

OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee held on Wednesday, 10 December 2025 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 9.30 am

Committee	Cllr P Bailey	Cllr C Rouse
Members Present:	Cllr V Holliday (Chair)	Cllr C Cushing
	Cllr A Fletcher	Cllr M Gray (Vice-Chair)
	Cllr M Hankins	Cllr K Leith

Members also attending: Cllr L Shires (PH for Finance, Estates and Property Services)

Officers in Attendance: Director for Service Delivery (DSD) Director for Resources (DFR), Democratic Services Governance Officer (DSGO), Housing Strategy and Delivery Manager (HSDM)

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllrs K Bayes and S Penfold.

91 SUBSTITUTES

None

92 PUBLIC QUESTIONS & STATEMENTS

None received.

93 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12th November were approved as a correct record barring the following minor amendments.

Pg.2 1st paragraph to remove 'and' or 'but' after year end
Pg 2. Licencing spelled incorrectly in American English
Pg.7. Add additional 'T' to end of Cllr Fitch-Tillett
Pg.7. Small gains rather than small gain
Pg.8.2nd paragraph it should be decarbonise rather than decarbon

94 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None received.

95 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

96 PETITIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

None received.

97 CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY A

MEMBER

None received.

98 NOMINATION OF REPRESENTATIVE TO THE NORFOLK HEALTH OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE (NHOSC)

RESOLVED to recommend to Full Council:

The Committee discussed nominating a candidate to be the new representative on the Norfolk Health Overview Select Committee (NHOSC). Cllr Cushing nominated Cllr Holliday. Cllr Bailey nominated Cllr Gray.

Cllr Cushing suggested it would be a good idea to hear from each nominee as to why they felt they would be best suited to the role. Cllr Gray believed there was no precedent for this, so the Chair sought advice from the DSGO. The DSGO advised it was prudent to hear from each nominee to give the Committee a balanced understanding of who they wished to vote for as the Committee's representative.

Cllr Gray wished to withdraw his nomination at this point. The Chair asked for clarification if that was his wish. Cllr Gray confirmed it was.

Action

- The Committee voted to nominate Cllr Holliday as the new O&S representative on the Norfolk Health Overview Select Committee with 5 votes for and 2 abstentions.

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

None received.

ANGLIAN WATER UPDATE

The Chair introduced Grant Tuffs (Regional Engagement Manager), Joe Thompson (Regional Operations Manager for Norfolk) and Hannah Wilson (Planning Manager) from Anglian Water (AW), who gave an update on their plans and progress since their previous visit in June 2025 (see Appendix to these minutes.).

AW highlighted that all seven bathing waters in North Norfolk were now rated as excellent. The Environment Agency (EA) rated the area as having some of the cleanest waters in the UK. The AW 5-year business plan had outlined a £11 billion investment in the region, including £1 billion to tackle storm overflows, specifically targeting those storm overflows that spill the most and have the greatest environmental impact. AW were also looking to reduce phosphorus, nitrogen and ammonia going through the water system, which has an environmental impact.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

Cllr Fletcher asked about the conservation of rivers, and protection of watercourses, with the increased pressures of providing new houses in the area. AW admitted that their business plan did not take into consideration the Government's aspirations for growth, and accelerated delivery of growth, so they had changed how they were responding to planning applications and were objecting when their water recycling centres (WRC) were at capacity, or in some cases over capacity. This was due to

protecting the environment at the receiving watercourse. They were recommending a pre-occupation condition for schemes within their business plan where a local authority applied a condition which would ensure the developer did not connect to the network, increasing the waterflows at that recycling centre, until AW had delivered that growth scheme. AW permits at WRC were unique to each centre and set by the EA with the intention of protecting the environment. AW were also using the planning system to highlight any constraints within the network, looking at overflows, pollution, the potential for increased spills and flood risk. They were working collaboratively with Government, DEFRA and OFWAT to understand how they could meet the demands of growth, whilst protecting their customers and the environment.

It was noted by Cllr Hankins that it was a good thing that AW had recognised there had been a significant increase in planning and asked if they had seen the Council's new Local Plan. AW confirmed they had seen it and had asked for specific provisions in the policies to ensure developers engaged with them early so they could confirm if there was capacity to ensure the environment was protected.

Cllr Rouse joined the meeting.

In response to Cllr Hankins' question querying if the increased number of houses provided a challenge in meeting that demand for supply, AW confirmed it did pose a challenge, although proposed development in North Walsham was less impacted from an environmental capacity as it did not discharge into a watercourse but into the North Sea, meaning less pressure on the WRC. AW explained they had a duty to supply domestic properties and for businesses, their toilets, kitchen and showers, so were looking at long term water resource and to protect that supply. In certain cases, that would include restricting non-household and industrial water demand, working with those industrial sites to lower water usage and encourage re-using water; as well as working with developers to deliver schemes that reduced water consumption.

A similar question was raised by Cllr Cushing in respect of the future developments planned in north Fakenham which would see an approximate 20% increase in the town. Unlike North Walsham they only had 1 water tower, so he asked for reassurance that some consideration had been made towards water capacity for the town.

AW were happy to take away the queries from Cllrs Hankins and Cushing in relation to the new homes planned for North Walsham and Fakenham and how they intended to meet that demand, but AW reiterated they were obliged to find ways to deliver for those domestic customers.

Cllr Leith also wished to know why North Walsham East residents were reporting that water pressure in that area was so low they couldn't have a shower and run a dishwasher at the same time. AW advised that water pressure was a statutory requirement so they had to maintain pressure, but would urge anyone with low water pressure to report it to them so they could investigate and look to resolve the issue.

Cllr Shires, Member for North Walsham West and Norfolk County Council Member for North Walsham East, had noticed that much of the AW infrastructure was failing and highlighted the many damaged pavements and roads caused by AW digging up surfaces. This caused difficulty for those with mobility aids in accessing the town centre and key services as well as proving a hazard for cyclists and motorbikes as they had less grip on the road. People said they had no faith in AW to deliver, with expansion coming, and, although Cllr Shires appreciated there were budgeting

constraints, she felt investment was required if people were not to be disadvantaged by AW in an attempt to fix poor infrastructure. AW said if details were forwarded to them of where the damaged surfaces were located they would take it up with their local network reinstatement teams. Cllr Shires agreed to provide this after the meeting.

The Chair asked about developments within the current local plan that might be exceeding capacity in terms of treatment or delivery. AW said they now raised an objection within the planning process where the environment or capacity was at risk, despite it being in a local plan. AW said that in respect of planning applications they now looked at total risk, rather than size of development, so one dwelling in a rural area could have a high risk, where with larger developments they very often had more control, time and conversations with developers. AW also confirmed, after a query from The Chair, they were statutory consultees for the Local Plan but not planning applications. They had lobbied Government for many years arguing they should be for both.

AW did say the Council's planning case officers were very good in notifying, and consulting them over applications and, additionally, they used a third-party to notify them of applications in the area and were due to speak to the Planning team very soon.

In response to a query from the Chair about the, in many cases Victorian, sewage network having capacity, AW said all North Norfolk sewage networks were monitored. The network monitors they had installed detected issues early to inform them of how the network was coping or if at risk of failure. They explained they carried out a programme of maintenance on their sewage network as much as they do on the clean water network and will fix, monitor and replace those in need on a priority basis. They assured the Chair that many of the older network was actually very good. Those monitors currently had an uptime of 97.8% and that was a performance metric upon which they were judged. The Chair did note that the overflow monitors for Holt, Langham and Walsingham appeared to be off after the recent heavy rain. AW confirmed that monitors were sometimes off for maintenance, or fault, with many being fixed daily to ensure optimum performance. Sometimes it could be a glitch as to how they show on their map but would happily confirm in this instance the specific reason if the Chair wished. The penalties for monitors being off were quite high so it was in AW's interest, for transparency purposes, that they remained online.

In terms of investment in reducing spill frequency at Langham, Walsingham and Holt there were investigations in those areas that essentially resulted in a modelled output, and they were likely to inform the next investment cycle, due between 2030 and 2035, subject to any wider regulatory change in the industry. Those overflows that were being improved in the area during that current cycle were those the EA deemed to be the most environmentally impactful ones.

The Chair asked if using dry weather flow to estimate WRC headroom was the most sensible methodology and AW said it was the rules they follow for calculating capacity. They could not comment if it was the best methodology for it, but it was what the industry followed per guidance from the EA and gave you a reasonable idea.

Cllr Rouse asked for an update to spillages since AW last visited. AW explained they were aiming to reduce discharges by 17% over the next 5 years, which was in line with the Government standards storm overflow reduction plan. AW reported that up

until the end of October discharges occurred on 194 occasions with an average of 6.4 spills per storm overflow for an average of 21 hours, which was significantly lower than the previous year and that was linked to the dry weather, but also that some of their interventions were beginning to help. All storm overflows were on a storm overflow reduction plan which was published on the Government website and people could view what the plan was to reduce spill numbers and what AW actions would be over the next 10-15 years to meet those targets.

AW also brought to the Committee's attention the new storage tank at Runton, Beach Road, which was now online and significantly impacted the spill frequency.

They also confirmed, at the Chair's request, that the permits they received from the EA in respect of discharging into chalk streams had very tight parameters compared with when the receiving watercourse was a km into the North Sea, as the nutrients being discharged this way had less of an environmental impact so fewer constraints.

AW kindly offered to answer any questions, submitted after the meeting, in writing and the DSGO will liaise with all Members and AW to action.

Action

- To give further detail on how Anglian Water endeavour to meet the challenges, in regard to water capacity, provided by the new homes, that are planned for the North Walsham and Fakenham areas over the coming years.

101 REPORTING PROGRESS IMPLEMENTING CORPORATE PLAN 2023-2027 ACTION PLAN TO END OF Q2

Cllr Shires introduced the report and invited members to ask questions.

It was felt by Cllr Hankins that the RAG (Red Amber Green) classification was too broad and suggested going forward it could be made clearer by including, as a percentage, the progress towards any action being completed, as he believed that would give more information. Cllr Shires felt they had tried various methods in showing progress in her time as a Member and had tried to work with the Committee in getting the best format. This was a 12-month plan, so the green meant they were on track at this point, to reach their outcome within that planned period.

The DSD said he could see the benefits of the suggestions but an obvious challenge around that would be that not all projects were linear so it could get to this stage and only be 10% complete which would raise concerns for the Committee. However, they could still be rated green as that was all it intended to deliver by that point in time as they were due to complete later in the 12 month cycle. Currently, an Officer would be asked if on track to complete on schedule and if they were it would be green, which would seem a fairer representation of where it was when being reported to the Committee.

Cllr Hankins believed all the elements must have a plan in place that clearly laid out the objectives, and the milestones to achieve those outcomes, and he asked that a subjective assessment be provided of those categories.

Cllr Shires said they had previously been criticised for being subjective, and not measurable, so the Committee needed to come to an agreement on what they wanted. The Chair felt she would like more explanation as to why something was amber but asked the Committee if they had any comments.

Cllr Hankins felt the categories were not specific enough and asked for some consideration to add more focus. Cllr Cushing agreed that there was no sign of anything being delivered within the plan and he'd expect to see more reds and ambers, as he believed any plan should have demanding objectives. Cllr Cushing suggested that was where the Committee could add value by asking, why is this action amber or red, and consider what they could then do to get it back on track.

Cllr Shires said the public do care about what was delivered off the back of the action plan. If the Committee wanted a detailed report on every specific thing that would be a lot of information and reports already came through various Committees, including Overview & Scrutiny. They would have to find the best way to direct the Committee to those existing reports.

Cllr Leith wondered if it was worthwhile adding, at CLT's discretion and barring any confidentiality that needed to be respected, an additional column summarising what remained to be done and providing a timeframe for each stage. It was suggested by Cllr Gray that the Committee convene in private to agree a template that would be a standard for what they needed. The DSD felt that adding additional information to those actions, that were amber or red, giving some context as to what the issues were and why they were rated that way, was a good idea.

In response to the Chair, around a query on the number of new affordable homes that were due to be completed in 2025/26 the HSDM agreed to take away and confirm in writing, but she believed the correct figure was 96.

The Chair also asked about two actions, one on sports pitches and the other on coastal protection schemes, that were amber but no explanation as to why. The DSD explained that in respect of the three 3G pitches, Cromer had been delivered, Fakenham was part of the Fakenham Sports and Leisure Hub provision, and for North Walsham they were waiting on the football club who had not yet signed off on a new lease to reach the threshold for football foundation funding. The Leisure team was meeting with the football club to progress this forward. In terms of coastal protection, the DFR advised there were some snagging issues towards the Mundesley scheme which was led by the local town council and most of those had now been progressed. In terms of the Coastwise programme, which was a very large scheme funded by the EA, the DFR explained it had a very tight delivery timetable with no ability to carry the money forward beyond the end of the programme of the 31st March 2027, As many of those Coastwise activities were very long term it was always going to be a challenge to meet that deadline, but the Coastal team were having very positive discussions around what type of programme could succeed that current funding.

Cllr Shires felt that Cllr Fletcher raised a pertinent issue on the Rural Position Statement of local services as they strongly believed what is there currently needed to be preserved. Cllr Fletcher wondered if there was a deadline to do this. Cllr Shires agreed the current central Government didn't appear to understand rurality and metropolitan boroughs appeared more favoured than rural communities. Cllr Shires asked if she could take that away to which Cllr Fletcher agreed.

Cllr Cushing wished to know of the sacrosanctity of the Neighbourhood Plans or was there a threat that the Council, or Government, could override them. Cllr Shires felt they needed to make sure communities understood what a Neighbourhood plan was designed to achieve, and she would recommend any community looking to embark on such a plan to meet with officers from the Planning Policy team as they were very keen to ensure communities were as informed as they could be at the beginning of

the journey. Cllr Shires believed Neighbourhood Plans were important for enabling local people to have a voice on what they want for their community, and it was important for Members to facilitate that with the uncertainty of a unitary authority not far away. The DSM added that planning decisions were balanced. Cllr Gray encouraged all Members to engage with the free seminars on Neighbourhood Plans to understand how they are formed. Cllr Hankins thought it would be beneficial to know the benefits of Neighbourhood plans.

Action:

- Cllr Shires to confirm if there is there a deadline for providing a Rural Position Statement of local services to ensure they are preserved as the Council transitions into a new authority.
- CLT to take away the suggestions to make the position clearer around why the reds and ambers are rated that way.

The Committee **Noted** the contents of the report and provided comments on any items they felt appropriate.

102 COUNCIL TAX DISCOUNT DETERMINATIONS 2026/2027

Cllr Shires introduced the item and wished to make the Committee aware that it was not legislated that they had to publicise in the newspaper, but it was best practice. Cllr Shires highlighted the report on second homes as the Council had to make that position known prior to February but discussions were ongoing with Norfolk County Council (NCC). Cllr Shires reminded the Committee that money generated from the second homes premium went to meet the cost of temporary accommodation.

The Chair wished to clarify if Appendix A was a full list of properties as it did not seem very extensive. The DFR agreed to investigate and confirm with the Committee after the meeting.

Cllr Cushing asked if the Committee should be worried about the risk of a legal challenge in regards the Council Tax Premium charge. Cllr Shires felt that any part of Council Tax could pose a potential risk as people looked to challenge and suggested maybe the Governance, Risk and Audit Committee (GRAC) might like to consider in more detail. The DSGO noted and would discuss with the GRAC Chair.

ACTION:

- The DFR to confirm if the Proposed Pre 1948 2nd Home Schedule is correct, and complete, in Appendix A.

The Committee RESOLVED unanimously to recommend to Full Council: that under Section 11A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Finance Act 2012 and other enabling powers that:

- 1) The discounts for the year 2026-27 and beyond are set at the levels indicated in the table at paragraph 3.1.
- 2) To continue to award a local discount of 100% in 2026-27 for eligible cases of hardship under Section 13A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended) and that the Revenues Manager has delegated authority to make Discretionary Reductions under the Hardship Policy up to the value of

- £4k as indicated in the associated policy in Appendix B.
- 3) That an exception to the empty property levy charges may continue to be made by the Revenues Manager in the circumstances laid out in section 4.2 of this report.
 - 4) The long-term empty-property premiums for the year 2026-27 (subject to the empty premium exceptions shown in Appendix C) are set at the levels indicated in the table at paragraph 4.2
 - 5) To continue to award a local discount of 100% in 2026-27 for eligible cases of care leavers under Section 13A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended).
 - 6) Those dwellings that are specifically identified under regulation 6 of the Council Tax (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings) (England) Regulations 2003 will retain the 50% discount as set out in paragraph 2.1 of this report.
 - 7) Those dwellings described or geographically defined at Appendix A which in the reasonable opinion of the Revenues Manager are judged not to be structurally capable of occupation all year round and were built before the restrictions of seasonal usage were introduced by the Town and Country Planning Act 1947, will be entitled to a 35% discount.
 - 8) A new second homes premium of 100% as detailed in paragraph 4.3 (subject to the second home premium exceptions shown in Appendix C) continues to be applied in 2026-27.

103 TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATION REVIEW

The HSDM and Cllr Shires introduced the report and explained that one of the main reasons the Council sought to purchase more of its own temporary accommodation (TA) housing stock was to keep people in their local community and close to support networks, in more suitable accommodation, aiding their recovery out of homelessness. Cllr Shires reminded the Committee of the rise in cost of overnight TA and how it influenced some decisions in the budget.

It was highlighted by the HSDM how the Council had gone from having one TA unit of its own in 2017 to having 32 by the end of 2025 and she paid tribute to the team's effort in managing that effectively. The HSDM also paid tribute to the hard work from the Housing Options and Property Services teams in working together to bring those properties up to a good standard quickly. It was noted by the HSDM that when the Council put families into its own TA the subsidy completely covered the rental income, and it had even started making an annual surplus on the costs that were then reinvested in the homelessness service. Its own TA also made a massive saving compared to the net cost of nightly paid TA: up to £1.2 million was saved over the last 4 years. The HSDM explained that having its own TA was an asset that increased in value over time whilst half of what they used to pay for that TA had come from separate grant money and not mainstream funding.

Cllr Hankins asked if Members' engagement with local parishes was having a positive impact on intervention in homelessness. The HSDM did say that the Council's Community Connectors were working with parish councils to identify those in potential need, enabling them to carry out essential early intervention work but it had set criteria of what its TA needed, and in most cases, that was to be sited in towns close to facilities. Cllr Shires reiterated that the key message to local parishes was that new social housing developments were needed in their area to keep people local.

It was suggested by Cllr Bailey that how the Housing Team used the extra revenue

generated by the second home premium in purchasing suitable TA for homeless families could be a positive news story. It could publicise, and in turn be a way of engaging second homeowners and make those who paid more tax feel they were contributing to a wider cause rather than feeling penalised. Cllr Shires and the HSDM both agreed.

Cllr Cushing asked what the criteria was for the Council when selecting its own TA as it had very few properties in Fakenham or east of North Walsham. The HSDM explained that they tried to find a balance between specific requirements of size, demand, budget and suitability of the property. The team was looking at a more even geographical spread but many properties to the east were least served by gas, and therefore, were less efficient, had a greater environmental impact and were not as cost effective for the resident. In the west, 2 of the 3 that they were currently purchasing were in Fakenham.

The HSDM clarified for the Chair that the most significant change, when considering improvements to management, was the establishment of the TA steering group as the management of the units had been spread across 4 or 5 service areas, and bringing that together to better understand shared agendas had helped, particularly around the right type of work to be done when taking on the property.

In response to a further query from the Chair, the HSDM explained that the indirect costs, such as the corporate allocations, were when a percentage of the costs had to be attributed to the end activity when comparing with other authorities or organisations delivering a particular service. Those indirect costs weren't exclusive to the new TA or applied to nightly paid accommodation, so were not included for internal comparative purposes. In terms of the interest that would have been made on the £2.4 million that was spent on purchasing the TA properties, this was not included as it could be argued anything that might have been gained would probably have been used to pay for the increase in costs for nightly paid TA. The DFR also said that if the Council wasn't investing in its own TA, then the grant money to pay for it would not have been given, and potentially NNDC would have received a smaller share of the revenue generated by the second home premium from NCC.

The HSDM also confirmed that the new authority after Local Government Reform (LGR) was completed would take on the TA and that, in some cases, it had to be retained for 30 years, as the reality was that the need for TA would remain after the Council, in its current form, ceased to exist. Cllr Shires strongly wished for TA to be protected for people so they can be housed, if needed, in their locality after LGR so as to not displace residents from their communities.

ACTION: The HSDM to confirm the number of new affordable homes built this year.

104 The Committee **Reviewed** and **Noted** the report.

NHOSC REPORT

Cllr Shires introduced the report and gave an update to the Committee from the most recent Norfolk Health Overview Select Committee (NHOSC) meeting outlining what was discussed around Speech and Language Therapy (SaLT); including reading a letter to the Committee that was sent by NHOSC to the NCC Cabinet on questions they felt had not been answered in that meeting. Cllr Carpenter, the Cabinet Member for Children's Services at NCC, responded by outlining those accessing the SaLT service, for the period Aug 2025 to Oct 2025, with 5165

children accessing the SaLT at that time with a varied level of intervention required. The NHS target wait time stood at 18 weeks with 81% of children seen within that timescale which was prioritised on need with most urgent cases seen more quickly. There were links to deprivation to be found. A letter had subsequently gone to Government seeking an overarching policy that served children better and made it easier for staff.

The Chair asked about the pathology waiting times and how could they be assured that no significant harm had happened, and were those proposed methodologies to determine harm sufficient as they seemed indirect. Cllr Shires said the Committee had asked the same question but were assured of no significant harm. They did challenge back and the suggestion was that the feedback they'd received indicated that it was not having a detrimental impact, but their teams were in position to support people should it be needed. The Chair also asked if the NHOSC were satisfied for the staffing pattern for speech and language and queried if there was a national benchmark. Cllr Shires felt there was too much pressure on parents to deliver SaLT when they didn't have a specific framework or measure, but the Committee hadn't had any more information on outcomes.

The Committee **Noted** the report.

105 THE CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

No comments

106 OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME AND UPDATE

The DSGO gave an update on the work programme including the possibility of having a private presentation for Members to look at deprivation data that could feed into many items that the Committee wished to consider going forward. The Committee **Agreed** that a session outlining deprivation and its impact on the local communities takes place at the earliest opportunity.

107 EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The meeting ended at 11.54 pm.

Chairman

Minute Item 93

North Norfolk District Council – verbal update for Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 10th December 2025.

Thank you for inviting us back to provide an update following our appearance at the June committee meeting.

We've provided written answers to the questions we've received and are happy to talk through these.

We're particularly pleased to note that **all seven of the bathing waters in North Norfolk are now rated as Excellent** and that the Environment Agency's recent classifications reinforce the East of England's position as home to some of the UK's cleanest bathing waters.

As we highlighted at the last committee, our 2025-2030 business plan proposes **£11 billion of investment across our region including £1 billion for tackling storm overflows**, whilst our total environmental enhancement spend will double to £4 billion. These plans are subject to approval by Ofwat, our financial regulator, and we are currently in discussions on the outcome of our final determination.

The proposed £1 billion storm overflow investment is geared to address the highest priority overflows soonest and will reduce storm overflow spills by creating new storage and ways to prevent surface water from entering the sewer network, installing additional monitoring and increasing the capacity of our treatment sites to deal with more rainfall as a result of unpredictable weather.

We aim to reduce discharges from storm overflows by 17% in the next five years, in line with our Storm Overflow Discharge Reduction Plan (SODRP).

In North Norfolk, planned schemes (subject to review and prioritisation) include:

- Spill reduction schemes at Briston, Fakenham and Horning Knacker's Wood WRCs
- A storm tank at Aldborough WRC – pleased to report that work on this started at the beginning of the month
- An overflow reduction scheme at Fakenham Norwich Road overflow
- Mundesley – a spill reduction scheme for all assets affecting bathing waters (including Gimmingham)
- New storm overflow screening at Briston, Ludham and Runton West Lane
- Surface water management schemes for Potter Heigham, Horning, Hoveton and Hickling

In addition, investigations are planned at a number of sites into reducing storm overflow spills. The outcome of these investigations may identify and inform the scope of any future improvement schemes.

As the Committee knows, all storm overflows are fitted with Event Duration Monitors (EDM). Full details of storm overflow discharges for 2025 will be released next April once all EDM activations have been fully validated. However, the latest validated EDM activations for 2025 (up until the end of October), show that **storm overflows in North**

Norfolk have discharged a total of 194 times – an average of 6.47 spills per storm overflow for an average of 21.09 hours. This is significantly lower than the figures for the last few years, reflecting the drier weather we've experienced this year.

Other planned investments during this business plan period (subject to review) include phosphorus removal from wastewater at 12 WRCs as well as nitrogen removal at four WRCs and ammonia removal at one site – helping to improve river water quality.

And as part of our Dynamic Sewer Visualisation (DSV) programme, **we've installed 939 monitors to date in North Norfolk** so that we can proactively detect blockages and resolve them before they escalate.

As we mentioned in June, our teams cleared a total of 35,000 blockages from the sewer network last year. 80% of these were avoidable and were caused by rubbish such as wet wipes, sanitary products, nappies and cooking oils which should have gone in the bin and not down the toilet or sink. Wipes are the most common problem – around half a million (9,500 packets) are flushed into our region's sewers every day. **And issues with Fats, Oils and Grease are especially worth bearing in mind as we head into the Christmas period.**

To help reduce blockages, our [Just Bin It](#) behaviour campaign is encouraging customers to only flush the 3Ps: pee, poo and (toilet) paper – so they can avoid costly blockages in homes and businesses as well as protecting the local community and environment. **We'd appreciate any help councillors can provide to help drive behaviour change and reduce blockages, floodings and pollutions.**

We've produced a toolkit which includes posters, flyers and ready-made social media posts to help spread the word and can share this with the committee. The toolkit also includes free materials on ways **people can save water**. Despite the rainfall in recent weeks, this is, of course, especially important as Spring and Summer were one of the driest in our region since records began in 1899.

Finally, we're pleased to update the Committee that we're also investing in our water supply network in North Norfolk with plans to replace **10,381 metres of pipe, representing an investment of £2.4million over the next five years.**

We hope this update is helpful and now we would be happy to run through the pre-submitted question responses if needed, and take any further questions.