

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

Minutes of a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 18 June 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 M Knowles
Cllr A Claussen-Reynolds	Cllr N Lloyd
Cllr V Gay	Cllr R Reynolds
Cllr S Hester	Cllr E Seward
Cllr N Smith	

Officers in Attendance: The Corporate Director (SB), the Head of Legal and Democratic Services, the Democratic Services Manager, the Democratic Services and Governance Officer (Scrutiny), The Planning Policy Manager, the Head of IT and Digital Transformation, the Policy and Performance Management Officer.

Members in Attendance: Cllr R Shepherd, Cllr A Fitch-Tillett, Cllr J Rest, Cllr J Lee (Leader), Cllr R Price (Portfolio Holder for Property and Asset Commercialisation), Cllr B Hannah, Cllr H Cox, Cllr P Grove-Jones, and Cllr W Northam (Portfolio Holder for Finance, Revenue and Benefits).

20. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllr J English and Cllr B Smith.

21. SUBSTITUTES

Cllr R Shepherd

22. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions were received.

23. MINUTES

The minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 20 June 2018 were accepted as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

24. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

25. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

26. PETITIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

None.

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

No items were submitted for consideration prior to the agenda being published, however several issues were raised during the meeting. These would go forward to the next meeting for the Committee to consider how to respond to such requests and when to schedule them into the Work Programme.

Questions and Discussion

Cllr S Bütikofer stated that she would like the district's public conveniences to be discussed.

Cllr A Claussen-Reynolds requested that the Police and Crime Commissioner be invited to the Committee to discuss the rise in online scamming activities. The Democratic Services Manager agreed that the Committee was overdue for an update and would contact the Commissioner. The Chairman added that there had not been a general update on crime and disorder for some time and asked this to be added to the work programme.

Cllr B Hannah stated that he had attended a positive meeting with the Coastal Forum in Trimmingham, at which a Project Manager from the Water Management Alliance had been in attendance. He asked if it would be possible to invite Planning Officers to future discussions. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett stated that there was a lack of understanding on the work of the Internal Drainage Boards. She informed the Committee that Members did not always attend these meetings, which she found surprising taking into consideration that the Council paid a significant sum into the region's drainage levy. The Chairman reminded the Committee that the Planning Policy Manager had given a comprehensive response on flooding in the Local Plan Rapid Review, but suggested that it should be added to the Pre-Council Briefing for Member's.

Cllr S Bütikofer referred to the request for a crime and disorder update, and suggested that the Committee should discuss the loss of PCSOs in the district. The Corporate Director (SB) suggested that this issue should be separated from the Police and Crime Commissioner, and recommended that the District Commander Superintendent Chris Harvey should be invited to discuss this issue as it was an operational issue for the Constabulary, rather than for the PCC. Cllr E Seward added that he would like to ask the Police and Crime Commissioner why he believes it would be advantageous for him to run the fire service in Norfolk.

The Chairman referred to the Annual Action Plan and the reference to a Business Process Review in HR. She asked whether recruitment was part of the BPR and suggested that the Committee should receive an update from the HR Manager on recruitment, with particular attention paid to the issue of attracting candidates for professional posts.

28. RAPID REVIEW OF THE LOCAL PLAN

The Chairman introduced the Rapid Review of the Local Plan and informed the Committee that a number of recommendations had been produced. The Report can be found in Appendix A.

Questions and Discussion

The Planning Policy Manager thanked the Committee for hosting the Rapid Review, and stated that overall the day had proven more beneficial than expected. He added that attendance had been slightly disappointing and suggested that a wider representation of Members would have helped to improve understanding of the Local Plan. Overall, he suggested that the Rapid Review had been a positive investment of time. Cllr J Lee stated that he appreciated the comments, but wanted to place on record his concerns about how the recommendations would be implemented, and suggested that this may place further strain on Officers. The Chairman replied that resourcing would be covered within the recommendations to Cabinet. She added that the purpose of the Rapid Review was to have a broader conversation about identifying and mitigating risks in the Local Plan and wanted to ensure that adequate resources were a part of this.

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett stated that as a Member of the Planning Policy and Built Heritage Working Party, many of the questions in the Rapid Review could have been answered if Members attended these meetings. She also agreed that Member's attendance of the Rapid Review had been disappointing. The Chairman suggested that it was not always possible for Members to attend all meetings. She added that this was one of the reasons for the recommendation on improving Member and community engagement. Cllr P Grove-Jones suggested that the Local Plan had no impact on the wards of some Members and they therefore had very little incentive to attend the Rapid Review. The Chairman stated that the challenge was maintaining the support and engagement of Members and the community over the period of preparing the Local Plan which involved several stages. Cllr R Reynolds stated that the Planning Department were well aware of the issue, but had found it difficult to address. He added that the team still did an excellent job.

The Chairman informed the Committee that the aim of the review was to highlight risks and offer recommendations to improve the Local Plan. She stated that overall it had been a helpful and positive review, but accepted that it had raised some challenges. Cllr V Gay suggested that the extra resources may not necessarily have to be qualified Planning Officers and stated that the review was not intended to be a burden on Officers. Overall she felt that the rapid review had helped to inform the Committee why the Local Plan was so important.

The Corporate Director (SB) stated that he had been unable to attend the review, but acknowledged that feedback had been positive. He added that a helpful summary had been provided and suggested that the attendance should be logged as a matter of record. On recruitment, he informed the Committee that a rolling advert was being used to recruit Senior Planning Officers and that a number of people were to be interviewed for roles in the Planning Team in the next couple of weeks. However assuming there were strong candidates identified through this process, it was unlikely that any new employees would be able to start at NNDC until October. He stated that the concerns surrounding a lack of both Member and community engagement in the Local Plan process needed to be addressed, and a Local Plan newsletter had been issued to this effect. He then reminded the Committee that all 48 Councillors could assist in promoting and facilitating greater community engagement through their ward level contacts.

Items such as the Objectively Assess Need (OAN) and the revised forthcoming National Planning Policy Framework were noted to be fluid by the Corporate Director (SB), and it was therefore recommended that NNDC remain flexible in its response to these items. He added that the work around specialist housing would carry forward into January, and that Developer obligations such as the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) needed to be revisited.

The Corporate Director (SB) stated that feedback on David McGrath of Link Training Services had been good, but the issue of Member attendance across the Rapid Review

and Working Party required further consideration, as it suggested that some still felt detached from the Local Plan process. He added that he also felt that a discussion on the strength of the economy in North Norfolk was needed, as it had not been discussed at any length during the rapid review. The Chairman stated that one intention of the Rapid Review was to learn how to manage the process in-house going forward.

Cllr B Hannah spoke in defence of Members that could not attend, and reminded the Committee that many Members have other commitments outside of the Council. The Corporate Director (SB) acknowledged that Members could not attend every meeting, but reminded the Committee that planning policy development was an ongoing process that Members could get involved in at any point. Cllr V Gay stated that in her experience the Committee must simply continue to encourage attendance.

The Chairman suggested that for the next Rapid Review Members should be given the opportunity to add their input earlier to allow more time for Officers to complete their response.

For clarification, the Democratic Services Manager stated that a total of sixteen Members equal to one third of all Councillors had attended the Rapid Review, and this was considered good attendance for a one-off event.

The Chairman asked the Committee to take a vote for the recommendations en-bloc, the vote was proposed by Cllr V Gay and seconded by Cllr E Seward.

RESOLVED

Recommendations from Rapid Review were agreed and would be sent to Cabinet.

29. DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION UPDATE

This item was brought to the Committee for information only, however there were several questions from Members and the Head of IT and Digital Transformation was in attendance to provide answers.

Questions and Discussion

Cllr S Bütikofer thanked the Head of IT and Digital Transformation for his attendance, then referred to section 2.2 of the report and asked why there had been issues with direct debit payments on the NNDC website. The Head of IT and Digital Transformation replied that there had been delays in arranging the legal signing and operating of direct debit payments using the existing IT infrastructure. He continued that these were one-off issues that needed to be overcome and around eighty percent of customers had now used the self-service direct debit function. Cllr S Bütikofer asked when the self-service system had gone live and how it was performing. The Head of IT and Digital Transformation stated that the system went live between late February and early March but had not yet been actively marketed, then noted that it had worked well so far.

Cllr S Bütikofer referred to the cleansing of data and asked whether this would include Members. The Head of IT and Digital Transformation replied that this related to GIS data that was mainly comprised of address lists and was a matter of accuracy rather than security.

Cllr N Lloyd congratulated the Head of IT and Digital Transformation and his department on their work, then asked how the Council was proving and verifying its savings figures.

He added that the report suggested that there appeared to be a four year return on investments and made reference to a discrepancy in the savings figures with page 24 of the report referring to £375k of savings, and page 28 referring to £428k of savings. He said he would like to know which figure was correct. The Chairman stated that she would ask for a written response to be given on this question. The Head of IT and Digital Transformation replied that he would provide a written response, but informed the Committee that these figures were produced by the Finance Team. He added that the confusion may have been caused by a discrepancy between the projected and actual savings. The Chairman reiterated the need for a clarified response to be given in writing and added that she would like to see a comparison between the savings 'banked' and the projected savings for Phase 1, and how the projected savings were calculated.

Cllr R Reynolds thanked the Head of IT and Digital Transformation for compiling an excellent report and stated that it covered Phase 2 of the DTP well. The Chairman stated that Phase 1 required further clarification.

30. ANNUAL ACTION PLAN 2018/19 AND ANNUAL REPORT 2017/18

The Annual Action Plan had come back to the Committee at the request of the Chairman.

Questions and Discussion

It was confirmed that the recommendations had been implemented and the Chairman asked if the Committee was satisfied. Cllr N Lloyd agreed that the data had been updated and it was now a robust report. The Chairman agreed that data had been added and necessary changes made. She then thanked the Policy and Performance Management Officer for making the recommended changes.

Cllr S Bütikofer stated that some actions were slightly unclear and could be improved. She referred to page 36 of the report which indicated a net loss of 1.5k jobs from the numbers of people employed in the District and suggested that the Council should have an aim to slow and reduce this number. She then stated that she would like to see how the reduction in numbers of people employed in the District would be addressed moving forward.

Cllr E Seward questioned how the results expected in March or April would be measured, and suggested that it would be helpful to include an indication on the progress of target delivery in future reports. He said that at Scottow Enterprise Park there had been delays and below par performance, then asked how this issue could be avoided at the Egmere Enterprise Zone. He went on to state that there was nothing in the Annual Action Plan to ensure that targets were achieved by March 2019. The Chairman replied that the report was the first version of an edited report that had been carried out at a high level and said that it might be helpful if more of the targets were SMART. The Corporate Director (SB) stated that work would begin in Autumn to set the direction of the future Corporate Plan and this would be refined and agreed in May following the elections. With reference to Scottow, he explained that the site was owned by Norfolk County Council, but situated within the North Norfolk District where the Council was the local planning authority, meaning NNDC was not the project leader. As a result, whilst NNDC had provided planning permission allowing re-use of buildings within the former Technical Site Area with a cap of up to 105 HGV movements per week, the significant increase in the number of businesses occupying floor space at the site could not be fully attributed to NNDC. Cllr E Seward replied that he had used the example to demonstrate issues with the current version of the Annual Action Plan, then asked that the report for Egmere be brought to the Committee.

The Policy and Performance Management Officer stated that many projects in the current Annual Action Plan were long-term projects, but the Annual Report's focus was for 2017/18. She then offered to provide more detailed information on specific issues upon request and it was agreed that Members could contact her directly for this information.

Cllr S Hester stated that it would be helpful to have an overall figure for employment in the district, then improvement figures could be viewed relative to the total. The Policy and Performance Management Officer replied that the Head of Legal Services had already started organising this data in preparation for the new Corporate Plan.

Cllr V Gay referred to page 38 of the agenda on tourism in the district, she stated that the layout was clear but asked why the only item of focus was the Deep History Coast. She then asked what other items could be focused on and how the number of visitors to North Norfolk was measured. She suggested that it appeared that a level of explanation was missing from the report overall. The Chairman informed Cllr V Gay that the report was not intended to document all items, just those relevant to the Corporate Plan. The Corporate Director (SB) confirmed this and reiterated that the report did not cover all of the Council's work, just the work relevant to the Corporate Plan.

Cllr H Cox stated that a member of the public had recently asked a question about local trade in Cromer, to which a thorough response had been drafted by the Data Analyst. She asked that it be shared with Members.

Cllr E Seward referred to page 32 paragraph 1.2 of the agenda, and stated that previously the Council had been "suffocated" by performance targets, and though their removal was welcomed, it had provided a clear indication of the Council's performance. He continued that it may now be necessary to develop an alternative method of measuring the Council's performance against other similar sized authorities. The Chairman agreed and said this was the driver behind the previous request for benchmarking, adding that it could highlight underperformance as well as innovation and best practice. She went on to say that following the Council's change to no overall control the LGA had provided support to Members and Officers and said that it would be helpful to receive an update on the support that had been provided so far. The Corporate Director (SB) said that it was important to scrutinise robust data sets, and that the Council had shared recent significant areas of success such as business Rates and Council Tax collection figures which placed the Council in the top 12% of all authorities with Members. He stated that some services would be more difficult to measure against other authorities as they may not be comparable owing to the fact that not all authorities provided public toilets, or had Blue Flag beaches for example. He suggested as an alternative that the Council could look to measure performance on a cost per user basis, but advised the Committee that a decision needs to be made on how much time the Council spends on monitoring its performance as opposed to doing the work.

Cllr S Bütikofer stated that all authorities measure customer satisfaction, then referred to page 52 of the agenda that gave a satisfaction rating of 100% and asked how this had been measured. The Head of IT and Digital Transformation replied that a metric had been used to arrive at the 100% figure and this was done quarterly. He informed the Committee that this data was based on the 20% of customers that had responded to the satisfaction survey. He added that the complaints data was measured separately. Cllr J Lee thanked the Policy and Performance Management Officer for the report and said that Cabinet was please to support it.

Cllr E Seward referred to the North Walsham Public Service Hub that had been identified in the report, and asked for more detail. The Corporate Director (SB) replied that this was a mistake and the report should have stated the site was in Fakenham (Fakenham

Connect) and not North Walsham. He added that there was an aspiration to deliver a similar multi-agency public service gateway in North Walsham, but at present there was no appropriate building able to accommodate such a hub. The Committee was informed that previously the Council had attempted to secure the former Northfield Surgery building in the town for this purpose, but could not reach an agreement with the NHS. The Corporate Director (SB) added that it was still an aspiration of the Council to see a multi-agency public service gateway provided in North Walsham, but as it was not leading the project, it relied on NCC to identify possible site opportunities and no more information was available at this time. Cllr E Seward was informed of the Officer responsible for the project at NCC and stated that he would attempt to determine the progress as a County Councillor. Cllr J Rest asked if the Northfield Surgery building was still available and was informed by the Corporate Director (SB) that NHS England had sought to advertise the asset for sale for residential development but sought a value which didn't respect the requirement to provide affordable housing as required by Local Plan policies and that at present the building was being used to deliver Norfolk Child Health Services at the county level.

RESOLVED

To receive the Annual Action Plan 2018-19 and the Annual Report 2017-18.

31. ASSET MANAGEMENT WORKING GROUP

This item was deferred until the next meeting to allow further time for appointments to the Working Group to be made.

32. BEACH HUTS AND CHALETS TASK & FINISH GROUP

Cllr M Knowles gave a brief update on the progress of the Task and Finish Group and informed the Committee that progress continued to be made.

Questions and Discussion

Cllr M Knowles informed the Committee that minutes for the last meeting were awaiting approval and would be circulated amongst Members once they had been agreed. He informed the Committee that a report was being drafted and would be ready to view by the next meeting. He added that he would not be able to attend the meeting himself but would ensure the report was available to view.

33. MARKET TOWNS INITIATIVE WORKING GROUP

Cllr S Bütikofer informed the Committee that the MTI launch event had been a success and was well received amongst the public.

Questions and discussion

Cllr S Bütikofer stated that the draft minutes were attached to the agenda but reminded Members that they were subject to change. The Chairman asked if a date had been agreed for the next meeting and was informed that it had not yet been agreed.

34. THE CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

The Democratic Services Manager provided an update on the Cabinet work programme.

35. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME AND UPDATE

The Democratic Services and Governance Officer provided an update on the Overview and Scrutiny Work Programme.

Questions and Discussion

It was agreed that the next Rapid Review would be on recycling as opposed to the scheduled housing review to allow time for housing figures to be published.

Cllr R Reynolds referred to the Norfolk County Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny Panel, for which he was the Council's appointed representative. He said that a report had been completed on the difficulties faced by police on tackling trafficking over county lines. He added that Norfolk had been targeted due to its vulnerability, and that arrests often involved London residents.

The Democratic Services and Governance Officer informed the Committee that the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme had been supplied by Cllr A Claussen-Reynolds and would be circulated to Members.

Cllr E Seward asked when the Egmore Enterprise Zone would be brought to the Committee for consideration and the Chairman proposed to refer this business case to the Asset Management Working Group once established.

The Democratic Services and Governance Officer informed the Committee that an invitation had been offered for Members to visit the NEWS' recycling facility prior to the Recycling Rapid Review. Concerns were raised regarding health and safety but it was agreed these would be addressed by the Environmental Services Team.

The meeting ended at 11.07 am

Chairman

APPENDIX A

RAPID REVIEW OF THE LOCAL PLAN

Summary: On 4th July 2018 the Overview & Scrutiny Committee carried out a 'rapid review' of the Local Plan. The review assessed the status and health of the plan and current arrangements to progress it.

Conclusions: The Committee considered the prepared written responses on four broad themes; housing, environmental policies, developer obligations and resources. Questions were asked of the Portfolio Holder for Planning and the Planning Policy Manager and a series of recommendations were made.

Recommendations: 1. That Overview & Scrutiny Committee approves the recommendations set out at **Appendix A**

2. That the Committee reviews the 'Outcome tracker' (**Appendix B**) and agrees target dates for review.

Cabinet Member(s)	Ward(s) affected
Contact Officer, telephone number and email:	

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 4th July 2018 the Overview & Scrutiny Committee held a 'rapid review' of the Local Plan. Before the review the Committee met to establish the themes that they wished to focus on and to agree key lines of questioning for the rapid review.
- 1.2 Nine themes were initially agreed upon; delivering housing targets, internal resources, availability and deliverability of current land, consideration of smaller sites to deliver new homes, NPPF impact on council's baseline target, AONB and landscape protection, developer contributions to new developments, strategic flood risk issues and social and affordable housing / second homes
- 1.3 These themes were sent to the Planning Portfolio Holder and the Planning Policy Manager for a written response. The responses were collated into four themes; housing, environmental policies, developer obligations and resources.
- 1.4 A timetable for the day together with the responses and key lines of questioning were circulated to all Members in advance of the rapid review with the request that anyone who wished to raise any further questions on the day should submit them in advance.
- 1.5 On the day of the rapid review the Committee met an hour before the start to agree which Member would put forward specific questions. This was to ensure that the questions were managed effectively and avoided duplication.

2. Rapid Review – 4th July

- 2.1 It was agreed that the questions would be put to the Planning Portfolio Holder and the Planning Policy Manager together to allow a joint response. The themes were addressed in the order set out above and 'headline' discussions are highlighted below.
- 2.2 **Housing**

- 2.2.1 It was established that the Council had not yet received its received its OAN (Objectively Assessed Need) target for the year. The current OAN was 409 dwellings, but this was expected to rise to approximately 540.
- 2.2.2 Contingency plans were discussed if it looked like that the Council's five year land supply might be at risk. It was confirmed that there were contingencies already in place (Plan B) but there were additional options available that could be considered if the need arose. In total there were five contingency plans identified by the Committee.
- 2.2.3 It was established that the predicted OAN could fall in the future as demand for housing declined across the district. It was suggested that if this was the case the OAN could fall to approximately 420 if current projections are confirmed.
- 2.2.4 The Planning Policy Manager said that OAN 'plus' would be a good position to deliver above the minimum requirement and encourage growth. It was likely that Cabinet would make the decision in October 2018.
- 2.2.5 Cross party support for the Local Plan was critical to ensure work continued uninterrupted beyond the Local Elections in 2019 and it was agreed that all members should be fully engaged in the any discussions regarding the policy options relating to the level of the OAN which will be included in the draft Local Plan. Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party should give consideration as to how this engagement should be implemented.
- 2.2.6 Affordable housing was priced at 80% market value and social housing was priced at 60% market value. It was felt that this was not sufficient for the region and solutions should be fully explored.

2.3 Environmental Policies

- 2.3.1 Encouraging building on long-standing Brownfield sites should be encouraged and a more 'flexible' brownfield sites policy could address this.
- 2.3.2 Policy SS2 (Development in the Countryside) was discussed and it was felt that an up to date evidence base on the Policy should be produced to ensure the balance of economic development with countryside protection, particularly in relation to micro businesses' start-up businesses, businesses which provide services to our aging demographic and small growth developments to improve the sustainability of villages.
- 2.3.3 The value of Conservation Area Appraisals to strengthen the Council's policy position was established. It was felt that a regular updates on progress with new and updated Conservation Area Appraisals would be useful and a rolling programme of review should commence as per the recommendation.

2.4 Developer Obligations

- 2.4.1 Members discussed potential inadequacies in the District's community infrastructure. Concerns were raised that many small developments did not meet the threshold that required them to build supporting infrastructure. for the communities. The Community Infrastructure Levy could provide a solution to this but the implications of introducing CIL should be fully explored.
- 2.4.2 CIL was not the only option available and alternatives for generating funding for infrastructure could be explored, including the introduction of a local infrastructure levy scheme.

- 2.4.3 Learning from other similar local authorities could be beneficial and enable the Council to learn from best practice.

2.5 Resources

- 2.5.1 Members discussed putting additional support in place to ensure that there was full engagement regarding the Local Plan. It was agreed that this should commence in the autumn and should be ongoing and proactive.
- 2.5.2 Concerns were expressed about ensuring parishes and towns were also regularly updated. The committee requested that if it was clear that the Local Plan would not be ready for consultation by January 2019 then a revised timetable should be issued and affected parishes must be briefed accordingly.

3. Additional representations

- 3.1 **Social housing and poor transport links** – concerns were raised regarding the siting of some social housing in areas with poor transport links. It was suggested that members should inform officers if they were aware of such sites.
- 3.2 **Duty to Co-operate** – the issue of the impact of neighbouring authorities failing to produce a Local Plan was considered. Members were advised that this was not considered to be a material risk and that the Norfolk authorities were working to the same timetable and the Forum would be requesting that each Council stated where they stood on their ability to address their housing target.
- 3.3 **Balanced growth** – the Planning Policy Manager and the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development both spoke about the need to balance housing with economic growth, although it should be acknowledged that there could be tensions between employment growth and housing growth. The Portfolio Holder for Economic Development reminded Members that the 2008 plan had identified sites for employment land and several of these had not been delivered. In addition, there had been several occasions where businesses wanted to expand but had been unable to find sites suitable for their needs. Mixed allocations could be a way forward as this would widen the choice available to businesses wanting to locate in the District.
- 3.4 **Micro-businesses in rural areas (including agricultural buildings)** - current policies were discussed and members were advised business owners had to justify that their business required a rural location. This could be widened out to ensure flexibility as there was currently insufficient good quality accommodation for small businesses. It was agreed that the policy could be strengthened whilst acknowledging that this would have a cost to developers.

4. Rapid Review of Housing

Several issues were identified as being suitable for further consideration under the rapid review of housing which will take place later in the year:

- 4.1 Housing Growth – low incomes and high prices. Current methodology suggested that if the supply of housing was increased then prices would fall. This was not reflected in North Norfolk and should be considered further.
- 4.2 St Ives Principle – If applied in North Norfolk this could encourage people to purchase properties as their main residence rather than as a second home, whilst acknowledging that this could lead to ‘dormitory towns’.
- 4.3 Mixed use developments – as discussed above, these should be looked at further to see if economic developments could be included as part of housing developments.
- 4.4 Accommodation for elderly people – consideration should be given as to how the Council could ensure that sufficient suitable accommodation was available. It was agreed that benchmarking with similar local authorities could be beneficial with this.
- 4.5 Re-establishment of the Housing Forum held amongst similar authorities (ie those with coastal issues, second homes, tourism etc) could help address issues within housing across the County.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 The Committee established a series of recommendations on the key themes presented to them (attached at Appendix A). Once agreed by the Committee these will be referred to the relevant Committee or sub-committee for consideration.
- 5.2 The recommendations would be tracked by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to ensure that proposed outcomes and benefits were achieved (attached at Appendix B).

6. Financial Implications and Risks

There are no financial risks arising from the Rapid Review. However, failure to publish a Local Plan could have financial implications for the Council. It is intended that the rapid review will ensure that the process for producing a Local Plan is robust and any challenges are addressed.

Recommendations from the Rapid Review of the Local Plan

General

To recommend to Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party:

- 1. That the timetable for the Local Plan (written in plain English) is published in a prominent place on the Council's website (e.g. front page) and is regularly updated to reflect any changes made.

To request of the Planning Policy Manager:

- 2. That clarification is given to as to why the Council has not been notified of the revised Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) housing figures, if it is shown that other Districts have been notified already.
- 3. That once notified of this figure, a statement will be provided to Overview and Scrutiny Committee regarding the consequences and how this figure supports or changes the risks for NNDC and whether additional mitigation is needed.

Housing

To recommend to Planning & Built Heritage Working Party:

1. That work is commenced in relation to the evaluation and generation of contingency sites ('Plan B') to establish whether it is required and any associated risks with pursuing this option. This work should be undertaken so that an informed decision can be made in the autumn.
2. That cross party support for the Local Plan is critical to ensure work continues uninterrupted beyond the Local Elections in 2019 and therefore that **all** Members are fully engaged in the consideration of the policy options relating to the level of the OAN which will be included in the draft Local Plan, recognising that Full Council will approve the final version of the Local Plan and that Overview & Scrutiny Committee can make recommendations to Council if they feel that the above issues have not been addressed.
3. That Overview & Scrutiny Committee receive a further report from the Planning Policy Manager in October 2018 to
 - (a) consider the revised OAN data and any policy options and implications
 - (b) provide pre-decision scrutiny and
 - (c) support a mechanism to engage all members in the assessment of key policy choices, including referral to and consideration by Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party.

To recommend to Cabinet:

4. That benchmarking is undertaken against similar authorities (demographics, topographic, housing mix) to ensure that the Council is following best practice in its approach (through the Local Plan) to the provision of :
 - (a) an appropriate housing mix
 - (b) suitably designed accommodation for an ageing population and
 - (c) mixed allocation sites
5. That further policy work is undertaken with particular reference to innovations in the provision of affordable housing, including a local definition of affordable products (e.g. what is 'usefully affordable' across North Norfolk?).

Environmental Policies

To recommend to Cabinet:

1. A more 'flexible approach' regarding the Council's policy on brownfield sites e.g. to incentivise land owners to bring forward potentially suitable brownfield sites for housing, commercial or mixed-use development and to recognise that a 'one-size fits all' policy on brownfield sites does not reflect the diversity across the District.

To recommend to Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party:

2. That an up to date evidence base on Policy SS2 (Development in the Countryside) is produced to balance economic development with countryside protection, particularly

in relation to micro businesses' start-up businesses and businesses which provide services to our aging demographic.

3. The introduction of a rolling programme of reviewing and updating Conservation Area Reviews prioritised to reflect potential or anticipated development applications as this will provide additional protection from developer challenge in appeal situations as evidenced by the Conservation Officer submission to the Rapid Review.
4. To request that the Planning Policy Manager provides a written response regarding the incomplete sentence on page 22 of the papers.

Developer Obligations

To recommend to Cabinet:

1. That the Council undertakes a review of whether the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as a policy for the Council should be considered, highlighting the pros and cons for the District, any risks to particular parts of the District and the resource implications of introducing CIL.
2. That alternative options for generating funding for infrastructure should be explored and research should be undertaken to understand what other local authorities have tried so we learn from good practice.
3. That consideration is given to the introduction of a local infrastructure levy scheme whilst considering the risks to local developers being priced out of the market.

Resources

To recommend to Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party:

1. That a communications and engagement plan is produced and implemented to ensure that Members and local communities are fully engaged with the Local Plan process and supported to respond to challenges. This should commence in Autumn 2018 as mitigation against a further delay and should be resourced with appropriately qualified and skilled communications and change professionals.
2. That if it is apparent by October 2018 that the Local Plan will not be ready for consultation in January 2019, that a revised timetable is published and all affected parishes are actively briefed and a revised risk assessment is undertaken to understand what mitigation is needed to support the five year land supply in this scenario.

To request of the Planning Policy Manager:

3. That the update to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in October 2018 will include a full or interim response to all recommendations made following the high level review, including any new emerging risks and the proposed mitigation.

Recommendation to Overview & Scrutiny Committee:

Summary of recommendation	How will we know that we have made a beneficial difference e.g. SMART outcomes?
---------------------------	---

1: Timetable for local plan prominently visible on website with timely updates	Timetable for local plan prominently visible on website with timely updates
2: Clarify to O&S why OAN figures not received	Provided to O&S meeting on X date
3: Update O&S on OAN figures and implications	Provided to O&S meeting on X date
4: Commence work to assess whether contingency plan B is required	Initial work completed and decision made by PPBHWG in the autumn on status of 'Plan B'
5: Cross party platform built to ensure stability in LP progress – through engagement with all Members	Engagement programme put in place to ensure cross party mechanism in place for consideration of policy options relating to OAN level – before Full Council approves the final version of the Local Plan
6: Use a benchmarking strategy to establish best practice in (a) housing mix (b) housing for an ageing population (c) mixed use allocations	New strategy commenced on x date, completed on y date and is now informing the z strategy
7: Produce a new flexible and innovative brownfield site use strategy to incentivise owners to bring sites forward	New strategy produced and agreed by X on Y date. Z number of new brownfield sites brought forward for assessment
8: Update of Policy SS2 needed to balance micro business use and countryside protection	Completed on X date.
9: Introduce a rolling programme of reviews and updates for Conservation Area Reviews	Prioritised list of CAR's agreed on x date to be completed by y date
10: Review the need for a CIL	Completed on X date
11: Alternative options for funding for infrastructure to be explored including Local Levy infrastructure scheme (and risks)	Completed on X date
12: Produce a communications and engagement plan for communities and members	Completed on X date. Members and communities surveyed and report good awareness of local plan
13: Produce a revised timetable and new risk assessment in the event of delay and engage communities	Subject to status report of local plan by Oct 2018
14: All outcomes are tracked and reported to O&S	All outcomes reported back and progress (or otherwise) considered by O&S and the PPBHWG

1. That the outcomes of all recommendations are 'tracked' by Overview & Scrutiny Committee to assess their impact and effectiveness.

