Scrutiny Committee

Members of the Scrutiny Committee:

Mrs M Dewsbury (Chairman)
Mr T Lewis (Vice Chairman)
Mrs V Bell
Mr T Blowfield
Mrs F Ellis
Mr C Foulger
Ms J Hardinge
Mr R McLenning
Mrs L Neal
Mr A Pond
Mr M Windridge

Group Meetings

Conservatives:
Kett Room  9.00 am

Liberal Democrats:
Chapman Room  9.00 am

If any member of the public wishes to speak on a non-confidential item, they may do so at the discretion of the Chairman

Agenda

Date
Tuesday 15 May 2012
(please note change of day)

Time
9.30 am

Place
Colman & Cavell Rooms

South Norfolk House
Long Stratton
Norwich
Norfolk
NR15 2XE

Contact
Caroline Heasley tel (01508) 533685
South Norfolk District Council
Swan Lane
Long Stratton Norwich
NR15 2XE

Email: democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk

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
AGENDA

At the discretion of the Chairman, a short break will be taken after the meeting has been running for approximately two hours.

1. To report apologies for absence and to identify substitute members;

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 form and flow chart attached – page 5)

4. To confirm the minutes of the Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 11 April 2012;
   (attached – page 6)

5. New Residents Welcome Pack
   (9.55 am)
   (report attached – page 9)

   (10.15 am)
   (report attached – page 14)

7. Review of Scrutiny
   (10.30 am)
   (report attached – page 58)

8. Recommendation from the Localism and Neighbourhoods OSC to Scrutiny Committee
   (10.40 am)
   (report attached – page 61)

9. Scrutiny, Overview Sub-Committees’, Accounts, Audit & Governance Committee Work Programmes and Cabinet Core Agenda
   (10.50 am)
   (attached – page 62)
Working Style of the Scrutiny Committee and Overview Sub-Committees

Independence
Members of the Scrutiny Committee and Overview Sub-Committees will not be subject to whipping arrangements by party groups.

Member leadership
Members of the Committees will take the lead in selecting topics for and in questioning witnesses. The Committees will expect members of Cabinet, rather than officers, to take the main responsibility for answering the Committee’s questions about topics, which relate mainly to the Council’s activities.

A constructive atmosphere
Meetings of the Committees will be constructive, and not judgmental, accepting that effective overview and scrutiny is best achieved through challenging and constructive inquiry. People giving evidence at the Committees should not feel under attack.

Respect and trust
Meetings will be conducted in a spirit of mutual respect and trust.

Openness and transparency
The Committees’ business will be open and transparent, except where there are sound reasons for protecting confidentiality. In particular, the minutes of the Committee’s meetings will explain the discussion and debate, so that it could be understood by those who were not present.

Consensus
Members of the Committees will work together and, while recognising political allegiances, will attempt to achieve consensus and agreed recommendations.

Impartial and independent officer advice
Officers who advise and support the Committees will give impartial and independent advice, recognising the importance of the Scrutiny Committee and the Overview Sub-Committees in the Council’s arrangements for governance, as set out in the Constitution.

Regular review
There will be regular reviews of how the overview and scrutiny process is working, and a willingness to change if it is not working well.

Programming and planning
The Scrutiny Committee will have a programme of work, in conjunction with the Overview Sub-Committees. The Committee will agree the topics to be included in the work programme, the extent of the investigation to be undertaken in relation to resources, and the witnesses to be invited to give evidence.

Managing time
The Committees will attempt to conclude the business of each meeting in reasonable time. The order of business will be arranged as far as possible to minimise the demands on the time of witnesses.
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

When declaring an interest at a meeting Members are asked to indicate whether the interest is a personal one only or one which is also prejudicial. The declaration should indicate the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates. In the case of a personal interest, the member may speak and vote. If it is a prejudicial interest, a member has the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public but must then withdraw from the meeting. A member can participate fully where the interest is shared with the majority of residents in that particular ward. Members are also requested when appropriate to make any declarations under the Code of Practice on Planning and Judicial matters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is (or should) the Interest be registered in the Register of Members’ Interests?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If not, whose well being or financial position is affected to a greater extent than the majority of other people in the ward?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any person or body who has employed or appointed your family member/close associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any firm in which your family member/close associate is a partner or company of which they are directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any company in which your family member/close associate has shares with a face value more than £25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any of the following in which you hold a position of general control or management: outside organisations, other public authorities, charities, pressure groups, political parties or trade unions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Does the interest:

(a) affect your financial position or the financial position of a person or body described above? **(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)**

(b) relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or any person or body described above? **(If Yes the interest may be prejudicial)**

(c) relate to scrutiny by the Overview and Scrutiny committee of a decision you were party to? **(If Yes the interest is prejudicial)**

(d) relate to the functions of the council in respect of housing (except your tenancy), statutory sick pay, an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members, any ceremonial honour given to members, or setting the council tax or a precept under the Local Government Finance Act 1992. **(If Yes the interest is NOT PREJUDICIAL)**

PREJUDICIAL INTEREST

If you answered Yes to (a) or (b) is the interest one which a member of the public with knowledge of the relevant facts would reasonably regard as so significant that that it is likely to prejudice your judgement of the public interest? **If Yes the interest is PREJUDICIAL**

If you answered Yes to (c) the interest is PREJUDICIAL

If prejudicial do you intend to attend the meeting to make representations, answer questions or give evidence?

FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE FLOWCHART OVERLEAF
DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF

What matters are being discussed at the meeting?

Do any relate to my interests?

A
Does it affect my entries in the Register of Interests?

OR

B
Does it affect the well being or financial position of me, my family or close associates; or my family's or close associates’
- employment, employers or businesses;
- companies in which they are a director or where they have a shareholding of more than £25,000 face value;
- business partnerships; or

C
Does it affect the well being or financial position of the following organisations in which I hold a position of general control or management:
- other bodies to which I have been appointed or nominated by the council;
- other public authorities;
- charitable bodies;
- bodies whose main purpose is to influence public opinion or policy

More than the majority of other people in the ward?

D
Is Overview and Scrutiny considering a decision I made?
If so you have a prejudicial interest.

The interest is prejudicial you can participate in the meeting and vote

Is the interest financial or relating to a regulatory issue e.g. planning permission?

You may have a prejudicial interest

The interest is prejudicial
withdraw from the meeting by leaving the room (after making representations, answering questions or giving evidence).
Do not try to improperly influence the decision

The interest is not prejudicial you can participate in the meeting and vote

This matter relates to
- housing (except your tenancy)
- statutory sick pay from the council
- an allowance, payment or indemnity given to members
- any ceremonial honour given to members
- setting the council tax or a precept

Would a member of the public – if he or she knew all the facts – reasonably think that personal interest was so significant that my decision on the matter would be affected by it?
Welcome Booklet for New Residents

It has been proposed to recommence the practice of sending information to new residents in the district, to welcome them to South Norfolk, to provide key information, advise of the key benefits of the website, ensure residents are aware of the services and amenities provided by the Council and encourage residents to subscribe to added value services they may find useful.

Members are asked to consider the approach as laid out in this report, which suggests a Welcome Booklet with a number of key sections, to be sent to new households in the district.

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

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail:
Joanna Kitchener 01508 533601
jkitchener@s-norfolk.gov.uk

1. Purpose of Scrutiny

1.1. South Norfolk Council had sent Welcome Packs to new residents which included a Welcome to the District letter, and various leaflets and information. This practice ceased some time ago and it was proposed this be restarted, although not in exactly the same format as previously.

1.2. The aims of providing information to new households are:

1.2.1. Welcoming the resident and family to the area;

1.1.2 Raising the awareness of all the services and amenities the Council has to offer, including the latest events;

1.1.3 Encouraging the resident to join facilities such as our Leisure Centres and other added value services residents may find useful;

1.1.4 Provide as much information as possible around the website and the number of transactions that can now be completed from home and encouraging take up of direct debits.
1.1.5 Provide information around the opportunities for community involvement.

2. Scope of Scrutiny

2.1. Members are asked to consider the proposal to restart the practice of sending information to welcome new residents and if members agree, to consider the most effective way of communicating the information, and also to which type of new residents the pack should be sent.

3. Findings

3.1. There are a number of advantages in restarting the practice of a Welcome Booklet, including the new resident understanding the role of the Council and other bodies, advising of the services we can offer, ensuring they are aware of all the amenities we provide in the district etc. As members are aware, we are encouraging a move towards the website, and the Booklet will highlight the convenience for customers of having access to a great deal amount of information and the ability to book and pay for services online 24 hours a day.

3.2. Previously, we sent out a folder of various leaflets and information which, although providing a great deal of information, did not look particularly cohesive and would mean the resident needing to keep a great deal of separate leaflets if they wished to refer to the information at a later date.

3.3. It seems an appropriate and cost effective option to provide all new residents with one booklet which effectively covers all the information they might need and explain the benefits and amenities available. The intention would be that this booklet was an attractive and useful item that residents would keep handy.

3.4. Having made an investment in printers, it is practical and cost effective to undertake short print runs of the Booklet in house so that it could be updated on a regular basis to ensure the latest, most important and appropriate information could be included.

3.5. This would include:

- Welcome to the district
- Details around the popular added value services we offer that residents might find useful, such as bulky goods collection, pest control, garden waste bins etc and how to apply/join. The website will be promoted as the first option, but of course telephone numbers and how to obtain paper copies of information if needed, will also be included.
- A section on leisure and events – ensuring residents are aware of the options on offer and also including the latest major events such as Discover South Norfolk Day.
- A tear off direct debit form and also information around other convenient ways to set up direct debits such as self service direct
debts on the website and also encouraging ebilling. Alternatives on how to obtain paper copies or telephone number to set up paperless direct debits will also be covered.

- Key section on encouraging residents to get involved, from public consultations on planning, to “Your Neighbourhood, Your Choice”, to attending meetings.

- FAQs – from when the bin will be collected, to how to find out about planning applications to who their local councillor is. This key information section would also include information such as what can go into the recycling bin.

- A section on “My South Norfolk” to explain the benefits and significant amount of local information available on inputting the postcode.

- A section of contact info, including website, email addresses and telephone numbers. Useful websites for other organisations could also be included.

- Electoral services – encourage people to join the electoral roll and how to apply for a postal vote (again with the website as the first option).

3.6. As a new resident comes into the district, or moves within the district, they are offered the option of receiving their council tax bill on line. For those residents who choose a paper bill, a hard copy Welcome Booklet would be posted and the only other items to be included, could be the latest Link magazine, along with of course the paper Council Tax bill.

3.7. Clearly, for those customers who choose not to receive paper bills, it would logical not to provide a hard copy Welcome Booklet, but instead communicate electronically. The council tax bill is sent as a pdf attachment to an email and the welcome Booklet could also be added as another pdf and also include an electronic weblink to the Link.

3.8. There is of course a cost implication but the intention is this would be at least a self funding initiative from residents signing up for added value services such as leisure centres and garden waste bins.

3.9. The estimate of the numbers needed would be around 5,000 (see 3.10 for details) and so the estimated costs would be as follows, which assumes 10% of people will choose ebilling:

- Price for posting welcome pack (Booklet, bill and Link magazine) at £0.76 each - £3,420

- Printing more Link magazines - £500

- Printing the Welcome Booklet - £500

- Total around £4,500 pa – less as more people move to ebilling.
3.10. In terms of who would receive the Welcome Booklet, it is suggested that only households (whether single or multiple people) who move into or around the district would be included, not change of circumstances. The estimate of numbers would be around 5,000 households moving who would require a hard copy or electronic Welcome Booklet.

3.11. The benefits of this approach would be that residents become more aware of the services we offer, they know how to access them in a manner that suits them, more services are transacted on the website, more direct debits are set up and income is increased.

4. **Other Options**

4.1. The previous practice of sending a folder with a large number of different leaflets, booklets and information could be restarted. This would however involve significantly more cost, from the postage to the printing of the material. The pack would also look less professional and be less likely to be kept by residents. There would be the advantage of being able to easily insert a new leaflet on a latest event for example, however it would be relatively easy to update the Welcome Booklet and thus members may feel this advantage does not outweigh the disadvantages.

4.2. Members may of course choose to take no action with new residents coming into the district and thus possibly save £4,500pa, although as stated the intention would be for this to be self funded. However the benefits of welcoming residents, providing them with key information, making them aware of the benefits and services provided by the Council and ensuring they are aware of the many opportunities to get involved with their community and the Council would seem to be significant.

5. **Relevant Corporate Priorities**

5.1. Driving services through being businesslike, efficient and customer aware, by ensuring all our residents are aware of all the services the Council provides, from garden waste bins, to Leisure Centres to events.

6. **Conclusion**

6.1. Introducing the Welcome Booklet should be a self funding initiative which will have significant benefits in helping to ensure residents are aware of the amenities, events and services offered by the Council and will also promote the use of the website and online services, as well as opportunities to get involved with their community and encourage residents to subscribe to added value services that they may find useful.

7. **Action Required**

7.1. If members endorse the approach of welcoming new residents to the district, then it is suggested the most cost effective and appropriate way forward, which include those residents who prefer electronic communication, as well as those
who prefer hard copies of information, would be to endorse the approach as described in this paper.

7.2. Officers will then take the appropriate steps to ensure the Welcome Booklets start being issued to residents by the end of June 2012.
Development Management Policies Document

Purpose and summary
To endorse in principle and offer any specific comments for the improvement of the proposed list of topics and policies to be included in the draft Development Management Policies Document.

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

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail:

|                         | Michael Thornton, 01508-533838, mthornton@s-norfolk.gov.uk or Tim Horspole, 01508-533806, thorspole@s-norfolk.gov.uk |

1. **Purpose of the Pre-Scrutiny**
   1.1. The **purpose of this pre-scrutiny** is to consider the attached Table (Appendix A) which outlines the topics and policies proposed to be covered in the new draft Development Management Policies Document. The comments will be used to help revise the draft Table before it is recommended to 11th June Cabinet as the basis for drafting the text of the policies for public consultation later in the summer.

   1.2. The **purpose of the Development Management policies** is summarised in the notes 1 – 8 on the first page of the attached Table (Appendix A). The Development Management polices will form part of the development plan; the starting point for all decision making about proposals for the development of land and buildings. (Other parts of the development plan will include the Joint Core Strategy and the proposed Site Allocations and Polices Document and Area Action Plans for Wymondham and Long Stratton – collectively these are now to be referred to as the Local Plan and will replace the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003)).

   1.3. The policies must be prepared in accordance with statutory regulations, with a separate Sustainability Appraisal process, and several rounds of public consultation and a public examination process.
2. **Scope of Pre-Scrutiny**

2.1. Pre-scrutiny comments are sought to help improve the document. The notes 1-8 at the front of the Table (*Appendix A*) outline the potential scope and purpose of the policies. The policies should all be traceable to the Spatial Vision and Objectives found in the Joint Core Strategy, and should be compatible with national planning policies.

2.2. While the fundamentals of the *plan led* planning system are unchanged, the Localism Act 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012 have made changes to planning system and greatly streamlined national planning policy and guidance, with some important changes including the introduction of a ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’. Further changes in national guidance, clarification of the meaning of national policy and new case law precedent can all be expected during the period the new Development Management policies are being prepared – all of which will need to be taken into account.

2.3. It should be noted that the Local Planning Steering Group advise the Portfolio Holder on the preparation of all planning policies and have been and will be closely involved in scrutinising and guiding the content of these policies and the preparation process. The revisions to be made to the draft Table will also take account the further comments to be made by the Steering Group.

3. **Findings**

3.1. A first round of public consultation (from January to March 2012) focussed on what the policies should seek to achieve, and the consultation document explored 40 questions about key ‘issues and options’ to be considered in preparing the policies. These questions reflected the guidance of the Cabinet, the Local Planning Steering Group and a discussion session held in the autumn open to all Members.

3.2. The response and the key findings of the public consultation are summarised in the documents attached at *Appendix B* – the original representations are viewable on the Council’s online consultation system:


3.3. *Appendix B* also includes (as Annex 1) a note of a workshop session held with regular planning agents operating in the district.

3.4. The results of previous reviews of the South Norfolk Local Plan have also been considered, this included comments from officers and members of Planning Committee.
4. **Corporate Priorities**

4.1 The policies will impact on all four the corporate priorities, in particular the proposed policy 1.1 addresses how the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ will be applied to ensure that all three dimensions of *sustainable development* are considered in planning decisions. Specifically the policies will help balance and achieve:

- *Priority 1: Enhancing our quality of life and the environment we live in* - by providing policies that ensure the proper consideration of the impact of development proposals on environmental and heritage assets and local communities; and

- *Priority 2: Promoting a thriving economy* - with policies ensuring proper consideration of the economic benefits of proposals.

5. **Implications and Risks**

5.1 There are no risks associated with the recommendations of Scrutiny Committee on this report.

6. **Conclusion**

6.1. The Table *(Appendix A)* outlines the topics and policies proposed to be covered in the new draft Development Management Policies Document. Comments are sought to improve the document before it is agreed as the basis for preparing full policies for public consultation later in the summer. Members may wish to refer to the summary findings of the public consultation conducted so far, these are summarised at *Appendix B*.

7. **Action Required**

7.1. Scrutiny Committee are asked to offer specific suggestions for improvement to the attached Table *(Appendix A)* and the policies to be prepared subsequently.

7.2. The Committee are asked to endorse the Table (as amended) for recommendation to the Cabinet.

---

**Appendix A** - Outline of the topics and policies proposed to be covered in the new draft Development Management Policies Document

**Appendix B** – Response and findings from the first Regulation 25 public consultation
1. Development Management policies will form part of the development plan (section 38(6) of the Planning Act applies), the starting point for all decision making about proposals for the development of land and buildings. (Other development plan documents will include: the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk; the South Norfolk Site Allocations and Polices Document; and Area Action Plans for Wymondham and Long Stratton).

2. Collectively, the development plan policies will now be referred to as the ‘Local Plan’ and will replace the South Norfolk Local Plan (2003). Where the Local Plan is “absent, silent or relevant policies are out of date” there is a “presumption in favour of sustainable development” – NPPF para 14. Supplementary guidance in the form of Supplementary Planning Documents such as the Place Making Guide will not form part of the Local Plan.)

3. All Local Plan policies should be traceable to the Spatial Vision and Spatial Objectives – found in the Joint Core Strategy.

4. We should aim for a minimum number of generic development management policies looking at general areas of activity and relating to the whole plan area or wide parts of the plan area. We should avoid lots specific policies for different eventualities and specific uses. The policies should be ‘timeless’ and flexible enough to handle innovation and change - good for 10-15 years – and supported by evidence.

5. We should aim for positive rather than negative policies where possible, which are likely to include criteria which focus on the effects of development proposals.

6. Each Local Plan policy will be supported with a brief explanatory Reasoned Justification (RJ) drawing on relevant evidence, and Notes that sign-post linkages to the other most relevant policy documents and guidance. The Local Plan should always be read as whole; it is unnecessary to include extensive cross referencing.

7. The following table provides: reference number; topic heading; outline of the purpose of the proposed Policy and content; points to be included in the Plan as Reasoned Justification (RJ) and Notes supporting and explaining the Policy, together with any Comments relevant at this stage; and the ‘reasonable alternatives’ to consider. This is a draft document which is evolving through discussion – note version date above.

8. The document will be organised in four sections: Strategic Policies followed by a section on each of the 3 dimensions of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental considerations – this echoes the structure of the NPPF.
## Section 1 – Strategic Policies or First Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref. No.</th>
<th>Topic area</th>
<th>Development Management (DM) Policy - purpose &amp; content outlined</th>
<th>Points to be included in the Plan as supporting Reasoned Justification (RJ) and Notes</th>
<th>Alternative Options considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1      | Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development | Policy to promote and **seek sustainable development in South Norfolk**, explaining how decisions will be reached. Policy to refer to a diagrammatic explanation included in the RJ:  

- Degrees of positive economic impact  
- Degrees of positive social impact  
- Degrees of positive environmental impact  
- Degrees of adverse economic impact - potential to mitigate / balance  
- Degrees of adverse social impact - potential to mitigate / balance  
- Degrees of adverse environmental impact - potential to mitigate / balance  
- Unacceptable – economic impact - refuse  
- Unacceptable social impact – refuse  
- Unacceptable environmental impact - refuse  

The Policy will require that adequate information be submitted to enable this assessment. In adequate information will be a basis of refusal.  

RJ - Proposals that accord with the ‘Development Plan’ (s38(6)) will be supported. Where there are competing interests to be balanced the benefits and adverse impacts of a proposal will be considered in terms of how it will help deliver the Vision and Objectives of the Local Plan (JCS and DM Policies), ensuring each of the three dimension of sustainability are considered. Gains will be sought in each dimension. DM Policies are arranged along the ‘golden threads’ of the three dimensions of sustainability.  

RJ - Refer to an explanatory diagram – if the proposal causes an unacceptable ‘significant and demonstrable’ harm in any one dimension – refuse. Degrees of adverse impacts in any dimension(s) may be balanced with degrees of overriding positive impact(s) in the other dimension(s) – good quality graphic required that uses shading to express a continuum of grades of impact.  

RJ- Explain that necessary information must be submitted to enable a positive assessment of impact and sustainability of any development proposal. Particular information requirements will be identified in Councils Validation Checklist or the relevant DM policy, supplementary guidance or NPPF. | Delete – policy as unnecessary duplication of the NPPF  
Whether to include or modify the suggested diagram to help explain |
| 1.2      | Requirement for adequate infrastructure | Policy to state that all new development will **only be permitted where the necessary utilities, services, physical and social infrastructure are adequate** or can be | RJ - Refer to s.106 and CIL  
Comment - Not clear that this is adequately addressed in JCS | Combine this requirement |
made adequate at necessary stage.

| 1.3 | Sustainable location of all new development | Policy to help manage patterns of growth to achieve the plan led spatial strategy of the Local Plan (JCS, Sites DPD, AAPs, NDPs) through the **sustainable location of all new development**:  
  - At identified locations & within development boundaries mapped in the Local Plan (Sites DPD, AAPs etc)  
  - other site allocations (Neighbourhood Development Plans)  
 and a **presumption that development proposals outside of defined settlement boundaries will be refused unless evidence to satisfy**:  
  - specific criteria in the DM polices or  
  - otherwise demonstrate overriding benefits in terms of social, environment & economy dimensions – Policy 1.1. | Policy 7? | RJ – to refer to the ‘plan led’ spatial strategy of the JCS seeking to meet identified needs in the locations identified – principally within the NPA and specified settlements & allocated sites or when supported by Local Plan criteria policies, in the open countryside. e.g. Specific DM policies for conversion of rural buildings, ‘exceptions’ local needs housing sites etc.  
 RJ - to summarise the Policies and levels of development required at settlements in the SNC area and areas of protection. Replacement for ENV 8 and consolidate JCS Policy 17.  
 RJ – Refer to Core Principles of the NPPF including (para 17.5) which recognises the ‘intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside’.  
 | Alternative options over how to coordinate and conduct further public consultation wording of DM Policies and corresponding mapping revisions to development boundaries |

| 1.4 | Environmental Quality | Strategic policy **promoting environmental quality and the conservation and enhancement of the historic and natural environment.** | Comment – a ‘strategic policy’ will supplement the existing JCS policies which by their nature do not fully address the protection of environmental, local heritage & landscape characteristics. A positive strategy is proposed – linking to supplementary guidance to be produced on List Buildings etc.  
 RJ - Sustainable development requires ensuring development avoids or enhances areas with environmental and heritage designations, is not subject to flooding or natural hazards, and that water and waste facilities are available. | Move to section 4 to become a non-strategic policy |
**Notes:**

1. It may be best to relocate the General Design Principles 3.8 policy to the ‘strategic’ policies section. Potentially, some other key Policies?

2. Text to make clear that the DM Policies do NOT apply to that part of district in the Broads Authority area where Broads Authority policies apply.

### Section 2 - Policies for Prosperity – the economic role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Topic area</th>
<th>Development Management (DM) Policy - purpose &amp; content outlined</th>
<th>Points to be included in the Plan as supporting Reasoned Justification (RJ) and Notes</th>
<th>Alternative Options considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 | Employment sites | Positive policy encouraging **new employment development on non-allocated sites to achieve sustainable economic growth** – both inside settlements/allocations & outside subject to criteria. Policy criteria for **smaller new offices and business space located outside of development boundaries** | RJ - Define appropriate ‘employment uses’ as *principally* but not exclusively Business Class B1-8. Cross reference to Policy 2.11 for accommodation of new employment uses in converted buildings in the rural area. Define sustainable in this context – improving local work opportunities. RJ – reflect that the NPPF (para 25) that there is a *non-sequential* approach to rural ‘small’ scale offices and other development, para 26 requires support for sustainable rural economic development. Define ‘smaller’ at a scale that complements policy 2.6 below | }
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policy to retain the use of sites and buildings currently in an employment use for employment uses</strong> – whether located in or outside of settlements.</td>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> - New employment site allocations will be addressed in the Sites DPD – replacing EMP1. Increase level of support to new sustainable economic development compared to SNLP EMP2, 4 &amp; 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria to consider proposals for the loss of sites and buildings currently in an employment use – focus on the future needs of the area as well as past / current viability of the business.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preference for community and other services where there is local evidence of need?</td>
<td><strong>RJ</strong> – Refer to key points of the JCS. This generic Policy will apply to all existing sites and the second use of new sites – the first use being addressed in the Sites DPD. Support proposals for B Class and other uses ancillary and supportive of the local employment area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> - Replaces EMP7 which applies protection to sites in the rural area only, to now also apply this protection to sites within settlements of all size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> – may be resistance to the latter point above? Also, if changing from business use, what evidence do we need to support a preferred for an alternative use to, say, residential conversion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Working from home</strong></td>
<td><strong>RJ</strong> - NPPF (para 21) and JCS Policy 5 encourage innovation &amp; integration of commercial and residential uses within the same unit - but do not address necessary limitations or changes of use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy to support an increase in working from home subject to criteria to access and manage any adverse impacts.</td>
<td><strong>Comment - Does this warrant a ‘specific use’ policy?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delete - rely JCS 5 for promotion and generic policy 3.15 to manage impact?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>Promotion of competitive town centres</strong></td>
<td><strong>RJ</strong> - JCS seeks protection and enhancement of commercial premises and services in all categories of centre and dispersed villages. The roles and criteria applied in SNC part of JCS area made clearer to the reader. i.e. After Norwich the main centres for shops and services are Diss, Harleston and Wymondham.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy to identify the strategy and hierarchy of towns and villages in the SNC area, to support their future vitality and viability and place at the heart of their communities and as preferred location for the ‘main town centre uses’.</td>
<td><strong>Potentially combine with 2.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.5 DM Policies for managing change and activity in the defined town centres and primary shopping frontages

Two or three **Policies required**:
- **Manage mix of retail / non-retail uses within primary shopping areas and town centres**
- **Manage food and drink uses (Use Classes A3-5)**

Comment – nationally there is a decline in demand for shopping floor space, not least as a result of internet trading. However, levels of planned growth in some settlements may steady demand? Evidence? Either revise the Primary Frontages / CBA or take a more flexible approach to uses within a similar geographic area? Propose the latter if required. This to be addressed in the wording of DM Policies and revisions to the Proposals map – which need to be coordinated.

Comment – key point is to maintain vitality and to keep the ground floor space available for the types of activities that present lively frontage and attract visitors to town - including shops but also more cafes, business services etc. Policy must be ‘future proof’ & allow for innovation & only restrict where justified by evidence and to achieve strategic objectives. e.g. control hours of operation to protect quality of life & amenity, maintain an adequate supply of retail floor space.

RJ- new definitions compliant with the NPPF are required e.g. replace definition of a CBA with a ‘town centre’ and consider defining primary and secondary frontages – subject to available evidence and data. Also recognise that that these Policies and Mapping are a ‘default’; AAPs & NDPs may override non-strategic Local Plan policies and designations for individual towns.

RJ - Policy for local and rural shops and services covered at 3.18

<p>| 6 | RJ - Refer to the scope for growth at the defined town centres identified for more development. JCS evidence on retail growth, the Sites DPD, AAPs and NDPs or Village Plans. | RJ – Definition of ‘main town centre uses’, including offices, using definition implied by NPPF para 23 | See options and comments in adjacent column |
| 2.6 | Proposals for major new town centre uses | Policy for the consideration of proposals for ‘main town centre uses’ which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres; criteria to assess retail impact and require a sequential approach to sites finding. Proposals resulting (cumulatively) in a total floor space above the threshold may be subject to similar considerations as proposal for new floor space in excess of the thresholds. | Below | Options – to combine with Policy 2.3 Or Delete - rely on NPPF (paras 23-27) Or Alternative thresholds and degrees of flexibility (see comment) |
| 2.7 | Rural economy and diversification | Policy for agriculture &amp; forestry development requiring approval – criteria to address the suitability of the access routes, unacceptable amenity impacts from intensive peaks of activity in unsocial hours, County defined ‘quiet lanes’ etc. | RJ - Supportive with criteria to guide how to overcome the constraints at 1.3 above. Policy should expand on scope of SNLP EMP5 to include support for agricultural contractors serving areas beyond the farm holding. RJ – supportive of agri-food sector industrial development and support the development of a ‘flagship food and farming hub serving the needs of Norfolk’ (JCS Policy 5 supports the concept – but no specific site identified) |  |
| 2.8 | Policy for small scale rural land based activities | RJ - Policy to help apply the ‘macro-scale’ concerns of JCS and Policy 1.3 above to the very small scale development proposals | | Delete as unnecessar |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td><strong>Policy with criteria for Equestrian use proposals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Comment</strong> - Frequency of use and level of detail required may make it clearer to have a separate policy to replace LEI14.</td>
<td>Combine with 2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.10 | **Policy for rural tourist and other recreational destinations** located in the countryside.  
Apply to both the expansion of existing facilities and new provision. | **RJ** - Support the consolidation and expansion of rural commercial recreation and leisure destinations where these exploit the unique attributes of the location or are located in a location accessible by sustainable modes. Criteria to guide the weighing of economic and cultural benefits against adverse impacts of either expansion or new facilities.  
**RJ** - Support the creation of new holiday accommodation at established attractions. (Rural buildings conversion Policy to address when the.) |   |
| 2.11 | **Policy applying the JCS preference for the re-use of suitable redundant rural buildings for commercial uses** – Criteria to recognise holiday accommodation as economic development and to consider when a residential use may be preferable to employment | **RJ** - Expand on JCS Policy 5 and replace EMP3. Conversions to holiday accommodation may be preferred as an economic use over Business Class uses. |   |
| 2.12 | **Policy for dwellings in the countryside necessary for rural enterprises** (agriculture, forestry, & other rural enterprise) located in the open countryside. | **RJ** - How to demonstrate a positive case to overcome Policy presumption 1.3 above.  
**Comment** – this is largely covered in NPPF para 55, is a Local Plan policy required? Comment - this is in effect rural | Delete – rely on NPPF which covers this aspect well |
| 2.13 | **Tourist accommodation** | Policy supporting **tourist holiday accommodation development**. Criteria to support development in settlements and in the countryside where there is evidence of benefits to local business and identified needs are not being met, while respecting the local countryside. Criteria for permitting **sites for caravans and other non-permanent holiday accommodation with limitations on period of occupancy**, and criteria for approving sites for non-permanent accommodation. | **live/work?** Comment – do not address ‘outstanding or innovative rural dwellings’ - this exception to Policy is adequately covered by the NPPF para 55. | **RJ** – Address permanent structures including log cabins and facilities. Basis of restrictions on period of occupation etc. **RJ** - Appropriate criteria for approving sites for non-permanent accommodation. Update references to camping and caravanning to address ‘glamping’ and ‘low-impact’ yurts etc. **Divide with separate policies for permanent and non-permanent structures?** |

**Notes:**

1. **JCS Policy 5** provides necessary promotion of the economy including provision of employment land, promotion of tourism, leisure, environmental and cultural activities and the rural economy and diversification.

2. **Sites DPD to include Policies for NRP, Longwater, Norfolk Show Ground and other strategic sites. Unclear if the existing boundaries of just areas for expansion will be designated for NRP**
### Section 3 - Policies for People – the social role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Topic area</th>
<th>Development Management (DM) Policy - purpose &amp; content outlined</th>
<th>Points to be included in the Plan as supporting Reasoned Justification (RJ) and Notes</th>
<th>Comments relevant at this stage</th>
<th>Alternative Options considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Housing quality</td>
<td>Policy providing a ‘hook’ for <strong>housing quality and design guidelines and standards</strong></td>
<td>RJ – to include table of internal space standards to address bed spaces and no. of bedrooms. Refer to design guidance for external space - Place Making Guide and other SPD to follow.</td>
<td>Comment – Alternative basis of standards under investigation – must be supported by evidence.</td>
<td>Options around specification of internal space standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment - Do not address standards for energy performance and fabric of houses – covered in JCS 4 and CSH and to be superseded by Building Regulations changes in 2010 &amp; 2013. *1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Housing needs</td>
<td>Policy for a <strong>mix of housing to meet housing need</strong> to meet latest evidence on need including an element of <strong>single storey dwellings</strong> in the mix.</td>
<td>RJ – Text at Policy 4 requires a housing mix to meet evidenced need and requires integration by design. JCS text provides the current overall housing mix requirements and references to latest evidence. Sites DPD will include any specific requirements for each site.</td>
<td>RJ - this policy adds a requirement for single storey housing element to the mix based on evidence – delivery to follow with the evidence to justify</td>
<td>Option to delete and rely on JCS – seek the evidence to support negotiations using existing JCS Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment – any evidence to support a requirement for a mix on small sites of less than 5 dwellings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment: mix identified in Policy 4 may need updating after the next Housing Needs Assessment because of the impact of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td><strong>Rural housing needs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policy as basis for local rural needs housing allocations and exception sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   |   | **RJ** – explain & regularise the established policy and practice of Council using a Cabinet approved Choice Based Lettings scheme. This gives first preference to local people with connections and allocation cascade thereafter.*3  
  **RJ** - Affordable housing site allocations in larger down to Service Villages, only by exception sites at Other Villages.  
  Comment – note that the NPPF (para 54) provides for ‘enabling’ private housing development as part of an local housing needs exception site |
| 3.4 | **Gypsies and Travellers** | **No DM Policy required?**  
  **Option to include a DM criteria policy for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Show People – criteria for assessing windfall proposals** |
|   |   | **RJ** – A specific G&T DPD may be prepared separately if Evidence finds this necessary in order to identify sufficient sites / pitches to meet identified needs for permanent and transit accommodation. National Policy requires the Council identify a housing need figure, & a basis of delivering & monitoring a rolling 5yr supply of sites. This document should include criteria for identifying sites to be allocated and may be prepared jointly with other authorities. (Temporary sites do not count towards the provision figure.)  
  **RJ** – A DM Policy would contain criteria with which to assess windfall applications only.  
  Comment - National planning policy for traveller sites Policy H identifies a list of issues the LPA should consider in the determination of planning applications for G&T and TS sites.  
  Alternative(s):  
  1. Rely on new national Policy / NPPF  
  2. Rely on NPPF, National Policy and Local G&T Sites DPD site selection |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Housing conversions, extensions and replacement Policy to guide housing conversions, extensions and subdivision – within settlement boundaries. Policy ‘hook’ for SPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Extension and replacement of houses in the countryside Policy to control the replacement, extension (and construction of outbuildings for) dwellings in the open countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Policy for residential annexes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Para 25 states that an absence of a 5 year supply of sites will be a ‘significant material consideration’ when considering applications to grant temporary planning permission. The LPA is also directed to use the site selection criteria used in Site Allocations (para 10-11) in DC decisions.

Comment – should we have a Local Plan DM policy? National policy is clear and likely to override at appeals? What would a local DM Policy add or achieve alone? Alternatively, the Council might rely on the criteria adopted in a G&T Sites DPD as well at national policies.

Comment – should we have a Local Plan DM policy? National policy is clear and likely to override at appeals? What would a local DM Policy add or achieve alone? Alternatively, the Council might rely on the criteria adopted in a G&T Sites DPD as well at national policies.

Comment – good evidence will be needed to support Policy and decisions imposing additional restrictions in the countryside.
| 3.8 | **Objectives for design** | Policy setting *objectives for high quality design* - locally distinctive and high quality design in all development. Include reference to:  
- SUDS integral to the design process  
- Control of lighting  
- Items listed in 1st Consultation draft etc | RJ - JCS Design Policy 2 is expressed at ‘macro scale’; needs to be applied more directly to smaller scale development. Address buildings & street scene. Cross reference to Place Making Guide but avoid being too specific about BfL checklist. Must be open to address new national guidance and standards that are likely to emerge. *2 | Option to make this a cross-cutting ‘strategic policy’ – relocate to section 1 |
| 3.9 | **Adverts, signs and shop fronts** | Policy to *control of advertisements and signs*. Address:  
- Rural area  
- Urban area  
- Off site  
- Illumination  
- Shop fronts | RJ - apply to shop fronts and cross reference to heritage and design policies and Guidance – inc. PMG and CA appraisals. Simplify and combine to replace IMP 19-24.  
RJ - Refer to and endorse / update the informal SNC guidance notes on directional signage etc.  
RJ – carry forward the Area of Special Advertisement Control – refer to Proposals Map | Delete – rely on NPPF? |
| 3.10 | **Parking standards and guidelines** | Policy from which to *set guidelines for car and cycle parking standards* and the approach to travel planning requirements | RJ - JCS Policy 6 fully addresses the ‘supply side’ of transport measures but less so the ‘demand side’ measures necessary other than reference to travel planning.  
RJ - Must replace TRA 19 Parking Standards.  
RJ / Notes – refer to NCC transport strategy and guidelines, Manual for Streets 1 &2, PMG. Need to better explain MfS etc?  
Comment - Consider approaches taken by Broadland Council and the Broads Authority to parking standards | |
| 3.11 | **Sustainable transport** | Policy to *protect and require connection to routes for sustainable modes of transport including walking networks*. Safeguard sites for transport improvements. | Require provision for walking, cycling and public transport – replace TRA 1 -4 to support Policy 6. NPPF para 75. | Alternative options: 1 – make |
| 3.12 | Policy to maintain the **safe and free flow of traffic**. Refer to Proposals Map | **Review Proposal Map designations for cycle and footway links?**  
Is a Policy necessary? – consider Policy 6 and associated transport strategies?  
Comment - Are any other transport site proposals and safeguarding still required in DM Policies and Site Allocations—e.g WYM 16 - Mid Norfolk Railway extensions? | this a strategic policy?  
2 Delete & rely on other plans | 3.11 above |
| 3.13 | Telecommunications | No DM Policy required?  
Policy for the **provision of improved ICT communications networks** | JCS Policy 6 requirement for all development to contribute to provision of fast Broadband? What does this mean for a land use policy? Require provision of cable trunking etc? See NPPF para 43  
Must be 15 years ‘future proof’ – ICT is evolving so rapidly  
Comment - NPPF is very clear on this - is a local DM Policy going to add anything /required? | Options:  
1 - delete - rely on JCS and NPPF?  
2 – combine into 3.14 |
| 3.14 | Policy of requirements for all **installation of new telecommunications equipment** | RJ - Applicant should demonstrate that has explored sharing and alternatives? Industry have proposed model policy but this is now addressed clearly in the NPPF – no particular local perspective to add? | Delete – rely on NPPF? |
| 3.15 | Quality of life | Policies with all **necessary standards to protect the amenity of all occupiers and the quality of life,** | RJ - JCS Policy 7 - All 'development will be expected to maintain and enhance the quality of life...' Aspects.....Health- Crime - |
including:
- Noise, smell, light, etc.
- Night time hours of activity
- Aim to integrate of new and existing communities by design connectivity

Education - community infrastructure and cohesion. DM Policy responds by addressing the protection of amenity for all occupiers at this point.

Comment - Last clause JCS Policy 7 on integration and cohesion of new and existing communities. JCS 5.52 puts the onus on developer to demonstrate this. How does this translate into DM Policies? Require a P&Ds to show developers response?

3.16 Important local community facilities, shops and services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy for protection and provision of outdoor play and multi-functional facilities and natural open space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RJ - Policy to provide the ‘hook’ for new Guidelines to be prepared. Replace LEI8 – consistent with NPPF para 74, 75. New evidence required to justify updating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider adopting the ANGsT standard for access to accessible natural open space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.17 Policy criteria to guard against the unnecessary loss of valued community facilities, local shops and services inc pubs

Viability assessment required before change of use to another use permitted – consider future need more than current viability / use

RJ - Reflect NPPF Policy 70 to both protect valued local shops and community facilities and ensure their ability to develop and modernise.

3.18 Localism and public engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No DM Policy required?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RJ – Explaining weighting and hierarchy of ‘strategic policies’, ‘non-strategic’ Local Plan Policies, the regard will be given had to Neighbourhood Development Plans, Community Right to Build Orders etc and other village and community plans etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ - Also clarify approach to community proposals for Local Green Spaces or community assets etc. Comment - This is helpful guidance and a statement of support for Localism. *4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment - DM Policy unnecessary but arguably useful to explain some of these matters are covered in Localism Act etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Options:
1. No Policy – address in other materials
2. Refer to in RJ to strategic policies
3.19

**No DM Policy required?**

Policy promoting appropriate **pre-application consultation** with a requirement for a Planning & Design Statement to demonstrate the impact of that engagement on the design process.

**RJ** – Refer to Localism Act, NPPF and Policy 2 and 12 requirements for master planning, engagement etc.

Comment – Option of setting a lower threshold to the regulations for requiring pre-app – perhaps a threshold proportionate to size of the settlement impacted? However, on balance better to address on a case by case basis

Comment – this is probably better addressed by updating the Council’s SCI

---

*1 Part L Building Regs (2013) will lead to will lead to changes in the alignment of BR and CSH, CSH6 replaced with Zero Carbon Homes. Also see 4.1 below
*2 Harman Review to rationalise national guidance and standards – e.g. delete BfL?
*3 For exception sites and dwellings within settlements of less than 3000 people priority given to expressions of interest from people satisfying ‘local connection’ criteria. Larger settlements – 1/3 prioritised for people with a ‘local connection’. (Modify scheme for the Covenant with Armed Forces.)
*4 Community generated proposals for Local Green Spaces should be promoted through the Plan Making process.
Infrastructure requirements – covered under Policy 20, CIL, s106 changes – anything for DM Policies to pick up?

---

**Section 4 - Policies for the Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Topic area</th>
<th>Development Management (DM) Policy - purpose &amp; content outlined</th>
<th>Points to be included in the Plan as supporting Reasoned Justification (RJ) and Notes</th>
<th>Alternative Options considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4.1?| Energy and water | Policy for Allowable Solutions and communal scale energy and water measures? | Comment - DM Policies are NOT required to address building energy / water and performance targets.*1  
Comment - Currently very unclear but there may be a need for the LPA to manage the new Allowable Solutions – a carbon off- | Alternative Option:  
Delete or |
| 2.1 | set payment performance shortfall against the new Zero Carbon Homes standard performance - funded by developer contributions from period 2013-16 onward? Comment – This may not be an issue for DM Policy but for Building Regulations? Could be left for later documents? On balance consider it worthwhile to get the issue out now for discussion with stakeholders? | Combine with 4.2 |
| 4.2 | Policy(s) to **promote commercial scale and community scale energy solutions, provide DM Policy for wind turbines**, and other energy generation plant such as anaerobic digestion. Refer to Guidelines. | RJ – Generic policy criteria will apply to such proposals. In addition, use this specific policy to give material weight to the SNC Wind Turbine Sensitivity Study for the purpose of assessing the impact of proposals. Similarly the Guidelines adopted by adjoining local authorities and the impending Broads Authority guidelines. Comment - May require further guidance for smaller scale turbines, anaerobic digestion etc? | Combine with 4.1 |
| 4.3 | **Flooding, water and scarce resources** Policy(s) for development in all areas of flood risk or important to water supply | Comment - NPPF and NPPF Technical Guidance includes considerable detail – a DM Policy may not be required. (Flood Zones are NOT to be shown on the Proposals Map.) Alternatively, local polices could address:  
- local flooding,  
- fluvial flooding and  
- small element of tidal flooding in the district.  
Policy should also restrict development adversely affecting the integrity of all flood defences and drainage, and Water Protection Zones, and upon Broads Authority planning area & neighbouring authorities. | Delete – rely on Technical Guidance to NPPF |
| 4.4 | Recycling and waste | Policy for waste and recycling facilities in all development, covering:  
- Access  
- Provision  
- Requirements for communal facilities as part of larger development | RJ - Policy ‘hook’ for Guidance and requirements to be prepared by other relevant authorities and departments | Option – combine into the design principles policy 3.8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4.5 | Natural environmental assets | Policy(s) to ensure all development has regard to the protection and enhancement of designated environmental assets – including all national and local designations to be included on the Proposals Map | RJ - Proposals will be required to demonstrate an understanding of the significance of environmental assets, consider the impact of the proposal and mitigate adverse impact. Proposals with an unacceptable impact will be refused.  
RJ - Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (NERC Act) – LPA has a duty to protect and enhance relevant ‘highest order’ assets.  
RJ - The total range of environmental and heritage assets include:  
- identified protected and important trees, hedgerows, woodlands, County roadside nature reserves, archaeology and buildings;  
- other designations to be shown on the Proposals Map, including; SSSI, County Wildlife Sites, Local Nature Reserves, Special Areas of Conservation, | Options:  
1- One overall policies for all national and local designation s to be mapped onto the Proposals Map  
2 – individual polices for each designation |
| 4.6 | **Landscape character** | **Policy(s) with criteria to assess the impact of development proposals on the wider landscape and landform** | **RJ - Give status of the SNC Landscape Characterisation Study**
**RJ - Require applicants demonstrate an understanding of the significance of the landscape characteristics, consider the impact of the proposal and mitigate adverse impacts on the character areas and river valleys. Proposals with an unacceptable impact will be refused.**
**RJ – refer to the landscape of South Norfolk characterised by ‘big skies’ by day and ‘dark skies’ by night. Also – guide on adapting to climate change.**
**Comment – To encompass advise to be received from Chris Blandford Assoc. on the wording of Policy criteria, to replace IMP 2, ENV1,2 and review the policy approach to Norwich Southern Bypass Protection Zone, Strategic Gaps, and Landscape Characterisation areas.** | **Options under considerati on on how best to organise policies for landscape etc.** |

| 4.7 | **Landscape design, trees and hedges** | **Policy setting criteria for the protection of significant trees and hedgerows and the design of site landscaping and planting**
**Policy to promote the protection and where appropriate the replacement of ‘significant’ trees and hedgerows.**
**Discourage development that would result in the loss of ancient hedgerows of Dickleborough or** | **RJ - Design for site to reflect site and surroundings and reflect Guidance in the Landscape Characterisation Study and ongoing work by CBA consultants.**
**RJ – to define ‘significant’ trees and woodland (veteran, ancient or subject to TPO) and ‘significant’ hedgerows. Applicant seeking to remove a 10m section of hedgerow that could be protected under the Hedgerow Regulations 1995 required to demonstrate that the hedgerow is not ‘important’ under the terms of the Regulations.** |
| **4.8** | **Heritage Assets** | Policy(s) for designated heritage assets, including Listed Buildings and archaeological sites | RJ - Proposals will be required to demonstrate an understanding of the significance of heritage assets, consider the impact of the proposal and mitigate adverse impact. Proposals with an unacceptable impact will be refused. Refer to 1.4 above, NPPF (para 58 and 126) – positive strategy for conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. Place Making Guide. (See English Heritage comments) Combine aspects of IMP 11-15

RJ - Ancient Monuments, Historic Parklands, Conservation Areas identified on the Proposals Map, plus LBs, archaeology and other heritage assets not shown on the map |

| **4.9** | **Policy for Conservation Areas** – criteria for considering applications for demolition, alteration, extension & new development | RJ - As 4.8, combine aspects of IMP 16-18 |

| **4.10** | **Policy for development impacting on non-designated heritage assets** | RJ - As 4.8. General promotional / protection policy in relation to impact on other assets. Require Heritage Statement &/or Planning and Design Statement (P&DS) to explain impact and designer’s response. |

Notes:

*1 Policy 3 sets building fabric, energy and use of water performance targets – however these will be superseded by Part L Building Regulations 2010 and 2013. Part L Building Regulations (2013) will lead to further re-alignment of BR and CSH; CSH6 to be replaced with Zero Carbon Homes. 2006 CSH3 = 2010 BR. 2013 BR will = fabric and energy elements of CSH5. Zero Carbon Homes to replace CSH6? Similarly – for non-residential buildings LEED, SKA introduced and BREEAM changing. Do not address energy and water in the DM Policies.
Appendix B

Development Management Policies Document

First Regulation 25 public consultation

1. Purpose

This report summaries the findings of the first Regulation 25 ‘issues and options’ public consultation conducted into the proposed Development Management policies.

2. Programme

The work programme to date has provided for:

- All Member discussions in the last quarter of 2011 to identify key issues to be addressed through the public consultation and what the policies should seek to achieve
- Cabinet approved the consultation documents in December 2011 with the benefit of the advice from Local Planning Steering Group
- Public consultation conducted for an 8-week period running 23rd January to 16th March 2012. This included an information session for Parish and Town Councils and a workshop session with planning practitioners regularly active in the district.

3. Form of response

904 responses were made by 62 parties, the parties were:

23 Parish and Town Councils
7 Other Authorities
6 Government Agencies and Utilities
14 Commercial bodies or planning agents
9 Individuals
3 Special interest groups

The responses are summarised below in the order of the themes and 40 questions laid out in the consultation document, that is, sections addressing: first principles, followed by the three dimensions of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental – and section on ‘anything else?’


In addition a discussion session was conducted with 19 local planning agents and representatives of the development industry – this meeting focussed on 6 of the questions and a note of the meeting is attached below as Annex 1.
The 40 questions posed in consultation reflect the findings of the earlier Member discussions which identified the key issues for exploration in the consultation questions. It was made clear at Question 40 that the consultation was not in anyway ‘closed’ to these matters only and that the non-inclusion of an issue did not mean it was unimportant.

4. Responses received

The issues posed and responses received are summarised below:

SECTION 1 - POLICIES WITH FIRST PRINCIPLES

Presumption in favour of sustainable development (Qs.1-3)

Summary of the issues: The questions asked about ‘what do you think makes a development sustainable?’ and whether a proposed draft Policy FP1 was helpful in explaining how the ‘presumption in favour of sustainable development’ will be applied in South Norfolk?

Summary of responses: Responses identified many different important features of sustainable development including for example: meeting housing need, meeting infrastructure requirements, matching workforce and employment requirements, promoting sustainable travel patterns, ensuring the right location of development, and strong policies to conserve and protect of local character and environment alongside the positive ‘presumption’.

Responses referred to the original Brundtland definition, the four aspects of sustainability identified in PPS1, and the five principles of the UK Sustainable Development Strategy 2005 as well as the three dimensions of sustainability referred to in the NPPF: economic, social and environmental. The need to consider the short, medium and long term benefits and adverse impacts were stressed by several.

There was general support of a ‘first principles’ policy to help clarify the meaning of all this and to apply the ‘presumption’ locally, so long as that were consistent the final form of the NPPF. A significant number of respondents said it will be necessary to await the NPPF before drafting the policies. However, several commented that a policy was unnecessary and should be left to the NPPF.

Sustainable location of development (Q.4)

Summary of the Issue: A draft Policy FP2 was offered for the sustainable location of development. Development should be either in the defined settlement boundaries (reflecting the wider JCS growth strategy) or outside of these limits only when it accorded with specific policies of the Plan or there was an overriding need or benefit that achieved the sustainable development objectives of Policy FP1.
Summary of responses: Of the responses a small minority considered the Policy unnecessary and a duplication of the JCS; the majority considered it necessary and clarifying addition to the JCS. Some representations considered the Policy offered too little protection outside of settlement limits.
Suggested amendments and additions were:
That the policy include a full list of the settlements together with the types of spatial policy applying in each (Breckland Council – supported this view, referring to the comments of the Inspector into their Sites DPD).
That greater importance should be placed on the availability of public transport to identify some locations more sustainable.
That reference should be made to Neighbourhood Plans and Parish Plans in the second part of the Policy, reflecting Localism and that these documents might support the case for development outside of settlement limits.

The Supporting information required with planning applications (Q.5)

Summary of the issue: The question asked whether the Council should adopt a policy that meant that the failure to provide adequate supporting documentation with which to assess the sustainability of a proposal should lead to refusal.

Summary of responses: The need for the Council to be clear about what information was required with applications was very widely supported amongst the responses. However, while a significant minority supported the proposal for a policy on this the majority either objected or felt that the objectives would be better achieved by:
Including reference in the lower case text of Policy FP1 to the importance of necessary information
By effective pre-application discussion
By the Council maintaining an up to date Validation Checklist for planning applications with clear requirements in Polices for additional information for particular types of planning applications where this was necessary.
Anglia Water made specific request for the details of surface water management to be included on the Checklist.

SECTION 2 – POLICIES FOR PROSPERITY

Business and economic development

Increasing flexibility for the uses accepted on commercial estates (Qs.6 & 7)

Summary of the issue: Existing SNLP is restrictive about the uses that can take place on employment sites; the JCS seeks more flexibility. How should the Council make the development management policies more flexible?

Summary of the responses: Amongst the responses there was general support for increasing the flexibility to allow ancillary uses to locate at commercial industrial estates, with a number of caveats:
The first consideration should be to protect nearby town centres and to not set up conditions leading to inappropriate competition – what uses were acceptable would depend to a degree on the proximity of neighbouring towns and villages, local pubs and restaurants etc. Some commented that a ‘sequential’ approach should be followed with suitable evidence to be submitted with planning applications on the proximity of alternative facilities. ‘A’ Class uses in particular should be carefully managed although ‘trade counter’ uses may have a useful role to play in some circumstances.

The majority felt that the support services should be ancillary to and support the businesses and workers on the particular estate – although these could cover the whole range of economic, social and environmental needs including small shops, training, health and crèche facilities for example. (On the other hand a minority commented that the uses could be useful to local residents and help build relationships with local communities in some certain circumstances.)

The priority should remain for ‘proper’ employment uses and maintaining the right balance of activities and standards of appearance and quality on the estate. Uses should be compatible with the character and uses on the estate – it should not include an ‘old peoples home’ for example.

The economic objectives should not be undermined by a too ‘loose’ an approach. Breckland Council referred to the particular importance of the ‘REV Active’ project supporting motorsport –related industry at Hethel and Snetterton Heath and the wider spin-off benefits in the A11 corridor.

A specific reference was made to the creation of a flag-ship food and farming hub focussed at Easton and the mix of uses that could come forward with such a proposal.

**Assessing the economic viability of premises for future business use (Q.8)**

**Summary of the Issues:** There are many sites and buildings scattered throughout the district that are in a business or employment generating use, many are in good sustainable locations. The question explored the situation of a new non-employment use now being proposed – how could the Council reliably assess the economic viability of the premises for future use?

**Summary of Responses:** All the comments received recognised the issue as one of concern but fell into two similar sized broad groups.

The first group responded directly by suggesting various forms of evidence including: evidence of marketing through a reputable agent, provision of accounts, cash flow information or even seeking an opinion from a third-party independent expert. Several cautioned against the use of ‘banks’ risk and investments assessments. One respondent suggested seeking information form the local Parish Council on the circumstances of the applicant. (At a workshop event with Planning Agents it was also suggested that future viability could be better assessed with a formula development appraisal calculation rather than requiring extended period of marketing etc.)
The second group approached the issue differently looking at it ‘in the round’ and considering that the decision should be based on what the area needed now and in the future, looking at all three aspects of sustainability and the future plans / needs of the area. This should include reference to sources including Neighbourhood Plans and Parish Plans. One respondent went further still and considered that a specific policy for this eventuality were not needed; rather the Council should rely on an enhanced version of Policy FP1 (Qs 1-3 above) assessing the benefits and adverse impacts in all three aspects of sustainability – plus a few generic policies on amenity, transport and design etc. (This respondent made a similar point in response to a number of questions.)

Promotion of home based businesses (Qs.9 & 10)

Summary of the Issues: The Council is keen to support new ways of working and more home based businesses but would a promotional policy be useful and what criteria is needed to protect against potential adverse impacts? Are respondents aware of any good practice or examples?

Summary of Responses: In the comments received no one wanted to discourage increased home working but the clear majority called for criteria to ensure:

- all types of potential adverse impact on residential neighbours were properly assessed to ensure the business was suitable for a residential area (e.g. character, amenity, visual intrusion, traffic, noise, hours of working, odour and lighting and other environmental controls) – including consideration for community views
- that the use should not grow beyond an appropriate scale, and
- that the vitality and viability of commercial areas should not be adversely affected by the cumulative effects many such small businesses.

Few examples of good practice were offered; local home based businesses mentioned were dog kennels and egg production which have not been without problems. One referred to the BedZed development in Sutton and another looked at the issue the other way around, and referred to the example of Maastrict where residential uses had been successfully introduced into areas of under-occupied commercial space to create a more lively town centre with social and commercial benefits.

Vitality and viability of town centres and the use of redundant rural buildings

The need to locate new shops and town centre uses in town centres (Qs.11 & 12)

Summary of the issue: The draft NPPF proposed softening the sequential approach of ‘town centres first’ and it’s application to all ‘town centre uses’ – the consultation question explored view on this. Subsequently, the NPPF has been published and a clear ‘town centre first’ for all ‘town centre uses’ including shops services and offices has been reintroduced , to a degree superseding the need for the question.
The NPPF proposes a 'default' 2,500 threshold for the requirement to carry out a sequential assessment – Q12 explored whether a lower threshold was appropriate in the context of smaller towns?

Summary of Responses: While the position of the NPPF has now clearer than at the time of consultation the comments included points to take forward in policy consideration:

- English Heritage referred to the Portas Review of high street retailing that recognised the importance of retailing activity to the character of the historic core of many town centres. South Norfolk has a number of such small towns that could be adversely affected by the drawing away of retail trade from the historic core; weight should be given to this heritage consideration.
- A number of planning agents and Sainsbury’s Supermarkets Ltd pointed to the importance of the developer and Council working together to consider the suitability of sequentially preferable sites in the assessments.
- One respondent stressed that some retail and leisure uses such as garden centres were not suitable for town centre locations.

A variety of suitable 'local' thresholds were mentioned in responses, these related to either floorspace (5,000sf/500 sq.m or a figure reflecting the average size shop in the relevant high street) or the number of employees (an SME or ‘more than 3 employees’). Several referred to the difficulty in comparing different types of retail business with very different ratios of turnover t/floorspace and the business efficiencies of a say a family run farm shop enterprise against small stores belonging to national multiples such as a Tesco Metro.

Conversion of redundant rural buildings (Qs.13-15)

Summary of the issues: The questions explored the circumstances and conditions in which conversion of both modern and historic rural buildings to another use should be supported, and when a use other than employment use would be preferable.

Summary of responses: The majority of comments were supportive of conversions subject to various criteria listed below. A couple of responses suggested that redundant ‘ugly’ modern farm buildings should simply be removed and not replaced and at the other extreme, that very low or small older rural buildings could be significantly extended in height or footprint. One responded felt a policy to deal with this eventuality was unnecessary and that reliance should be placed on the Policy FP1 and generic design and transport policies. Several said that cases should all be dealt with on a ‘case by case’ basis.

Constraining factors on reuse for employment use referred to included:

- The impact on surrounding landscape (including cumulative effects), environment and the amenities of neighbours; including lighting, hours of use and signage. Also, the adequacy of basic services including foul drainage infrastructure
- The scale of the new use and the availability of services nearby
- Parking, sustainable transport services and access including the and nature of vehicle movements likely to be generated the routeing to the nearest ‘A’ and ‘B’ class roads
- The Environment Agency pointed to flood risk – it was recognised that flood resistance and resilience measures may be appropriate in the case of conversions in areas of flood risk.

A number of comment were made about when a community use might be preferable; referring to the significance of the lack of availability of facilities locally and the aspirations of Parish Plans and Neighbourhood Plans as reflections of public support for reuse of buildings for such proposals. Parish Councils might also identify buildings as ‘community assets’.

In relation to the conversion of historic and older buildings many referred to the critical importance of maintaining the character and visual appearance of the original, although whether the hidden structure was ‘sound’ or needed to be rebuilt was not generally thought to be significant. Natural England drew attention to the importance of understanding the impact on wildlife inhabiting redundant buildings and yards including protect species to which licensing procedures apply; they drew attention to their ‘Biodiversity Planning Toolkit’ to help incorporate biodiversity into development. English Heritage drew attention to the Practice Guidance available on the HELM website in relation to rural building conversions.

**Sustainable location of development, transportation and infrastructure**

**Maximising development in the most sustainable locations (Q.16)**

**Summary of the issue:** Policies should direct development to the most sustainable locations but should higher building and densities be encouraged at the most sustainable locations with a design justification for anything above 2 storeys?

**Summary of responses:** Of the responses only one supported any form of ‘presumption’ for development to not exceed two storeys. The vast majority supported encouraging higher densities of development at the most sustainable locations (taking account of a range of factors), but that this should respond to the characteristics of the site and surroundings and not any ‘blanket’ standard. A number of comments suggested the inclusion of density standards on Site Specific allocations to ensure site potential is realised.

**When to allow employment uses to locate outside of settlement boundaries? (Q.17)**

**Summary of the issue:** Of the responses the majority urged varying degrees of caution or restraint on encouraging any development outside of settlement limits and site allocations – they limits should remain precisely this. A small number of exceptions were referred to including buildings for agricultural use, those connected with work or buildings of historical importance. One commercial respondent pointed to the need to not undermine site allocations by then supporting speculative
proposals elsewhere – the onus should be placed on such developers to demonstrate why a speculative development outside of boundaries should be supported. Another referred to the potential for a ‘new’ site to come forward and replace an allocated site that had become ‘stuck’ – there should be a process to review Site Boundaries and Site Allocations to facilitate this.

Several respondents misinterpreted the question and referred to the case for exceptional rural housing whereas the question related to employment uses.

Broadband and communications infrastructure (Q.18)

Summary of the issue: The JCS requires all development to contribute to the provision of improved fast Broadband connections, the question explored whether development management policies could usefully contribute to this?

Summary response: The responses agreed to the importance of fast Broadband and to ensure provision made was suitably ‘future proof’ to new innovations. The desirability of development providing necessary ductwork and for CIL to provide necessary exchange network capacity was mentioned by several. Fibre optic connection was recognised as impractical in some rural locations where enhanced wireless connection was required. Interestingly, several saw the impact of new development / users on existing users Broadband speeds as an aspect of a location’s lack of capacity for new development.

A significant minority of the responses felt this was not a matter for development management policies and that provision should be a matter for the provider companies / utilities and CIL.

SECTION 3 - POLICIES FOR PEOPLE

Policies for housing

Ensuring delivery of sufficient housing (Qs. 19-21)

Summary of the issue: Three questions explored responses to a proposed Policy H1 which was drafted to ensure delivery the of necessary housing numbers, and in particular this proposed a contingency criteria to deal with planning applications in the event of the Council not having the necessary five year supply of available housing sites. (The policy was prepared in response to the draft NPPF which was suggesting that no local plan policies would apply in such a situation and only the NPPF. However, this threat was not carried forward into the published version of the NPPF and the need for the policy now needs to be re-evaluated.)

Summary of responses: The responses are nonetheless interesting in revealing priorities. The great majority of respondents thought the policy had value and provided a useful link to the JCS spatial strategy as it applies to the distribution of
housing in SNC. It was also said that the Council should be explaining what it will do in the event of a shortage of sites.

A virtually unanimous view was that a lack of a five year supply should not mean good locally agreed sustainable planning principles should be abandoned, and that local priorities should apply. The most frequently mentioned priorities were:

- The need to avoid coalescence between settlements and ribbon development, and to maintain the essential rural character of the district and the identity of individual places
- Local infrastructure capacity should not be exceeded
- That no place should not be overwhelmed by the scale or character of new development
- That environmental and heritage assets should be protected
- That local opinion including Parish Council and village and neighbourhood plans should not be ignored.

Ensuring the quality of housing (Qs. 22-24)

Summary of the issue: Three questions explored what guidance and standards the Council should apply to external space and internal space in new housing development. Further, if internal standards are applied, what form should they take? A Policy H2 was proposed to include objectives and expectations for design of external space and minimum standards for internal space.

Summary of responses: Most people supported design guidance of external space, with less support for external space standards. A minority of respondents objected to guidance too. The importance of avoiding prescription and formulaic design and providing for market choice and ensuring consultation with parish / town councils and local people in the design process were stressed by many. Key issues to be addressed in guidance included:

- Minimum off-street parking standards
- Adequately sized streets for service and emergency vehicles alongside any street parking and pedestrian safety
- Utility space, including waste recycling provision (at household and local communal levels)
- Gardens that provide privacy and play space for small children
- Design that creates a sense of place and a distinct rural or urban character depending on location.

In relation to the prescription of internal space standards of some form there was 2:1 support – this was not entirely a case ‘communities for’ motivated by negative factors and ‘housing industry against’. The support ranged from those wanting minimum bedroom sizes to those wanting the standards to be applied with flexibility. Those against stressed: that minimum standards can become a ‘norm’; the need for market choice; for house builders to be able to use their knowledge and to respond to changing patterns of demand; the availability of other minimum controls; and the likely increase in housing costs if minimum standards are applied.
The majority of those supporting some form of standard thought it should be statutory rather than guidance; the only alternative source to the HCA quality indicator mentioned was the recent RIBA publication.

**Meeting the housing needs of older people (Qs.25 & 26)**

**Summary of the issues:** Two questions explored: how the mix of housing should best meet the needs of young and old and whether it should include single storey houses; and whether existing policies for residential annexes should be relaxed?

**Summary of responses:** A great majority of the responses to the first question on housing mix supported the inclusion of some single storey accommodation. This should reflect local housing market assessment and also ensure that other special needs are accounted for. Several comments suggested a need for some specialist estates of sheltered single storey houses for special needs and for owner occupation, located close to appropriate facilities; others stressed the need to spread accommodation in order to house people close to their existing family network. The Environment Agency pointed to the particular vulnerability of single storey accommodation to flooding.

Of those responding to the question about Annexes the great majority were against further relaxation of policy.

**Design**

**Design quality (Qs.27 & 28)**

**Summary of the issues:** Two questions looked at the setting of general objectives and expectation of good design with a Proposed Policy D1 to sit with the Place Making Guide. Q 28 explored how the Council might promote innovative modern design that respects local character?

**Summary of responses:** General support amongst the responses for an objective based policy to support the Place Making Guide SPD and to apply JCS Policy 2, with some suggestions for improving the wording. One addition suggested was to refer to introducing the planning of SUDS ‘management train’ to the ‘base layer’ of the design process.

In terms of encouraging the best in new design a variety of comments on: the challenges that new high standards of building fabric and energy performance places on continuing vernacular design; the dangers of poorly executed replication of vernacular architecture appearing merely a pastiche; and the need for clear guidelines in order to avoid subjectively in assessing design. The focus should be on policies that put the focus on ensuring all developments enhance local distinctiveness and contribute to a sense of place, that buildings are of a scale and design that respects character and setting and form of the surroundings.
Parking design and standards (Q.29)

**Summary of the issue:** Should the Council produce parking standards and what principles should underline these?

**Summary of responses:** Of the responses the overwhelming majority supported the introduction of standards. These should be based on providing enough off-street residential parking to meet actual needs and encourage greener travel modes where practical. Design Guidance should address drainage and the need to protect water Source Protection Zones. There was expressed doubt about whether garage spaces should be counted as part of a minimum parking space provision unless they were of good size and their availability for use could be ensured.

Encouragement of country houses of truly outstanding or innovative design (Q.30)

**Summary of the issue:** The question addressed in what circumstances a truly outstanding or innovative house design in the countryside might be justified and whether it might help raise the standard of design in South Norfolk.

**Summary of responses:** There was no support in the responses for encouraging such building in the open countryside. Whereas there was good support for encouraging high quality design and innovation it was generally it was agreed that all development should be on sustainability principles and exemplar buildings should equally be in sustainable locations within settlement boundaries. Several comments referred to the likelihood of this issue being addressed in the NPPF and a significant minority queried how ‘outstanding quality’ could be properly assessed. An expert panel and a voice for the local community were both advocated.

Sustainable communities

Open space and community facilities (Q.31)

**Summary of the issue:** A question asked for comments on the community facilities and the Councils existing Open Space standards – SNLP Policy LEI7 refers.

**Summary of response:** The responses addressed a range of issues. In relation to the LEI7 standards a number commented that the standards based on achieving the NPFA standards were out of date – the local standards should address the actual need in the locality rather achievement of a national standard. Several comments referred to the imminent replacement of the PPS 17 national policies by the NPPF and that certain new play space provision will be achieved through CIL funded, JCS green infrastructure strategy.

A number of comments spoke of the value of multi-functional open spaces and Natural England suggested use of their ANGS national standard for access to accessible natural open space.
The Theatres Trust wanted policies to address the protection of indoor community facilities and theatres.

**Safeguarding local shops and facilities (Q.32)**

**Summary of the issue:** The question explored how the future viability of premises for local shops and other facilities could be fairly assessed when change to another use was proposed?

**Summary of responses:** The responses raised a range of different points. It was generally agreed as important to protect such facilities but difficult to assess potential viability of premises and the actual performances achieved by current management. Several suggested reference to audited accounts from the previous 5 years trading; evidence of marketing; and evidence reviewing the availability and performance of comparable facilities. Other comments focussed on taking a view about future potential by looking at the profile of the changing profile of the local population and the plans for growth.

**Responding to Localism and neighbourhood planning (Q.33)**

**Summary of the issue:** How can development management policies best help explain and set the framework for how Localism will operate in South Norfolk?

**Summary of responses:** The responses made a series of interesting points:
- Several commented that Localism Act was separate legislation and at most any related statements should be restricted to advisory text rather than part of statutory planning policy
- Several opposing comments point to the need for the Plan to clarify whether ‘precedence’ is to be given to Neighbourhood Development Plans (NDPs) over the Development Management Policies and the Sites Policies DPD, and what is required to show ‘general conformity’ of NDPs with the Core Strategy (Section 8 Sch 10 Localism Act requires)
- The Theatre Trust pointed out that under the Localism Act 2011 Part 5, Chapter 3 Assets of Community Value obligations on the LPA to consult their body under the (GPD)(England) Order 2010 on all applications involving ‘any land on which there is a theatre’ should now extend to the producers of NDPs – a similar principle might now apply to other bodies?
- Guidance should be given to neighbourhoods on how to prepare NDPs
- That higher status should be given to Parish Plans and Village Plans too. For many smaller communities it was simply impractical to produce a NDP but other community led plans have legitimacy and should be adopted as supplementary guidance by the LPA as such.

In terms of improving public engagement references were made to:
- Planners engaging with local communities and establishing a three way dialogue with developers and communities on major proposals
- Feedback – the Council should reflect back to communities how their input has influenced decisions about development
- Simplification of language
- There should be a requirement for developers to meaningfully engage with the community at an early stage.

SECTION 4 - POLICIES FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

Adapting to and mitigating the effects of climate change

Low carbon and renewable energy and the use of water, development in areas at risk of flooding (Qs.34 & 35)

Summary of the issues: The questions sought examples of good practice, any evidence to favour particular types of renewable energy technology, and mitigating factors to take into account in areas of flooding.

Summary of responses: A common response was that the relatively high levels of sunshine and visually open landscape of South Norfolk favoured solar over wind power. Several felt ground source heat pumps were the least intrusive for new development and several favoured communal scale solutions as part of larger new development. Most stressed the need to reduce energy and water use with new homes that will be efficient over the building’s lifetime.

The Broads Authority drew attention to the Broads Landscape Capacity Study for Turbine, PV Arrays and Associated Infrastructure Requirements for Renewable Energy Production’ and stressed the need for the two authorities to consider inter-visibility.

On flooding, the great majority thought there should be no change in current approach and that development should only take place in areas prone to flood in exceptional cases. The Environment Agency and Anglian Water gave detailed responses referring to PPS25 and the impending NPPF, and to Part H of the Building Regulations and National SUDs Standards respectively.

Natural Environment

Non-designated but highly valued open spaces in and around settlements (Q.36)

Summary of the issues: The question explored whether development management policies should do anything to ensure proper consideration of such space.

Summary of responses: A significant minority strongly objected to policies to protect non-designated open spaces and stated that national policy (PPS7 para 24-25) opposed such area based landscape designations. If an area was warranted designation it should be designated.
A number of responses spoke of the intrinsic value of open countryside and its importance to rural communities. The Geographical Society referred to the enhancement of geodiversity by the preserving of small exposures as part of development. Thurton Parish Council commented that SNC and communities should work together to systematically identify important open spaces just as they are with looking for sites for development in the Sites DPD.

**Protection of landscape, trees and hedges (Q.37)**

**Summary of the issues:** The question explored whether a separate policy for landscape, trees and hedges was required or whether these matters should be dealt with as part of a general design considerations policy.

**Summary of responses:** The responses were completely divided with a small majority favouring a separate policy. Those wanting the issues dealt with as part of the general design considerations policy stressed the need to streamline the number of policies and/or felt that this would reinforce the importance of landscape considerations as an integral part of the design process. On the other hand, those wanting a separate policy thought this would help ensure the importance of the issues was recognised and given proper consideration.

Two other distinct points were made by those wanting policies organised differently:

- The Broads Authority favoured addressing landscape considerations on the site and immediate surrounding within a general design considerations policy, and distinctly, the impact of development on the wider landscape in a separate policy. This was particularly important for development in the countryside and also where there was inter-visibility with adjacent districts or the Broads Planning Area.
- The Geological Society of Norfolk consider that landscape should encompass landform (geomorphology). They consider that the preservation of landform is important and best dealt with alongside the rest of geodiversity (and biodiversity) as was indicated in PPS9. Soft landscaping was better dealt with in a separate policy however this is arranged.

**Historic Environment**

**Development impacting on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas (Q.38)**

**Summary of the issue:** The question explored how the Council can encourage development of the highest quality that respects local building traditions, and innovative modern design that respects local character and heritage?

**Summary of response:** All of the responses agreed it was important to get these matters right; a number pointed to the need to respect local design features and that engagement with local communities, architects and builders would help. The important role of the Place Making Guide was mentioned by several.
English Heritage note that the draft NPPF refers to the historic environment among topics to be addressed in local plan strategic policies. They consider the JCS coverage is limited and recommend that the DM policies include strategic policy in this area. They support the DM policy as proposed but consider it should link to a strategy for the historic environment; this should include policies for addressing and the monitoring of heritage assets at risk.

Norfolk County Council supported the suggested policy and suggested additions. They consider that archaeology should be fully addressed and the potential for previously unknown or unrecorded heritage assets should be investigated on sites of over 1ha. Also, that certain types of business premises have historic and archaeological significance as heritage assets and evidence of their significance and the impact of development upon this should be required.

SECTION 5 – ANYTHING ELSE?

Important parts of the soon to be deleted national planning policies and guidance, that the Council should reproduce? (Q.39)

Summary of the issue: Important parts of the soon to be deleted national planning policies and guidance, that the Council should reproduce?

Summary of responses: Several respondents warned that the spirit of Government policy was to streamline the planning system and that it would be contrary to include additional guidance purely because it had been deleted at national level.

Several pointed out that it will be necessary to await the publication of the NPPF in final form to allow proper a review, and one respondent suggested an extension of the consultation period by 4 weeks to allow this. A range of aspects were considered important to carry forward by various respondents:

- The importance of supporting the rural economy
- That local plan policies should include reference to the higher level NPPF policies relied upon to make it easier for the reader to understand the whole range of relevant planning policies
- The Mobile Operators Association consider it necessary to include a positive generic criteria based policy for telecommunications equipment to replace PPG8. A draft policy is proposed.
- The Environment Agency pointed to the lack on guidance in the draft NPPF on water quality, the requirements of the Water Framework Directive and Contaminated Land
Is there anything else you want to say? (Q.40)

Summary of the issue: The consultation document and questions had focussed on some key issues identified by the Council but was not intended to address everything that might be included in the policies, was there anything else really important respondents wished to say?

Summary of responses: A wide variety of points can be summarised thus:
- The importance of keeping the identity of towns and villages intact
- Maintaining rural character of the district
- Importance of resisting all night outdoor lighting and street lighting in rural villages
- The Sustainability Framework Objectives (SFO) (Appendix A of the consultation document) should be developed with guidance and examples of how these might be achieved
- Add further SFO ENV 10 to ensure that all new build and existing sewage and surface water schemes are coordinated
- Add further SFO ENV11 to ensure communities achieve 2.00ha natural space per 1000 residents
- The design principles policy should include reference to water efficiency and JCS Policy 3
- The importance of rural local needs housing
- In relation to new shopping and town centre uses – the Council should allocate sufficient sites based on up-to-date evidence of economic development and retail capacity and need, and assessment of the capacity of town centre sites for new floorspace. Any locally adopted thresholds for requiring a sequential site assessment should be proportionate to the scale of the towns affected, the catchment of the development proposal. It is important that the LPA and developers engage at pre-application stage to agree the basis of retail impact assessments and sequential site assessments
- That the Duty to Cooperate presents further opportunity to cooperate in the operation of planning documents and further the work done with the GNDP
- The districts have a Duty to Cooperate with the Norfolk County Council. In particular in relation to transport, infrastructure delivery, SUDs and adult social care
- There should be cross references to CIL through the GNDP and to other planning obligations for matters such as on-site infrastructure, land transfer, highways and on-site infrastructure
- There needs to be facility for considering cross boarder impacts for the parishes that boarder another district, and one parish on another
- The Broads Authority would like to see more prominence given to the Broads Planning Area, including criteria for development proposals in the vicinity of the Broads with particular reference to landscape impacts, flood and water quality risks, development in the open countryside, and the interdependence of the Broads and South Norfolk planning areas in terms of community identity, facilities, and recreational and economic value. The Policies should make clear that they do not apply in those parts of South Norfolk District in the designated Broads area.
- Density should be reduced
• Neighbourhood Boards should be consulted
• Brownfield sites should be developed in preference to Greenfield
• The importance of the overarching definition of sustainability is key
• No more Homezones – dangerous
• The policies should give more consideration of Surface Water flooding and the management of surface water
• Localism is about reflecting the need of the people at a local level and ensuring that decisions and power comes from that level – need to show more recognition of the need for and use of the evidence of consultation, to demonstrate that this is actually what is being provided for
• Parish Council views must be given weight and when not concurred with, the PC must be advised why. There should be facility for PC to appeal decisions where permission is granted against their views
• There should be discussion about the future consultation arrangements and roles between the parishes and district councils
• Use of plain English and simplify planning
• Support existing businesses located in the countryside – these can make a significant contribution to the rural economy.
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<td>Allan Irvine</td>
<td>Allan Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Durrant</td>
<td>Durrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Whithan</td>
<td>South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Horspole</td>
<td>South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Thornton</td>
<td>For South Norfolk Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agenda items

   After a welcome by TH and introductions around the table, MT gave a presentation on the Development Management Policies and led into discussion around some of the issues addressed in the Summary Questionnaire.

2. Some key issues – discussion around the questions in the ‘issues and options’ documents

Q.1 What make development sustainable?
   - Generally acceptance of the suggestion that the Sustainability Appraisal should be the starting point for determining what is sustainable development. Should look to the SA framework indicators to identify what is sustainable.
   - General feeling that location was the key factor in achieving sustainable development.

Q.6 Increased flexibility for commercial uses?
   - The whole group was supportive of more flexibility. Planning aspirations should be realistic about market forces. However there should be with ‘sensible’ limits to the flexibility.
   - Generally agreed that the key issue is whether the new uses will support the particular business area, therefore the appropriate uses will vary on a case by case basis. May need to be more restrictive at locations where seeking to create a particular type of business characteristic. e.g. More restrictive at the NRC?
   - Agreement that the mix of business / industrial uses at an employment locations can be problematic too – e.g. the location of a proposed waste incinerator at Eye conflicts with aspirations for smart BI uses at the frontage.
   - Similarly, must recognise that a range of different type and ‘quality’ of business areas are needed to cater for all the necessary types of business and each will be differ in character / market values etc.
   - Several comments that industrial estate locations are often attractive to shops and services simply because they are accessible and cheap (an example of £8sq.ft vs £48sq.ft quoted) for comparison of some estate and some town centre locations. Reference made to estates outside of Diss compared to the town centre.
   - The Council’s concern to avoid open retailing moving onto convenient out-of-town employment locations were generally recognised and accepted, however no one disagreed with one comment that in this part of the country a bigger threat to town centres appears be the impact of internet shopping.

Q13 – reuse of redundant farm buildings?
   - A suggestion that we introduce a default starting point that employment use is always acceptable in redundant rural buildings was supported by many. It was then the case for an exception to be demonstrated.
   - Generally agreed that current Policy needs to change. General agreement with one comment made that the requirement for long periods of marketing and other detailed evidence is a waste of everybody’s time – and that a simple commercial viability ‘formula’
will show whether the costs of conversion for an industrial rent return will ever be viable. Basic rural industrial values quoted at £2.4 sq.ft.

- The requirements of the funding and finance institutions should be better understood and that these underpinned everything. One comment that many farmers don’t seem to understand this either met some agreement. They can make irrational decisions leading to both unviable investments and refusal to raise capital for a development – missing out on good opportunities.
- Waveney’s Policy referred to by one as being far worse!
- Policy expectations of achieving ‘rustic craft workshops’ and high quality offices in heritage quality rural conversions are likely to be unrealistic. High costs of conversion will be unaffordable for crafts and there will be no demand to travel to a remote locations for an office space necessarily at some £8 sq.ft.
- Conversion of outbuildings for business uses where the owner lives on elsewhere site can be viable and should be allowed. Sustainable pattern of development. Agreement that this may require allowing some retail use as a ‘shop window’ to the business - even if the business principally it relies on internet sales and/or delivery services. e.g. Furniture making.

Q22-23 – residential standards?

- Generally comments were very much against the introduction of minimum internal space standards. Considered that this will: deter house building by increasing costs, reducing land values and therefore reducing the supply of sites coming to market.
- Comment that external standards will lead to formulaic design.
- RSLs have minimum space and performance standards – for the benefit of occupiers who have no choice in the market. The Policy will apply to market housing only. Some comments that LPA should not attempt to intervene in the open market - it should be left to buyers to choose what size property they buy. Comments that ‘it’s a buyers market’ and they won’t buy something they don’t want.
- Comment that we have the code for sustainable homes and parts for buildings regulations to give some uniform standards.
- One comment that if we have minimum sizes – who is going to check all the sizes? What will the LPA do if a unit is only a couple of sq.m. under the minimum? On the other hand, it was noted that applicants we will need to give precise dimensions for CIL purposes.

NB. Outside of the meeting, several attendees expressed support for some minimum standards

Q.25 – single storey housing?

- General agreement to one comment that a requirement to include bungalows in schemes will lead to less efficient use of land and will be less sustainable on some criteria (as will a requirement to increase the size of houses with minimum space standards). More Greenfield land will be required! It was asked if Members really appreciated this?
- One comment that we would need to remove PD to maintain the stock of bungalows in perpetuity, others felt this would be unjustifiable.
- Some questioning of what evidence there is to say there is a need for single storey homes in SNC?
- However, also a number of comments that in fact bungalows are popular and sell well so there is commercial interest in some provision. Appeared to be some sympathy for Members preference for bungalows over Lifetime Homes standards.
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- One comment that integrating single storey buildings into a scheme design could be problematic.

Q.19 - five year housing supply?

- Generally felt that a Policy was not necessary – SNC have a short-term problem; should ‘get on with it’ and allocate adequate land quickly.
- Also a general view that this is really a political not a technical problem – a reluctance to allocate more sites than absolutely necessary.
- One comment met with wide agreement – that SNC should allocate more sites, perhaps aiming for a 10 year supply of available sites so that this problem doesn’t reoccur. These could be phased, if a first phase site doesn’t perform then relegate to a later phase or delete it altogether and bring forward another.
- Another suggestion was to establish a ‘strategic reserve’ of sites as a contingency.


- There was interest in further discussion and also in the use of social networking media for ‘virtual’ discussion. This may not be successful but it is worth a try.

4. Interest in re-establishing the Planning User Panel (or similar) for a targets set of tasks and timescale?

- Generally agreed that this was a good idea. Probably with less people than here present.
- General support for a suggestion that a small number of key Members attend in order to help them understand the market perspective and to discuss issues.
- Officers undertook to take this suggestion to the Leadership.
Review of Scrutiny

Scrutiny Officer

This report outlines a review of the amendments made to Scrutiny Committee a year ago, namely the TOPIC analysis, scrutiny report template and suggested approach report and how these have improved the scrutiny process.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma Nangle 01508 533747 <a href="mailto:enangle@s-norfolk.gov.uk">enangle@s-norfolk.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Purpose of Scrutiny

1.1. In late 2010, a review of the effectiveness of scrutiny at South Norfolk was conducted by officers and the Chairman of Scrutiny Committee with the view to ensuring that

- member and officer time is spent efficiently;
- reports are produced on time, to clear objectives and within scope; and
- reports have a real purpose and will make a difference to the work of the Council and/or the lives of residents.

1.2. In order to achieve the objectives above, the following were developed and their use endorsed by Scrutiny Committee at its meeting in February 2011.

- a flowchart that details a process by which items are added to the work programme.
- TOPIC analysis, by which members and officers should evaluate the merits of investigating an issue suggested by members.
- a new Scrutiny report template and “suggested approach” report template.

1.3. This report will evaluate whether the changes have made scrutiny more effective and asks if members consider that any further amendments are necessary.
2. **Scope of Scrutiny**

2.1. This report aims to evaluate the changes made to the scrutiny process in the last twelve months, including the new report templates, TOPIC analysis (is it Timely, Objectives, Performance, Interest, Corporate Priority) and mechanism for adding items to the committee work programmes.

3. **Findings**

3.1. The new report templates have now been in use since May 2011 and are used for reports received by Scrutiny Committee and each of the Overview Sub-Committees (OSCs). The report template has led to the production of more focussed reports that clearly identify the findings of investigations made. Members have recently congratulated officers on clear and concise reports that they have trust in, which is partly a result of clearly defined reporting, with evidenced recommendations. This is not only of benefit to members who are able to make better informed decisions, but it also ensures that the scrutiny process is more transparent for the public. Clear evidence has also given more weight to recommendations of the Committees, which on the whole are accepted.

3.2. The Suggested Approach report has been used a number of times in the last year and has saved officer time as it avoided the need for a full report. The style of report encouraged debate amongst members as it gives the Committee the option to investigate the issue further if they are not satisfied with the information provided or with the outcome that officer have recommended.

3.3. TOPIC analysis of suggested items to be added to work programmes has been in use for 12 months, in which time it has not been extensively used. This is partly due to the fact that most items added to the work programmes have been raised by members in committee meetings and generally have been reviewing issues raised in a report being discussed at the time – a 12-monthly review for example. It is also a result of few items being raised outside of committee by members. All potential items are discussed with officers with the TOPIC analysis in mind and it is also hoped that members consider the TOPIC analysis when proposing items. The fact that this type of analysis is not heavily relied upon suggests that reports put forward by members are appropriate and relevant.

3.4. The use of the flowchart and process that it outlines has also had limited use, again due to limited items being suggested by members. The Scrutiny Officer, relevant member and report author have met to discuss the scope of reports ahead of their production, to good effect – for instance the review of Local Democracy Week and the review of the role of the Council Chairman. This ensures that the report author is clear of what is expected of the report and members receive the information they have requested, by which they can make informed judgements. This has been particularly of use when officers have been asked to conduct a review as officers are clear of the scope at an early stage so can focus on the areas that members are particularly interested in. This also means that officers should not be surprised by questions put forward by members at Committee.

3.5. In order to continually improve, steps are being taken to review the efficiency and effectiveness of the report writing process, which will take into account the points
raised in this report. This will not be limited only to scrutiny and will cover all reports. It is hoped that the already good standard of reports at the Council can be built upon, ensuring reports are timely, concise and to scope.

4. Relevant Corporate Priorities

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

4.2. Promoting a thriving local economy.

4.3. Supporting communities to realise their potential.

4.4. Driving services through being businesslike, efficient and customer aware.

5. Implications and Risks

5.1. None

6. Conclusion

6.1. Overall, it appears that the new report templates and processes have been well received by both members and officers. No negative feedback regarding the new ways of working has been received. Reports now have a definite focus on scrutiny, rather than Cabinet, by concentrating on findings and evidence. Generally, reports are also more concise as both members and officers are clear on the scope of the report and what is required. It is also hoped that the recently developed Pre-Scrutiny Guidelines will lead to further improvements and add to the weight and effectiveness of scrutiny.

6.2. Work in the future will focus on how members can fully utilise the scrutiny process and develop balanced work programmes based on clear and achievable objectives. However, this would not result in quantity overshadowing quality of reports.

7. Action Required

7.1. Members note the report and discuss whether any further changes should be implemented.
Recommendation from the Localism and Neighbourhoods Overview Sub-Committee to Scrutiny Committee

Scrutiny Officer

This report details the recommendation of Localism and Neighbourhoods Overview Sub-Committee (OSC) to Scrutiny Committee, arising from the consideration of the “Neighbourhood Board Review” report at the meeting of the OSC on 23 April 2012.

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

Contact Officer, telephone number, and e-mail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Telephone number</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma Nangle</td>
<td>01508 533747</td>
<td><a href="mailto:enangle@s-norfolk.gov.uk">enangle@s-norfolk.gov.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Neighbourhood Board Review**

1.1. The Localism and Neighbourhoods OSC considered a report on the possible scope and process for the review of the Neighbourhood Boards at its meeting on 23 April 2012. The report recommended that a Scrutiny Task and Finish Group be established to carry out a review of the five Boards.

1.2. Members considered the report and attached proposed Terms of Reference (appendix A) and after discussion were in agreement with the proposal. Members noted that other aspects of the Community Empowerment work would be reviewed by Scrutiny Committee at its December meeting and therefore would not be covered by the Task and Finish Group. The OSC made the following recommendations to Scrutiny Committee:

   1. To recommend to the Scrutiny Committee that a task and finish group be established and that the work of the group concludes with its recommendation being made to the Scrutiny Committee on 5 September 2012 and to Council on 24 September 2012.
2. To endorse the Terms of Reference for the Neighbourhood Board Task and Finish Group as detailed in the report, and recommend them to the Scrutiny Committee.

2. Recommendations

2.1. That Scrutiny Committee considers the recommendations set out in paragraph 1.2 of this report and establishes a Neighbourhood Board Review Scrutiny Task and Finish Group.
APPENDIX A

Proposed Terms of Reference for the Neighbourhood Board Review Task & Finish Group

Name of Group: Neighbourhood Board Review Task & Finish Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Outcome</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Council and the neighbourhood boards themselves will have a clearer understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the Neighbourhood Boards and as such be able to work more objectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Boards working more efficiently on behalf of their communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local residents will have a better understand the mechanism for getting involved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Boards clearly articulate local needs and reflect local priorities accurately, through comprehensive community engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Objectives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging community contact with the Council and a greater emphasis on the role of neighbourhood boards as a significant opportunity for residents to engage with the Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the involvement and engagement of residents in neighbourhoods consultations and decision making to help shape local services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring that the Neighbourhood Boards are fit for purpose to play a key role in the Council’s Community Empowerment element of the Localism Act</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Boards are promoted and utilised as being the “community conduit” for partners agencies and strategic partners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building the excellent reputation of the Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits Sought</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local communities benefit from the growth in their neighbourhood area through having an influence on future service delivery locally;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council services become even more responsive to local needs;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community influence provides more direct, local influence over the level of service delivery in a local area;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More local communities, organisations and volunteers are involved in delivery;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident/Political acceptance of continuing investment in the Neighbourhood Boards as an effective way of communicating with them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Communities, individuals and locally based organisations will be fully engaged in the community empowerment process;

Provides greater community focus to the Council’s services, supporting the corporate priority.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Deliverables</th>
<th>Alignment of the development and growth of the Neighbourhood Boards alongside other organisations, including larger Town and Parish Councils.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To improve the development and training of Board members including the chair and vice chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A revised approach to the membership and constitution of Neighbourhood Boards and governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A framework for how Neighbourhood Boards are able to influence decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Milestones (2012)</th>
<th>May – Establish Task &amp; Finish Group, agree Terms of Reference, plan work and schedule meetings, group meets to commence the review.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June/July – Task and Finish group meets to agree draft recommendations and undertake the review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July/August – Task and Finish Group meets to propose revised approach to membership, roles and responsibilities and suggests amendments to the Terms of Reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August – Presentation of recommendations on the new approach to Neighbourhood Boards to Scrutiny Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September - Scrutiny Committee presents recommendations on the revised approach to Neighbourhood Boards to full Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Stakeholders</th>
<th>Attendees at Neighbourhood Board meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Residents (inc. respondents to the Participatory Budgeting consultation exercise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrutiny Committee and members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CMT / Board / Cabinet / NB Chairmen and Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Officers / Locality &amp; Communities Team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Key Resources         | Deputy Leader and Chairmen of the Neighbourhood Boards |
| Leader, Cabinet, Chief Executive / CMT          |
| Peer Review Team (feedback and comments)      |
| Staff and Members, especially the Locality & Communities Team |

| Key Risks                  | Reputation of the Council |
|                          | Political and public concern |

| Membership of the group | The T&F Group will comprise of three Conservative Members and one Liberal Democrat (to be appointed) |

| Approved by the Chief Executive / CMT | Date: 12 April 2012 |