

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

Minutes of a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 21 March 2018 in the Council Chamber, North Norfolk District Council, Holt Road, Cromer at 9.30 am.

Members Present:

Committee: Cllr K Ward (Chairman)

Cllr S Bütikofer

Cllr J English

Cllr V Gay

Cllr S Hester

Cllr M Knowles

Cllr B McGoun

Cllr E Seward

Cllr B Smith

Officers in Attendance: The Corporate Director (NB), the Corporate Director (SB), the Monitoring Officer, the Head of Finance and Asset Management, the Head of Economic and Community Development, the Health and Communities Team Leader, the Policy and Performance Management Officer, the Democratic Services Manager and the Democratic Services Officer.

Members in Attendance: Cllr J Lee (Leader), Cllr W Northam (Portfolio Holder for Financial Services, Revenues and Benefits), Mrs S Arnold (Portfolio Holder for Housing, Planning and Planning Policy), Cllr A Claussen-Reynolds, Cllr J Rest, Cllr N Pearce, Cllr S Arnold, Cllr A Fitch-Tillett and Cllr P Grove-Jones.

Also in Attendance: Members of the public.

127. CHAIRMAN'S OPENING ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman welcomed members of the public. She told the Committee that there would be some changes to its membership after they had been ratified at Full Council on 28 March 2018 and explained that, because of changes to Cabinet Membership, some of the new Portfolio Holders were newly aware of their responsibilities and weren't free to attend this morning's meeting.

128. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Mr R Reynolds, and from Miss B Palmer (Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Culture, Health and Customer Services) and Mr R Price (Portfolio Holder for Property and Asset Commercialisation).

129. SUBSTITUTES

None

130. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions were received.

131. MINUTES

The minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 14 February 2018 were accepted as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman after the following was noted:

Page 14 (i) employee budgets: the figure should read £450,000.

132. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

133. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To be taken, if necessary, at the appropriate item on the Agenda.

134. PETITIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

None

135. CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY A MEMBER

The following items had been submitted by Members of the Council for inclusion on an agenda of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting. The Committee considered how it should respond to such requests and when to schedule them into the work programme:

1. Request for a peer review of the Council's governance and decision making processes.

The review had been requested because the Council had moved into a situation where there was no overall control, and had arisen from an article in the LGA First magazine. There had been positive conversations between the Group Leaders and a Working Protocol was being drawn up. The Group Leaders had agreed to circulate the Working Protocol to all Members and the LGA were coming to talk to all Groups. The Chair of Scrutiny had also met with the Leader to discuss how the Overview and Scrutiny Committee could best work with Cabinet.

The Monitoring Officer said that Officers had considered the support that could be provided and had contacted the LGA, who had provided a useful publication. Ms V Gay requested that this publication should be circulated to all Members. The Democratic Services Manager undertook to do this.

As well as the Working Protocol, consideration would be given to a Media Protocol and project boards.

Part of the LGA's support was to provide Political Group Leaders and Officers with 5 days of peer support. The Group Leaders had agreed to access this as and when needed. Peer support for Officers would come from Cambridge City Council. The LGA was happy with our progress and a project plan was in place to ensure that we were on track.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed that the approach outlined above met requirements.

2. Homelessness – a report on the current situation in the District and an outline of new legislation and funding.

This matter had arisen because of a concern at the rise in homelessness figures since Christmas. Information had since been received that there was additional funding from Norfolk County Council. In view of this, it would be opportune to receive a further report when a clearer picture had emerged.

RESOLVED

To receive a further report in June.

3. Presentation by Housing Associations on their strategies for the provision of smaller properties in villages and how they facilitate the movement from larger to smaller properties. To include update on possible merger of Victory Housing Association and Flagship HA.
 - a) Anecdotally, Victory were disposing of properties in some parts of the District and building in others. This, and any consequences, should be included in the report. The Portfolio Holder, Mrs S Arnold, explained that Victory was disposing of some older properties because it wasn't cost-effective to upgrade them.
 - b) The possible merger of Victory and Flagship would result in a larger organisation. This could impact on North Norfolk.
 - c) Mr E Seward said that it would be good to ask Victory how they would see their involvement with the Community Housing Fund, the second bidding process for which was still being determined by the Government. Mrs S Arnold informed the Committee that she was giving an interview on local radio in the afternoon, to provide an update on the Community Housing Fund.
 - d) The Chairman asked that an update on Victory's working with communities on schemes should be included.
 - e) Mr J Rest said that Victory didn't build any market housing, whereas the Flagship model included market with affordable housing. The Chairman suggested that Victory should be asked to talk about the benefit of merging with Flagship. The Corporate Director (SB) said that the balance between market and social housing could impact on Local Plan policy. It was important to get clarity from the Housing Associations.

DECISION RESOLVED

To invite a representative from Victory Housing Association to attend in May or June and request a written response from Broadland Housing Association

4. Mental Health – to receive a presentation (further details to be agreed).
 - a) The matter had been referred by Mr S Hester.
 - b) The Health and Communities Team Leader suggested inviting a representative from the Norfolk and Suffolk Foundation Trust. The Corporate Director (SB) advised that, if the Committee decided on this course of action, it was important to scope what was required. He reminded the Committee that, although it was right to lobby and advocate better provision, NNDC didn't

employ a Mental Health professional and did not have a large budget or significant powers in this area. The Council had its own budget pressures and it would not be appropriate to pick up work when other agencies had cut services. In scoping any presentation it would be advisable to consider:

- Are there particular concerns?
- How best to lobby for service provision.
- How NNDC worked with other agencies.

The Chairman would email Members to invite their questions for a possible presentation at a later meeting.

- c) Ms V Gay observed that a profile of the District was necessary to understand provision. However, the Council could influence some things, e.g. Social Prescribing. The Corporate Director (SB) said that funding for Social Prescribing had recently been received from Norfolk County Council. This could lead to two people being employed to deliver the programme, but further clarity was required at present.
- d) Mrs P Grove-Jones said there was a need for respite care for people who had been sectioned. The Corporate Director (SB) said that a profile of need would help Members better understand what they required.
- e) Mr S Hester said that councillors, in their Ward work, could encounter constituents with mental health problems. He suggested referring this to the Member Development Group. The Democratic Services Manager reminded the Committee that the Mental Health First Aider training was being rolled out to all Members, and said she would re-circulate the information.
- f) The Chairman said that the Committee needed to know particular areas that were putting a strain on delivery of NNDC services. Information from the report on the Early Help Hub was likely to help with this.

RESOLVED

- 1. To remind members about training available on mental health**
- 2. To invite a representative from the Norfolk and Suffolk Foundation Trust to give a presentation to the committee**

136. APPONTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE TO THE NORFOLK HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

At Full Council on 21 February 2018, delegation was given to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee to make appointments to the Norfolk Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee (NHOSC). The Terms of Reference had been circulated. Eligible Members must be Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds had represented NNDC on the NHOSC for some years until she had been appointed to the Cabinet. She was not currently a Member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee but had been recommended by the Leader to replace Mrs H Cox, who had been appointed to Cabinet. If she was nominated today, the appointment would not take effect until it was ratified by Full Council on 28 March. Mr M Knowles was nominated as Substitute.

RESOLVED

- 1. That, dependent on her ratification by Full Council on 28 March as a Member of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Cllr Annie Claussen-Reynolds be appointed a representative on the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.**
- 2. That Cllr Mike Knowles be appointed substitute on the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.**

137. RESPONSES OF THE COUNCIL OR THE CABINET TO THE COMMITTEE'S REPORTS OR RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendation was made by the Committee to Cabinet on 12th March:

'That any revisions reflected the committee's concerns about the democratic deficit in the previous version as well as ongoing oversight of the implementation of the new Asset Management Plan'.

The Chairman reported that there had been a very positive response from Cabinet. All the suggestions made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had been included in the recommendations and an Asset Panel was to be set up. The next step would be for the Committee to resolve to set up an Asset Management Plan Working Party for oversight of the Plan. Once it had been signed off by Full Council, Terms of Reference and membership could be agreed in April.

138. SCHEDULED TRAINING FOR THE COMMITTEE

Because the Council had moved into a situation where there was no overall control, there was a general need for support regarding working effectively together. A small group of Overview and Scrutiny Members had met to discuss how the Committee might work together better. Training had been requested from David McGrath, who had recently delivered some well-received sessions. The Overview and Scrutiny training would be held on 17 and 18 April. All Committee Members were strongly urged to attend.

139. NORTH NORFOLK EARLY HELP HUB

In the absence of the Portfolio Holder, Miss B Palmer, the report was introduced by the Health and Communities Team Leader, who was thanked for a comprehensive report, which included case studies as well as an outline of the challenges and difficulties that were faced. The Chairman said that the case studies had been very helpful.

The North Norfolk Early Help Hub had substantially increased communication and multiagency working between key statutory and voluntary organisations in North Norfolk. From April the Police would be included, having 2 people working there.

The Hub had resulted in significant and demonstrable benefits to the Council in terms of resolving issues with individuals with complex needs who are willing to engage. Increasingly, Housing Benefit and Customer Services staff were referring clients to the Hub.

Individuals and families referred to and willing to engage with the Hub were receiving more co-ordinated, joined up services that were resolving complex issues in a more co-ordinated and cohesive way.

The Hub had initially focussed on children but it had quickly become apparent that it needed to include adults.

Questions and Discussion

- a) Mrs S Bütikofer asked if Members could refer someone to the Hub, and how. The Health and Communities Team Leader advised that the best person to contact was herself or the Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager. She explained that cases could be discussed and the help needed identified but that permission was needed from the client before action could be taken. She could provide Members with details of the help available. The Chairman suggested obtaining an individual's consent to get information from the Hub then pass it back to them.
- b) Sharing of information between organisations: in response to a question from Mrs S Bütikofer, the Health and Communities Team Leader said that more work was being done on this. There had been some challenges, including case reviews where information sharing had resulted in negative consequences.
- c) In response to a question from Mrs B McGoun, the Health and Communities Team Leader said that information about the Hub was communicated to Parish Councils via their newsletters.
- d) The Corporate Director (SB) said that it was difficult to accurately quantify the savings to agencies accrued by the Hub. The main aim was to minimise vulnerability. In the long term, money was saved by early intervention. The Head of Economic and Community Development explained that the Hub wasn't a new agency, but a better way for existing agencies to work together.
- e) Mr S Hester commended the Health and Communities Team Leader for a moving report. He hoped that all Members would support the Early Help Hub.
- f) The Chairman said that the Hub was a great example of cross-boundary working and very beneficial for the individuals who were receiving support.

RESOLVED:

- 1. The Committee recognises the benefit of the Hub and continues to support its ongoing development.**
- 2. That information about the work of the Hub is circulated to parish & town councils via 121 magazine**

140. ESTABLISHMENT OF TASK & FINISH GROUP FOR BEACH HUTS AND CHALETS

Beach huts and chalets had been a subject of discussion when the Committee considered Fees and Charges 2018/19 at the December meeting. The Head of Finance and Asset Management intended to undertake a more fundamental review of strategy. It was proposed to form an Overview and Scrutiny Task and Finish Group to work with him and this was reported to the January meeting. The Chairman had invited any Members who were interested in being part of the Group to contact her. As well as Members of the Committee, expertise could be drawn from other Members.

Councillors J English, M Knowles and B Smith would form the nucleus of the Group. There had also been expressions of interest from Cllrs B Hannah, N Pearce, H Cox and A Fitch-Tillett.

The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that he wanted to work on a longer term strategy for beach huts and chalets. NNDC's charges were significantly lower than those of other authorities. A more joined-up approach was necessary with a business plan for the next 5 years.

An email had been received from Cllr D Smith, on behalf of Sheringham residents, This would be considered by the Task and Finish Group.

The Democratic Services Manager would finalise the Terms of Reference. It was hoped that they would come to the April meeting of Overview and Scrutiny. The Terms of Reference should include frequency of meeting, method of reporting to the Committee and timespan for the work. The Group would ideally meet before the next meeting of Overview and Scrutiny and would be fully supported by Democratic Services. Thereafter it would be timed so that outcomes and recommendations could come to the Committee on a monthly basis.

RESOLVED that:

- 1. The Task & Finish Group should comprise Mrs J English, Mr M Knowles and Mr B Smith, with input from Mr B Hannah, Mr N Pearce, Mrs A Fitch-Tillett and Mrs H Cox.**
- 2. The Group aimed to meet ideally before the Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 25 April.**
- 3. Terms of Reference should be drafted prior to 25 April, including frequency and method of reporting to Overview and Scrutiny, and timespan of the Group.**

141. ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN

This report had originally been brought to the Committee for pre-scrutiny in December 2017 and had been referred back to Cabinet for revisions. The report being presented today included the revisions requested by Overview and Scrutiny. It would go to Full Council on 28 March.

Questions and Discussion

- a) Mrs B McGoun asked if consideration had been given to purchasing the former RAF site at Neatishead. The Corporate Director (SB) replied that the site had constraints and wouldn't deliver a financial return. Mrs McGoun asked if Gleeds could look at the site. The Corporate Director (SB) said that authority would be required for this. Gleeds' brief was to look at existing assets and investments that the Council was making in assets, e.g. Splash and the Sports Hub, and land facilities in towns. The Chairman informed the Committee that there would be an Asset Panel (in the gift of Cabinet) which would be the relevant forum for discussion of potential assets which Members were aware of in their wards. Mr E Seward said that progress had been made in the context of the Council's experience in asset management. If the Terms of Reference of the Asset Panel were agreed by Full Council, further work would be done by the Constitution Working Party. Mr Seward proposed that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should set up an Asset Management Working Group. This was seconded by Mr S Hester and agreed. Mr B Smith abstained.
- b) Mr B Smith explained that he had abstained because of concerns over allocations of some concessions. Mr J Lee told Mr Smith that he had met with other Group Leaders and had reached consensus about which concessions should be agreed and which should be withdrawn, including one at Mundesley.

Mrs A Fitch-Tillett expressed a concern on how concessions were offered. The Corporate Director (SB) suggested that Mr Smith should discuss a further concern about his ward after the meeting. The Chairman said that an element of commercialisation always brought challenges. The Group Leaders had met, and would meet again with the Heads of Paid Service. A communication would be sent to all Members. Mr E Seward said that he understood Mr Smith's concern but that the Policy would ensure that such situations were avoided in the future.

- c) The Chairman suggested that the Committee should look at the Asset Management Policy Framework and consider if there were any additional points for Full Council.
- d) Mr J Rest said that he'd asked a lot of questions about the Asset Management Plan at Cabinet and was satisfied with the answers. He recommended support of the document.
- e) Asset Portfolio Summary table: Mrs P Grove-Jones asked why there was nothing in the Land Held for Sale row. The Head of Finance and Asset Management explained that the row could only be populated if the Council was actively engaged in the sale of land. The table was a summary of the current portfolio. No land was held for sale at this time but the Policy Framework included the possibility of purchasing land if it brought financial return.
- f) Ms V Gay said that she supported the document which included democratic involvement and public benefit. She asked if the amendments to the Constitution would be happening soon. The Democratic Services Manager informed her that a meeting of the Constitution Working Party would be scheduled for April.
- g) Mr N Lloyd, referring to the Policy Relating to the Use of Council Property Assets, said that the free parking policy was very prescriptive. He asked how the Council would respond if there was a significant public occasion. The Corporate Director (SB) said that he would reflect further on this. Often "free facility" involved significant cost to the authority, e.g. provision of toilets, grass cutting and litter collection. Such opportunities weren't available throughout the District. The Policy was to provide openness, equity and transparency as well as putting some checks in place, because Officers were sometimes put in difficult positions by town and parish councils. The Chairman asked if the Council still had the power to lift charges on an *ad hoc* basis. The Corporate Director (SB) said that the Council did have this power but that some locations were better endowed than others.

RESOLVED

- 1. That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should set up an Asset Management Working Group.**
- 2. To support the Asset Management Plan and recommend to Full Council to approve:**
 - 8. Asset Management Plan as the basis for the strategic framework for asset management (Appendix A).**
 - 9. The amendments to the Constitution as highlighted within (Appendix G).**
 - 10. £2m allocated as a local property capital fund for acquisitions as described in the Acquisition Policy (Appendix C).**

142. MANAGING PERFORMANCE Q3

The report, which had been to Cabinet on 12 March, was introduced by the Portfolio Holder, Mr J Lee. He commended the way the report had been set out to provide increased clarity. It was easier to read, with less paperwork. The Chairman commented that the monthly updates were very helpful.

Questions and Discussion

- a) Mr E Seward asked if the number of apprenticeships in North Norfolk was going down because of the apprenticeship levy. The Corporate Director (SB) said that this was a factor in North Norfolk as well as the level of vocational training providers.
- b) Mr Seward asked for an update regarding the car park at North Walsham Station. A fuller written answer would be provided but the Estates and Asset Strategy Manager had made an initial offer to say that NNDC was interested in the site. It was believed that an access could be installed to the railway platform. This would impact on any offer for the site.
- c) Referring to charges being applied for household waste at recycling centres, Mr Seward asked how the situation would be monitored and if it would result in increased fly-tipping. He believed that the government had been clear that local authorities shouldn't be charging. The Corporate Director (NB) said that the situation was being monitored and that the waste that would be charged for sat in a grey category. NNDC had always made strong representation that charges should not be applied because of the impact on fly-tipping. Over the next 6 months it would be seen if the change in policy resulted in increased fly-tipping.
- d) Ms V Gay commented that the report contained a greater level of detail within a more concise piece of work.
- e) Jobs and the local economy (JO13): Mrs S Bütikofer asked why there was no mention of properties that were subject to Business Rates reviews. The Head of Finance and Asset Management said that appeals and reviews since 2017 were difficult because of problems with the Valuation Office. The situation would need to be monitored and this could be built into the Budget Monitoring report. There were outstanding appeals from the previous list.
- f) Draft Local Plan (02C01): Mrs Bütikofer said that she believed that a sum of £50,000 previously agreed was for inspection fees. She asked if some money could be dedicated to resources to focus on the Local Plan. The Head of Finance and Asset Management said that he would speak to colleagues in Planning and Finance to get clarification. However, a potential underspend in Planning could finance the roll-out of the draft Local Plan. The Corporate Director (SB) said that the programme was currently quite intense and that there was an issue of quality over speed, as well as issues around the Neighbourhood Plan that would need to be resolved separately. Some of the information received from parish councils had been of varying quality. Six or seven Plans had been confirmed with the only real progress being made in Holt. The team was fully resourced. There was a proposal, being worked on by the Monitoring Officer, to increase membership of the Planning Policy and Built Heritage Working Party by one seat. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee could comment on programme issues but not on the recommendations and decisions of the Planning Policy and Built Heritage Working Party (details of site locations and policy). The new job specification for the Head of Planning post would major on the delivery of the Local Plan. Mr E Seward made a recommendation that, in June (when the new member of the

team would be up to speed), the Committee should receive an update on progress of the delivery of the draft Local Plan, the level of resource, and the implications of any delays/slippage. Ms V Gay seconded the proposal, which was agreed by the Committee.

- g) Continue to develop and promote the Norfolk and Suffolk Coastal Partnership (03A02): the Leader had attended the meeting regarding ICT challenges. NNDC had decided to take this on in-house. The Corporate Director (SB) explained that the Partnership commissioned work. NNDC paid the authority's coastal staff who worked in the partnership. NNDC's Head of IT believed that there was work that needed to be done, but the manager of Coastal Partnership East was not comfortable with the solution.

RESOLVED

That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should receive in June a report on:

- **The progress of the Local Plan.**
- **The level and resilience of resources available.**
- **The implications and risks of any delays.**

143. BUDGET MONITORING 2017/18 PERIOD 10

The report, which had been to Cabinet on 12 March, was introduced by the Portfolio Holder, Mr W Northam. It summarised the budget monitoring position for the revenue account and capital programme to the end of January 2018. He reported that the budget was on track and thanked the excellent finance team led by the Head of Finance and Asset Management.

Questions and Discussion

- a) Referring to car park income, Mr E Seward asked if the limit had been reached. The Head of Finance and Asset Management said that there had previously been an over-forecast on income, but that the limit had not been reached. There would always be opportunities to acquire new car parks and a pay-by-phone scheme had just been introduced that worked better than credit card payments.
- b) In response to a question from Mrs S Bütikofer, the Corporate Director (SB) said that the District had 81 conservation areas. A specific programme was being carried out by Purcell, but it would not represent value for money to review all areas, e.g. Sharrington. In response to a further question from Mrs Bütikofer regarding Sculthorpe, he said that the Council's case for appeal would not have been strengthened in the context of a conservation area review. This had been discussed broadly by the Planning Policy and Built Heritage Working Party. The Major Projects Manager had been tasked with identifying any other areas under pressure and prioritising them for review. Mr S Hester, referring to the release of £20,000 for cost implications of the Sculthorpe appeal, asked if the Council was being represented by Eastlaw. The Corporate Director (SB) explained that a certain amount of work was done by Eastlaw and that a barrister was engaged where more specialist representation was required. The Council had won the Sculthorpe appeal, but this had cost money. There had been a challenge in the High Court and judgement was imminently awaited. The £20,000 related to these costs. Ms V Gay said that conservation area reviews raised people's awareness

of what they had, but weren't necessarily the right vehicle for preventing planning developments.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

144. ENFORCEMENT UPDATE

The report, which had been to Cabinet on 12 March, was introduced by the Portfolio Holder, Mrs S Arnold. It provided an update for Members on the work of the Enforcement Board over the past six months and also gave an assessment of progress made by the Board on the difficult enforcement cases since its inception. To date the Board had considered more than 150 cases which represented the most challenging cross-service cases. The public could now see that the Council applied a robust attitude towards enforcement. In thanking the Board, Mrs Arnold observed that dealing with empty homes and properties was the most difficult part of the work. Long term empty homes had increased in number with people stockpiling property for financial reasons.

The Chairman said that the Enforcement Update had been coming to the Committee on a regular basis. At the April Meeting there would be discussion about how best to use such reports.

Questions and Discussion

- a) Sutton Mill: Mrs P Grove-Jones reminded the Committee that Full Council had, on 21 December 2017, following a recommendation from Cabinet, approved loan funding of £350,000 to the National Millwrighting Centre CIC to facilitate the acquisition and improvement of Sutton Mill. She expressed concern that the Historic Buildings Trust did not appear to have matched funding. The Corporate Director (SB) said that the building was in a poor state of repair and the owner was hoping to sell it to the Historic Buildings Trust. The Council's offer had not been withdrawn, nor had the Historic Buildings Trust come forward. The owner had re-advertised the building for sale. It was possible that a "crowd funding" initiative could be happening. The Corporate Director (NB) added that the property was protected by regulatory issues. The Chairman explained that if the property was sold and nothing was done with it, the matter would come back to the Enforcement Board.
- b) Mrs S Bütikofer asked what could be done to address the increasing numbers of empty properties. Mrs S Arnold suggested that any ideas could be communicated to the Board but that the removal of the Second Homes Discount might help. The Corporate Director (NB) said that the problem was a social issue, (because the Council needed houses to be occupied) and financial (because it impacted on the homes bonus). He had met with colleagues in Revenues where long-term empty homes was a subject high on the agenda. Work was continuing and it had been discovered that some data wasn't being received quickly enough. More accurate data had removed 70 properties. Each empty property was being visited over the next two months to check that they were unoccupied. The people who owned these properties were paying their Council Tax, but there was every incentive for people to leave homes empty if market prices were increasing. The priorities were:
 - To ensure data was correct and processed in a timely manner.

- Is there anything wrong with the property which requires enforcement?
 - Is it for compulsory purchase?
- c) Tyre Storage, Tattersett Business Park: Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds said that she found the action unsatisfactory. The Corporate Director (NB) explained that it was a very difficult case but that public benefit had to be demonstrated before prosecution was embarked on. The owner had agreed to apply for a variation in his environment licence and it wouldn't be appropriate to prosecute under the circumstances. It would be very expensive for NNDC to remove the tyres. The Chairman suggested more robustness in the wording of reports that went into the public domain and that specific cases should be discussed with Officers.
- d) 4a Market Street, North Walsham: Ms V Gay said that she was not satisfied with the action and requested a written report. The Corporate Director (NB) agreed to provide it.
- e) Mr E Seward, referring to the temporary post in the Combined Enforcement Team, made the following recommendations to Cabinet, which were seconded by Ms V Gay.
- That the temporary post in the Combined Enforcement Team is made permanent.
 - To support the use of Reserves to fund the above, if necessary.
 - To support the early use of Compulsory Purchase Orders.
- f) Mr Seward said that it would be helpful if a report came to the Committee about challenges brought about by changes in legislation. He suggested that the government should be lobbied regarding the difficulty of current processes. Mrs S Arnold supported this. The Corporate Director (NB) said that the Combined Enforcement Team had been in operation for 2 years and had achieved really good results in planning enforcement. It encouraged people to complain louder about enforcement issues. A clean break had been created between planning policy and enforcement. There were some underspends at the end of the year which could fund a permanent post-holder for next year's budget. The reserve allowed the Council to bring in specialists. Compulsory Purchase Orders went to Cabinet first. The key issue was that there was a reserve and authorisation to spend it.
- g) Mr E Seward, referring to the temporary post in the Combined Enforcement Team, made the following recommendations to Cabinet, which were seconded by Ms V Gay and resolved.

RESOLVED to recommend to Cabinet:

- a) That the temporary post in the Combined Enforcement Team is made permanent.**
- b) To support the use of Reserves to fund the above, if necessary.**
- c) To support the early use of Compulsory Purchase Orders.**

145. THE CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

- a) The Leader was keen that ideas came not only from Cabinet, but from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.
- b) The Market Towns initiative was on the Cabinet Work Programme for 16 April. Cabinet would ask the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to do some initial work on this. It was intended that a paper would come to the Committee.
- c) The Beach Road Wells toilet site was on the work programme for May.

RESOLVED

To note the upcoming Cabinet Work Programme.

146. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME AND UPDATE

- a) This month's agenda had included 2 written reports that had been requested by Members.
- b) A decision list would be produced from today's meeting. This would enable progress to be more easily tracked.
- c) This month's Work Programme was brief because the Committee would be setting the annual Work Programme in April.
- d) Changes would be announced next month by central government regarding the way overview and scrutiny committees worked. It was likely that, for district councils, this would mean that recommendations went from Overview and Scrutiny to Full Council, rather than Cabinet.
- e) A dedicated post for Overview and Scrutiny was being advertised.

RESOLVED

To note the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme.

The meeting ended at 12.40 pm

Chairman