Cabinet

Monday 4 December 2017

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

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting,
please let us know in advance

Large print version can be made available

Contact Claire White on 01508 533669 or democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Members of the Cabinet</th>
<th>Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Fuller (Chairman)</td>
<td>The Economy and External Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr M Edney (Vice Chairman)</td>
<td>Stronger Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Y Bendle</td>
<td>Housing, Wellbeing, Leisure and Early Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr B Stone</td>
<td>Finance and Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr L Hornby</td>
<td>Regulation and Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs K Mason Billig</td>
<td>Environment and Recycling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Group Meetings

Conservatives – 8.00 am, Cabinet Office

Liberal Democrats – 8.15 am, Kett Room
Agenda

1. To report apologies for absence;

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

3. To Receive Declarations of Interest from Members; (please see guidance – page 7)

4. To confirm the minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on Monday 30 October 2017; (attached – page 8)

5. Greater Norwich Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation: Growth Options; (report attached – page 21)

Please note that all the appendices to this report are available to view here on the Council’s website.
6. Update to the South Norfolk Local Development Scheme;  
   (report attached – page 29)

7. Conservation Area Appraisals and Boundary Amendments for Bawburgh, Dickleburgh, Hempnall, Mulbarton and Scole Conservation Areas  
   (report attached – page 55)

   NOTE: Appendix D (the appraisals requiring adoption) can be viewed here on the Council’s website.

8. The Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Register;  
   (report attached – page 79)

9. Using Section 106 Receipts and Affordable Home Ownership;  
   (report attached – page 88)

10. Council Tax Support Scheme 2018/19  
    (report attached – page 95)

11. South Norfolk Council Response to Norfolk County Council Budget Consultation 2018/19;  
    (report attached – page 108)

12. Recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee;  
    (report attached – page 115)
13. **Greater Norwich Joint Five Year Infrastructure Investment Plan 18/19 – 22/23**

   Further work is taking place on the preparation of the 2018/19 Infrastructure Investment Plan, and so this will be considered at a later meeting of Cabinet and Council.

   Adam Nicholls
   Planning Policy Manager

14. **Future Management of Street Lights;**

   Further work is being undertaken on the future management of local lighting which, on conclusion, will be reported to Cabinet.

   Bob Wade
   Head of Environmental Services

15. **Cabinet Core Agenda** (attached – page 128)

16. **Exclusion of the Public and Press**

   To exclude the public and press from the meeting under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act (as amended)
17. **Review of Build Insight Companies and Future Plans**; (report enclosed separately for members)

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

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

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

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

Minutes of a meeting of the Cabinet of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton on Monday 30 October 2017 at 9.00 a.m.

Members Present:

Cabinet: Councillors K Mason Billig (Chairman for the meeting) Y Bendle, L Hornby and B Stone

Apologies: Councillors M Edney and J Fuller

Non-Appointed: Councillors V Bell, D Bills, F Ellis, M Gray, C Hudson, N Legg and T Lewis

Officers in Attendance: The Chief Executive (S Dinneen), the Director of Growth and Business Development (D Lorimer), the Director of Planning and Environment (T Horspole), the Director of Communities and Well-Being (J Sutterby), the Accountancy Manager (M Fernandez-Graham), the Planning Policy Manager (A Nicholls), the Policy and Partnerships Delivery Manager (T Cooke), the Business Improvement Programme Manager (A Mewes), the Senior Economic Growth Coordinator (D Disney) and the Senior Governance Officer (E Goddard)

2586 CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman welcomed three new members of staff to the Council:

• Jamie Sutterby, the Director of Communities and Well-Being
• Simon Hawken, the Operations Manager at Ketteringham Depot
• Charles Pratt, the Senior Management Accountant.
2587 MINUTES

Referring to minute number 2578, the Response to the Waveney First Draft Local Plan (July 17), third paragraph, the Chairman requested that the word “exasperate” be amended to “exacerbate”.

Subject to the above change, the minutes of the meeting held 9 October 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2588 PERFORMANCE, RISKS, REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET POSITION REPORT FOR QUARTER 2 2017/18

The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the report of the Accountancy Manager, Business Improvement Programme Manager, and the Senior Governance Officer, which detailed the Council’s performance against strategic measures, risk position, and the revenue and capital position for Quarter 2 2017/18.

Cllr B Stone commended the report to members and was pleased to report that corporate risk capacity remained positive, that there was a positive variance on the revenue budget of £1.11 million and that £2.29 million had been spent against a capital budget of £3.44 million. With regard to strategic measures, performance remained good, although three measures had failed to hit stretched targets.

The Business Improvement Programme Manager outlined the Council’s performance under each of the Council’s corporate priorities.

Referring first to Economic Growth, Productivity and Prosperity, he outlined performance relating to start-up businesses, business rate collection and property rental income. Members noted that LI 758, ‘External Funding Identified and Brought in to the Local Economy’ was below the quarter 2 target, however, three new pooled business rate projects for approximately £530,000 was anticipated for quarter 3, which would bring performance back in line.
Turning to Health and Well-being, the Business Improvement Programme Manager referred to the increase in leisure centre memberships, the work of the Early Help Hub and Community Connectors, and housing and council tax benefit claims. He explained that HE 1604, the % of households prevented from becoming homeless had failed to reach the stretched target set, but that this was mainly due to the reduction in cases coming forward. Cllr Y Bendle explained that the high level of prevention work had reduced the number of cases, and that those still coming forward were the more complex ones. She hoped that a more appropriate measure could be found that would more accurately demonstrate the performance of the service. Cllr Bendle also applauded the progress that had been made by the community connectors and commended the work of all staff across the service.

Under Customer Focus, the Business Improvement Manager then gave mention to the good performance relating to resources, staff and IT and digital services.

Concerning performance under Place, Community and Environment, the Business Improvement Programme Manager referred to the number of affordable homes delivered, the Long Stratton bypass and the reduction in the cost of waste collection. The number of missed bins had failed to hit target, but this had been due to a number of vehicle breakdowns resulting in capacity issues, an increase in garden waste tonnage, and fewer agency staff being available to cover holidays and sickness. Members noted that these issues had since been addressed.

The Decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOLVED:</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Note the 2017/18 performance for the quarter and the combined efforts across the Directorates to deliver the vision of the Council (detail contained in Appendix 1 of the report).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Note the current position with respect to risks and accepts the actions to support risk mitigation (detail contained in Appendix 2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Note the capital and revenue position and the reason for the variances on the General Fund (detail contained in Appendices 3 and 4).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Note the decision to commission works on the Wymondham Digital Heritage Trail and approve expenditure of £116,550 in order to deliver the project as referred to in paragraph 3.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Endorse the decision of the Leader of the Council to participate in the bid for a one year pilot of 100% business rates retention as outlined in paragraph 3.2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Reasons for the Decision

- To ensure that processes are in place to improve performance, and that the management of risks is sound.
- To ensure that appropriate revenue budgets and reserves and capital programme are in place and are aligned to the Council's priorities.

Other Options Considered

None

2589 TREASURY MANAGEMENT QUARTER 2 2017/18

The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the report of the Accountancy Manager, which detailed the treasury management activity during the first six months of 2017/18, the position on investments as at 30 September 2017, and performance against prudential indicators required under the Treasury Management Code of Practice.

The Accountancy Manager outlined the key issues arising from his report, explaining that investments had risen £5.5 million from 1 April 2017 to £39.8 million at 30 September 2017. Cash had also increased by £4.1 million from 1 April 2017 to £27.6 million as at 30 September, and members were advised that this position was typical for the current time of year.

Referring to the Treasury Management Code of Practice, members noted that the Code was currently being reviewed by CIPFA, and that the Council had recently responded to the relevant consultation.
The Decision

RESOLVED: TO RECOMMEND THAT COUNCIL

a) Notes the treasury activity between April and September and that it complies with the agreed strategy.
b) Approves the 2017/18 prudential indicators for the first six months of the year.

The Reasons for the Decision

To ensure a balanced portfolio in terms of risk, rates and liquidity.

Other Options Considered

None

SOUTH NORFOLK COUNCIL RESPONSE TO THE BABERGH AND MID SUFFOLK JOINT LOCAL PLAN – REGULATION 18 CONSULTATION (AUGUST 2017)

The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the report of the Planning Policy Manager, which invited Cabinet to comment on, and agree the Council’s response to the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan.

The Planning Policy Manager presented his report and drew attention to the key points of the Council’s response. He explained that little growth was expected in the north of Mid Suffolk, but that Diss would remain an important service centre for the area.

Members noted that the response emphasised the importance of the A143 and A140 links to accommodate future growth, and also indicated some support for small scale infill development in rural areas. The Planning Policy Manager stressed the
importance of continuing to engage with Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils, through the Duty to Co-operate Group, to consider strategic cross-border planning matters.

The Decision

**RESOLVED:** To agree the South Norfolk Council response to the Regulation 18 consultation on the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan, outlined at Appendix 1 of the report.

The Reasons for the Decision

To ensure that the impacts of the Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan on the South Norfolk District, are fully considered.

Other Options Considered

None.

2591 PLANNING IN HEALTH: AN ENGAGEMENT PROTOCOL BETWEEN LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITIES, PUBLIC HEALTH AND HEALTH SECTOR ORGANISATIONS IN NORFOLK

The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the report of the Planning Policy Manager, which invited Cabinet to consider and adopt the Norfolk Health Protocol.

In presenting his report, the Planning Policy Manager explained that the protocol set out how councils and Health bodies would engage with each other to ensure a “no surprises” approach to housing development, healthcare data and early help/social prescribing. He acknowledged that in the past, the level of co-operation between Planning and Health bodies had not always been ideal. Members noted that the protocol would be reviewed and updated regularly.
Cllr Y Bendle commended the report to members, and felt the protocol to be a positive step forward in ensuring co-operation between the organisations. She accepted that the Council could do little to address the GP shortage across Norfolk, but stressed the need to concentrate on areas where it could make a difference. Cllr B Stone referred to Maple Park at Poringland, where Council built properties were accessible to the disabled and allowed for future adaptations. Members agreed that the Council should do all it could to encourage commercial developers to do the same.

Cllr N Legg welcomed the protocol, but was concerned that the NHS would fail to deliver on its obligations. The Chief Executive explained that part of the problem was that Health organisations were very fragmented, adding that the Norfolk and Waveney Sustainable Transformation Plan was an important programme looking at ways of providing more sustainable services. Part of this would involve finding more coherent ways of working together, both inside the NHS and with partner organisations.

During discussion, Cllr M Gray expressed his support for the protocol and queried whether doctors’ surgeries could benefit from section 106 or CIL monies, as many of them were private businesses. The Director of Growth and Localism advised that as private organisations they could not, and also reminded members that such funding could only contribute to the direct impact of any development.

Cllr V Bell explained that Costessey had recently been moved from the South Norfolk Clinical Commissioning Group to the Norwich Clinical Commissioning Group area, and that whilst she understood the reasons for this, it had resulted in the need for much change for many patients involving the building of new relationships. Cllr Bendle explained that this move had been at the request of the surgery in Costessey.

Members agreed that whilst the protocol alone could not resolve all the issues, it was a positive step in the right direction.

**The Decision**

| **RESOLVED:** | To formally adopt Planning in Health: An Engagement Protocol Between Local Planning Authorities, Public Health and Health Sector Organisations in Norfolk. |

Cab Min 30/10//17CLW
The Reasons for the Decision

To support better liaison and a “no surprise” approach with Public Health and Health Sector Organisations in Norfolk.

Other Options Considered

None.

2592 PLANNING FOR THE RIGHT HOMES IN THE RIGHT PLACES CONSULTATION – SOUTH NORFOLK COUNCIL RESPONSE

The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the report of the Planning Policy Manager, which invited Cabinet to note and comment on the draft response to the consultation document, Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places.

The Planning Policy Manager summarised the key areas of the proposed consultation response, giving mention to the housing need approach, neighbourhood planning and viability assessments and planning fees.

Cllr L Hornby endorsed the response and explained that the issues had been discussed at some length at the recent meeting of the Regulation and Planning Policy Committee.

The Chairman suggested that as a priority for the Government, local authorities needed to be more flexible with regard to its approach to housing, and that maybe more control should be given to local people who often knew the best places to position new housing. She also expressed some concern at the rising costs of planning applications, not wishing individuals to be further daunted by what could be a complex process.

The Decision

RESOLVED: To agree the proposed South Norfolk Council response (as outlined at Appendix 1 of the report).
The Reasons for the Decision

To ensure that the Council’s views on this consultation are considered.

Other Options Considered

None.

2593 HOUSING SUPPORT AND REGULATION STRATEGY AND ASSOCIATED POLICIES

The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the report of the Policy, Partnerships and Delivery Manager, which presented Cabinet with the Housing Support and Regulation Strategy for approval.

The Policy Partnerships and Delivery Manager explained that the Strategy and associated policies were supplementary documents to the South Norfolk Housing Strategy. Its purpose was to outline the Council’s approach to supporting residents to remain in their homes, though advice and support services, and to illustrate the Council’s approach to maintaining the quality of homes, including enforcement activity within the housing sector and its work to minimise the number of empty homes. Members noted that the Housing Well-Being, Leisure and Early Intervention Committee, had considered the Strategy at its last meeting, and had recommended that it be taken to Cabinet for approval.

Cllr Y Bendle welcomed the new Strategy and drew members’ attention to the difficult and sensitive issue of dealing with terminally ill patients, and ensuring that any necessary property adaptations were completed speedily. In response to queries, the Policy, Partnerships and Delivery Manager advised that the assistance given through the early help approach was helping people to stay in their own homes for longer, and that this then delayed the need to move in to sheltered housing.

During discussion, members noted that the standard of accommodation in South Norfolk, compared very favourably with some in other areas, such as in the London boroughs. With regard to enforcement, the Chairman reminded members that this was a daunting prospect for some, and that consideration should be given to the tone of all communications.
The Decision

RESOLVED: To approve the Housing Support and Regulation Strategy, to be included as an addendum to the South Norfolk Housing Strategy 2016 -2019.

The Reasons for the Decision

To ensure a comprehensive and up to date strategy.

Other Options Considered

None.

2594 CAR PARKING PROPOSALS

The Subject of the Decision

Members considered the report of the Senior Economic Growth Co-ordinator, which sought Cabinet approval for the granting of a new lease to Redenhall with Harleston Town Council, regarding car parking provision within the town.

Cllr L Hornby commended the report to members, explaining that negotiations had been ongoing between the Council and the Town Council for some 18 months, and he was pleased that a proposed lease with terms acceptable to both parties had now been reached.

The Senior Economic Growth Co-ordinator outlined the background to his report, drawing attention to a number of proposals that had been considered during negotiations. Members noted that the Co-op in Harleston was contributing towards the Town Council costs, but that this was a separate negotiation, and that the Coop did not form part of the Council’s lease agreement.
Cllr M Gray expressed his disappointment that members from adjacent villages to Harleston had not been included in consultations or discussions regarding the proposals, yet residents in these villages were clearly affected by any car parking changes. He drew attention to the Town Council’s offer of a “peppercorn” lease that had been rejected on the grounds that there were irreducible costs to be covered that were allocated across the District on an equitable basis, and he explained that the Director of Growth and Business Development had provided him with a breakdown of these costs, which he then distributed at the meeting. Referring to these figures, Cllr Gray drew attention to the litter pick and transport costs, suggesting that these needed to be removed as litter picks would be carried out by the Town Council. Staff hours that were associated with this function would need to be reduced or redeployed elsewhere. He was disillusioned with the costs that had been presented and felt they required serious scrutiny. He suggested that it was unacceptable that these costs had been classed as irreducible, especially for a Conservative controlled authority which prided itself on being business like and efficient. He believed that the Council should be working actively to reduce these costs, as any business would have to do if its customer base had decreased. This would then allow for the Town Council to take on the management of the car parks, with a peppercorn rent, and no overhead costs for South Norfolk Council to reallocate.

Referring to the terms of the lease, Cllr Gray queried the fact that there was no mention of periodic increases in rent, and referring to paragraph 4.1 of the report he suggested that as the lease was for the sum of £50,000, any future changes should be reported to Cabinet, not the Senior Leadership Team (SLT).

In response, Cllr Hornby expressed his disappointment regarding Cllr Gray’s comments regarding the calculated costs, explaining that the Town Council was fully aware of the costs involved and had already scrutinised these figures. The Director of Growth and Business Development reminded members that these were not new costs and that they were apportioned across all the Council car parks, in line with the principles for car parking, reaffirmed by Cabinet back in October 2016. She advised that it had been agreed with the Town Council that South Norfolk would continue to carry out the daily litter picks in Harleston and the costs associated with this did include the costs of maintaining street cleaning equipment and vehicles. She added that the Town Council had been fully briefed on the costs involved and details of service provision.

Regarding the terms of the lease, the Director of Growth and Business Development referred members to paragraph 3.8 of the report which referred to a “combined index linked annual rental”, and she confirmed that the proposal was for a lease of £37,000, not £50,000 as suggested by Cllr Gray.

Cllr C Hudson referred to paragraph 3.4 of the report which advised that the total running costs of the Council’s car parks was approximately £400,000. With Harleston being responsible for approximately a fifth of these costs, Cllr Hudson had calculated that this equated to £79,000, and with the proposed lease at £37,000, he queried whether the Town Council’s share of costs was to be
subsidised by the tax payer. The Director of Growth and Business Development advised that this was not the case, and that the £400,000 figure quoted, referred to all costs, including rates and ticket machines. In response to a query from Cllr T Lewis, regarding employee costs and enforcement, it was explained that as the car parks remained assets of the Council, these officers would continue to inspect the car parks.

Discussion followed with regard to the lack of “churn” in the Council’s car parks and members were reminded that this was an important factor and formed one of the Council’s principles for car parking across the District. Cllr Hornby reminded members that surveys carried out had indicated that churn was a problem in Harleston. Cllrs Gray and Hudson did not believe this to be the case stating that they had not ever experienced a problem with parking in the town. Cllr Gray did however acknowledge that with more houses being built in the area, this was a concern for the future. Both Cllrs Gray and Hudson were pleased that the current proposal would ensure that free parking would continue, for the time being.

The Chairman felt it important to note that whilst the original proposal from the Council involved car parking charges, there was always an intention to provide 1 hour, or possibly 2 hours of free parking for motorists.

Cabinet noted that members were querying the costs to Redenhall with Harleston Town Council, yet the local members for Harleston were not present. Cllr Gray explained that the Town Council consulted villages in his area and he felt that he had a role to play in addressing the issues that affected the residents in his ward.

After the Chairman had ensured that all those wishing to contribute to the debate had done so, Cabinet indicated its support for the proposals, as outlined in the report.

**The Decision**

| RESOLVED: | To agree to the granting of a new lease to Redenhall with Harleston Town Council on the terms set out in paragraph 3.8 of the report. |

**The Reasons for the Decision**

To ensure the provision of income to cover the irreducible costs of operating car parking services in Harleston.

**Other Options Considered**

Cab Min 30/10//17CLW
None.

2595 CABINET CORE AGENDA

Members noted the latest version of the Cabinet Core Agenda.

(The meeting concluded at 10.44 am)

___________________________
Chairman
Greater Norwich Local Plan Regulation 18 Consultation: Growth Options

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

CONTACT
Adam Nicholls
anicholls@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1 The Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) was re-constituted in September 2016 to oversee the production of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP).

1.2 The sixth meeting of the (GNDP) Board took place on 20th November 2017 and recommended that the three Greater Norwich authorities (plus the County Council) agree the Regulation 18 version of the Greater Norwich Local Plan for public consultation.

2. Background

2.1 The first meetings of the re-constituted GNDP Board took place in September and November 2016, followed by meetings in January, March and June 2017 (see www.gnlp.org.uk for the papers). The 23rd June paper covered broad strategy options for the GNLP (especially housing distribution alternatives), a housing requirements discussion paper and a high-level Sustainability Appraisal of policy alternatives.

2.2 Considerable work has continued since June on preparing the Regulation 18 consultation version of the GNLP. The Regulation 18 stage is an important part of the plan-making process, and is the main opportunity for residents, consultees, infrastructure providers etc to comment on the draft contents of a Local Plan. In particular, the Regulation 18 stage needs to detail the main policy alternatives under consideration, and invite representations on these. Some councillors will doubtless recall the judicial review of the Joint Core Strategy, where the judge held that the JCS process has not demonstrated satisfactorily how reasonable policy alternatives had been considered adequately, and it is vital that the Regulation 18 version of the GNLP covers this matter appropriately.

2.3 The Government recently closed a consultation called Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places (https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/planning-for-the-right-homes-in-the-right-places-consultation-proposals), to which Cabinet agreed a response on 30th October 2017. Amongst the proposals in this consultation is a “standard” approach to calculating the objectively assessed need for housing for a district (or groups of districts). Whilst a consultation (and
therefore subject to change), it is stated in it that emerging Local Plans should use this approach as the starting point for assessing housing need.

2.4 At their meeting on 17th November 2018, the Regulation and Planning Policy Committee considered the draft Regulation 18 Greater Norwich Local Plan. They made two recommendations: 1) to change references to “Village Clusters” to “Village Groups” (to minimise the potential for confusion with other existing clusters, such as those for schools and GP surgeries); and 2) to add some text to paragraph 4.66 to explain more clearly what the different housing numbers in Figure 3 of the document represent.

3. Contents of the Regulation 18 documentation

3.1 The 20th November GNDP Board meeting considered the draft Regulation 18 consultation document. They considered – and agreed – seven relatively minor changes proposed (in aggregate) by the three districts’ policy committees/panels, the County Council’s Environment, Transport and Development Committee and one amendment proposed by officers correcting the percentage of affordable housing needed (see www.gnlp.org.uk for the list). The updated Regulation 18 document is attached as Appendix 1.

3.2 Particularly significant elements of the consultation documents are covered below:

Housing numbers

3.3 The proposed approach in the GNLP now uses the Government’s recently released draft methodology for calculating housing need; rebases the plan period to 2017; and revisits the approach to the contingency or delivery buffer. The latter includes additional allocations and likely windfall development to help ensure the identified need is met. The combined result of these changes suggests that the GNLP will need to ensure sites are provided for at least 42,900 homes of which 35,700 are already allocated or permitted. Therefore, additional sites will need to be identified for at least 7,200 homes. The overall level of provision will be sufficient to support the enhanced job growth targets of the Greater Norwich City Deal.
Growth strategy options

3.4 Six options for a growth strategy are included. The growth strategy will help locate the sites for the additional 7,200 homes. The options are broad and strategic, outlining how much growth could be allocated to general locations and categories of settlement rather than to any specific place. All the options propose a common approach to locating the sites for 3,900 of the dwellings that both maximises the opportunity for brownfield growth in the urban area and ensures that there are opportunities in more rural locations. Each of the options takes an alternative approach for the remaining 3,300 homes. These options include: urban concentration; supporting the Cambridge Norwich Tech Corridor; a focus on transport corridors; and various levels of rural dispersal with and without a new settlement (a New Settlements Topic Paper is attached as Appendix 2).

3.5 Current Local Plans reflect the “division”, for housing land supply purposes, of Greater Norwich into the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) and two Rural Areas (one in both Broadland and South Norfolk). In significant part, this reflected the need for the JCS to guide the location of housing in “daughter” Local Plan documents which made specific allocations of land. As the GNLP will contain both strategic policies and site allocations policies, there is now a significant question about whether the NPA (on existing or different boundaries) is necessary, and the Regulation 18 document invites views on this important matter.

Settlement hierarchy and clustering

3.6 The Regulation 18 document proposes that that current top three levels of the settlement hierarchy (Norwich Urban Area, Main Towns and (Key) Service Centres will remain as is. However, there are two alternatives for lower tier settlements: firstly, that they are retained as is (with perhaps some minor changes of tier for particular settlements to reflect current service levels), in other words Service Villages, Other Villages and Smaller Rural Communities and the Countryside); or secondly, that these three categories are merged into one, Village Groups. This latter option would reflect the fact that there are often service links between these settlements (e.g. one village may have a shop, the next a primary school and a third some employment opportunities), whilst recognising that people will also visit higher-order settlements for some services (such as a secondary school). Views are sought in the consultation document on how villages could best be grouped together.
Infrastructure

3.7 The document recognises the importance of infrastructure and asks questions to help establish needs. For example, the section on transport outlines the need to include a policy on supporting strategic improvements which “will need to recognise that the County Council has identified the Norwich Western Link as one of its infrastructure priorities. As it develops, the GNLP will reflect progress towards delivery of the scheme”.

Housing allocations

3.8 The GNLP will also include site allocations to meet the need for the minimum 7,200 additional homes. Consequently, there will be a parallel consultation on the sites that have been put forward by landowners and developers for consideration. At this stage, high level analysis of the sites has been undertaken to help inform the consultation, but no “preferred” sites are identified in the Regulation 18 consultation. All the sites proposed (by the deadline of 31st July 2017) will be consulted on and the consultation comments assessed. Apart from two example sites (one in Dickleburgh, and one in Horsford), and the settlement summaries for these two villages (which are included in the papers), the assessment of all the sites is not yet complete. Delegated powers are sought for the Director of Growth to agree these prior to the consultation commencing.

3.9 New sites will be able to be submitted during the Regulation 18 consultation period, which will run from early January to mid-March 2018, and additional material or evidence to support (or object to) existing sites will also be acceptable. The choice of preferred sites will only be included in the GNLP at the next stage of plan-making, having been subject to more rigorous assessment.

3.10 The introductory text to the Site Proposals Document, including the examples of Dickleburgh and Horsford referred to above, is included as Appendix 3.

3.11 An Interim Sustainability Appraisal has been prepared to accompany the Regulation 18 consultation. This is included as Appendix 4.

3.12 Accompanying the consultation will be a number of evidence base documents. These will include a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Employment and Retail Study, and Viability Study. These will be available to view on the GNLP website (www.gnlp.org.uk).
Next steps

3.13 If agreed by the three districts’ Cabinets, public consultation is expected to commence on 8th January and run to 15th March 2018. In addition to the consultation material being available on the GNLP website, there will be a series of “roadshows” at various venues across Greater Norwich (the precise dates and locations are to be confirmed, but are likely to include at least Wymondham, Poringland, Diss, Loddon, Harleston and Hingham, in South Norfolk) at which GNLP officers will be available to answer questions on the consultation.

3.14 Following the close of the consultation period, all representations will be assessed, and the GNLP will advance to the pre-submission (Regulation 19) stage. This representations period is expected to be reached in mid-2019.

4. Risks and implications arising

4.1 The preparation of a Local Plan is governed by various pieces of legislation, policy and guidance. The GNLP is being prepared in line with the legal requirements (including the Duty to Co-operate), taking account of policy and guidance.

4.2 The financial impact of preparing the GNLP is allowed for in the current budget, and will be planned for in future years’ budgets too.

4.3 The most significant risks to the production of the GNLP are unforeseen events and significant changes to Government policy, causing delays. These risks are being regularly assessed and updated. The implementation of the Housing White Paper (published in February 2017), will have very significant implications for strategic planning, albeit that full details of many changes will not be known until the revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is published (in draft form in early 2018, and in final form in spring 2018).
4.4 Whilst the implementation of the GNLP will have significant environmental impacts, these will be assessed through a Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment.

4.5 The equalities implications of the GNLP will be considered through an Equalities Impact Assessment.

4.6 The GNLP in general, and the implications of this report in particular, is not expected to have any impact on crime and disorder.

5. Other options

5.1 Cabinet could recommend some changes to the Regulation 18 document, or not agree the document at all. However, the document is a consultation, so there will be plenty of opportunity for relevant changes to be made as the GNLP progresses. The document has also been subject to scrutiny by the Regulation and Planning Policy Committee and the Greater Norwich Development Partnership Board, both of which are content with the document (subject to the minor amendments discussed in paragraph 3.1 above.

6. Recommendation

6.1 Cabinet is asked to resolve to:

i) Agree the Greater Norwich Local Plan Regulation 18 Growth Options (Appendix 1), the New Settlements Topic Paper (Appendix 2) and the Interim Sustainability Appraisal (Appendix 3), for consultation;

ii) Delegate authority to the Director of Planning and Environment, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for The Economy and External Affairs, to:

a. Agree for publication, in advance of the start of the public consultation, the Site Proposals document, and specifically the proposed sites in South Norfolk; and

b. Agree any necessary minor corrections and presentational/formatting changes to the Growth Options, New Settlements Topic Paper and Interim Sustainability Appraisal and other documents
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1. Introduction

1.1. The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet’s approval for some amendments to the Council’s Local Development Scheme, which sets out the ‘timetable’ and details of Local Plan document production.

1.2. The Local Development Scheme (LDS) sets out a rolling timetable for the production of the main Local Plan documents. The LDS is made up of a project plan/timetable supported by text about production of Local Plan documents and Supplementary Planning Documents; the text includes details of the documents to be produced, what they need to conform with, what they replace, resources and monitoring/review. Progress against the timetable is reported each December in the Local Plan Annual Monitoring Report.

1.3. The most recent South Norfolk LDS update was agreed by Cabinet in October 2016. However, some updates are recommended to be made, including minor adjustments to the GNLP timetable and the proposed to cease work on the Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan (GTLP).

1.4. It is recommended that a revised South Norfolk LDS is adopted, setting out the timetable and some details for the new documents’ production, alongside the other South Norfolk Local Plan documents which are already in production or planned to be prepared.

2. Details of update to the Local Development Scheme

2.1. Local Planning Authorities are required, by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, to prepare and keep up to date a Local Development Scheme, or LDS. In essence, as stated in paragraph 1.2 above, they are public “project plans” for the preparation of Local Plan documents, so that interested people can find out the status and timetable of document production.
production. Whilst “real-time” updates can be made at any time, more formal updates take place as part of the Annual Monitoring Review process, and it is sensible to formally update the LDS at other times if major milestones have been reached and/or substantive new work is planned.

2.2 Since the October 2016 LDS revision, there have been some updates to the Council’s Local Plan progress. The Greater Norwich Local Plan production timetable has changed slightly (the main public consultation is now planned to run from January-March 2018).

2.3 There has been little progress on the Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan (GTLP) since summer 2015, following the publication of the updated Planning Policy for Traveller Sites by the Government in August 2015. This document introduced some significant changes to the policy regime and it was decided to delay work on the GTLP until some of the uncertainty engendered by the document cleared (related to the definitions of Gypsy and Travellers for planning purposes). In particular, the changed definitions meant that the Council’s Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA), prepared in 2014, was rendered out of date.

2.4 There has not yet been significant clarity on some of the key uncertainties by way of further guidance – for example, some draft Government guidance on assessing needs published in March 2016 remains in draft form, with no indication as to when (if ever) it will be finalised.

2.5 In 2016, the Housing and Planning Act introduced a new requirement (in section 124) for local housing authorities to assess the needs for caravans and houseboats in their areas. This replaced the previous duty to prepare Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments.

2.6 Working jointly with the Broads Authority, Great Yarmouth Borough Council and North Norfolk DC, the Greater Norwich authorities commissioned a Caravans and Houseboats Needs Assessment in late 2016. The final report was published in October 2017 and assesses needs up to 2036. For Greater Norwich, the report concludes that, should the so-called “strict” approach to assessing need be practiced (which is that only those practicing work-related nomadism or temporarily not travelling “count” as Gypsies and Travellers for planning purposes, assessed against the criteria in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites), there is a five-year land supply of Gypsies and Traveller sites across Greater Norwich as at the end of 2016/17.
2.7 The results of the Needs Assessment are being taken forward through the Greater Norwich Local Plan, and will be planned for accordingly in this document.

2.8 On the basis that the current needs for Gypsies and Travellers (alongside other caravan needs and houseboats needs) to 2036 will be considered through the GNLP, and that there is a current five-year supply of sites across Greater Norwich, it is concluded that there is relatively little benefit in carrying on the preparation of the GTLP. For the reasons explained above, this has not been progressed beyond its early stages, and continuing work on it now would in effect be unhelpful and unnecessary duplication of current and future GNLP work.

2.9 The Supplementary Planning Document on Open Space underwent a period of consultation earlier in 2017, and will undergo a second public consultation in early 2018, with adoption planned for spring 2018. Adjustments to the LDS to reflect this are proposed.

2.10 The new Government appears to be less focused on Starter Homes than the previous administration. Some of the expected additional policy and guidance on the topic has been less forthcoming than expected. As a result, it is proposed that preparation of the Starter Homes SPD be delayed until later in 2018 – the publication of the revised National Planning Policy Framework in spring 2018 is likely to contain more details of Starter Homes.

2.11 During 2017, it was agreed that the previously-proposed SPD on Custom-Build and Self-Build no longer needed to be produced. Instead, the Council has published an Advice Note on the subject instead (see https://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Advice%20Note%20on%20proposals%20for%20Custom%20and%20Self%20Build%20-%20Final.pdf)

2.12 The updated LDS (Appendix 1) contains full details of exactly what each document entails, and why and how they will be progressed.
3 Risks and Implications arising

3.1 The proposals will not have an impact on crime and disorder.

3.2 The equalities implications of the revisions to the LDS have been considered carefully, in particular the proposed ceasing of the Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan. The Council is subject to the public sector equality duty created by the Equalities Act 2010. This requires the Council, in the exercise of its functions, to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct that is prohibited by the Act, advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not, and foster good relations between people who share a characteristic and those who do not. Protected characteristics include race, and it is thus important to note that some groups of Gypsies and Travellers (Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers) are recognised as ethnic groups under the law.

3.3 The current adopted Local Plan does not contain any specific allocations for Gypsies and Travellers sites. However, there is a policy (DM3.3), called Sites for Gypsies and Travellers, in the South Norfolk Development Management Policies Document, which planning applications for Gypsies and Travellers sites are assessed against. This policy includes a clause which enables greater flexibility to be applied to applications if there is not a five-year supply of Gypsies and Travellers sites.

3.4 As (1) there is a current five-year supply of sites, (2) the Council has an up-to-date Development Management policy covering planning applications for Gypsies & Travellers sites and (3) the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to the consideration of such planning applications, permitting several pitches per year (on average) and (4) the Council is actively planning, with its Greater Norwich partners, for future provision (to 2036) through the Greater Norwich Local Plan, it is concluded that abandoning the Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan document would not be inconsistent with the Council’s duties and obligations under the Equalities Act 2010.

Financial implications

Financial implications
3.5 The costs of preparing the Greater Norwich Local Plan, the SPDs and the other non-statutory documents have been allowed for in the 2016/17 budget. Appropriate allowances will need to be made in future years’ budgets, particularly for the GNLP.

*Risks*

3.6 There are no direct risks associated with the publication of the updated Local Development Scheme, with the possible exception of potential objections to the decision to cease production of the GTLP (discussed above). However, the Government is consulting on and introducing a significant number of changes to the national planning policy ‘landscape’, including changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In addition, there are a number of factors which could have implications for keeping to the timetable set out in the LDS, these include: volume and nature of responses received to consultations; unforeseen need for additional information/studies to support documents; staff resources; and legal challenges. These will be addressed as part of the production of each of these documents. Any need to update the LDS will be considered annually (through the Annual Monitoring Review), with, ‘real-time’ updates made sooner if desirable.

3.7 The South Norfolk Local Plan Inspector required, in his report of September 2015, that an early review of the South Norfolk Local Plan be undertaken, and that this review be adopted within five years of the adoption of the Local Plan (i.e. before October 2020). The LDS timetable indicates that the GNLP will still be adopted by the end of 2020. Progress against this target will be kept under review.

3.8 Regulation and Planning Policy Committee considered this paper at their meeting on 17th November 2017 and were content with it.

4 **Other Options**
4.1 Cabinet could decide not to agree the updated LDS. However, this would result in the LDS becoming increasingly out of date, diminishing its usefulness and providing inaccurate information to developers, the public and other interested parties. It would also mean that work on the Gypsy and Traveller Local Plan would not formally be ceased.

5 Recommendation

5.1 That Cabinet resolves to:

i) Agree the updated South Norfolk Local Development Scheme (Appendix 1) and bring it into effect immediately.
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1. Introduction

1.1 A Local Development Scheme (LDS) must be prepared under Section 15 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011). A LDS is essentially a project plan which identifies (among other matters) the Development Plan Documents which, when prepared, will make up the Local Plan for the area. It must be made publicly available and kept up-to-date. This enables the public and stakeholders to find out about planning policies in their area, the status of those policies, and the details of and timescales for production of all relevant documents.

1.2 In addition to providing information about the development plan documents in preparation, this LDS also provides detail about the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), and adopted local development documents, to provide a full account of the planning policies that will operate in South Norfolk. This document also refers to anticipated workstreams contributing to documents which may in due course form part of the Local Development Scheme.

1.3 This LDS will be considered approved by the Council’s Cabinet on 4 December 2017 and will, if agreed, take effect from this date. It will replace the current LDS which was last updated in October 2016.

Summary of progress since the last LDS

1.4 The previous Local Development Scheme was published in October 2016. This included a timetable for the production of the Greater Norwich Local Plan, changes to the timetable for the Long Stratton Area Action Plan and Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan and the proposed production of an Open Space Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

1.5 The main changes made to this LDS are:

- an update of the timetable for the production of the Greater Norwich Local Plan;
- the proposed abandonment of the Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan;
- revisions to the timetable for producing the Open Space Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), the Starter Homes SPD and the Norfolk Strategic Framework; and
- the proposed abandonment of the Custom Build SPD, reflecting the publication instead of a Custom Build Guidance Note instead.
2. Scope of the South Norfolk Local Development Scheme

2.1 The LDS covers the following types of documents:

Development Plan Documents (DPDs)

2.2 Development plan documents or DPDs (now more usually called “Local Plans”) are the formal policy documents which make up the statutory development plan for South Norfolk. Once adopted, these have full legal weight in decision making. The council’s decisions to approve or refuse any development which needs planning permission must be made in accordance with the policies in the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

2.3 The currently adopted development plan for South Norfolk comprises the following documents:

- Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (the JCS), which was adopted in March 2011, with amendments adopted January 2014. The JCS will be replaced by the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP);
- the South Norfolk Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Document (the Site Allocations Document), adopted October 2015;
- the Development Management Policies Local Plan (the DM Policies Document), adopted October 2015;
- the Wymondham Area Action Plan, adopted October 2015;
- the Long Stratton Area Action Plan, adopted May 2016;
- the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan, adopted February 2014;
- the Mulbarton Neighbourhood Plan, adopted February 2016;
- the Food Hub Supplementary Planning Document (SPD); and
- the South Norfolk Place-Shaping Guide SPD.

2.4 Each document (apart from Neighbourhood Development Plans) must be prepared in accordance with a nationally prescribed procedure set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. At key stages of plan-making there is an opportunity for the public to comment on emerging planning policies and proposals in the documents. At the end of the process, development plan documents must be submitted to the Secretary of State and be independently examined by a government appointed inspector to assess their soundness and legal compliance before they can be adopted by the Council and come into force.

2.5 Certain other documents must be published alongside each DPD, including:

- the independently prepared sustainability appraisal (SA) report of the DPD at each stage (a sustainability appraisal scoping report is prepared and consulted on at the start of the process to set out what sustainability issues and objectives the SA should cover and what evidence it will use);
• a policies map, setting out the DPD’s policies and proposals on a map base (if relevant);
• a statement of consultation summarising public representations made to the plan and how they have been addressed (called the “Regulation 22(c) statement”);
• copies of any representations made;
• any other supporting documents considered by the council to be relevant in preparing the plan;
• an adoption statement and environmental statement (when the plan is adopted).

Supplementary planning documents (SPDs)

2.6 Supplementary planning documents (SPDs) help to support and explain in more detail how the Council will implement particular policies and proposals in the local plan. SPD can also take the form of masterplans, detailed design briefs or development briefs for sites identified for future development (“allocated”) in the plan, as well as for other emerging sites.

2.7 SPDs can be reviewed frequently and relatively straightforwardly to respond to change, whereas a review of the policies in the plan is a longer and more complex process.

2.8 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) state that SPDs should be used “where they can help applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery”, and should not be used to add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development. SPDs should not introduce new or include excessively detailed policy guidance, but ought to be used only where it can clarify and amplify existing policy and set out how it will help to bring forward sustainable development.

2.9 A number of SPDs have so far been prepared to support adopted policies in the JCS. SPDs adopted by the Council include the Food Hub SPD (prepared jointly with Broadland District Council, adopted in July 2014) and the South Norfolk Place-Making Guide SPD (adopted in September 2012). The Norwich Research Park SPD (March 2009) was superseded on the adoption of the Site Allocations Document in October 2015.

Other Local Plan documents

2.10 In addition to the progress report provided by this LDS, a number of other documents must be prepared alongside the local plan, but do not form part of it. A Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) must show how the council intends to involve the community in plan preparation and planning decision making. The South Norfolk SCI was originally adopted in 2007, but after being reviewed, an updated version was adopted in May 2016.

2.11 To ensure that plans and policies are effective, an Annual Monitoring
Report (AMR) must also be prepared to record progress on implementing the local plan and how new development and change taking place in the previous year has contributed to achieving its targets. From 2011, the AMR for South Norfolk has been incorporated within a combined monitoring report for the Joint Core Strategy prepared jointly by Norfolk County Council and the three district authorities covering Greater Norwich. The most recent AMR, for the monitoring period April 2015 to March 2016, was published in February 2017. The AMR for the period April 2016 to March 2017 is due to be published by January 2018 and will include detailed monitoring of the South Norfolk Local Plan documents which were adopted in 2015 and 2016.

2.12 Neighbourhood (Development) Plans can also be produced, to guide development and change in local areas. They are not produced by South Norfolk Council, although the Council has a duty to support their production through providing evidence, information and support. NDPs are not Local Plan documents, but do (on adoption) form part of the development plan for the district.

Associated documents and initiatives

2.13 Although not required to be published as part of the LDS programme, the following additional documents and initiatives are listed in this LDS for information, as they will inform the preparation of future statutory development plan documents and/or provide a wider context for their implementation.

a) Non-statutory strategic guidance including the emerging Norfolk Strategic Framework (NSF).

3. The existing adopted Local Plan

3.1 A number of planning documents are already in place to guide the council’s decisions on planning applications: together these form the existing adopted Local Plan for South Norfolk, which has been through a formal process of consultation and independent examination before adoption.

3.2 As these documents are already in use, they are not part of the formal LDS schedule set out in Annex 1, which deals in the main with the new and emerging documents that will be prepared to replace or supplement them. However, they are included below in order to provide a complete picture of the planning policy documents which apply in South Norfolk.

3.3 The documents making up the Local Plan must conform to national planning policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), supported by national Planning Practice Guidance, including demonstrating that the Duty to Co-operate is being discharged in an ongoing manner. The Local Plan documents fit into a hierarchy with broad strategic policies at the top and more detailed policies interpreting the strategic approach at a district and small area level. This is illustrated in Figure 1.
3.4 For the Greater Norwich area (which includes the whole of South Norfolk), the adopted *Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk* (JCS) is the primary document at the top of the hierarchy to which other development plan documents prepared by individual districts should conform. The JCS was adopted in March 2011, with amendments adopted in January 2014. It is a strategic planning document prepared jointly by the three constituent districts in Greater Norwich and provides a long-term vision, objectives and spatial strategy for development of Norwich and its surrounding area. The JCS is therefore at the heart of the South Norfolk Local Plan.

3.5 The *Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document* (the Site Allocations Document) identifies and sets out policies for site allocations in South Norfolk where development is proposed or expected to occur between now and 2026. Alongside the Wymondham Area Action Plan, the Cringleford Neighbourhood Plan and the Long Stratton Area Action Plan, it responds to the requirement of the JCS to identify additional sites for approximately 16,000 new homes in the district by 2026, over and above existing housing commitments at the base date of the JCS (2008). It also identifies opportunities to accommodate the overall levels of growth in jobs and services anticipated over that period and to ensure that these can be delivered and located sustainably. It will also help to deliver the community facilities and green infrastructure and elements of the sustainable transport network required to support new development as it occurs, in accordance with the JCS. The Site Allocations document was adopted in October 2015.

3.6 The *Development Management Policies DPD* (the DM Policies Plan) sets out a range of more detailed policies applying throughout South Norfolk which will be used in the council’s assessment of development proposals and to guide future council decisions on applications for planning permission up to 2026. Policies cover a range of topics, building on the national policy principles for sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the strategic policies and objectives of the JCS. In certain cases, the policies also set out local criteria and standards for different kinds of development. The DM Policies Plan was also adopted in October 2015.

3.7 The *Wymondham Area Action Plan* guides development in the town between 2008 and 2026. The plan provides for at least 2,200 new homes and 20 hectares of employment land, balanced against protecting and enhancing a Kett’s Country Landscape’ to strengthen the role of the Tiffey valley, maintaining the strategic separation between Wymondham and Hethersett, extending the conservation area to protect the landscape setting of the town and abbey and creating connections and linkages between green infrastructure. The Wymondham Area Action Plan was adopted in October 2015.

3.8 The *Long Stratton Area Action Plan* will deliver a minimum of 1,800 new dwellings, additional employment land and, probably most importantly, the long-sought Long Stratton bypass to reduce congestion and pollution through the village in peak hours and improve connectivity along the A140 corridor. The
Long Stratton Area Action Plan was adopted in May 2016.

3.9 A Local Plan must be supported by a robust evidence base. There was an extensive library of documents which informed the preparation of the DM policies, site allocations plan and the Wymondham and Long Stratton Area Action Plans and information on these documents is available on request. The JCS documents library can be searched from the Greater Norwich Growth Board website [here](#).

3.10 The Localism Act 2011 allows for community led *Neighbourhood Development Plans* to be brought forward to complement the adopted Local Plan, and this is reflected in Figure 1. As noted above, there are existing Neighbourhood Plans for Cringleford and Mulbarton. A Neighbourhood Plan for Easton passed its referendum in September 2017, and will be formally “made” (adopted) at Full Council in December 2017.

![Figure 1: Suite of South Norfolk Local Plan Documents (current and emerging)](image-url)
4. Looking forward – the revised LDS programme

4.1 With the major milestone of Local Plan adoption now achieved, this iteration of the Local Development Scheme outlines the updated programme of documents and associated workstreams that will contribute to an eventual replacement and review of the development plan for South Norfolk, the Greater Norwich Local Plan. These will include progress towards the statutory and non-statutory planning documents detailed below. Further information on each of the documents is given in the Document Profiles section at the end of the document which also includes the proposed production timetable for each document.

Current (emerging) Development Plan Documents

4.2 The *Greater Norwich Local Plan* will be a new statutory local plan for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk to update the present Joint Core Strategy (JCS). This will, similarly, set out a statement of strategic planning policy for the wider Norwich area but, unlike the present JCS, will also include policies and proposals for individual sites. As such, the GNLP will eventually also replace separate site allocations plans for individual districts. The timetable for the production of the Greater Norwich Local Plan shown in this LDS has been adjusted to reflect a slight delay in the publication of the Regulation 18 public consultation stage (which will now run from January-March 2018).

Proposed new non-statutory planning framework

4.3 The proposed *Norfolk Strategic Framework* will be a non-statutory strategic policy statement which will set broad targets and priorities for the next round of statutory Local Plans for individual districts and larger areas in Norfolk, facilitating joint working across district boundaries and helping to fulfil the statutory Duty to Co-operate. Consultation on the NSF took place from July-September 2017, and is expected to be adopted in early 2018. It will then be reviewed periodically.

4.4 Both the GNLP and the Norfolk Strategic Framework will cover the period to 2036. The work programme set out in this LDS is subject to review dependent on the extent of evidence likely to be required and emerging changes to national policy and practice.

Brownfield Register

4.5 Local Planning Authorities must publish and maintain a statutory *Brownfield Land Register*. The register is intended to include details of any previously developed land suitable for housing which is capable of accommodating five or more dwellings. The first Register must be prepared by the end of December 2017, and reviewed annual thereafter. See [https://www.gov.uk/guidance/brownfield-land-registers](https://www.gov.uk/guidance/brownfield-land-registers) for more details. The Brownfield Register is prepared jointly by the Greater Norwich authorities.
Local Plan documents and SPDs proposed to be abandoned

Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan

4.6 The Council has undertaken work on the early stages of the Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan document. The most recent work was an Issues and Options consultation in 2014, with the representations received considered by Cabinet in June 2015.

4.7 Consultation on the Preferred Options was scheduled to commence in autumn 2015, but was suspended following the publication of the updated Planning Policy for Traveller Sites by the Government in August 2015. This document introduced some significant changes to the policy regime and it was decided to delay work on the GTLP until some of the uncertainty engendered by the document cleared (related to the definitions of Gypsy and Travellers for planning purposes). In particular, the changed definitions meant that the Council’s Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA), prepared in 2014, was rendered out of date.

4.8 There has not yet been significant clarity on some of the key uncertainties by way of further guidance – for example, some draft Government guidance on assessing needs published in March 2016 remains in draft form, with no indication as to when (if ever) it will be finalised.

4.9 In 2016, the Housing and Planning Act introduced a new requirement (in section 124) for local housing authorities to assess the needs for caravans and houseboats in their areas. This replaced the previous duty to prepare Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessments.

4.10 Working jointly with the Broads Authority, Great Yarmouth Borough Council and North Norfolk DC, the Greater Norwich authorities commissioned a Caravans and Houseboats Needs Assessment in late 2016. The final report was published in October 2017 and assesses needs up to 2036. For Greater Norwich, the report concludes that, should the so-called “strict” approach to assessing need be practiced (which is that only those practicing work-related nomadism or temporarily not travelling “count” as Gypsies and Travellers for planning purposes, assessed against the criteria in Planning Policy for Traveller Sites), there is a five-year land supply of Gypsies and Traveller sites across Greater Norwich as at the end of 2016/17.

4.11 The results of the Needs Assessment are being taken forward through the Greater Norwich Local Plan, and will be planned for accordingly in this document.

4.12 On the basis that the current needs for Gypsies and Travellers (alongside other caravan needs and houseboats needs) to 2036 will be considered through the GNLP, and that there is a current five-year supply of sites across Greater Norwich, it is concluded that there is relatively little benefit in carrying on the preparation of the GTLP. For the reasons explained above, this has not been progressed beyond its early stages, and continuing work on it now would in effect be unhelpful duplication of current and future GNLP work.

4.13 The equalities implications of this step have been considered carefully. The
Council is subject to the public sector equality duty created by the Equalities Act 2010. This requires the Council, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct that is prohibited by the Act, advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not, and foster good relations between people who share a characteristic and those who do not. Protected characteristics include race, and it is thus important to note that some groups of Gypsies and Travellers (Romany Gypsies and Irish Travellers) are recognised as ethnic groups under the law.

4.14 The current adopted Local Plan does not contain any specific allocations for Gypsies and Travellers sites. However, there is a policy (DM3.3), called Sites for Gypsies and Travellers, in the South Norfolk Development Management Policies Document, which planning applications for Gypsies and Travellers sites are assessed against. This policy includes a clause which enables greater flexibility to be applied to applications if there is not a five-year supply of Gypsies and Travellers sites.

4.15 As (1) there is a current five-year supply of sites, (2) the Council has an up-to-date Development Management policy covering planning applications for Gypsies & Travellers sites and (3) the Council takes a positive and proactive approach to the consideration of such planning applications, permitting several pitches per year (on average) and (4) the Council is actively planning, with its Greater Norwich partners, for future provision (to 2036) through the Greater Norwich Local Plan, it is concluded that abandoning the Gypsies and Travellers Local Plan document would not be inconsistent with the Council’s duties and obligations under the Equalities Act 2010.

Self-Build/Custom Build Supplementary Planning Document

4.16 Following the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Act (March 2015) and the subsequent publication of the Self-Build and Custom Housebuilding Regulations 2016, the Council proposed to produce a SPD to provide greater detail about self-build and custom build in South Norfolk. However, on reflection, it was decided that an SPD was not necessary, and that the main information could be contained within a Guidance Note instead. This Guidance Note has been published (see https://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/custom-and-self-build-homes). As a result, it is now proposed to formally abandon the production of the SPD.

Anticipated/potential workstreams

4.17 There are no other anticipated or potential workstreams that are likely to come forward during 2018. However, this will be kept under review and if anything does come forward, it would form part of revisions to the Local Development Scheme in due course.
5. Local development document profiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role and content</td>
<td>To provide the strategic vision, objectives and strategy for future development of the Greater Norwich area, to accommodate objectively assessed needs for growth and to identify specific sites for development in the period to 2036. The GNLP provides the strategic context for the preparation of any lower level policy documents prepared by the three constituent district planning authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Statutory Development Plan Document (DPD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>The document must conform with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (the NPPF) and with any subsequent review of the Framework. It should also accord with standing advice in national Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical coverage</td>
<td>The three districts of Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk, excluding the parts of those districts falling within the Broads Authority area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint working arrangements (if any)</td>
<td>The plan will be prepared jointly with Broadland and Norwich councils, working with Norfolk County Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Relationship with adopted local plan(s) | The GNLP will supersede  
  a) the *Joint Core Strategy (JCS)* for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (adopted March 2011, amendments adopted 2014)  
  b) the *South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations and Policies Document, the Wymondham Area Action Plan, the Long Stratton Area Action Plan, the Norwich Site Allocations and Site Specific Policies Local Plan and the emerging Broadland Site Allocations Plans and North East Growth Triangle AAP* |
Evidence required
May include selective reviews of the evidence base already in place for the JCS and new and/or updated studies where necessary.

Includes (but may not be limited to): Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA); Employment Land and Economic Growth study; Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA); Infrastructure study; Health Impact Assessment; Strategic flood risk assessment (SFRA); Retail and town centres study; Water Cycle Study; Landscape Character Assessment; Green infrastructure study; Sport and recreation study.

The plan must be accompanied by a Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) which will draw on, and themselves be part of, the evidence base.

Production milestones
(Timetable consistent with that for Councils)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commence document production</td>
<td>December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of first Local Development Scheme</td>
<td>February 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call for sites – invitation to put forward specific development sites for inclusion in the GNLP</td>
<td>May-July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission, prepare and publish evidence studies required to support the GNLP</td>
<td>March 2016 – December 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete and publish draft (Regulation 18) plan for consultation: to include issues and policy options and initial site results</td>
<td>January-March 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete and publish pre-submission draft (Regulation 19) plan for consultation: to include agreed strategic policies, sites and Assess representations in response to Regulation 19 draft, prepare all formal submission documents</td>
<td>June-July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal submission of GNLP to Secretary of State (Regulation 22)</td>
<td>August – September 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings start</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation on Proposed Main Modifications</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of Inspector’s Report</td>
<td>September-October 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of the Greater Norwich Local Plan</td>
<td>November 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk Governance</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led by Planning Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>GNLP partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management arrangements</td>
<td>Refer to project plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources required</td>
<td>Planning Policy team with assistance from other teams as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach to stakeholder involvement</td>
<td>Widespread participation and consultation as set out in SCI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Monitoring and review | Annual Monitoring Report, including housing land supply updates |

| Governance and Resources |  
| * Norfolk Duty to Co-operate Member Forum  
| * Norfolk Strategic Planning Officer Group,  
| * Norfolk Strategic Framework Steering Group and task groups  
| * Agreement at each stage through Cabinet and (at Reg 19, Reg 22 and adoption) Full Council approval |

**Document Title** | **Norfolk Strategic Framework (NSF)**
--- | ---
Role and content | To set out an overall vision, strategic development principles and indicative housing and employment numbers and distribution for Norfolk in the period to 2036; to address relevant cross-boundary planning issues; to inform and provide a context for the preparation of statutory local plans for individual districts and areas within the county (including the GNLP)

Status | Non statutory strategic policy document

Geographical coverage | The administrative county of Norfolk. (The Broads Authority will be involved in the production of the document but it is not intended to include separate housing or
Adoption

Revise and finalise content

CJG

RMMG

Commence document production

Prepare draft framework

Public consultation on draft framework

Revise and finalise content

Adoption

Conformity

As a non-statutory document there is no formal requirement for conformity with higher level national policy statements, however the framework will need to follow the general principles of national policy and guidance

Relationship with adopted local plan(s)

This will be a new document providing a framework for the eventual formal review and replacement of existing local plans

Evidence required

Includes Strategic Housing Market Assessments and Housing and Economic Land Assessments

Production milestones (provisional)

Commence document production

Prepare draft framework

Public consultation on draft framework

Revise and finalise content

Adoption

January 2016

Spring 2016-Summer 2017

July-September 2017

September-December 2017

January 2018

Governance and Resources

As per Greater Norwich Local Plan, with membership of steering groups extended to include representation from all Norfolk districts

Monitoring and Review

To be confirmed

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Title</th>
<th>Open Space SPD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Role and content</td>
<td>The Council’s current Open Space Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) dates from 1994, and so is in need of updating. Whilst the SPD cannot introduce new policy or specific mandatory standards, the standards expressed will be guidance, much as in the current SPG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Supplementary Planning Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical coverage</td>
<td>South Norfolk District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint working arrangements (if any)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>Will provide guidance to the interpretation of policies in the Development Management Policies Document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Relationship with adopted local plan(s)
Supplementary Planning Document to support policy in the adopted Local Plan

### Evidence required
Review of existing best practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production milestones (provisional)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commence document production</strong></td>
<td>January 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft document considered at Cabinet</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First public consultation on draft SPD</td>
<td>June-August 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second public consultation on draft SPD</td>
<td>January-February 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revise and finalise content</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td>Spring 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### South Norfolk Governance

| Department | Led by Planning Policy |
| Management arrangements | Refer to project plan |
| Resources required | Planning Policy team with assistance from other teams as appropriate |
| Approach to stakeholder involvement | Widespread participation and consultation as set out in SCI |
| Monitoring and Review | To be confirmed |

### Document Title
Starter Homes SPD

<p>| Role and content | The Council is currently awaiting the publication of further guidance, policies and regulations. Once these regulations have been published the Council intends to produce a SPD to provide greater detail about the provision of Starter Homes in South Norfolk |
| Status | Supplementary Planning Document |
| Geographical coverage | South Norfolk District |
| Joint working arrangements (if any) | None |
| Conformity | Will provide guidance to interpretation of Government guidance and planning policy |
| Relationship with adopted local plan(s) | Supplementary Planning document to support policy in the adopted Local Plan |
| Evidence required | Possible update of Strategic Housing Market Assessment |
| Production milestones (provisional) |  |
| <strong>Commence document production</strong> | Spring 2018 |
| Draft document considered at Cabinet | September 2018 |
| Public consultation on draft SPD | September – October 2018 |
| Revise and finalise content | November- December 2018 |
| Adoption | December 2018 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South Norfolk Governance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department</strong></td>
<td>Led by Planning Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management arrangements</strong></td>
<td>Refer to project plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources required</strong></td>
<td>Planning Policy team with assistance from other teams as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach to stakeholder involvement</strong></td>
<td>Widespread participation and consultation as set out in SCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring and Review</strong></td>
<td>To be confirmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## South Norfolk Local Development Scheme Timetable - December 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Norwich Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Strategic Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space SPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starter Homes SPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies Map - update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield Register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legend
- Preparation of document/evidence gathering to inform Reg 18 consultation
- Reg 18 (or equivalent for SPD) consultation
- Publication of document
- Submission, Examination and Adoption
  - Submit to Secretary of State
  - Examination
  - Adoption
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th></th>
<th>2020</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater Norwich Local Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Strategic Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space SPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starter Homes SPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies Map - update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield Register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- Blue: Preparation of document/evidence gathering to inform Reg 18 consultation
- Green: Reg 18 (or equivalent for SPD) consultation
- Pink: Publication of document
- Yellow: Submission, Examination and Adoption
  - Green: Submit to Secretary of State
  - Yellow: Examination
  - Red: Adoption
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To read the natural text, please refer to the diagram and legend provided above.
Conservation Area Appraisals and Boundary Amendments for Bawburgh, Dickleburgh, Hempnall, Mulbarton & Scole Conservation Areas

Report of the Chris Bennett (Senior Conservation and Design Officer)
Cabinet Member: Lee Hornby, Portfolio Holder for Regulation & Public Safety

Chris Bennett
01508 533828
cbennett@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1.0 Introduction

1.1 This purpose this report is for Cabinet to recommend to Council to approve and adopt:

- Amended conservation area boundaries for Bawburgh, Dickleburgh, Hempnall, Mulbarton, and Scole Conservation Areas.

2.0 Background

2.1 Under the section 69 of Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the Local Planning Authority is required from time to time to determine which part of their areas are of special architectural or historic interest whose character or appearance it is desirable to preserve or enhance, and to designate them as conservation areas. Under Section 71 of the Act the authority is also required to formulate and publish proposals for their preservation and enhancement.

2.2 The council currently has 52 conservation areas. The current programme of conservation area appraisals being undertaken is the first comprehensive review of the conservation areas since their original designations, in some cases dating back to the mid-1970s. During this period development has led to a change in the character and appearance of the conservation areas and there has also been a change in opinion as to what heritage may be considered worthy of preservation.


2.4 The appraisals have been carried following guidance in the Historic England Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management Historic England Advice Note 1 published March 2016.
2.5 The appraisals and proposed boundary revisions were taken to the Regulation and Planning Policy Committee on 20 September who recommended approval of the revised boundaries, conservation area appraisals and the conservation management guidelines by Cabinet and Council.

3.0 Current position and issues

3.1 The conservation area boundaries have not been reviewed or amended for these five conservation areas since the original designations as follows: Bawburgh (1973), Dickleburgh (1975), Hempnall (1994), Mulbarton (1977), and Scole (1994). In order to be effective in assisting in making planning determinations and making informed decisions it is important that the conservation area boundary and the appraisals content is up-to-date.

3.2 The appraisals assess the character and appearance of the conservation areas and recommend either extending or removing peripheral areas by changing the boundary line depending on whether the areas make a positive, negative or neutral contribution to the conservation area. Conservation management guidelines are included which set out proposals as to how the conservation areas can be managed and further enhanced.

4.0 Proposals

4.1 The proposed boundary changes reflect that the conservation areas have changed in character and appearance over time, and that in some cases curtilages have changed.

4.2 The maps at Appendix A show the proposed revised conservation area boundaries with the areas to be included and the areas to be excluded. The maps at Appendix B show the conservation area boundaries that are proposed to be approved and adopted.

**Bawburgh:** Minor changes to reflect current curtilages/plot boundaries of properties already within the conservation area.

**Dickleburgh:** Removal of areas which have been extensively developed with modern development and no longer make a contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area as a heritage asset. After consultation a slight boundary modification has been made to exclude a modern garage block.

**Hempnall:** Inclusion of the extension to the churchyard to the north of St Margaret’s Church. Part of the historic farm buildings on the north side of Bussey’s Loke have been included but slightly modified from the original proposal to take account of comments made by the owners that the new farm buildings should remain outside the conservation area.
Mulbarton: Minor changes to reflect current curtilages/plot boundaries of properties already within the conservation area. A small change to a garden curtilage was made following consultation as the OS base map was incorrect.

Scole: The boundary has been altered to include the extension of the St Andrew’s churchyard, land to the east of the Crossways Public House and The Cottage on Bridge Street, with minor changes to the boundaries around The Thatched Cottage.

4.3 Consultation on the appraisals was undertaken from 1 July to 13th August (having been extended by two weeks to allow for public exhibitions and meetings with the Parish Councils to be scheduled within the consultation period, and to give residents more time to respond.) The process, comments and response are summarised in Appendix C.

4.4 Appendix D contains the five conservation area appraisals for adoption (available to view electronically here). The recommendation is to adopt the appraisals as an evidence base in support of the Local Plan and Joint Core Strategy. Planning inspectors have accepted appraisals as material considerations of considerable weight in appeals whether or not they have been adopted as supplementary Planning Document (SPD), so it is not necessary to adopt as SPDs. The appraisals also contain Conservation management guidelines that will be agreed in principle once the appraisals have been adopted.

5.0 Risks and implications arising

5.1 There is relatively small increase in Hempnall and Scole, otherwise the boundaries have been amended to modern plot boundaries, as recommended in the Historic England Guidance Note 1. The significant reduction in the size of the Dickleburgh conservation area should reduce the number of planning applications.

5.2 Inclusion in the conservation area will result in the following changes to those properties to be included:

- Any submission for planning permission will be considered with regard to preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- Planning permission will be needed to demolish buildings and other structures such as front garden walls (if over 1m in height)
- Alterations affecting external appearance, particularly to the front elevation are likely to require planning permission e.g. dormer windows and satellite dishes
- Six weeks notice is required to be given to the council prior to undertaking any works to trees.

5.3 Removing areas from the conservation area will result in some deregulation for owners of those properties. However, the removed areas will be subject to design policies in the Joint Core Strategy and the Local Plan, and guidance on design such as the South Norfolk Place Making Guide. A high standard of design will still be sought when considering planning applications.

5.4 It is important to note that the setting of the conservation area is a material consideration. Any development outside the conservation area but still deemed to affect the setting will be considered on its relative merits on that basis.

5.5 The character assessment in the appraisals will provide improved background information on defining the character and appearance of the conservation areas, and this in turn will lead to an improvement in design and access statements and assist in decision making when determining planning applications.

5.6 The conservation management guidelines are written to support and develop good practice in management and enhancing the conservation area.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 To recommend that Council approves and adopts the amended conservation area boundaries for Bawburgh, Dickleburgh, Hempnall, Mulbarton, and Scole Conservation Areas.

6.2 To recommend that Council approves and adopts the conservation area appraisals and conservation management guidelines for the conservation areas of Bawburgh, Dickleburgh, Hempnall, Mulbarton, and Scole.
Appendix A: Maps indicating the proposed revised conservation area boundaries with the areas to be included and excluded.

Appendix B: Maps showing the new conservation area boundaries to be approved and adopted (indicated by a red line.)

Appendix C: Summary of Consultation Responses.

Appendix D: Conservation Area Appraisals for Bawburgh (C1), Dickleburgh (C2), Hempnall (C3), Mulbarton (C4), Scole (C5) (available to view electronically here)
APPENDIX C

Consultation responses

Consultation process

Informal ‘walkabouts’ of the conservation areas took place as part of the process of reviewing the existing boundaries and proposing any boundary changes. This was formed of a small group of local councillors (district and parish) and local amenity groups, such as local heritage and history societies.

The statutory consultation on the prepared appraisal drafts, which included recommended boundary changes and conservation management guidelines, took place from July 1 until August 13th (following the agreement of a two week extension.) The following process took place:

- Residents directly affected by the proposed boundary changes were contacted by letter.
- Emails were sent to Ward Councillors, County Councillors, the Parish Councils, Norfolk County Council (Historic Environment Service) and Historic England.
- Adverts were placed at local information points such as village noticeboards.
- The appraisals were available to view on the council’s website and at the reception desk, with forms available online to complete.
- Presentations were made to each Parish Council.
- Exhibitions were held for a minimum 2hrs in each village, with attendance by an officer and a questionnaire to prompt a reply on the description of character, drawing of the revised boundary line, and the conservation management guidelines.

Comments received and responses:

Historic England

No response

County Council - Historic Environment Service

“Overall the five appraisals are solid documents. Their strength lies in the detailed way they consider historic buildings, areas of open space and selected landscape features within each area…. We feel they are not as strong on archaeology or the wider historic landscape as they could be.”

In response to this, the appraisals are deliberately quite precise to describing the area within the boundary and immediate setting rather than wider parish characteristics that are covered in the Historic Environment Record Parish Summaries and district landscape character assessment. However, where relevant some additional information has been provided.
### Bawburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change ‘water meadows’ to ‘river meadows’</td>
<td>Noted and amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman creations of 1st and 2nd centuries could be referred to as ‘pagan’, ‘inhumations’ are 4th century and referred to as ‘Christian’</td>
<td>Noted and amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More stress on Bawburgh as pilgrimage site</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide better description of location of the Old Hall (now demolished)</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old elements of Kings Head are C17th</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include photos of Hermits Chapel and Slipper Chapel (important SAMs)</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support deletion of area to E and would prefer extension for setting.</td>
<td>Not amended—there is no ‘protection’ from conservation area status for agricultural fields, so Historic England advise they are not included unless they had an important historic function e.g. former designed parkland. For any development consideration of the setting of the conservation area any heritage assets are also a materials consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled monument should be marked on map</td>
<td>Noted and amended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dickleburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The wider Scole-Dickleburgh field system deserves a mention e.g. trackways running north south which was the seasonal movement of livestock from the Waveney to high plains.</td>
<td>Noted and included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative suggestion is that Dickleburgh named after a clearing in the wood and could also mean ‘a forest belonging to Diss’</td>
<td>Noted and included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domesday date changed to 1086</td>
<td>Noted and amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed undergrounding of overhead cables will have implication for below ground archaeology.</td>
<td>Potentially – but this would be looked at as any proposals if forthcoming.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hempnall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refer to Roman Road as Pye Street</td>
<td>Noted and included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River may not have been navigable</td>
<td>Noted and amended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It might be worth adding that the Domesday Book suggests Hempnall was a large *vil* with one major manor held by Ralph Baynard and a small holding held by Roger Bigod. The manor included 2 churches and 2 mills. The second church may have been to the west of Hempnall Green.

The Character Assessment is good, but it could stress the importance of the isolated hamlets associated with commons (which are very characteristic of this part of Norfolk)

Mention field system aligned with Pye Road in parish

Core of settlement appears to be the junction of Mill Road, Bungay Road and The Street with an open space at this junction, the stream crossing and the church (there are suggestions that this may be the market site and possibly the site of a mill). The roads, especially The Street appear characterised by scattered Late medieval and post medieval farms, with infilling occurring through the 19th and 20th centuries to produce the linear settlement pattern.

Would it be possible to extend the conservation area to include the field to east of church?

### Mulbarton

Common unlikely to be associated with tree clearance as trees were probably largely cleared by bronze age

the photograph on page 3 is of a different location to that marked on the Streetscape Map.

A map of 1724 is mentioned on page 4 – it would be great if this could be included.

Page 6 – the caption on photo ‘Sports field on the common looking north’ is incorrect, instead appears to be looking across the

Noted and included

Noted and included

Noted and included

Noted

Not amended – there is no ‘protection’ from conservation area status for agricultural fields, so Historic England advise they are not included unless they had an important historic function e.g. former designed parkland. For any development consideration of the setting of the conservation area any heritage assets is also a material consideration.

Noted

Noted and amended

The map is available from other sources.

Noted and amended
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance of Old Hall and moat could be stressed more strongly</th>
<th>Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>could be added to the Streetscape map, including the view across pond towards church and the southwestern gateway to the common?</td>
<td>This has been looked at and noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood plan not referred to</td>
<td>Noted and referenced in the introduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text errors paragraph 2 of page 12</td>
<td>Noted and amended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect photograph of the sports field on page 6</td>
<td>Noted and amended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scole**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance of the impact of the Romans, and later changes to the settlement, including the impact of the bypass, could be stressed more strongly</th>
<th>Noted and changed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there any merit in including residential areas north and south of the church on the east side of the road, as the area is heavily weighed on the west side?</td>
<td>These areas, with one exception, comprise modern dwellings and gardens, which are not of special architectural or historic interest, and do not make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the area. Not changed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parish Councils**

**Dickleburgh**

Following the consultation the following items were discussed by the parish council:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why does the Conservation Area need to be changed?</th>
<th>This is covered in the report and in the appraisal. The principal reason is that the boundary was drawn in 1975. Since that time the settlement has changed significantly. Large areas of modern housing estates peripheral to the concentration of historic building in the settlement should not be included unless they are of historic or architectural merit. The modern housing is ok, but would be considered ‘neutral’ in terms of contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. There is no reason to include it.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What will those changes mean to residents either in the area or sitting on the edge of the Conservation Area, or with split site?</td>
<td>There will be no change to residents in the existing area, except that the area will be better described for development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
management decisions, especially appeals. Development proposed outside the conservation area but still deemed to affect it setting, will need to take that into account in any proposals and it will be a material consideration. Split sites are avoided, but if this happens to occur for example at a later date, conservation area legislation will only be applied to that part of a site within the conservation area boundary.

| There was a perceived lack of communication from SNC regarding this change particularly to those affected, which residents felt was on oversight | All those directly affected by having houses taken out of the conservation area were directly notified by letter. There is no change to houses staying in the conservation area. The parish council also advertised the consultation event on the parish noticeboard and through their email. |
| Would a Conservation Area protect against development on neighbouring sites? | Conservation area status does not ‘protect’ from development, but it does assist in managing it so that development takes into account the character and appearance of the conservation area, and this includes its setting. Any proposal would be considered on its merits, along with other planning considerations. It was made clear at the consultation event which some parish councillors attended that the neighbourhood plan would be useful in terms of assisting the management of development outside the conservation area. |

**Mulbarton**

| Neighbourhood plan not referred to | Noted and referenced in the introduction |
| The common is an important area for wildlife a survey having previously been carried out by the Norfolk Wildlife Trust. | Noted and referenced in the text. |
| Page 6 – the caption on photo ‘Sports field on the common looking north’ is incorrect, instead appears to be looking across the pond. | Noted and amended |

There have been no responses from Bawburgh, Hempnall or Scole Parish Councils.

**Response from members of the public (including attendance at consultation events):**
### Bawburgh:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Warmans Close should be omitted as it has no special architectural or historic interest and is not visible in public views.</td>
<td>Noted but not omitted. The houses along Warman’s Close are part of a modern development but are good quality buildings in a very traditional style. The use of materials is also sympathetic to the general historic character of the area. Although the close is situated behind the main street the houses form an attractive group and their very traditional character makes a positive contribution to the street scene. No.2 marks the end of the close where it meets the open countryside to the north. Bawburgh is a small settlement and these houses integrate with and form part of the core village cluster. For these reasons its inclusion together with adjacent properties is considered justified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dickleburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One person at the exhibition discussed keeping the allotments in the NE corner of the CA behind the houses on the East side of Norwich Road.</td>
<td>The allotment does not contribute to street views, and any proposals would still be considered in terms of setting. It would be more appropriate to consider the allotment in terms of a community space in the emerging neighbourhood plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident of Smiths Court mentioned that her house was being taken out, but her garage remained in.</td>
<td>This modern garage block can be considered neutral in terms of its contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area and is now proposed to be taken out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident of Harvey Lane had following comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new boundary does not include the listed building on Levett Cottage, Harvey Lane</td>
<td>Being a grade II building, Levett Cottage benefits from protected listed status. In terms of the CA, it is quite detached from historic cluster and core of historic properties and has later C20th surrounding it. The property does not make a significant contribution in terms of group value. The proposals to keep the proposed boundary is recommended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Lane is described as ‘rural’ but includes the village school, hall and</td>
<td>Harvey Lane is more landscaped than the street and different in character – the part of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recreation ground and pre-1967 housing in the present CA discussed at that time.

Villagers were not aware of proposal.

The reduction in area takes no account of the historical layout of the village pre-1967 when houses along Harvey Lane were already in situ.

Any reduction on the boundary will allow this part of the village to be altered not in keeping with its historical heritage.

Reducing rules on planning within the present conservation area would appear to be detrimental to the village and not beneficial in any way, although at much cost to the council.

The lane within the CA does feel more rural in character.

The Edwardian OS map shows the extent of pre-1914 properties in village. Later properties some distance from the core are not considered to have sufficient historic or architectural merit to warrant inclusion on that basis, although some later houses in very close proximity to historic properties in the village ‘core’ have been included.

As above, the new boundary will allow this part of the village to be altered not in keeping with its historical heritage.

Any development in areas removed will still be covered by policies in the local plan. In some cases setting of the conservation area will still be a consideration.

Taking areas of modern development which do not contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area out of it means that residents will not have to make. Concentration of the boundary on areas of historic and architectural value concentrates the CA.

**Hempnall**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concern about the impact of the area on the farm at Bussey’s Loke.</td>
<td>The proposal was based on the buildings identified on the historic map, but on site it was clear that many have been removed or radically altered as part of the modernisation of the farm buildings. The main range on the street frontage and the principle barn, which make the most significant contribution, are however largely intact, and it was agreed that the proposed boundary would be modified to reflect this. The owners object to the suggestion by Historic Environment Service to include further land east of the church. (Noted).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the Parish Council have not been able to respond, two members did make comments supporting the proposals in the appraisal and the boundary changes. Noted.

The County Councillor supported the proposals. Noted.

**Mulbarton**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Acre, south of the common should be included within the conservation area boundary.</td>
<td>Noted but no amendments made. Only properties immediately south of the common are included as they define the boundary. South Acre sits behind these properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation area boundary does not follow rear garden boundary at Church View, South of the Common</td>
<td>Noted and amended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scole**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the walkabout, the members recommended the inclusion of landscaped areas to the south of the area which border onto the main A140 and A143.</td>
<td>These areas are being taken over by the parish council and comprise amenity areas and footpaths for the general public which run along the river and under the A140. They include a number of trees, mostly willow, but the areas are separated from the conservation area by the modern housing developments to the north. As such they do not make a significant contribution to the setting of the conservation area. Historic England advise that such landscaped areas are not included unless they had an important historic function e.g. former designed parkland. Not changed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix D**

The appraisals to be adopted can be found [here](#).
The Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Register

Report of the Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer
Cabinet Member: Yvonne Bendle (Housing, Wellbeing, Leisure & Early Intervention), and John Fuller (The Economy & External Affairs)

CONTACT
Keith Mitchell  01508 533756
kmitchell@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1. Under the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 and the Housing and Planning Act 2016 the Council has a duty to keep a register of people wishing to acquire a serviced plot in South Norfolk on which to build a home for them to live in.

1.2. The legislation and government Regulations provide some flexibility about how the register is to operate. On 5 December 2016 Cabinet agreed:

- not to introduce a registration fee at present, but to review the position in 12 months’ time;
- to introduce a local connection test on the basis of:
  - having lived in South Norfolk for 6 of the previous 12 months, or
  - having lived in South Norfolk for 3 of the previous 10 years, or
  - having a current contract of employment where the job is mostly located in South Norfolk.
- not to introduce a financial resources test.

1.3. This report considers the question of a possible registration fee, and also raises local connection and applicants’ financial resources because they are affected by new government guidance (part of Planning Practice Guidance) issued on 28 July 2017. Cabinet is asked to consider whether there should be any changes to the adopted approach.

1.4. The Housing, Wellbeing, Leisure & Early Intervention Policy Committee considered the matters raised in this report on 13 November 2017. Their views are summarised and the recommendation in this report reflects their views.

2. Background

2.1. The Regulations set three years for the time for each local authority to grant planning permissions equal to the number of people joining its register in the first base period (which ran from 1st April 2016 to 30th October 2016). The duty with respect to the first base period will therefore end on 30th October 2019. Future duties will also be by three years from the end of the next annual base period (so 30th October 2020, and so on). The obligation for later base periods will be based only on the number of people who register during the base period in question.
2.2. If sufficient plots are made available (i.e. granted planning permission across the District as a whole) to fulfil the obligation rising from the first base period, there will be no further obligation to those on the register even if individuals have not acquired a serviced plot after three years. In other words, the requirement is only to meet the overall district need in numerical terms, not to ensure that every person/association on the register has had their individual need met with a (to them) suitable plot in a suitable location. Such individuals would count towards the second base period obligation only if they de-registered and re-registered during the second base period.

2.3. Regulations permit a local authority to introduce a local connection test, and in December 2016 Cabinet agreed to do this. The effect was to divide the register into two parts with effect from 9th December 2016:

- Part 1: people with a local connection (see paragraph 1.2 above).
- Part 2: people without a local connection.

The obligation described in paragraph 2.1 applies only to Part 1 of the register. The obligation to people on Part 2 is a more general duty to have regard to the number when carrying out functions relating to planning, housing, disposal of land and regeneration.

2.4. Under the legislation any resident of the European Economic Area over the age of 18 may join any local authority’s register. It is not possible to ascertain how many of those on the South Norfolk register have registrations elsewhere. At the end of the second base period on 30th October 2017, the table below summarises the current position.
Part 1:
Registrations Requiring Planning Permissions (local connection)

Part 2:
Registrations Not Requiring Planning Permissions

Totals

**Base Period 1 (1 April 2016 – 30 Oct 2016)**
– all regarded as ‘local connection’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Part 1: Registrations Requiring Planning Permissions</th>
<th>Part 2: Registrations Not Requiring Planning Permissions</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base Period 2 (31 Oct 2016 – 30 Oct 2017):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Part 1: Registrations Requiring Planning Permissions</th>
<th>Part 2: Registrations Not Requiring Planning Permissions</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before the local connection test (31 October 2016 – 8 December 2016)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the local connection test (9 December 2016 – 30 October 2017)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Base Period 2 totals</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>194</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5. To date 108 planning permissions have been issued towards the obligation of 112 arising from Base Period 1. These permissions comply with the legislation and Guidance, being a serviced plot of land which can, in the opinion of the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, be provided with access to a public highway and connections for electricity, water and waste water within the period before the planning permission expires. In practice the vast majority are single plots.

2.6. As soon as the number of permissions reaches 112 the subsequent permissions will start counting towards the obligation arising from Base Period 2.

**3. The Latest Guidance and Legal Advice**

3.1. The Council’s solicitor was asked for detailed legal advice about the implications of the new guidance for retaining the local connection test and for introducing a registration fee. This section considers both of these in detail, and then summarises the financial resources test position, which has not changed.
The Local Connection Test

3.2. Since the introduction of the local connection test on 9 December 2016, registrations have been 61 (45%) on Part 1 of the register (with a local connection) and 74 (55%) on Part 2 (without a local connection). This demonstrates that only a minority of those registering since then reflect local demand.

3.3. On 28 July 2017 the Government updated Planning Practice Guidance with regard to the local connection test. Legal advice on the implications of the changes is:

- A local connection test may be introduced (or retained) only if there is a ‘strong justification’ responding to ‘a recognised local issue’. This excludes a broader reason such as multiple registrations with more than one local authority.
- Without a strong justification for a local connection test, all the 33 registrations from 28 July onwards should be recorded as being in Part 1 of the register. This means that the 15 people registered since that date in Part 2 should be retrospectively moved to Part 1, and Part 2 abolished from that date.
- Local authorities should consider consulting on proposals before they introduce a local connection test. It would be possible to consult on a proposal to retain the test if the Council believed there was a strong justification.

3.4. Although the local connection test has provided a clear basis for assessing local demand for custom build, it is concluded that the Council will have to abandon it to comply with government guidance.

A Registration Fee

3.5. In December 2016 Cabinet resolved not to introduce a registration fee, but to review the position in 12 months’ time.

3.6. There has been no significant change to guidance about charging a registration fee. The Council may charge a reasonable fee, but the income may not exceed the cost of maintaining the register plus the cost of providing sufficient planning permissions to fulfil obligations.
3.7. Introducing a registration fee would probably dissuade local people from joining the register. Since Broadland DC (the only Norfolk council to charge) introduced a fee of £100 in January 2017 only 3 people have joined their register (all in Part 1). This indicates strongly that a fee would result in there being no clear evidence of demand for custom build.

3.8. There would be IT cost implications to introducing a fee. The current IT arrangement is with Kings Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council at a total cost of £1,000 for three years (until March 2019), so the necessary IT changes would incur additional costs. Introducing a fee of £100 would risk incurring a financial loss.

3.9. Further costs would be incurred if it was felt necessary to record the time spent by various officers in order to respond to a query about justifying the amount charged for registration.

3.10. Overall, it is considered that the disadvantages and risks of introducing a registration fee outweigh the potential benefits.

**A Financial Resources Test**

3.11. The Regulations permit the Council to introduce a test based on whether someone will have the financial resources to buy a plot on which to build their home. However, setting clear financial criteria is difficult. There is as yet only a limited local market in smaller plots which might be suitable for custom-build properties, so a minimum amount required could not be set without risking a challenge which might cause cost and inconvenience to the Council. Also, there might be uncertainty about robustness and certainty of funding sources (e.g. credit-worthiness, or loans from family members), with the potential for considerable work being required to fully understand an applicant’s financial position.

3.12. In December 2016 Cabinet recognised these factors and decided not to introduce a financial resources test. There has been no change, so it is concluded that this reasoning remains valid.
4. Consideration of Options and Conclusion

4.1 Multiple registrations with several councils mean that a local authority’s custom build register is not a true measure of demand. A local authority wanting to assess genuine local demand would have free registration while clearly distinguishing people with a local connection, as the Council has operated since December 2016. However, legal advice is that this option is not now compliant with government guidance. Consequently, on the basis of the points considered in section 3, it is felt that the best option is to register all applicants on a single register.

4.2 Such an approach would mean that the Council would have a duty to provide within 3 years planning permissions equal to the total number registering in each Base Period. There have been 108 planning permissions in the 12 months commencing 31 October 2016. It is expected that the Council will meet the obligation (112) arising from Base Period 1 within the next month, when subsequent permissions can start counting against the obligation arising from Base Period 2 (97). At the present rate of approvals, this second obligation will be met about November 2018.

4.3 Obligations arising from future Base Periods (and the ability to fulfil them) will depend on the number of people registering and the number of planning permissions. The number of registrations during the past year has fluctuated, without a noticeable trend, so it is assumed that this will continue. It is also assumed that the number of planning permissions will continue at about the same rate, possibly including some larger sites.

4.4 Consequently there should be no cumulative problem within the next 5 years, but there might be problems from 2023 onwards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base Period</th>
<th>Qualifying Registrations</th>
<th>Date Duty Fulfilled</th>
<th>Deadline to Fulfil Duty</th>
<th>Cumulative Backlog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(1) Assuming the local connection is retained until 28 July 2017
(2) Assuming 108 permissions per annum
4.5 On the basis of legal advice and current trends, it is concluded that:

- the local connection test should be ended;
- the Council is able to fulfil obligations for more than 5 years without a local connection test or a registration fee;
- there is no pressure to introduce a registration fee at present.

5. Proposals

5.1. It is suggested that Cabinet prioritises the Council’s desire to assess demand for custom build, so it is proposed that:

- The local connection test is abolished, backdated to 28 July 2017.
- No registration fee is introduced.
- No financial resources test is introduced.
- The position is reviewed in 2 years’ time unless circumstances provide reason for earlier review.

5.2. On 13 November 2017, the Housing, Wellbeing, Leisure & Early Intervention Policy Committee considered these issues raised, and agreed to recommend the above proposals to Cabinet.

5.3. The Committee noted that there is no means from currently-available evidence of establishing how many people on the register have succeeded in building their own home. They also agreed that it would be useful to continue to monitor the number of people registering who do not have a connection with South Norfolk. Consequently, they also resolved to recommend to Cabinet that:

- For monitoring purposes only, the Council:
  o continues to collect data to establish who on the register has a local connection with South Norfolk;
  o contacts all applicants to establish how many have been successful in acquiring a plot of land in South Norfolk, on which to build a house to live in.
6. Risks and Other Options

6.1. The proposed course of action complies with legal advice and no risks regarding registration have been identified.

6.2. There is a risk that the Council will struggle to provide sufficient planning permissions to fulfil obligations after 5 years, but a review in 2 years’ time will suffice to provide time to address the situation (for instance by introducing a registration fee).

6.3. The Council could retain the local connection, but there would be the risk of a challenge which the Council would not be able to defend.

6.4. The Council could introduce a registration fee and/or a financial resources test, but in each case the cost would be likely to exceed the benefit.

6.5. Under proposals to work more closely with Broadland District Council it would be possibly to have joint administrative arrangements for the two custom build registers, but it would not be possible to merge them into a single joint register because the legislation requires each Local Planning Authority to ‘keep a register of individuals and associations of individuals who are seeking to acquire serviced plots of land in the authority’s area’.

7. Recommendation

7.1. Cabinet agrees that:
   1. The local connection test is abolished, backdated to 28 July 2017
   2. No registration fee is introduced.
   3. No financial resources test is introduced.
   4. For monitoring purposes only, the Council:
      (a) Continues to collect data to establish who on the register has a local connection to South Norfolk;
      (b) Contacts all applicants to establish how many have been successful in acquiring a plot of land in South Norfolk, on which to build a house to live in;
   5. The position is reviewed in 2 years’ time unless circumstances provide reason for earlier review.
Using S106 receipts to provide affordable home ownership

Report of the Housing Enabling and Strategy Officer
Cabinet Member: Yvonne Bendle (Housing, Wellbeing, Leisure & Early Intervention) and John Fuller (The Economy & External Affairs)

CONTACT
Keith Mitchell  01508 533756
kmitc@l@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1 Several sites with planning permission for residential development have S106 agreements which include the payment of commuted sums instead of or in addition to the provision of affordable housing on-site. The commuted sums are paid to the Council, and they must be used to provide affordable housing in South Norfolk, usually with a specified period (often within 5 years from the date of the payment).

1.2 This report proposes using money currently available from this source to provide homes for affordable home ownership through the Big Sky group in a way which will meet housing need, create an asset within the Council’s control, and use sales income to generate further resources to provide more affordable homes.

2. Background

2.1 Currently £830,000 is available, with a further £400,000 expected within the next few months. Included in the sums already received, £660,000 comprises payments received from housebuilders at Queens Hills, Costessey.

2.2 As this report proposes to use the Queens Hills receipts, it is essential to ensure that the use of this money complies with the Council’s obligations. Legal advice is that:

- The Queens Hills obligation is to apply each payment within 5 years of receipt. To be sure of compliance the money should be spent (applied) by the deadline associated with each payment (the first being £157,000 by May 2018).
- The money is to be used for the provision of affordable housing. This may be through the acquisition of new-build homes or by acquiring homes which are not already within the affordable housing sector.
- There is no restriction on how the money is to be applied. This means that the money may be passed to a third party to be used solely for the prescribed purpose. The Council is advised to ensure that it retains control through appropriate contractual arrangements.
- The affordable housing must comply with the National Planning Policy Framework. This means that all receipts from the sale of equity in the homes must be recycled into the provision of more affordable housing.
2.3 The arrangement proposed for the provision of affordable home ownership complies with these requirements. It also complies with the terms of the other S106 agreements generating payments from other sites.

3. The Proposed Tenures

3.1 Any affordable housing should meet South Norfolk’s housing need. Currently there is a good supply of new homes for rent through S106 agreements with developers because of: large numbers of homes being built, achieving a high percentage of affordable homes (often the target percentage of 33%), and a large proportion of those homes being for rent (often the target percentage of 85%). The outcome is that the supply of homes becoming available for rent (including relets) is close to the level of need. This provides the opportunity to meet other needs.

3.2 Another reason for not acquiring homes for rent is the risk arising from the Right to Buy. The wish for the Council to control and benefit from the affordable homes (see section 4) means avoiding significant risk. There is the potential for a tenant to have the Right to Buy because of previous social tenancies, with the risk of a £70,000+ discount eligibility. The owner of a large stock can spread this risk across other properties, whereas a Right to Buy sale for the Council or Big Sky would be a significant loss within a small stock.

3.3 The affordable tenures proposed for this initiative are:

- Shared ownership (sale of a proportion of the equity, with rent payable – usually 2.7% of the unsold equity per annum);
- Shared equity (the sale of a proportion of the equity, with no rent – or a purely token amount – payable).

3.4 When blending two tenures into a single programme it is necessary to ensure that the monthly cost to purchasers (of mortgage plus rent) does not have the unwanted consequence that buying a smaller percentage of the equity in one tenure is more costly than buying a higher percentage in the other tenure. At current rates of interest, buying 65%, 70% or 75% through shared ownership on the usual terms is more expensive than buying 80% through shared equity.
3.5 To counter this, a graduated rent arrangement is proposed to ensure that the monthly cost does not exceed the cost of buying 80% through shared equity:

- 40% - 60% shared ownership with the rent at 2.75% of the unsold equity per annum (the usual percentage)
- 65% shared ownership with the rent at 2.5% of the unsold equity per annum
- 70% shared ownership with the rent at 2% of the unsold equity per annum
- 80% shared equity

No 75% level is proposed because it would require rent at 1%, creating a risk of financial loss after paying acquisition, sale and management costs.

3.6 The outcome is a progressive arrangement which balances access to an affordable home with encouragement to buy the highest affordable percentage, thus increasing the receipt available to provide more affordable homes.

3.7 To keep the product as simple as possible, it is proposed to use the Homes and Communities Agency’s shared ownership lease template for both tenures, the duration of the lease being 125 years. Mortgage lenders are used to this document, and several have approved its use, leaving the branch office to assess only whether the applicant can afford to borrow the amount sought. The lease could be literally ‘in perpetuity’ if the law grants lessees the right to renew when it expires.

3.8 The financial return on the shared ownership ranges from 1.8% to 2.5% after deducting management costs. It is proposed that this revenue income is also included within the recycled money for the provision of more affordable housing.

3.9 The long-term capital investment return through ‘staircasing’ (the purchaser buying the remaining equity) depends on the timing of when owners choose to staircase and house price inflation.
4. Proposed Arrangements

4.1 Sufficient money is available to acquire four properties at a cost of about £800,000, with the first two to be in Diss. Re-investing sales receipts will increase the number of homes to seven or eight after about 18 months, depending on the amount of equity sold in each house. The properties acquired are likely to be on the second-hand market. This is advantageous because the lack of a ‘new home premium’ improves the loan to value ratio available from mortgage lenders.

4.2 It is proposed that the homes will be acquired through a contract with Big Sky Developments Limited, and owned by Big Sky Property Management Limited. This will enable the Council to control where properties are acquired, to prioritise local applicants, and to benefit from rental income and capital receipts from sales.

4.3 Big Sky Property Management Limited will be required to set up a ring-fenced account to demonstrate that all S106 payments and recycled receipts are used for the required purpose of providing affordable homes in South Norfolk in perpetuity.

4.4 The Council will undertake the following:

- Provide the funding
- Approve properties to be acquired, the first two to be in Diss
- Approve purchasers on the basis of housing need
- Provide independent advice to purchasers and Big Sky

4.5 Big Sky Developments Limited will

- Acquire the houses, having ensured that they comply with S106 and contractual requirements
- Market the houses
- Arrange sale on the basis of a 125-year lease

4.6 Big Sky Property Management will:
• Become the freeholders of the homes
• Be the lessor of each property for the duration of the lease
• Manage the property, including rent collection
• Administer staircasing
• Administer resales, approving assignment of the lease
• Ensure ongoing compliance with contractual and S106 obligations (e.g. ensuring that lease assignment is to eligible people)
• Manage the ring-fenced affordable housing account

5. Risks and Implications

5.1 Risks:

• There is a small risk that buyers will not be found, but there is currently unmet demand for affordable home ownership, especially shared ownership.
• There is the possibility of obtaining less-than-expected income if the property market was to go into recession between the purchase and sale of a particular property.

5.2 Financial Implications:

• There are no financial implications for the Council because the money is not within the Council's budget.
• For Big Sky, rental income will exceed management costs and produce a modest surplus of 1.8% - 2.5%.
• Big Sky has support worth £14,000 from the Local Government Association, and is considering how best to use the 20 days' officer support time available. It is likely to include administering set-up arrangements, legal arrangements, and investigating how to assess need and target marketing.

6. Other options
6.1 The usual alternative approach to providing affordable housing is to give the money to a housing association, which would benefit from the asset instead of the Council.

6.2 It would be possible to use the receipts to fund land acquisition for future affordable housing, but there is insufficient time before the May 2018 deadline. However this option will be investigated as a possibility for future receipts.

6.3 If the money was not spent by the deadline it would have to be returned to the housebuilder.

7. Recommendation

7.1 It is recommended that Cabinet agree to:

   a) The Council using S106 receipts to acquire properties for affordable home ownership.
   b) The properties being acquired and owned by Big Sky.
   c) Sales being on a shared ownership or shared equity basis.
Council Tax Support Scheme 2018/19

Report of the Head of Early Help
Cabinet Member: Yvonne Bendle

CONTACT
Mike Pursehouse 01508 533718
mpursehouse@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1 The purpose of this report is to obtain Council agreement for a Council Tax Support scheme for 2018/19. The report outlines the legal requirements of the scheme and explains the proposal that we make changes for 2018/19. This is after reflecting on both the impact of Welfare Reform changes which have taken place since April 2013 and the effect on demand for discretionary help.

1.2 Our scheme remains one which follows the original guiding principles set by members to;

- incentivise work while protecting the most vulnerable who may find it difficult to work
- protect families
- enable efficient management of the scheme

2. Background

2.1 From 1 April 2013, the Government abolished the national Council Tax Benefit system. Since then the Council has been operating the Council Tax Support scheme. Each year, we are required to set a Council Tax Support scheme for the year ahead. Council Tax Support is a discount scheme which reduces Council Tax bills to a more affordable level for low income households.

2.2 The scheme needs to balance the needs of those who require help with those who help fund it through their Council Tax.

2.3 The Government sets out how the scheme must operate for pensioners, but allows local authorities to shape their own scheme for those of working age.

2.4 Over the last five years we have refined our scheme to continue to reinforce our original principles and we believe that we have a fair scheme for the current climate. As we have developed this scheme we have consulted with our residents each year to check that we are getting it right.
3. Current Position/Findings

3.1 Over the past four years we have monitored carefully the effects of welfare reform and tax changes and considered how this has affected our residents in conjunction with demand for discretionary hardship payments. Our response is reflected in our proposals for going forward in 2018/19.

3.2 Throughout the Welfare Reform agenda, a number of benefit changes have been implemented which have affected our residents. Our response has been to adopt a framework approach both internally and with our partners so that we can work in a ‘joined up’ way. Working together with an emphasis on early prevention measures we have helped to pre-empt some of the adverse effects of Welfare Reform. We continue to work in this way and have developed this significantly by working closely with Housing, the Early Help Hub, the Job Centre Plus and local Residential Social Landlords.

3.3 For 2018/19 the financial situation remains the same in that the Council needs to look to set a scheme which is affordable within the Council’s overall fiscal position to help those in financial need without putting a financial burden on Council Tax payers or resulting in service cutbacks. However, we continue to have the issue of protecting those of pension age which means there is pressure on the funding available for support of working age.

3.4 During the last year, we have monitored the demand for discretionary hardship funding as a result of the changes made by the DWP to Housing Benefit. There has been no relevant correlation so we are confident that the equivalent changes proposed to our scheme will not increase demand for hardship funding.

3.5 Our proposals for the Council Tax Support scheme for 2018/19 have been publicised on the councils website over a number of weeks giving an opportunity to respond with views. No common theme has arisen requiring revision to the proposals. We have also consulted Norfolk County Council and the Police who have no objection to our proposals.
4. Proposals

4.1 From April 2017, the DWP amended a few rules for Housing Benefit and we propose that our Council Tax Support Scheme is changed to reflect these changes. The intention is that the proposals will be combined with existing features of the scheme to form a new scheme for 2018/19.

**Proposal 1:** Change the length of time allowed for Temporary Absence outside of Great Britain.

As part of the Government’s Welfare Reform programme, from July 2016 there has been a change in the length of time people can claim benefit to help towards their rent while temporarily absent from Great Britain. The change was from 13 weeks to 4 weeks. It is proposed that the local Council Tax Support scheme for South Norfolk is adjusted to align this change.

**Proposal 2:** Align our Council Tax Support Scheme rules with Housing Benefit where families have a third child (or more) after April 2018.

The DWP limited the amount of benefit paid to families where a third or more child was born after April 2017 in that no additional help has been given. It is proposed that the local Council Tax Support scheme for South Norfolk is adjusted to align this change to Housing Benefit for children born after 1 April 2018.

**Proposal 3:** Align our Council Tax Support rules with Housing Benefit for ‘persons from abroad’.

The rules within benefits nationally change frequently and we have not kept up with these changes. The changes have been around discouraging those who have arrived without work. The Council is proposing to align the rules within Council Tax Support Scheme to the provisions in Housing Benefit and Universal Credit. This will mean that all future changes will be automatically applied.

**Proposal 4:** Align our Council Tax Support rules with Housing Benefit for the treatment of Bereavement Allowance.
The Bereavement Allowance rules changed from April 2017. Previously, an allowance could be paid for many years and Housing Benefit rules stated that it was treated as income. However, since April 2017 the allowance is for a much shorter time period so it is disregarded for the calculation thus allowing the recently bereaved to not be adversely affected.

5. Risks and implications arising

5.1 Financial

5.1.1 It is difficult to detail any financial impact of these changes to the scheme for 2018/19 due to the complexity of predicting the cumulative effect of any reduction in Council Tax Support alongside likely demand. The combination of a reduction in support alongside the current trend of higher employment leads to the assumption that it is extremely unlikely that the financial impact for the costs of the scheme will be significant and it is expected to be affordable.

5.1.2 The proposed scheme for 2018/19 should not be a financial risk as the cost of the scheme is falling overall year by year as numbers of claimants reduce, find work or work increased hours (in-work claims). The 2018/19 scheme should place no further cost on South Norfolk and other precepting authorities than the 2017/18 scheme was forecast to cost when agreed by Council in December 2016.

5.1.3 The funding of variations to the cost of the scheme is shared between the County Council, Police Authority, South Norfolk Council and parishes. It is critical that our scheme is affordable to these authorities and that any volatility in costs can be absorbed by them.

5.1.4 There is a financial risk as demand for support can rise and any increase in the cost of the scheme would fall partly on SNC. We will review the scheme annually to ensure it continues to meet priorities, is affordable and because the law requires us to do so.

5.1.5 We have a discretionary fund available for help for those individuals and families for whom the scheme has unintended consequences. The policy on use outlines how it will be used as short term help for those in financial crisis rather than long term support. Adverse effects on residents will be monitored carefully and home visits will continue to give holistic and individual assistance for those requiring advice and support.
5.2 Legal - there is a legal requirement to make a scheme under the Local Government Finance Act (Section 8 and Schedule 4)

5.3 Equalities – In moving from the 2017/18 scheme to the proposed 2018/19 scheme groups of those currently claiming would be adversely affected if they were families who had a third child after April 2018 and/or those people who wished to go abroad for more than four weeks. Anyone recently bereaved from April 2018 will be better off under the proposals. Appendix A contains an Equality Impact Analysis.

6. Recommendation

6.1 To Recommend that Council agrees the proposed changes to the Council Tax Support scheme for 2018/19.
1. Introduction

1.1. Council Tax Support is a local scheme to support those on low incomes to help with Council Tax liability.

1.2. When developing policy, procedures, practices or services we will need to consider any potential impact on protected groups in relation to the three aims of the duty which are to:

1.2.1. Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation and other conduct prohibited by the Act

1.2.2. Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not

1.2.3. Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and those who do not

2. Background

2.1. Over the last six years there have been several changes in welfare reform which have impacted on those who have protected characteristics as defined in the Equality Act 2010.

2.2. These changes disproportionately affect those who are vulnerable and in the lowest income brackets, many of which rely on benefits.

2.3. To protect pensioners on low incomes, the scheme at South Norfolk Council is required to replicate as far as possible the provisions under which pensioner eligibility for council tax benefit was assessed.

3. Statistics

3.1. This section details those in protected groups in our current caseload (where information is available)

3.2. Of the total caseload 49.8% are of pension age and 50.2% are working age.

3.3. Of the total caseload 2% (169) are single persons aged between 17 and 25.
3.4. Current Caseload: Primary claimant by sex

- Men: 41%
- Women: 59%

3.5. Current Caseload: Disability Related Premiums & Carers

- Disability Related Premiums: 6%
- Carers Premium: 3%
3.6. Ethnic Origin (only disclosed in 36% of cases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian British/Bangladeshi</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Asian British/Indian</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian British/Other</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black British/Other</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/British African</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black British/Caribbean</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>91.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Other</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not disclosed by customer</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed White and Black African</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed White and Asian</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Other</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.7. Current caseload

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Council Tax Support Caseload @ 22/11/17</td>
<td>7077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18 - 65</td>
<td>3553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>3524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>4175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Related Premium</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carers Premium</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Parents</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.8. The largest group in our caseload is single females over 60 years old (28%). Our smallest group is the single under 25’s (2%).

4. Impact Analysis

4.1. From April 2018 working age customers, currently in receipt of Council Tax Support will no longer be able to claim support for longer than 4 weeks if they go abroad (currently the maximum is 13 weeks).

4.2. From April 2018, current customers will have no change to their benefit if they have a third child after April 2018. It is difficult to predict volumes of those who may be affected as we do not know who of our caseload will have a third child. However, if a third child is born this change means that their benefit will remain the same and will not increase due to the birth.

4.3. From April 2018, the rules about ‘persons from abroad’ will be aligned to those of Housing Benefit which will affect new claims only. It is difficult to predict volumes of those affected as we cannot know who will claim as a ‘person from abroad’.

4.4. From April 2018, the treatment of Bereavement Allowance will be aligned to those rules currently administered for Housing Benefit. This means that the recently bereaved will be better off under the new rules as any payments under this scheme will be disregarded in the assessment for Council Tax Support.

5. Mitigation

5.1. The protected groups most vulnerable to any reductions in benefit are those who may have more difficulty in gaining employment such as lone parents with young children, older people and disabled people. Older people are protected from any reductions under the new scheme by the legislation and therefore any reduction in support is borne by the remainder of those in receipt of Council Tax Support.

5.2. Under our scheme, lone parents with children under 5 years are protected as it is considered that they may have more difficulty in obtaining employment due to child care issues.
5.3. One of the principles of our scheme is to encourage people into work therefore there are financial incentives to promote this. However, disabled people find it much harder to secure employment than non-disabled people so employment incentivisation could impact on this group who find it more difficult to access the labour market.

5.4. Our scheme takes into consideration that disabled people who are not working may find it more difficult to access the job market, therefore, the scheme uses an assessment within the calculation of support which treats disabled people as if they were working.

6. **Conclusion**

6.1. Any scheme that leads to a reduction in support for those on means-tested benefits will have a negative impact, leading to difficult decisions to be made as to where such cuts should fall.

6.2. As part of our considerations we have been mindful of those who are protected under the Equality Act 2010 when reaching our proposal for our Council Tax Scheme.

6.3. We believe that our Council Tax Support Scheme where we disregard certain incomes, offer Lone Parents with children under 5 full protection, treat those who are disabled as if they were working and have a Discretionary Fund for any who suffer hardship we are offering the best fit scheme for the resources that we have available to us.
Equality Screening Tool
Relevance, Proportionality, Risk

This tool should be used to carry out a screening check of any policy, procedure, practice or service for its potential impacts or significance to equality and relations between different protected groups. The check will allow you to establish whether a full equalities analysis is appropriate and necessary. Further information can be found on our equalities pages.

Each statement should be scored as either none, low, medium or high. If any of the statements score medium or high you should refer to the Equality Review Principles guidance which details further actions needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Amanda Adams</th>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Housing and Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title of the policy, practice or service</td>
<td>Council Tax Support Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Relevance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the likelihood of any disproportionate negative impact occurring for staff or residents relating to a protected characteristic?</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the potential for any negative impact on relations between groups or communities related to any given protected characteristic?</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any additional comments on relevance: From April 2018 those who are working age and have a third child (or more) will not have an increase in support due to that birth. It is difficult to predict numbers involved however, based on the number of families that have been in receipt of Housing Benefit during 2017 who subsequently have had a third (or more) child it is estimated that up to 25 families a year may be affected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Proportionality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will it have any direct implications for the life chances of staff or residents?</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the budgetary/resource implications?</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What proportion of staff or residents will be impacted?</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the significance or value placed upon it by relevant stakeholders?</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any additional comments on proportionality: As above, the number of families likely to be affected by the ‘third child rule’ is relatively low.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Risk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the potential for negative impact on the inclusion or involvement or any particular group?</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the likelihood of media interest?</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the likelihood of formal challenge?</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any additional comments on risk: There will be no changes for existing claimants receiving Council Tax Support who have no changes in circumstances. For those who have a third (or more) child after April 2018. For new claimants, approx. 350 to 400 families could be affected as their support will be reduced, although this number is yet unknown.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the overarching significance of the policy, practice or service to equality?</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does it require further equality analysis? (If relevance, proportionality or risk were ranked medium or high then further analysis will be needed. No

Please state the reason either why further analysis is not needed or what further analysis will be required:

For existing customers who are currently in receipt of Council Tax Support in 2017/18 and whose circumstances do not change, their level of support will stay the same with no adverse impact.

Under the scheme, lone parents with children under five years are protected as are older people and disabled people.

As disabled people find it harder to obtain employment, the Council Tax Support scheme assesses them as if they were working which is more favourable to them.

Older people are protected from any reductions under the legislation and any reduction is borne by Council Tax Support.

The Council Tax Support scheme disregards certain incomes and includes a discretionary fund for any who suffer hardship.
South Norfolk Council Response to Norfolk County Council Budget Consultation 2018/19

Report of the Chief Executive
Cabinet Member: John Fuller

CONTACT  Sandra Dinneen
01508 533603
sdinneen@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1 Norfolk County Council (NCC) has identified that it is has saved £334 million since 2011 and it needs to save a further £125 million by 2021. NCC is consulting on Council Tax adjustments and 6 other specific proposals to save money over the next 3 years. Responses are due by the 2 January 2018, with the full budget for 2018/19 being set on 12 February 2018 at NCC’s Full Council meeting. The consultation can be found here.

1.2 This report summaries the main proposals made in the consultation and recommends how South Norfolk Council (SNC) should respond.

2. Background

2.1 NCC’s budget consultation highlights the need to create and sustain long term savings in the face of growing financial challenges. They highlight that their central government grant has fallen by £189 million since 2011 and is expected to fall to zero by 2021.

2.2 Similar to the ethos of SNC, NCC summarise how they are looking at developing new ideas through service reviews, creating and encouraging a customer contact channel shift online and generating income and savings through joint working and commercial ventures.

2.3 In 2015, County agreed four strategic priorities to support the challenges they are facing. These are:

- Excellence in Education
- Real Jobs
- Good Infrastructure
- Supporting Vulnerable People
2.4 These four priorities are aligned with SNC’s own corporate priorities, particularly around supporting economic growth and prosperity and sharing the benefits of growth with our local communities.

*South Norfolk Council’s priorities:*

- **Economic Growth, Productivity and Prosperity:**
  Providing the conditions to stimulate growth, productivity and prosperity, sharing the benefits of growth with our communities.

- **Health, Well-being and Early Help**
  Proactively working with communities to provide help at the earliest opportunity and enhancing the health and well-being of our residents

- **Place, Communities and Environment**
  Improving the quality of life of our communities and enhancing the built and natural environment in our towns and villages.

2.5 Whilst SNC understands the need to make savings and the difficult decisions the County Council faces, it would be concerned that the impact of the spending reductions would be to simply pass on the cost to another public service rather than produce overall joint savings. SNC would like to continue to work closely with NCC to achieve joint savings; for example, our collaborative approach to Early Help has demonstrated how working together across the public and voluntary sector as a whole can create more joint savings in comparison to working alone.

3. **South Norfolk Council Response**

3.1 A letter from the Leader of SNC to the Leader of NCC has been drafted and can be found in Appendix A.

4. **Risks and implications arising**

4.1 Financial – There are potential financial risks to SNC if the County Council proposals would increase demand for our services at a time when SNC itself is considering how it can adapt to changing funding environments. South Norfolk Council will be looking to reduce its spending. However, this has to be balanced with the opportunity to work more closely together to deliver savings through improved service delivery which will have a positive impact on our residents and businesses.
5. Conclusion

5.1 South Norfolk Council wants to continue to work collaboratively with the County Council to deliver on key savings which need to be made across a wider scale.

6. Recommendation

6.1 That Cabinet;

   1. Note the letter from the Leader of SNC to the Leader of NCC in Appendix A
Appendix A

Councillor Cliff Jordan
Norfolk County Council
County Hall
Martineau Lane
Norwich
NR1 2DH

John Fuller
South Norfolk Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton
Norwich
NR15 2XE

Dear Cllr. Jordan,

Norfolk County Council Budget Consultation – South Norfolk Council Response

Thank you for providing the opportunity for South Norfolk Council to comment on your budget proposals for 2018/19.

Norfolk County Council is a valued partner of South Norfolk and we have many examples of how we have successfully collaborated to deliver on our shared priorities, from the NNDR pool through to the City Deals, Greater Norwich Growth Board and Early Help.

We appreciate the difficult situation the County Council faces, with a need to continue to deliver quality services when balancing demand, with reducing funding. We have already worked closely together on a number of initiatives and would welcome further opportunities to discuss the proposals outlined in the budget consultation with your members and officers to explore how we can continue to work together for the benefit of our residents.

As an authority, we have identified three key priority areas to focus our resources and efforts, underpinned by our customer focussed, collaborative and commercial approach to service delivery. The County Council’s four priorities will assist in delivering South Norfolk Council’s own priorities in particular providing the conditions to stimulate growth, productivity and prosperity, sharing the benefits of growth with our communities.

As the consultation questions are targeted towards individuals we have captured below our main proposals regarding continued collaborative working between our two authorities and the budget changes outlined:
• **Collaborating on key strategic issues to improve outcomes for people and place** – we welcome the continued opportunity to work in partnership with the County Council to support key strategic issues that impact on the lives of our residents and the way in which businesses can thrive and grow, both locally and across the wider region. We want to continue to work with you tackle issues and seize opportunities rooted in the principle of what will make a difference for people and place rather than what works best for organisational structures.

• **Ensuring the cuts don’t pass service burdens between public sector organisations** – whilst we recognise the difficult decisions that the County Council has to make in the context of a reduced funding envelope it is important that any cuts to County Council services do not simply move the need around the public sector system, increasing pressures on other authorities.

• **Continuing to promote early help to provide support to those residents who need our help the most** – the South Norfolk Help Hub is a fantastic example of district/county joint working at its best. With 14 agencies and 27 services now supporting the hub and nearly 4000 residents supported we must continue to support the Hub to grow and develop. In particular, providing more support for those with mental health issues and supporting those residents making the transition to universal credit, will be key priorities going forward. Any changes to Children Centres must have early prevention as a key driver and a commitment to continued locality-based working.

• **Driving economic growth and prosperity** – With our partners, including the LEP and districts from across the County, we can be proud of the investments that we have made to support growth for our locality and wider region. Through the work with our Greater Norwich Growth Board we have continued to drive economic and housing growth across the area. We look forward to the completion of the Northern Distributor Road and the wider benefits this will bring for our residents and businesses as well as the opportunity to work together to deliver the Long Stratton Bypass. It will be important for the County Council to recognise the value of all parts of Norfolk to support growth, not just the urban centre. For example, as a district last year we invested over £700,000 into the business rates pool to support economic growth in our area and the wider County.

• **Council Tax** – we recognise there is a growing gap in social care funding and whilst we would naturally want to see Council tax kept at a low level for our residents, we recognise the need to secure funding to support those vital services that improve the lives and wellbeing of our residents. We would also welcome the County Council’s support in promoting to central government a 2% prevention precept for district councils in order to secure investment across the county in preventative services that can stop the escalation of need and improve outcomes for our residents.
Waste and Recycling – we would like to continue to work collaboratively with NCC to reduce waste and encourage recycling. The Budget consultation’s proposal to change the construction and demolition waste concession at recycling centres does potentially increase the likelihood of fly tipping due to the new charges. We would therefore like to continue to work collaboratively with the County to promote our fly-tipping preventative campaigns to encourage residents to dispose of waste materials safely and legally.

Moving forward, we would like to continue to work with Norfolk County Council, as we believe together, we can further improve the services we provide for our residents and businesses, though it is important that when savings are made these are to the overall public purse, not one organisation making the savings at the expense of another because the costs have simply been transferred.

We would welcome your thoughts on working together on the suggestions above and any other areas you would like us to consider. We look forward to continuing to work together and to hearing the outcome of your budget consultation.

Yours sincerely

Cllr. John Fuller
Leader of South Norfolk Council
Recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee

Report of the Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee
Cabinet Member: Cllr Michael Edney

CONTACT
Senior Governance Officer
egoddard@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. **Introduction**

1.1 In line with the decision of Cabinet regarding Member Grants (27 March 2017), the Scrutiny Committee reviewed the grants process at its meeting on 15 November 2017. Members were requested to review the grants process in relation to the Community Action Fund (CAF) and the Member Ward Budget and make recommendations as appropriate with regard to the scheme; ensuring compliance with the ground rules, and that monies are spent effectively and in line with corporate priorities. In doing so, the Committee considered the Decision of the CAF Panel meeting on 13 July 2017, a summary of Member Ward Grant spending, the Ground Rules and process maps. These documents can be viewed here: [https://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/sites/default/files/downloads/scrutiny-committee-agenda-15-november-2017_0.pdf](https://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/sites/default/files/downloads/scrutiny-committee-agenda-15-november-2017_0.pdf), however the Ground Rules are attached at Appendix 1.

1.2 This report sets out the recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee and reasons for those recommendations.

2. **Findings of the Scrutiny Committee**

2.1 The Committee discussed various aspects of the Community Action Fund (CAF) and the Member Ward Grants. Members generally considered that the CAF was working well and noted that the budget had been fully spent at the first meeting. However, members raised a number of queries regarding the Member Ward Grant and were concerned with a few issues that they considered might be helpful to bring members’ attention. The Committee discussed whether a review conducted by internal audit may assist and concluded that this would be beneficial in order to ensure that the scheme remains compliant with legislation and is meeting the objectives set (see recommendation 1, at paragraph 3.1 below).

2.2 Members considered the level of detail included in the decision notices that record spend from the Member Ward Grant budgets and were concerned that the information can be limited and may not meet the requirements of the scheme. Furthermore, this did not assist the Council to identify what funds had been spent on and outcomes achieved. In light of this the Committee considered that members should be reminded of their obligations in this regard and encouraged to insert more detailed and meaningful data within the Decision Notices (see recommendation 2, at paragraph 3.1 below).
2.3 The Committee also questioned how delivery of projects and activities are monitored and were reminded that it was the responsibility of Councillors to undertake this. The Committee was concerned that this might not occur in all instances and considered it would be helpful if all members were reminded of this requirement and a record was made of when this was completed (see recommendation 3, at paragraph 3.1 below).

2.4 Discussion also focussed on the spend to date of the Member Ward Budget, which totalled £7,770 out of £46,000. Members highlighted how it had been difficult to identify projects in their Ward to fund, citing that they had been encouraged to apply for Go For It grants instead of using their own budgets or that eligible Groups were not coming forward despite making it known that funding was available. Whilst recognising that spend in the past has increased towards the end of the financial year, the Committee was keen to avoid unspent funds being lost. Members were also mindful that the CAF funding was oversubscribed at the beginning of the year and therefore considered that it may be advantageous to pool together unspent Member Ward Grant monies to allocate to the CAF budget (see recommendation 4, at paragraph 3.1 below).

3. Proposals

3.1 The Scrutiny Committee resolved to recommend to Cabinet that:

1. Internal audit examines the grants process to assess the scheme to ensure compliance and that objectives are being achieved.

2. Members are reminded that to comply with paragraph 4.6 of the Ground Rules in relation to a transparent audit trail of decisions, members should ensure that details in the Member Ward Grant decision notice adequately outlines what the money is being spent on and the outcomes to be achieved.

3. Members are reminded that to comply with paragraph 7.6 of the Ground Rules in relation to the delivery of funded projects and activities, members must make sure that money is being spent appropriately and ensure that delivery is as agreed. In doing so, it is also recommended that the table outlining spend of the Member Ward Grants, which is published on the council's website, includes an additional column to indicate when the local member has undertaken this.
4. The Ground Rules be amended at paragraph 7.4 in respect of unspent monies so that from 2018/19, any unspent monies in the Member Ward Grant budget as at 1 January is allocated to the Community Action Fund (CAF). If those monies total £10,000 or above, then a CAF Panel should be arranged before the end of the financial year. If the monies total £9,999 or below, the money will be rolled over to the next financial year.

4. Risks and implications arising

4.1 If the recommendations above are not supported by Cabinet, the Council may not be able to demonstrate a transparent audit trail or certify delivery of funded projects and activities, and should consider the risks associated with this.

4.2 With regard to financial implications, the recommendations are within the current budgets.

5. Recommendation

5.1 Cabinet approves the recommendations outlined in paragraph 3.1 of the report
South Norfolk Council Member-Led Grant Rules  
March 2017

These ground rules set the criteria in awarding Member-Led Grants. However as the purpose is to increase flexible and responsive local decision-making, Members are encouraged to make quick, sound decisions which support groups or initiatives that meet identified local need.

1. Local 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 priority areas and the way in which we work:

- Economic Growth, Productivity and Prosperity: Providing the conditions to stimulate growth, productivity and prosperity, sharing the benefits of growth with our communities
- Health, Well-being and Early Help: Proactively working with communities to provide help at the earliest opportunity and enhancing the health and well-being of our residents
- Place, Communities and Environment: Improving the quality of life of our communities and enhancing the built and natural environment in our towns and villages
- MFT: Customer focussed, can do and collaborative and business like, efficient and entrepreneurial

1.2 All Members will take a central role in identifying and delivering improvements to the quality of life of people in their communities. Members are expected to be 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 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 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. **The Community Action Fund**

2.1 There will be some initiatives which will require larger amounts of funding and to support this, the Community Action Fund is in place. The aim of this funding is to:

- build capacity within communities so that groups are enabled to be self-sustaining without ongoing practical and financial support from the Council,
- stimulate local economic growth, and
- facilitate creative partnership approaches to helping people in need at the earliest opportunity.

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

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

ii) The granting of funding is for a specific activity and will not imply an ongoing commitment nor have a revenue implication for the council;

iii) The activity being funded:
   a. Has not already taken place (retrospective funding is not permitted);
   b. Could not easily be funded elsewhere
   c. Can demonstrate how it meets a local need and provides support to the community
   d. Does not cover costs of routine maintenance
   e. Supports the Council’s priority areas
   f. Has not received Member-Led funding from the Council funding over the past 2 years.

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

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

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

vii) As far as the Member is aware, making the payment to the recipient 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

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

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

2.3 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 priority areas. Members should also be satisfied that the project or activity being funded would increase community capacity and 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).

3. The Application Process

3.1 Clear process needs to be followed when allocating large amounts of public money, therefore procedures will be followed to administer the Community Action Fund:

a) It is the Member’s responsibility to obtain sufficient information on which to base an application for funding. If the Member does not consider that project or activity fits the criteria or they do not wish to fund it, the Member should liaise directly with the organisation to inform them of their decision.

b) Once the Member is satisfied that the project or activity fits the criteria and are happy to allocate their funding, they should complete the online application form in conjunction with the applicant(s). Two or more Members wishing to support the same project or activity should fill in one application form.

c) Once submitted, the online application forms will automatically be sent to an allocated Inbox.

d) All applications will be considered at the Community Action Fund Panel which meets up to twice a year (May/June and September/October).

e) The Panel will consider all applications in order to reach a decision as to which Groups should receive funding, and how much. In some cases the Panel may make a recommendation to assign a proportion of the total monies requested to ensure that the budget is optimised.

f) The Community Action Panel consists of:

- Portfolio Holder for Stronger Communities or substituted by another Cabinet member.
• Chairman of the Housing, Wellbeing, Leisure and Early Intervention Policy Committee, or Deputy chairman, if not available, another member from the Committee can be substitute.
• Shadow Portfolio Holder, or substitute from their political party.

The following officers are also in attendance at panel meetings, but not voting members:

• Director responsible for Communities (or substitute Director if necessary)
• Either the Early Help & Prevention Manager OR the Community Capacity Manager

A minimum of two Members must be present at the Panel for it to be quorate.

The voting members will make recommendations for allocation of the grant monies; the final decision will be with the Director for Communities (or substitute) who will consider the views of voting members of the Panel.

g) Members who submit applications can attend the panel meeting and speak on behalf of their application.

h) The Panel cannot defer an application. It is either awarded or rejected at the meeting. If it’s refused due to insufficient information, the application can be resubmitted at the next Panel meeting. However an application cannot be submitted more than twice. If it is refused twice, a period of 12 months must pass before being submitted again.

i) There is no limit to the amount awarded at any one Panel; but the total budget must be spent within the financial year and will not be carried over.

j) Officers will advise Members of the outcome of the application. The Member should request successful organisations to advise them of the outcomes achieved as a result of the funding, which can be published by both the applicant and the Council to promote good practice.

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

l) Those recipients of funding towards a physical asset are encouraged to place a Council plaque or sticker on the asset to recognise the funding contribution.
4. Role and responsibilities of local Members

4.1 The primary aim of community capacity building is to encourage and enable individuals, groups and relevant organisations to shape their local area and the provision available. All Members have a vital role to play, working in and with their communities to identify important issues, to help to develop potential solutions, to influence outcomes and to have a positive impact on the quality of life in South Norfolk.

4.2 Members must be able to represent their local community effectively to maintain open communication with the Council.

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, and to provide information to the Council on local needs and issues.

4.3 Each Member will be allocated a budget (the Members’ Ward Fund) to:

- increase levels of community capacity at a very local level;
- allow flexible and timely funding of very small initiatives within communities;
- enable communities to help themselves, as early as possible; and
- enhance the social, economic or environmental wellbeing of the community.

4.4 Each Member is responsible for making decisions to allocate funding from their budget. The decisions must meet the following criteria:

i) The payment must be over £100;

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

iii) The granting of the funding is for a specific activity and will not imply an ongoing commitment by the Council nor have a revenue implication;

iv) The activity being funded:

a. Has not already taken place (retrospective funding is not permitted);

b. Could not easily be funded elsewhere

c. Does not cover costs of routine maintenance
d. Can demonstrate support in the community

e. Has not received member-led Council funding over the past 2 years.

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 or religions;

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 activity more than once in a two year period.

viii) As far as the Member is aware, making the payment to the recipient 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.

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.

4.5 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. It is the responsibility of each Member to evaluate the merits of any payments.

4.6 There must be a transparent audit trail in respect of decisions. In compliance with the legislation, the individual Member is responsible for ensuring a record is made in writing of any decision or action she or he has taken. The online Member Ward Grant Notice of Decision Form will form both the request to process a particular payment and also the record of that decision and reasons for it.

4.7 Following submission of the online decision form the Finance team will process payment of the grant. From the point that the form and all supporting evidence is received, officers in the Finance team have 5 working days to process the payment.

4.8 In performing this role, local Members will be expected to work with a range of partners and stakeholders including town/parish councils, local community groups, town teams, local action groups, and County Councillors.
4.9 Members will be encouraged and supported 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 budget.

4.10 Twice a year the Scrutiny Committee will review grants paid in the previous six months and make any necessary recommendations.

5. Identifying other funding streams

5.1 Members should ensure that relevant community groups are aware of other funding that 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.

5.2 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 the Community Capacity Team.

6. Interests and Reputation of the Council

6.1 The following process should apply to any applications where Local Members declare an interest (including pecuniary) in the project for which they are making an application.

Community Action Fund

6.2 Where a Member has an interest they will be prompted to supply details on the online application form before they can continue with the grant application.

6.3 The application form will be shared with all Members of the Community Action Fund Panel for approval, prior to final approval from the Director for Communities. Details of the interest will be cited.

6.4 Should concern be expressed about the interest, the case it will be referred to the Monitoring Officer, or the Deputy Monitoring Officer.

Members' Ward Fund

6.5 The Members' Code of Conduct applies to the exercise of the Scheme. Members must declare any Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) or Other Interest (OI) in the proposal. No proposal may be put forward in which the Member has a DPI or OI which would require the Member to have withdrawn from a meeting.

6.6 Should a Member have any queries they should refer to the Monitoring Officer, or the Deputy Monitoring Officer.
Community Action Fund – declaring an interest in the approval process

6.7 Should a Member of the Community Action Fund Panel have an interest (excluding pecuniary) in a grant application that they are approving, the Member may continue to act in processing the application; however, should they believe the nature of their interest means that they cannot consider the application with an open mind, they will refrain from the process.

6.8 If more than half of the Members of the Community Action Fund Panel have an interest in the application then it will be passed directly to the Director for Communities for consideration.

7. Finance and Recovery of Unused Funding

7.1 All spend will be subject to sufficient funds in the specific budget.

7.2 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 relevant bank or building society account relating to the activity;
   b) collaborating with a local organisation that would meet the funding criteria

7.3 The Scrutiny Committee will give consideration to budgets, spend and projections. The Council will incorporate those reports into its financial and performance management and reporting arrangements.

7.4 Any underspend from the Community Action Fund or Members’ Ward Fund of over 10% of the budget amount will be brought back into the Council. This is unless the money has been specifically allocated to a project that has been delayed. In which case the underspend can be carried forward but this will be the exception rather than the norm. Members should aim to spend their full allocation for the year.

7.5 In the first year of a new administration Members will be able to carry forward any underspend from their budget into the following financial year. This accounts for the period of time lost in the run up to elections and training for new Members regarding spending the fund. Members are required to discuss options for spend before budget is carried over into the following financial year.

7.6 Members should make sure that the funded projects and activities are delivered as agreed. Where that is not the case, the Member, together
with the Community Capacity Manager will be responsible for resolving disputes and taking action, including withdrawal of funding where appropriate.

7.7 If a grant has been used for the purpose that it was not originally intended, or has not been spent within the given time period then the Community Capacity Manager will follow the Corporate Debt Policy to recover the funds from the community group, alongside the Member who awarded the funds.
# CABINET CORE AGENDA 2017/18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Date</th>
<th>Key Decision/Item</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Cabinet Member</th>
<th>Exempt Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Dec</td>
<td>Conservation Area Appraisals Review – Bawburgh, Dickleburgh, Hempnall, Mulbarton, and Scole</td>
<td>C Bennett</td>
<td>L Hornby</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Future Management of Street Lights</td>
<td>B Wade</td>
<td>K Mason Billig</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Tax Support Scheme</td>
<td>M Pursehouse</td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section 106 Receipts and Affordable Home Ownership</td>
<td>K Mitchell</td>
<td>J Fuller/Y Bendle</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Custom Build Register</td>
<td>K Mitchell</td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GNLP – Regulation 18 Consultation</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greater Norwich Joint Five Year Infrastructure Investment Plan 18/19 – 22/23</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Update to South Norfolk Local Development Scheme</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of Build Insight Companies and Future Plans</td>
<td>D Lorimer</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SNC Response to Norfolk County Council Budget Consultation</td>
<td>S Dinneen</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee – Members’ Grants</td>
<td>E Goddard</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council 11 December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Jan 18</td>
<td>Shared Services Update</td>
<td>S Dinneen</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines for Recreation Provision in New Residential Developments – Revised Consultation Draft</td>
<td>T Horspole</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Approver(s)</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Feb</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Performance Risks and Finance Budget Position Q3</td>
<td>E Goddard / A Mewes / M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>B Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Response to Changes to the National Planning Policy Framework</td>
<td>T Horspole</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Proposed 2018-19 Business Plan</td>
<td>A Mewes</td>
<td>B Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Budget Consultation 2018/19</td>
<td>M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>B Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Revenue Budget, Capital Programme and Council Tax 2017/18</td>
<td>M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>B Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Treasury Management Strategy April 2018 to March 2021</td>
<td>M Fernandez-Graham</td>
<td>B Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Adoption of Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework</td>
<td>T Horspole</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Leisure Pricing 2018/19</td>
<td>S Goddard</td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council 19 February 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Approver(s)</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 Mar</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Legal Services</td>
<td>E Hodds</td>
<td>B Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Apr</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key decisions are those which result in income, expenditure or savings with a gross full year effect of £100,000 or 10% of the Council’s net portfolio budget whichever is the greater which has not been included in the relevant portfolio budget, or are significant (e.g. in environmental, physical, social or economic) in terms of its effect on the communities living or working in an area comprising two or more electoral divisions in the area of the local authority.