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AGENDA

1. To report apologies for absence;

2. Any items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as matters of urgency pursuant to Section 100 B (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 form and flow chart attached - page 7)

4. Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 31 March 2014; (attached – page 9)

5. Review of Neighbourhood Area Working; (report attached – page 19)

   Following the steer from the informal meeting of the Growth and Localism Committee on 11th March 2014 this report takes the preferred option for improving neighbourhood working and outlines proposed new Ground Rules to ensure the effective delivery of that option. Members are asked to endorse the preferred option and accompanying Grounds Rules and agree to recommend them to Cabinet.


   Following the Agenda Note for 10 February Cabinet, work has continued to progress on developing the Proposed Submission version of the Long Stratton Area Action Plan (LSAAP). Meetings and discussions are ongoing with parties key to the success of the AAP and significant elements of the Proposed Submission version have been prepared; however, due to unforeseen circumstances (beyond the Council’s control) a small number of important issues remained to be finalised before officers are satisfied that the document can be recommended as sufficiently robust to proceed. Consequently it is anticipated that the Proposed Submission version of the AAP will be considered by Cabinet in June 2014, followed by Council in July.

   Simon Marjoram
   Senior Planning Officer
7. **Long Stratton Area Action Plan: Exploration of the potential use of compulsory purchase powers for land at Long Stratton**;
   (report attached – page 45)

   As part of the Local Plan for South Norfolk, the Council is preparing an Area Action Plan (AAP) for Long Stratton to bring forward the growth identified in the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS). There may be benefits in the Council exercising its powers of compulsory purchase to help implement the Local Stratton AAP, in particular the land needed to deliver the bypass and the minimum 1,800 dwellings. Cabinet is therefore asked to authorise work to explore the case for compulsory purchase in more detail.

8. **Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) providing Guidance for the Delivery of a ‘Food and Agriculture Hub for Broadland and South Norfolk’**;
   (report attached – page 49)

   Policy 5 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk refers to the development of a flagship food and farming hub serving the needs of Norfolk. In 2013 South Norfolk and Broadland District Councils produced and consulted on a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for assessing Food Hub proposals. The SPD sets out the types of uses that would be appropriate as part of a food and farming hub and the principles that would be used to test any planning applications that come forward for such uses. Following the outcomes of the consultation, this report highlights some suggested changes to the SPD, principally concerning the mix of uses and the scale of proposals, plus some changes to add clarity. The Public Participation Statement concerning the consultation is attached as Appendix A and the proposed final SPD is attached as Appendix B.

9. **Norwich Northern Distributor Road Development Consent Order Application: South Norfolk Council’s response**;
   (report attached – page 99)

   The Norwich Northern Distributor Road planning (Development Consent Order) application was accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate on 4 February 2014 and the statutory timeframe for determination has commenced. There will be an opportunity for South Norfolk Council to make an official response to the DCO application in late May or early June 2014 in the form of a Local Impact Report. The NDR forms a key element underpinning the delivery of the adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk and as such its successful delivery will bring benefits to South Norfolk. Broadland, Norwich, South Norfolk and Norfolk County Councils are proposing to lodge either a single combined Local Impact Report, or to agree common text covering much of the justification for the scheme, and the main impacts of the scheme. Given the likely short timescales to lodge a Local Impact Report in late May/early June, it is requested that the Director of Growth and Localism be granted delegated powers to agree and lodge South Norfolk Council’s official response by the date required.
10. Government Review of the role of local housing authorities in housing supply: call for evidence: South Norfolk Council’s response;  
(report attached – page 105)

In January 2014, the Government announced that it was commissioning an independent review into the role that Local Authorities could play in boosting housing supply, with the review examining how councils are using their current powers and flexibilities to deliver new housing, and how they could team up with housing associations, house builders, residents and businesses to do more. The public call for evidence and ideas was launched on 25th March, and focuses on 10 questions. Responding to the consultation is a very useful opportunity to highlight to Government some of the positive measures that the Council has taken over recent years to boost housebuilding rates in the district, both delivering new affordable homes and developing land owned by the Council itself. It will also allow the Council to seek changes to certain regulations that are believed to hinder local authorities seeking to achieve growth and innovation.

(report attached – page 111)

The Department for Communities and Local Government has issued a consultation paper which seeks comments on proposals to:

- Increase the threshold for designating authorities as underperforming, based on the speed of determining applications for major development to 40% or fewer of decisions made on time, and
- To introduce a 10 unit and 1000 square metres gross floorspace threshold for affordable housing contributions through Section 106 planning obligations to aid the delivery of small scale housing sites. Rural Exception Sites will be excluded from this threshold.

The deadline for comments is 4 May 2014 and consequently the purpose of this paper is to confirm the comments which were submitted following the Environment, Regulation and Planning Policy Committee on 16 April 2014.

12. Governance arrangements for the Greater Norwich Growth Board;  
(report attached – page 132)

This report sets out the proposed governance arrangements for delivering South Norfolk Council’s growth proposals contained in the Joint Core Strategy, the recently agreed Greater Norwich City Deal and the New Anglia LEP Strategic Economic Plan.

13. Distribution of the Community Infrastructure Levy to Parishes and Town Councils;  
(report attached – page 166)

Under the Community Infrastructure Levy regulations the Council is required to pass a proportion of the income received to Towns and Parishes. This paper proposes how this will be accomplished.
14. Banking Tender;

The Council is currently undertaking a procurement exercise to obtain a new banking services provider. It is doing this in conjunction with all Norfolk District Councils, Norfolk County Council and the police. The timetable aims to award the contract in the summer of 2014. This report requests Cabinet approval to delegate the decision to award the contract to the Head of Finance in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources to ensure this timetable is met.

15. Recommendations from the Finance, Resources, Audit and Governance Committee meeting held 7 March 2014;

Extract of the relevant minutes

Cabinet is asked to endorse the following recommendations of the Finance, Resources, Audit and Governance Committee:

(a) Internal Audit’s Charter, Strategic and Annual Audit Plans and Summary of Internal Audit Coverage for 2014/15

RESOLVED: To recommend that Cabinet approve:
1. Internal Audit’s Charter for 2014/15;
2. Internal Audit’s Code of Ethics for 2014/15;
3. Internal Audit’s Strategy for 2014/15;
4. The Strategic Audit Plan for 2014/15 to 2016/17;
5. The Annual Audit Plan for 2014/15;
6. The Summary of Internal Audit Coverage for 2014/15;

(b) Working Protocol Between Internal and External Audit for 2013/14 and 2014/15

RESOLVED: To recommend that Cabinet approve the Audit Protocol and thereby give it its endorsement to the level of interaction which will be adopted by Internal and External Audit throughout the remaining quarter of 2013/14 and the financial year 2014/15.

16. Cabinet Core Agenda;

17. Exclusion of the Public and Press;

To exclude the public and the 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)
The Council is securing a leading role in developing a significant regional partnership for building control and a new private company that will provide an ongoing return, while enhancing the Council’s reputation as one of the most forward thinking authorities in the U.K.

In order to have a delivery systems platform capable of supporting the planned growth of the Eastern Regional Building Control Partnership in 2014/15 Cabinet is asked to retrospectively approve the procurement of the supporting IT solution.

The Council is committed to increasing its commercial capability and entrepreneurial approach as a route to financial independence and that will involve taking risks to move quickly to service market opportunities. There is a slight risk, which is well mitigated, to procuring this solution now but the benefits both in terms of the deal obtained and maintaining the pace of development to stay ahead of the competition are significant.
Following the steer from the informal meeting of the Growth and Localism Committee on 11th March 2014 this report takes the preferred option for improving neighbourhood working and outlines proposed new Ground Rules to ensure the effective delivery of that option. Members are asked to endorse the preferred option and accompanying Grounds Rules and agree to recommend them to Cabinet.

Cabinet member(s):
Martin Wilby

Ward(s) affected:
All

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail:
Ian Lambert,
Tel: 01508 533943,
email: ilambert@s-norfolk.gov.uk

1. Background

1.1 Through the Localism Act, the Government aims to give power back to people and communities. The provisions of the Act are meant to reduce bureaucracy, remove barriers and make it easier for local authorities to work with their communities to make things better. The intention is that members and officers alike are able to have a positive view that we can do things, and ask ‘how can we make this happen?’ rather than the more negative, traditional view - ‘can we do this?’

1.2 South Norfolk Council has a long and successful track record of making things happen, but to take it a stage further, in February 2012, the Council approved plans to deliver community empowerment in South Norfolk, through Your Neighbourhood, Your Choice (YNYC). it took the bold step to set aside substantial sums of money from the Council budget, to provide funds for each of our five Neighbourhood Boards to allow local priorities to be agreed and action on those priorities implemented.

1.3 The main aim of YNYC was to encourage and enable communities, individuals and relevant organisations to shape their neighbourhood, by
developing the role of the Neighbourhood Boards to be agents for change and improvement in and for their communities.

1.4 Neighbourhood Boards were given a central role in identifying and delivering improvements to the quality of life in their communities - by becoming more active in consulting with the community, identifying local priorities and working with the communities to identify how best to achieve progress. However, their role as a catalyst in building capacity within communities has been limited – or at best mixed – and this is likely to become ever more important. Emphasis in the future needs to be less about structures and more about how local Members engage with their communities in an effective and meaningful way.

1.5 Whilst there have been some positive outcomes from Year One of YNYC, the emphasis on working creatively and in partnership to ensure that communities feel the benefits of growth has not been fully realised. Furthermore, it is at the heart of the Council’s approach to localism that initiatives funded through the allocation of New Homes Bonus (NHB) money should build sustainability into local communities and organisations. It is not intended that NHB money should provide ongoing revenue support.

2. Current Position and Issues

2.1 Consideration has now been given to how South Norfolk Council’s commitment to developing and engaging with communities within neighbourhoods can be further refined and enhanced based on lessons learned to date. The Council’s aim continues to be to act as a catalyst for community empowerment encouraging communities, individuals and relevant organisations to influence and improve service delivery in ways that more closely reflect local needs and increases social capital.

2.2 Analysing the lessons from YNYC has provided an opportunity to reflect on how we move forward. This will mean changes to our localism approach. The benefits of growth must still be shared across communities but there is now a greater emphasis on entrepreneurship, income generation, growing the economy and using that growth to ensure health and wellbeing and support to those that need it most. This recognises that the use of New Homes Bonus funding, must be fully focused on supporting all corporate priorities and not a discrete, stand-alone programme.

2.3 Joining up service delivery at a local level and growing existing or joining new partnerships are likely to be key transformational approaches going forward and are embodied in the Market Towns’ Initiative proposals.
While Neighbourhood Boards were intended to utilise their experience and knowledge to establish what the important issues are for local people, the emphasis in the future will be on identifying local initiatives that build capacity within communities and reduce demand on Council services. This is a key role for local Members and this report identifies a revised approach to how local Members can support their communities.

Four options were considered by an informal meeting of the Growth and Localism Committee on 11th March 2014. The four options were:

Option 1. To continue with the current Neighbourhood Board structure.

Option 2. To retain neighbourhood areas (but not Boards) with Neighbourhood “Chairmen” replacing the role of Board Chairman – with an allocated budget of £25,000 to manage.

Option 3. To decommission Neighbourhood Boards and neighbourhood areas and devolve very local budgets of £1,000 to each ward Member.

Option 4. Retain neighbourhood areas with “Chairmen” managing allocations of £25,000 in addition to local members being allocated £1,000 (this is a combination of options 2 and 3).

The Growth and Localism Committee concluded that option four should be progressed by officers and requested that further details be brought to a future meeting of the Committee.

As a result this proposal was presented to the Growth and Localism Committee on 15th April and was further considered as a pre-scrutiny item at Scrutiny Committee on 17th April. Both Committees considered the proposal in detail and agreed endorse the approach and recommend that Cabinet recommend it to Council for approval.

The proposal (Option 4) is as follows:
3.2 In place of Neighbourhood Boards it is proposed that a budget be devolved directly to Members in order to facilitate their role in community engagement. The objectives of such a scheme are to:

- Enhance effective community engagement
- Continue to build capacity within communities;
- Support locally responsive services;
- Stimulate local economic growth;
- Enable the Early Help agenda;
- Ensure all communities feel the benefit of growth;
- Provide flexibility and support to the role of the local Member.

3.3 Under this proposal the local, neighbourhood structure is retained by continuing with the existing Neighbourhood Areas with the following characteristics:

- Keeping neighbourhood board areas – with minor boundary revisions*;
- Retaining a Neighbourhood lead member or “Chairman” role within each Neighbourhood area;
- Taking advantage of existing structures, groups and organisations to deliver innovative solutions on the ground - rather than building new structures;
- Retaining the Neighbourhood Fund as this funding stream is now well recognised, understood and utilised.

*This boundary revision consists of transferring the villages of Ashwellthorpe, Fundenhall and Tacolneston to the Tas Valley Neighbourhood area from the Tiffey Valley Neighbourhood area.

3.4 The community leadership role of the Chairmen will be similar to the previous one and the roles and responsibilities are contained in Section 2 of the attached Ground Rules.

Community Action Fund

3.5 Under the proposal the Neighbourhood Chairmen will be responsible for the management of a budget with £25,000 being allocated to each of them per annum. This represents a total investment of £125,000 and will be known as the Community Action Fund.

3.6 The intention is that the Community Action Fund will allow Neighbourhood Chairmen, on behalf of local Members across South Norfolk, to respond flexibly and quickly to requests for funding that will empower local communities and build social capital.
3.7 The process for allocating funding will be considerably simplified with a much less formal, and Member-led application process. Nonetheless Chairmen will need to ensure transparency and accountability in respect of the distribution of public funds. The aims of the Fund are to:

- Build capacity within communities so that groups can be effective without ongoing financial support from the Council,
- Stimulate local economic growth, and
- Facilitate creative partnership approaches to helping people in need

3.8 The criteria for the Fund are contained in the Ground Rules, attached as an appendix to this report, at paragraphs 2.7 and the process for allocating funding is described in paragraph 2.10.

3.9 The third element to this proposal is the devolution of a small budget, or Member’s Ward Budget, of £1,000 to each Member of the Council.

3.10 In performing this role local members will be required to work with a range of partners and stakeholders including parish councils, local community groups, Town Teams, Local Action Groups, and County Councillors. The minimum commitments all members are expected to make are:

- To keep informed on key local issues and promote their community, and
- To be accessible to members of the community to act as a conduit and facilitator for local people and groups to provide information to the Neighbourhood Chairmen on local needs and issues

3.11 The aim of the Member’s Ward Budget is:

- to increase levels of community engagement at a very local level across the district;
- to allow flexible and timely funding of very small initiatives within communities which provide flexible solutions;
- to help communities help themselves
- to enhance the social, economic or environmental wellbeing of the community.

3.12 Members will be expected to demonstrate that they have undertaken a “ward walk” at least once per year and from which they have drawn evidence for the decisions they have taken about how to allocate their £1,000.

3.13 The criteria for the use of the Member’s Ward Budget are similar to those for the Community Action Fund except that the minimum payment that can be made through this scheme is £100. The Member
would be responsible for assessing, agreeing and evaluating each initiative against these criteria. The full criteria are contained in the Ground Rules.

3.14 The rationale for supporting the proposal is that it:

- Firmly positions local Members at the heart of community engagement
- Allows both strategic and very local interventions;
- Fosters close working between Neighbourhood Chairmen and local ward Member colleagues;
- Enhances working opportunities with key partners and groups within communities;
- Gives Members more options when working with communities to get schemes off the ground;
- Retains a monitoring role for Growth and Localism Committee.

Transparency and Accountability

3.15 One of the key characteristics of either the Community Action Fund or the Member’s Ward Budget is that the Members will be responsible for receiving, considering and proposing applications with minimal involvement from officers. Officers will have a minor residual role in the process and will maintain a log of each of these decisions.

3.16 Allocations of Ward Member funding will be reported each formal meeting of Growth and Localism Committee.

3.17 At the end of the first year of implementation the Scrutiny Committee will be asked to undertake a review of how the new arrangements are working, and whether they are delivering the outcomes contained in paragraph 3.3 above.

3.18 It is also recommended that each individual Member’s funding awards are displayed on the SNC website.

3.19 The process for allocating the Community Action Fund is contained within the Ground Rules (attached as an appendix) at paragraph 2.10 and those for the Members’ Ward Budget at paragraph 3.5.

Evidence of Schemes Elsewhere

3.20 There is evidence that devolved budgets to Members, in a range of configurations, are widespread across the Country. There are a
number of useful examples across the region. Three that are worthy of consideration are:

**Hertfordshire County Council** - each Member is allocated £10k, for applications that “promote the social, economic and environmental wellbeing”, there is a simple application form (available through the local Member), and applications are cleared by the Monitoring Officer. The current scheme has run since 2009.

**Suffolk County Council** – each Member is allocated £12k for proposals that “benefit the community”, there is a simple application form (available through the local Member) and this scheme has been running since 2000.

**Forest Heath District Council** – each Member is allocated £2.5k to “support grass roots community projects”, the onus is on Members to “apply” for funding with democratic services officers having a light touch overview to ensure compliance with the criteria. This scheme began in 2012/13.

In each of the three schemes identified above the breakdown of allocations by individual Members is readily available on the Councils’ websites.

4 **Other Options**

4.1 These were considered at the informal Growth and Localism Committee meeting on 11th March 2014.

4.2 There are other options in respect of the proposed Ground Rules, which Members are invited to put forward. Any amendments proposed must balance the need for flexibility and quick decisions with accountability for public money and reputation of the Council.

5 **Relevant Corporate Priorities**

Enhancing our quality of life and the environment we live in.

Promoting a thriving local economy.

Supporting communities to realise their potential.

Driving services through being businesslike, efficient and customer aware.
6. Implications and Risks

Risks

6.1 Devolving budgets directly to local Members will inherently carry risk around probity, a potential for a lack of consistency, adherence to corporate priorities, and potential conflicts of interest. However whichever approach is adopted it will be possible to build in safeguards which have been proposed in the draft Ground Rules.

7. Other Implications

Neighbourhood Fund

7.1 It is anticipated that the Neighbourhood Fund will continue to run in parallel with whichever of the above options are agreed. As outlined below the Neighbourhood Fund is now running efficiently with application turn-round times improving and the whole allocation committed in just eight months.

7.2 As part of the Funding Review requested by Cabinet on the 29th October 2012, a review of the Neighbourhood Fund was undertaken by the Funding Manager in 2013. Although the eligibility criteria remained largely unchanged, the Review highlighted a number of areas where improvements could be made including a simplified application process for applicants, more efficient processing of application and improved capturing of benefits.

7.3 As a result of Cabinet’s decision on the 7th May 2013, the Neighbourhood Fund was re-launched in July 2013 where key changes agreed by Cabinet on the 7th May included:

- Delegated decisions on grant applications would be taken by officers and the Grants Panel would be discontinued;
- The introduction of an online application form and detailed guidance for applicants;
- Grants awarded to be capped at £2,000 and
- Grants to be awarded on a first come first served basis.

These changes have resulted in a reduction of .75 fte officer time within the Communities Team and the elimination of any need for Democratic Services resource. The awards for 13/14 are as follows:
7.4 It may be necessary to revise the criteria for this Fund to ensure that they are comparable to the Community Action Fund and Member’s Ward Budgets in terms of simplicity and flexibility – although the Neighbourhood Funds’ ability to lever in 6x external funding is one of its key characteristics.

Communities Team

7.5 If it is agreed that the Neighbourhood Boards should be discontinued then it will be necessary to realign the role and structure of the Communities Team. This realignment is already under consideration as the role of the Team adjusts to meet the emerging themes highlighted in our Directorate Plans around Early Intervention, Health, Economic Growth and Commercialisation.

Constitution

7.6 The adoption of the new approach means that the Council’s Constitution will need to be revised by full Council for example to delete Neighbourhood Boards and introduce Neighbourhood Chairmen and devolved budgets to Members.

8. Conclusion

8.1 This report has highlighted the consideration that has been given to how South Norfolk Council’s commitment to developing and engaging with communities within neighbourhoods can be further refined and enhanced based on lessons learned to date. The Council’s aim continues to be to act as a catalyst for community empowerment encouraging communities, individuals and relevant organisations to
influence and improve service delivery in ways that more closely reflect local needs and increases social capital.

8.2 As a result of this work and following consideration by Members it is proposed that Neighbourhood Boards be disbanded but that Neighbourhood Chairmen remain with a similar community leadership remit and a budget of £25,000 to manage. The role of the local Member will also be enhanced through the allocation of £1,000 to each local Member.

9. Recommendation

9.1 Cabinet recommends to Council to agree:

- the implementation of the new way of neighbourhood working; and
- the adoption of the revised Ground Rules are adopted.
1. **Neighbourhood Working**

1.1 The Council has a long standing commitment to empowering people and organisations to do more to help communities throughout South Norfolk. The Council supports its members in meeting the ambitions of the community and identifying and delivering local solutions, which in turn support the Council’s corporate priorities:

- Enhancing our quality of life and the environment we live in;
- Promoting a thriving local economy;
- Supporting communities to realise their potential; and
- Driving services through being business-like, efficient and customer aware.

Through this commitment, the Council is also able to deliver its four themes:
- Public Health;
- Early Intervention;
- Economic development; and
- Commercialisation

1.2 All members and particularly the Neighbourhood Chairmen will take a central role in identifying and delivering improvements to the quality of life of people in their communities. The Chairmen will be expected to become more active in consulting with the community, identifying local needs and working with the communities to identify how best to achieve these needs.

1.3 This means combining and utilising all the experience, knowledge, skills and networks of the Chairmen and local members to understand what goes on in their communities and what the important issues are for local people, and to come up with innovative and effective solutions to make the necessary improvements.

1.4 The role of the Chairmen is to influence spend in the community, representing and reflecting on community priorities.

1.5 The key to effective community empowerment is strong community involvement. We want to ensure that the priorities of the Council and the priorities of local people and communities can be aligned wherever possible, and delivered upon.

2. **Role and Responsibilities of Neighbourhood Chairmen**

2.1 The main aim of the Council in appointing and supporting Neighbourhood Chairmen is to encourage and enable communities, individuals and relevant organisations to shape their neighbourhood, by the Chairmen
being agents for change and improvement in their communities. Neighbourhood Chairmen, have a vital role to play, working in and with their communities to identify important issues, develop potential solutions and influence outcomes to have a positive impact on the quality of life in the area.

2.2 The Chairmen will work closely with the Communities Team to understand what goes on in their communities, what the important issues are for local people, and to come up with innovative and effective solutions to make any necessary improvements. The Chairmen and a Locality Officer should be in contact on a weekly basis, at least.

2.3 The Chairmen must be able to harness the combined experience, knowledge, skills and networks of local Councillors, community leaders and parish and town councils for the benefit of the area. They will not be able to function effectively without working closely with other local Members and partners contributing. The Chairmen must facilitate good communication with and between all partners in the community.

2.4 The Chairmen will be responsible for the effective investment of the Community Action Fund within their area. The ground rules provide the framework for the Chairmen to identify opportunities that will make a real difference to their communities, and to work with the local community to deliver on agreed local priorities in the most appropriate and effective way.

2.5 In summary, the Neighbourhood Chairman should:

- be the Community Chairman for their Neighbourhood area
- provide clear leadership to ensure objectives and outcomes of the activities and projects funded are achieved in an effective and inclusive way
- be the focus for partnership working with other public, private, voluntary and community organisations to identify and address local needs
- lead the members within the Neighbourhood area in responding to the needs of local people and communities, seeking to minimise and resolve conflict
- co-ordinate neighbourhood activity, working in collaboration with officers
- work with officers to monitor performance and make improvements as required
- be accountable for the work funded within the Neighbourhood to the Council and to the community
2.6 There will be some initiatives which will require funding and to support
this, each Chairman will be responsible for the management of a budget.
Each Chairman has been allocated £25,000, meaning a total investment
of £125,000 per annum. The aims of this funding is to:

- build capacity within communities so that groups can be effective
  without ongoing financial support from the Council,

- stimulate local economic growth, and

- facilitate creative partnership approaches to helping people in need.

2.7 Each Chairman is responsible for receiving, considering and proposing
applications for funding from the allocated budget. The applications must
meet the following criteria:

i) The payment must be over £2,000 to differentiate this scheme
   from the existing Neighbourhood Fund;

ii) The funding will normally go to a community group, but may be
    awarded to social enterprises, businesses or other public
    agencies if the aims are being met - but NOT to an individual.

iii) The granting of the funding is a one-off and will not imply an
    ongoing commitment by the council nor have a revenue
    implication for the council;

iv) The activity being funded:

   a. Has not already taken place;
   b. Could not easily be funded elsewhere
   c. Can demonstrate support in the community
   d. Supports the Council’s corporate priorities
   e. Has not received Council funding over the past 12 months.

v) The project or activity promotes communities working together
   and does not unfairly discriminate against people from different
   backgrounds;

vi) The funding can be used by the community group during the 12
    months following receipt;

vii) The funding cannot be used to support any initiative more than
    once in a two year period;

viii) As far as the Member is aware, making the payment to the
     community group would not result in fraudulent or illegal activity
or any practices which would bring South Norfolk Council into disrepute. This would include ensuring that all recipients have any required permissions in place, including requisite insurance, and DBS checks if appropriate;

ix) The funding must not replace funding previously provided by other statutory agencies such as the County Council; and

x) Funding must not form part of the Parish precept.

2.8 In addition to satisfying the criteria above, Chairmen are encouraged to fund projects and activities that directly benefit at least two Wards within their neighbourhood area. This should assist the Chairmen to embed the neighbourhoods and feeling of community within them.

2.9 Funding can be used for new or existing projects and work carried out by community groups and other agencies within South Norfolk. Projects should support the Council's Directorate Plans and corporate priorities. Members should also be satisfied that the project or activity being funded would improve the community or enhance the quality of life for local residents. They should also be clear that it will promote sustainable development in the area (that is, it balances social, economic and environmental objectives and does not cause damage in any of these areas).

2.10 Clear process needs to be followed when allocating large amounts of public money, therefore the following procedures will be followed to administer the Chairmen fund:

a) It is the Chairman's responsibility to obtain sufficient information on which to base an application for funding. If the Chairman does not consider that project or activity fits the criteria or they do not wish to fund it, the Chairman should liaise directly with the organisation to inform them of their decision. Officers will not be involved in this preliminary stage.

b) Once the Chairman is satisfied that the project or activity fits the criteria and are happy to allocate their funding, they should aim to complete the application form in conjunction with the applicant(s). Two or more Chairmen wishing to support the same project or activity should fill in one application form and state clearly on the form how much funding should be allocated from each budget.

c) Completed application forms should be submitted to the Communities Team. Officers will check that applications meet the criteria and will liaise with other departments to ensure compliance with legislation governed by the Council, if applicable. Forms will be updated accordingly by officers depending on information obtained at this stage.

d) Officers will then refer the applications to members of the Growth and Localism Committee. Applications will be considered at the next Committee meeting if time allows, or will be considered via email.
e) Following feedback, the Director of Growth and Localism will consult with the Neighbourhood Chairman and the Portfolio holder, and will determine the level of funding, if any, to be allocated.

f) Officers will advise Chairmen of the outcome of their application. Chairman should then advise funding recipients and also those unsuccessful. The Chairmen should also requests organisations to advise them of the outcomes achieved, which will be published positively for SNC, by both the applicant and the Council.

g) All funding allocations and outcomes achieved will be made public on the Council's website and will be reported back to the Growth and Localism Committee and Scrutiny Committee through monitoring reports twice a year.

2.11 Neighbourhood Chairmen should make sure that the funded projects and activities are delivered as agreed. Where that is not the case, the Chairman, together with the Director of Growth and Localism will be responsible for resolving disputes and taking action, including withdrawal of funding where appropriate.

3. **Role and Responsibilities of Local Members**

3.1 The main aim of Neighbourhood working is to encourage and enable communities, individuals and relevant organisations to shape their neighbourhood. All members have a vital role to play, working in and with their communities to identify important issues, to help to develop potential solutions and to influence outcomes to have a positive impact on the quality of life in the area.

3.2 Members must be able to represent their local community, especially at neighbourhood level effectively. Members will be expected to maintain good liaison with the Chairmen and Officers, to ensure that communication is effective, and that they are able to make a strong contribution to work within the Neighbourhood.

The minimum commitments all members are expected to make are:

a. to keep informed on key local issues and promote their community; and

b. to be accessible to members of the community to act as a conduit and facilitator for local people and groups to provide information to the Neighbourhood Chairmen on local needs and issues.

3.3 Each member will be allocated a budget of £1,000 to:

- increase levels of community engagement at a very local level;
- allow flexible and timely funding of very small initiatives within communities which provide flexible and immediate solutions;
- help communities help themselves
enhance the social, economic or environmental wellbeing of the community.

3.4 Each member is responsible for approving applications for funding out of their budget. The applications must meet the following criteria:

i) The payment must be over £100 (set at 10% of the overall budget);

ii) The funding will normally go to a community group, but may be awarded to social enterprises, businesses or other public agencies if the aims are being met - but **NOT** to an individual.

iii) The granting of the funding is a one-off and will not imply an ongoing commitment by the council nor have a revenue implication for the council;

iv) The activity being funded:
   a. has not already taken place;
   b. Could not easily be funded elsewhere
   c. Can demonstrate support in the community
   d. Has not received Council funding over the past 12 months.

v) The project or activity enhances the quality of life of people living or working in the Ward and does not unfairly discriminate against people from different backgrounds;

vi) The funding can be used by the community group during the 12 months following receipt;

vii) The funding cannot be used to support any initiative more than once in a two year period.

viii) As far as the Member is aware, making the payment to the community group would not result in fraudulent or illegal activity or any practices which would bring South Norfolk Council into disrepute. This would include ensuring that all recipients have any required permissions in place, including requisite insurance, and DBS checks if appropriate.

ix) The funding must not replace funding previously provided by other statutory agencies such as the County Council.

x) Funding must not form part of the Parish precept.

3.5 The process involved in the Members’ Ward Budget is simplified when compared to that of the Chairman’s budget. Each member is responsible for assessing, agreeing and evaluating each initiative against these criteria. Each member must satisfy himself/herself that the funding of money would not bring the Council into disrepute or
result in fraudulent or illegal activity. Completed forms should be referred to the Director of Growth and Localism to authorise payment. The Director of Growth and Localism will not evaluate the merits of any payments; this is the responsibility of each member.

3.6 In performing this role local members will be expected to work with a range of partners and stakeholders including the Neighbourhood Chairmen, parish councils, local community groups, Town Teams, Local Action Groups, and County Councillors.

3.7 Members will be expected to undertake a “ward walk” at least once per year from which they will have drawn evidence for the decisions they make about how to allocate their £1,000.

3.8 Officers will submit a listing of the allocations made to the Growth and Localism Committee (in addition to publication on the Council’s website). This will allow all Chairmen to get an understanding of how the members’ Ward budgets are being spent throughout the Neighbourhoods and wider District.

4. Interests and Reputation of the Council

4.1 In addition to the processes above, any applications that members declare an interest in will be referred to the Monitoring Officer or Deputy Monitoring Officer. The Monitoring Officer or Deputy will make any comments as necessary to Officers. Applications that members have a pecuniary interest in cannot be accepted.

4.2 These Ground Rules set a criteria to develop some consistency. However as the purpose is to increase flexible and responsive local decision-making, members are encouraged to make quick, sound decisions in isolation.

4.3 members must be mindful that some in the community may not support some decisions and in these instances members may become more likely to receive allegations or complaints against them of misuse of public money.

4.4 This risk can be mitigated by each member:
   - Ensuring the criteria is followed
   - Sharing knowledge and information with other members
   - Considering the perception some people may have of a decision
   - Avoiding contentious decisions at sensitive times (eg, Purdah period)
   - Considering how a decision enhances, not detracts, from South Norfolk Council’s reputation.

5. Identifying projects/activities and other funding streams
5.1 Neighbourhood Chairmen and local members are responsible for identifying projects and activities to be funded by the appropriate funding source.

5.2 Members should ensure that relevant community groups are aware of this funding is available and assist if the activity or project they wish to be funded would be more appropriately funded from another source (including other Council funding schemes). Details of both schemes will be available on the council’s website.

5.3 Members (including Chairmen) should liaise with each other in order to discuss possible pooling of resources for those activities or projects that benefit more than one Ward or Neighbourhood. In these instances, applications for funding from more than one budget can be made on one form (however it should be clearly stated how much should be funded from each budget). Members should also encourage community groups to approach other members and/or Chairmen in order to secure additional funding if applicable. Community Action Fund and Members Ward budgets may not be pooled together.

5.4 Members should seek to assist organisations in securing funding from other sources if their application does not fit the criteria of either funding schemes or they require additional funds. Advice may be sought from Officers and/or the Funding Manager.

6. Finance

6.1 All spend will be subject to sufficient funds in the specific budget. Each budget will be managed by the Ward member (£1,000) or Chairman (£25,000).

6.2 As stated in the criteria for both funding schemes, funding will not be paid to individuals. For un-constituted bodies that wish to obtain funding from these budgets, they should consider the following:
   a) opening a business account relating to the activity;
   b) collaborating with a local organisation that would meet the funding criteria; and
   c) requesting that the Council purchase an item or service directly on behalf of the organisation.

Members should advise and assist Groups to ensure that one of the above is met if they only have individual bank accounts available.

6.3 Officers will report regularly to the Growth and Localism Committee on budgets, spend and projections. The Council will incorporate those reports into its financial and performance management and reporting arrangements.

6.4 Budget carry forwards will be allowed, subject to a maximum of half the budget allocation – this applies to both the Community Action Fund and the Members’ Ward budget. Any additional underspends should be brought back to the Council.
Community Action Fund Application Form

Please complete this form electronically where possible. If you have any queries please refer to the guidance appended to this form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor’s Name:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yyyy):</td>
<td>/ /</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of group requiring funding:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of application:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you attached supporting evidence?</th>
<th>☐ Yes</th>
<th>☐ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>If no, please send in via post or email.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of the Council’s priorities does your application address?</th>
<th>☐ Enhancing the quality of life and the environment</th>
<th>☐ Promoting a thriving economy</th>
<th>☐ Supporting communities to realise their potential</th>
<th>☐ Being business-like, efficient and customer aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How does your application meet this priority?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Cost of the project:</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there any match-funding available?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>If yes, please state source:</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much is required from your Locality Budget?</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does the award comply with appropriate Criteria?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where appropriate, the goods/equipment will be sourced at the best available price and supplied to the organisation via the procurement process.

### Organisation details

**Please note:** payments will only be made to the organisation applying for the funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation’s bank account details:</th>
<th>Account number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sort code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Account name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed by organisation | Date | / | / |

By signing you commit to use the funds for the purpose stated on this form.
# Declaration of Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have an other interest in this organisation?</th>
<th>☐ Yes ☐ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>If yes, please supply further information:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have a disclosable pecuniary interest in this organisation?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>If yes, please supply further information:</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed by Councillor</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed by Director</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please save this document to your computer and send to: communities@s-norfolk.gov.uk

## Admin use only

**Cost Centre:**
The applications must meet the following criteria:

i) The payment must be over £2,000 to differentiate this scheme from the existing Neighbourhood Fund;

ii) The funding will normally go to a community group, but may be awarded to social enterprises, businesses or other public agencies if the aims are being met - but NOT to an individual;

iii) The granting of the funding is a one-off and does not imply an ongoing commitment by the council or have a revenue implication for the council;

iv) The activity being funded:
   a. Has not already taken place;
   b. Could not easily be funded elsewhere
   c. Can demonstrate support in the community
   d. Supports the Council’s corporate priorities
   e. Has not received Council funding over the past 12 months.

v) The project or activity promotes communities working together and does not unfairly discriminate against people from different backgrounds;

vi) The funding can be used by the community group during the 12 months following receipt;

vii) The funding cannot be used to support any initiative more than once in a two year period;

viii) As far as the Member is aware, making the payment to the community group would not result in fraudulent or illegal activity or any practices which would bring South Norfolk Council into disrepute. This would include ensuring that all recipients have any required permissions in place, including requisite insurance, and DBS checks if appropriate;

ix) The funding must not replace funding previously provided by other statutory agencies such as the County Council; and

x) Funding must not form part of the Parish precept.
Members’ Ward Budget Application Form

Please complete this form electronically where possible. If you have any queries please refer to the guidance appended to this form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor’s Name:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date (dd/mm/yyyy):            / /</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of group requiring funding:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of application:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Cost of the project:</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there any match-funding available?</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If yes, please state source:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much is required from your Locality Budget?</th>
<th>£</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How does the award comply with appropriate Criteria?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Where appropriate, the goods/equipment will be sourced at the best available price and supplied to the organisation via the procurement process.
**Organisation details**

**Please note**: payments will only be made to the organisation applying for the funding.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation’s bank account details:</th>
<th>Account number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sort code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Account name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone number:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed by organisation</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By signing you commit to use the funds for the purpose stated on this form.

**Declaration of Interest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have an other interest in this organisation?</th>
<th>☐ Yes ☐ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>If yes, please supply further information:</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have a disclosable pecuniary interest in this organisation?</th>
<th>☐ Yes ☐ No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>If yes, please supply further information:</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signed by Councillor</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please save this document to your computer and send to: communities@s-norfolk.gov.uk

Admin use only
Cost Code:
Criteria

i) The payment must be over £100 (set at 10% of the overall budget);

ii) The funding will normally go to a community group, but may be awarded to social enterprises, businesses or other public agencies if the aims are being met - but NOT to an individual.

iii) The granting of the funding is a one-off and does not imply an ongoing commitment by the council or have a revenue implication for the council;

iv) The activity being funded:
   a. has not already taken place;
   b. Could not easily be funded elsewhere
   c. Can demonstrate support in the community
   d. Has not received Council funding over the past 12 months.

v) The project or activity enhances the quality of life of people living or working in the Ward and does not unfairly discriminate against people from different backgrounds;

vi) The funding can be used by the community group during the 12 months following receipt;

vii) The funding cannot be used to support any initiative more than once in a two year period.

viii) As far as the Member is aware, making the payment to the community group would not result in fraudulent or illegal activity or any practices which would bring South Norfolk Council into disrepute. This would include ensuring that all recipients have any required permissions in place, including requisite insurance, and DBS checks if appropriate.

ix) The funding must not replace funding previously provided by other statutory agencies such as the County Council.

x) Funding must not form part of the Parish precept.
Long Stratton Area Action Plan: Exploration of the potential use of compulsory purchase powers for land at Long Stratton

Planning Policy Manager

As part of the Local Plan for South Norfolk, the Council is preparing an Area Action Plan (AAP) for Long Stratton to bring forward the growth identified in the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS). There may be benefits in the Council exercising its powers of compulsory purchase to help implement the Local Stratton AAP, in particular the land needed to deliver the bypass and the minimum 1,800 dwellings. Cabinet is therefore asked to authorise work to explore the case for compulsory purchase in more detail.

Cabinet member(s): John Fuller
Ward(s) affected: Long Stratton, Tharston and Hapton

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail: Adam Nicholls, Planning Policy Manager, 01508 533809, anicholls@s-norfolk.gov.uk

1. Background

The Long Stratton Area Action Plan

1.1. There has been a decades-long campaign to secure a bypass for Long Stratton. The rise in traffic volumes and congestion in the village, and the associated environmental impacts and safety concerns, have a detrimental impact on Long Stratton, and also cause frustration to road users passing through Long Stratton on the A140 (which is the principal road connecting Norfolk and Suffolk).

1.2. Following the lapse of planning permission of the permitted dual carriageway scheme a few years ago, it has been agreed through the adopted Joint Core Strategy that the most certain way of delivering the bypass would be through a development-led solution. The emerging Long Stratton Area Action Plan (AAP) will allocate at least 1,800 homes (with other elements such as employment land and town centre improvements) to ensure the delivery of a bypass for Long Stratton.

1.3. Since the close of the Preferred Options consultation, officers have been preparing the Pre-Submission version of the AAP. In order for the AAP to be considered ‘sound’ at the independent Examination, it must be demonstrated that the proposals contained within are viable and deliverable. The Pre-Submission version of the AAP will be considered by Cabinet in June 2014.
1.4. It is accepted in the emerging AAP that the cost of delivering the bypass (a total of about £20m) would be split broadly 50:50 between the landowners/developers and the public purse. Various sources of public funding could be used to fund the second half of the costs, including Community Infrastructure Levy monies and using the borrowing capabilities offered through the Greater Norwich City Deal.

Compulsory purchase powers

1.5. The compulsory purchase powers vested in local authorities through Section 226 (1) of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act (as amended) are broad in their extent. In essence, they enable local authorities to compulsorily purchase (through a Compulsory Purchase Order, or CPO) land within their administrative area that they conclude is necessary to deliver development “which it is necessary to achieve in the interests of the proper planning of an area in which the land is situated”. “Proper planning” in essence means that the development must contribute to the achievement of the promotion or achievement of the economic and/or social and/or environmental well-being of the local authority’s area.

1.6. The main benefit to the Council of a Compulsory Purchase Order, if granted by the Secretary of State, is that it transfers legal ownership of all the land within the CPO area to the local authority. This eliminates difficulties and delays which can be caused in seeking to demonstrate the legal ownership of unregistered land, or when it proves extremely difficult/impossible to track down the owner(s) of land (whether that land is registered or unregistered).

1.7. Policy 20 of the Joint Core Strategy (Implementation) recognises that the use of CPO powers will be exercised where appropriate, stating that (inter alia): “Local Planning Authorities and the County Council will make use, where necessary, of their legal powers to bring about strategically significant development, including compulsory purchase”.

2. Current Position and Issues

2.1. Negotiations between the main Long Stratton landowners and potential development partners to demonstrate the deliverability of the housing and bypass are well advanced, but supporting information on a few key points necessary to enable the AAP to progress to the Pre-Submission stage has yet to be secured.

2.2. Officers are of the initial view that there would appear to be a good case that a CPO application to secure land to deliver the strategic aims of the AAP (including the bypass, 1,800 homes, employment land and other elements too) would be granted by the Secretary of State. As land is within a number of separate ownerships, a CPO would also minimise the risk of any ransom situations arising between the different landowners, thus providing greater certainty of timely delivery of the aims of the AAP.

3. Proposal and reasons

3.1. It is proposed that, if Cabinet agrees the principle that the use of compulsory purchase powers could be considered to help deliver the objectives and aims of the Long Stratton Area Action Plan, officers would undertake some more detailed work into the basic elements of the compulsory purchase process with specific
reference to the Long Stratton situation. The main advantages and disadvantages of the approach would be listed, along with likely costs and timescales of the various different options, with a recommendation of whether to commence the CPO procedure or not. This work will be reported back to Cabinet on 16 June 2014, the same date that the Pre-Submission version of the AAP will also be considered by Cabinet.

3.2. For the avoidance of doubt, it is not being asserted that the objectives of the Long Stratton AAP can only be delivered through the grant of a CPO. However, it is believed that there is considerable merit in the CPO procedure in the specific context of the AAP and that further work should be undertaken as a matter of urgency to inform the Pre-Submission version of the AAP.

4. Other options

4.1. It could be decided not to instruct officers to investigate the CPO process in relation to the Long Stratton AAP. However, as a brief piece of work, incurring relatively little cost, this is not recommended

5. Relevant Corporate Priorities

5.1. Enhancing our quality of life and the environment we live in.

5.2. Promoting a thriving local economy.

5.3. Supporting communities to realise their potential.

6. Implications and Risks

6.1. Financial – There are numerous cost implications arising out of the use of CPO powers including administrative costs, legal costs, compensation costs and inquiry costs. However, the commencement of a CPO would not be made unless and until Cabinet has formally resolved at the meeting on 16 June 2014 to approve the principle of the exercise of the Council’s compulsory purchase powers.

6.2. Legal – There is a requirement in the adopted JCS (Policies 9 and 10) for the Council to develop a Long Stratton AAP to set out detailed development proposals for the village.

6.3. Section 226(1) of the Town and Planning Act 1990 (as amended) enables the compulsory acquisition of land. These powers provide a positive tool to help acquiring authorities with planning powers to assemble land where this is necessary to implement the proposals in their Local Plan. Under these powers, an acquiring authority can acquire land compulsorily for the purposes of development, redevelopment or improvement, or, if it is considered that the land is required for a purpose which it is necessary to achieve in the interests of the proper planning of an area in which the land is situated.

6.4. Environmental – The AAP offers opportunities to maximise the local and wider environmental gains from development in Long Stratton.
6.5. **Equalities** – An Equalities Impact Assessment for the AAP is in preparation. All consultation to date has complied with equalities legislation.

6.6. **Risks** – In not exploring the use of compulsory purchase powers, the Council may run the risk of not considering appropriately a vehicle which might offer advantages in seeking to implement the AAP’s core objectives.

7. **Conclusion**

7.1. A rapid investigation of the use of compulsory purchase powers in relation to Long Stratton, reporting back to Cabinet on 16 June 2014, is recommended as a prudent and pragmatic course of action, to better inform Cabinet and Council of the options for the Pre-Submission version of the Area Action Plan.

8. **Recommendation**

8.1. Cabinet is recommended to:

   a) instruct the Director of Growth and Localism to explore the principle and effectiveness of using compulsory purchase powers to help implement the aims and objectives of the Long Stratton Area Action Plan (including the bypass and at least 1,800 homes); and

   b) agree to a detailed report to the next meeting of Cabinet (16 June 2014) giving details of the legal, financial and timescale implications for the Council of compulsorily purchasing of land in Long Stratton and recommending a course of action for the Council to take.
Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) providing Guidance for the Delivery of a ‘Food and Agriculture Hub for Broadland and South Norfolk’

Planning Policy Manager

| Policy 5 of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk refers to the development of a flagship food and farming hub serving the needs of Norfolk. In 2013 South Norfolk and Broadland District Councils produced and consulted on a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for assessing Food Hub proposals. The SPD sets out the types of uses that would be appropriate as part of a food and farming hub and the principles that would be used to test any planning applications that come forward for such uses. Following the outcomes of the consultation, this report highlights some suggested changes to the SPD, principally concerning the mix of uses and the scale of proposals, plus some changes to add clarity. The Public Participation Statement concerning the consultation is attached as Appendix A and the proposed final SPD is attached as Appendix B. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cabinet member(s):</th>
<th>Ward(s) affected:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Fuller</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail: Simon Marjoram 01503 533810 smarjoram@s-norfolk.gov.uk

1. **Background**

1.1. The concept of a Food Hub has developed from initial proposals in the 2006 feasibility study prepared for Shaping Norfolk’s Future. The study supported the concept of a cluster of uses utilising proximity to existing research and educational establishments, in order to support a step change in the capacity of local producers.

1.2. Policy 5 (The Economy) of the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) refers to the development of a flagship food and farming hub for Norfolk. The supporting text to Policy 5 notes that this would allow ‘local producers’ to ‘coordinate activity and access larger markets’. The JCS also refers to the potential relocation of Norwich livestock market to the food hub.

1.3. In July 2013 the Government Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) published the ‘UK Strategy for Agricultural Technologies’, which looks to ‘develop the opportunities and strengths of the UK agri-tech sector’. The constituent elements of the agri-tech sector encompass ‘public and private sector agricultural research through the supply chain spanning seeds, agro-chemicals, machinery, engineering and other inputs across arable and livestock agriculture,
horticulture, and food processing and packaging’. Food and life sciences are already strongly represented in the Norwich area, specifically at the Norwich Research Park which is used as an example in the BIS report. Consequently, agri-tech is also considered an important potential element of the food and agriculture hub.

1.4. In September 2013 the ‘Norfolk Rural Development Strategy (2013-2020)’ was published, prepared by a Steering Group supported by Norfolk County Council. The strategy states that ‘food processing would add value to Norfolk farm output & create high value jobs, particularly if linked to improved logistics and marketing through a Norfolk Food Hub’. The Food Hub is also referred to in the New Anglia Strategic Economic Plan, which was submitted to Government on 1 April 2014.

1.5. The Cabinet meeting of 7 May 2013 agreed a consultation draft version of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to guide proposals for a Food and Agriculture Hub. The consultation draft, which was produced jointly with Broadland District Council, was deliberately not location specific, as the final SPD will be a material consideration when assessing planning applications wherever they might be made across the two districts. The draft SPD does not create new planning policy, but supplements JCS Policy 5. It sets out the main considerations to be applied to any proposals relating to (1) Location, (2) Scale and Design, and (3) Uses. Amongst other things the SPD requires proposals to be close to areas of populations and establishments (e.g. education, training and research institutions) with links to the food and farming sector and with good access to the main road network and public transport links. Proposals should be appropriate in scale and design and should not undermine established retail centres or strategic employment locations. Specific justification will need to be given for the floorspace of the specific primary and secondary uses proposed in any application.

1.6. Consultation on the draft SPD took place between 11 October and 9 December 2013. 25 responses were received, which are detailed in the Public Participation Statement attached as Appendix A. The Appendix sets out the background to the SPD, who was consulted, how the consultation was undertaken, the level of response and a summary of issues raised and, where appropriate, how the Council proposes to amend the SPD in the light of those representations; Appendix 1 of the Statement sets out the full list of representations and responses.’

2. Current Position and Issues

2.1. Broadly responses to the draft SPD were supportive of the document, with only one outright objection from a local resident concerned about a specific proposal put forward for a potential food hub development in the vicinity of Easton/Honingham Thorpe.

2.2. However, a number of issues were raised about the detailed content of the document. These are summarised in the following table, extracted from Section 7 of the Public Participation Statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>How the main issue are addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
<td>The JCS does not set a specific scale for the food hub, and the precise size</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of Scale would be dependent on a number of factors (such as infrastructure capacity, characteristics of the area, proposed mix of uses, market demands and viability). Consequently, it is accepted that the SPD should not suggest an overall limit to the scale of a food hub development. However, a specific proposal would need to be fully justified as acceptable through the planning application process.

Proposals should be based on an overall masterplan demonstrating how identified needs will be met. Given the difficulty of predicting future needs in the long-term, it is expected that a development will be done in phases with the scale and uses in each phase reflecting the identified needs at that time, but having regard to the need to make provision for necessary infrastructure and give flexibility for a development. An indicative scale for an initial phase of up to 10 ha is suggested.

Clarification of vision

The overarching policy is set out in the JCS, including supporting text that explains the role of the food hub; this is included in the SPD in Appendix 1. It is not the role of the SPD to redefine this.

Appropriate use/mix of uses

Whilst the JCS is not specific about the uses that might be included as part of a food hub, the hub is identified separately from the strategic employment allocations in the NPA precisely because it is intended to fulfil a particular role. As such, the range of uses needs to be limited to agriculture and food, but allowing for the various elements of the industry. In this respect, consideration needs to be given to the importance of “adding value” to the agricultural produce, as identified in the economic strategies.

Also, the case is strongly put forward that the market demand is for locations where a greater variety of functions can be accommodated within one site. Consequently, the list of primary uses is extended to include agri-tech, processing of agricultural produce and manufacture of food products.

Transport

The SPD is deliberately not specific about the potential location of a Food Hub, but instead sets out a range of criteria. One of those criteria is good access to the main road network, and the document specifies those routes most likely to be suitable. Existing development sites, including new allocations to meet the JCS (or other Local Plans) requirements will need to be taken into account when assessing the implications of a Food Hub proposal.

Other

A number of other suggestions for amendments were considered, including mentioning the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, highway improvements outside the district, and climate change, but these are not seen as necessary or appropriate for inclusion in the SPD, other than a minor factual change to insert “existing” before “food and agricultural sector” in the final sentence of 3.1(1). However a change to the text to emphasise that the SPD needs to be read in the context of other national and local planning documents is proposed.

3. Proposal and Reasons

3.1. In response to the consultation it is proposed to make the following changes:

- Change to the first sentence of paragraph 3.1 to emphasise that the SPD needs to be read and applied in the context of other national and local Policies including the JCS and other Local Plan documents of the respective authorities;
• The last sentence of section 3.1 (2) to read ‘proposals should be based on an overall masterplan demonstrating how identified needs will be met. Given the difficulty of predicting future needs in the long-term, it is expected that a development will be done in phases with the scale and uses in each phase reflecting the identified needs at that time, but having regard to the need to make provision for necessary infrastructure and give flexibility for a development. An indicative scale for an initial phase of up to 10 ha is suggested.’

• In order to ensure proposals reflect the nature and purpose of a food hub, add to the following to the opening part of section 3.1 (3) ‘to represent a food and agriculture hub, proposals/applications should cover a range of uses and scales and not be limited to one or two users or type of use.’

• In order to reflect the market demand for development which facilitates a range of processes at a single location, the following are moved from ancillary uses to primary uses: ‘Agri-tech businesses which make use of the local agri-science base; Processing of agricultural produce; Manufacture of food products.’

• Given the added requirement in the third bullet point above for a range of uses and scales, delete the reference in 3.1(3) to large-scale food manufacture/processing being unsuitable.

3.2. A copy of the SPD incorporating the above changes is attached as Appendix B.

3.3. The SPD will be adopted by both South Norfolk Council and Broadland District Council, and the adoption process will occur after the Broadland’s June Council meeting.

4. Other Options

4.1. Not to develop an SPD. However, no allocations for a food hub have been included in the submission version of the South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document (or the emerging Broadland equivalent). Given the potentially large-scale and specialist nature of a food and agriculture hub a joint SPD produced under JCS Policy 5 provides the opportunity to deal with proposal on their merits against existing national and local planning policies, whilst providing greater clarity for landowners, developers, the public and other interested bodies.

5. Relevant Corporate Priorities

5.1. Promoting a thriving local economy. The SPD is intended to guide and facilitate proposals for a food and agriculture hub which is part of supporting the rural economy and rural diversification in the JCS area and could help facilitate considerable investment in the area.

6. Implications and Risks

6.1. Legal - the final, adopted SPD would be a material consideration in determining planning applications for food and agriculture hub proposals.

6.2. Environmental - The SPD offers opportunities to address the environmental issues related to potential proposals for a food and agriculture hub.
7. **Conclusion**

7.1. An SPD providing ‘Guidance for the Delivery of a Food and Agriculture Hub for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk’ is seen as the most appropriate way to help guide and evaluate proposals in a consistent way across the JCS area. As such it is proposed to adopt on the SPD attached as Appendix B.

8. **Recommendation**

8.1. That the ‘Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) providing Guidance for the Delivery of a Food and Agriculture Hub for Broadland and South Norfolk’ attached as Appendix B be agreed for adoption by the Council.
Public Participation Statement for the Draft Food and Agriculture Hub

April 2014

Regulation 12 (a) Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

April 2014

1. Introduction,

This Public Participation Statement sets out how South Norfolk Council and Broadland District Council have engaged and consulted with the public on the Food Hub Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in accordance with Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and the adopted Statements of Community Involvement (SCI).

This Statement sets out the background to the SPD and the evidence used for in developing the 2013 draft.

Following preparation of the draft SPD, this Statement also summarises the comments made during the statutory public consultation (October to December 2013), plus subsequent supporting information received in respect of one particular proposals, after the consultation period.

2. Purpose of the SPD

The principle of developing a Food Hub has been set in the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS). JCS Policy 5 (The Economy) refers to the development of a flagship food and farming hub serving the needs of Norfolk. The supporting text of the policy notes that this would allow local produces to “co-ordinate activity and access larger markets”, provide a focus for ancillary supporting business and suppliers, and an opportunity for the relocation of the livestock market from its current site within Norwich.

This SPD provides further detail on the main criteria for assessing any proposals, including the mix of uses, locational criteria and the expected scale of proposals.

3. Pre-production background

In 2006 a feasibility study was undertaken on behalf of Shaping Norfolk’s Future into the prospects for a Food Hub. The study identified a possible range of supportive enterprises, both infrastructure and knowledge based, which are needed to help achieve “a step change in the scale of the potential market for local producers”. As such the study supported the concept of a cluster of users that could be located in the Norwich area, utilising proximity to existing research and educational establishments.
The need for a food and farming hub serving the needs of Norfolk was identified in the JCS and reflected in Policy 5 and the supporting text. The concept was to allow "local producers to co-ordinate activity and access larger markets, provide a focus for ancillary supporting businesses and suppliers, as well as having the potential to relocate Norwich Livestock Market.

During 2011/12 proposals for a food hub at Honingham/Easton were put forward as part of the process of developing the South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations and Policies document. Because the proposals straddled the district boundary, included a range of uses that the Council did not consider appropriate for a food hub and was of a scale beyond what was envisaged as a hub for local producers, the decision was taken by South Norfolk Council not to support allocation of the site.

In 2012 the Government consulted on “Shaping a UK Strategy for Agri-tech” (BIS, October 2012), which highlighted the need to support innovation which builds on the scientific research and development in food and life sciences. Food and life sciences are strongly represented in the Norwich area, specifically at the Norwich Research Park. Consequently the SPD seeks to include the facilitation of agri-tech uses as part of the food and agriculture hub. In July 2013 the Government published the ‘UK Strategy for Agricultural Technologies’.

In September 2013 Norfolk County Council published the Norfolk Rural Development Strategy. This sets out the strategy for the future economic growth of the rural area. The long-term focus is on four key areas, including “Agriculture and the food chain” such as adding value to food by processing and marketing; creating new technology to increase agricultural productivity. In addition, “more food processing would add value to Norfolk farm output & create high value jobs, particularly if linked to improved logistics and marketing through a Norfolk Food Hub”; and “developing a Norfolk Food Hub to add value to Norfolk’s food and farming sector as the demand for provenance increases strongly in food markets”. Consequently, an identified priority is:

“Food Hub - the proposed Norfolk Food Hub could add significant value to the Norfolk agri-food chain through its focus on adding value to Norfolk production, improving logistics and providing a shop window to promote Norfolk food and drink nationally “.

More recently, in January 2014, the New Anglia Local Economic Partnership published its draft Strategic Economic Plan which contains similar objectives to the Norfolk Rural Development Strategy, including the proposed Food Hub.

4. Consultation on the Draft SPD

The draft SPD was approved by South Norfolk Cabinet for consultation on 7 May 2013 by and the 20 March 2013 Place Shaping Committee at Broadland District Council.
The representation period took place between Friday 11 October and 5pm, Monday 9th December 2013. The Consultation invited comments from a broad mix of people including: those on the council’s database, comprising the specific and general consultation bodies (including town and parish councils), as identified in the SCIs, as well as a range of planning and land agents who have promoted larger scale sites to the two authorities, and other bodies representing the food and agriculture sectors.

The consultation was also published on both South Norfolk Council’s website and Broadland Council’s website.

Methods of communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication method</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-mails and letters</td>
<td>Letters (sent as an e-mail attachment where possible) to: all statutory (specific) consultees; a wide range of planning and land agents; specialist interest bodies (e.g. National Farmers Union, Royal Norfolk Agricultural Association, Country Land and Business Association, Federation of Small Businesses, Norfolk Chamber of Commerce and the Local Enterprise Partnership); and all elected members and parish and town councils across the two districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>All consultation information was displayed on dedicated pages of the South Norfolk Council and Broadland Council websites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking to Officers</td>
<td>Officers were available to deal with enquiries in person or over the phone during normal working hours, with specific contact details included in the consultation letter and on the website.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How many representatives were received?

During the 8 Weeks consultation, responses were received from 25 individuals and organisations. 7 of which were specific consultation bodies and 18 from general consultation bodies and landowners.

Of the 25 consultation responses received:

- 15 supported the concept of the Food Hub and the SPD; however, of these many sought amendments and 2 strongly objected to the “current wording” of the SPD;
- 9 neither support or object
- 1 objects outright.

A further 17 letters of support from local businesses and endorsements from potential end users and interested parties were submitted by the proposers of the Honingham/Easton site in support of their representations. These were supplemented by a further 12 letters received after the consultation period.
6. Summary of the main issues raised during the consultation

The overarching general comment was one of strong support for the concept of the SPD and Food and Farming Hub with many respondents qualifying support with some specific wording changes. Below is a short summary of the main issues raised, full summary list of consultation responses is contained in Appendix 1

6.1. Support for the SPD

The vast majority of respondents supported the concept and the benefits a food hub could bring to the regional economy and agricultural sector; however most suggested amendments in a number of areas, to allow greater flexibility. Most responses were general in nature, covering similar points of support. The notable exception was the detailed submission provided by Lanpro on behalf of Honingham Thorpe Farms, who provided detailed consideration and justifications for suggested changes to the SPD. Previously Honingham Thorpe Farms have proposed a specific scheme for a Food Hub, extending from their existing business units towards Easton village. Whilst the information relating to this proposal was provided as part of the support for their representation, the majority of their response dealt with general principles of scale.

6.2. Consideration of Scale

A significant number of representors (particularly Lanpro/Honingham Thorpe Farms and those supporting their position) questioned the need for the size threshold/restriction of 10ha for a first phase of the Food Hub. The reasons put forward varied but were all around the same theme of allowing economic growth, through market forces and included:

- The size should depend on the viability and the provision of a comprehensive and sustainable development which supports efficiency and does not undermine the projects viability;
- The threshold is unrelated to known market;
- Should be scope to develop in an integrated way, unconstrained at a scale to allow for market certainty;
- Allow uses room for expansion;
- Concerns that large scale business may not locate there if the land supply was constrained through policy

Other general comments thought that scale should be appropriate, sustainable and consistent with local dynamics.

6.3. Clarification of vision

Some representors mainly from Town and Parish councils, as well as one neighbouring planning authority thought the SPD was vague, lacked ambition and needed to give a further steer on suitable locations and or criteria used for guiding/selecting a suitable site. The wider market demands and growth
trends should be recognised in the vision along with “precise” definitions for large scale food manufacturing / processing.

6.4. Appropriate Use / mix of uses

The majority supported the concept but raised concerns regarding the intended mix of uses. A strong business case (theme) was put forward by many representors of the food and agricultural industries as well as individual companies for a greater flexibility in uses. The SPD should promote uses to reflect growth sectors and added value sectors and demonstrate more flexibility in the prescribed uses. There were a number of suggestions put forward:

a) That the SPD should not be prescriptive and there should be no distinctions between primary and ancillary uses. Flexibility must be applied to allow the most efficient growth to maximise jobs.

b) There should be a focus on higher value activities with integration of other uses such as education. The issue is that much of Norfolk’s agricultural produce is “exported” and added value is lost to another region was put forward for justification that the permitted uses should include increased food processing facilities along with research and development opportunities and supportive logistics.

c) That the SPD should reflect market demand and economic growth opportunities and be market focused, maximising / retaining value in the Norfolk economy and job creation at the same time as promoting Norfolk’s Food and Drink industry through retail outlets, research and development and educational opportunities.

A re-occurring theme in the representations by the major promoters of a potential food hub was that it is essential that the Food Hub SPD promotes added value agri-food business alongside associated logistics and wholesaling to gain economies of scale and retain “added value” in Norfolk while capitalising on the current and future growth in the food processing sectors. Primary uses should be amended to reflect food processing and associated logistics, wholesaling and educational potential. Secondary uses should be to encourage agricultural support industry including agricultural equipment, machinery, veterinary services and offices to support the primary functions.

6.5. Transport

Some respondents raised the issue of impact of development on junction capacity while others linked impacts to the cumulative effects of growth and wider cross boundary network impacts. Others noted that the location should be on major transport routes and that the location should build on and reflect existing highway improvement priorities. Some expressed a preference for links to the A47, others the A140/ A11 adding a regional dimension to the location.
7. How have the main issues of members of the public been addressed in the emerging SPD?

The following table lists the suggested changes in response to the four main areas in 6.2 to 6.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Issue</th>
<th>How the main issue are addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of Scale</td>
<td>The JCS does not set a specific scale for the food hub, and the precise size would be dependent on a number of factors (such as infrastructure capacity, characteristics of the area, proposed mix of uses, market demands and viability). Consequently, it is accepted that the SPD should not suggest a limit to the scale of a food hub development. A specific proposal would need to be fully justified as acceptable through the planning application process. Proposals should be based on an overall masterplan demonstrating how identified needs will be met. Given the difficulty of predicting future needs in the long-term, it is expected that a development will be done in phases with the scale and uses in each phase reflecting the identified needs at that time, but having regard to the need to make provision for necessary infrastructure and give flexibility for a development. An indicative scale for an initial phase of up to 10 ha is suggested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of vision</td>
<td>The overarching policy is set out in the JCS, including supporting text that explains the role of the food hub; this is included in the SPD in Appendix 1. It is not the role of the SPD to redefine this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate Use / mix of uses</td>
<td>Whilst the JCS is not specific about the uses that might be included as part of a food hub, the hub is identified separately from the strategic employment allocations in the NPA precisely because it is intended to fulfil a particular role. As such, the range of uses needs to be limited to agriculture and food, but allowing for the various elements of the industry. In this respect, consideration needs to be given to the importance of “adding value” to the agricultural produce, as identified in the economic strategies. Also, the case is strongly put forward that the market demand is for locations where a greater variety of functions can be accommodated within one site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consequently, the list of primary uses is extended to include agri-tech, processing of agricultural produce and manufacture of food products.

| Transport | The SPD is deliberately not specific about the potential location of a Food Hub, but instead sets out a range of criteria. One of those criteria is good access to the main road network, and the document specifies those routes most likely to be suitable. Existing development sites, including new allocations to meet the JCS requirements will need to be taken into account when assessing the implications of a Food Hub proposal. |
| Other     | A number of other suggestions for amendments were considered, including mentioning the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy, highway improvements outside the district, and climate change, but these are not seen as necessary or appropriate for inclusion in the SPD, other than a minor factual change to insert “existing” before “food and agricultural sector” in final sentence of 3.1(1). |
## Appendix 1  
### Food and Agricultural Hub SPD Consultation Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>S/0</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Council Comment</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Salhouse Farms                    | Henry Cator          | S   | Dated 17<sup>th</sup> December 2013 received 23 December 2014          | Supports Ian Alston application re Honingham  
  - Job growth  
  - Reconnect public with Norfolk food production  
  - Logical step building on Norwich Research Park / UEA and Cambridge University  
  - 30 hectares will soon reach full potential                                                                                       | Support noted for food hub. The SPD is to guide decisions regarding a food hub and is non site specific. | No change |
| Natural England                   | Mr Jamie Robert Melvin | -  | Dated 9<sup>th</sup> December 2013                                    | No comment. Further advice contact Jamie Melvin directly Jamie.melvin@naturalengland.org.uk                                                                 | Noted   | No change |
| Royal Norfolk Agricultural Association | Greg Smith - Chief exec | S   | Dated 9<sup>th</sup> December 2013                                    | Supports in context of growing investment in knowledge and competitiveness with additional benefits to the UK – development of food and agricultural sector hubs have the potential to increase economic output (jobs & wealth creation) and reduce impact on the environment / resource. Planning policy can help support business and investment and the development of a cluster will deliver higher skills and leadership  
  Specific comments:  
  - SPD is NPPF compliant, however important to consider viability of any proposal and coherence with existing related developments  
  - Location should reflect and build upon existing highway improvement priorities  
  - 10ha should not be used as a threshold. The size depends on viability and the provision of a comprehensive and sustainable development should be the principle  
  Viability is a material consideration.  
  It is acknowledged that as the SPD is not site specific there should not be a set a finite limit on the scale of development allowable. For a proposal to exceed 10 Hectares,”  
  Add Proposals should be based on an overall masterplan demonstrating how identified needs will be met. Given the difficulty of predicting future needs in the long term, it is expected that a development will be | Support noted, and agree.                                                                 | At end of 3.1(2) delete “and will not be expected to exceed 10 Hectares”, Add Proposals should be based on an overall masterplan demonstrating how identified needs will be met. Given the difficulty of predicting future needs in the long term, it is expected that a development will be |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>S/0</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Council Comment</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>objective.</td>
<td>specific proposal, the scale would depend on the identified needs and the appropriateness of the particular location</td>
<td>done in phases with the scale and uses in each phase reflecting the identified needs at that time, but having regard to the need to make provision for necessary infrastructure and give flexibility for a development. An indicative scale for an initial phase might be up to 10 ha.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The intention of the Food Hub is to support a cluster of uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>By its nature a “food hub” will incorporate a variety of agricultural / food related uses, which will be a variety of sizes. The appropriateness of a particular scale of use would depend on the need identified and whether it was appropriate in that location.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Precise definition of “large –Scale” food manufacturing /processing would be a helpful addition.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Dated 9th December 2013 Norfolk has the largest agricultural sector of any county. Disproportionate added value to the food production as much is processed out of the county. Uses – increasing food processing facilities should be seen as a priority along with R &amp; D and Logistics. Benefits</td>
<td>Support welcomed</td>
<td>SPD must show flexibility to adapt to market.  See changes proposed under Royal Norfolk Agricultural Association and Suffolk County Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rob Wise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The intention of the Food Hub is to support a cluster of uses.</td>
<td>The intention of the Food Hub is to support a cluster of uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased flexibility of Uses (increase processing) suggests there</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Council Comment</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk County Council</td>
<td>James Cutting</td>
<td>9th January 2013</td>
<td>should be no distinction between primary and ancillary uses. Flexibility must be applied to allow the most efficient growth to maximise jobs. Development of a food hub is in line with Suffolk Growth Strategy and New Anglia LEP growth plan and is to be supported. Potential processing and manufacturing elements (3.1 (3)) are key to adding value for regional produce. Consider adding the potential for a regional dimension in 3.1 (1) by the inclusion of regional offer which would mean locations to the A140 / A11 could be considered preferable to A47.</td>
<td>The intention is to develop a hub serving the needs of Norfolk and agri – food sector in and around Greater Norwich. The SPD is non site specific. Its intention is to assist guiding interested parties and planning application on scale/ design, types of uses and locational issues. The comments on the key importance of processing and manufacturing elements noted.</td>
<td>Agri-tech, Processing and manufacturing (bullet points 2, 3 and 4 under the ancillary uses in 3.1) to be moved into the list of acceptable primary uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Anglia LEP</td>
<td>Andy Wood Chairman</td>
<td>9th December 2013</td>
<td>The SPD is in line with the LEP’s Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) and the Norfolk’s Growth Plan. Model compliments existing approach of exemplar clusters at Hethal and NRP. Success is dependent on integrated food processing, logistics and marketing. Benefits include supply chain efficiency, and significant gains for the local economy. Global food demand is projected to grow by 50% by 2030-potential exist for significant added value and job growth should a strategic move along the supply chain be realised. Uses • Focus on high value activities • Integration of other users include education / pupil engagement Amend SPD to reflect wider market demands and growth trends in food market and the broader vision that will see Norfolk, SN and</td>
<td>Noted Alignment of Strategic Plans is beneficial for delivery and for setting priorities</td>
<td>See changes under Royal Norfolk Agricultural Association, NFU and Suffolk County Council above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>S/0</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Council Comment</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Broadland play a major and significant role in Governments Agi-Tech Strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of Public</td>
<td>Mr Raymond Roberts</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Dated 5th December 2013 – email Easton/ Honoming is not an appropriate location. Countryside views Already extra housing development at Easton Existing employment at Longwater Junction / infrastructure at capacity Near to my house</td>
<td>The SPD is non site specific. Its intention is to assist guiding interested parties and planning application on scale/ design, types of uses and locational issues</td>
<td>No changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breckland Council</td>
<td>Janie Smith</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Dated 4th December 2013 Consider amending section 3 part 2 to address the potential for wider cross boundary highway/road network implications To avoid any misunderstanding consider defining “local” in the context of supports local food production.</td>
<td>3.1(2) bullet-point 3 refers to “any necessary improvements to the highway network”; this is not restricted to any particular district. JCS policy 5 states that the policy context is to “support the needs of Norfolk and Agri-food sector in and around Greater Norwich”</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Country Land &amp; Business Association</td>
<td>Claire Wright</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Dated 28th November 2013 Endorse correct approach for location to be close to Norwich and take full account of established transport links and educational / research opportunities. Support the scale and design as an appropriate balance of rural economic development and the protection of the landscape Users should be linked to development of food production and agriculture from Greater Norwich and wider region. Increase floor space for ancillary uses to 50% to ensure food agriculture hub presents greatest benefit to the rural economy.</td>
<td>Support noted The concept set out in JCS policy 5 is to “support the needs of Norfolk and Agri-food sector in and around Greater Norwich”</td>
<td>See changes under Royal Norfolk Agricultural Association, NFU and Suffolk County Council above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment agency</td>
<td>Mr Graham Steel</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Dated 25 November 2013 Second bullets 3.1.2 add climate change is one of the biggest threats to the economy, environment and society. New development should therefore be designed with a view to improving resilience and adapting to the effects of climate change,</td>
<td>Noted. These issues are addressed in the lpa’s development plan documents and the National Planning Policy</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>S/0</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Council Comment</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>particularly with regards to already stretched environmental resources and infrastructure such as water supply and treatment, water quality and waste disposal facilities. We also need to limit the contribution of new development to climate change and minimise the consumption of natural resources.</td>
<td>Framework, and do not need repeating in the SPD.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recommends measures are in line with Objectives of NPPF paragraphs 7, 93-108 pre assessment under Code/ BREEAM Consider resource efficiency through design Net gains for nature Minimise energy use through design Flood risk assessment and drainage strategy incorporating SUDS would be required. Advise joint working with LA/ EA and any applicant to ensure potential issues resolved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waveney District Council</td>
<td>Julie Hood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Dated 25 November 2013 – e mail No concerns - no comments</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costessey PC</td>
<td>Hilary Elias</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Dated 21st November 2013 – email Any new development should not acerbate existing traffic difficulties. Should the Food Hub be developed at Easton/ A47 it should have easy access to north, south east and west and substantial Improvements undertaken at the Longwater junction and wider road network, including improved access from the north of Norwich and the development of the NDR.</td>
<td>The SPD is non site specific. Its intention is to assist guiding interested parties and planning application on scale/ design, types of uses and locational issues. Any application would have to be submitted with a transport assessment.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swannington with Alderford PC</td>
<td>Helen Mutimer</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Dated 20th November 2013 Agri hub must not be reliant on the livestock market as the financial future is uncertain. Linked trips to local centres could be lost if livestock market was relocated. Access consideration and NDR development is essential Any location must take into consideration local housing</td>
<td>Noted The inclusion of the livestock market is just one possibility amongst a range of uses.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>S/0</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>developments along the A47 Consideration must be given to biosecurity of any livestock markets In principle a food agricultural hub will benefit regional agricultural business, farmer – potential to create a nationally recognised centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton PC</td>
<td>John Witcombe</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Dated 19 November 2013 Location should be relative to the A11 / A140 rather than A47 and the parish of Easton. Access considerations should include dedicated junctions Potential uses need to be streamlined to move towards quality rather than quantity. Consultation needs to be longer than 21 days.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taverham PC</td>
<td>Sophie Cockburn</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Dated 19th November 2013 – email Supported in principle. However SPD was vague. Location of any site should be close to good rail, bus and road links and subject to an Environmental impact assessment Location towards Easton would add weight to the development of the NDR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk County Council</td>
<td>Stephen Faulkner</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Dated November 2013 • Clarification / further explanation required para 2.1 on what is envisaged by a food and agricultural Hub. Inclusion of a vision statement may help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Council Comment

Noted - The SPD is non site specific. Its intention is to assist guiding interested parties and planning application on scale/design, types of uses and locational issues. The consultation ran for 8 weeks ending on 9th December 2013.

No change

No change

No change

No change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>S/0</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Council Comment</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider other large scale employment uses in addition to storage and distribution. As long as they are consistent with aims and objectives of JCS policy 5 and paragraph 5.42</td>
<td>Appendix 1. It is not the role of the SPD to redefine this. The SPD chapter three provides guidance to interested parties and planning application on scale/design, types of uses and locational issues. The SPD sets out the main considerations governing a “Food Hub” in Broadlands and South Norfolk. It is possible that fish products etc. might be included within “food products”. This would cause no conflicts with the Marine Plan.</td>
<td>Add “existing” to para 3.1(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Clarification on whether the SPS covers fishing and aquaculture – if so SPD must have regard to the adopted Marine Plan</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For clarification Paragraph 3.1 – final sentence should read … functional links with other elements of the existing food and agricultural sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph 3.1 –section 2 bullet 2 consider adding “where there is any impact there will be a need for appropriate mitigation. The case for proceeding with the proposal, if it is not possible to mitigate the impact, will need to be made clear as part of the application, e.g. where there is an overriding national need”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 (3) clarification over whether agriculture covers aquaculture and or the commercial fishing sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 (3) clarification to indicate no more than approx. 10% of any single application/proposal will be for subsidiary uses</td>
<td>Issue of subsidiary uses considered under other comments above noted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TRANSPORT In general the promoters of any application would have to demonstrate that the local transport networks are capable to cater for the impacts of specific proposals, and where the need is identified, suitable improvements made. Such issues would be</td>
<td>See changes under NFU above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 1. It is not the role of the SPD to redefine this. The SPD chapter three provides guidance to interested parties and planning application on scale/design, types of uses and locational issues. The SPD sets out the main considerations governing a “Food Hub” in Broadlands and South Norfolk. It is possible that fish products etc. might be included within “food products”. This would cause no conflicts with the Marine Plan. Agree

Add “existing” to para 3.1(1) No change

See changes under NFU above
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>S/ 0</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Council Comment</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>addressed through a Transport Impact Assessment, TIA. Members: have expressed concerns regarding access and traffic generation around the A47 and the impacts on local lanes, should such hub be located at Easton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saxlinghaam Nethergate PC</td>
<td>Mrs Julie King</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Dated 12th November 2013 email Support the proposals contained in the SPD.</td>
<td>Support welcomed</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broads Authority</td>
<td>Natalie Beal</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Dated 8th November 2013 In principle the SPD is supported, however more detail is required on suitable locations and these could be included. The Broads Authority welcome continued dialogue over potential sites.</td>
<td>Noted, The SPD is non site specific. Its intention is to assist guiding interested parties and planning application on scale/design, types of uses and locational issues</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways Agency</td>
<td>Roger Chenery</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Dated 7th November 2013 - email Highways Agency operates and maintains the Strategic Road Network which means the A47 and A11 in the region. Should a proposal come forward the HA would seek to work with Norfolk CC with regard to the understanding of all transport issues. General comments Accept that a food hub by its very nature will need good transport links which central locations would find difficult to achieve. There is a need to balance the strategic role of the highway network and that of local business, and other local traffic generation which generate relatively short trip local traffic. Infrastructure improvements that address the requirements of growth in the region including the food hub and proposed residential growth may be significant; however this is in line with Circular 02/2013. The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellesdon PC</td>
<td>Jonathan Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dated 6th November 2013 – email No comments</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Council</td>
<td>Jessie Prior</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dated 4th November 2014 – email General comments only in regard to plan making and design.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>S/0</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Council Comment</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (CABE)        |                      |     | 1. Plans should tell the story  
2. Proactive and positive about the future of the place and how this will be achieved  
3. Say it clearly  
Further advice is contained in various publications.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | No change |
| Norfolk County Council | Richard Drake | -   | Dated 6th November 2013  
Consider providing additional guidance on the policy content. The Norfolk Mineral and waste core strategy should be included in the SPD as this forms part of the development plan.  
Suggested text  
*Any future proposal for a food and agriculture hub will also need to have regard to their documents within the Development Plan for Norfolk, in particular the Norfolk Minerals and Waste core strategy – Policy CS16 safeguarding. There is the potential that any site proposed for a Food Hub based on this SPD may be located on defined Mineral Safeguarding Areas, and that a mineral assessment and potentially prior extraction may be required in order for future development to comply with policy CS16. It is recommended that pre application discussions with Norfolk County Council, in its capacity as the Mineral Planning Authority, are undertaken.*  
Noted  
The SPD is not site specific. The SPD is supplementary to a policy in the JCS, and not any policies in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. Any relevant policies in a Development Plan Document, such as the NMWCS, would be taken into account in considering a specific proposal as part of an application for planning permission. It is not necessary to include reference to all DPDs in the SPD. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | No change |
| Sprowston TC  | Evelyn Elliot       | -   | 1st November 2013 – email  
The SPD lacks ambition and detail. The SPD should concentrate on high technical and high value schemes.  
Noted, The SPD is non site specific. Its intention is to assist guiding interested parties and planning application on scale/design, types of uses and locational issues, but must be flexible enough to guide as yet unknown proposals. | Support is noted and welcome                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | No change |
| Member of Parliament South Norfolk | Richard Bacon | S   | Dated 31st October 2013  
Please to support South Norfolk and Broadland Councils on this guidance The criteria for consideration of a proposal is particularly welcome and will allow for the development of a hub in the areas where the hub could both provide and receive the greatest  
Support is noted and welcome                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | Support is noted and welcome                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | No change |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>S/ 0</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Council Comment</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lanpro</td>
<td>C Leeming (Director)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Supportive of the Norfolk Food Hub Concept - recommends further amendments.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>See changes under Royal Norfolk Agricultural Association, NFU, Suffolk County Council and New Anglia LEP above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|              | O              |      | Strongly objects to the “current wording of the emerging SPD” On the basis that land use mix and restrictions on scale are “wholly unrelated to known market” Current emphasis on storage and distribution does not address issues of added value, future growth, business / market need of NPPF para 20 and contrary to aims and objectives of JCS policy 5  
“to realise the full economic potential of the food hub, it must be balanced and have the scope to develop the food sector in an integrated way which adds real value to the economy by developing facilities for which there is market demand for business in the sector and consumers” NPPF Para 20 states that “to help achieve economic growth, local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support and economy fit the 21 century” The current focus on storage and distribution is not addressing this focus as there is no market demand, nor business need, and no ability to add value to the Norfolk Economy. The 10 ha restriction on scale is challenged - as there is no basis for it. There should be no restriction on size to: Attract investment Allow users to grow Allow distribution efficiencies | Can see the benefits of aligning growth to market needs. There has to be a balance to ensure organic growth and for providing for a variety of interrelated uses to promote the Norfolk Food and Drink Industry. | Enlarging the scale may help to provide market certainty and long term investment options, however the demand for a specific scale would need to be demonstrated as part of that proposal |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>S/0</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|              |     |     | Vision is to maximise employment opportunities Distribution efficiencies Maximise infrastructure contributions SPD fails to address market demand and identifies the wrong sectors for growth and added value. "there is evidenced by the clear misconception.

That there is sufficient existing value in raw agricultural produce to warrant dedicated storage and distribution park with in Norwich."

“It is more efficient to transport refined added value goods than raw produce” The restrictive land use mix imposed will “impact on added value” as currently proposed directly limits the ability of any proposal to meet specified aims of the JCS in terms of employment provision. The SPD should be more aligned to the Honingham Farm Proposal rather than the delivery of a storage and distribution park. – reflecting market demand and economic growth opportunities. Currently there are concerns that this advice is not being followed in the production of the SPD and the council’s justification of this is refuted and unfounded. Namely:
- Concerns about out of town retail development
- The intent is to raise the profile of the Norfolk food industry, retail sales would be ancillary
- Impacts on existing employment allocations
There are no other suitable allocations with in Broadland and South Norfolk for major food processing / storage & distribution – hence the ethos of the Food Hub
- Limited demand for food processing through the local plan process or economic development informal enquiries. |
<p>|              |     |     | Council Comment |
|              |     |     | The scale and design of any proposal will need to be appropriate to its surroundings, and intended use |
|              |     |     | The SPD is non site specific. Its intention is to assist guiding interested parties and planning application on scale/design, types of uses and locational issues See also scale and uses issues discussed under other responses above |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>S/0</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Council Comment</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is unmet market demand but without a credible alternative existing firms will only expand or move to other less constrained areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerns that large scale business would not locate on a food Hub</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The idea of sharing resources, links to labour force, education and knowledge hubs is the very ethos of the Food Hub Concept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerns regarding the supply of water resource for food processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There is potential for the re use of water from industrial processes for use in other agricultural production in the wider area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>As a way forward</strong> it is suggested as a minimum that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. <strong>Primary uses</strong> are amended to reflect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Processing of agricultural produce at whatever scale is appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing of food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Storage and distribution of agricultural produce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Storage and distribution of Livestock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• General Haulage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Display and wholesaling of agricultural and food products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Education and training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Secondary Uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing of non-food agricultural products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacture agricultural equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage and distribution of agricultural equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Veterinary services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Offices linked to primary uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Size is not limited to 10 ha on the initial proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. The primary focus in on crops, products etc. should be amended to “from Norfolk” instead of from the “ Greater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The wording in the SPD 3.1(3) acknowledges that it might be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>S/O</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Council Comment</td>
<td>Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Collison Associates</td>
<td>Martin Collison on behalf of Norfolk Food Hub - Ian Alston</td>
<td>S &amp; O</td>
<td>Dated 9th December 2013 Supportive of the SPS concept and commitment but suggest further changes to the use categories in order to realise the Food Hubs economic potential and development must respond directly to market demand. This is for locally branded food production and distribution, food experience and education. Objectives should be: 1. Market focus – respond to increased demand for production of food and food products 2. Maximising / retaining value in the Norfolk economy 3. Job creation / inward investment 4. Support new start-ups as well as larger established business through the opportunities to expand 5. Promotion of Norfolk’s Food and Drink Industry, retail outlet/ R&amp;D linked to science and education Purpose should be to maximise the economic multiplier effect by exploiting the current and predicted economic growth. Suggested changes: 1. Food Hub promoting “local food” must support at least food from the whole county.</td>
<td>Noted See also scale and uses issues discussed under other responses above</td>
<td>See changes under Royal Norfolk Agricultural Association, NFU, Suffolk County Council and New Anglia LEP above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Remove reference the “a food and agricultural hub will not be a suitable location for large scale food manufacture/processing” 5. Assuming the above is acceptable in land use terms, the principle of a suitable proportion of secondary classification land uses is acceptable.  

A second representation was also submitted comprising of a site specific Highways Access Strategy for the site at Easton. (9th December 2013). This relates to a site specific comment and is not a consideration of the SPD | appropriate for crops to be from outside the Greater Norwich Area. | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>S/ 0</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Council Comment</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td>The wording in the SPD 3.1(3) acknowledges that it might be appropriate for crops to be from outside the Greater Norwich Area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Currently Norfolk is a strong sector for farming, food and drink and exports produce for processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Food &amp; drink sector is expanding, 17% growth 2007 -11 in food processing, 37% - agriculture (DEFRA 2012, ONS 2013). – need for Norfolk producers to capitalise on this growth and projected 40% growth by 2030 caused by increased consumer demand for added value food services and population growth / agricultural productively requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Survey data shows the concept of local means county / regional wide. Only 40% think that local food means immediate vicinity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- In order to be successful in the supply chain food hubs need to consolidate food from many suppliers from a wide area so the offer to major outlets is varied and attractive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Focussing too small or on niche markets is not ambitious does not create jobs or address where the demand / growth potential is.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Food hub must support food processing alongside logistics to meet the needs of food companies and satisfy demand. Failure to do so runs the risk of investment going elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Justification:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Most of rapidly growing agricultural business in Norfolk combines primary agriculture agricultural production with food processing, logistics and wholesale.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Agricultural sector is disproportionally large compared to food processing sector in the county</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Decline in agricultural income and essential to invest in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>S/0</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>processing and wholesale.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased demand for “food-telling” as a key trend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Proximity to research at NRP is an opportunity to exploit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sector will create higher value jobs and support farm output and logistics without displacement of jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Create inward investment through economies of scale for existing companies and “can do” attitude by being responsive to needs of international companies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Constraining the use to only one section of the food chain runs the risk that investment will go elsewhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Food Wholesaling - with the right investment in wholesaling linked to storage, distribution and food &amp; drink manufacturing there is a large potential to create additional high value jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Justification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Storage and distribution divorced from wholesaling is a deviation from the natural business model in the food industry which every successful food hub in the UK integrates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• A logistic hub as part of the food hub will help to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Streamline distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Access new markets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• reduce vehicle movements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk that a single focus on distribution may result in a loss of jobs and displacement from other distribution centres.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• If the county is to grow its food processing capacity and retain more GVA then there is a requirement to increase both wholesale and distribution to national markets.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk of double handling and increased cost/ prices if wholesaling / distribution is a separate location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Create a shop window to promote the depth and scale of food production in Norfolk.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>S/0</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Justification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support the profile of Norfolk food and drink. so that significant marketing and promotional value can be retained and Norfolk brand can be promoted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Currently the “brand” is week despite a large agricultural sector but mainly due to the focus on commodity crops and export to other areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Allow a focused and consolidated outlet for local produce.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased promotion helps to generate future demand through tourist spending and follow through demand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Offers opportunities for marketing of plants and flowers that account for 4.5% of agricultural output by the county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Promote education and provenance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Justification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Norfolk is well placed to create a world class educational and visitor facility for its food sector. This however needs to be integrated into the Hub in order to finance such a venture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Advantages include educational role will help to promote health and sustainability in the food chain from producers to consumers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing commitments around this from Easton &amp; Otley College, NRP, UEA and NHS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Food production companies have expressed desire to work with the Food Hub to support public engagement work in education about food production.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an existing demand for the food hub to include food production, marketing, wholesaling and logistics facilities from:

• Medium – large scale overseas investors who want a base in the UK for food processing integrated with logistics and wholesaling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>S/0</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Council Comment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Actions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JCS Policy 5 refers to a flagship food and farming hub serving the needs of Norfolk, providing opportunities to co-ordinate activity &amp; access larger markets, be a focus for supporting ancillary businesses /suppliers and the relocation of the livestock market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Established links are a consideration in deciding the most appropriate location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>S/0</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Other parts of the UK who want to develop a Norfolk base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing companies that are currently constrained growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing companies who wish to achieve greater efficiencies in processing Norfolk agri-food products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Food &amp; Drink sector is in the top 10 sector for attracting Foreign direct Investment. Norfolk’s low share of food processing and high share of agriculture coupled with a food hub providing modern integrated logistics, strong local supply base, R&amp;D cluster should allow Norwich to compete successfully bringing inward investment, growth of existing companies and new start-ups, helping to grow Norfolk’s economy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**
Welcome the commitment to the food hub, but the SPD should reflect / respond to market demand which is “for added value, locally branded food production and distribution, food experience and education. |
• Norfolk is already undersupplied in food processing relative to its share of agricultural production. |
• Utilising this use in the food hub will not cause displacement rather it will lead to the creation of high value jobs, in a growing sector |
• Offer benefits of R& D , food traceability and increased accountability/ traceability in the food supply chain |
• The uses must be balanced in the food industry to have the scope to fulfil its potential. |
• The primary uses must be expended to include :
  - Processing of agro produce |
  - Education and training related to agriculture and food |
  - Display, wholesaling and retailing of agricultural products |
Two current uses identified as primary should be identified as secondary as they are complementary
- Storage and distribution of agricultural equipment, machinery and supplies
- Veterinary services

Recommends the SPD use be

**Primary**
- Processing of Agricultural produce,
- Manufacturing of food products
- Storage & distribution of agricultural produce
- Storage & distribution of agricultural products (processed)
- Storage and distribution of livestock
- Haulage services related to the above storage and distribution
- Display, wholesaling, retailing of agricultural and food products
- Education / training related to agriculture and food

**Secondary**
- Manufacture of non-food agricultural products
- Manufacturing of agricultural equipment, machinery and supplies
- Veterinary services
- Offices necessary as part of a primary use

Welcome general support and endorsements from potential end users and interested parties. Some letters are however dated and refer to specific correspondence which the council is not party to, and appear to relate to a specific proposal.

Supporting representations received from Lanpro December 9th 2013. These comments have been taken into account in considering the Lanpro representation. Support from MPs, companies and others for Lanpro's proposal noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>S/0</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member of</td>
<td>George</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dated 13 07 11, received December 9th, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parliament – Mid Norfolk</td>
<td>Freeman</td>
<td>I am extremely enthusiastic about this project, and will promote the scheme to the Council. It will provide a huge boost to the economy. Will write to Chief Executive of NCC and Cliff Jordan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                         |         | Dated 30 09 11  
|                         |         | Ref forwarded copy of David White reply letter from NCC |
| Member of Parliament – Broadland | Keith Simpson | Dated 19 08 11, received December 9th, 2013  
| Member of Parliament – Broadland | Keith Simpson | I have today written to the Transport Secretary of State drawing his attention to ludicrous situation. Food Hub Must be encouraged. |
| Member of Parliament – North Norfolk | Norman Lamb | Dated 25 09 11, received December 9th, 2013  
| Member of Parliament – North Norfolk | Norman Lamb | I am keen to support - fantastic Initiative  
| Member of Parliament – North Norfolk | Norman Lamb | I have written to the Secretary of state for Transport asking him to ensure the project is not unnecessarily delayed |
| Member of Parliament – SW Norfolk | Elizabeth Truss | Dated 23 06 2011, received December 9th, 2013  
| Member of Parliament – SW Norfolk | Elizabeth Truss | Happy to help, suggest a joint approach to highways. |
| Norfolk County Council | David White Chief Exec | Dated 10 09 11, received December 9th, 2013 – re George Freeman MP  
| Norfolk County Council | David White Chief Exec | NCC has been and remains very supportive of the Food Hub proposal in terms of its potential contribution to the local economy. There are practical issues that need to be resolved.  
|                       |         | - Outstanding transport work by promoters. NCC / HA cannot accurately determine mitigation and promoters assumptions are premature in regards HA  
|                       |         | - NCC happy to facilitate discussions with relevant parties through Ann Carruthers, Transport Planning Strategy Manager. |
| Frank Dale Foods Ltd |         | Dated 25 11 13, received December 9th, 2013  
| Frank Dale Foods Ltd |         | Reported that Robert Dale (MD) see Food hub location is a major advantage – access onto A11  
|                       |         | Currently investing in present site and experiencing rapid growth to meet 5 year plan to double sale. If this growth is faster than predicted then Food hub is the best re location. |
| CLA East | Claire Wright | 28 November 2013 , received December 9th, 2013 (copy of submission)  
| CLA East | Claire Wright | Endorse correct approach for location to be close to Norwich and take full account of established transport links and educational / research opportunities.  
|                       |         | Support the scale and design as an appropriate balance of rural economic development and the protection of the landscape  
|                       |         | Users should be linked to development of food production and agriculture from Greater Norwich and wider region.  
|                       |         | Increase floor space for ancillary uses to 50% to ensure food agriculture hub presents greatest benefit to the rural economy.  
|                       |         | 5 December 2013  
|                       |         | Additional comments |
Vital importance that the food hub supports food education, though establishing links with surrounding institutions
Considerable benefits of congregation of specialist food sector
Concerns re proposed scale are insufficient to attract large scale processing – skilled labour/added value etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harvey &amp; co</th>
<th>David Harvey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dated 9th December 2013, received December 9th , 2013</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Important to understand that demand will manifest over time and may not be possible to identify immediate demand, and recognise the need for scale and critical mass.  
  o Vision should include reasonable expectation at concept stage of genuine demand and expansion.  
  o Provide long term certainty and space to enable future expansion and keep firms in the district  
  o NRP – recent expansion and major driver/ magnet of inward investment at the time extent of demand not identified -object is to set the conditions in which emerging demand take advantage of over time without obstacles to delivery. And provide a long term strategy.  
  o The site must be of sufficient size to accommodate a reasonable expectation of longer term demand.  
  o Broadland Business Park – gave major firms choice  
  o Beacon Park in G Yarmouth – now become cluster for energy sector, but long term vision provided the land  
  o Large enough to generate critical mass. – i.e. accommodate a range of organisations to warrant central facilities - 25 acres will struggle to establish credibility  
  • Requirement for choice and opportunity for clusters from co location  
  o Food industry in generally land hungry, land prices on existing employment site sites is high in excess £400,000 /acre. Cheaper land proposed @ food hub of £150 - £200,000/ acre is an affordable choice.  
  o Promoting clusters is part of Governments growth agenda and LEP’s Feb 13 growth strategy  
  • Sites need to large enough to embrace a range of uses and allow segregation  
  o Existing commercial enterprises show that the proposed 25 acre site is two small and would not allow processing firms to relocate. At best only 2 firms could be established based on current land use of existing firms e.g. Banham Poultry, Kettle foods, Britvic soft Drinks ETC  
  o Must be large enough to allow for segregation of uses e.g.  
  o Public areas – retail/ cultural  
  o R & D / Office  
  o Production  
  o Livestock / farm machinery.  

Summary the driver is the long term vision.

<p>| UEA | John Turner (professor) | s  |
|-----|-------------------------|
| <strong>Dated 5th Dec 13, received December 9th , 2013</strong> |
| Strong support given for the food hub |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
<th>Date and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sands Agricultural machinery LTD</td>
<td>T N Sands</td>
<td>Dated 09 December 2013, Re proposed development @ Honington Thorpe. NNDC have not found many suitable options in the past 3 years to which I could expand / relocate my business. I am now looking further afield and would be interested in your site. Well connected for Norwich and subcontractors with space for demonstrations and open days (need approx. 6 acres).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McVeigh Parker Co ltd</td>
<td>Lucy McVeigh</td>
<td>Dated 040613, received December 9th , 2013, Currently found somewhere else, but keen to be involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randells</td>
<td>William Randell</td>
<td>Dated 4 11 13, received December 9th , 2013, Confirm still interested in the site for farm and garden machinery business. Good central location Neighbouring business to increase footfall Display potential New build/ purpose design Require approx. 2.15 acres/ 1hectare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettle Chips</td>
<td>Dominic Lowe</td>
<td>Dated 4th December 2013, received December 9th , 2013, Kettle food Support the vision. It would add significantly to Norfolk as a centre of excellence for small food business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown and Co</td>
<td>Nick Dunn</td>
<td>Dated 5th Dec 2013, received December 9th , 2013, Head of commercial agency in Norwich - 100acre site at Easton is : Central with excellent transport links, easy access to labour market, proximity to largest agri- food research in Europe at NRP, potential for educational links with Easton college. Size needs to be capable of accommodating demand, and future expansion. Consider there is excellent demand from agri/food based industries keen to locate to a centralised location, with benefit from proximity to R&amp;R.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Garden Preserves</td>
<td>David Atherton</td>
<td>Dated 25 January 2010, received December 9th , 2013, Welcome opportunity to learn more. Plans could include kitchen facilities which can be rented by small companies. A similar idea is being run in Cumbria Rural Enterprise Agency, and has allowed small scale local entrepreneurialism in the food industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Food Research</td>
<td>Professor David H Boxer</td>
<td>Dated 24 August 2010, received December 9th , 2013, IFR is only publically funded research institute in UK underpinning food and health. IFR leads research across BBSRC institutes. The John Inness Centre and the Genome Analysis Centre and the UEA. We support the food Hub and look forward to developing commercial and educational links.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartram Mowers Ltd</td>
<td>Mark Bartram</td>
<td>Dated 26 06 2009, received December 9th , 2013, Firm is interested in re locating to Easton – is depended on existing site which is currently undergoing LDF allocation process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supporting documentation received from Lanpro regarding proposal / position of Honingham Thorpe Farms Ltd as promoters of the Norfolk Food Hub as of 18th December 2013 and 10th January 2014. These comments have been taken into account in considering the Lanpro representation. Support from companies and others for Lanpro’s proposal noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>s/ o</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ben Burgess & Co                  | Ben Turner (MD)              | s     | Dated 9th December 2013, received 18th December 2013  
Ben Burgess fully supports the concept of clustering food suppliers and associated industries such as agricultural machinery dealers on one site with good access to the A47. Educational links with Easton college would be useful to address shortage of skilled labour. |
| Royal Norfolk Agricultural Association | Greg Smith (Chief Executive) | S     | Dated 9th December 2013, received 18th December 2013  
Supports in context of growing investment in knowledge and competitiveness with additional benefits to the UK –  
development of food and agricultural sector hubs have the potential to increase economic output (jobs & wealth creation) and  
reduce impact on the environment / resource.  
Planning policy can help support business and investment and the development of a cluster will deliver higher skills and  
leadership  
Specific comments:  
- SPC is NPPF compliant, however important to consider viability of any proposal and coherence with existing related  
developments  
- Location should reflect and build upon existing highway improvement priorities  
- 10ha should not be used as a threshold. The size depends on viability and the provision of a comprehensive and  
sustainable development should be the principle objective.  
- Uses. –  
  - the mix of business will depend on the location.  
  - the SPD should not be prescriptive (more flexibility)  
  - the mix should be based around the viability of core business and the wider benefits  
  - Precise definition of “large –Scale” food manufacturing /processing would be a helpful addition. |
| Fresh Direct                      | Kamal                        | s     | Dated: No date. (received 18th December 2013)  
Recently taken over the Country fresh business and operating out of a short term, compact site at Hockering. Supports idea  
of cluster of local businesses and see economies of scale. Site of 1-2 acres could well be needed close to the A47 is ideal. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken Proctor</td>
<td>NFU</td>
<td>Dated 9th December 2013, received 18th December 2013</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>NFU fully supports Lanpro plans for a food hub and centre of excellence west of Norwich. Sufficiently increasing processing facilities in line with the full proposals would help to address the lost “added value” and generate growth and employment. Norfolk has the largest agricultural sector of any county. Disproportionate added value to the food production as much is processed out of the county. Uses – increasing food processing facilities should be seen as a priority along with R&amp;D and Logistics. Benefits - Take ownership of food chain – promote local products - Facilitate greater collaboration between farmers and food processing - Help establish local market and stability of prices - Showcase variety of agricultural foods. In order to make a real impact the hub has to operate efficiently and be of a size that does not compromise its ability to benefit the county’s businesses and consumers or undermine the entire project’s viability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Wise</td>
<td>NFU</td>
<td>Dated 9th December 2013, received 18th December 2013</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>Norfolk has the largest agricultural sector of any county. Disproportionate added value to the food production as much is processed out of the county. Uses – increasing food processing facilities should be seen as a priority along with R&amp;D and Logistics. Benefits - Take ownership of food chain – promote local products - Facilitate greater collaboration between farmers and food processing - Help establish local market and stability of prices - Showcase variety of agricultural foods. Suggested Amendments to SPD: Increased flexibility of Uses (increase processing) suggests there should be no distinction between primary and ancillary uses. Flexibility must be applied to allow the most efficient growth to maximise jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers LTD</td>
<td>Anglia</td>
<td>Dated 10th December, received 18th December 2013</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>Anglia Farmers are “very Supportive” of proposed food hub at Honingham Thorpe: The intended focus on food processing will help improve food traceability and transparency to the consumer - Address concerns regarding food mileage - Improve links with Institute of food research and development - Help in the creation of a strong local economy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The location of the proposal is significant as it can benefit from economies of scale (compliment) agricultural industry Easton and Otley College, the Royal Norfolk Agricultural Association and the Institution of Food Research. The suggested 25 acres may not be sufficient.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Date of Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Research Park</td>
<td>Dr Sally Ann Forsyth (CEO)</td>
<td>Dated 6\textsuperscript{th} January 2014, received 10\textsuperscript{th} January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Liquid Feeds LTD</td>
<td>Mike Beckett (MD)</td>
<td>Dated 2\textsuperscript{nd} January 2014, received 10\textsuperscript{th} January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich Livestock Market Ltd</td>
<td>Mr Stephen Lutkin (Chairman), Mike Beeckett (Vice Chairman)</td>
<td>Dated 4\textsuperscript{th} January 2014, received 10\textsuperscript{th} January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A W Alston</td>
<td>Andrew Alston</td>
<td>Dated 31 December 2013, received 10\textsuperscript{th} January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Big Prawn co</td>
<td>Sean O Hanlon</td>
<td>Dated 5\textsuperscript{th} December 2013, received 10\textsuperscript{th} January 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The vision of the NRP is to develop a thriving research and innovation campus by supporting spin out and start-up companies, as well as attracting inward investment, particularly from food, health and the environment. The development of a food hub fits well with the vision and the activities of food processing and distribution are complementary with world class research undertaken at the park. NRP are supportive of a food hub and its potential for developing closer links and collaboration with the group.

Currently part located at Norwich Livestock Market and Woodton, Bungay. Declares support in moving business to the proposed hub.

Size requirements approx. 8,000 – 10,000 sq. ft.

Livestock market is very much in demand with the Agricultural community and with future planned improvements with planned market sales, the proposal would be an ideal position for the market to progress to in the future. Land required would be approx. 8 -10 acres.

Food hub is central to Norfolk’s Rural Development Strategy. Add value to farm produce, retaining it in Norfolk

Attract Skilled workers

Opportunity to develop now for the future

Investment in processing compliments recent Rural enterprise grants and LEADER grants which has increased storage capacity for winter crops and increased water efficiency

Opportunity to support change by creating local demand

Changes in Agri Environment and EU policy mean more emphasis on added value crops

Opportunities for start-up business on the site.

Existing premises in Melton Constable constrained.

Support visionary idea

Plans to grow business from 50 – 100 employees with correct location.
| Anglian Pea Growers   | Richard Hurst (Chair) | S Dated 19\textsuperscript{th} December 2013, received 10\textsuperscript{th} January 2014
Existing freezing facility at Oulton Broad is poorly located on the outskirts of growing region with poor access. Opportunity for a more central location would benefit long term sustainability - improved access, improved efficiency and quality and open unit up to other markets and opportunities
Site size approx. 5 ha |
Supplementary Planning Document

Guidance for the Delivery of a Food and Agriculture Hub for Broadland and South Norfolk

Add Broadland logo

Add South Norfolk logo
1 Introduction

1.1 This Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out the main considerations that will apply to any proposal for a food and agricultural sector “hub” in the greater Norwich area (the area of Broadland district, and South Norfolk district local planning authority areas). It supplements policy 5: The Economy in the Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk Joint Core Strategy (JCS) adopted March 2011 (see Appendix 1). As such, this SPD does not create new planning policy, but it provides further interpretation and guidance on the application of the JCS policy, and so will be a material consideration in the determination of an application for planning permission.

1.2 The following sections explain the planning policy context to the SPD, set out the criteria that will be applied to a development proposal and indicate the type of uses that will be considered appropriate.

1.3 The Joint Core Strategy, including policy 5, was subject to a Sustainability Appraisal (incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment) and Appropriate Assessment under the Habitat Regulations. As this SPD is not forming new policy, but merely supplements the JCS policy, a specific Sustainability Appraisal or Appropriate Assessment for the SPD is not necessary and has not been undertaken.
Planning Policy Context

2.1 This SPD expands on policy 5: The Economy contained in the Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk Joint Core Strategy Development Plan Document, adopted March 2011. That policy states:

The rural economy and diversification will also be supported by: ....... the development of a flagship food and farming hub serving the needs of Norfolk and supporting the agri-food sector in and around greater Norwich. In addition, supporting text explains: 5.42 A food and farming hub will support local agriculture by providing opportunities for local producers to co-ordinate activity and access larger markets, provide a focus for ancillary supporting business and suppliers, and an opportunity for the re-location of the livestock market. Any proposal will need to be carefully located and controlled to ensure it fulfils this role in a sustainable way, with any retailing fulfilling an appropriate role in the retail hierarchy, (full policy and text in Appendix 1).

Therefore, a proposal for a food and agricultural hub in an appropriate location, and of an appropriate scale and range of uses is supported in principle.

2.2 The retail hierarchy is set out in Policy 19: The hierarchy of centres in the JCS. This states:

The development of new retailing, services, offices and other town centre uses as defined by government guidance will be encouraged at a scale appropriate to the form and functions of the following hierarchy of defined centres;

before listing the hierarchy as Norwich City Centre, specified town and large district centres, specified large village and district centres, and local centres. Consequently, the focus for retailing is on existing centres, appropriate to their level in the hierarchy. In addition, supporting text states at para 6.74:

no potential has been identified for additional out-of-centre retailing.

Therefore, although an element of retailing may be acceptable within the hub, this should be ancillary to the main uses and of a scale and type that does not impact on existing centres.

2.3 The policies in the JCS were developed in accordance with national planning policies at the time. Also, the JCS policies conform to the new National Planning Policy Framework published 27 March 2012. This contains national level policies on issues such as building a strong economy, ensuring the vitality of town centres and supporting a prosperous rural economy, as well as on housing, transport, infrastructure, and environmental matters.
2.4 Of particular relevance to this SPD are the following paragraphs from the NPPF:

20. To help achieve economic growth, local planning authorities should plan proactively to meet the development needs of business and support an economy fit for the 21st century;

24. Local planning authorities should apply a sequential test to planning applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan. They should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.

25. This sequential approach should not be applied to applications for small scale rural offices or other small scale rural development.

26. When assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres, which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:

- the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and

- the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made.

27. Where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact on one or more of the above factors, it should be refused.

28. Planning policies should support economic growth in rural areas in order to create jobs and prosperity by taking a positive approach to sustainable new development. To promote a strong rural economy, local and neighbourhood plans should: support the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas, both through conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings; promote the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based rural businesses; support sustainable rural tourism and leisure
developments that benefit businesses in rural areas, communities and visitors, and which respect the character of the countryside. This should include supporting the provision and expansion of tourist and visitor facilities in appropriate locations where identified needs are not met by existing facilities in rural service centres; and promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.

34. Plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. However this needs to take account of policies set out elsewhere in this Framework, particularly in rural areas.

2.5 Other policies in the NPPF, JCS or other development plan documents produced by the local planning authorities may also be relevant to a particular proposal. In addition, in accordance with normal planning practice other material considerations will also be taken into account in determining an application for planning permission.

2.6 More recently the Government has consulted on ‘Shaping a UK Strategy for Agri-tech’ (BIS, October 2012), which highlights the need to support innovation which builds on the scientific research and development in food and life sciences. Food and life sciences are strongly represented in the Norwich area, specifically at the Norwich Research Park, and development of this sector is a key element of the successful City Deals bid. Consequently the SPD includes an element of facilitating agri-tech uses as part of the food and agriculture hub.
3 Criteria for Consideration of a Proposal

3.1 Following on from the above policies a proposal for a food and agriculture hub will need to comply with relevant policies of the adopted Joint Core Strategy, relevant Local Plan Documents of the respective local planning authorities, and appropriate national guidance as well as the following:

1) Location

The site should be located close to Norwich and the related areas of population, with good public transport links and access to the main road network (i.e. one or more of the A47, A11, A140 South, and proposed Northern Distributor Road). Any necessary junction or highway improvements should take into account other development that may take place in the area.

The location should also be able to take advantage of potential functional links with other elements of the existing food and agriculture sector, including proximity to education / training and research establishments.

2) Scale and design

The scale and design of the development should be appropriate in terms of:

- Relationship with adjoining communities
- Minimising any potential environmental impacts, including in terms of landscape, countryside, agricultural land quality, noise, smells, drainage, wildlife, and residential amenity.
- Access provision, including any necessary improvements to the highway network and public transport.
- Not impacting on the viability and vitality of strategic employment areas or city/town/district centres.
- Not impacting on the viability of other Local Plan allocations, such as strategic housing sites
- A demonstrable need for the amount and type of floorspace proposed, with the development to be phased to reflect the identified needs and provision of necessary infrastructure.

Proposals should be based on an overall masterplan demonstrating how identified needs will be met. Given the difficulty of predicting future needs in the long-term, it is expected that a development will be done in phases with the scale and uses in each phase reflecting the identified needs at that time, but having regard to the need to make provision for necessary infrastructure and give flexibility for a development. An indicative scale for an initial phase of up to 10 ha is suggested.

3) Uses

Any uses proposed will need to be closely and directly linked to food production and agriculture. The primary focus should be on crops,
products etc from the greater Norwich area, though for certain elements (for example where obtaining produce from a wider area would be necessary for a use to be viable) this might extend to other parts of East Anglia. To represent a food and agriculture hub, proposals/applications should cover a range of uses and scales and not be limited to one or two users or types of use.

Acceptable primary uses will, subject to considerations of scale, impact and infrastructure requirements, include:

- Agri-tech businesses which make use of the local agri-science base
- Processing of agricultural produce
- Manufacture of food products
  - Storage and distribution of agricultural produce
  - Storage and distribution of agricultural products (i.e. have undergone processing)
  - Storage and distribution of agricultural equipment, machinery and supplies
  - Storage and distribution of livestock (e.g. livestock market)
  - Haulage services related to the above storage and distribution
  - Veterinary services

In addition, subject to the proportion constituting no more than approximately 10% of the area by floorspace, an element of other uses ancillary and subsidiary to the above uses will also be acceptable, including:

- Offices necessary as part of a primary use
- Manufacture of non-food agricultural products (e.g. timber fencing)
- Manufacture of agricultural equipment, machinery and supplies
- Education / training related to agriculture and food
- Display, wholesaling and retailing of agricultural and food products.

Clear justification, in terms of the benefit proposals make to the overall hub, will be needed for significantly exceeding 10%.

A food and agriculture hub will not be a suitable location for general manufacturing, offices, storage, distribution or other uses not clearly linked to the primary uses.
4 Application

4.1 The criteria set out in this document will be used to help guide the consideration of any applications for planning permission for a “food and agriculture hub” within the local planning authority areas of Broadland, and South Norfolk. The main consideration will be the policies of the adopted Joint Core Strategy, particularly policy 5; and any other relevant policies contained in other planning documents of the three authorities, together with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework. This Supplementary Planning Document will be taken into account as a “material consideration”, as will any other factors that are regarded as “material” to the consideration of a specific proposal.

4.2 For any planning permission that is given, it is likely that conditions will be applied to ensure that the development takes place in an appropriate manner and in accordance with the relevant policies and guidance.

4.3 Potential applications are encouraged to discuss any proposals with the relevant planning authority prior to submitting a planning application.
Appendices

Appendix 1: Extract from Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk Joint Core Strategy adopted March 2011

Policy 5: The economy

The local economy will be developed in a sustainable way to support jobs and economic growth both in urban and rural locations. This will:

- provide for a rising population and develop its role as an engine of the wider economy
- facilitate its job growth potential with a target at least 27,000 additional jobs in the period 2008-2026
- increase the proportion of higher value, knowledge economy jobs while ensuring that opportunities are available for the development of all types and levels of jobs in all sectors of the economy and for all the workforce

Sufficient employment land will be allocated in accessible locations consistent with the ‘Policies for places’ in this strategy to meet identified need and provide for choice.

In particular:

- the needs of small, medium and start-up businesses will be addressed through the allocation of new smaller scale employment sites and the retention of, and the potential expansion of, a range of existing small and medium employment sites across the area and by requiring the provision of small-scale business opportunities in all significant residential and commercial developments. Flexible building design and innovative approaches will be sought in new and existing residential developments to encourage local working and business opportunities
- larger scale needs will be addressed through the allocation of sufficient land to provide a choice and range of sites. Development Plan Documents and investment strategies will ensure that a readily available supply of land is maintained throughout the Joint Core Strategy period
- investment strategies will focus on overcoming constraints to the release and development of key sites
- land identified for employment uses on proposals maps will only be considered for other uses that are ancillary and supportive to its employment role. Employment land with potential for redevelopment for other uses will be identified in supporting DPDs or SPDs

Opportunities for innovation, skills and training will be expanded through:

- facilitating the expansion of, and access to, vocational, further and higher education provision
- encouraging links between training/ education provision and relevant business concentrations including co-location where appropriate
• support for enterprise hubs at Norwich Research Park, the University of East Anglia, EPIC (East of England Production Innovation Centre), and Hethel, and at easily accessible locations in the area

Tourism, leisure, environmental and cultural industries will be promoted. This will be assisted by:

• the general emphasis of the Joint Core Strategy on achieving high quality design, resource efficiency, environmental enhancement and retention of local distinctiveness
• implementation of the green infrastructure network
• encouragement for appropriate development including sustainable tourism initiatives
• encouragement for development that creates a supportive environment for cultural Industries
• promotion of the creative industries cluster
• support for cultural initiatives including festivals

• The rural economy and diversification will also be supported by:
  • a preference for the re-use of appropriate redundant non-residential buildings for commercial uses, including holiday homes to support the tourism industry (affordable housing may be an acceptable alternative use)
  • promotion of farmers markets, farm shops and cottage industry, including e-commerce in villages
  • the development of a flagship food and farming hub serving the needs of Norfolk and supporting the agri-food sector in and around greater Norwich
  • promoting the development of appropriate new and expanded businesses, which provide either tourism or other local employment opportunities

Contributes to spatial planning objectives 1, 3, 4, 8 and 9

5.38 Achieving the full economic potential of the area is dependent on improved connectivity, including the implementation of the priorities set out in the sustainable transport policy and maintaining and enhancing the environment and quality of life in the area. Research suggests that the local economy has the potential to provide sufficient jobs to support the level of housing growth proposed. Indeed jobs growth will be dependent on housing growth. Jobs and employment potential should be a key priority when considering any form of development, especially rural development.

5.39 Enhancing the knowledge economy and promoting innovation will be important across all sectors and parts of the area. However, the expansion of activity at the Norwich Research Park, a refocus on employment and education in and around the city centre, and building on the early success of the Hethel Engineering Centre will play a fundamental role.

5.40 A range and choice of employment sites are allocated and retained, including sites suitable for workshop and light industrial type uses.
5.41 Tourism, leisure, and cultural industries are recognised as crucial sectors in the local economy that are also fundamental to local quality of life and the attraction and retention of other businesses and staff.

5.42 A food and farming hub will support local agriculture by providing opportunities for local producers to co-ordinate activity and access larger markets, provide a focus for ancillary supporting businesses and suppliers, and an opportunity for the re-location of the livestock market. Any proposal will need to be carefully located and controlled to ensure it fulfils this role in a sustainable way, with any retailing fulfilling an appropriate role in the retail hierarchy.

5.43 A wide range of businesses can be appropriate in rural areas, either because they are of a scale that is appropriate to a small town or village, they serve local needs or because they have a particular connection to the area such as rural leisure and tourism.

References
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- East of England Plan Policies E1-E6
- East of England Regional Economic Strategy
- Greater Norwich Economic Strategy 2009-2014
- Employment Growth and Sites and Premises Study (2008)
- Feasibility Study for a Conference Centre and Concert Hall for the Greater Norwich
- Area (2009)
Norwich Northern Distributor Road Development Consent Order Application: South Norfolk Council’s response

Planning Policy Manager

The Norwich Northern Distributor Road planning (Development Consent Order) application was accepted for examination by the Planning Inspectorate on 4 February 2014 and the statutory timeframe for determination has commenced. There will be an opportunity for South Norfolk Council to make an official response to the DCO application in late May or early June 2014 in the form of a Local Impact Report. The NDR forms a key element underpinning the delivery of the adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk and as such its successful delivery will bring benefits to South Norfolk. Broadland, Norwich, South Norfolk and Norfolk County Councils are proposing to lodge either a single combined Local Impact Report, or to agree common text covering much of the justification for the scheme, and the main impacts of the scheme. Given the likely short timescales to lodge a Local Impact Report in late May/early June, it is requested that the Director of Growth and Localism be granted delegated powers to agree and lodge South Norfolk Council’s official response by the date required.

Cabinet member(s): John Fuller
Ward(s) affected: All

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail: Adam Nicholls 01508 533809 anicholls@s-norfolk.gov.uk

1. Background

1.1. Norfolk County Council has long proposed to build a Norwich Northern Distributor Road (NDR) as part of a wider package of transport measures (the Norwich Area Transportation Scheme) to enhance connectivity in and around Norwich, and to support the levels of growth and housing set out in the adopted Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk.

1.2. The NDR has been drawn up over a number of years, with a number of phases of public consultation. Various changes to the NDR (most relatively minor) have taken place during its genesis, but in essence it has remained broadly the same: a 20km dual carriageway road starting at the A47 Postwick junction, passing north to Norwich Airport, and then west towards Drayton/Taverham, ending at the A1067 north of Taverham.

1.3. The NDR has been formally designated a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and it has been allocated £86.5m from the Government for the
section from Postwick to the A140 (Norfolk County Council has committed to continue and fund the remaining section to the A1067 at Taverham).

1.4. As an NSIP, it does not fall to Norfolk County Council (as Planning Authority) to determine the application; rather, such an application is made directly to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS). PINS must then appoint an Inspector (or panel of inspectors) to process the application to a fixed six-month timescale (as set out in the Planning Act 2008), following which there is three months for a recommendation to be made to the Secretary of State (in this case, for Transport) for a final decision to be made.

1.5. No part of the NDR application area falls within South Norfolk (it is about 99% within Broadland and 1% in Norwich). However, the western terminus lies close to Costessey and so there may be some indirect effects on this part of South Norfolk in particular. More broadly, however, the NDR will (if permitted and built) be an important part of the longer-term growth plans for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk. Should the NDR not go ahead, it is likely that the development pressure in South Norfolk would increase, particularly in the South Norfolk part of the Norwich Policy Area.

1.6. It is important to note that, although both Norfolk County Council and South Norfolk Council would, in principle, like to see the “missing link” added in (the section from the A1067 at Taverham to the A47 at Easton/Longwater to “complete” the NDR), this section has never been a formal part of the route. This is because it would need to cross the River Wensum, which as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC), has the highest possible level of environmental protection. Despite much work from Norfolk County Council, an environmentally acceptable and economically affordable way of crossing the River Wensum could not be found. The “missing link” therefore does not form part of the DCO application, and so there is no benefit in any parties making any representations to PINS as part of the official consultation response seeking to press the case.

1.7. South Norfolk Council has previously commented on the draft Environmental Statement for the NDR, and lodged representations seeking comfort about the potential impacts on Costessey and Longwater/Easton.

2. Current Position and Issues

2.1. Norfolk County Council (Transport) formally submitted the NDR Development Consent Order application to the Planning Inspectorate on 7 January 2014. After a month to consider whether the DCO application had been subject to adequate pre-application consultation (for which South Norfolk Council, amongst all other interested parties, was asked for its view (which was “yes”)), PINS formally accepted the application for examination on 4 February 2014.

2.2. The DCO application is, as would be expected for a scheme of this magnitude, very lengthy, with documents including a transport assessment, detailed highway modelling results, public consultation statements, a flood risk assessment and a formal Environmental Statement (all are available to view on the PINS website – see ‘Background Documents’ above for the link).
2.3. The next formal stage of the process – the current stage – is Pre-Examination, during which interested parties could register their interest in lodging formal representations by 23 March (South Norfolk Council did not need to do this: as an adjoining authority it is automatically registered).

2.4. A formal Pre-Examination Meeting (chaired by the Inspector(s)) is likely to take place in late May or early June. This meeting is purely procedural and no evidence will be heard or tested. At this PEM, the Inspector will set out the timescale for official consultation responses to be lodged, and this time period is likely to be short (2-3 weeks). South Norfolk Council’s official response – should Cabinet resolve to make one – will be in the form of a Local Impact Report.

2.5. The Examination stage – which will almost certainly include a public Hearing for the testing of evidence – must be completed within six months. The Inspector(s) then has three months to make a recommendation to the Secretary of State for Transport, who has a further three months to issue their decision on the application.

2.6. There is a great deal of common ground between the five main local authorities most closely involved with the NDR: Broadland, the Broads Authority, Norwich, South Norfolk and Norfolk County Council (its Growth and Infrastructure department, as distinct from the Transport department, which is the applicant). Excluding the Broads Authority, the other four authorities have worked closely together for years to prepare and now implement the growth strategy set out in the adopted Joint Core Strategy; without the NDR, the longer-term growth to the north and north-east of Norwich (in Broadland) would be constrained, with the need to look elsewhere to accommodate additional growth. If at all practicable, a combined Local Impact Report from the five authorities would be very helpful statement of unity, indicating clearly to the Inspector(s) that the principle of the NDR is supported fully by all the authorities and that the supporting information to the application is acceptable and appropriate.

2.7. The NDR supporting information concludes that, despite the “missing link” between the end of the NDR at Taverham and the A47 at Easton/Longwater, there will not be a material increase in traffic passing through Costessey to/from the A47 and the north of Norwich as a direct result of the NDR. South Norfolk Council officers have no evidence to believe that this will not be the case. However, post-NDR monitoring of traffic levels through Costessey will be important, and appropriate mitigation measures may be required (such as traffic calming, speed cameras etc) should the forecast traffic levels be exceeded.

2.8. Whilst it is not mandatory for South Norfolk to lodge a formal response to the DCO application (because the NDR does not fall within South Norfolk), given the NDR’s key role in facilitating growth across the three districts (Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk) it will undoubtedly have effects on South Norfolk. Not to lodge a representation might therefore raise questions for objectors to the NDR and the Inspector(s) about whether South Norfolk is actually fully supportive of the NDR, and as stated in paragraph 1.5 above, in a non-NDR scenario, it is likely that there would be an increase in development pressure in South Norfolk.
2.9. Broadland District Council's Cabinet considered a paper on the NDR at their meeting on 24 April 2014, seeking delegated approval to officers (in consultation with the relevant portfolio holder) to lodge Broadland DC’s official response by the given deadline.

2.10. South Norfolk Council officers have also been in discussions with Norfolk County Council (Transport) about agreeing a Statement of Common Ground (SCG), but to date Norfolk County Council has not yet produced the first draft of the SCG. The SCG is not likely to be a particularly lengthy or contentious document (Norfolk County Council is seeking to agree SCGs with all relevant local authorities, parish councils and other key consultees) and delegated approval for the Director of Growth and Localism (in consultation with the Group Leaders) to agree the SCG is sought.

3. **Proposal and Reasons**

3.1. Officers from the five authorities have scrutinised the NDR DCO application details. Whilst a complete (draft) combined LIR is unfortunately not yet finalised, an early draft of the LIR has been prepared and officers are satisfied that the technical evidence justifying the NDR scheme is robust, the mitigation measures are generally appropriate (although a few modifications are likely to be requested) and that the overall rationale for the scheme (as part of the ambitious growth plans set out in the Joint Core Strategy and the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership’s Strategic Economic Plan) is also clear. The NDR will also play a key role in the implementation of the Greater Norwich City Deal (agreed in 2013).

3.2. It is proposed that South Norfolk Council therefore agrees the contents of a joint Local Impact Report covering the rationale for the NDR and the detailed assessment of the supporting evidence. Given that the Joint LIR is not yet finalised (various officers from the authorities are still finalising parts of the response), it could be that a single LIR be submitted jointly, by the five authorities (the most likely option), or that each will issue an individual LIR (but with substantial elements of the text being common). In either case, delegated powers for the Director of Growth and Localism to agree (in consultation with the Group Leaders) the final form of the South Norfolk Council response is sought.

3.3. It is also proposed that South Norfolk Council agrees a Statement of Common Ground with Norfolk County Council, highlighting the areas of common agreement and also any areas of difference in relation to the NDR application. It is likely that some of the SCG contents will reflect some of the LIR contents (particularly in relation to the Joint Core Strategy). Delegated powers for the Director of Growth and Localism to agree (in consultation with the Group Leaders) the final form of the Statement of Common Ground is sought.
4. **Other Options**

4.1. The Council could decide not to make any representations to the NDR Examination and also to not agree a Statement of Common Ground. However, for the reasons outlined in paragraphs 2.6 and 2.10 above, this is not recommended.

5. **Relevant Corporate Priorities**

5.1. *Enhancing our quality of life and the environment we live in.* The NDR will help ensure that growth in the Greater Norwich area is properly balanced, and will help allow an expansion of public transport and walking and cycling routes into Norwich.

5.2. *Promoting a thriving local economy.* Delivering the NDR is a fundamental part of delivering the ambitious levels of growth planned for the Greater Norwich area in general set out in the Joint Core Strategy, Strategic Economic Plan and the Greater Norwich City Deal.

5.3. *Supporting communities to realise their potential.* There has been considerable consultation for local residents and businesses in relation to the NDR. The economic boost to South Norfolk residents (particularly those located close to Norwich) could be considerable.

6. **Implications and Risks**

6.1. *Financial.* Few direct implications. The work required is within existing budgets.

6.2. *Legal.* The NDR, as a Major Infrastructure Project, will be determined under the Planning Act 2008. South Norfolk Council is, as an adjoining authority, automatically an “interested party” and able to make representations without registering.

6.3. *Environmental.* The Environmental Statement has ensured that environmental impacts of the NDR have been assessed.


6.5. *Risks.* Should the NDR not be approved and constructed, there would be a high likelihood of increased development pressures in South Norfolk.

7. **Conclusion**

7.1. It is concluded that the Council should lodge representations to the NDR Examination, wherever possible working jointly with Broadland, Norwich, Norfolk County and the Broads Authority to minimise unnecessary duplication of work and maximise the effectiveness of the message that the NDR is a critical part of the future infrastructure for the Greater Norwich area. Agreeing a Statement of Common Ground with Norfolk County Council will also assist in the smooth progression of the NDR Examination, by highlighting to the Inspector(s) areas of agreement and (if there are any) disagreement.
8. **Recommendations**

8.1. Cabinet is asked to resolve to:

8.2. Lodge representations to the Norwich Northern Distributor Road examination in the form of a Local Impact Report expressing the Council’s support in general for the NDR, working wherever possible jointly with the other local authorities in the area (Broadland, Norwich, Norfolk County and the Broads Authority).

8.3. Grant the Director of Growth and Localism (in consultation with the Group Leaders) delegated powers to agree the precise contents of the South Norfolk or combined authorities’ Local Impact Report (as relevant) by the deadline given by the Inspector(s).

8.4. Grant the Director of Growth and Localism (in consultation with the Group Leaders) delegated powers to agree the precise contents of the South Norfolk Council/Norfolk County Council Statement of Common Ground.

**Appendices**

None
Government Review of the role of local housing authorities in housing supply: call for evidence: South Norfolk Council’s response

Planning Policy Manager

In January 2014, the Government announced that it was commissioning an independent review into the role that Local Authorities could play in boosting housing supply, with the review examining how councils are using their current powers and flexibilities to deliver new housing, and how they could team up with housing associations, house builders, residents and businesses to do more. The public call for evidence and ideas was launched on 25th March, and focuses on 10 questions. Responding to the consultation is a very useful opportunity to highlight to Government some of the positive measures that the Council has taken over recent years to boost housebuilding rates in the district, both delivering new affordable homes and developing land owned by the Council itself. It will also allow the Council to seek changes to certain regulations that are believed to hinder local authorities seeking to achieve growth and innovation.

1. Background

1.1. In January 2014, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Chief Secretary to the Treasury launched an independent review into the role that local authorities could play in increasing the supply of housing, to be led by Natalie Elphicke (a former housing barrister and Chair of Million Homes, Million Lives) and Cllr Keith House, the Leader of Eastleigh Borough Council.

1.2. On 25 March, Mrs Elphicke and Cllr House issued a public call for evidence, ideas and case studies “so they could consider new approaches to increase housebuilding, identify barriers and challenge ‘myths’ that may stand in the way of housing developments”. Novel and innovative ideas are particularly welcome, with the submission of case studies actively sought as part of submissions (where relevant). A total of ten questions are asked in the call for evidence.

1.3. The review is specifically investigating the role of local authorities in directly increasing the supply of housing themselves (i.e. through local authority direct build, for either market or affordable/social housing). It is not investigating the role
of local authorities in how they might be facilitating the increased delivery of market housing by the private sector (e.g. volume housebuilders).

2. **Current Position and Issues**

2.1. South Norfolk Council is not a stock-owning council, and is very unlikely to wish to build council houses itself in the future. However, the Council has, for some years, sought to maximise the value of its landholdings through appropriate development schemes. Two schemes in preparation at present are the development of land at Poringland for a mix of housing and commercial properties (through the Council’s own company Rosebery Park Developments Ltd), and the re-development of the Cygnet House site in Long Stratton for a similar mix of houses and commercial properties. The Council is also seeking to set up a property joint venture company with a development partner, with a view to develop/re-develop land in the future.

2.2. The Council’s experiences as a developer therefore give it some useful experiences to inform its response to the public call for evidence.

2.3. Emerging findings from the consultation responses received are expected to be published by or before the end of August 2014, with a final report to be published at a later date.

2.4. The Council’s Environment, Regulation and Planning Policy Committee considered (and agreed) on 16 April 2014 the substance of the draft response outlined below.

3. **Proposal and Reasons**

3.1. The Council’s proposed response to the consultation is as follows. It is recommended that the Director of Growth and Localism be granted delegated powers to agree the precise final text of the response:

**Q1: What are recent experiences of stock-owning councils using recent flexibilities to build new council homes?**

A: South Norfolk Council is not a stock-owning council.

**Q2: To what extent are non-stock owning councils interested in building council houses?**

A: Whilst the Council supports affordable housing through grants to Housing Associations (from the affordable housing element of the New Homes Bonus) – and has been very successful at this in recent years - it does not intend to become a stock-owning authority again as the cost would be prohibitive and the local Housing Associations are very successful.

**Q3: How could the Government support local authorities that want to do more to deliver new housing?**
A: Increasing or removing completely the cap on the number of houses a council can own before triggering a Housing Revenue Account. In addition, EU procurement rules can make forming a joint venture company or contracting an external firm to help develop sites a very lengthy and bureaucratic process.

3.3. Q4: To what extent are councils managing their asset portfolio to support new developments?

A: The Council constantly manages its asset portfolio to maximise to support new developments. In the example given in answer to Q5 below in Long Stratton, the Council is re-developing a redundant care home alongside some adjoining ‘white’ land to deliver a mix of houses and B1 floorspace. More details of this are given in a short case study in Appendix A (prepared by the Council’s Corporate Asset Manager).

3.4. Q5: How are councils using their own land to support house building by themselves or with others?

A: The Council constantly assesses its land and property holdings to seek to maximise their development value. As one example, the Council has set up a wholly owned company called Rosebery Park Developments Ltd to develop 45 residential dwellings, 14 affordable houses and seven business units at Poringland (http://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/democracy/1906_393133.asp). Another (re)development granted outline planning permission in April 2014 is a scheme for up to 50 dwellings and up to 800m² of class B1 floorspace on land owned by the Council at Long Stratton. The Council intends to retain some residential property it will construct on its own land to let on the open market.

Opportunities to make strategic purchases of land to be (re)developed for housing for capital receipts, a rental revenue stream (from market houses) or a mixture of the two are also actively sought.

3.5. Q6: How are councils using their capacity and skills to support locally-led larger developments?

A: South Norfolk Council has a number of in-house skills, including design, heritage and Building for Life experts. It also practices a ‘whole team’ approach to pre-application discussions and the consideration of planning applications, mixing development management officers, planning policy officers, building control officers (from the CNC consultancy) and other specialists from inside and outside the authority (including highways). However, it is recognised that the Council does not have the necessary skills and expertise in-house to deliver larger developments, and so is procuring for a development partner to form a joint venture company. Allowing a swifter procurement process for such partnering arrangements would be extremely advantageous for local authorities, allowing them to be much fleeter of foot in exploring development possibilities.

The Council has experience of assisting in the development of neighbourhood plans. It assisted Cringleford Parish Council in preparing its Neighbourhood Plan, which allocates land for 1200 new dwellings. The Plan, which was adopted
(‘made’) in February 2014, contains the largest housing allocation of any adopted
neighbourhood plan so far in England.

South Norfolk Council also works very closely with its partners Broadland District,
Norwich City and Norfolk County councils as the Greater Norwich Growth Board,
which agreed a City Deal with the Government at the end of 2013. The councils
have an adopted Joint Core Strategy promoting an ambitious programme of
housebuilding and job creation across the three districts, which is supported by a
Business Plan and Local Infrastructure Plan and Programme. South Norfolk
Council is also an active partner in the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership,
which has recently submitted its Strategic Economic Plan to the Government.

3.6. Q7: What innovative finance mechanisms have councils used to support
housing developments?

A: South Norfolk Council is, as detailed in earlier answers, seeking a
development partner to form a joint venture property company (LLP structure) to
explore and maximise development opportunities to add value to the Council’s
landholdings and to seek access to predictable revenue streams through private
sector rental properties.

3.7. Q8: What innovative finance mechanisms are used in funding private
sector housing development?

A: The Council has insufficient knowledge of private sector funding mechanisms
to add much of value in answering this question.

3.8. Q9: How have local authorities improved the efficiency of their
management and development of social housing?

A: As a non stock-owning authority, no answer to be given.

3.9. Q10: How easy have you found it to locate details about local authorities’
housing/land assets?

A: No answer to be given.

3.10. It is proposed that a short case-study of the Council’s general approach to
property development, with particular reference to the Poringland scheme (by
Rosebery Park Developments Ltd) also be submitted. This case-study is
attached as Appendix A.

4. Other Options

4.1. The Council could decide not to submit a response to the Elphicke/House
Review. However, this would be a missed opportunity to seek improvements to
the some of the administrative hurdles holding back authorities in seeking to act
more commercially in building houses, and to inform the Review of some of the good work done by the Council.

5. Relevant Corporate Priorities

5.1. Enhancing our quality of life and the environment we live in.

5.2. Promoting a thriving local economy.

5.3. Supporting communities to realise their potential.

6. Implications and Risks


6.2. Legal. None, except for the fact that some loosening of legal hurdles (such as EU procurement rules) is sought.

6.3. Environmental. No immediate implications.

6.4. Equalities. No implications.

6.5. Risks. No real implications, but an improved legislative environment would enable the Council to make more effective use of its land and financial resources to deliver a valuable revenue return on its assets.

7. Conclusion

7.1. The proposed responses to the Elphicke/House Review reflect the Council’s current position and thoughts on the issues raised and give a useful opportunity to try to influence Government to allow greater freedoms and flexibilities for local authorities to make best use of their property assets and expertise.

8. Recommendations

Cabinet is asked to:

8.1. Agree the substance of the responses listed in section 3 of this paper, and the submission of the Poringland case study, and to delegate to the Director of Growth and Localism the power to agree and lodge the final Council response (making any appropriate minor modifications or improvements) to the ‘call for evidence’ by the deadline of 23 May.

Appendix

Appendix 1: Case study of the Council’s property development strategy and the Poringland development scheme being delivered by the Council’s company Rosebery Park Developments Ltd.
South Norfolk Council has a track record of identifying and delivering income streams to support Council services, as we move to a financial model of self-reliance.

As part of this commercialisation, the Council is seeking to use its good capital levels and land holdings, to maximise the value of its land holdings, which in turn will:

- Generate capital income through the sale of property;
- Generate revenue income through rents received from both residential and commercial property retained;
- Create of affordable housing;
- Improve economic development and growth including the creation of jobs;
- Support highway improvements to the local infrastructure; and
- Support the Health Agenda by providing recreation areas for the community.

The Council’s Asset Management Plan and Investment Property Strategy, highlights that the Council will consider opportunities for collaborative working with private partners to facilitate development and investment, through sharing of expertise, funding and assets.

We are investing in new homes and commercial premises through our new property development company – Rosebery Park Developments Ltd. The plans include a development in Poringland consisting of 43 residential market properties, 14 affordable homes, 3539m² of office units and recreational areas. The Council is seeking to retain some residential units and the commercial office space to provide an income stream that meets a minimum return of 5%. The commercial units will be small, modular units aimed at business start-ups, but flexible in design to allow expansion.

Work is well underway to procure a strategic partner to form a Joint Venture Company. The Council is seeking a partner who has a dynamic approach, and is experienced in the construction and delivery of a wide range of developments. The Council is committed to developing high quality, sustainable and innovative homes and commercial space, with a vision of being recognised as leading the way. The JVC will be established to acquire and develop sites for residential and commercial units over a 25 year period. The JVC will develop these sites, and retain some units to rent in the private market.
Agenda Item No. 11

Planning performance and planning contributions consultation paper

Business Improvement Manager

The Department for Communities and Local Government has issued a consultation paper which seeks comments on proposals to:

- Increase the threshold for designating authorities as underperforming, based on the speed of determining applications for major development to 40% or fewer of decisions made on time, and
- To introduce a 10 unit and 1000 square metres gross floorspace threshold for affordable housing contributions through Section 106 planning obligations to aid the delivery of small scale housing sites. Rural Exception Sites will be excluded from this threshold.

The deadline for comments is 4 May 2014 and consequently the purpose of this paper is to confirm the comments which were submitted following the Environment, Regulation and Planning Policy Committee on 16 April 2014.

Cabinet member(s): Ward(s) affected:
Keith Kiddie All

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail: Stuart Pontin 01508 533753 spontin@s-norfolk.gov.uk

1. Background

1.1. On 23 March 2014 the Department for Communities and Local Government issued a consultation paper in relation to planning performance measures and the use of Section 106 Planning Obligations requiring contributions to affordable housing. This is attached at Appendix 1. Comments are required by 4 May 2014.

1.2. The draft of this paper was presented to the Environment, Regulation and Planning Policy Committee on 16 April 2014, after which the following comments set out in appendix 2 were submitted as the Council’s initial response.

2. Planning Performance

2.1. The Government introduced measures in 2012 to identify under performing Planning Authorities. These Authorities were defined as those determining less than 30% of major applications within the statutory determination period or such extended period as has been agreed in writing with the applicant, over a rolling two year period. For Authorities who were designated as under performing, applicants could choose to submit proposals to the Planning Inspectorate for
determination rather than to the under performing Planning Authority, with the 
associated fee going to the Inspectorate. Before any decisions to designate 
Authorities are confirmed, they will be given an opportunity to explain any 
exceptional circumstances which would make the designation unreasonable. The 
consultation paper propose two tests which relate to whether the issue 
significantly affects the reasonableness of the conclusions drawn from the 
recorded data and whether the issue had a significant impact on the Authority’s 
performance which were beyond its control.

2.2. The interim performance figures published for the period July 2011 to March 
2013 show South Norfolk Council’s performance as 35% (20 applications out of 
57 within the statutory determination period. There were no applications with an 
agreed extension of time.

2.3. The figures published for the year ending December 2013 set out that 55% of 
major residential applications were determined with the statutory determination 
period and 11 applications were determined within the agreed extension of time. 
The Council’s calculation of the rolling two year figure up to the last quarter is 
59%

2.4. Members will be aware that the Development Management Teams have been 
realigned to allow more flexible working and a team approach to the 
consideration of major applications. In addition, the teams are now on a weekly 
basis monitoring the progress of major applications and where it is not possible to 
determine them within the the statutory determination period, are seeking to 
agree an extension of time with the applicants. In addition the scheme of 
Delegation has been amended to increase the number of applications which can 
be determined under delegated powers. I therefore consider that the continued 
development of these methods of working should ensure that South Norfolk 
Council can continue to determine major applications in a timely manner.

2.5. The consultation paper sets out 4 questions in relation to the proposed changes 
and the Council’s responses are set out in appendix 2.

3. **Planning Contributions**

3.1. The consultation paper is seeking to restrict the use of Section 106 planning 
obligation contributions where sites contain 10 units or fewer with a maximum 
combined floor space of 1000 square metres and for residential extensions or 
annexes. It is proposed to include a maximum total floorspace in combination 
with a unit threshold to avoid creating an incentive in terms of construction 
density.

3.2. The consultation paper sets out that this proposal is to help address the 
disproportionate burden being placed on small scale developers, including those 
wishing to build their own homes, and which prevent the delivery of much 
needed, small scale housing sites.

3.3. The Government has already amended Community Infrastructure Levy 
regulations to exempt self build, extensions and annexes and for consistency the 
consultation paper therefore considers that where CIL is not levied, such 
proposals should not be subject to Section 106 obligations for affordable housing.
3.4. Policy 4 of the Adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS) sets out the thresholds for affordable housing. This seeks a mix of tenure, the details of which are agreed on a site by site basis. The policy requires 20% of the dwellings to be affordable on sites of 5 to 9 dwellings (or 0.2 to 0.4Ha), 30% for sites of 10 to 15 dwellings (0.4 to 0.6Ha) and 33 % for sites of 16 or more dwellings (or over 0.6Ha). South Norfolk Council does not seek contributions in relation to extensions or annexes. With regard to the revisions to the CIL Regulations, the current JCS policy would still seek on site provision of affordable housing, although the affordable units and dwellings may be eligible to claim exemption to CIL. If the proposed change becomes national policy it would supersede the JCS policy thresholds.

3.5. One of the objectives of the Joint Core Strategy and the emerging South Norfolk Local Plan is to ensure that allocations of new housing in smaller settlements will still deliver a few affordable properties there, thus contributing to social and economic sustainability. Of the allocated sites within the “rural areas”, 43 sites are allocated for 10 or less dwellings. The proposed changes will result in the loss of 16 affordable dwellings on sites of between 5 and 9 dwellings and 27 affordable dwellings on sites of 10 dwellings.

3.6. Notwithstanding the Government’s view that the provision of affordable housing is adversely affecting the delivery of housing on small sites, the Council has not had any cases where the viability of the development has been an argument for not providing affordable units on sites of less than 10 dwellings.

3.7. The paper states that Rural Exception sites can deliver affordable housing in rural areas, however, it is our experience that housing associations look for a minimum of four dwellings for exception sites and there needs to be an identified local need for at least six local households to justify a scheme of four dwellings. Of the 24 exception sites provided over the last five years, none have been on sites of fewer than four dwellings. The current JCS policy provides affordable housing in areas of low need (below four affordable dwellings) by providing affordable housing on sites of five or more dwellings. These affordable units have a requirement for a local connection cascade to occupation, thus providing affordable housing in locations where an exception site may not come forward. Removing the ability of allocated sites to deliver affordable housing would reduce rural social sustainability.

3.8. The consultation paper sets out three questions in relation to the proposed changes and the Council’s responses are set out in appendix 2.

4 Implications and Risks

4.1 Financial – In relation to Planning Performance, if performance fell below the threshold level applications and their associated fee would be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate

4.2 Equalities – In relation to the proposed changes to the use of Section 106 planning obligations and the provision of affordable housing, if this becomes national policy it would remove the ability of allocated sites in the Local Plan to deliver affordable housing which would reduce rural social sustainability.

5 Relevant Corporate Priorities

5.1 Enhancing our quality of life and the environment we live in
5.2 Driving services through being businesslike, efficient and customer aware.

6 Recommendations

6.1 That the above comments and response in Appendix 2 be submitted as this Council’s response to the consultation paper.

Appendices

1 Planning performance and planning contributions – Consultation
2 Response to questions in the consultation paper
Question 1 – Do you agree that the threshold for designating authorities as under-performing, based on speed, should increase to 40% or fewer of decisions made on time?

The measures have been in place for one and a half years and has resulted in an increase in planning performance both nationally and locally. It is appropriate to review these periodically to encourage continued improvement in the determination of major applications. The ability to agree an extension of time recognises that in certain circumstances it is not possible to determine applications within the statutory determination period, but these are counted towards the Authority’s performance.

It should be recognised that in some cases applications can not be determined due to holding directions issued by Government agencies such as the Highway Agency.

Question 2 – Do you think there is scope to raise the threshold for underperformance above 40% (for example to 45% or 50%); and, if so, by when?

There is scope to raise the threshold above 40%, however this should be based on the national average of Local Planning Authorities. In addition to seeking to increase Local Planning Authority’s performance, the Government has sought to improve the performance of the Planning Inspectorate. Setting a level too high could result in an increased number of Planning Authorities being designated as under performing, impacting on the performance of the Inspectorate which would hinder plan making and the delivery of growth.

Question 3 - Do you agree that authorities that have dealt with no more than two applications for major development, over the two year assessment period, should be exempt from designation based on their speed of decision?

Yes

Question 4 - Do you agree that the tests set out at paragraph 21 of this consultation are appropriate for taking exceptional circumstances into account, prior to designations being confirmed?

It is difficult to define tests which would address all circumstances relating to under performance. It is noted that the purpose of the measures is to encourage Planning Authorities to determine applications in a timely manner and if designated, that the Government would work with the Authority to address areas of concern.

Question 5 – Is the Government’s objective of aiding the delivery of small scale housing sites and expanding the self build housing market supported by:

The introduction of a 10 unit and 1000 square metres gross floor space threshold for Section 106 affordable housing contributions; and

The exclusion of domestic extensions and annexes from section 106 affordable housing contributions?

The Council are concerned that the thresholds proposed could encourage low density development, or the breaking up of larger sites for developments to fall below the thresholds. This would result in an inefficient use of land and uncoordinated
developments. It is considered that any proposal should also include a site size threshold (0.4Ha).

Policy 4 of the Council’s Adopted Joint Core Strategy sets out the thresholds for affordable housing. This seeks a mix of tenure, the details of which are agreed on a site by site basis. The policy requires 20% of the dwellings to be affordable on sites of 5 to 9 dwellings (or 0.2 to 0.4Ha), 30% for sites of 10 to 15 dwellings (0.4 to 0.6Ha) and 33% for sites of 16 or more dwellings (or over 0.6Ha). South Norfolk Council does not seek contributions in relation to extensions or annexes. With regard to the revisions to the CIL Regulations, the current JCS policy would still seek on site provision of affordable housing, although the affordable units and dwellings may be eligible to claim exemption to CIL.

One of the objectives of the Joint Core Strategy and the emerging South Norfolk Local Plan is to ensure that allocations of new housing in smaller settlements will still deliver a few affordable properties there, thus contributing to social and economic sustainability. Of the allocated sites within the “rural areas”, 43 sites are allocated for 10 or less dwellings. The proposed changes will result in the loss of 16 affordable dwellings on sites of between 5 and 9 dwellings and 27 affordable dwellings on sites of 10 dwellings.

Notwithstanding the Government’s view that the provision of affordable housing is adversely affecting the delivery of housing on small sites, the Council has not had any cases where the viability of the development has been an argument for not providing affordable units on sites of less than 10 dwellings.

The Council has concerns that the proposed revisions would have a significant impact on the delivery of mixed developments in rural areas.

**Question 6 - Should the proposed exemption apply beyond affordable housing to other tariff style contributions based on standard formulae?**

If the aim of the policy is to give a consistent approach across the country then yes, however, part of the arguments put forward for the implementation of CIL was that all developments should contribute to the infrastructure needs to facilitate the growth agenda and that the cumulative impacts of smaller developments should be addressed.

**Question 7 - We would like your views on the impact on the Government’s policy objectives to incentivise brownfield development through the proposed national policy change. This would reduce the financial burden on developers by requiring that affordable housing contributions should not be sought where buildings are brought back into use – other than proportionately for any increase in floor space.**

The costs of developing brownfield developments were included in setting the Community Infrastructure Levy for South Norfolk. The danger is that without funding for infrastructure we will end up with unplanned development which does not meet its infrastructure needs to the detriment of residents and business.
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The consultation process and how to respond

Scope of the consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic of this consultation:</th>
<th>The Autumn Statement 2013 included a commitment to consult on a new threshold for designating local planning authorities as underperforming, and on a proposed new 10-unit threshold for section 106 affordable housing contributions.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scope of this consultation:</td>
<td>In relation to planning performance, the consultation seeks views on changes to the threshold for the speed of decisions, as well as proposing to clarify the way in which exceptional circumstances affecting performance will be taken into account. The consultation also suggests possible changes to section 106 planning obligations policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical scope:</td>
<td>These proposals relate to England only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact assessment:</td>
<td>An impact assessment is not required because the impact on business is considered to be minimal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To:</th>
<th>This is a public consultation and it is open to anyone with an interest in these proposals to respond.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body responsible for the consultation:</td>
<td>The Department for Communities and Local Government is responsible for the policy and the consultation exercise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration:</td>
<td>This consultation will run for 6 weeks. It will begin on 23 March 2014 and end on 4 May 2014.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquiries:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:planning.consultation@communities.gsi.gov.uk">planning.consultation@communities.gsi.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How to respond:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Please respond to this consultation by email to: <a href="mailto:planning.consultation@communities.gsi.gov.uk">planning.consultation@communities.gsi.gov.uk</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Alternatively, please send postal responses to: | Rosie Bennet  
Department for Communities and Local Government  
1/J1 Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London SW1E 5DU |

### Additional ways to become involved:

| | N/A |

### After the consultation:

| | A summary of responses to the consultation will be published. |

### Background

#### Getting to this stage:

| | The Autumn Statement 2013 can be found at: https://www.gov.uk/government/topical-events/autumn-statement-2013 |
Introduction

About this consultation

1. The Government has already taken steps to transform the planning system into a simpler, more transparent and locally driven process, through which homes can be delivered and business investment secured. The National Planning Policy Framework streamlined over 1,000 pages of planning policy into a clear, easily accessible statement of national policy. Through the Localism Act 2011 and the Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013, important reforms to simplify and speed-up planning procedures have been taken forward.

2. Our reforms have given significant additional power to local authorities and communities in deciding the scale, location and form of development in their areas. But with this power comes a responsibility to exercise planning functions properly. We are making good progress. Since the introduction of these reforms, decision making performance has improved and local residents have seen the positive impact of Section 106 contributions. There remains some way to go, however, before every local authority uses its powers effectively to encourage appropriate development.

3. This consultation proposes some additional improvements to ensure further progress is made on decision making and housing delivery. Views are sought on proposals relating to the following two areas:
   - Ensuring there are further improvements in the speed of decisions on planning applications for major development;
   - Promoting housing delivery by introducing a threshold for Section 106 affordable housing contributions.

4. We would welcome comments from any individuals or organisations with an interest in these proposals, which apply to England only. The closing date for responses is 4 May 2014.
What are we proposing?

5. We are proposing that the threshold for designating authorities as underperforming, based on the speed of deciding applications for major development, should increase to 40% or fewer of decisions made on time. The threshold may be raised further at a future stage. Authorities that have dealt with an average of no more than two applications for major development, over the two year assessment period, would be exempt from designation based on their speed of decisions. The document setting out the criteria for designation would set out the types of exceptional circumstances that may be taken into account, prior to designations being confirmed.

6. We are also proposing to introduce a 10-unit and 1,000 square metres gross floor space threshold for affordable housing contributions through section 106 planning obligations. This will aid the delivery of small scale housing sites. Rural Exception Sites will be excluded from this threshold.
Planning performance

Context

7. Timely and well-considered decisions on planning applications are a key part of delivering an effective planning service. Applicants, as well as local communities, should be confident that a decision on proposals will be reached within a reasonable time – whether that is within the statutory timescale or a longer period agreed transparently with the local planning authority.

8. Equally, all parties should have confidence in the quality of the decisions made on applications for development – that all relevant considerations are being taken into account, and that the weight being given to different considerations is reasonable in the context of national and local policies.

9. The Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013 gives the Secretary of State power to designate local planning authorities, if he considers that their performance in handling planning applications has fallen below an acceptable standard. Where this happens, the Act gives applicants for major development the option of applying directly to the Secretary of State (although they may if they wish apply to the local planning authority in the usual way). In addition, support is made available to designated authorities to help them improve as quickly as possible.

10. Any designations of local planning authorities must be made by reference to criteria published by the Secretary of State (the 'criteria document'\textsuperscript{1}). The published criteria relate to the speed and quality of decisions on applications for major development.

11. The Government believes that the thresholds for acceptable minimum standards of performance against these criteria should be kept under review, to take into account changing circumstances and encourage continuing improvement in service standards. This consultation proposes changes to the threshold for speed, as well as proposing to clarify the way in which any exceptional circumstances affecting performance will be taken into account.

12. Following this consultation we will consider whether changes should be made to the criteria document; if so, a revised document will be laid before Parliament for a statutory 40 day period before any changes can come into effect. None of the changes to the thresholds proposed here will affect the first designations of ‘county matter’ authorities scheduled for April 2014 (for which the thresholds in the existing criteria document will apply).

\textsuperscript{1} Improving planning performance: criteria for designation (June 2013) http://tinyurl.com/odqu8v8
**Speed of decisions**

13. The existing threshold for identifying under-performance in the speed of determining applications is low, at just 30% or fewer of an authority's decisions on applications for major development made on time. ‘On time’ means within the statutory period of 13 weeks (or 16 weeks for applications subject to Environmental Impact Assessment), or such longer period as has been agreed in writing between the local planning authority and the applicant.

14. A low threshold was used originally for a number of reasons. Because the two year period over which performance was to be assessed started before the announcement of the policy (and local planning authorities could not remedy past failings), the threshold was set at a level that would only affect cases of very poor performance, in the context of a national average of fewer than 60% of major decisions being made on time. The low threshold also reflected the fact that prior to April 2013 the data recorded by DCLG did not fully reflect agreed extensions of time\(^2\) (although this is something that could be taken into account in assessing any claims for exceptional circumstances; see paragraph 20 below).

15. The next full round of designations, due to be made in October 2014, will be based on performance from July 2012 to June 2014. The intention to designate under-performing authorities has been known for the great majority of this assessment period, as have the thresholds that might be applied and the Government’s intention to raise the threshold for speed of performance after the first year\(^3\). The majority of the data used to inform designations in October this year will also reflect agreed extensions of time on applications for major development.

16. Since this policy was first announced there has also been a positive improvement in the percentage of applications for major development decided on time – the performance of district matter authorities improved from around 57% when the Growth and Infrastructure Bill was introduced (October 2012) to 69% in July-September 2013\(^4\).

17. Taking these changes into account – and to encourage further improvement – we think it would be appropriate to raise the threshold for designating authorities as under-performing, based on the speed of decisions, from 30% to 40% made on time. This threshold would be used for any designations in October 2014, for both district and county matter authorities.

\(^2\) Previously the recorded data reflected agreed extensions of time made through Planning Performance Agreements, but not those agreed once an application had been submitted.

\(^3\) [Planning performance and the planning guarantee: consultation (November 2012), page 13](http://tinyurl.com/d8hm66l)

\(^4\) For county matter authorities, over the same period, there has been an improvement from around 50% to 53% decided on time.
Question 1: Do you agree that the threshold for designating authorities as under-performing, based on speed, should increase to 40% or fewer of decisions made on time?

18. We expect the extent to which applications for major development are decided on time to continue to improve, especially if more effective use is made of Planning Performance Agreements. In that context it would be appropriate for the definition of under-performance to continue to change as well. How quickly this happens will depend on the overall trend in performance, but we are interested in your views on when and by how much the threshold might rise in future, beyond the move to 40% proposed above.

Question 2: Do you think there is scope to raise the threshold for under-performance above 40% (for example to 45% or 50%); and, if so, by when?

19. We have looked again at whether it is appropriate to exempt authorities that have dealt with very small numbers of applications for major development from designation. In principle it should be possible to deal with all such applications 'on time', whether this is within the relevant statutory period or – where necessary – within a longer period agreed with the applicant. At the same time we accept that one or two decisions that run over time during the assessment period are insufficient to point to a record of under-performance. We therefore propose to exempt authorities that have dealt with no more than two major applications per two year assessment period from designation.

Question 3: Do you agree that authorities that have dealt with no more than two applications for major development, over the two year assessment period, should be exempt from designation based on their speed of decisions?

Exceptional circumstances

20. Before any decisions to designate authorities are confirmed, they will be given an opportunity to explain any exceptional circumstances which, in their view, would make a designation unreasonable. What constitutes an ‘exceptional circumstance’ cannot, by its very nature, be defined fully in advance, but we think it would be helpful to set out the general tests that will be applied in considering such cases.

21. Consequently, we propose to include the following tests within the criteria document:

(a) Whether the issue significantly affects the reasonableness of the conclusions that can be drawn from the recorded data for the authority, over the assessment period;

(b) Whether the issue had a significant impact on the authority's performance, for reasons that were beyond its control.
22. We will, in considering the first of these tests, take into account corrections that need to be made to the data, where authorities can provide clear evidence that such changes are justified.

**Question 4:** Do you agree that the tests set out at paragraph 21 of this consultation are appropriate for taking exceptional circumstances into account, prior to designations being confirmed?
Amending section 106 planning obligations

Affordable housing contributions on small sites

23. A significant proportion of all planning obligations are affordable housing contributions. Previous research\(^5\) found that affordable housing accounted for approximately half of the value of all planning obligations. The Government considers that such contributions for small scale sites, including for those wishing to build their own home, can make a scheme undeliverable.

24. In its 2013 Autumn Statement, the Government made a commitment to reduce the planning costs to developers; including through a proposed new 10-unit threshold for section 106 affordable housing contributions. This is to help address the disproportionate burden being placed on small scale developers, including those wishing to build their own homes, and which prevents the delivery of much needed, small scale housing sites.

25. This consultation proposes that before any request for affordable housing contributions can be considered as part of a section 106 planning obligations agreement, authorities will have to have regard to national policy that such charges create a disproportionate burden for development falling below a combined 10-unit and maximum of 1,000 square metres gross floor space threshold. We also intend to make clear that, having regard to such disproportionate burdens, authorities should not seek affordable housing contributions for residential extensions or annexes added to existing homes.

26. This change in policy would restrict the use of section 106 planning obligation contributions where sites contain 10 units or less with a maximum combined gross floor space of 1,000 square metres and for residential extensions or annexes. It is proposed to include a maximum total floor space in combination with a unit threshold to avoid creating a perverse incentive in terms of construction density.

27. The Government is committed to providing access to affordable housing in rural communities. Rural Exception Sites provide affordable housing in rural areas.

---


on land that would not otherwise be acceptable for development. These tend to be developments of ten or fewer homes. These sites are crucial in providing cheaper land for affordable homes in areas where development costs tend to be higher. National policy will make it clear that Rural Exception Sites are outside the scope of the proposed 10-unit and 1000 square metres gross floor space threshold.

**Question 5:** Is the Government’s objective of aiding the delivery of small scale housing sites and expanding the self build housing market supported by:

- the introduction of a 10-unit and 1000 square metres gross floor space threshold for section 106 affordable housing contributions; and
- the exclusion of domestic extensions and annexes from section 106 affordable housing contributions?

28. The Government has already amended Community Infrastructure Levy regulations explicitly to exempt self-build, extensions and annexes. However, this may lead to a situation where self-build development could be subject to section 106 tariff-style contributions in councils which have not yet adopted the Community Infrastructure Levy; whereas, such charges would not be levied in councils where tariffs had been incorporated into the levy. This is inconsistent. Moreover, the fact that the Community Infrastructure Levy is not levied on self-build provides a strong argument for not levying any tariff-style contributions via Section 106 mechanisms either, given the desire of the Government to reduce burdens on self-builders.

**Question 6:** Should the proposed exemption apply beyond affordable housing to other tariff style contributions based on standard formulae?

Excluding buildings brought back into use from section 106 affordable housing contributions

29. The Government has recently introduced amended regulations for the Community Infrastructure Levy which extend an existing exemption for vacant buildings being brought back into use from the levy. This exemption applies either where buildings are brought back into the same use, or for a change of use provided they have not been “abandoned” and have been in use for at least six months in the last three years. In either case the levy is only charged on any increase in floor space.

30. As with the amendment to the levy the intention of this change in national policy is to reflect the reduced impact on local infrastructure likely to arise from bringing a building back into use and to provide a clear incentive to brownfield development. It is also intended to reflect the often higher costs of conversion and refurbishment and bringing an existing building back into use.

31. This consultation proposes an amendment to national policy so that local authorities should consider that section 106 affordable housing contributions
should not be applied to buildings brought back into any use, other than proportionately for any increase in floor space. This would be on the basis of incentivising brownfield development in accordance with national policy and that such development has a limited impact on local infrastructure.

Question 7: We would like your views on the impact on the Government’s policy objectives to incentivise brownfield development through proposed national policy change. This would reduce the financial burden on developers by requiring that affordable housing contributions should not be sought where buildings are brought back into any use – other than proportionately for any increase in floor space.
Consultation questions

Planning Performance

Question 1: Do you agree that the threshold for designating authorities as under-performing, based on speed, should increase to 40% or fewer of decisions made on time?

Question 2: Do you think there is scope to raise the threshold for under-performance above 40% (for example to 45% or 50%); and, if so, by when?

Question 3: Do you agree that authorities that have dealt with no more than two applications for major development, over the two year assessment period, should be exempt from designation based on their speed of decisions?

Question 4: Do you agree that the tests set out at paragraph 21 of this consultation are appropriate for taking exceptional circumstances into account, prior to designations being confirmed?

Amending section 106 planning obligations

Question 5: Is the Government’s objective of aiding the delivery of small scale housing sites and expanding the self build housing market supported by:

- the introduction of a 10-unit and 1000 square metres gross floor space threshold for section 106 affordable housing contributions; and
- the exclusion of domestic extensions and annexes from making section 106 affordable housing contributions?

Question 6: Should the proposed exemption apply beyond affordable housing to other tariff style contributions based on standard formulae?

Question 7: We would like your views on the impact on the Government’s policy objectives to incentivise brownfield development through proposed national policy change. This would reduce the financial burden on developers by requiring that affordable housing contributions should not be sought where buildings are brought back into any use – other than proportionately for any increase in floor space.
Governance arrangements for the Greater Norwich Growth Board

Director of Growth and Localism

This report sets out the proposed governance arrangements for delivering South Norfolk Council’s growth proposals contained in the Joint Core Strategy, the recently agreed Greater Norwich City Deal and the New Anglia LEP Strategic Economic Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cabinet member(s):</th>
<th>Ward(s) affected:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Fuller</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail: Tim Horspole 01508 5330806 thorspole@s-norfolk.gov.uk

1. Background

1.1. At its meeting on the 10th February 2014 Cabinet considered a report which explained the content of the Greater Norwich City Deal. One of the report’s recommendations agreed by Cabinet was to delegate authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader to draw up governance arrangements for the delivery of the Greater Norwich City Deal, through the establishment of the Greater Norwich Growth Board (GNGB). The GNGB will replace the Greater Norwich Development Partnership, and will focus on delivery of the growth plans that are enshrined in the Joint Core Strategy, the City Deal and the New Anglia LEP Strategic Economic Plan.

1.2. It was also agreed at cabinet that the final arrangements to be reported back for agreement from Full Council.

2. Current Position and Issues

2.1. Negotiations between the leaders of Broadland, Norwich City, Norfolk County and South Norfolk Councils have developed proposed formal structures and support arrangements for the Greater Norwich Growth Board.

2.2. Three documents have been drafted, these documents set out the governance arrangements for the Board and the agreements that will be in place to manage the funding streams. These documents will form the basis of the Greater Norwich Growth Board going forward. They are:

- The Joint Working Agreement – this sets the framework for governance. (Appendix 1)
• The Infrastructure Investment Fund – Which sets out the management of Community Infrastructure Levy contributions from Broadland, Norwich, South Norfolk Councils. (Appendix 2)

• The Local Infrastructure Fund – This sets out the management of a fund that will be offered to developers to accelerate delivery on sites that could come forward early. (appendix 3)

3. Proposal and Reasons

3.1. The three proposed governance documents are appended to this report. They can be summarised as:

The Joint Working Agreement (JWA) for the Greater Norwich Growth Board

3.2. This document sets out the working relationship of the parties, Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk Councils, Norfolk County Council plus the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership.

3.3. It is recommended that the JWA will be signed by all parties. It is intended that the Growth Board will:

• Provide strategic direction, monitoring and coordination of both the City Deal and wider growth programme for the greater Norwich area, working through three sub-Boards focussed on: infrastructure delivery; enterprise and Innovation; and, employment and skills.

• Implement an agreed annual programme of delivery (a joint business plan), which is developed and approved by all parties.

• Publish the annual programme, which will set out the financial implications for income and expenditure the forthcoming year; the cumulative financial impact of funding decisions on the Programme given funding and borrowing commitment from earlier years; and will take account of the long-term financial implications for the end of the programme period i.e. 2026, to ensure that the authority is not exposed to any undue financial risk and that the programme can be fully supported from future income streams.

• Monitor progress of delivery and spend including reviewing the programme risks and its risk mitigation measures.

• Secure the co-operation of the parties.

• Identify, lobby for, secure and coordinate funds.

3.4. The GNGB membership will be the Leaders of each of the four councils (or a representative) and a representative of the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (not a local authority member). In addition there is scope to add other partners to the GNGB and consideration will be given to other members and the role of the private sector at the first meeting of the GNGB.

3.5. The JWA assumes that each Council and LEP representative will have delegated authority to make decisions about delivery, strictly within the limits of the business plan.

3.6. This will be achieved by South Norfolk Council agreeing the CIL payment to be made annually as part of the normal cycle for agreeing the Council’s budget. The Council’s representative on the GNGB (the Leader of the Council) will be tasked
with ensuring the Council’s CIL is used to deliver the agreed joint business plan for infrastructure. The representative of the Council will be responsible for reporting back to the Council on the delivery of the joint business plan for infrastructure.

The Infrastructure Investment Fund

3.7. This document sets out the arrangements for management of the Infrastructure Investment Fund. The City Deal included an agreement with HM Treasury to give the County Council the facility to borrow up to £60m via Public Works Loan Board at a reduced rate (40 points below the base rate) to the period 2026 to support the delivery of the programme. The main points are:

- Norfolk County Council will manage the Programme, as part of the County Council’s capital programme, as the majority of the infrastructure investment is for capital investment that the County Council has responsibility for e.g. transport, schools.
- As part of the Greater Norwich City Deal all the District Councils have agreed to pool their Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) income, less the percentage (up to 5%) that can be retained by the collecting authority to cover administrative costs and less the % that has to be passed to parish and Town Councils (up to 25% depending on whether a Neighbourhood Plan is in place). This will ensure that approximately 70% of CIL income collected by Districts will be made available to support the Programme and any borrowing.
- The £60m HM Treasury reduced rate Public Works Loan Board (PWLB), which formed part of the City Deal, was signed by Norfolk County Council as the Accountable Body. The borrowing will only be required if the pooled fund has a shortfall and if the investment is a priority. This will be set out in the Business Plan which will be used to prepare the Capital Programme.
- Each Council will approve the joint business plan at least annually. It is essential that South Norfolk Council ensures all necessary infrastructure requirements are included in this joint business plan.

The Local Infrastructure Fund

3.8. The negotiation of the City Deal included a request for the Government to offer some support to accelerating housing delivery across greater Norwich. There is planning consent for some 10,000 dwellings (July 2013) where development has not started. In some cases this is because of the need for up-front funding to deliver infrastructure. The deal agreed with HM Treasury also includes the facility for the County Council to borrow up to £20m from the PWLB at the project rate discount to establish a Local Infrastructure Fund. This fund will provide secured loans to developers for site specific help to enable development sites to be delivered quickly. The objective of the Local Infrastructure Fund is:

- To establish a revolving fund so that funding can be reinvested to unlock development and leverage private sector investment on developments.
• To target and bring forward those development sites which require short-term funding support.
• To support schemes that may not otherwise go ahead because of the requirement for up-front infrastructure investment.
• To generate economic activity in the short term by addressing immediate infrastructure and site constraints and promote the delivery of jobs, housing and commercial developments.

4. Other Options

5. Relevant Corporate Priorities
5.1. Enhancing our quality of life and the environment we live in.
5.2. Promoting a thriving local economy.
5.3. Supporting communities to realise their potential.

6. Implications and Risks
6.1. Financial – the establishment and activities of the Growth Board are intended to bring greater investment and support for infrastructure to the area. The overall delivery of the infrastructure investment fund will be managed to take into account external grant funding and expected future CIL income. The programme will be reviewed annually to ensure that any borrowing can be fully supported by future CIL income streams to ensure the future liabilities can be fully funded. The Local Infrastructure Fund will look to unlock development by providing financial support to developers. Norfolk County Council’s Head of Finance will oversee the programme as the County Council will take the role of accountable body.

6.2. Legal – the legal implications of the governance arrangements have been checked with Nplaw. State Aid issues that could be faced by developers will be addressed as part of the Local Investment Fund applications and will be the responsibility of developers.

6.3. Environmental – the environmental implications of each project will be identified and taken forward with the relevant bodies as part of the planning and implementation process.

6.4. Equalities – there are no equality issues related directly to these proposals; there may be equality implications related to individual schemes that may be funded, and equality impact will form part of the assessment process for funding.


6.6. Risks – Norfolk County Council, as the responsible body, will carry much of the financial risk. The main risk for all Councils in the GNGB is CIL income being lower than predicted. This risk will be mitigated through the proposed assessment of the individual business cases for each of the projects identified.

7. Conclusion
7.1. The preparation of the strategic policy framework for growth in the greater Norwich area is complete, and the focus is now on the delivery of the infrastructure that will enable the growth to come forward. In signing up to the
Greater Norwich City Deal, South Norfolk Council has committed itself to the formation of a Greater Norwich Growth Board, which will administer an Infrastructure Investment Fund and a Local Infrastructure Fund.

7.2. The appended Joint Working Agreement contains the arrangements for providing strategic direction, monitoring and coordination of both the City Deal and wider growth programme. The Greater Norwich Growth Board will replace the Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board.

8. Recommendations

8.1. Cabinet recommends to Full Council:

   a) To agree to the dissolution of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board and remove the three places from the list of the Council’s appointments to outside bodies.

   b) Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3.6 of this report, agree the governance arrangements as contained in the Joint Working Agreement for the Greater Norwich Growth Board (appendix 1), the Infrastructure Investment Fund (appendix 2), and the Local Infrastructure Fund (appendix 3).

   c) To agree to the appointment of the Leader of the Council to be South Norfolk Council’s representative on the Greater Norwich Growth Board.
Joint Working Agreement

Broadland District Council
and
Norwich City Council
and
South Norfolk Council
and
Norfolk County Council
and

1. New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership
THIS AGREEMENT is made the day of 2014

BETWEEN

BROADLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

AND

NORWICH CITY COUNCIL

AND

SOUTH NORFOK COUNCIL

AND

NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL

THE NEW ANGLIA LOCAL ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP ("LEP")

WHEREAS

2. Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council, South Norfolk Council and Norfolk County Council are the Local Authorities for the Greater Norwich area. New Anglia LEP is the Local Enterprise Partnership for Norfolk and Suffolk.

3. The afore-mentioned Local Authorities and the Local Enterprise Partnership are hereafter referred to as ‘the parties’

4. The parties have agreed to work together to establish a Greater Norwich Growth Board overseeing the delivery of the Greater Norwich Growth Programme.

5. The parties intend that such arrangements for the Greater Norwich Growth Board shall be an effective mechanism for joint management of the Greater Norwich Growth Programme.
IT IS HEREBY agreed as follows:-

1 Interpretation

1.1 In this Agreement unless the context otherwise requires the following expressions have the following meanings:-

"The Agreement" means this Agreement comprising the terms and conditions together with the Schedules hereto.

"The Commencement Date" means the date on which this Agreement is executed by the parties.

"The Constitution" means the constitution of the Greater Norwich Growth Board as set out in Schedule A to this Agreement.

"The GNGB Board" or "Board" means the representatives of the parties appointed to the Board.

"Programme" means the Greater Norwich Growth Programme developed by the GNGB in accordance with this Agreement as approved annually by Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council, South Norfolk Council, Norfolk County Council and the LEP.

“SEP” is the New Anglia Strategic Economic Plan that sets out the economic vision for Norfolk and Suffolk until 2025.

“City Deal” is the agreement signed in December 2013 between central government and the parties.

1.2 Reference to any statute or statutory provision includes a reference to that statute or statutory provision as from time to time amended extended or re-enacted.

1.3 Words importing the singular include the plural, words importing any gender include every gender, words importing persons include bodies corporate and unincorporated; and (in each case) vice versa.

1.4 Reference to Clauses and Schedules are references to clauses and schedules of this Agreement and any reference to a sub provision is unless otherwise stated a reference to a sub provision of the provision in which the reference appears.

1.5 The Clause and paragraph headings and titles appearing in this Agreement are for reference only and shall not affect its construction or interpretation.

2 Term
2.1 This Agreement shall come into effect on the Commencement Date and shall continue in force in respect of the parties until such time as the parties so agree, unless this Agreement is terminated earlier in accordance with its terms.

2.2 Should one or more of the parties wish to leave the Greater Norwich Growth Board then they can do so. However the following will apply:

2.2.1 Local authorities can only leave the Greater Norwich Growth Board on the 31 March each year.

2.2.2 At least one calendar year’s notice must be given in writing of the wish to leave. This timeframe recognises that there may be a need to organise other funding streams.

2.2.3 When a local authority wishes to leave, the costs and funding of projects which have been attributed to them, including on-going costs of borrowing will be calculated as at the date of exiting. The party/parties will have to repay any excess funding they have received along with their contribution of any on-going costs of borrowing. Should a situation arise where a local authority has made a larger contribution the Greater Norwich Growth Board will repay the party/parties, in some cases this may necessitate borrowing by Norfolk County Council to raise the funds.

3 General Principles

3.1 This Agreement has been entered into by the parties to establish a Greater Norwich Growth Board comprising representatives of each of the parties.

3.2 The parties will work together in good faith and in an open, co-operative and collaborative manner for the duration of this Agreement. The parties' members and officers will work together in the spirit of mutual trust in order to endeavour to procure the successful implementation of the Greater Norwich Growth Programme.

3.3 Board meetings will be held in public providing an open forum for debate and decision.

3.4 The Scrutiny Committees (or equivalent for Norfolk County Council) of Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council, South Norfolk Council and Norfolk County Council can scrutinise the arrangements under this Agreement.

3.5 All Board papers, technical reports that support decision making and scheme business cases will be made publicly available, including publication on a suitable website.

3.6 Clear policies on conflict of interest and hospitality will be adopted by the Board.
3.7 The parties and the Board shall comply with The Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency.

3.8 Costs associated with the Board, (including all administrative and secretarial support) and any costs incurred by any member of the Board on behalf of the Board (having been approved beforehand by the Board), shall be shared equally between the parties. Members expenses/allowances for attending Board meetings will be met by the individual parties.

4 Status of this Agreement

4.1 The parties agree that this Agreement shall take the form of a legally binding contractual relationship and shall from the Commencement Date be construed accordingly.

5 Greater Norwich Growth Board - Representation

5.1 The parties agree to constitute the Board to discharge its functions on the terms set out in the Constitution.

5.2 In appointing a representative to the Board, Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council, South Norfolk Council and Norfolk County Council will, unless there are overriding reasons to the contrary, appoint as their representatives, a member of the cabinet (or equivalent for Norfolk County Council) of each Authority. The LEP shall appoint, so far as possible, a business representative who is not an elected representative of a local authority.

5.3 Insofar as any representative requires authority from his/her appointing body to attend and take part in the meetings of the Board and in any decisions required of the Board, in accordance with the Business Plan, each party hereby confirms that it has delegated all such powers to its appropriate representative (or equivalent for Norfolk County Council) or otherwise authorised such action.

5.4 The parties agree to keep the membership of the Board under review and to consider from time to time the addition of other bodies or organisations who may contribute to the achievement of the aims and objectives of the Board. Any changes to the membership or constitution shall only be by agreement of all the parties.

6 Functions of the Greater Norwich Growth Board

6.1 The functions of the Greater Norwich Growth Board include the following:

- To provide strategic direction, monitoring and coordination of both the city deal and wider growth programme for the Greater Norwich area. It will have representation on, and links with, the Business
Growth Programme Operational Board and the Employment and Skills Strategy Board

- Implement an annual Greater Norwich Growth Programme (business plan) agreed by the parties
- To take account of the New Anglia LEP Strategic Economic Plan and the Greater Norwich City Deal and ensure alignment with the Programme
- Monitor progress of delivery and spend including reviewing the programme risks and risk mitigation measures
- Secure the co-operation of all parties
- Identifying, lobbying for, securing and coordinating funds
- Receive reports/recommendations from the Greater Norwich Strategic Planning Group as and when required

7 Greater Norwich Growth Programme

7.1 Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council, South Norfolk Council, Norfolk County Council and the New Anglia LEP shall develop and approve the Greater Norwich Growth Programme.

7.2 The Councils will approve the Greater Norwich Growth Programme at least annually. The Programme shall be published on a suitable website.
Schedule A

Greater Norwich Growth Board

Constitution

This Constitution has been approved by Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council, South Norfolk Council, Norfolk County Council, and New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership ("the parties") as the Constitution of the Greater Norwich Growth Board.

1 Establishment of the Greater Norwich Growth Board

1.1 The Board shall discharge the functions of the Greater Norwich Growth Board in the manner set out in this Constitution.

2 Objectives

2.1 The functions and objectives of the Greater Norwich Growth Board are as set out in paragraph 6.

3 Membership and Appointment of the Board of the Greater Norwich Growth Board

3.1 The Board shall comprise 5 members, one being appointed by each of the parties. In appointing representatives to the Board, Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council, South Norfolk Council and Norfolk County Council will, unless there are overriding reasons to the contrary, appoint as its representative a member of the cabinet (or equivalent for Norfolk County Council) of the Authority. The LEP shall appoint, so far as possible, a business representative who is not an elected representative of a local authority.

3.2 All appointments to membership of the Board shall be made by notification in writing from the Chief Executive of the appointing Party.

3.3 Each Party may appoint an alternate (or substitute) member (based on the scheme of substitution of each of the parties) of the Board.

3.4 Membership of the Board shall cease in the event that the member ceases to be a member of his/her Authority or the LEP.

4 Chair and Vice-Chair of the Board
4.1 At the first meeting of the Board and thereafter at its annual meeting the Board shall elect a Chair and Vice Chair from among its members on a rotating basis.

4.2 The Chair and Vice Chair should not be from the same appointing body and will serve for a 12 month period or when

4.2.1 A new Chair is elected in accordance with Paragraph 4.1 above,

4.2.2 He/she ceases to be a member of the Board, or

4.2.3 He/she resigns from the office of Chair or Vice-Chair.

4.3 Where a casual vacancy arises in the office of Chair or Vice-Chair of the Board, the Board shall at its next meeting elect a Chair.

4.4 Where, at any meeting or part of a meeting of the Board, both the Chair and Vice Chair are absent or unable to act as Chair the Board shall elect one of the local authority members to preside for the whole or the balance of that meeting.

5 Secretary to the Board

5.1 The Secretary shall be an officer of the appointing body of the Chair appointed by the Board for this purpose.

5.2 The Secretary shall support the Board.

5.3 The functions of the Secretary shall be -

- To maintain a record of membership of the Board.
- To maintain the Forward Plan.
- To summon meetings of the Board in accordance with paragraph 6 below.
- To prepare and send out the agenda for meetings of the Board in consultation with the Chair and the Vice-Chair.
- To keep a record of the proceedings of the Board.
- To take such administrative action as may be necessary to give effect to decisions of the Board.
- Such other functions as may be determined by the Board.
- Maintain a register of Board member interests.

6 Convening Meetings of the Board

6.1 Meetings of the Board shall be held at such times, dates and places as may be notified to the members by the Secretary being such time, place and location as -

6.1.1 the Board shall from time to time resolve
6.1.2 the Chair of the Board or if he/she is unable to act, the Vice-Chair, shall notify to the Secretary, or 

6.1.3 the Secretary in consultation where practicable with the Chair and Vice Chair shall determine in response to receipt of a request in writing addressed the Secretary -

- from and signed by any member of the Board, or
- from the Chief Executive of any of the parties

which request sets out an urgent item of business within the functions of the Board.

6.1.4 the Secretary shall settle the agenda for any meeting of the Board after consulting with the Chair.

7 Procedure at Meetings of the Board

7.1 The Board shall, unless the member presiding at a meeting determines otherwise, conduct its business in accordance with the Rules of the Council in whose premises the meeting is held except insofar as may be specified to the contrary in this Constitution.

7.2 A meeting of the Board shall be inquorate and shall not be able to discharge any business unless all members of the Board are present.

7.3 Decisions and recommendations of the Board shall be unanimous.

7.4 The Board shall comply with The Code of Recommended Practice for Local Authorities on Data Transparency.

8 Attendance at Board Meetings

8.1 The following are the officers who shall have a right of attendance

- the Chief Executive of any of the parties, or their representative
- the Chief Finance Officer of the parties, or their representative
- the Monitoring Officer of the parties, or their representative
- the officers of each party required to advise the board on specific matters included on the agenda

8.2 Notwithstanding that a meeting or part of a meeting of the Board may not be open to the Press and public, the officers specified in Paragraph 8.1 above of each appointing Party shall be entitled, in person or by another officer nominated by that officer, to attend all, and all parts, of such meetings, unless the particular officer has a conflict of interest as a result of a personal interest in the matter under consideration.
8.3 The meetings of the GNGB will be held in public.

9 Register of Interests and Conflict of Interest

9.1 The Secretary shall maintain a register, available for public inspection, containing a record of the relevant interests of each of the members of the Board. In determining whether an interest should be declared and recorded the principles set out in the [Local Government Code of Conduct] shall apply.

10 Amendment of this Constitution

This Constitution can only be amended by agreement of all the parties.
Greater Norwich Growth Partnership Governance

GREATER NORWICH GROWTH BOARD
Meets in March and October

- The Board will provide strategic direction, monitoring and coordination of both the city deal and wider growth programme for the Greater Norwich area. It will have representation on, and links with, the Business Growth Programme Operational Board and the Employment and Skills Strategy Board.
- To work with the New Anglia LEP and other relevant bodies and the private sector to promote the work of the board and to secure funding for the benefit of the area.

Leader - Broadland District Council
Leader - Norwich City Council
Leader - South Norfolk Council
Leader - Norfolk County Council
Chairman – New Anglia LEP (If not Leader or Chairman must be appointed representative)
Plus others TBC

**Business plan prepared by LAs and signed-off by LAs and endorsed by New Anglia LEP**

**Business plan signed-off New Anglia LEP and endorsed by LAs**

**Business plan signed-off New Anglia LEP and endorsed by LAs**

**Infrastructure Business Plan**
Delivery managed by:

**Skills**
Business Plan prepared by and delivery managed by:

**Employment and Skills Strategy Board**
- GN LA rep plus Suffolk LA rep, New Anglia LEP, training providers, voluntary organisations, business representatives

**Business support**
Business Plan prepared by and delivery managed by:

**Business Growth Programme Operational Board**
- GN rep TBC plus Suffolk LA rep, LEP, business representatives, HE, FE and enterprise agencies

**Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Board**
Chief Executive/Director representatives from Broadland, Norwich, South Norfolk and County Council and New Anglia LEP plus Accountable Body finance lead(s)

Meets monthly
Local Delivery/ Coordination Teams

**GREATER NORWICH GROWTH BOARD**

---

**Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board**

*Chief Executive/Director representatives from Broadland, Norwich, South Norfolk and County Council and New Anglia LEP plus Accountable Body finance lead(s)*

- Managing the capital programme for the Infrastructure Investment Fund and Managing the Local Infrastructure Fund
- To oversee strategic planning issues and the effectiveness and implementation of the Joint Core Strategy

---

**Greater Norwich Business Support, Enterprise and Innovation Working Group**

*Hamish Melville, Ellen Tilney, Sharon Quantrell, SNC representative, David Dukes*

---

**Greater Norwich Skills Working Group**

*TBC*

---

**Greater Norwich Strategic Planning Group**

---

**Local Planning Authorities / Highways Authority**

---

**Coordination, advocacy, support and challenge to Greater Norwich Growth Board, Business Growth Programme Operational Board and the Employment and Skills Strategy Board**
Infrastructure Investment Fund

£440m infrastructure investment including:

NATS/ NDR
Bus Rapid Transit / Bus Improvement schemes
Schools
Green Infrastructure
Community Space
Libraries
Sports Provision

Set of legal contracts for individual infrastructure detailing agreements around CIL, risk, mainstream funding, spend profile

Local infrastructure Fund

£20m revolving infrastructure loan fund:

On-site infrastructure fund
Scheme to enable developers to get site going, loan is paid back against terms of funding agreement

Contract between developer and loan provider (County Council)
Criteria for scheme assessment
County Council has to borrow so manages scheme
Infrastructure Investment Fund

Purpose

The purpose of the Infrastructure Investment Fund is to deliver the capital programme of projects identified in the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and the Local Investment Plan and Programme (LIPP). These include but are not restricted to:

- Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (NATS), including the NDR
- Long Stratton Bypass
- Schools
- Green Infrastructure
- Community Space
- Libraries
- Sports Provision

It is estimated that this represents approximately £440 million of investment over a fifteen year duration (the figures are based on the current cost of these projects as presented to HMT as part of PWLB agreement). The project profile will be updated through the local authorities business plans and managed by the Greater Norwich Growth Board.

Management of the Infrastructure Investment Fund

The decision on the timing and delivery of the projects will be determined by the Greater Norwich Growth Board, who will ensure the co-ordination between projects being delivered by the Strategic Infrastructure Investment Fund and those being delivered by the Local Infrastructure Fund. They will also ensure the wider synchronization of Infrastructure projects alongside the other two key strands of the City Deal programme, namely Skills and Business Support.

Norfolk County Council has been given the authority through the Greater Norwich City Deal agreement to borrow up to £60 million from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) to assist with the delivery of the LIPP.

In the overarching governance, the Greater Norwich Growth Board has the authority to request Norfolk County Council to borrow on its behalf.

Delivery of the Infrastructure Investment Fund
The implementation of the agreed programme of projects will be through the Greater Norwich Growth Board. The Board will use the joint business plan to determine the programme of projects for the forthcoming year and the next five years and the timeline for delivery. This Board will decide how each project will be delivered and the appropriate accountable body for delivery of each project.

**Process for determining the timing of the delivery of projects**

Broadland, Norwich City, South Norfolk and Norfolk County Councils, and New Anglia LEP will produce a joint business plan that will take account of the requirements across the three districts and will prioritise the projects to be delivered in the whole area as well as the geographical area for their council. The joint business plan will require prior approval by the Councils and the LEP.

The Greater Norwich Growth Board will report annually on the progress of each project by the 1 June, this information will assist the Councils’ annual review of the joint plan. Any changes which the Councils wish to see will be reflected in the revised joint business plan which will be submitted to the Greater Norwich Growth Board.

The joint business plan will be revisited by each Council on an annual basis with any agreed changes being fed through to the programme setting process by the Greater Norwich Growth Board. The approval by each Council of the joint business plan will be completed annually by the 30 September

**Criteria for prioritisation**

To assist the Greater Norwich Growth Board in determining the order of priority and to manage the annual delivery, projects will be assessed against set criteria. These criteria will include:

- **Projects which are already in progress.** Projects which are in progress that can demonstrate certainty of delivery, will take precedence over any new projects. Any changes in cost and timescale will be taken into account.

- **The funding of the individual projects.** Where projects are being funded by central government or European funding then this may determine the timing of their delivery.

- **The impact of the delivery of the individual project in terms of jobs, housing and economic growth.** Those projects which contribute a higher level of these will need to be delivered sooner, having taken any constraints into account such as planning permissions, external funding, co-reliance of other on-going projects etc.

- Criteria to assess the prioritisation/authorisation of the projects is agreed and in place as set out in the Local investment Plan and Programme.
The integration of this programme with those projects being delivered through the Local Infrastructure Fund and the other two strands of the City Deal.

The funding of the programme and how the timing of individual projects will impact on the requirement to borrow. The Greater Norwich Growth Board will need to balance the delivery of the projects with the cost of borrowing.

The Greater Norwich Growth Board will determine the programme for the forthcoming year by the 31 December together with the accountable body for each project. Unless there is good reason Norfolk County Council will be the (financial) accountable body. The body taking responsibility for procuring and delivering the body will be assessed as part of the programme.

**Funding of agreed programme & Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

The GNDP has identified funding from a variety of sources including planning obligations under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, Government departments and agencies and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Apart from CIL the other sources of funding can be aligned with specific projects.

The funding remains fluid as new sources are identified or can be applied for as projects are commenced.

Current estimates are that there will be a funding gap for which PWLB financing can be used. Under current regulations only Norfolk County Council are permitted to borrow against the future income stream from CIL (in accordance with the CIL regulations). Under the City Deals agreement a lower rate of borrowing has been agreed from the PWLB for borrowings up to £60 million.

In order to give assurance to Norfolk County Council, as the accountable body, that the CIL funding will be made available, the three local authorities will sign an agreement to pass over their contribution to Norfolk County Council or other accountable bodies (if different to Norfolk County Council). It is recognised that the CIL may be used to repay borrowing undertaken by Norfolk County Council on behalf of the Greater Norwich Growth Board for the delivery of the LIPP.

The local authorities will pass CIL over to the accountable body on a half yearly basis. The accountable body will invest the CIL income, in order to earn interest until such time that it is required. The interest will be invested in the projects as well.

In accordance with the CIL legislation, Norwich City Council, Broadland or South Norfolk District Councils deduct up a maximum of 5% of the CIL to cover administration costs, such as invoicing and collection of CIL.

The relevant % of CIL which is required to be paid over to the Parish/Town Council in Broadland and South Norfolk is dependent upon whether there is a Neighbourhood plan in place. As Norwich is un-parished the community element of CIL will held and
managed by the City Council. The remaining balance of CIL from each local authority will be designated for infrastructure investment, identified in the long-term capital programme to 2026.

**Profiling of spend v funding**

It is essential that the Greater Norwich Growth Board consider the cost of borrowing when agreeing the programme of projects, as this will need to be paid from CIL income.

Funding will be allocated to projects on the following basis and in this order:

- Funding which has been provided specifically to that project
- The CIL funding will then be spread pro-rata annually (as a percentage of the outstanding funding requirement for each project) across the projects so that if there is a shortfall, the cost of borrowing is then attributed across these projects as well.

It is important to establish the method funding is allocated to individual projects so that it is clear the amount of borrowing (if any) that is being used to fund individual projects. This will be important should any of the local authorities wish to exit the agreement in future years.

**Commissioning of projects**

Once the Greater Norwich Growth Board has agreed the programme of projects then the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board will commission the work required to deliver the project in accordance with the County or accountable body’s rules of financial governance and contract standing orders.

**Monitoring & Reporting of projects**

The Accountable Body will report monthly to the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board on the progress of its individual projects in accordance with the signed-off contract/delivery timeline. This reporting will include as a minimum:

- Progress against the agreed project plan including milestones
- Progress against the agreed budget, including justification for variances and slippages;
- Where there are slippages on programmes, how these will be addressed and potential impact on overall delivery of the programme;
- Major risks and their mitigation
• Communication plans around the progress and delivery of projects to the public so there is no confusion between the members of the Greater Norwich Growth Board on the message being told.

The reporting must highlight any variations in terms of timescale, costs, resources and funding.

The Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board will report regularly to the Greater Norwich Growth Board on all projects and highlight those which are not being delivered as agreed. Where issues arise then the Greater Norwich Growth Board have the authority to reprioritise the programme of projects. This includes:

• Bringing projects forward where other projects have been delayed.

• Delaying forthcoming projects to enable funding to be reassigned to existing projects whose costs have increased.

• Requesting Norfolk County Council to borrow to pay for unexpected increases in costs for projects already underway.

• Stopping projects should the need arise.

It has been agreed through the City Deals that the four local authorities, in their reporting requirements for the use of CIL, will not have to comply with the requirement to report at individual project level the amount of CIL which they have individually utilised. Instead the authorities can state the amount of CIL they have used as a total and list those projects which CIL has funded.

**Delivery of projects – signing and adoption after completion**

The Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board will sign off each completed project. Once the project has been delivered by the Accountable Body it will be adopted by the applicable authority and on-going maintenance of these assets will be the responsibility of the adopter.

**Formal Agreement**

There is a requirement for the Greater Norwich Growth Board to have a formal agreement with the Accountable Bodies, prior to the commencement of the programme of projects. This agreement must bind authorities with regards to:

• Passing to the accountable body the balance of CIL after the admin percentage (up to 5%) and the Parish/Town Council proportion (15 or 25% if a neighbourhood Plan is in place) has been paid

• The criteria for assessing the business plans to formulate the programme of projects
• An exit strategy for a local authority

Exiting agreement early

The delivery of the strategic infrastructure in the LIPP is predicted to take fifteen years, and it is anticipated that the Greater Norwich Growth Board will be in existence for the whole duration.
Establishment of a Local infrastructure Fund

Upfront funding for onsite infrastructure can be a barrier to the creation of new jobs and homes. Across Greater Norwich there is planning consent for some 10,000 dwellings (July 2013) where development has not got started.

The City Deal signed in December 2013 gives City Deal partners the ability to borrow £20 million from the Public Works Loan Board at the project rate discount to establish a Local Infrastructure Fund. This fund will provide loans to developers for site specific help to enable development sites to be delivered quickly, and will be managed on a rolling basis. The overall fund has been established from 1 November 2013 to end March 2026.

This fund will be used to support infrastructure required to open up sites for housing or employment development.

The Allocation

As set out in the HMT letter (December 13) a Local Infrastructure Fund of up to £20 million will be established through borrowing from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) by Norfolk County Council on behalf of the Greater Norwich Growth Board. Borrowing will be undertaken to finance individual schemes for specified periods. All schemes will be assessed by the Greater Norwich Growth Board, the organisation named in the Business Case will be required to enter into a legal contract with Norfolk County Council, the Accountable Body for the funding.

The Local Infrastructure Fund is to provide forward funding to pump prime essential public work infrastructure required to unlock developments which have otherwise stalled thereby realising significant sustainable growth in jobs, homes and commercial builds.

All schemes must complete the Business Case template; successful schemes will be allocated funding, up to a maximum of £5 million, which will be subject to interest charges, not less than the PWLB rate at which Norfolk County Council has borrowed at for this scheme. Formal agreements will be required for each scheme, loan agreements must be secured (Registered Charges), and applicants will be required to confirm what collateral is available to underpin the investment including the potential legal charge over the scheme and the terms of the legal charge. Repayment timelines for each scheme will vary, but loans must be repaid within 5 years.

The Local Infrastructure Fund will be a revolving fund with repayments of loans being reinvested in future schemes; however the total value of all outstanding loans will not exceed £20 million at any point in time.
Fund Objectives

The objective of the Local Infrastructure Fund is:

1. To establish a revolving fund so that funding can be reinvested to unlock further development and leverage private sector investment on developments.
2. To target and bring forward those development sites which require short-term funding support.
3. To support schemes that may not otherwise go ahead because of the requirement for up-front infrastructure investment.
4. To generate economic activity in the short term by addressing immediate infrastructure and site constraints and promote the delivery of jobs, housing and commercial developments.

Eligibility Criteria

All potential schemes must meet the following criteria:

- Schemes must be for capital investment (not revenue).
- Schemes must contribute to the objectives of the Local Infrastructure Fund.
- Schemes must be within the Greater Norwich Growth Board area.
- Schemes will need to demonstrate that the investment addresses a funding shortfall that cannot be met by other means.
- Schemes will need to demonstrate that there are no barriers or constraints in relation to land ownership, planning and other approvals and that other funding is in place to enable the development to get underway.
- Schemes must be repaid within 5 years and loans will be secured.
- Schemes must be State Aid compliant.
- Schemes must demonstrate that the loan will result in unlocking and bringing forward development

State Aid

Can be covered in the supporting Business Case

For the schemes to not qualify as State Aid they must demonstrate that the infrastructure to be funded is open access infrastructure intended to benefit the whole
community (e.g. roads, footpaths, sewers, drains, landscaping etc.) it is considered to be open and accessible to all potential users.

**Selection Process (Flowchart Appendix A)**

The Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board will make an initial call for schemes from April 2014. Schemes submitted will need to complete the application proforma (Appendix B [to be prepared]) which will be subject to an initial evaluation against the eligibility criteria, described above, by the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board in order to agree a short-list of schemes to take forward for formal evaluation.

Norfolk County Council will request a full Business Case (Appendix C [to be prepared]) and Norfolk County Council or appointed independent financial appraiser will carry out a detailed assessment and a financial appraisal of the schemes short-listed by the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board.

Following this assessment and financial appraisal the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board will recommend schemes to the Greater Norwich Growth Board. A consensus will be required on each scheme in order for it to be recommended to the Board.

The Greater Norwich Growth Board will assess all schemes recommended against a formal framework and the results of the financial appraisal which will include:

- Speed of delivery i.e. has planning consent already been obtained
- Number of jobs being created, including construction phase and follow on permanent jobs
- Number of homes accelerated i.e. delivered early as a result of the loan
- Prospect of additional growth arising from individual scheme
- The individual project within the existing projects being delivered through the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board
- The overall funds available within the Local Infrastructure Fund
- The strategic fit of the schemes against the existing projects being delivered by all three boards; Business Growth Programme Operational Board, Employment and Skills Strategy Board and the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board to ensure any project agreed contributes to the strategic direction of the wider growth programme.
- Value of the scheme being delivered in relation to the funding required.
• Financial viability of the scheme
• Security of the loan
• Risks around the individual scheme
• Other public or private sector leverage i.e. external funding which is being brought into the geographic area

Any renegotiation of loans will be notified by Norfolk County Council to the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board who will propose the appropriate course of action and advise the Greater Norwich Growth Board for a decision. The decision will be communicated to the Borrower by Norfolk County Council as the Accountable Body.

Further calls for schemes will be made if there is any unallocated funding after the initial round has been completed. Schemes that are unsuccessful in the first round may be supported by the Local Infrastructure Fund in the future, once the revolving fund is more established.

Future calls will be dependent upon the repayment profile of loans which have been issued.

**Timetable**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initial call for schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closing date for schemes to be submitted with application proforma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Appendix B – [to be prepared])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board meets to approve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schemes to be shortlisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk County Council requests full Business Case for schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Appendix C – [to be prepared])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norfolk County Council OR appointed independent appraiser to carry out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>due diligence and a financial appraisal of each scheme shortlisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board makes a recommendation of schemes to be considered by the Greater Norwich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Board</td>
<td>The Greater Norwich Growth Board agrees first funding allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Greater Norwich Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivery Board notifies successful schemes and makes the funding offer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Formal Agreements & Authorisation (Administered by Norfolk County Council)

Prior to funding being drawn down for each scheme a loan agreement must be signed by:

- Norfolk County Council representing the Greater Norwich Growth Board
- The borrower
- Any parent group/company/companies who own the assets which are being held for security.
- Any existing charge-holders on the securitised assets who have agreed the Local Infrastructure Fund legal charge for the loan

The contract will as a minimum include:

- Name and Address of the Borrower
- Name and Address of any parent group/company/companies who own assets which are being held for security
- Name and Address of any existing charge-holders on the securitised assets
- Company registration number
- Purpose of the loan
- Details of how the loan will be secured (a first legal charge over the land and buildings or other assets) as part of the contract
- The value of the loan
- Term and repayment profile of the loan
- Early repayment terms
- Interest to be applied to the loan
- Arrangement and administration fee
- Financial Covenants
- Conditions Precedent
Borrowers will be required to inform the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board via the Programme Manager should they no longer require the loan or if there are any changes which impact on the scheme and the agreed borrowing. The Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board will inform Norfolk County Council who will then cease work in the loan agreements.

Any renegotiation of existing loans, once agreed by the Greater Norwich Growth Board will be actioned by Norfolk County Council in accordance with the governance of the scheme and the Council’s monitoring and reporting processes.

**Availability of Loans (Administered by Norfolk County Council)**

For each scheme the loan will be available in tranches, with a minimum value of **£100,000** each tranche. The Borrower shall provide a minimum of 14 days’ written notice to Norfolk County Council when funds are required. No more than one tranche will be paid in a calendar month and the total number of tranches shall not exceed 50, with the maximum loan available being **£5 million**.

**Tranche Draw Down**

1. Each tranche shall be drawn down against certified construction valuations completed by a qualified Quantity Surveyor who will be appointed by the Borrower; however Norfolk County Council reserves the right to have the valuations independently verified at the Borrower’s cost.

2. The amount of each drawdown shall be calculated as a proportion of the total value of the Quantity Surveyor certificate, with such proportion calculated to be equal to or less than the relative value of the loan compared to the total construction costs for the individual development.

**Interest Rates & period of borrowing from the PWLB (Administered by Norfolk County Council)**

Interest rates payable by Norfolk County Council who are borrowing on behalf of the Greater Norwich Growth Board will be determined by the prevailing rate on the day of borrowing and by the length of loan agreed for the particular scheme being financed.

The interest rate payable by Norfolk County Council will be passed onto the agreed scheme plus **1** base point. The **1** base point will cover the administration cost of running the Local Infrastructure Fund.
Interest will be calculated on a daily basis on the balance of the loan at the end of each day.

Repayments will be credited to the account on the day cleared funds are received by Norfolk County Council. Compound interest will be charged by Norfolk County Council if interest remains unpaid after it falls due.

**Repayments to the Fund (Administered by Norfolk County Council)**

Repayment profiles will be agreed with developers on an individual scheme basis, as part of the loan agreement, to assist the Developer with cashflow and to deliver agreed phases within the development. Repayments will be made to Norfolk County Council.

Early settlement of the loan is permitted. A discount may be permitted depending upon the ability to recycle the Local Infrastructure Fund money and the refinancing of the PWLB debt at the time of early repayment. Early settlement will be as per the contract and terms of the loan.

The Borrower shall be responsible for all reasonable fees, costs and expenses incurred by Norfolk County Council in making the loan available, monitoring or valuing the security, obtaining any other additional information required and recovering all amounts outstanding whether or not the loan is taken.

**Security (Administered by Norfolk County Council)**

As part of the loan agreement, each scheme will need to confirm what collateral is available to support this investment including potential legal charge over property and the terms e.g. is it first legal charge or is it behind other lender(s).

In the case that a first charge is not available collateral warranties will be provided by the borrower and may include a step-in clause.

**Financial Covenants for each scheme (Administered by Norfolk County Council)**

**Loan to Value (LTV):**

The loan shall never exceed of 70% of the total value of the security held by Norfolk County Council.
Interest Cover:
Annual interest costs for the loan will be assessed and specified in the loan agreement.

Conditions Precedent:
1. Satisfactory due diligence carried out by Norfolk County Council on the finances of the Borrower and any parent company/companies.
2. Planning decision notices and any building regulations consents must be granted for the development.
3. Professional valuation of the security instructed by and acceptable to Norfolk County Council.
4. Independent appraisal of the estimated build costs instructed by and acceptable to Norfolk County Council prior to the loan being provided to the Borrower.
5. Norfolk County Council has obtained any related collateral warranties and step in rights.
6. Comprehensive project cashflow to include projected tranche draw down requirements.
7. Norfolk County Council reserves the right to appoint a monitoring surveyor, which will be at the Borrower’s cost.

Post Completion:
1. Property Insurance - The new development to be insured to Norfolk County Council’s entire satisfaction at all times, with Norfolk County Council being a named interest on the insurance policy. Evidence of payment of the insurance premium and a copy of the insurance certificate to be provided annually to Norfolk County Council for the duration of the loan on both the development and any other assets which Norfolk County Council holds as security for the Loan.
2. There shall be no transfer of ownership of the Borrower (or parent company/companies) or the security held by Norfolk County Council in respect of this loan, nor any changes to the Borrower’s (or parent company/companies) corporate structure, without Norfolk County Council’s express consent, such consent not to be unreasonably withheld.
3. Audited financial statements for the Borrower (or parent company/companies) will be provided to Norfolk County Council in accordance with the loan agreement.

Monitoring & Reporting

Norfolk County Council will produce monitoring reports for the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board on a monthly basis. The reports will include as a minimum the following for each scheme:
Details of each scheme
The total agreed value of the loan
How much has been drawn down
How much of the loan is still to be drawn down
The interest rate for the loan which is to be paid by the Developer
The PWLB rate which has been agreed for the funding to support the Fund
The Start date & final repayment date
The length of the loan in months
The amount outstanding which is still to be repaid by the Borrower (Loan outstanding plus interest payable)
Notification of any risk of default
Notification of any renegotiation of terms of the current loan

Details of any sum remaining in the Local Infrastructure Fund which is available to lend.

Special Meeting of the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board

Norfolk County Council can call a special meeting of the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board in the following circumstances:

- Request by a Borrower for a re-negotiation of an existing loan
- Request by a Borrower for early repayment of an existing loan and an application for a discount
- Imminent risk or actual default by a Borrower of an existing loan
- Sufficient surplus funds within the Local Infrastructure Fund to warrant a call for schemes prior to the next meeting of the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board

Norfolk County Council must give at least 7 days’ notice of the special meeting and the reason(s) why it has been called. The special meeting shall be carried out in accordance with the governance arrangements of the Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board.

Defaults on Loans

Norfolk County Council will underwrite both the PWLB loans and the Local Infrastructure loans. In the case of default, Norfolk County Council as the accountable body will lodge the relevant claim and pursue the sale of assets on which the charge to secure the loan has been placed (in accordance with the security set out in the loan agreement).
Appendix A

GNIDB call for schemes

GNIDB evaluate against criteria and agree short-list of schemes

GNIDB consider short-listed schemes against assessment framework, and carry out financial appraisal

GNGB consider the schemes recommended by the GNIDB along with strategic fit to the Greater Norwich

Yes

GNGB sign off successful schemes

Scheme approved?

Yes

GNIDB inform applicants of success & NCC undertakes admin of loans to successful applicants

No

GNIDB inform applicant – can apply again at later funding round

Key
GNIDB = Greater Norwich Infrastructure Delivery Board
GNGB = Greater Norwich Growth
Distribution of the Community Infrastructure Levy to Parishes and Town Councils

Head of Finance

Under the Community Infrastructure Levy regulations the Council is required to pass a proportion of the income received to Towns and Parishes. This paper proposes how this will be accomplished.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cabinet member(s):</th>
<th>Ward(s) affected:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garry Wheatley</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail:
Debbie Lorimer 01508 533981
dlorimer@s-norfolk.gov.uk

1. **Background**

1.1. The Council adopted the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) at its Council meeting on 24 February 2014. The Levy came into effect from the 1 May 2014.

1.2. Under the CIL regulations the Council is required to forward to the Parish and Town Councils an element of the income received. This paper sets out the governance arrangements around how the Council will pass on this funding; including how and when payments will be made and includes variations to reflect the preferences of Parish and Town Councils.

1.3. It is also intended that briefing sessions will be run for Parish and Town Councils to inform them of how the new system will operate and the regulations around how the funds can be spent as laid out in the Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2013.

2. **Proposal and Reasons**

2.1. The Government introduced CIL to enable charging authorities, such as South Norfolk council, to raise a levy on most development to contribute towards the costs of funding important infrastructure. South Norfolk Council has identified the infrastructure required, which will be funded through CIL, through its work on the Joint Core Strategy and the production of the Local Investment Plan and Programme (LIPP). South Norfolk Council will work with Parish and Town Councils to ensure the CIL funding is used to maximum effect for the benefit of residents in their area.

2.2. The CIL regulations state that charging authorities (the District Council) must pass a proportion of CIL receipts to parish and town councils from developments
that take place in their areas. The proportion of CIL receipts that are required to be passed to relevant Parish and Town Councils arising from developments in their areas has been set nationally at 15%. This rises to 25% in areas with an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan.

2.3. To prevent excessive amounts being passed on, the regulations provide that the payments to parishes without a Neighbourhood Development Plan in place will be capped to £100 per council tax dwelling per year. This means that a parish with 400 dwellings cannot receive over £40,000 of CIL receipts per year.

In areas with a Neighbourhood Development Plan the amount to be passed over will be 25% with no cap.

2.4. It is proposed that to assist Parish and Town Councils, with their financial planning, the Council calculates the number of dwellings and the maximum amount an individual Parish or Town Council can receive, prior to the start of the financial year. It is proposed that the Council utilises the number of dwellings in each Parish and Town Council on the 30 September each year, as recorded on the Council Tax system and the information to be published on the Council’s website.

2.5. The Council will forward the relevant amount to Parishes and Town Councils as follows:

- CIL received from 1st April to 30th September will be forwarded in one payment by the 28th October of that financial year,
- CIL received from 1st October to 31st March will be forwarded in one payment by the 28th April of the following financial year.

2.6. For those Parish Councils who account on a receipts and payments basis they will record the lump sum they receive in April in that financial year’s accounts e.g. Sum received in April 2016 will be recorded in the accounts from 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017. Any expenditure relating to this funding will be taken after the CIL funding has been received and recorded in the financial year it is spent.

For those Parish and Town Councils accounting on an accruals basis the lump sum they receive in April will need to be accrued for in the previous year’s accounts e.g. Sum received in April 2016 will be recorded in the accounts from 1 April 2015 to 31 March 2016.

2.7. Where Parish or Town Councils wish the Council can spend the funds on their behalf, however this will need to be in accordance with the amended regulations which state that this proportion of funds must be used ‘to support the development of the local council’s area, or any part of that area, by funding-

(a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or
(b) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.’

2.8. A proposed policy is attached in Appendix A.
3. **Other Options**

3.1. The Council is required to pass on the relevant share of the CIL income it receives. However the frequency and timing of the payments to the Parish and Town Councils could be varied, as could the date at which the number of dwellings in each Parish and Town Council is determined.

4. **Relevant Corporate Priorities**

4.1. Enhancing our quality of life and the environment we live in.

4.2. Promoting a thriving local economy.

4.3. Supporting communities to realise their potential.

5. **Implications and Risks**

5.1. None

6. **Conclusion**

6.1. Following the adoption of CIL the Council is proposing a policy to fulfil it’s obligation to pass an element of the CIL income to the Parish and Town Council’s in line with the regulations. These payments will be made half yearly and briefing sessions to inform Parish and Town Councils will be held shortly.

7. **Recommendations**

7.1. To approve the policy as detailed in Appendix A.
POLICY IN RELATION TO THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) FUNDS TO PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILS

Summary
The Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment) Regulations 2013 requires District Councils to pass a proportion of CIL receipts collected from developments in their areas directly to parish and town councils to be spent on infrastructure or anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.
The District Council will pass accumulated funds to the parish every 6 months, and the parish council will be required to report publicly on the income they have received and how this has been spent each year.

Introduction
The Amendment Regulations which came into effect in April 2013 state that charging authorities (the District Council) must pass a proportion of CIL receipts to parish and town councils from developments that take place in their areas. The proportion of CIL receipts that are required to be passed to relevant Parish and Town Councils arising from developments in their areas has been set nationally at 15%. This rises to 25% in areas with an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan.

To prevent excessive amounts being passed on, the regulations provide that the payments to parishes without a Neighbourhood Development Plan in place will be capped to £100 per council tax dwelling per year. This means that a parish with 400 dwellings cannot receive over £40,000 of CIL receipts per year.

In areas with a Neighbourhood Development Plan the amount to be passed over will be 25% with no cap.

How the funds must be spent
The amended regulations state that this proportion of funds must be used ‘to support the development of the local council’s area, or any part of that area, by funding-
(a) the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure; or
(b) anything else that is concerned with addressing the demands that development places on an area.’

This is a wider definition than that which defines how the District Council may use CIL funds (restricted to “funding infrastructure to support the development of its area”). These wider spending powers allow the local community to decide what they need to help mitigate the impacts of development.
The regulations do provide that where a parish council has failed to spend CIL funds passed to it within 5 years of receipt, or has applied the funds otherwise than in accordance with the regulations, then the District Council can serve a notice on the parish council requiring it to repay some or all of the receipts passed. The District Council will be required to spend any recovered funds in the parish council’s area.

Where a Parish or Town Council wishes to they can seek advice from the Monitoring Officer at South Norfolk Council on the proposed use of CIL to ensure it complies with the legislation.

Should a Parish or Town Council decide that they do not want to receive the CIL funding, they must notify the District Council in advance stating that the funding is to be retained by the District Council who will use it for the benefit of the parish council’s area.

**Payment periods**

The District Council will make payment in respect of CIL it receives from 1st April to 30th September in any financial year to the parish council by 28th October of that financial year and pay the CIL received from 1st October to 31st March in any financial year by the 28th April of the following financial year.

**Interest**

Where amounts are paid over to the Parish and Town Councils six monthly, no interest will be accrued. However should a Parish or Town Council decline the funding and ask the District Council to take responsibility for it then it will held in a separate holding account and administered by the District Council. The account will be credited with any funds due to it from the six monthly lump sum payments of CIL funding and debited with any expenditure. Interest will be applied daily, based on the seven day libor rate.

**Reporting**

To ensure transparency parish councils must publish each year their total CIL receipts; total expenditure; a summary of what the CIL was spent on; and the total amount of receipts retained at the end of the reported year from that year and previous years.

Reports can be combined with reports already produced by parish council and must be placed on their websites (or on the District Council’s website where the parish council does not have a website) and a copy of the report must be sent to the District Council.
Banking Tender

Accountancy Manager

The Council is currently undertaking a procurement exercise to obtain a new banking services provider. It is doing this in conjunction with all Norfolk District Councils, Norfolk County Council and the police. The timetable aims to award the contract in the summer of 2014. This report requests Cabinet approval to delegate the decision to award the contract to the Head of Finance in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources to ensure this timetable is met.

Cabinet member(s): Garry Wheatley
Ward(s) affected: All
Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail: Matthew Fernandez-Graham 01508 533919 mgraham@s-norfolk.gov.uk

1. Background

1.1. The Council currently banks with the Co-operative Bank under a five year contract up to 31 March 2017. Following large losses, the Co-operative Bank’s debt was downgraded to “junk” status and the bank recently reported a further loss of £1.3 billion for 2013.

1.2. The Co-operative Bank has given notice that it intends to exit the local authority market and would therefore not hold existing customers to their current contracts. At its meeting on 10th February 2014, Cabinet approved a decision to procure a new banking services provider and to undertake a procurement exercise to achieve this.

1.3. At the moment all Norfolk local authorities and the police are with the Co-operative. Officers have held discussions and are currently conducting a joint tender exercise through OJEU to procure a new banking provider. The combined transactions volumes should make this tender more attractive to the banks and produce keener pricing. Soft market testing produced five banks which may be interested in bidding.

1.4. The invitation to tender was drawn up with the assistance of a jointly appointed banking consultant who visited South Norfolk Council to ensure that our specific requirements were met in the tender document. East of England LGA has provided funding to cover some of the costs of the banking consultant. South Norfolk Council has been on the project steering group and will be represented on the evaluation and interview panels.
1.5. The result of the procurement will be a single banking provider across Norfolk, but each Council will have its own contract that reflects its own service specification.

2. Proposal and Reasons

2.1. The timetable for the procurement is achievable but challenging and envisages contract award in the summer. This is to ensure that banking arrangements are in place for those Councils that are nearing the end of their current contract with the Co-operative. Unfortunately, this timetable, and in particular the dates around the tender evaluation and award, does not coincide with any of South Norfolk Council’s Cabinet meetings.

2.2. It is important that the decision to award a contract to the successful bidder is made by all the authorities involved within the agreed timescale for the procurement. To ensure that this is achieved, it is proposed that the decision to award the contract be delegated to the Head of Finance in consultation with the portfolio holder for Finance and Resources. The outcome of this decision will be reported back to Cabinet in due course.

3. Relevant Corporate Priorities

3.1. Driving services through being businesslike, efficient and customer aware.

4. Implications and Risks

4.1. Financial – if the tender process does not proceed to timescale there could be additional procurement costs. In addition, while Norfolk is currently ahead of other areas in procuring new banking services, any delay risks the banks turning their attention to other councils that are currently with the Co-operative, which could reduce the number and competitiveness of the bids received.

4.2. Legal – if one of the authorities did not agree to award a contract in the timescale then the whole procurement exercise would be jeopardised which could have implications for relationships with our partner authorities.

5. Conclusion

5.1. The joint procurement exercise for a new banking service provider is progressing well, but flexibility is needed to ensure that the contract award is made in accordance with the timescales.

6. Recommendation

6.1. That Cabinet delegates the decision to award a contract for banking services to the Head of Finance in consultation with the portfolio holder for Finance and Resources.
INTERNAL AUDIT’S CHARTER, STRATEGIC AND ANNUAL AUDIT PLANS AND SUMMARY OF INTERNAL AUDIT COVERAGE FOR 2014/15

The Internal Audit Consortium Manager presented her report which provided members with an overview of the stages followed prior to the formulation of the Strategic Audit Plan for 2014/15 to 2016/17 and the Annual Audit Plan for 2014/15.

Members requested and received clarification on some aspects regarding the presentation of information contained in the report and had no further questions.

It was then

RESOLVED: To recommend that Cabinet approve:

1. Internal Audit’s Charter for 2014/15;
2. Internal Audit’s Code of Ethics for 2014/15;
3. Internal Audit’s Strategy for 2014/15;
4. The Strategic Audit Plan for 2014/15 to 2016/17;
5. The Annual Audit Plan for 2014/15;
6. The Summary of Internal Audit Coverage for 2014/15;

WORKING PROTOCOL BETWEEN INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL AUDIT FOR 2013/14 AND 2014/15

Members considered the report of the Internal Audit Consortium Manager which provided details of the Audit Joint Working Protocol developed between Internal Audit and the Council’s External Auditors, Ernst and Young.

After a brief discussion, it was

RESOLVED: To recommend that Cabinet approve the Audit Protocol and thereby give it its endorsement to the level of interaction which will be adopted by Internal and External Audit throughout the remaining quarter of 2013/14 and the financial year 2014/15.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cabinet Meeting</th>
<th>Decisions: Key, Policy, Operational</th>
<th>Key Decision/Item</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Cabinet Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O6 May (Tues)</td>
<td>K Building Control – IDOX: Fenland</td>
<td>A Radford</td>
<td>D Bills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadlines: 24 April (Dem Services)</td>
<td>K Neighbourhood Working</td>
<td>I Lambert</td>
<td>M Wilby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 April (SLT)</td>
<td>O Long Stratton Area Action Plan Pre Submission Version (agenda note only)</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Exploration of the Potential Use of Compulsory Purchase Powers for Implementing the Long Stratton Area Action Plan</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Food Hub</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Norwich Northern Distributor Road</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Consultation Response : Review of the LA role in Housing Supply</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Consultation Response: Planning Performance and Planning Obligations</td>
<td>S Pontin</td>
<td>K Kiddie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Governance Arrangements for the Greater Norwich Growth Board</td>
<td>T Horspole</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Banking Delegations</td>
<td>D Lorimer</td>
<td>G Wheatley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Town and Parish Councils and CIL</td>
<td>D Lorimer</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Working Protocol between Internal and External Audit</td>
<td>E Hodds</td>
<td>G Wheatley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FULL COUNCIL 19 MAY**

| 16 June | O Performance Risk and Revenue Budget Report Quarter 4 2013/14 | D Lorimer / W Salmons/ E Nangle | G Wheatley |
| Deadlines: 23 May (SLT) | O Capital and Treasury Management Report Quarter 4 2013/14 | D Lorimer | G Wheatley |
| 4 June (Committee) | K Long Stratton Area Action Plan | A Nicholls | J Fuller |
| | O Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan Document: Issues and Options | A Nicholls | J Fuller |
| | O Compulsory Purchase Order (Exempt) | A Nicholls | J Fuller |

**FULL COUNCIL 7 JULY**

| 28 July | O Performance Risk and Revenue Budget Report Quarter 1 2014/15 | D Lorimer / W Salmons/ E Nangle | G Wheatley |
| | O Capital and Treasury Management Report Quarter 4 2014/15 | D Lorimer | G Wheatley |
| | O Medium Term Plan | D Lorimer | G Wheatley |
| | K Electronic Working | P Kearsey | D Bills |
| | O Pre-Application Planning Charges | T Horspole | K Kiddie |
| | O Banking Tender | D Lorimer | G Wheatley |
| | O Extension to the Internal Audit Contract (recs from FRAG) | E Hodds | G Wheatley |

**FULL COUNCIL 22 SEPT**

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.