Scrutiny Committee

Thursday 10 November 2016

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

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

Large print version can be made available

Contact: Sue Elliott on 01508 533669 or democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Members of the Scrutiny Committee:

Cllr L Neal (Chairman)
Cllr T Lewis (Vice-Chairman)
Cllr B Bernard
Cllr B Duffin
Cllr D Fulcher
Cllr C Gould
Cllr K Kiddie
Cllr G Minshull
Cllr J Wilby

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

1. To report apologies for absence and identify substitute voting members (if any);

2. To deal with any items of business the Chairman decides should be considered as matters 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 attached page 6)

4. To confirm the minutes of the Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 28 September 2016; (copy attached – page 7)

5. Diss Heritage Triangle; (report attached – page 10)

6. Review of the Five-Year Land Supply Methodology; (report attached – page 17)

7. Scrutiny Work Programme, Tracker and Cabinet Core Agenda; (attached – page 27)
Working style of the Scrutiny Committee and a protocol for those attending

**Independence**
Members of the Scrutiny Committee will not be subject to whipping arrangements by party groups.

**Member leadership**
Members of the Committee will take the lead in selecting topics for and in questioning witnesses. The Committee 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 Committee will be constructive, and not judgmental, accepting that effective overview and scrutiny is best achieved through challenging and constructive enquiry. People giving evidence at the Committee should not feel under attack.

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

**Openness and transparency**
The Committee’s 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 Committee 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 Committee will give impartial and independent advice, recognising the importance of the Scrutiny Committee 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. Members 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 Committee 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

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

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

Should Members have any concerns relating to interests they have, they are encouraged to contact the Monitoring Officer (or Deputy) or another member of the Democratic Services Team in advance of the meeting.
Minutes of a meeting of the Scrutiny Committee of South Norfolk District Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton on 28 September 2016 at 9.30am.

Committee Members Present:
Councillors: L Neal (Chairman), B Bernard, B Duffin, D Fulcher, K Kiddie, and G Minshull

Apologies
Councillors: T Lewis, C Gould and J Wilby

Substitute
Councillors: V Bell for T Lewis and T Palmer for J Wilby

Cabinet Members in Attendance:
Councillors: Y Bendle and K Mason Billig

Officers in Attendance:
The Director of Community Services (P Boyce), the Head of Environmental Services (B Wade), the Waste Resources Manager (I Kerrison) and the Senior Governance Officer (E Goddard)

1177 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held on 28 June 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
Following a brief introduction from Cllr Mason Billig, the Head of Environmental Services presented his report which detailed the background and issues leading to the review of the Council’s waste collection rounds. He explained the reasons for the changes, implemented in June 2016, and the objectives sought by implementing a four-day collection service.

The Committee commended the Head of Environmental Services and his team for their hard work and dedication in ensuring the substantial changes to the service were achieved with minimal disruption and confusion to residents. Members were also pleased to note that there had been considerable communication between managers and staff during the transition and that the workforce had recognised the need to future-proof the service in view of the significant increase in housing growth in parts of the District. It was also noted that there had previously been imbalances within the waste collection rounds but that these had been addressed to ensure that the workloads of individual crews were more balanced.

In response to a member’s question, officers advised that although there were likely to be a few minor changes to the rounds in the future, the Council now had a good model in place for the next two to five years, which could accommodate any alterations as they arose.

Members discussed the levels of contamination in South Norfolk’s recycling due to the incorrect disposal of waste by residents in the green re-cycling bins. Although South Norfolk Council had the lowest contamination rate in the county, officers agreed that more communication to residents was needed to ensure that people were aware of which items were suitable for recycling and which should instead be placed in their black refuse bins. The Committee discussed the various ways in which the Council could remind customers of the correct practises, including the provision of bin stickers and through written communications via the Link Magazine. The Director of Community Services advised that the Council would need to consider a marketing plan to incorporate multiple channels of communication to residents. It was also suggested that raising residents’ awareness of the consequences and loss of income caused by the contamination of recycled waste might help to alleviate the problem. Cllr Billig advised that the Norfolk Waste Partnership was looking at ways to educate residents in the correct disposal of their waste and was targeting its work in areas where problems had been identified.

Members briefly discussed the depot at Ketteringham, and were pleased to note that plans were in place to optimise the depot and upgrade the staff facilities.

The Committee agreed that when undertaking its further review of the Route Optimisation Delivery in July 2017, they would also review the Council’s contamination statistics, recycling targets and marketing campaigns.
It was then:

**RESOLVED:** To note the content of the Route Optimisation Delivery Review report, and to commend the Head of Environmental Services and his team for their hard work and dedication in ensuring the success of the implementation a four-day collection service.

1179 **SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME AND TRACKER, AND CABINET CORE AGENDA**

The Committee noted the Work Programme, Tracker and Cabinet Core Agenda.

The Senior Governance Officer advised the Committee that the Chairman of the South Norfolk Clinical Commissioning Group (SNCCG) would no longer be attending the meeting of Scrutiny on 10 November 2016. It was noted that a presentation would instead be made by Cllr Legg and the Independent Living Team Leader to update the Committee of the work that had been undertaken by the Council and the SNCCG during the past six months.

It was also noted that a further item, “a Review of the Diss Heritage Triangle” had been added to the Scrutiny Committee Work Programme for 10 November 2016, and that representatives from the Diss Heritage Triangle would be invited to attend the meeting.

(The meeting concluded at 10:18 am)

_________________
Chairman
Diss Heritage Triangle

Report of the Governance and Business Manager
Cabinet Member: Councillor Michael Edney, Finance and Resources / Councillor Clayton Hudson, Stronger Communities and Leisure

CONTACT
Leah Mickleborough, 01508 533954
lmickleborough@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1 In September 2014, Cabinet agreed to provide a funding package totalling £400,000 towards the Diss Heritage Triangle Project.

1.2 This report seeks to demonstrate how the Council’s funding has been spent, and how the package of funding is being delivered.

2. Background

2.1 In 2014, South Norfolk Council was approached to provide financial support towards the Diss Heritage Triangle Project. This project sought to regenerate the historic centre of Diss, seeking to create the Triangle as a destination and centre of attraction for residents and visitors alike. The project will provide:

- Refurbishments of the Corn Hall, to provide a sustainable, flexible and exciting building with modern facilities;
- An identity for the Triangle, making the streets more pedestrian friendly and reverse the economic and social decline of the area;
- A boardwalk to take pedestrians across the Mere to a landscaped wildlife garden, leading up towards the Market Hill

2.2 The potential of the project was clear. Of the 50,000 visitors each week to Tesco’s and Morrison’s in the Town, over 40% never cross the road towards the Town Centre as “there is too little to tempt them”. The project sought to improve the town’s offer, and even if just an additional 10% of people would visit the town, it would add up to 250,000 additional visitors to the Town Centre each year, improving the viability of the Town’s many small businesses and aligning to the Market Towns Initiative.

2.3 South Norfolk Council was being asked to make a major funding investment in just one part of its area, which had to be balanced against the needs of the wider District. To put simply, to invest in Diss to this extent, South Norfolk Council needed some benefit in return that would ultimately help support services in the wider District.
2.4 In that regard, a “package” was put forward to support the project, which can be summarised as follows:

- The Town Council would take on responsibility for a new toilet block to replace the current Mere toilets;
- The Town Council would be responsible for the activities carried out by the Tourist Information Centre which would be delivered from the Corn Hall
- The Corn Hall toilet facilities would be made available for public use, free of charge, for stated office opening hours

2.5 This package could support a financial offer of £400,000 towards the project, which it was expected would be funded through Council reserves as a grant, and the sale proceeds from 9 Park Road, Diss. A funding agreement was entered into between South Norfolk Council and Diss Town Council to confirm the terms on which the funding offer was made.

3. Current Position/Findings

Heritage Triangle

3.1 Representatives from the Heritage Triangle Project will be present at the Scrutiny meeting to present the progress they have achieved. In summary, the Corn Hall refurbishment is now nearing completion, whilst the formal consultation process on changes to the Streetscene will soon begin, with work scheduled to run between April and June 2017. Further information can be found from the Heritage Triangle website, www.heritagetriangle.co.uk

3.2 The funding agreement identifies milestones at which Council funding will be paid. The milestones were set in conjunction with the Heritage Triangle Project Manager, to best complement Heritage Lottery funding and to support the programme’s cashflow. This has meant that our funding is mostly committed towards the latter stages of the project; so far, £100,000 of Council funding has been released (with a further £50,000 due on completion of the Corn Hall) and the remaining funds will be used to support the development of the Streetscene, Boardwalk and Gardens and associated content / interpretation workstreams.
Toilets

3.3 At the time of determining the funding package for the Heritage Triangle, it was understood that the Toilets may be in need of substantial refurbishment due to problems with the foundations, however this will ultimately need to be formally determined following analysis of survey work. Once this has been formally determined, the Cabinet agreement requires that the Toilets will then be refurbished and transferred to the Town Council (subject to satisfactory transfer of the lease from the leaseholder, Diss Parochial Charities). Although the solution is yet to be determined, a careful cost benefit analysis will be undertaken before any final decision is made.

3.4 The requirement for public toilet provision at the Corn Hall has been preserved within the funding agreement.

Tourist Information Service

3.5 At the time of agreeing the funding package, the potential transfer of the Tourist Information Service was considered exempt as it was recognised that changing the delivery model could impact upon the staff currently operating the Service.

3.6 The Town Council subsequently worked with the Corn Hall Trust to develop a proposal that the service would be delivered by the Corn Hall Trust’s volunteer team, who would build on their existing local knowledge to provide a complementary service to the new Corn Hall offering. It was initially hoped that the Corn Hall would be open to deliver the service from September 2016 but delays to the project meant this deadline could not be achieved.

3.7 With the delay in the refurbishment in mind, it was decided to continue to provide the Tourist Information Service as normal throughout the summer period until the timing of the Corn Hall opening became clearer. Unfortunately, in September, local media became aware of the proposed changes which raised the matter in the public domain at the same time as the Councils and Corn Hall Trust were considering the options for future delivery.

3.8 It has now been confirmed that the Corn Hall should be opening in March 2017. Officers wrote to the Town Council to confirm that the current service will close at the end of December, and whilst it would be preferable for the Town Council to operate a service until the Corn Hall re-opens, there is ultimately a clear expectation that the new Service must be available for visitors in time for the School Easter Holidays. It is pleasing to be able to report that suitable redeployment opportunities have arisen for both permanent
members of staff based at the Centre and it is worth highlighting the feedback the Council has consistently received on the excellent customer service provided by the staff at the Centre.

3.9 We are now investigating alternative options for each aspect of the service with the Town Council and Corn Hall Trust, and current proposals are attached at Appendix 1. In addition, officers are seeking alternative uses for the current Tourist Information building that are complementary to the existing Town offer, ensuring the building’s future as a valued asset to the Town and are compliant with the terms of the leaseholder, Diss Parochial Charities.

3.10 The media reaction has caused some concern from the public and letters to the local papers, although to place in context, only 2 complaints have been received by South Norfolk Council. There have also been some comments in local media that are complimentary to the proposal, recognising the benefit the Heritage Triangle project could deliver.

3.11 The crux of the concerns raised is that the Mere site is the entry point to the Town for visitors. However, the purpose behind the Heritage Triangle Project is to draw people to the upper end of the Town, making it the primary destination with visitors who are then informed about, and attracted to the other aspects of the Town. Car parking options are available nearby, pedestrian friendly measures are in development and accessibility issues have been carefully considered through the scheme. Whilst we appreciate this may cause some unsettlement in the short term, it is considered by officers that this remains the most long term beneficial option to Diss and the wider District.

9 Park Road

3.12 The original proposals envisaged that the funding would be supported by income from the sale of 9 Park Road, Diss. However, after further consideration, it was considered that it would be difficult to obtain best value for the Council to sell the property as is and better value could be secured through redevelopment of the site – which could provide the Council with an ongoing revenue stream. Development proposals are now being finalised and will be considered in due course. In the meantime, the funding for the Heritage Triangle continues to be provided from the Council’s capital funding budgets.
4. Recommendation

4.1 The Scrutiny Committee is requested to consider the current progress in delivering the Diss Heritage Triangle Project, making any recommendations they consider appropriate to ensure the Council’s funding is delivering best value for the project and for the District.
AGENDA ITEM 5

Diss Heritage Triangle Tourist Information Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Proposals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sale of items – duck food, bus tickets,</td>
<td>• Discussions to be held with local businesses to see whether they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local memorabilia</td>
<td>would like to take on these services, they may also be available from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corn Hall if Corn Hall Trust decides to provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopying and advertising of events</td>
<td>• There are already companies providing photocopying services within Diss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Town Council to decide whether to put up (additional?) noticeboards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to advertise local events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps and local information leaflets</td>
<td>• Maps and other local information to be available at the Corn Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and may also be available from local retailers who choose to stock this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:1 Tourist advisory services</td>
<td>• This will be available from the Corn Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signposting</td>
<td>• DTC and SNC to work with relevant bodies to ensure signposts are updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Building</td>
<td>• SNC to review future use of building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM 6

Scrutiny Committee
10 November 2016

Review of the Five-Year Land Supply Methodology

Report of the Director of Growth and Localism
Cabinet Member: Cllr John Fuller

CONTACT
Tim Horspole, 01508 533806
thorspole@s-norfolk.gov.uk
1. Introduction

1.1 In the light of a continued lack of a Five-Year Housing Land Supply in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) members have requested that the methodology for calculating the supply be considered by Scrutiny Committee. The timing of this report allows for any changes to the methodology to be considered in the 2015/16 Annual Monitoring report (AMR), subject to the agreement of Broadland District and Norwich City Councils.

1.2 This report assesses the following areas of the methodology:

- How the backlog from past under-delivery is recovered – over the remaining lifetime of the plan or over the next five years;
- When the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) additional buffer of 5% (to provide choice and competition in the market for land) should be increased to 20% due to ‘persistent under-delivery’;
- The inclusion of a windfall assumption;
- Whether small sites (which are not individually monitored) should be discounted to allow for a proportion of non-delivery;
- Assumptions made about the future delivery on larger sites;
- Types of accommodation that can count as sources of supply;
- The area over which the supply is measured;
- When updated information on the housing requirements for the area (from the 2016 Strategic Housing Market Assessment) can be applied.

2. Background

2.1 For a number of years there has been a shortfall in land supply in the Norwich Policy Area (NPA) that covers Norwich City and those parts of Broadland and South Norfolk that relate most closely to the city. Over time the three authorities have approved a number of sites outside of their Local Plan Development Boundaries (where market housing would not normally be approved) and progressively adopted a series of new Local Plan documents to allocate additional sites; however the land supply situation has not significantly improved and remains a concern.
2.2 With the joint planning and monitoring under the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) process, the Council's methodology for calculating land supply is shared with Broadland and Norwich. The methodology has changed over time as Government advice has changed and the outcome of appeals, both locally and nationally, has firmed up the interpretation of Government advice. As such there are a number of areas where the methodology is no longer debated. For example, earlier Government methodologies looked at past delivery up to the previous year and future projections for the five years from the following year, but excluded any shortfall or surplus in the current year; this is no longer considered a sound approach, so future projections start in the current year.

2.3 There is no one, prescribed methodology for calculating land supply. The NPPF and PPG provide guidance and numerous appeal decisions (by Inspectors and the Secretary of State) have interrupted this in different ways, reflecting local circumstances and refining the position over time. It is worth noting at this stage that the Local Plan Expert Group\(^1\) reported to Government earlier this year and recommended that a number of areas of the Five-Year Land Supply methodology be clarified and a standard approach be adopted; some of these recommendations are noted in the following sections. However, at present there are still a number of areas where there is debate about alternative approaches and these are set out below.

3. Current Position and Possible Alternatives

Recovering past under-delivery

3.1 There are two accepted methods for recovering any past under-delivery:
- Recovering the past shortfall over the remaining life of the plan (in South Norfolk’s case over the remaining ten years of the JCS to 2026). This is known as the residual or ‘Liverpool’ approach; or
- Recovering the shortfall in next five years, over which the supply is being measured, known as the ‘Sedgefield’ approach.

3.2 The JCS was prepared and is monitored in accordance with the Liverpool approach. Current government guidance allows for both methodologies to be used and the issue was the subject of debate at the part JCS Examination in 2013. On this issue the

---

\(^1\) Local Plans: Report to the Communities Secretary and to the Minister of Housing and Planning (March 2016) – Local Plans Expert Group
Inspector agreed with the Greater Norwich authorities that ‘the shortfall should be added to the housing delivery target over the plan period’.

3.3 Since the adoption of the JCS the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) has been published (March 2014) which favours the use of the Sedgefield methodology. However, it does not require it; instead stating that Local Authorities should ‘aim to deal with any undersupply within the first 5 years of the plan period where possible’ (emphasis added). Subsequent to the publication of the PPG various site specific documents for South Norfolk and Broadland have been examined and found sound based on the Liverpool approach. The Inspector for the South Norfolk Site Specific Allocations noting that ‘this is a reasonable, realistic and pragmatic approach, particularly given the reliance on larger strategic sites’ and the Inspector for the Broadland documents concluded that ‘I find that in this case the Liverpool approach is the most appropriate’.

3.4 The Greater Norwich authorities maintain that the big growth locations in the JCS, particularly the North East Growth Triangle, will take time to gain momentum and that the additional sites required to meet the Sedgefield approach could divert investment away from the key infrastructure needed to deliver those sites – developers instead going for smaller sites with fewer infrastructure requirements. There is also a question as to whether the market could ever deliver the numbers needed if the Sedgefield approach was applied.

3.5 The Inspector at the recent Wymondham Rugby Football Club (WRFC) appeal considered the arguments for the Liverpool approach for Development Management purposes, and concluded that, with the Local Plan documents having recently been found sound, there should be a period of time where the newly made allocations are not undermined by the application of the Sedgefield approach: ‘it seems to me that the Liverpool approach would reflect the policy making approach and give the Councils time to deliver the housing they project’. However, the Inspector notes that this does not necessarily apply for an indefinite period, and that ‘support for the Liverpool approach is very much linked to the newness of the policy position’.

3.6 Clearly, for the meantime, the continued application of the Liverpool approach is favourable to the Greater Norwich authorities.

Persistent under-delivery

3.7 The concept of persistent under-delivery was introduced by the NPPF; if a local authority persistently under delivers, then instead of needing to demonstrate five years supply plus an additional 5% (to ensure choice and competition in the market for land), they
need to demonstrate five years supply plus 20% (to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and ensure choice and competition in the market for land). This means that authorities who are persistently under delivering have to deliver their annual requirement, make up part or all of their backlog (depending on whether the Liverpool or Sedgefield approach is applied) and have an additional buffer of 20%. The NPPF contains no definition of what constitutes ‘persistent’; however, PPG talks about any assessment of delivery record being ‘more robust if a longer term view is taken, since this is likely to take account of the peaks and troughs of the housing market cycle’.

3.8 For the first six years from the JCS baseline (2008 to 2014) the Greater Norwich authorities argued that the under-delivery was not persistent and was a reflection of the long-term downturn in the market and the fact that the new Local Plan documents, which allocate the sites required by the JCS, were not sufficiently far advanced. However, in 2015 the authorities recognised that this position could no longer reasonably be defended. For 2015/16 delivery in the NPA is still significantly below the JCS requirement, making a total of eight years under-delivery.

3.9 In terms of applying the 20% buffer, there is debate as to whether the buffer should be applied to the baseline requirement or to the figures adjusted for backlog. Again, there is no fixed guidance on this issue. However, the Greater Norwich authorities’ arguments for taking the former approach in previous land supply assessments were considered at the recent WRFC appeal and the Inspector concluded that: ‘I disagree. The baseline plus the shortfall element … is the housing that is needed’ i.e. the 20% buffer should be added to the baseline adjusted for backlog. The Inspector’s assessment of land supply is endorsed by the Secretary of State is paragraph 10 of his decision letter. In addition, the recent Local Plan Expert Group report to Government also recommends that a more standardised approach to calculating Five-Year Land Supply be adopted, which would include ‘clarifying that the application of the buffer is to the requirement plus backlog’.

3.10 At present it is not considered reasonable for the Greater Norwich authorities to claim there has not been persistent under-delivery in the NPA, as it now stretches to eight years. Given the Secretary of State’s decision for WRFC and the recommendations of the Local Plan Expert Group, applying the 20% buffer to the baseline requirement adjusted for backlog is now the recommended approach.
Windfall assumptions

3.11 Windfall development is a term used for permissions that come forward on sites not specifically identified for housing and includes redevelopments, conversions and exceptions sites. The requirement in JCS Policy 4 is for new allocations to be made to meet the minimum figures and this has been done through adopted Local Plan documents. Therefore the JCS does not rely on the provision of windfall development to meet objectively assessed needs. However, it is considered appropriate for some element of windfall provision to be included in the housing land supply calculations. NPPF paragraph 48 notes that ‘Local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five-year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply.’ The windfall figures used in the land supply calculations are based on past trends in the respective parts of the NPA and exclude garden land (as required by the NPPF) and sites that have specifically been released to address previous shortfalls in the Five-Year Land Supply. For each part of the NPA the average figures have been moderated downwards by 1/3, to reflect that fact that some sources of windfall may diminish over time, and applied in a staged manner, starting with 0 units in the first year and rising to the full amount in year four; this is to avoid any ‘double counting’ of future windfall sites with small sites that already have permission, which are taken into account in the land supply calculation separately.

3.12 Whilst windfall is development that is not explicitly planned for through Local Plans, the definition of Development Boundaries can restrict or increase the likelihood of windfall occurring. A number of recent Government proposals, such as the support for self-build development, starter homes and brownfield registers could lead to additional windfall development, as could the continued application of permitted development rights which have opened up additional potential for conversion of existing office and agricultural buildings to residential use. Consequently the current Greater Norwich approach to windfall is considered to be cautious but robust.

Discounting small sites

3.13 When making the assessment of future delivery on larger sites (10 or more units in Norwich, 5 or more units in Broadland and South Norfolk) the Greater Norwich authorities undertake a site-by-site assessment, in conjunction with site owners, developers or agents wherever possible. For smaller sites, where it is not feasible to undertake this assessment, it is assumed these will all be delivered within the five-year supply period; this is distinct from the windfall assumption considered above as it covers known sites which already have planning permission and which are therefore considered suitable and available for delivery in accordance with
NPPF paragraph 47, footnote 11. The Local Plan Expert Group report has recommended that, through a standardised approach to calculating land supply, a 10% deduction would be made to reflect that fact that not all sites will be delivered. However, the Greater Norwich authorities consider that it is still appropriate to include all of the smaller sites within the land supply, unless there is ‘clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years’, as set out in the NPPF footnote.

**Assumptions about development rates**

3.14 As noted above the approach of the Greater Norwich authorities for estimating delivery on larger sites (10 or more units in Norwich, 5 or more units in the remainder of the NPA) is to undertake a site-by-site assessment, in conjunction with site owners, developers or agents, wherever possible. Each authority contacts the most appropriate respondent for each site on at least an annual basis so that the delivery projections (both in terms of timing of delivery and rates of delivery) take account of the differences between sites, rather than take a blanket approach of making broad assumptions about delivery.

3.15 Where information from landowners, agents or developers is not available, assumptions need to be made about the likely timing and delivery of sites. For the JCS examination in 2013 and the subsequent South Norfolk Local Plan examinations in 2014 and 2015 the Council produced evidence to support a development rate of 50 dwellings per developer/per year on larger sites and 25 dwellings per developer/per year for smaller sites. Larger sites tend to be delivered by individual or groups of national, volume housebuilders, whilst smaller site are often delivered by smaller regional or local housebuilders. The 50 dwellings per year figure originally derived from the Calcutt Review of Housebuilding Delivery (CLG, 2007); page 43 of the Calcutt Review refers to builders being able to achieve 35-50 annual sales per ‘outlet’. The Greater Norwich authorities have taken the lower end of this range, 35 market units per outlet; factoring in affordable units this gives a delivery rate of 50 units per year (i.e. 35 = 70% market units, 15 = 30% affordable units). Whilst it could be argued that this represented the position prior to the economic downturn in 2008, and therefore an over-estimate of likely delivery, the approach of taking the lower end of the Calcutt delivery range plus local evidence on major sites in the NPA (the majority of which have been in South Norfolk over recent years) suggests that 50 dwellings remains a reasonable and robust assumption. As a comparison, recent figures provided by developers of large sites range from around 30 dwellings per year to over 70.

3.16 Similarly, as part of the evidence to the South Norfolk Local Plan examinations, the Council set out an estimated timetable for the delivery of sites, from the submission of an outline application to the completion of the first units; this extends to around 2½ years. Whilst some smaller sites, with less complex applications, S106 agreements and infrastructure requirements may come forward
more quickly, other, larger sites may take longer to progress. The 30 month timetable is also in line with the assumptions made by site promoters proposing sites due to the lack of a Five-Year Land Supply, used to demonstrate that they can deliver a meaningful number of units within the five year period.

3.17 Whilst it may be possible to increase the estimated development rate (on sites where the landowner, agent or developer has not provided actual estimates), levels of over 50 units per developer have not been consistently demonstrated across a range of sites. Equally, suggesting sites might deliver more quickly may be feasible for smaller sites, but is not likely to be robust for medium and large sites, which make up a significant proportion of overall delivery.

Sources of supply

3.18 The vast majority of new accommodation falls into planning Use Class C3 ‘Dwellinghouses’; any dwellings in this category can count towards past delivery and future supply. The PPG indicates that other types of accommodation could also be counted towards delivery, in particular citing delivery of care homes. Across the Greater Norwich authorities the two main additional categories would be care homes and student accommodation, the latter particularly being a feature of Norwich City. Adding additional categories could boost both past performance, thus reducing the backlog that needs to be recovered, and also future supply. The argument is that these types of accommodation potentially ‘free up’ Class C3 dwellings; however this would not necessarily be on a one-for-one basis, i.e. one unit of care home or student accommodation would not necessarily free up one dwelling, therefore a ratio would need to be agreed e.g. five units of student accommodation equals one dwelling.

3.19 The main concern with adding these additional sources of supply is that care homes and student accommodation do not form part of the baseline requirement i.e. additional numbers may need to be added to the JCS requirement as well as the delivery/supply. The potential risk is that they could make the position worse if delivery of this type of accommodation has also not kept pace with the requirement.

The area over which the land supply is measured

3.20 This report has arisen out of the concern that there has been a long-term lack of housing land supply across the joint NPA (Norwich City and the parts of Broadland and Norwich that relate most closely to it). The NPA is only part of the Greater Norwich Area and consideration could be given to monitoring alternative geographies such as the wider three district area or separate local
authority areas. Because the Rural Areas of Broadland and South Norfolk have performed more strongly than the NPA there may be some benefits to this it terms of being able to demonstrate a stronger supply. However the NPA represents more than 81% of the JCS requirement in South Norfolk and more than 87% of the whole Greater Norwich requirement, consequently under-delivery in the NPA could also outweigh the strong supply in the Rural Areas, opening up other parts of the district to planning applications proposed on the basis of a lack of Five-Year Land Supply. Furthermore, the Inspector in a 2013 appeal decision at the former Lakenham Cricket Ground at Carshalton Road, Norwich clearly signalled that it is the joint NPA against which the Five-Year Land Supply should be tested; this position has subsequently formed the basis of statements of common ground with appellants at other appeals in the NPA.

The 2016 ‘Strategic Housing Market Assessment’

3.21 Currently the Five-Year Land Supply is measured against the adopted housing requirement in the JCS for the period 2008 to 2026. In January 2016 a new Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) was published, covering both the Greater Norwich authorities and also Breckland and North Norfolk. The new SHMA sets out the objectively assessed housing need (OAN) for the period 2012 to 2036. As part of that process, any unmet need for the period 2008 to 2012 has been included in the new OAN to 2036 i.e. there would no longer be a backlog for the period 2008 to 2012. For the NPA the SHMA also suggests a slightly lower annual requirement of 1,698 dwellings per year (compared to 1,825 in the JCS), meaning that the backlog from 2012 onwards is also reduced. The whole three authority figure for Greater Norwich has risen slightly from 2,097 dwellings in the JCS per year to 2,174 in the SHMA. Consequently the Greater Norwich authorities are concerned that, in seeking to achieve the current JCS five year requirements in the NPA, provision is being made for additional houses, significantly over and above the actual need.

3.22 Moving to using the SHMA to measure Five-Year Land Supply would have benefits for the NPA. However, although the SHMA has been produced in accordance with the latest available guidance, it has not been through any form of formal scrutiny or testing. The figures in the JCS were examined at the initial Examination in Public in 2010 and again, in part, at the 2013 Examination. Examination gives the opportunity for third parties to assess the OAN and argue for either increases or decreases. This lack of testing was noted by the Inspector for the WRFC appeal who concluded that she does ‘not afford significance to the potential for change at this stage’. Moving to the new SHMA may also make it difficult to justify continuing to use the Liverpool approach, because (a) it would be recovering the 2012-2016 shortfall over a 20 year period, which would clearly not be in accordance with the spirit of the PPG, and (b) the policy position in terms of the pattern of development and type of sites being promoted for the period beyond the current JCS is not in place, therefore there may not be a policy justification to maintain the Liverpool approach in the
longer term. Lastly, whilst the SHMA provides figures for the NPA, it also suggests a larger Central Norfolk ‘Core Area’ and considers the wider five-district Central Norfolk area as a housing market; consequently there are still decisions to be had about the geography over which the new SHMA figures should be measured.

4. Risks and implications arising

4.1 The main risk with changing the approach to Five-Year Land Supply would be that it moves away from an approach that the Council has put forward in previous AMRs and at a number of appeals. This was most recently tested earlier this year at the WRFC appeal, which considered a number of the variables detailed above at considerable length. Significant moves away from previously agreed approaches could heighten the risk of the Council being found liable for costs at subsequent appeals.

4.2 It should also be noted that the approach to calculating Five-Year Land Supply is shared with the other Greater Norwich authorities and there is no certainty that any change promoted by South Norfolk would be accepted by the other parties.

5. Recommendation

5.1 That the Scrutiny Committee reviews the methodology currently used to determine the Five-Year Land Supply figure for the Norwich Policy Area and recommend any changes they would like to see considered, based on the assessment of the methodology above.
Scrutiny Committee – Work Programme

In setting future Scrutiny TOPICS, the Committee is asked to consider the following:

T  Is this the right time to review this issue and is there sufficient Officer time and resource to conduct the review? What is the timescale?

O  What is the reason for review; do officers have a clear objective?

P  Can performance in this area be improved by input from Scrutiny?

I  Is there sufficient interest (particularly from the public)? The concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen for scrutiny.

C  Will the review assist the Council to achieve its Corporate Priorities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of meeting</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Organisation / Officer / Responsible member</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Dec 2016</td>
<td>The Year Ahead – Planning for Success Workshop</td>
<td>Senior Managers and all cabinet members</td>
<td>Members to review the draft Business Plans 2017/18 and make recommendations to officers in an informal workshop environment. This is a great opportunity for members to find out what work is planned for the coming year and influence the direction of the Council and where resources are allocated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Dec 2016</td>
<td>Update from the Council’s representative on Norfolk Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee (NHOSC)</td>
<td>Cllr N Legg &amp; Cllr Y Bendle</td>
<td>For members to consider an oral update from the Council’s representative on the NHOSC to assess the impact of issues discussed on South Norfolk residents and the Council. The Committee to consider if any further scrutiny into the issues is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Dec 2016</td>
<td>South Norfolk Clinical Commissioning Group update paper</td>
<td>Independent Living Team Leader &amp; Cllr Y Bendle</td>
<td>The Committee to be advised of the work that has been undertaken by the Council and South Norfolk Clinical Commissioning Group in the last 6 months.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jan 2017</td>
<td>Review of The Year Ahead – Planning for Success Workshop</td>
<td>Business Improvement Programme Manager &amp; all cabinet members</td>
<td>For members to review the Business Plans and make recommendations as appropriate. The Committee to assess the outcomes of The Year Ahead – Planning for Success Workshop in December 2016 and receive feedback regarding the recommendations/suggestions that were put forward at the Workshop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jan 2017</td>
<td>South Norfolk Choice Based Letting / Home Option Review</td>
<td>Housing Access &amp; Standards Manager and Cllr Y Bendle</td>
<td>For members to review the South Norfolk Choice Based Letting Scheme / Home Options ahead of the SLA drawing to a close in 2018. The Committee to consider whether the scheme has met the objectives set and whether new objectives are required when negotiating a new SLA. For members to consider the effectiveness of the scheme and make recommendations regarding moving forward once the SLA has expired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Feb 2017</td>
<td>Review of Leisure Centre Refurbishments</td>
<td>Head of Leisure and Cllr C Hudson</td>
<td>For members to receive details of usage, income and membership figures since the Diss and Wymondham Leisure Centres have been refurbished. The Committee to evaluate the impact of the refurbishments and whether the outcomes have met targets set and delivered an increase in membership numbers and usage in comparison to previous figures. Members to make recommendations as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of meeting</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Organisation / Officer / Responsible member</td>
<td>Objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Feb 2017</td>
<td>2017/18 Budget</td>
<td>Director of Business Development &amp; Cllr M Edney</td>
<td>Scrutiny Committee to consider the Council’s 2017/18 budget and the recommendations of Cabinet. The Committee should formulate a recommendation to Council regarding the budget for consideration at its meeting at the end of February 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Feb 2017</td>
<td>To be held in the event of a call-in only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April 2017</td>
<td>No items scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 May 2017</td>
<td>No items scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 June 2017</td>
<td>Update from the Council’s representative on Norfolk Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee (NHOSC)</td>
<td>Cllr N Legg &amp; Cllr Y Bendle</td>
<td>For members to consider an oral update from the Council’s representative on the NHOSC to assess the impact of issues discussed on South Norfolk residents and the Council. The Committee to consider if any further scrutiny into the issues is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 June 2017</td>
<td>Waste Collection Round Remodelling – review</td>
<td>Head of Environmental Services &amp; Cllr K Billig</td>
<td>The Committee to review the Council’s waste collection round remodelling introduced in June 2016. Members to assess whether the remodelling has realised the objectives sought and achieved the financial savings anticipated. The committee to also receive data relating to the Council’s contamination statistics and recycling targets in order to assess performance in this area. Members have also requested details relating to marketing campaigns and the impact of these. Members to make any relevant recommendations as required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Aug 2017</td>
<td>To be held in the event of a call-in only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Sept 2017</td>
<td>No items scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Nov 2017</td>
<td>Update from the Council’s representative on Norfolk Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee (NHOSC)</td>
<td>Cllr N Legg &amp; Cllr Y Bendle</td>
<td>For members to consider an oral update from the Council’s representative on the NHOSC to assess the impact of issues discussed on South Norfolk residents and the Council. The Committee to consider if any further scrutiny into the issues is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Dec 2017</td>
<td>No items scheduled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
<td>Resolution and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 June 2016</td>
<td>NORFOLK AND SUFFOLK DEVOLUTION PROPOSAL</td>
<td>Chief Executive</td>
<td>1. To note the progress made in relation to addressing the issues raised by Full Council in October 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. TO RECOMMEND THAT CABINET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Agrees that the Leader of the Council should sign the Norfolk and Suffolk Devolution Agreement and supports the publication of a Scheme of Governance for public consultation. Consultation literature should be uniform across Norfolk and Suffolk and present a consistent message, focusing on no more than five key benefits for residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Notes the concerns of the Scrutiny Committee in relation to governance arrangements, and address these concerns to the governance team working on the Deal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cabinet considered the recommendations of Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 30 June 2016:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Cabinet endorse the signing of the Norfolk and Suffolk Devolution Agreement by the Leader. Cabinet also agreed with the recommendation regarding the consultation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. In relation to the concerns regarding governance arrangements, Cabinet agreed that the Chairman should raise these issues with the governance team working on the Deal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As a result of pre-scrutiny of the Devolution documents, Scrutiny Committee was able to highlight any areas which they felt required further consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Committee was also able to evaluate whether the concerns raised previously at Full Council had been addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Responsible Officer</td>
<td>Resolution and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 28 Sept 2016 | REVIEW OF ROUTE OPTIMISATION DELIVERY           | Head of Environmental Services                          | To note the content of the Route Optimisation Delivery Review report, and to commend the Head of Environmental Services and his team for their hard work and dedication in ensuring the success of the implementation a four-day collection service.  
(The Committee agreed that when undertaking its further review of the Route Optimisation Delivery in July 2017, they would also review the Council's contamination statistics, recycling targets and marketing campaigns.) | No action required                           | Members were pleased to note the delivery of the route optimisation and as a result, did not have any further recommendations to make to cabinet or officers.  
During discussion, members made a number of comments regarding contamination and recycling targets; details of which will be added to the report that the Committee will receive in July 2017. |
# CABINET CORE AGENDA 2016/17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions: Key, Policy, Operational</th>
<th>Key Decision/Item</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
<th>Cabinet Member</th>
<th>Exempt Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Council and Cabinet 17 November 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Nov</td>
<td>K Devolution</td>
<td>S Dinneen</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Dec</td>
<td>O Review of Conservation Area Appraisals – Loddon, Hingham and Harleston</td>
<td>C Bennett</td>
<td>L Hornby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Greater Norwich Joint Five Year Infrastructure Investment Plan 2017-18-2021-22</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Custom Build Register</td>
<td>K Mitchell</td>
<td>Y Bendle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Meeting 12 December 2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Jan 2017</td>
<td>O Community Asset Strategy</td>
<td>B Wade</td>
<td>K Mason Billig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O GNLP Sustainability Appraisals</td>
<td>A Nicholls</td>
<td>J Fuller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Feb</td>
<td>K Performance Risks and Finance Budget Position Q3</td>
<td>E Goddard A Mewes</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M Fernandez -Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Treasury Management Report Q3</td>
<td>M Fernandez -Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Budget Consultation 2017/18</td>
<td>M Fernandez -Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K Revenue Budget and Council Tax 2017/18</td>
<td>M Fernandez -Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K Capital Programme April 2017 to March 2022</td>
<td>M Fernandez -Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Treasury Management Strategy April 2017 to March 2020</td>
<td>M Fernandez -Graham</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O Asset Management Plan</td>
<td>R Garfoot</td>
<td>M Edney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Meeting 21 February</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Mar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key decisions are those which result in income, expenditure or savings with a gross full year effect of £100,000 or 10% of the Council’s net portfolio budget whichever is the greater which has not been included in the relevant portfolio budget, or are significant (e.g. in environmental, physical, social or economic) in terms of its effect on the communities living or working in an area comprising two or more electoral divisions in the area of the local authority.