenue (2017/18)</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Control</td>
<td>(1,275)</td>
<td>(35,112)</td>
<td>33,837</td>
<td>The fall-off in demand experienced in 2016/17 has continued and CNC Building Control fee earning income is less than budgeted. Costs and staff vacancies continue to be managed to offset this and the position is therefore a positive variance overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Management</td>
<td>37,020</td>
<td>8,133</td>
<td>28,887</td>
<td>There is a positive variance on staffing budgets owing to changes that have been made to the team for 2017/18, with staff being employed through the Council’s property companies. These staff are recharged back to the Council for work on the Council’s general property assets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>95,642</td>
<td>71,178</td>
<td>24,464</td>
<td>There is a positive variance owing to lower than budgeted expenditure on corporate training, where expenditure is anticipated to increase over the course of the year. Recruitment of Council graduate trainees is planned to take place later in the year and this has led to a positive variance on this corporate budget.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Charges</td>
<td>(52,805)</td>
<td>(76,165)</td>
<td>23,360</td>
<td>Income from land charges is currently ahead of budget due to the volume of searches being higher than anticipated. The national changes to land charges administration are expected to reduce income from 2018/19 onwards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax/NNDR Cost of Collection</td>
<td>(103,262)</td>
<td>(122,840)</td>
<td>19,578</td>
<td>Council Tax Support Administration Grant is higher than budgeted, since although the overall caseload for South Norfolk fell, it was a larger proportion of the national caseload in 2015/16 than in 2014/15, which has thus increased South Norfolk’s share of this grant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Living Team</td>
<td>62,749</td>
<td>44,607</td>
<td>18,142</td>
<td>There are 1.82 FTE vacancies in this area and the cost of temporary cover is less than the staffing budget. Recruitment is expected to reduce this positive variance as the year progresses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Waste Collection</td>
<td>(1,144,339)</td>
<td>(1,108,414)</td>
<td>(35,925)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annual invoices for the service were raised in April. In April and May £40k of these transactions were refunded, partly due to customer changes of address. Total garden waste fees in April and May were £1,083k which is lower than the budget of £1,122k, but still £215k higher than the same period last year (£868k), indicating that the price increase has been accepted by most customers.
## Appendix 4: Analysis of Major Variances on Capital Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Projects</th>
<th>Budget to 31/05/17</th>
<th>Expenditure to 31/05/17</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waste Vehicle Replacements</td>
<td>154,180</td>
<td>28,659</td>
<td>125,521</td>
<td>Expenditure to date comprises wholly of the purchase of the vehicle tracking system. No vehicles have been purchased in the year so far. It is currently expected that orders for 3 Refuse Collection Vehicles will be placed with a view to delivery being taken late in Quarter 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aids &amp; Adaptations &amp; DFGs</td>
<td>158,908</td>
<td>62,329</td>
<td>96,579</td>
<td>Expenditure to the end of May is relatively low compared to the budget to date. The team are confident that a sufficient level of expenditure will be incurred to qualify for the full allocation of funding for the financing of DFGs in 2017/18 (£781k).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Centre Improvements</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>The positive underspend relates to the proposed investment in improvement works at Harleston Leisure Centre. It is unlikely that this work will be carried out before the end of the year and this would result in a total positive variance of £300,000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeled Bin Replacements</td>
<td>30,833</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,833</td>
<td>Due to current stock levels, there has not been a need to order any bins this financial year. Stock will continue to be monitored and bins will be ordered as needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Future Management of Streetlights

Report of the: Director of Planning and Environment and the Head of Environmental Services
Cabinet Member: Councillor Kay Mason Billig - Environment and Recycling

CONTACT
Tim Horspole and Bob Wade
01508 533806
bwade@s-norfolk.gov.uk
thorspole@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1 This report considers a proposal for the future management of the streetlights currently maintained by South Norfolk Council (SNC) in Town & Parish Council (TPC) areas. The report sets out assessment criteria intended to help support local decision making as to the future retention of streetlights together with how it is proposed TPC’s should progressively assume responsibility for the future management and maintenance of these assets.

2. Background

2.1 Currently only ten of South Norfolk’s 119 parishes have street lights managed by South Norfolk Council. The Council is currently responsible for the management of 1,043 streetlights including 108 on behalf of Saffron Housing Trust. We are in active discussions with Saffron on the future management arrangements for their 108 lights and so those do not form part of this proposal although a ‘joined up’ approach is envisaged.

2.2 The remaining 935 lights are in varying states of condition, with a number coming to the end of their life. Further, there are 12 dispersed lights which we discovered were at the point of failure. As a matter of urgent public safety, these 12 were recently capped to make them safe, whilst we work out the wider long term locality solution with the TPC’s concerned.

2.3 The Council is facing a situation whereby, over the next five years, most of the stock of streetlights will come to the end of their natural life. This means we need to have a planned approach to assessing the future provision and management of streetlights.

2.4 Having undertaken a thorough review, it is considered that the Council is no longer ‘best placed’ to provide a managed service for local street lighting. Rather, the Council believes that localities are best placed to determine the need and then fund and manage their own lighting, noting that South Norfolk Council only manages lights in 10 areas and all other local footpath street lighting is funded directly by Town and Parish Councils i.e. a mixed economy already exists.
3. Current Position/Findings

3.1 The provision of streetlights in new developments has until recently been delivered through agreement between Norfolk County Council and developers at the wish of local communities. However modern housing developments generally do not include street lights (unless they are necessary for Highways purposes as determined by Norfolk County Council and the developer). In the past, provision was made as part of the road adoption by the County Council (in its role as Highway Authority). This approach has now changed, and Norfolk County Council’s policy is not to require streetlights in new housing developments.

3.2 Many of the ten parishes with lights are rural communities, where there is often a feeling that streetlights detract from the dark night sky. The Campaign for the Protection of rural England (CPRE), has an initiative that seeks to reduce the amount of light pollution in our towns and villages.

3.3 There can be a perception that streetlights protect residents from crime and disorder. This belief is not backed up by any evidence we have found, and studies have consistently shown that the absence of streetlights does not have a detrimental effect on crime in unlit areas. These studies are local (Norfolk and Suffolk) as well as national research. For example, a study by the London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, London found little evidence of harmful effects of switch off, part-night lighting, dimming, or changes to white light/LEDs on road collisions or crime in England and Wales. These results have been supported by studies undertaken by the Norfolk and Suffolk Constabularies.

3.4 The cost of South Norfolk Council managing streetlights within Town and Parish Council areas is currently funded by raising ‘Special Expenses’, which are paid for through their annual Council Tax Bill by the individual households who directly benefit (this being the fairest way of charging for lights for those that use them). However, the current funding arrangement is unbalanced and there are wide variations in terms of cost per light per household which is unsustainable. In addition, Special Expense levels have not been increased for many years and now, in most cases (seven out of ten), do not cover the full-life cost.

3.5 It’s time for a rethink, and what is proposed is an approach to work collaboratively with local Town & Parish Councils to ensure local needs and aspirations are met on a fair and sustainable basis.
4. Proposals

4.1 The following approach is proposed:

- Given the compelling rationale for not having street lights, it is proposed that they should only be retained where there is a convincing need, based on evidence based criteria applied in consultation with the local Town or Parish Council – in broad terms (see Appendix for more detail), this could mean retaining those lights where:
  - there are safety reasons associated with dangerous road junctions (in dialogue with the Highways Authority); or
  - there are high levels of recorded crime (and specific Police advice is that individual light retention will make a real difference); and/or
  - groups of particularly vulnerable people specifically need footpaths lit (which will be assessed on a local risk assessed basis)
- Where the case for retention is demonstrated by the requisite Town or Parish Council (and they agree also to then take them over moving forward), South Norfolk Council will accept the responsibility to fund the capital cost of replacement provision, noting this may not necessarily be on a one-for-one basis as:
  - new LED and directional technologies mean one new, and/or potentially taller column can do the same job as two or three old ones; and/or
  - intelligent lights can be used to reduce the hours of operation and so reduce electricity usage / carbon footprint
- If there is a local desire for retention of lights above and beyond those that are identified as qualifying lights under the criteria, the Council will be willing to fund the equivalent of decommissioning the column (which is less than replacement) on the basis that the Town or Parish Council is willing to fund the ‘gap’ for a new one (typically £500) and also to take them over moving forward.
- Over the course of time (a timed programme will be put forward to allow adequate consultation) should the local Town or Parish Council not be willing to assume responsibility for the local stock South Norfolk Council will be drawn to decommission that local lighting.
5. Risks and implications arising

5.1 The proposed criteria take account of actual crime and disorder issues as well as the impact on vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, the proposed approach will also have a positive impact on the environment as it will reduce energy use.

5.2 Not having an approach to deal with the streetlights has public health and safety considerations as corroded streetlights could fall and damage people or property.

5.3 The proposed approach will have a one-off financial impact with a potential of an additional capital requirement of up to £600k in the next two years, dependent on the exact number of street lights that are replaced or decommissioned. It is proposed that the capital cost is added to the Capital Programme, the impact of which will be to bring forward the requirement for borrowing. Thereafter, there will be no ongoing costs to South Norfolk Council, as locally managed costs for removal or replacement and long term maintenance would be covered through local precepts (which would be offset by the concurrent ending of the current Special Expenses scheme). The ability for District Councils to raise special expenses is contained in the 1992 Local Government Finance Act. However, under section 35(2)(d) of the act special expenses can be raised where a function is carried out by the district in only part of its area and the same function must be carried in another part of the district by one or more parish councils. As the proposal is that the Council will no longer provide this service anywhere within the district it will no longer have the ability to raise special expenses for this function.

6. Other options

6.1 The Council could decide now not to continue to maintain streetlights, however, this would expose the Council to risk of damage or injury to people or property, leaving the Council liable. As this is discretionary spend, the Council could decide to no longer manage them and simply remove them. However, this would not be in line with local needs and subject to democratic decision making by those affected by the decision. The Council therefore intends to engage with local Town and Parish Councils to ensure a locally financed sustainable lighting approach.
7. Recommendation

7.1 Cabinet is recommended to agree the approach set out in section 4 of this report.

7.2 Cabinet is recommended to authorise an amendment to the capital programme to include an additional £600,000 for street lighting for the period 2017/18 to 2018/19, the profiling of expenditure to be determined following discussions with Town and Parish Councils.
# Appendix: Proposed Evidence Based Criteria for the Retention of Streetlights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Objective Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key road junctions with a proven history of accidents, where removal of lighting is likely to significantly increase future risk of incidence and there is no viable prospect of applying other control measures in mitigation (e.g. changes in local speed limit).</td>
<td>Number of recorded RTA’s in proximity of junction (say 50m in all directions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas with high levels of recorded crime, where removal of lighting is likely to significantly increase the potential for future offending and so materially and adversely affect public safety.</td>
<td>Number of recorded crime incidents in last 2 years as advised by local Police (suggested minimum 4 i.e. six monthly).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas with a high concentration of particularly vulnerable people, who have a demonstrable need to be able to use well-lit footpaths at night-time as part of their regular daily life.</td>
<td>Local risk assessment focussing on settings where there is an unusually high concentration of vulnerable people e.g. hospital/GP surgeries to bus-stop paths, sheltered housing schemes and so forth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Public Space Protection Order (PSPO)

Report of the Head of Environmental Services
Cabinet Member: Cllr Mrs Kay Mason Billig, Environment and Recycling

CONTACT
Bob Wade 01508 533787
bwade@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1 This report proposes necessary changes to the dog fouling controls in place across the district and the process to be implemented to achieve this. This dates to a specific order made in 2008 which across the country are being repealed by Government in October. The consequence of this is that if we are to have fouling and other dog control measures in place then a new order will need to be brought in under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act 2014.

1.2 This report addresses the proposed introduction of such an order – a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) and the process to be implemented to achieve this.

2. Background

2.1 Dog fouling, without clearing up, is antisocial and upsetting to local communities and is a persistent cause of complaint. We typically receive about 140 complaints each year about dog fouling. Our approach to this is based primarily on minimising resource demands but focussing on local education to try and resolve problems by community engagement. Most recently we have worked closely with schools, in particular via the community connectors and local members, in areas such as Costessey, Wymondham, and Hingham with very positive feedback. Enforcement is a last resort not least because the criminal proof level of evidence required to serve a fixed penalty notice (FPN) for failure to clear up after fouling with the backdrop of public interest.

3. Current Position/Findings

3.1 In terms of current legal controls, since 2008 there has been a dog control order in place across the district which applies to all areas of land which are open to the air and to which the public are entitled or permitted to have access (with or without payment). The order makes it an offence for the person in control of a dog not to clean up after it.
3.2 In terms of sanction for the existing dog control orders, offenders can be issued with a FPN which attracts a fixed fine of £50. Failing to pay the FPN can result in a maximum fine of £1,000 at a magistrate’s court. Exceptionally the offence can be directly referred to a magistrate’s court but this is not the norm and any referral would have to be clearly in the public interest to do so. In terms of new sanctions, failure to comply with a Public Space Protection order (PSPO) attracts a FPN of up to £100, although it is proposed this is set at £80, with a reduction to £60 for prompt payment. As with the existing process with unpaid FPNs a referral to magistrate’s court can result in a fine of up to £1000 if found guilty.

3.3 The existing dog control order will be repealed on 17 October 2017 by the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime & Policing Act 2014. In order for it to remain an offence not to clean up dog fouling in South Norfolk we must make a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) under section 59 of the 2014 Act.

3.4 A PSPO runs for a maximum period of up to 3 years unless extended. To make a PSPO we must be satisfied that the matter we wish to restrict:
   - Has had, or is likely to occur with, a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality
   - Is persistent, requires specific things to be done by persons.
   - Justifies the making of a PSPO.

3.5 When proposing a PSPO there is a requirement to:
   - Consult with:
     - the chief officer of police and the local policing body and the Police and Crime Commissioner
     - Whatever community representatives the local authority thinks it appropriate to consult;
     - The owner or occupier of land affected as far as reasonably practicable.
   - Notify
     - The parish council for the area affected
     - The county council.
3.6 Once a PSPO has been made by SNC, it must be published on our website and such notices as considered appropriate erected to draw the attention of any member of the public to the fact that the order has been made and its effect.

4. Proposals

4.1 It is proposed that we make a PSPO that runs for a period of 3 years (the maximum period permitted) which:

- Requires a person in control of a dog to clean up after it when it fouls in a public place - as currently required by our dog control order.

- Excludes dogs from enclosed children’s play areas (i.e. those enclosed by a fence) in South Norfolk that are open to the air. This is a new approach.

4.2 Our proposed approach is to ‘keep it simple’. The matters that can be the subject of a PSPO must meet specific tests and we are not aware of dog control issues across the district that would warrant or we feel we could justify more onerous controls. The consultation process we are required to undertake on the proposed PSPO could bring issues out but as it stands this is our proposed two element approach.

5. Risks and implications arising

5.1 When proposing a PSPO there is a requirement to consult. PSPO’s can be controversial due to a perception in some circles of them having been used inappropriately by some Councils. In addition, dog fouling tends to be an emotive issue. Having regard to this and information obtained from other local authorities, etc. we may receive feedback along the following lines:

- Objections to the proposed PSPO on the ground it is unfair to dog owners and victimises / criminalises dog owners.
Requests for more severe restrictions to be included in the proposed PSPO e.g. requiring dogs to be kept on lead in certain areas, banning dogs from specific land, requiring dog owners to be able to demonstrate they have dog bags on request.

5.2 An individual who lives in, visits or works in the area covered by a PSPO may apply to the High Court to question the validity of the PSPO.

5.3 As it stands the proposals within this report for PSPO controls are viewed as proportionate and not significantly more onerous than current and achieve the right balance between dog owners and the community.

6. Other options

6.1 There are following options:

- Not to make a PSPO in which case it will cease to be an offence for persons not to clean up after their dog on 17 October 2017 and persons can continue to take dogs into enclosed children’s play areas. This option has the potential to cause an increase in dog fouling and attract criticism and bad publicity.

- Make a PSPO as proposed – subject to consultation. It is considered that this represents the appropriate balance between addressing the concerns of our residents and restrictions imposed on dog owning residents.

- Make a PSPO with more severe controls than those proposed e.g. requiring dogs to be kept on leads, excluding dogs from additional areas, requiring dog walkers to be able to produce paraphernalia for cleaning up after their dog. It is questionable whether such additional controls meet the legal tests for the creation of a PSPO along with attracting criticism and bad publicity.
7. **Recommendation**

7.1 Cabinet to agree to the proposed approach and consultation leading to the creation of a Proposed Public Space Protection Order (PSPO)

7.2 Should the outcome of the consultation bring forward substantive issues in relation to the proposals in the consultation these are considered by the Growth, Infrastructure and Environment Policy Committee.

7.3 Notwithstanding the above, Cabinet agrees to delegate the decision as to the proposed PSPO to the Director of Planning and Environment, in consultation with the Portfolio holder for Environment & Recycling.
Discretionary Rate Relief Guidelines

Report of the Policy Officer
Cabinet Member: Cllr Barry Stone – Finance and Resources

CONTACT
Paul Chapman 01508 533892
pchapman@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this report is to:

• get Cabinet approval to a local Discretionary Rate Relief scheme to support those businesses most adversely affected by the revaluation of rateable values.
• provide further support through the Council’s discretionary rate relief powers from April 2017 to help the Government deliver on commitments it made in the Spring Budget of 2017 under their initiatives for “Supporting Small Businesses” and “New Business Rate Relief Scheme for Pubs”.
• update the Council’s Discretionary Rate Relief Guidelines (which sets out our approach to awarding relief generally) to incorporate the above and update the document for those other forms of relief that are still current.

2. Background

2.1 South Norfolk Council can award discretionary rate relief under powers contained in Section 47 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988

2.2 The Council has a guideline document outlining our general approach to the award of discretionary reliefs, which sets the parameters within which officers assess cases. These are guidelines only as we are required to be able to consider any case on its own merits.

2.3 The full guideline document was last updated and approved by Cabinet on 21 March 2016

2.4 The Government has over recent years increasingly come up with new ways of supporting businesses, and has asked Council’s to implement that support using its discretionary rate relief powers, with revenue foregone being fully reimbursed. This has most recently happened in the Spring Budget of 2017 and we now need to implement that support for local businesses.
3. Current Position/Findings

3.1 The scope of discretionary rate reliefs has grown considerably over many years from initially being focussed on rate relief for charities, local sports clubs and non-profit making organisations to support for key facilities in smaller settlements (post offices, general stores, specialist food shops and public houses) and now to a wide power to provide support to any type of business – a power which is utilised by Government to deliver locally on national initiatives for support.

3.2 Since Cabinet last approved our guideline document we have received further details from Government of additional support with rates that they intend to provide nationally. The Government requests that to avoid changing legislation, local authorities utilise discretionary rate reliefs in order to deliver on Government commitments to provide support with rates. This additional rate relief is fully funded by Government and South Norfolk is fully reimbursed for the loss of retained income of awards made under specific relief schemes.

3.3 In March 2017 Cabinet agreed that South Norfolk Council would award relief to the offices of local newspapers, and increase rural rate relief so that post offices, general stores, specialist food shops, rural petrol filling stations and public houses with post revaluation rateable values that are beneath existing qualifying threshold levels receive 100% rural rate relief. That is now incorporated into the attached revised Guideline document.

3.4 The Spring Budget 2017 brought three new initiatives. The first two of these “Supporting Small Businesses” and “New Business Rate Relief Scheme for Pubs” will be delivered by South Norfolk Council under our discretionary rate relief powers. These will give a one year £1,000 discount for almost all pubs in 2017/18 and provide support to cap the amount of increase for those ratepayers facing large increases as a result of the loss of small business rate relief or mandatory rural rate relief. These are now incorporated into the Guidelines. The Council will be fully reimbursed by Government for awards of relief made.
3.5 The third initiative in Spring Budget 2017 required South Norfolk Council to shape and adopt a local discretionary revaluation rate relief scheme to help those businesses facing the steepest increases as a result of the revaluation of rateable values. The Government have made available a discretionary fund of £300m over four years from 2017/2018 – the share for South Norfolk will be allocated as follows: 2017/18 £243k, 2018/19 £118k, 2019/20 £49k and 2020/21 £7k. Every Billing Authority has been awarded a share of the £300m, and Billing Authorities are free to decide on a scheme to allocate the funding to their ratepayers. South Norfolk must consult the County Council in shaping its scheme. The Council will be fully reimbursed by Government for awards of relief made up to the maximum of the funding allocation provided.

3.6 A working group of Norfolk Authorities met in April and May 2017 to scope possible options for a local revaluation relief scheme and explore whether a common approach could be adopted. Two alternatives types of scheme were suggested – a scheme limiting increases in bills to a certain percentage, or a ‘banded’ scheme awarding a fixed amount of relief depending on how much a ratepayer’s bill has increased. Within the banded scheme, two options were considered; either an award based on a percentage increase, or an award based on the value of the increase.

3.7 Further modelling led to agreement between representatives of those authorities present that a banded scheme based on the value of the increase in ratepayer’s bills was the preferred option. The County, who Government have requested are consulted, have also agreed with this approach. It is acknowledged that within this common theme each local authority may have different numbers of bands of increase, with differing levels of support to be awarded. This will then allow authorities to adapt to the funding level available and to reflect local priorities.

The banded scheme, based on value of increase in bill, was favoured for the following reasons:

i. There is a direct link between the relief provided and the actual amount of increase in ratepayer’s bills.

ii. The scheme is relatively straightforward to explain to ratepayers

iii. It is the simplest scheme to administer in year 1 and subsequent years.

iv. It provides an element of support to more businesses than other models

3.8 Many of the businesses who have experienced increases in their rates bills are national or regional chains with multiple business premises. They will not be able to take advantage of such local relief schemes in many areas before reaching State Aid de minimis levels (200,000 euros over a rolling three-year period). Support cannot be awarded above that level. As a result the total amount of
support that will be awarded in South Norfolk could vary significantly depending on how many of these businesses are able to take up support in our area before reaching that limit.

3.9 The amount of the increase is calculated after all other reliefs are awarded. Ratepayers may therefore qualify for multiple reliefs e.g. transitional relief, mandatory charity relief, rural rate relief, Small Business Rate Relief as well as the Discretionary Revaluation Relief.

4. Proposals

4.1 It is recommended that South Norfolk Council adopt a local discretionary rate relief scheme that contains 15 bands of increase in bills with award levels of relief set at 40% of the mid-point of those bands of increase. This would result in a scheme where the total value of awards is anticipated to be in the range £203k to £326k and which will benefit up to 217 businesses.

4.2 Support will only be focussed on those ratepayers meeting all the following criteria:
- The business faces an increase in 2017/18 of at least £500, representing an increase of at least 5% on 2016/17
- The business occupied the same premises immediately before and after the revaluation came into effect (i.e. on both 31 March 2017 and 1 April 2017). This means that the support will not be available to businesses taking on premises after 1 April 2017 and will cease when there is a change in occupier.
- That the premises were occupied on those qualifying dates and remain occupied (no support will be provided for any periods that the premises are vacant).
### 4.3 The table below sets out the proposed bands of increase and corresponding award levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Lower level of band £ increase</th>
<th>Upper level of band £ increase</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Award level for band £</th>
<th>Anticipated awards for band in total £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£499</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>£ nil</td>
<td>£0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>£999</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>£300</td>
<td>£11,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,999</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td>£53,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£3,999</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>£1,200</td>
<td>£49,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>£5,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
<td>£7,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£2,800</td>
<td>£8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>£8,000</td>
<td>£9,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>£3,600</td>
<td>£28,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>£11,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£4,400</td>
<td>£4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
<td>£13,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£5,200</td>
<td>£10,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>£14,000</td>
<td>£15,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
<td>£18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>£17,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>£6,800</td>
<td>£13,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>£18,000</td>
<td>£19,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>£7,600</td>
<td>£22,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£21,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£8,400</td>
<td>£8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>£22,000</td>
<td>£23,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>£9,200</td>
<td>£9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>£24,000</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>£50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total £326,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.4 Of those awards it is estimated that as much as £123k might not be taken up due to the businesses already receiving awards up to State Aid limits elsewhere.

#### 4.5 There is no upper limit to the amount of increase that qualifies for some support. Increases of above £24,000 will be reduced by £10,000 (subject to State Aid restrictions).
4.6 In setting out the proposed bandings and levels of award we have sought to make the most of the available funding to support those most adversely affected by significant increases in their business rates as a result of the revaluation, and at a level proportionate to their increase.

4.7 We considered providing some support to those with smaller increases in their bills, but those increases should be capable of being managed by the businesses concerned. This allows the support funding provided to be focussed to those hardest hit.

4.8 The amount of relief will be recalculated if there is any change to the amount due as a result of changes to: the periods of liability, other reliefs awarded or the rateable value of the premises.

4.9 The amount of relief awarded will be capable of being recalculated in-year in the event of a change of circumstances. This could include, for example, a change to the rateable value of the premises, a change to the period of liability or a change in the amount due as a result of the application of other reliefs/exemptions. Relief may also be varied during the year where eligibility criteria are no longer met.

4.10 The scheme seeks to maximise the support provided to South Norfolk businesses. To ensure we do so the Director of Growth & Business Development should be given delegated power to increase the award factor (initially set at 40% of the mid-point of the band) if it becomes clear that less support is accessed by businesses in the area than initially anticipated. In making such a decision it will be balanced against the administrative burden involved.

5. Risks and implications arising

5.1 There is a potential financial impact on South Norfolk Council. The Government will only reimburse local authorities for the total level of awards made up to the maximum of the allocation of funding for that authority (i.e. up to £243k for South Norfolk in year 1). Any support awarded inexcess of the funding level provided will have the effect of reducing business rates revenue to South Norfolk Council to the extent of 20% of the value of that excess support awarded.
5.2 South Norfolk Council cannot refuse to award relief for those that meet the qualifying criteria even if reliefs have already been awarded up to the level of funding provided. Any relief scheme could be open to challenge if cases are not able to be decided on their own merits and discretion is fettered in some other way such as by funding levels.

6. Other options

6.1 The Council could instead adopt a local scheme that would cap the level of increase at 10% for all cases. This would provide more support to those with the largest increases but would not support those with increases of between 5% and 10% (as the proposed scheme would). Such a scheme would be anticipated to cost between £149k and £339k and would help 172 businesses (the proposed banded scheme would help 45 more businesses).

6.2 Such a scheme capping increases at 10% would mean taking a different approach to the consensus of approach supported by other Norfolk districts and Norfolk County Council. Award levels would each have to be calculated manually on a case by case basis and would be more administratively burdensome and expensive to operate.

7. Recommendation

7.1 Cabinet to agree to adopt the proposed local banded scheme of discretionary revaluation rate relief as set out in this report and Appendix A.

7.2 Cabinet to agree the revised Mandatory and Discretionary Rate Relief Guidelines document at appendix A. This will now apply in respect of all rate charges from April 2017 onwards. The guidelines also correct an omission relating to the award of relief for rural petrol filling stations with a rateable value between £12,500 and £16,500 by awarding them 50% relief in line with rural public houses (both are enabled by the same clause in legislation). All additions to previous Guidelines are highlighted.

7.3 Cabinet to agree to delegate authority to the Director of Growth & Business Development, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder, to determine the bandwidths and levels of relief award per band for the scheme in future years.
Appendix A
Non-Domestic Rates - Mandatory and Discretionary Rate Relief Guidelines

The Local Government Finance Act 1988 requires local authorities to grant “Mandatory rate relief” to the following categories of Non-Domestic ratepayer:

- Registered charities
- Village Post Offices, general stores, specialist food shops, public houses and petrol filling station – where they are in a designated rural settlement
- Registered Community Amateur Sports Clubs (CASCs)

The Local Government Finance Act 1988 also gives local authorities the power to grant “Discretionary rate relief” as follows:

- To make a further award on top of mandatory relief granted to registered charities
- To village Post Offices, general stores, specialist food shops, public houses and petrol filling station – where they are in a designated rural settlement
- To make a further award on top of mandatory relief granted to registered Community Amateur Sports Clubs (CASCs)
- In respect of sports grounds and clubs
- To other non-profit making organisations

The Local Government Finance Act 1988 also gives local authorities the power to reduce or remit the amount of rates liable to be paid on the grounds of hardship.

The Localism Act 2011 (clause 69) introduced a further general power for local authorities to reduce the business rates of any local ratepayer (not just those who could previously be granted discretionary relief), where the authority is satisfied that it is in the interests of its Council Tax payers.

Guidelines Aim

These guidelines set out the Council’s intentions for dealing with discretionary rate relief applications from Charities, Community Amateur Sports Clubs (CASC’s), Non-Profit Making Organisations, and other businesses which are situated within the South Norfolk Council area.

Through these guidelines, the Council is providing a mechanism to reduce or, remove the business rates liability for such charities, non-profit making organisations, certain rural businesses providing valuable facilities and services to communities within the South Norfolk area, and other businesses.

These guidelines aim to provide clarity around the process of administration of applications for Discretionary Rate Relief, consistency in the application of the guidelines and to ensure maximum take-up from potential qualifying
organisations, which will in turn contribute to achieving the Council’s ambitions for the district.

MANDATORY RELIEFS

Mandatory Relief for registered charities.

Mandatory relief applies to registered charities or trustees for a charity where the rated premises are used wholly and mainly for charitable purposes. In the case of charity shops they must sell goods that have been donated to the charity (this condition is also necessary for discretionary relief.)

The relief allowed is 80%.

Mandatory Relief for village post offices, general stores, specialist food shops, public houses and petrol filling stations.

The rural business must be in a rural settlement area that has a population of 3,000 or less.

a) Sole post offices and general stores with a rateable value of £8,500 or less are entitled to 50% relief.

b) Any village shop that sells food for human consumption but excludes restaurants, tearooms, fast or hot food shops and confectionary shops with a rateable value of £8,500 or less are entitled to 50% relief.

c) Where there is only one public house in a rural settlement, which has a rateable value not exceeding £12,500, there is an entitlement to 50% relief.

d) Sole petrol filling stations with a rateable value of £12,500 or less are entitled to 50% relief.

Mandatory Relief for registered Community Amateur Sports Clubs (CASCs)

Sports clubs that have registered with the Inland Revenue as Community Amateur Sports Clubs are entitled to 80% relief.

DISCRETIONARY RELIEFS

All Discretionary Relief applications must be accompanied by a Small Business Rate Relief application where applicable.

Throughout this policy document it shall apply that discretionary relief will be awarded only up to a maximum sum of:

- £4,000 per registered charity or Community Amateur Sporting Club (CASC) in any financial year
- £12,000 per non-profit making organisation or rural business in any financial year (not charities or CASCs)

Applications for relief to be backdated in to the previous financial year may only be accepted if the decision can be made by 1st October of the financial year in which the application is received.
All qualifying businesses and organisations are required to notify The Council of any change in circumstances that may affect their entitlement to Discretionary Rate Relief.

**Discretionary top-up relief for registered charities.**

Registered charities may apply for additional 'top-up' discretionary relief where 80% mandatory relief has been granted.

Applicants will need to demonstrate that the use of the premises is in furtherance of the objects of the charity, and that the property is wholly or mainly occupied by the charity.

Each application will be looked at on its own merits and it will be at the discretion of the Council whether or not to make an award of discretionary relief.

Discretionary charitable relief will not usually be granted:

1) to charity shops, or
2) in respect of periods where any property is unoccupied (other than in the Enterprise Zone).
3) In respect of properties in an Enterprise Zone while other Discretionary Enterprise Zone Rate relief is available.

**Discretionary Relief for village post offices, general stores, specialist food shops, public houses and petrol filling stations.**

The rural business must be in a designated rural settlement area that has a population of 3,000 or less.

a) Sole post offices and general stores with a rateable value of £8,500 or less qualifying for 50% mandatory relief are eligible for 50% discretionary relief.

b) Where there is a second post office or general store or the only post office or store has a rateable value above £8,500 but not exceeding £16,500 they are eligible for 50% discretionary relief. Where there are more than two in a rural settlement no relief is granted.

c) A village shop that sells food for human consumption (excluding restaurants, tearooms, fast or hot food or confectionary shops) with a rateable value above £8,500 but not exceeding £16,500 will be entitled to 50% relief.

d) The only public house in a rural settlement, which has a rateable value above £12,500 but not exceeding £16,500 will be awarded 50% discretionary relief.

e) Sole petrol filling stations with a rateable value of £12,500 or less qualifying for 50% mandatory relief are eligible for 50% discretionary relief.

f) Sole petrol filling stations with a rateable value above £12,500 but not exceeding £16,500 will be awarded 50% discretionary relief.
**Additional Discretionary Rural Rate relief**

The Autumn Statement 2016 confirmed that the Government would double rural rate relief to 100% from 1 April 2017. The Government intends to amend the relevant primary legislation to require local authorities to grant 100% mandatory rural rate relief.

However, before the requirement to grant mandatory relief comes into force South Norfolk Council will use local discount powers to grant 50% discretionary rural rate relief in addition to the 50% mandatory rural rate relief to eligible ratepayers from 1 April 2017.

**Discretionary Relief for registered Community Amateur Sports Clubs (CASCs)**

Some sports clubs have registered with HM Revenue and Customs as Community Amateur Sports Clubs. CASCs may apply for an additional 20% ‘top-up’ discretionary relief, in addition to the mandatory relief that CASCs are entitled to.

This ‘top-up’ relief will be awarded up to a maximum of £4,000 per CASC per financial year.

**Discretionary Relief for sports grounds and clubs.**

Both sports grounds and sports clubs may apply for discretionary relief with the amount to be awarded being on a sliding scale percentage related to the balance between sporting and social membership and bar takings. The amounts are as follows:

- 100% relief where there is no bar, or the bar takings are below £10,000.
- 75% relief where bar takings exceed £10,000 but membership is mainly sporting.
- 50% relief where bar takings exceed £10,000 and membership is equally split between sporting and social.
- 25% relief where bar takings exceed £10,000 and membership is mainly social but there is an element of sporting membership.
- 0% relief where the club is operated primarily as a business enterprise and where the level of joining fees excludes membership by the public at large.

Exceptions to the above are:
- sailing, boating, and water sports clubs
- flying and gliding clubs

These will be eligible for 80% relief.
No discretionary relief will be awarded to golf clubs.
Discretionary Relief for other non-profit making organisations.

Village and Community Halls

a) Where the occupier is a registered charity and there is no bar at the premises an additional 20% discretionary relief may be applied for, on top of the 80% mandatory relief. No additional relief will be given if there is a bar.

b) Where the occupier is a non-registered charitable group and there is no bar at the premises 100% discretionary relief will be given.

c) Where the occupier is a non-registered charitable group and there is a bar at the premises 80% discretionary relief will be given.

Voluntary Bodies

Applications from non-registered charitable groups are to be considered on an individual basis.

Discretionary relief to a maximum of 100% is granted.

Conservation and Cultural Organisations

Premises will include:

- Museums
- Rehearsal rooms for bands or dramatic societies
- Premises occupied for preservation projects
- Premises occupied by Norfolk based wildlife groups

In addition to the 'top-up' 20% discretionary relief granted to registered charities, 100% discretionary relief will be granted to non-registered charitable groups.

Discretionary relief will not be given to nationally based groups.

Young People’s Activities

In addition to the ‘top-up’ 20% discretionary relief granted to registered charities, 100% discretionary relief will be granted to non-registered charitable groups.

This category excludes any hereditaments occupied for sporting activities.

Discretionary Hardship Relief

Section 49 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 gives discretion to the billing authority to reduce or remit payments of rates in respect of both occupied and unoccupied premises. This award can be up to 100%. When making an award an authority must be satisfied that:
1) the ratepayer would sustain hardship if the authority did not do so, and
2) it is reasonable for the authority to do so, having regard to the interests of persons subject to its Council Tax.

Decisions to award hardship relief will be made by the Finance Manager, or the s151 Officer or his/her deputy.

New Build Empty Property Relief

This relief is temporary and is government funded.

South Norfolk Council will provide 100% relief from unoccupied property rates on properties completed on or after 1 October 2013 and before 30 September 2016, in the circumstances explained below.

Properties that will benefit from the relief will be all unoccupied non-domestic properties that are wholly or mainly comprised of qualifying new structures. South Norfolk Council intend that “structures” means:

a) foundations and/or
b) permanent walls and/or

South Norfolk Council intend that “new” means:

a) completed less than 18 months previously, and
b) completed after 1 October 2013 and before 30 September 2016.

New structures are to be considered “completed” when the building or part of the building of which they form part is ready for occupation for the purpose it was constructed unless a completion notice has been served in respect of such a building or part of a building - in which case it would be the date specified in that notice.

In terms of considering whether a property is wholly or mainly comprised of qualifying new structures, South Norfolk Council intends that “mainly” means more than half. As the test is made in regards to the composition of the structure, it will not be relevant to consider matters such as the rateable value or use of parts of the property. However, factors such as the area or volume of the property will be relevant. It is not intended that this relief should apply to properties that have been refurbished, but it is intended to capture those that have been the subject of substantial structural construction, so for example those properties that are built on existing foundations or built around a retained façade are likely to benefit from the relief.

Where a property is created as a result of a split or merger of other properties, or where the existing property is altered for example with an extension, the same test will apply i.e. the premises must be wholly or mainly comprised of new structures completed within the necessary timeframes to benefit from the relief. Ratepayers will not benefit merely because a property has split or
merged but, our aim is for ratepayers to have some flexibility to adapt their properties without losing the relief. There will be some instances where this is not clear cut (such as where one unit is formed from the merger of a property that comprises mainly or wholly of new structures with a property that comprises structures that are not new) – in such cases South Norfolk Council will only award discretionary relief where the new property wholly or mainly comprises qualifying new structures.

The relief will run with the property rather than the owner. So, if a developer initially owns a Property that qualifies for the relief he/she will be able to sell/lease the property with the benefit of the remaining term of the relief, subject to the ratepayer’s State Aid de-minimis limits.

Properties that are completed before 1 October 2013 will not benefit from these proposals. However, rating assessments comprising such properties will not be subject to empty property rates for the first 3 or 6 months they are empty, in the normal way.

**Transitional Relief 2015-17**

This relief is temporary and is government funded.

Transitional relief will be awarded in 2015/16 and 2016/17 in respect of properties (with a rateable value not exceeding £50,000), which would have received transitional relief had the existing transitional relief scheme continued in its current format.

The value of relief awarded will be the same level of protection they would have received had the transitional relief scheme been extended into 2015/16 and 2016/17.

The £50,000 rateable value threshold is based on the rateable value shown for 1/4/10 or the substituted day in the cases of splits and mergers. Changes in rateable value which take effect from a later date should be calculated using the normal rules in the transitional relief scheme – so properties whose rateable value is £50,000 or less on 1 April 2010 (or the day of merger) but increase above £50,000 from a later date will still be eligible for the relief.

In the Council making an award for the extension of transitional relief it will be on the condition that the relief can be recalculated in the event of a change to the rating list for the property concerned (retrospective or otherwise). This is so that the relief can be re-calculated if the rateable value changes.

Transitional relief will only be awarded for those moving to higher bills, and after 30 September 2017 no further awards can be made in respect of 2016/17.
Enterprise Zone Rate Relief – Norwich Research Park

South Norfolk Council has the discretion to award a business rate discount of up to 100% in respect of properties situated within a designated enterprise zone area.

To qualify for this relief the property concerned must be within the enterprise zone area and a discount on business rates will be awarded for up to five years up to the maximum state aid de minimis threshold, for businesses that are already in the Enterprise Zone area or enter the zone before 31 March 2022, e.g. if a business enters the zone on 31 March 2022, it can receive the discount (subject to de minimis) until 30 March 2027.

Each case will be considered on its own merits and in considering each case the Council may have regard to:

- Whether the ratepayer is new to Norwich Research Park
- Whether the ratepayer will be delivering an increase in employment over the next 5 years
- Whether by moving into the Enterprise Zone and receiving rate relief the ratepayer anticipates being able to make the necessary investment to generate further growth in the business
- The availability of funding from Government to recompense the Council for such awards of relief.

The level of any award of discount, and the period of rates against which any discount will be awarded will be decided on a case by case basis. Any case (or groups of cases) to be considered under this power will be determined by the Director of Growth & Business Development, or in the absence of the Director by the s151 officer.

Non-domestic Rates discount

The Localism Act 2011 (clause 69) introduced a general power for local authorities to reduce the business rates of any local ratepayer (not just those who could previously be granted discretionary relief). This is a wide power under which each case will need to be treated on its own merits. The key test is whether the authority is satisfied that it is in the interests of its Council Tax payers to decide to award relief.

In considering whether to award a business rate discount the Council will particularly have regard to:

- Whether the business operates in one of the key sectors that the Council wishes to support under its Economic Growth Strategy
  - Food, Health and Agri-tech
  - Advanced Engineering and Specialist Technologies
  - ICT / Digital Creative
  - Visitor Economy
  - Business Services/Finance
  - Construction
• Whether short-term assistance is sought as part of a project that will deliver an increase in jobs created locally, or see expansion of the rateable premises

• Whether the business is located in a key strategic location/growth area

• Whether by offering a short-term rates discount it would help support bringing a property into use, or stimulating further occupiers to a business location - which would generate additional rates income to fund local services in the longer-term

• Whether the discount would support a new enterprise (<2 years) that has significant growth potential (in key sectors and emerging/growing markets)

• Whether the ratepayer will be undertaking activity which will provide support for wider employment initiatives such as apprenticeship schemes, work placements, sponsoring students etc

• Whether a business is investing which may lead to some other community benefit

• Whether the ratepayer is a Community Interest Company whose Articles of Association or Memorandum clearly state that any surplus of income over expenditure will be applied in a manner that ensures no profit is made, and which is set up with the purpose of providing benefit to the local community or a section of the community.

• Whether the ratepayer is already (or has previously been) in receipt of other forms of rate relief, or has previously received a business rate discount

**General points regarding discretionary discounts under the above power.**

The level of any award of discount, and the period of rates against which any discount will be awarded will be decided on a case by case basis.

Any case (or groups of cases) to be considered under this power will be determined by the Director of Growth & Business Development, or in the absence of the Director by the s151 officer.

**Local Newspapers**

The Chancellor announced at the Budget 2016 that the Government will introduce a £1,500 business rates discount for office space occupied by local newspapers, up to a maximum of one discount per local newspaper title and per property for 2 years from 1 April 2017. The relief will be delivered through local authority discretionary discount powers under section 47(3) of the Local Government Finance Act. Government will reimburse local authorities for the actual cost to them under the rates retention scheme of granting this relief.

South Norfolk Council will provide such an award of discount to any qualifying business.
Supporting Small Businesses

At the Spring Budget 2017, the Chancellor announced that a scheme of relief would be made available to those ratepayers facing large increases as a result of the loss of small business or mandatory rural rate relief following the revaluation.

To support these ratepayers, the Supporting Small Businesses relief will ensure that the increase per year in the bills of these ratepayers is limited to the greater of:

a). a percentage increase p.a. of 5%, 7.5%, 10%, 15% and 15% 2017/18 to 2021/22 all plus inflation (the real terms transitional relief cap for small businesses each year). Unlike the transitional relief scheme, for the first year of the scheme the percentage increase is taken against the bill for 31 March 2017 after small business rate relief or rural rate relief, or

b). a cash value of £600 per year (£50 per month). This cash minimum increase ensures that those ratepayers paying nothing or very small amounts in 2016/17 after small business rate relief are brought into paying something.

In comparing to the bill for 31 March 2017 any award of discretionary relief shall be disregarded. This shall have the effect of limiting calculation of support to those cases where it is the loss of mandatory rural rate relief that triggers the calculation of the £600 per year cap. Support is not available to those ceasing to be entitled to discretionary rural relief.

The exact calculation of relief shall be in carried out in accordance with detailed guidance provided by Government as set out in the following document:


Support for pubs

In 2017/18 there will be a business rate discount awarded of £1,000 per eligible public house with a rateable value of less that £100,000

For the purposes of this relief a public house shall be considered to be eligible if it:

- is open to the general public
- allows free entry other than when occasional entertainment is provided
- allows drinking without requiring food to be consumed
- permit drinks to be purchased at a bar

For these purposes, public house excludes:

- restaurants
- cafes
• nightclubs
• hotels
• snack bars
• guesthouses
• boarding houses
• sporting venues
• music venues
• festival sites
• theatres
• museums
• exhibition halls
• cinemas

Local Discretionary Revaluation Rate Relief

Support will be provided to those businesses facing the steepest increases in their bills as a direct result of the revaluation which came into effect on 1 April 2017.

Support will be available (subject to State Aid de minimis rules) to those ratepayers meeting all the following criteria:

• The business faces an increase in 2017/18 of at least £500, representing an increase of at least 5% on 2016/17

• The business occupied the same premises immediately before and after the revaluation came into effect (i.e. on both 31 March 2017 and 1 April 2017). This means that the support will not be available to businesses taking on premises after 1 April 2017 and will cease when there is a change in occupier.

• That the premises were occupied on those qualifying dates and remain occupied (no support will be provided for any periods that the premises are vacant).

There is no upper limit to the amount of increase that qualifies for some support. Increases of above £24,000 will be reduced by £10,000 as per the following table (subject to State Aid restrictions):

The amount of relief awarded will be capable of being recalculated in-year in the event of a change of circumstances. This could include, for example, a change to the rateable value of the premises, a change to the period of liability or a change in the amount due as a result of the application of other reliefs/exemptions. Relief may also be varied during the year where eligibility criteria are no longer met.
The table below sets out the proposed bands of increase and corresponding award levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Lower level of band £ increase</th>
<th>Upper level of band £ increase</th>
<th>Award level for band £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£499</td>
<td>£ nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td>£999</td>
<td>£300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
<td>£1,999</td>
<td>£600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
<td>£3,999</td>
<td>£1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>£4,000</td>
<td>£5,999</td>
<td>£2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
<td>£7,999</td>
<td>£2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>£8,000</td>
<td>£9,999</td>
<td>£3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
<td>£11,999</td>
<td>£4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
<td>£13,999</td>
<td>£5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>£14,000</td>
<td>£15,999</td>
<td>£6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>£16,000</td>
<td>£17,999</td>
<td>£6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>£18,000</td>
<td>£19,999</td>
<td>£7,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>£20,000</td>
<td>£21,999</td>
<td>£8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>£22,000</td>
<td>£23,999</td>
<td>£9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>£24,000</td>
<td>No limit</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Support will be provided at a lower level for 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21. The bandwidths and award levels per band will be determined in advance of bills being issued for those years.

**Recalculations of relief award**

With all forms of relief the amount of relief awarded will be recalculated in the event of a change in circumstances. This could include, for example, a change to the rateable value of the premises, a change to the period of liability or a change in the amount due as a result of the application of other reliefs/exemptions.

Relief may also be varied during the year where eligibility criteria are no longer met.
**Period of Award (general)**

The award period for new and renewal applications will be for a period ending not later than the end of the current financial year (with the exception of Enterprise Zone Rate Relief which, once awarded, will be for a five-year period).

**Review of Relief Award**

The Council will regularly review its approach to the award of relief, and will periodically review the eligibility of qualifying businesses and organisations.

When a review of eligibility is carried out continuation of relief will be subject to satisfactory completion of review forms and provision of requested supporting information. Where a renewal form is not returned, relief will not be awarded and the business or organisation will be sent a rate bill for the full charge.

When completed forms are returned, awards will be considered in the light of these or amended guidelines.

Prior to guidelines being revised organisations will be given at least twelve months’ notice that their eligibility to relief may change.

**Award of all discretionary reliefs**

Where a rate payer is concerned that they have not been awarded relief in accordance with the guidelines above they can apply in writing to have the case reviewed by the Director of Growth & Business Development.
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Procurement Strategy 2017-2021

Report of the Procurement Consortium Manager
Cabinet Member: Barry Stone, Finance and Resources

CONTACT
Ian Purdom 01508 533645
ipurdom@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1 The Council’s current Procurement Strategy 2012-2015 needs to be revised to reflect the changes in procurement legislation and to ensure continuation of best practice procurement processes for the Council. Following a period of procurement staff changes, with the recruitment of the Procurement Consortium Manager it has given the Council the opportunity to strategically review its procurement strategy and processes for going forward until 2021.

1.2 The proposed strategy was discussed by FRAG at the meeting held on 23 June 2017 and was recommended for approval by Cabinet for adoption.

2. Background

2.1 The current Procurement Strategy requires updating as it has exceeded the original timeframe agreed. There is a requirement to ensure a revised strategy considers the National Procurement Strategy for Local Government which was launched in June 2014.

2.1.1 The current Procurement Strategy 2012-2015 has been revised and localised to make a more simplified document to enable the Council to achieve its Corporate, Business and Moving Forward Together plans.

2.1.2 The revised five-year Procurement Strategy 2017-2021 will be reviewed annually to ensure its continues to meet the Council’s plans.

3. Current Position

3.1 The Council has undertaken and will refresh a range of initiatives and activities to encourage staff at all levels to be aware of the benefits of procurement and commercialisation to enable the Council to meet its challenging budget position. The procurement of Works, Services and Supplies contractors are strictly procured under EU Public Contract Regulations 2015, UK Law and the Council’s Constitution.
3.2 In addition, using EU Public Contract Regulations 2015, UK Law and the Councils Constitution manage risk proportionately while maintaining compliance when procuring services and goods, this may include innovation around procurements and contracts.

3.3 Future procurement processes for Works, Services and Supplies will require appropriate clauses to minimise risks with the Councils contracts in preparation for the UK leaving the EU.

3.4 The Procurement Strategy 2017-2021 sets the strategic direction and rational for the Council’s future procurement and commercialisation plans including and not limited to achieving value for money, supporting local economies, strong leadership, expansion of and revenue generation opportunities and obtaining corporate social responsibility values.

3.5 A key element of the Procurement Strategy 2017-2021 is the further development and expansion of the Procurement Consortium Services which its currently provides by partnering and collaboration to other Public Bodies which will aggregate spends and may provide significant savings.

4. Risks and implications arising

4.1 The Council has and is facing significant funding reductions; thus, procurement plays a significant role in assisting the Council to balance its budgets. Without a clear direction and best practice procurement, opportunities could be lost in achieving maximum value for money and revenue generation.

4.2 The procurement process has risks and the Council manages these risks through ensuring best practice is followed. Risks are identified and mitigation put in place to either eliminate or manage proportionately to the risk.

5. Recommendation

5.1 Cabinet to approve the revised Procurement Strategy 2017-2021.
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Introduction

This Strategy sets out what procurement is and the procurement objectives for South Norfolk Council (SNC) which are required to assist in meeting SNC’s overall vision and priorities, as laid out in the Corporate Plan. The aim of effective procurement is to ensure the Council achieves value for money with its limited financial resources and complies with statutory requirements.

Our Vision and Priorities

Our vision is to retain and improve the quality of life and prosperity of South Norfolk, for now and future generations, to make it one of the best places to live and work in the Country. Our priorities are set out below, and are reinforced by our values: to be customer focused, collaborative and commercial in our approach to service delivery.

What is procurement?

Procurement is the process of obtaining works, supplies and services to enable the Council to deliver its priorities as outlined through the Corporate Plan. In procuring works, goods and services the Council continuously seeks to deliver best value and to have a transparent process which is open to scrutiny at all levels. With reducing funding, it is essential that procurement delivers value for money and efficiency savings throughout the Council.

Commercialisation is the process of delivering our existing services in new and different ways, to increase income and profit margins, improve customer experience or reduce costs. Commercialisation is undertaken in the context of the public-sector environment in which we operate. Councils face restrictions on what they can carry out for a commercial purpose, how and where they can charge for services, and in which capacity they can trade and each case should be individually judged to determine what is the best way forward.
What are Procurement’s key objectives 2017-2021?

Five key objectives seek to:

- **Simplify and improve procurement processes** through revising the Council Standing Orders and procurement documentation. SNC is and has been facing funding reductions. Procurement plays an important role in assisting teams to deliver services within this environment. By revising contract standing orders, the processes involved can be simplified and made more efficient. However, current procurement legislation is complex and is a statutory requirement, with the potential for costly legal challenges if breaches occur, and this needs to be borne in mind when revising practices. Creative solutions can, though deliver innovative contracts, which provide other value for money benefits such as revenue generation, social value, discounts and training.

- **Consider procurement options** before going out to the market to ensure the right outcome is achieved. If tendering is decided upon as the right solution, ensure that it is an attractive opportunity to the market by encouraging more SMEs to bid for opportunities through forward planning, wider advertising and market engagement. Seek to promote bid opportunities by ensuring projects are well developed and allow the market to actively engage in contract opportunities. Simplify the procurement process and contract management to assist in raising procurement standards within the public sector and encourage more suppliers to participate in contract opportunities. This approach will also assist in attracting the best contractors and maximizing value for money in delivery of the Council’s priorities.

- **Introduce formal performance indicators and contract management** on strategic contracts to ensure suppliers meet their obligations and that the Council achieves value for money. Performance indicators and contract management will cover risk, compliance, satisfaction, value for money, complaints and continued innovation. This process should feed into the next contract opportunity. With limited resource to carry out contract management, there is a requirement to maximise the benefits of this activity and therefore it is envisaged that performance indicators will be applied to any contract > £50k.

- **Provide innovative procurement solutions** within the existing Public Contracts Regulations 2015, UK law, and within the existing local government transparency and participate in future consultations on legislative changes and maintain ongoing compliance.

- **Grow the Procurement Consortium** to provide a centre of excellence across the public sector to provide strategic and professional procurement services and to lead and collaborate on procurement opportunities which will assist organisations in achieving achieve greater value for money and reduced procurement costs.
### What are we going to do?

**Current financial year 2017/18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Growth, Productivity and Prosperity</th>
<th>Health, Wellbeing and Early Help</th>
<th>Place, Communities and Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurements to support the district-wide digital strategy for online business.</td>
<td>Where appropriate procurement to assist in promoting Health &amp; Wellbeing in contracts using the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012.</td>
<td>Procurement to ensure contracts are in place that are effective, efficient and provide value for money to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement to seek contractors to enhance broadband provision across the District.</td>
<td>Procurement advice in relation to the refurbishment works at Long Stratton Leisure Centre.</td>
<td>• Maintain household waste and recycling collection services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintain the Council’s transport fleet safely for tyres, vehicle spares.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintain the Council’s tree surveys and surgery services for the community assets team.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Moving Forward Together

Procurement for the following contracts which provide services and supplies across the organisation:
- Cash Collection
- Legionella
- Cleaning Services and supplies
- Health and Safety services

Specifically, we will:
- Update on a quarterly basis the Council’s contract register and forward plan which contain details of current contracts which exist or forthcoming procurements to alert potential contracts of future opportunities.
- Review Contract Standing Orders.

More generally we will look to:
- Ensure the Council achieves best value through effective and efficient procurement and to ensure procurement processes are compliant with the Public Contract Regulations 2015, UK law and the Council’s Constitution.
- Provide support to South Norfolk Businesses through enabling them to access Council procurement activities and embedding the importance of social value in procurement.
- Lead the procurement consortium, actively seeking opportunities for new partners to join the service and / or to provide advice and guidance to other partners in order to generate income for all participating Councils.
• Ensure the Council’s resources are managed effectively and provide value for money, reducing the risk to the Council’s reputation and procurement challenge.

Medium/Longer Term Activities – to be delivered over duration of the strategy

• To provide procurement information in real time for Local Government Transparency Code
• To provide procurement services to suppliers to assist in winning more public sector opportunities
• To use technology to automate evaluation of appropriate elements of bid submissions
• To maximize the benefits of Social Value in contract opportunities for the community
• To continuously improve procurement processes

How will we measure our success?

• By improving and making procurement processes simpler through revising Standing Orders and procurement documentation, increase the number of participants per contract opportunity for the supply of Works, Service and Supplies based on traditional procurement processes.
• By recording the number of alternative options considered before commencing a particular procurement process.
• By monitoring the benefits of corporate social responsibility provided to the community within contracts and equate these into £s.
• By measuring and monitoring key performance indicators within contracts > £50k and utilise this information to develop and enhance performance, ensuring continuous improvement throughout the life of the contract.
• By increasing the number of local authorities and other public bodies who join the Procurement Consortium.
### CABINET CORE AGENDA 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Key Decision/Item</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Cabinet Member</th>
<th>Exempt Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>17 July</td>
<td>Performance Risks and Finance Budget Position Q1</td>
<td>E Goddard, A Mewes, M Fernandez –Graham</td>
<td>B Stone</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Easton Neighbourhood Plan</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Procurement Strategy</td>
<td>I Purdom</td>
<td>B Stone</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Revisions to Local Plan Annual Monitoring Report Indicators</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Programme Report</td>
<td>M Stanton</td>
<td>B Stone</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed Public Space Protection Order</td>
<td>A Nicholas/B Wade</td>
<td>K Mason Billig</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discretionary Rate Relief Guidelines</td>
<td>P Chapman</td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>11 Sept</td>
<td>Draft Norfolk Strategic Framework</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Norwich Joint Five Year Infrastructure Investment Plan 18/19-22/23</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GNLP Strategic Framework</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>30 Oct</td>
<td>Performance Risks and Finance Budget Position Q2</td>
<td>E Goddard, A Mewes, M Fernandez –Graham</td>
<td>B Stone</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Renewal Grants and Loans Policy</td>
<td>T Cooke</td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treasury Management Half Yearly report</td>
<td>M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>B Stone</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4 Dec</td>
<td>Conservation Area Appraisals Review – Bawburgh, Dickleburgh, Hempnall, Mulbarton, and Scole</td>
<td>C Bennett</td>
<td>L Hornby</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key decisions are those which result in income, expenditure or savings with a gross full year effect of £100,000 or 10% of the Council’s net portfolio budget whichever is the greater which has not been included in the relevant portfolio budget, or are significant (e.g. in environmental, physical, social or economic) in terms of its effect on the communities living or working in an area comprising two or more electoral divisions in the area of the local authority.