



# AGENDA

**MEETING VENUE:**

**Anglia Room, The  
Conference Suite,  
Elizabeth House, Dereham**

Our Ref: HM/L.18

Contact: Helen McAleer

Direct Dial: 01362 656381

e-mail: [helen.mcaleer@breckland.gov.uk](mailto:helen.mcaleer@breckland.gov.uk)

Date: Tuesday, 10 December 2013

Dear Sir/Madam,

Members of the Council are hereby summoned to a Meeting of the **District Council** which will be held at **10.00 am on Thursday, 19th December, 2013** in the **Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

Yours faithfully

Assistant Director – Democratic Services

The Senior Committee Officer to call the roll of Members

**Members of the Council requiring further information, or with specific questions, are asked to raise these with the appropriate officer at least two working days before the meeting. If the information requested is available, this will be provided, and reported to Council.**

**Note** – *The Conservative Group meets in the Anglia Room and the Labour Group meets in Room 2 before Full Council at 9.00am.*

[contactus@breckland.gov.uk](mailto:contactus@breckland.gov.uk)

Breckland Council Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham, Norfolk NR19 1EE  
Telephone: 01362 656870 [www.breckland.gov.uk](http://www.breckland.gov.uk)



**1. MINUTES**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2013.

**2. APOLOGIES**

To receive apologies for absence.

**3. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Engagements List – Chairman**

**14 November, 2013 – 18 December, 2013**

Date	Event	Host
25 November, 2013	An Evening of Greyhound Racing charity night	His Worship The Mayor and Madam Mayoress of Great Yarmouth
29 November, 2013	Breckland Art Trail and the Christmas Art Exhibition	Breckland Council and Wayland Partnership
30 November, 2013	Opening Night of the Cromer Christmas Show	Directors of Openwide Coastal Limited
6 December, 2013	Yuletide Winter Reception	Colonel & Mrs. Kenneth T. Gibb, Commander 100 <sup>th</sup> Air Refuelling Wing, and Colonel & Mrs. Kyle W. Robinson, Commander, 48 <sup>th</sup> Fighter Wing
9 December, 2013	Annual Civic Carol Service, Carols in the Minster	His Worship the Mayor of the Borough of Great Yarmouth, Councillor John Burroughs, and the High Sheriff of Norfolk, Viscountess Lady Sarah Leicester
12 December, 2013	Reception	Mayor & Consort of King's Lynn & West Norfolk, Councillor Elizabeth Watson and Mr. Alex Langley

**4. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Members are reminded that under the Code of Conduct they are not to participate and must leave the room, for the whole of an agenda item to which they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest.

In the interests of transparency, Members may also wish to declare any other interests they have in relation to an agenda item, that support the Nolan principles detailed within the Code of Conduct.

	<u>Page(s)</u> <u>herewith</u>
<b>5. <u>CABINET MINUTES</u></b> Unconfirmed minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 3 December 2013.	7 - 14
<b>6. <u>OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION</u></b> Unconfirmed minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission meeting held on 21 November 2013.	15 - 22
<b>7. <u>PLANNING COMMITTEE</u></b> Confirmed minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 25 November 2013.	23 - 34
<b>8. <u>GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE</u></b> Unconfirmed minutes of the General Purposes Committee meeting held on 27 November 2013.	35 - 39
<b>9. <u>NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE AND OTHER SEATS</u></b> To receive nominations for any changes to Committee and other seats from political groups.	
<b>10. <u>REV ACTIVE - END OF PROJECT REPORT</u></b> To receive a presentation.	
<b>11. <u>MOTIONS RECEIVED</u></b> To consider the following Motion received under Standing Order No 6:  This Council recognises the significant impact that the spare room subsidy changes (commonly known as the 'bedroom tax') is having in the Breckland District. Council notes that figures obtained by the Eastern Daily Press show that 1,026 residents are being affected in this District with an average of £773.03 worth of support taken away from residents. This figure is the third highest out of fifteen neighbouring authorities in Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex. Council calls upon registered social landlords operating in the District to do all that they can to ensure that there are suitable, smaller properties for people to move in to, so that the impact of these changes is reduced. Furthermore, Council pledges to do all that it can, within a very difficult financial situation, to support this aim being achieved.	

#### **For Information**

#### **CHAIRMAN AND EXECUTIVE MEMBERS' SURGERY**

At the end of the Council meeting, Chairmen of Committees and Executive Members will be available to members who wish to put forward specific questions, for example on ward issues.

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**COUNCIL**

**Held on Thursday, 14 November 2013 at 10.00 am in the Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

Mrs S Armes	Mr M.A. Kiddle-Morris
Mr S. Askew	Mr R.G. Kybird (Vice-Chairman)
Mr S.G. Bambridge	Mr K. Martin
Mr W.P. Borrett	Mrs S.M. Matthews
Councillor C Bowes	Mrs K. Millbank
Mr A.J. Byrne	Mrs L.H. Monument
Mrs B Canham	Mr T F C Monument
Mr C G Carter	Mr M J Nairn
Mr T R Carter	Mrs J A North
Councillor M. Chapman-Allen	Mr J.W. Nunn
Mr C. S. Clark	Mr R. R. Richmond
Mr P.D. Claussen (Chairman)	Mr W. R. J. Richmond
Mr J.P. Cowen	Mr M. S. Robinson
Mr P R W Darby	Mr J.D. Rogers
Mr R.W. Duffield	Mr B. Rose
Mr P.J. Duigan	Mr F.J. Sharpe
Mr K.S. Gilbert	Mr I. Sherwood
Mr R.F. Goreham	Mr B J Skull
Councillor E. Gould	Mr W.H.C. Smith
Mr S R Green	Mrs P.A. Spencer
Mrs D.K.R. Irving	Mr A.C. Stasiak
Mr T. J. Jermy	Mrs L.S. Turner
Mr A.P. Joel	Mr M. A. Wassell
Mrs E. M. Jolly	Mr N.C. Wilkin
Mr C.R. Jordan	

**In Attendance**

Julie Britton	- Senior Committee Officer
Lucy Burt	- Fraud & Visits Team Manager
Paul Corney	- Head of ARP
Helen McAleer	- Senior Committee Officer
Leanne Neave	- Member Trainer
Geoff Rivers	- Interim Chief Executive

**90/13 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)**

Two spelling mistakes to the new Chief Executive's name in the resolution on page 6 were pointed out. Subject to those being amended the Minutes of the meeting held on 3 October 2013 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**Action By**

**91/13 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 2)**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Childerhouse, Lamb, Pettitt, Steward and Williams.

**92/13 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 3)**

The Vice-Chairman commented on the YMCA AGM and Annual Celebration which he had attended. It had been a most impressive event with a number of presentations. He would put a copy of the YMCA's Annual Report in the Members' Room.

**93/13 CABINET MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

- (a) Environmental Services Organisational and Services Review (Minute No 83/13)

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) the implementation of the restructure of Environmental Services within both Breckland District Council and South Holland District Council as detailed in the report be approved; including
    - a) the provision of the senior management capacity for Environmental Services via the appointment of a Corporate/Strategic Manager; jointly shared between the two Authorities. Officers are requested to investigate further and report back on the most appropriate organisational structure/service arrangements to be managed by this position taking into account the potential synergies, weaknesses noted within paragraphs 1.19-1.20 of the report;
    - b) the further sharing of posts namely the proposed Senior Environmental Services Officer and Senior Waste & Recycling Services Officer;
  - 2) the Environmental Services Statement of Purposes at paragraph 1.7 of the report be agreed; and
  - 3) the headline improvements as at paragraphs 1.33-1.35 of the report be agreed.
- (b) Town/Parish Council Localised Council Tax Grant (Minute No 84/13)

With reference to the final sentence in the fourth paragraph on page 14 the Leader of the Labour Group invited the Chairman to Thetford to see the efficiencies they had made.

**Action By**

- (c) Calendar of Meetings 2014/15 (Minute No 86/13)

**RESOLVED** that the Schedule of Council and Committee meetings for 2014-15 be approved, subject to any changes made by the Constitution Review.

- (d) Adoption

**RESOLVED** that the unconfirmed Minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 29 October 2013 be adopted.

**94/13 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

**RESOLVED** that the unconfirmed Minutes of the Overview & Scrutiny Commission meeting held on 17 October 2013 be adopted.

**95/13 PLANNING COMMITTEE (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

- 95 .a Confirmed Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 30 September 2013.

- (a) Proposed Changes to Delegated Arrangements in light of the introduction of the Planning Guarantee (Minute No 100/13)

**RESOLVED** that the Council's Delegated Arrangements be amended as set out in the Minute.

- (b) Adoption

**RESOLVED** that the confirmed Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 30 September 2013 be adopted.

- 95 .b Unconfirmed Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 28 October 2013

**RESOLVED** that the unconfirmed Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 28 October 2013 be adopted.

**96/13 GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE (AGENDA ITEM 8)**

- (a) Living Wage (Minute No 54/13)

The Leader of the Labour Group said that he was very pleased that the principle of applying the Living Wage was making progress. However, as the recommendation had originally been presented to Council on 4 July 2013 he asked for the award to be backdated to then.

The Chief Executive agreed to look into the matter and the increase would be paid from 4 July if costs were not prohibitive.

**Action By**

Councillor Smith advised that he had been tasked with looking into the remuneration package for all staff. That review would include the Living Wage. Papers were being prepared.

Councillor Goreham suggested that Members should vote on an amended proposal but after further discussion it was confirmed that he and the Leader of the Labour Group were happy for the Chief Executive to deal with the matter.

**RESOLVED** that:

- (1) the Living Wage should be considered as part of the general review of remuneration being carried out by HR; and
- (2) the five staff currently being paid below the Living Wage should each receive a one-off payment to bring their salary for the current financial year up to £14,374.

(b) Adoption

**RESOLVED** that the unconfirmed Minutes of the General Purposes Committee meeting held on 16 October 2013 be adopted.

**97/13 LICENSING COMMITTEE (AGENDA ITEM 9)**

**RESOLVED** that the unconfirmed Minutes of the Licensing Committee meeting held on 9 October 2013 be adopted.

**98/13 ANGLIA REVENUES & BENEFITS PARTNERSHIP - CELEBRATING SUCCESS (AGENDA ITEM 11)**

The Chairman told Members that it was important to understand the journey of the Anglia Revenues and Benefits Partnership (ARP) which had been formed at a time when the Council was officially the third worst in the Country for dealing with Benefits; taking up to three months to determine claims.

At that time he had been an Executive Member and the Leader (Councillor Jordan) had tasked him with improving things. In 2003 the Council had started a partnership with Forest Heath District Council; who were marginally better at handling Benefits claims. They had worked together to provide an acceptable service for customers. In the process they had come to make year-on-year savings of over £2million and achieved Beacon Status. The Chairman was very proud of what had been done.

One of the original Officers involved in the ARP had recently been re-employed. He was the right person to take the ARP on to the next stage of its journey. The Chairman introduced Paul Corney, Head of



**Action By**

ARP to Members.

Mr Corney said he was extremely happy to be rejoining the ARP which had been the first partnership in the country for Revenues and Benefits. It was still a National leader, helping to deliver excellence for customers as well as savings. Officers had been invited to the meeting to celebrate an example of excellence and he introduced Lucy Burt, Fraud & Visits Team Manager.

Ms Burt said the celebration was for winning the Institute of Revenues Valuation and Rating (IRRV) Excellence in Fraud award – which was a team award. She introduced three other members of the team who were in attendance: Katie Mills, Shirley Brimelow and Neil Oxbury, and then gave Members a short presentation.

The award process, which was open to all Local Authorities in England and Wales, involved a submission, shortlisting, inspection and then an awards dinner.

The ARP's submission had highlighted the additional challenges they faced, being four teams working as one to achieve targets for four different Councils across three County boundaries.

The fraud world was constantly changing and the Partnership had evolved to keep abreast of those changes.

The four authorities covered a large area and the fraud team worked with lots of different departments and agencies including the Police and the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) requiring the development of many diverse working relationships.

Team members had significant qualifications and experience and those skills were shared. The investigations and interviews were divided amongst the team members and the system worked very well.

They constantly reviewed their working practice and were very proactive in their approach, showing the public that fraud would not be tolerated. They had adopted new technology and reviewed their visiting function. Investigations were targeted to ensure they were productive, had value and provided good publicity. Everything was 'risk scored' and support mechanisms were in place. Even in cases where it was decided that prosecution was not in the public interest, the customer was advised that the ARP were aware of what they were doing. The main aim was to protect the public purse throughout all the departments of the Council on behalf of the Audit Office.

Some recent cases that had received good publicity were highlighted. Both had been successfully prosecuted. That did not always mean that all monies were recovered but the publicity acted as a deterrent to others.

**Action By**

It had been a very useful exercise putting together the submission as it had provided an opportunity to take a step back and look at the way they worked. It had been particularly satisfying to discover how very well the system was working. They were smart working and multi-functional and a very good team which is why they had won the award. Ms Burt held up the award for Members to see.

The Fraud Team received generous applause from Members. The Chairman hoped that they had felt it worthwhile to invite the team in to celebrate their success and to show that Members were supporting them.

Ms Burt said that was a good point. During the inspection process it had been highlighted that there was an anti-fraud culture throughout the organisation which came from the top and was driven by Members.

The Chairman thanked Ms Burt for her presentation and congratulated the whole team on their achievements.

**99/13 MEMBER / OFFICER PLEDGE (AGENDA ITEM 12)**

The Member Trainer gave a brief update on the Member/Officer Pledge which had been drawn up by the Corporate Management Team (CMT) and the Member Development Panel.

The aim of the Pledge was to empower Councillors as community leaders. Sessions had been held with all staff in July to inform them of the importance of making Members aware of any issues that were happening in their Wards. Staff had been encouraged to notify Members of problems and good news stories. Some things might still slip through the net and there would be things that Members heard about before Officers. In those cases, Members were asked to make Officers aware of the issues.

A copy of the Pledge was attached to the Agenda and if Members had any questions they should be directed to either CMT or the Training Team.

Councillor Kybird noted that the Pledge should refer to *Town* and Parish Councils.

The Chief Executive reiterated that the whole purpose of the Pledge was to ensure that Members were not taken by surprise by something happening in their Ward. Sometimes it was difficult for back-bench Members to keep in touch with the Council and this was a way to try to keep them included and informed and to keep a two-way dialogue open.

The meeting closed at 10.40 am

CHAIRMAN

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**CABINET**

**Held on Tuesday, 3 December 2013 at 9.30 am in  
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

Mr M. A. Wassell (Chairman)	Mr M.A. Kiddle-Morris
Mrs L.S. Turner (Vice-Chairman)	Mr I. Sherwood
Councillor E. Gould	Mr W.H.C. Smith

**Also Present**

Mr M J Nairn	Mr J.P. Cowen
Mr T R Carter	Mr P.J. Duigan
Mr M. S. Robinson	Mr T. J. Jermy
Mrs S.M. Matthews	Mr A.P. Joel
Mr S.G. Bambridge	Mr K. Martin
Councillor M. Chapman-Allen	Mr F.J. Sharpe

**In Attendance**

Dominic Chessum	- Joint Marketing & Communications Team Leader
Robert Walker	- Assistant Director of Commissioning
Julie Britton	- Senior Committee Officer
Mark Finch	- Assistant Director of Finance
Geoff Rivers	- Interim Chief Executive
Simon Best	- REV Active Project Manager
Kevin Ward	- Growth Programme Manager

**Action By**

**93/13 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)**

The Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 29 October 2013 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**94/13 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 2)**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor E Jolly.

**95/13 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)**

Mark Kiddle-Morris declared an interest in agenda item 7 by virtue of him being Chairman of the Strategic Board for Grants4Growth.

**96/13 NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

M Chapman-Allen, S Matthews, G Bambridge, T Carter, P Cowen, P

**Action By**

Duigan, T Jermy, A Joel, K Martin, M Nairn, M Robinson and F Sharpe.

**97/13 EXTENSION OF EXISTING EUROPEAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT FUND (ERDF) PROGRAMME FOR THE COUNCIL'S CURRENT FUNDED LOCAL ENTERPRISE GROWTH AND EFFICIENCY(LEGE) 'GRANTS4GROWTH' PROGRAMME (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development presented the report which asked for Members' guidance on an opportunity to increase East of England European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) funding for the existing Local Enterprise Growth and Efficiency (LEGE) project/Grants4Growth Programme to deliver additional outputs.

Additional papers were circulated that summarised the ERDF backed project.

The Low Carbon Growth Programme Manager stated that demand for the support from the Project had been significantly greater than anticipated. The delivery pipeline (i.e. committed private sector match funding) was already £5.8 million after six months, against a two year target of just £5 million. 36.4% of grants settled and 43% of grant value settled was within the Breckland area. The Bulletin that had been circulated highlighted the value of these grants. This funding helped businesses to invest and grow in the future.

It was noted that the Project Management Team had been informally approached by the ERDF Programme about extending the Project's value. There was certainly a clear demand for this funding and the Low Carbon Growth Programme Manager could not see any additional risks by bidding for this additional £2 million. There would be no additional costs incurred by Breckland as all direct costs were eligible ERDF expenses and would be reclaimed through the Project.

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development said that the Grants4Growth had enabled £20k grants to be given to businesses. This extra funding, if the bid was accepted, would be used for 20 super grants totalling £100k each. Submissions for such grants would be requested by a certain date. He urged the Cabinet to support the recommendation.

The Chairman pointed out that this report should be considered in conjunction with agenda item 11, the references from the Overview & Scrutiny Commission, where this report had been well received.

The Overview & Scrutiny Commission Chairman said that the Project Management Team had provided the O&SC with a very good presentation and the main focus had been on how the grants would be allocated. He felt that there would be great demand for this funding and suggested a second stage in the process to assess how the applications should be judged. He hoped that this initiative would be marketed and put in the public arena as soon as possible.

**Option A:** the *do-nothing* option.

The Project management did not apply for £2 million+ of additional funding. The existing ERDF-funded grant pot of £2.54 million would be matched with £5 million+ of private sector investment in growth. A number

**Action By**

of significant opportunities to catalyse transformative growth in SMEs would be unrealised.

**Option B:**

Grants4Growth was re-profiled and additional ERDF funding sought. This would increase the size of the grants pot to £4.54 million and leverage £9 million+ of private sector investment. Total ERDF funding would increase from £3,361,423 to £5,396,561, reflecting the £2 million increase in the size of the grants pot and £35,138 to cover additional administrative costs incurred in managing the new *supergrant* facility (such as salaries/subcontracts to cover the extra responsibilities around investment due diligence, marketing of the facility, travel associated with the grant applications process, and technical consultancy to assist with feasibility work around the specific initiatives being presented for appraisal by the Grants Panel.

Option B was recommended. The Economic Development Service's track record of delivery and performance under scrutiny/audit meant that DCLG considered the Project and its management/governance/oversight structures to be '*lower than low risk*'. If DCLG was unable to allocate funding before the end of 2013, the funding allocation would be returned to central government and then to the EU Commission.

**Reasons**

There were likely to be no further opportunities to access additional ERDF funding during the current programme. The LEP-administered operational programmes for the 2014-2020 EU structural funds were unlikely to be in any position to begin allocating funds until late 2014. This proposal represented, therefore, the only real opportunity for capacity building during the immediate future and was clearly aligned to established business demand/need.

**RECOMMEND** to Council that the offer of additional funding of £2 million from the East of England European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) Programme for the Council's current Local Enterprise Growth and Efficiency project (LEGE) branded as *Grants4Growth* be accepted.

**SB/MS**

**98/13 FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE QUARTER 2 2013-14 (AGENDA ITEM 8)**

The Chairman presented the report which provided information on the forecast financial position at the end of the current financial year based on budgetary control work at the mid year point which covered revenue, capital and treasury management activities.

Breckland Council was continuing to deliver revenue savings, many of which were on-going and have been factored into the budgets figures in future years.

The efficiency savings for 2013-14 to date was £960,663 against a target of £456,820 (see page 19 of the report). This represented 210% of the total, in other words, Breckland Council's efficiencies, its savings, were twice that of which was originally forecast. This was something that Members and Officers should be justifiably proud of, and something that the press should be delighted to report.

**Action By**

Retained business rates was currently forecasting above budget income, with Breckland's share being around £263k in the current year. However, this performance was subject to a number of external factors and risks, therefore, these figures should be treated with caution as backdated appeals could have a devastating impact on this funding stream.

The Assistant Director of Finance highlighted a number of key areas within the report.

The Opposition Leader wanted to know why the housing benefit subsidy figure was so high and asked what this money could be spent on. Members were informed that this was an additional grant received for processing benefit claims accurately. He also asked a question in relation to the New Homes Bonus and highlighted how this money was being spent by another Council and wanted to know if Breckland Council planned to do the same. The Chairman reminded Members that this particular Council charged a great deal more than Breckland for its Council Tax. It was felt that this question related to the next agenda item (agenda item 9) and would be answered accordingly during that debate. The Executive Member for Internal Services pointed out that the monies received for the exemplary performance of the Anglia Revenues Partnership had been put into the Communities Reserve.

**Option 1**

To note the report and approve the virements detailed within Table 4 of Section 1 of the appendix and recommend to Full Council that the additional housing benefit subsidy income of £112,320 be vired to efficiencies and approve the capital budget carry-overs of £6,147,562 to 2014-15 as detailed in Section 2 of the appendix.

**Option 2**

To note the report and not approve the virements detailed within Table 4 of Section 1 of the appendix and not make the recommendation to Full Council and not approve the capital budget carry-overs in Section 2 of the appendix

**Reasons**

To provide timely information to Members on the overall finances of the Council, and to make the best use of resources available.

1. **RESOLVED** that:

- a) the report and appendix be noted;
- b) the virements as detailed in Table 4 of Section 1 of the appendix be approved; and
- c) the Capital Budget carry-overs of £6,147,562 to 2014-15 as detailed in section 2 of the appendix be approved.

2. **RECOMMEND** to Council that the additional housing benefit subsidy income of £112,320 be vired to efficiencies.

**MF/AC**

**MF/AC**

**Action By**

**99/13 DRAFT BUDGET, FINANCIAL MEDIUM TERM PLAN AND CAPITAL STRATEGY (AGENDA ITEM 9)**

The Chairman presented the draft Revenue and Capital budget and Medium Term Plan which the Cabinet was being asked to approve so that the authority could release the papers for consultation.

The report set out the assumptions and strategies in delivering the Council's services over the medium term, whilst recognising the impact that continuing Government cutbacks in local government funding was having on local authorities finances. Breckland Council had been able to use the savings and efficiencies achieved over the last two years to balance the budget over the next two years. However, between 2016 and 2019 there would be real challenges ahead to continue to deliver a balanced budget as a significant budget gap would grow if further steps were not taken to address the situation. The graph on page 34 of the report highlighted what was being called the "Jaws of Doom" and displayed the gap between income and the costs of services. However, Members and Officers were working on an innovative and comprehensive programme of savings and efficiencies for delivery in the short term to address the emerging funding shortfall. Longer term, a more fundamental transformation programme would be required as the funding gap would grow to £2.6m without intervention. It was envisaged that some of the plans to begin addressing these issues would be incorporated into the budget and Medium Term Financial Plan when it came before Cabinet again in the New Year, where Members would be considering the plan again before formally asking Full Council's approval.

The Assistant Director of Finance pointed out that this initial draft budget, if approved, would be put out to consultation on the website where hopefully comments would be received from council tax payers, business rate payers and key stakeholders. The same report would also be discussed at the forthcoming Audit Committee meeting. The Chairman had already covered the main key areas but he assured Members that as far as the "Jaws of Doom" were concerned, Breckland Council was not alone as the budget situation across many other authorities was very similar. It was noted that the forecast grant funding figures would be available following the Autumn Statement announcement. As far as settlement dates were concerned, the settlement announcement was not expected to be released until 18 December 2013. The budget would not be approved until the February meetings of Cabinet and Council.

The Assistant Director of Finance then went through the report covering the overall revenue budget position, the capital budget, risks and the sensitivities of major variables. The indicative tax figures on page 44 of Appendix C of the report would be affirmed in January 2014.

In response to the Opposition Leader's question in relation to an authority using its NHB monies to generate their town centres, and whether Breckland Council would be following suit, the Chairman reminded Members of the Local Asset Backed Vehicle (LABV) process that for a local authority was quite innovative.

The Overview & Scrutiny Commission Chairman said that he had been having discussions with the Executive Member for Finance & Democratic

**Action By**

Services about having wider Member involvement in the budget process and engaging with the Task & Finish Group in how this budget was going to be shaped. Further to this, in relation to the revenue support grant, which in his opinion was dropping like a proverbial stone, Members were informed that this would be a piece of work that would be taken forward to the Overview & Scrutiny Commission.

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development highlighted the fact that the Drainage Board might have to adopt more river and felt that this could have a knock on effect on the drainage board levies (page 29 of the agenda). The Assistant Director of Finance said that he was not aware of this but agreed that this would undoubtedly put more pressure on the levy. Councillor Bambridge, who was also a member of the Internal Drainage Board, said that he had specifically asked this question at the IDBs last meeting and was told that this would not have an immediate effect as the IDB would only be taking over an extra 20% of river at the moment.

The Chief Executive was pleased that Breckland Council had a balanced budget for 2015/16 - this was not the case for South Holland District Council. The Council needed to be concentrating on savings to bridge the future gap otherwise this authority would reach a stage where it was actually at the 'bone'. He felt that a different organisation was needed and from February 2014 onwards, the whole Transformation Programme would be re-visited. Transformation was not about budget savings it was about describing what Councillors wanted in the future, in other words, what they would like the Council to look like in a few years time.

**Options**

No alternative options presented; however, amendments could be made before release for consultation.

**Reasons**

To comply with the budgetary and policy framework.

**RESOLVED** that the draft Capital and Revenue budget estimates, the financial Medium Term Plan and the Capital Strategy be released for consultation.

**MF/AC**

**100/13 BRECKLAND COMMUNITY FUNDING APPLICATIONS (STANDING ITEM) (AGENDA ITEM 10)**

The Vice-Chairman highlighted the various grants that had been awarded in October 2013 which included:

- Bridgham Community Car Park - £5000.00
- Watton Christian Community Centre - £661.60

There were several grants in the pipeline that would be forthcoming.

Members were informed of a pot of monies that had been ring-fenced for parishes to commemorate the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the start of World War 1 similar to the theme that Breckland Council had provided for the



**Action By**

Queen's Golden Jubilee celebrations. These monies would be released in the New Year.

**101/13 REFERENCE FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION (AGENDA ITEM 11)**

1) Extension of Existing ERDF Funded LEGE/Grants4Growth Programme

This item had already been discussed under agenda item 7 (see Minute No. 97/13 above).

2) Town/Parish Council Localised Council Tax Grant (decision Call-in)

The Overview & Scrutiny Commission Chairman said that a robust and healthy debate had been had by Members of the Commission and the decision by Cabinet had been upheld.

The Chairman said that he had been delighted with the Commission's support.

The Opposition Leader had been quite intrigued by an email he had received from the National Association of Local Councils (NALC) which unfortunately had been after the Overview & Scrutiny Commission meeting. He read aloud the letter which highlighted the impact it would have on Parish and Town Councils if the grant was not passed on. He pointed out that NALC had pressed the Minister of the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) to issue further guidance in relation to authorities that passed on such grants.

The Chairman said that he would look forward to receiving such guidance.

Councillor Sharpe reminded the Opposition Leader that Breckland Council would not be receiving any further funding so would be unable to pass a grant on. He read aloud an email that he had been sent saying that the decision had already been made not to support the distribution of such a grant.

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development reminded Members of the email from the DCLG that clearly stated that the grant in 2013/14 had been a one-off.

Councillor Joel asked if a grant could be passed on if there was money available in the budget. In response, the Chairman advised that this would affect the Council's budget and the Council Tax would have to be increased. He said that he would be intrigued to see DCLGs response.

The Overview & Scrutiny Commission pointed out that his parishes had been quite clear about the payment being a one-off.

The Executive Member for Communications, Organisational Performance, Development & Public Protection reminded Members

**Action By**

that it was Council Tax payers' money that was passed on not the Council's and he felt that Town and Parish Council's needed to take responsibility for their own budgets. He further felt that it was about time to do away with this illusion that the Council had money to give away.

The Executive Member for Internal Services stated that Breckland did have some very pro-active parishes. Attleborough for example ensured that its services were aligned to the monies that the town received. He pointed out that the distribution of the so-called grant was a voluntary decision made by Breckland Council for 2013 only. All parishes were informed that the grant was a one-off and had been told to budget accordingly.

**RESOLVED** that the Cabinet decision on 29 October 2013 to remove the Council tax Support Grant be upheld.

**MF/AC**

**102/13 NEXT MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 12)**

The arrangements for the next meeting on Tuesday, 7 January 2014 at 9.30am in the Anglia Room were noted.

**103/13 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC (AGENDA ITEM 13)**

**RESOLVED** that under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

**104/13 RIVERSIDE DEVELOPMENT, THETFORD (AGENDA ITEM 14)**

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development presented the report and provided Members with the background in relation to the Riverside development.

The Executive Member responded to a number of questions and the financial implications within the Proforma B were highlighted.

It was agreed that further wording should be added to the last sentence at paragraph 5.2.3 of the report to read: ".....a proportion of.....".

**Options**

See report.

**Reasons**

See report.

**RESOLVED** that the recommendations as set out in option 2A of the report be approved taking into account the financial implications as set out in the Proforma B.

**KW**

The meeting closed at 10.30 am

CHAIRMAN

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION**

**Held on Thursday, 21 November 2013 at 2.00 pm in the Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Walpole Loke, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

Mr J.P. Cowen (Chairman)	Mrs S.M. Matthews
Mr T. J. Jermy (Vice-Chairman)	Mr R. R. Richmond
Mr C G Carter	Mr J.D. Rogers
Mr K.S. Gilbert	Mr B. Rose
Mrs D.K.R. Irving	Councillor C Bowes (Substitute Member)
Mr A.P. Joel	Mr S.G. Bambridge (Substitute Member)

**Also Present**

Mrs S Armes	Mr C.R. Jordan
Mr W.P. Borrett	Mr M J Nairn
Mr T R Carter	Mrs L.S. Turner
Councillor M. Chapman-Allen	Mr M. A. Wassell
Mrs E. M. Jolly	
Mr R. Atterwill	- Chairman, Swanton Morley Parish Council

**In Attendance**

Simon Best	- REV Active Project Manager
Mark Finch	- Assistant Director of Finance
Helen McAleer	- Senior Committee Officer
Susan Smith	- Funding Support Officer
Teresa Smith	- Committee Officer (Scrutiny & Projects)

**Action By**

**67/13 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 17 October 2013 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**68/13 APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTES (AGENDA ITEM 2)**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Byrne and Kybird. Councillors Bambridge and Bowes were present as Substitutes.

**69/13 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)**

For transparency, Councillor Irving declared that she was employed by Brandon Lewis MP in a constituency capacity.

**70/13 NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

Councillors Armes, Borrett, T Carter, Chapman-Allen, Jolly, Jordan, Nairn, Turner and Wassell were in attendance.

**Action By**

**71/13 EXTENSION OF EXISTING ERDF FUNDED  
LEGE/GRANTS4GROWTH PROGRAMME (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

Simon Best, Programme Manager and Susan Smith, Financial Claims Manager, introduced themselves to Members.

The Programme Manager presented the report. The Council had been approached by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) with a proposal to take more money to extend the existing Local Enterprise Growth and Efficiency (LEGE)/Grants4Growth Programme. The additional funding would have no resource implications and would enable the provision of larger grants of £100,000. With the smaller grants it was very difficult to provide evidence of cost savings. However, with larger grants savings, efficiencies and additional jobs could be more easily identified.

Councillor Gilbert supported the proposal but asked for clarification of the term 'intervention rate' mentioned on page 10. It was explained that the term referred to the maximum percentage funding that would be provided to any project.

Councillor Joel asked whether it would be possible to spend the additional funding before the project concluded at the end of 2013. He was advised that the project would actually run until December 2015. The 2013 date referred to the period when money would be clawed back from any underperforming projects. It was confirmed that there was plenty of time to spend the money and demand for the funding was high. The biggest issue would be ensuring that it was distributed fairly.

Councillor Bambridge asked if the funding was for new businesses only and the Programme Manager explained that the funding was for new and existing small and medium 'enterprises' whose work involved implicit transactions. Therefore businesses, charities and voluntary organisations could apply.

The Chairman asked how the funding would be awarded. The most likely way would be by 'open call'. Applications would be submitted which explained the merits of a project and they would be compared on a like for like basis with those providing the greatest outputs being successful. It was hoped that that process could commence by the end of Quarter One in 2014. That would give sufficient time for active marketing if there was not enough interest.

The Chairman asked whether £2million was the right sum; would it be sufficient or would it be a struggle to spend it?

The Programme Manager advised that it was a conservative sum which reflected the very real and latent demand with minimum risk to the Council.

**Action By**

Finally the Chairman asked whether the money would all be spent within the Breckland area. It was pointed out that the money was for the project target area which covered the four Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) zones which included a large part of East Anglia. However, it was noted that out of 44 grants awarded so far, 16 had been within Breckland District.

**RESOLVED** to **RECOMMEND TO CABINET & COUNCIL** that the offer of additional funding of £2 million from the East of England European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) Programme for the Council's current Local Enterprise Growth and Efficiency project (LEGE), branded as *Grants4Growth*, be accepted.

The Chairman said it was great news for Breckland and wished the Officers good luck with the project.

**72/13 SCRUTINY CALL-INS (AGENDA ITEM 9)**

(a) **Town/Parish Council Localised Council Tax Grant**

The Chairman noted that a number of Councillors had called-in the item. Mr Roger Atterwill, Chairman of Swanton Morley Parish Council was also in attendance and he was invited to put his point of view first.

Mr Atterwill said that he had been very disappointed about the lack of consultation with the Parishes. He had found out about the decision from the local paper which he did not consider good practice. There was an emphasis on Localism from Central Government but in this case they had been dictated to.

On the DCLG website it said that in allocating funding the Government clearly expected that Council's would pass funds down to parishes to reduce precepts, although he acknowledged that 2014/15 was not mentioned.

In the presentation to Cabinet a table of options had been provided. Times were tough but he asked why more credence had not been given to Option B – to reduce the funding to parishes. That option was revenue neutral. Otherwise the Council would be gaining money. He asked that the decision be reconsidered.

The Chairman thanked Mr Atterwill for his comments which were very useful. He then went on to say that he had not been able to attend the Cabinet meeting when the item was discussed. However, all Members could attend and had the opportunity to comment at Cabinet. He did not feel it was Scrutiny's purpose to debate what should have been debated at Cabinet. He pointed out that many of the Councillors that had

**Action By**

called in the decision had done so for that reason. Councillor Jermy's call in was different. Like Mr Atterwill he did not believe that the matter had been adequately assessed. Members were asked to consider whether they thought it had been dealt with effectively.

Councillor Jordan felt that Cabinet had not given enough weight to what the Government had said. There was nothing in the report to say there was no money for the parishes.

The Vice-Chairman said that he had also been unable to attend the Cabinet meeting. He had called the item in because he thought the decision was flawed. He was also a Town Councillor and he knew the really grave effect that the decision would have and he felt that the towns and parishes should have been consulted.

The Chairman invited the Member with direct Portfolio responsibility for the decision to respond. Councillor Jolly, Executive Member for Finance & Democratic Services set the scene and explained how things had happened. Firstly she said the report title had been incorrect. It should have been Local Council Tax Support Grant. The support grant replaced Council Tax benefits which used to be 100% Government funded. That had been reduced to 85-90% resulting in a fall in the tax base and the increase to Council Tax. Parishes had been advised that some funding would be provided as a transitional grant by Breckland Council – although they had been under no obligation to provide it. The amount of the grant had been advised in time to inform their precept submissions. Members agreed that the parishes had known that grant was only to be paid for one year.

The options in the Cabinet report came from early budget setting assumptions which had since been amended. There were also inconsistencies in the text of the report for which she apologised.

Cabinet had addressed the impact of the 65% of parishes that had taken the grant and still increased their precept. They acknowledged that the 35% that had reduced their precept would be affected by the decision. However, the impact on Breckland Council was great. Parishes could set their precept but the Council, which started with the lowest Council Tax in the country, could only make a very small increase. She quoted comparisons with neighbouring districts. The changes imposed by Central Government were increasing costs and the decrease in income meant that the Council was facing a significant short-fall by 2016/17.

She hoped the overview had been helpful. She then asked the Assistant Director of Finance to provide some details. He clarified that during discussions with Executive Members it had

**Action By**

been agreed that reference to the grant should be removed from the Medium Term Budget plan. Unfortunately that had not been done, hence the confusion. Officers had sought to rectify that by bringing a report to Cabinet to give clarity to parishes about the precept and tax base levels for 2014/15 onwards and to reflect the changing position of Government funding.

The impact of paying the grant would be significant for the Council. If Option B had been approved it would have had an impact on the precept well in excess of the Government cap, requiring a referendum.

With regard to the DCLG consultation he advised that it had been unclear whether the support grant to Districts would be continued. There was no reference to the grant in the current year's settlement.

The Council did regularly communicate with parishes although they had not done so specifically about the grant. It had been discussed at the Town & Parish Forum in May and it had been made clear then that it would not be paid again.

The Leader of the Council then spoke. He wished to clear up the fallacy that the Council was holding on to money meant for the parishes. He had received additional information from Mr Needham, the Clerk of Dereham Town Council. Mr Needham had e-mailed the DCLG early in the year about budget setting. He had asked whether the transitional grant was continuing. The Leader read out the response from the Deputy Director for Council Tax which said that Ministers were clear that the grant had been for 2013/14 only.

The Leader had written again last week asking for clarification and been advised that the grant had been for one year only and was not part of the Rate Support Grant (RSG) for 2014/15. There was no money being hidden.

With regard to the hand over of facilities without payment which had also been raised, he advised that the Council had passed £1.9million to the Town Councils as part of the transfer of assets.

Councillor C Carter said that he had not been at the Town & Parish Council Forum. He asked what the feeling had been from those there and the Assistant Director of Finance said that he had not detected hostility. The message had been understood. The Leader, who had chaired the Forum, agreed.

The Vice-Chairman responded to two points raised by the Executive Member for Finance & Democratic Services. He said that in the report to Cabinet it said that 65% of parishes had increased their precept. He felt that was misleading because it

**Action By**

did not take budgetary pressures into account. He wanted to highlight the fact that expenditure was increasing and a proper analysis of what parishes had done was required.

He also noted that the commuted sums transferred with assets did not adequately cover the running costs. He gave an example and said that the towns and parishes did not have the same resources as the Council and it was a financial burden on them.

As a Town Councillor he was aware that the issue had caused considerable concern. Thetford had not been aware the grant was for one year only. They were looking at putting up their precept due to other cost pressures. The cumulative effect was causing real concern. The District Council should act as an umbrella to provide services. The transfer of responsibilities was being called Localism but true assets were needed that would generate money. He asked why the Council had not worked with the towns and parishes to look for economies of scale and to share services with them.

He concluded by saying that Members had not looked at all the options. It would be fairer if some money was transferred. There might not be a legal obligation for the Council to do so, but there was a moral obligation.

Councillor Bambridge had been at the Cabinet meeting and confirmed that there had been considerable debate about all the options. Very few back-bench Members had been in attendance. He had thought it important that the matter was heard in a wider forum which was why he had called it in.

The Chairman pointed out that the matter was receiving a wider debate and he was glad about that. In response to the Vice-Chairman's comments he pointed out that the towns and parishes had not been forced into taking over assets. It was regrettable that interest rates were not providing the necessary investment return.

Councillor Gilbert agreed that the towns had not been forced, but said that Watton had been advised that if they did not take responsibility for the public toilets they would be closed. They had not wanted to assume that responsibility but they had not wanted their residents to lose that service. It was the same with streetlights. He thought that the perception of a vast majority of people was that the Council were receiving money for the towns and parishes and keeping it.

The Leader read the e-mail he had received again and repeated that there was no money in the RSG for Towns and Parishes.

Councillor Rogers said that he had put his name to the call-in



**Action By**

because he thought it would be better for the Council if more people agreed with the Cabinet. He had advised his parishes that the money was a one-off.

Councillor Jordan gave a brief history of things being handed to the towns and said that it had started in Watton. With regard to the grant he noted that it was a 'big hit' for small parishes.

Councillor Sharpe understood that the Council was to receive a sum of money. If they decided to take a lump sum out of that and pass it to the parishes it would leave them short for other services. If a grant was provided to the parishes it would mean a cut in services.

Councillor Matthews had also called in the decision because she wanted it to be heard in a wider forum. The towns had always wanted to run their own things. The Clerks were talking to each other about streetlights and she thought that was the way forward; to work collectively.

Councillor Joel agreed that the matter had been well debated at Cabinet and that the parishes had been advised that it was a one off grant.

The Executive Member recalled that the Council had not been advised of the amount of their RSG until 20 December the previous year and it had only been then that they realised the funding was for one year. Option B it would mean a loss of over £½million in income over two years, making an additional hole in the budget. It was a really tough time, but money could only be spent once.

Councillor Borrett made two points. With regards to play areas and street lighting he advised that his parish of North Elmham had streetlights which it funded through the precept without any commuted sum. The system was therefore not unfair to the towns.

He went on to say that the issue of the grant was perceived as important. In the report it clearly gave options. Option B had no cost to the Council and Option D said it saved £259,000. As a result of that it appeared that the Council was hanging on to money that was due to the parishes. It was why a lot of people were in attendance at the Scrutiny meeting. However, having listened to the Executive Member and the Assistant Director it was clear that the report gave the wrong impression. No money had been given and if the Council paid the grant it would cost the Council money which would have to be found from elsewhere. He was not surprised about public perception because the information presented had been incorrect. That had caused a serious problem for Members, but he now

**Action By**

understood that the Council had not been given money and they were not withholding a penny.

The Assistant Director for Finance read out the content of the letter to parish councils sent out with the final figures for the 2013/14 grant. Although it did not explicitly say that the grant was for one year only it purely referred to the 2013/14 precept and did not refer to future years.

The Vice-Chairman proposed that the matter should be referred to Council for consultation with the parishes on the implications to the parishes. Councillor Gilbert seconded the proposal. The proposal was not supported.

Councillor Rogers proposed that the matter be referred back to Cabinet with a recommendation that option D be approved. Councillor Bowes seconded the proposal.

The Chairman clarified that the proposal referred to the options in the report and that option D would remove the grant completely.

**RESOLVED** to **RECOMMEND TO CABINET** that Option D be approved.

**73/13 WORK PROGRAMME (AGENDA ITEM 11)**

The Chairman asked Members to give consideration to items to put forward for the work programme.

The Vice-Chairman asked whether the Housing Associations had been contacted as he was aware that Members were keen to question them about matters such as housing stock management, repairs and garage forecourts.

**74/13 NEXT MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 12)**

The arrangements for the next meeting on 30 January 2014 were noted.

The meeting closed at 3.30 pm

CHAIRMAN

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Held on Monday, 25 November 2013 at 9.30 am in  
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

Mrs S Armes	Mr M. S. Robinson (Vice-Chairman)
Mr S.G. Bambridge	Mr F.J. Sharpe
Mr T R Carter	Mrs P.A. Spencer
Mr P.D. Claussen	Mr N.C. Wilkin (Chairman)
Mr T.J. Lamb	Mr P.J. Duigan (Substitute Member)
Mrs J A North	

**Also Present**

Mr S. Askew	Mrs A.L. Steward
Mr K.S. Gilbert	Mr M. A. Wassell
Mrs L.H. Monument	

**In Attendance**

Viv Bebbington	Senior Development Control Officer
Heather Burlingham	Assistant Development Control Officer*
John Chinnery	Solicitor & Standards Consultant
Paul Jackson	Planning Manager
Helen McAleer	Senior Committee Officer
Martin Pendlebury	Director of Planning & Business Manager *
Chris Raine	Senior Planner*
Paul Took	Interim Senior Planner*

\* Capita Symonds for Breckland Council

**Action By**

**110/13 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 28 October 2013 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**111/13 APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTES (AGENDA ITEM 2)**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bowes and W Richmond.

Councillor Duigan was present as Substitute.

**112/13 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED (AGENDA ITEM 3)**

All Members had received direct representation for the following items:

Schedule Item 2	Watton
Schedule Item 5	Little Dunham
Schedule Item 9	Dereham

**113/13 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)**

The Chairman welcomed Paul Took to the meeting. He was temporarily working in the Planning Department again.

**114/13 REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

Schedule Item 4 (Old Buckenham) had been withdrawn and Schedule Item 10 (Thetford) had been deferred from the agenda.

**115/13 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

The Director of Planning & Business Manager gave an update.

Work was continuing on key pieces of evidence to support the Local Plan. The next meeting of the Local Plan Working Group would be held on 3 December 2013 and would consider the Employment Growth Study and the Housing Numbers reports.

The three Transport Studies for Attleborough had been considered by Cabinet and the Local Plan Working Group on 29 October and had been accepted as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. Further work was needed to assess the costs associated with the Council using its powers of Compulsory Purchase.

Work was also underway on a Local Service Centre topic paper which would re-look at which villages should be local service centres and the potential for housing growth within them.

The Draft Charging Schedule for the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) had been reported to Cabinet on 29 October. Just prior to that meeting the Government had released its response to the consultation on changes to the CIL Regulations. New Regulations would be published in January. Cabinet had therefore decided to delay the consultation on the Draft Charging Schedule until after the CIL regulations were published. The delay was likely to set back the introduction of CIL charging to October-December 2014.

Councillor Bambridge asked whether the principles would be changes for the Local Service Centre Review. The Director of Planning & Business Manager advised that all Councillors would be invited to a visioning exercise to be held in the New Year to look at the whole aspect and he expected that to result in a change to the principles.

Councillor Claussen asked if the Council stood to lose any money due to the late introduction of the CIL but he was advised that was not likely.

**116/13 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 8)**

116 .1 COLKIRK: Azure, Market Hill: Minor Material Amendment to 3PL/2011/0747/F in respect of increased height of the dwelling and garage and a Juliet balcony to the front elevation (retrospective): Applicant: Mr and Mrs Cram: Reference: 3PL/2013/0434/F

This application, for an amendment to a dwelling which had been built higher than approved, had been deferred from the Committee meeting on 1 July 2013 for negotiations between the Applicants and the Objector on mitigation measures.

The Applicants had suggested planting bamboo between the fence and wall as it would reach a good height quickly and would screen softly, with movement. Other options had been considered and rejected for various reasons. The neighbour had not been satisfied with their proposal and had suggested the planting of mature pleached hornbeam with a maintenance agreement. The main volume of the trees would be above the fence creating a good screen.

Attention was drawn to a recent amendment adding a Juliet balcony. Officers felt that both the balcony and the proposal to plant bamboo were acceptable.

Mrs Lawrence (Objector) had suggested the pleached hornbeam as it would provide a natural hedge-on-stilts with no risk of root damage. She was even willing to have the trees planted on her side of the fence. Bamboo was non-native, did not fit the rural location and had invasive roots.

Mrs Cram (Applicant) said the application sought approval for the additional 15 inches in height. They were willing to mitigate its appearance but as the fence was less than five feet from the garage it was difficult to plant. Bamboo had been suggested after research. The impact of the extra 15 inches was not adverse. Most of the house was single storey whereas Mrs Lawrence's house was three storeys. If the extra height had been included in the original application it would probably have been accepted.

Councillor Armes was very disappointed. She did not think that bamboo was suitable; it could be noisy and invasive. She favoured the pleached hornbeams. She was also concerned about the sudden addition of the Juliet balcony.

Councillor Spencer agreed and asked where the balcony would be located. The position of the balcony was pointed out. It was also clarified that a Juliet balcony was a safety feature only, providing railings across a window opening to stop people falling out.

Members discussed their powers to impose a condition for the planting of the pleached hornbeams. The Planning Manager advised that it would be

difficult to enforce a condition to plant the trees in the neighbour's garden and might require a legal agreement.

Mrs Cram asked whether the Council would be liable for any damage to the foundations if they enforced such a condition and the Solicitor advised that the Council would not normally be liable for any such damage in connection with a planning permission but said that she should take legal advice.

It was confirmed by several persons present that pleached hornbeam could be planted (if done in the correct manner) without any risk to buildings.

**RESOLVED** that the application be approved subject to conditions including:

- a) the planting of pleached hornbeam along the length of the garage wall;
- b) details of the planting scheme and future maintenance to be submitted to the Council within two months;
- c) planting of the trees to take place within two months of approval of the planting scheme; and

Members further approved Enforcement Action if the conditions were not complied with.

#### **117/13 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 9)**

**RESOLVED** that the applications be determined as follows:

- (a) Item 1: DEREHAM: Mill Vue Farm, Badley Moor: Revocation of covenants 5.1, 5.3 & 5.4 on pp 3PL/2006/1067 relating to occupational restriction: Applicant: Mr & Mrs Worledge: Reference: 3OB/2013/0002/OB

This application requested the lifting of restrictions tying the dwelling to the agricultural engineering business. The applicants had not been able to secure a mortgage to build the house due to the legal tie. Although Officers had sympathy with the applicants there was no policy justification to remove the restriction.

Mr Futter (Agent) said the Applicants had been trying to obtain a mortgage since 2008 but due to the restriction they could not find a lender. They were living on site in the caravan which had been given temporary permission. They had lived on the site for 21 years and wanted to build a modest dwelling. It was a successful rural enterprise.

Councillor L Monument (Ward Representative) said that the legal agreement was a blight on the property which would continue to affect whoever owned the site. There was no chance to borrow money. Officers were right about the Policy but she asked

Members to use their prerogative to make an exception.

Councillor Claussen noted that the rules and policies had been drawn up in better times.

The temporary permission for the caravan was clarified by the Planning Manager who advised Members that once that permission expired Enforcement Action could be taken to remove the caravan if necessary. However, if the restriction was lifted and the dwelling built, the caravan could remain as a chattel in the grounds. If economic conditions changed the house could be built. He asked Members to consider whether they would grant permission for an unrestricted dwelling on the site.

The vote was tied and the Chairman used his casting vote to support the recommendation.

**Refused, as recommended.**

- (b) Item 2: WATTON: Thetford Road: Erection of 110 Dwellings with associated Open Space: Applicant: Hopkins Homes Limited: Reference: 3PL/2013/0510/F

This full application for 110 dwellings would include 25% affordable housing (28 units). The District Valuer had confirmed that 40% was not viable and 25% was acceptable. The supplementary information provided referred to a contribution for bird monitoring and mitigation. That figure had been re-calculated and should be £125,000. If that sum was required the applicant would have to reduce their affordable housing contribution to 22% (25 units).

Mr Denempont (Objector) said that Watton did not have the facilities to accommodate the development. If affordable housing was developed it would attract more people and there were not enough shops, doctors or schools.

Mr Smith (Applicant) said the development had been carefully planned in consultation with officers and key stakeholders. The current scheme would provide affordable and market housing, open space and land for the school.

Councillor Wassell (Ward Representative) had concerns about the development. The four accesses to the site were potential accident spots, there should be a roundabout at Barn Ruche. He was also concerned about the proposal to reduce the number of affordable housing units. Finally he noted it was a very muddy site which often smelt of sewage.

Councillor Gilbert (Ward Representative) thanked the Applicants for their thorough public consultation. However, certain aspects were still not right. He agreed that the access should be off a roundabout at Barn Ruche, if not a right turn lane would be essential. He asked

Members to defer the application for further consideration.

Councillor Spencer thought that a roundabout would help as it was a very dangerous junction.

Councillor North agreed and said that needed to be re-examined. She was concerned that a three storey unit overlooked a bungalow. With regard to the reduction in affordable housing she asked whether there would be any contributions if 28 were retained.

The Planning Manager apologised for the confusion with the figures which was not the Applicant's fault; they had also received late notification. He suggested that affordable housing in this instance was more important than a contribution to protect wildlife but it was up to Members to decide. With regard to the request for a roundabout, he advised that it was not a policy requirement. It was also on land outside the ownership of the Applicants and would have a significant impact on the tree belt and on the affordable housing provision.

Councillor Bambridge was also concerned about the access and hoped some improvements could be made. He suggested that the parking places and some roads on site should have sustainable drainage.

Councillor Sharpe asked if a roundabout would affect the viability of the site and the Agent advised that it would as there would be a substantial cost, besides the issue of them not owning the land. He also confirmed that there was no Highways justification for a roundabout.

Councillor Sharpe asked about a separate access point for emergency vehicles and also requested that the affordable housing element be re-valued and uplifted if necessary when the site was completed. He agreed that social housing should take priority over birds.

Councillor Lamb made the general point that not enough consideration was given to how the new residents would be accommodated without additional infrastructure.

The Chairman suggested that the 30mph zone should be extended and questioned the number of accesses onto the busy road, especially the one that served only three properties.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred for the issues raised to be addressed. It was noted that the three storey dwelling was 20m from the bungalow and should not cause an issue.

**Deferred, contrary to the recommendation, for consideration of an extension to the 30mph zone, the number of accesses to be**



**looked at, particularly the northernmost access; road markings and signage possibly with a right-hand turn lane at the site entrance; and the provision of an emergency access/exit.**

- (c) Item 3: THETFORD: Former Railway Depot, Station Yard: Conversion of former train engineering workshop to 4 x 2 bed flats & 2 x 1 bed flats & erect 4 x 2 bed houses: Applicant: Havebury Housing Partnership: Reference: 3PL/2013/0852/F

This application was for 100% affordable housing in a sustainable location.

Mr Wilkie (Agent) said it was an excellent opportunity to bring a derelict site back into use and deliver one and two bedroom affordable housing.

Councillor Armes was very concerned that the requirement for Open Space had been waived as there was nowhere for the occupants to go.

Councillor Lamb said it was the only part of the railway system left in Thetford and if passenger traffic increased there would be no opportunity to extend the railway station as all the land would have been used. There was not enough parking for the station and the site could accommodate that need.

Councillor Spencer asked how residents would be separated from the railway line and the Agent advised that there would be a gateway between the building and the railway line and fencing. The access to the site would be narrowed and surfaced differently to secure residents' parking.

**Deferred and the officers authorised to grant approval, subject to conditions, on completion of the section 106 agreement.**

- (d) Item 4: OLD BUCKENHAM: Land off Folly Lane: Erection of agricultural livestock building & associated hardstanding & feed bin: Applicant: O P Bunn: Reference: 3PL/2013/0876/F

This item had been withdrawn. See Minute No 114/13 above.

- (e) Item 5: LITTLE DUNHAM: Brick Kiln Pightle, Barrows Hole Lane: Erect 4 Dwellings, create 2 new access points & 2 passing places onto Barrows Hole Lane: Applicant: Susan Wright: Reference: 3PL/2013/0888/F

All Members had received direct representation on this item.

It was clarified that there was no Settlement Boundary for Little Dunham; it had been removed by the LDF process. The main concern was that it was development in the countryside. The location was not sustainable and could not be considered against

the housing land shortfall.

Mr Wright (for Applicant) asked Members to support the small, much needed contribution towards the housing land supply. The Highways objections were inconsistent. The application offered high quality design which could be delivered. The site was between two Service Centres.

Councillor Carter lived near the area. He accepted that small villages were not sustainable. The site was near the A47 and could access other areas for facilities. Villages needed life. Highways had commented on the width of the road but NCC had granted permission for lorries to use the road without limitations.

Councillor Claussen agreed and said 95% of Norfolk was unsustainable. There was a need to put life blood back into villages.

The Planning Manager asked Members to be mindful of policy and to be consistent. If they were minded to approve the application they needed clear reasons why it was acceptable when others had not been.

The recommendation for refusal was not supported.

**Deferred, contrary to the recommendation, and the officers authorised to grant approval on completion of the section 106 agreement, on the grounds that Members were mindful of the positive benefits of the scheme relating to specific and directly-related improvements to highways conditions and to the provision of an affordable housing contribution; and were equally mindful of the need to re-visit within the Local Plan process the desire to seek to promote some small-scale, reasonably sited and inherently well-designed housing development in settlements currently lacking defined settlement boundaries within the open countryside; approval being subject to conditions including requiring improvements to the highway network; the provision of passing places; site investigation and archaeological work; and an affordable housing contribution.**

- (f) Item 6: BEETLEY: 16 Beech Road: Erection of a single storey upvc/glass conservatory on the side of the house: Applicant: Miss Gillian Rosindell: Reference: 3PL/2013/0902/F

This application was before the Committee as the applicant was a member of staff.

**Approved, as recommended.**

- (g) Item 7: ICKBURGH: The Old Rectory, Ashburton Road: Residential development of four detached dwellings and garages: Applicant: Mr

Donal McGovern: Reference: 3PL/2013/0908/F

Mr Took left the room whilst this item was discussed.

This application proposed the development of a vacant site, previously used for storage. The scheme itself was acceptable but as there were limited facilities in Ickburgh there would be significant reliance on cars and Officers felt the disadvantages outweighed the advantages.

Mr Gore (Parish Council) said there was overwhelming support for the development. It would remove old buildings used by drug users and dealers. The Applicant had offered to provide passing places. Local facilities were in Mundford which was only one mile away.

Mr Hendry (Agent) advised Members that the site had permission for commercial use which could be intensified. Breckland needed houses and the brownfield site could be brought forward quickly and would support local facilities. It would have negligible impact on ecology and would reduce hardstanding by 85%. A habitat buffer would be provided increasing the bio-diversity of the site. A Unilateral Undertaking would provide contributions for affordable housing, open space and passing places.

Councillor Steward (Ward Representative) said the Local Development Framework (LDF) had looked for windfall sites such as this. It would provide executive housing for people employed in the area. The site had been advertised for employment for two years. All procedures had been followed. Local people wanted the site developed.

Councillor Lamb noted that people in villages also wanted commercial opportunities and the site could enhance work opportunities in the village. If houses were built it would increase traffic in the countryside.

Councillor Bambridge disagreed and thought it should be treated as an exception site. He asked how the buffer zone would be accessed for management and the Agent advised that the applicant owned adjacent land and could make the access wider if necessary and also provide access to the rear.

**Refused, as recommended.**

Mr Took returned to the room.

- (h) Item 8: BANHAM: Rear of 59 Crown Street, off Greyhound Lane: Residential development (3 dwellings): Applicant: Mr & Mrs Barry Pardue: Reference: 3PL/2013/0940/O

This proposal was not for 100% affordable housing and would result in a cramped form of development outside the settlement

**Action By**

boundary. Officers felt it would have limited effect on the five year housing land supply deficit. There were also Highways objections.

Mr Evans (Agent) thought that if all such sites were permitted it would impact the housing land shortfall. The proposal was similar to the adjacent site which had received approval. There was scope to amend the layout and parking provision. The access complied with visibility requirements and the adjacent application included a footpath. The site would provide much needed low cost housing.

Councillor Askew (Ward Representative) said Banham was a large village with good amenities. It was a logical site for modest development which the Parish Council were keen to have included within the boundary. He was confident that resident's concerns could be addressed at Reserved Matters stage. The Parish wanted the development and it would contribute to the housing land shortfall.

It was clarified that some market housing could be acceptable if a viability case was made to cross fund the affordable housing.

Members were shown photographs of the existing footpath on the opposite side of the road, which did not extend to the junction. There was no guarantee that the proposed footpath with the adjacent site would be developed.

Councillor Duigan was concerned that public perception would be that the Council favoured large developments and smaller developments were discriminated against because they did not address the housing land shortfall.

The Planning Manager agreed about gradually addressing the shortfall through smaller sites, but said that the consequence of allowing ad-hoc development meant poor layout. If the two sites could be developed together it would provide a better form of development.

Councillor Lamb said that if the Parish had wanted the whole area to be included within the boundary a small part should not be granted permission in isolation.

**Refused, as recommended.**

- (i) Item 9: DEREHAM: Old Hall Nurseries, Dumpling Green: Erection of two 3 bedroomed detached houses with garages: Applicant: Reads Nurseries: Reference: 3PL/2013/0945/F

All Members had received direct representation on this item.

Additional information had been supplied in the Agenda Supplement. A letter from Mr Goreham, Ward Representative was read out. He supported the application saying that the application

site was sizeable and the proposal was not intrusive or unpleasant.

Officers felt that the scheme made very little contribution to the housing land deficit and were concerned that approval would set a precedent.

Mr Cannell (Objector) lived opposite and showed photographs of the access road which was a farm track which he said could not sustain further development. If permission was granted he feared that other residents would follow suit. It was a unique, rural part of Dereham outside the Settlement Boundary, which he did not want to be lost.

Mr Mathews (Agent) said that the Applicant's family had owned the Nursery for 100 years. They had spent time and money maintaining the track. The proposed houses were in keeping with the area and would maintain neighbour's privacy. No other applications discussed had been refused because of setting a precedent. Each application should be considered on its own merits. The site was available, suitable and achievable and was therefore appropriate in light of the housing land shortfall.

Mrs Edwards (objector) had had to leave before the item was discussed. The Solicitor believed her main objection had been about land ownership

Councillor Carter noted that the development would make a contribution to the shortfall but Councillor Lamb noted that the main issue was that the site was outside the Settlement Boundary.

**Refused, as recommended.**

- (j) Item 10: THETFORD: Tesco, Kilverstone Lane: Extension of time limit on pp 3PL/2009/0973/F – extension to foodstore, car park & associated works: Applicant: Tesco Stores Ltd: Reference: 3TL/2013/0013/TL

This item had been deferred from the Agenda. See Minute No 114/13 above.

**Notes to the Schedule**

Item No	Speaker
1	Cllr L Monument – Ward Representative Mr Futter - Agent
2	Cllr Gilbert – Ward Representative Cllr Wassell – Ward Representative Mr R Denempont – Objector Mr C Smith - Applicant
3	Mr Wilkie - Agent
5	Mr Wright – for Applicant
7	Cllr Steward – Ward Representative Mr Gore – Parish Council

Action By

	Mr Hendry - Agent
8	Cllr Askew – Ward Representative Mr Pardue – Applicant Mr Evans - Agent
9	Mrs Edwards – Objector Mr Cannell – Objector Mr Mathews – Agent Mr Read - Applicant
Deferred Item 8a	Mrs Lawrence – Objector Mr & Mrs Cram - Applicants

**Written Representations Taken Into Account**

<b>Reference No</b>	<b>No of Representations</b>
3PL/2013/0510/F	32
3PL/2013/0908/F	8
3PL/2013/0940/O	6
3PL/2013/0945/F	17
3PL/2013/0888/F	10
3TL/2013/0013/TL	3
3PL/2013/0434/F	2

**118/13 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING (AGENDA ITEM 10)**

Noted.

**119/13 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL (AGENDA ITEM 11)**

Noted.

**120/13 APPEAL DECISIONS (AGENDA ITEM 12)**

Noted.

The meeting closed at 1.35 pm

CHAIRMAN

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE**

**Held on Wednesday, 27 November 2013 at 10.00 am in  
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

Mr P.J. Duigan (Chairman)	Mr B J Skull
Mr T R Carter (Vice-Chairman)	Mr A.C. Stasiak
Mr S.G. Bambridge	Mrs A.L. Steward
Mr W.P. Borrett	Mr D.R. Williams JP
Mr R.F. Goreham	Mr R. R. Richmond (Substitute Member)

**In Attendance**

Phil Adams	- Public Protection Manager
Sue Daniels	- Electoral Services Manager
Helen McAleer	- Senior Committee Officer
Alison Peart	- Interim Senior HR Advisor

**Action By**

**58/13 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2013 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**59/13 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 2)**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chapman-Allen, Clark and Matthews. Councillor R Richmond was present as Substitute for Councillor Matthews.

**60/13 COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW - WATTON (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

The Electoral Services Manager presented the report which considered a request from Watton Town Council to reduce their number of Councillors from 15 to 13. The Council had a statutory duty to consider the request. If approved, it was proposed to use a 'light touch' approach, posting notices on the Council's website and in Watton Town Hall. It was not expected that the review would have any cost implications.

The motivation behind the request was to align with Norfolk Association of Local Councils (NALC) recommendations and ensure that the Town Council was able to be active in the community.

**Action By**

Councillor Williams was concerned that there would be a cost to the Council at a time when it was trying to keep costs down. The public would not appreciate money being wasted on what was only a miniscule reduction. He also pointed out that there would be Parish elections in only 18 months.

The Electoral Services Manager advised that even if 15 Councillors were not elected there would still be a requirement for the Town Council to co-opt as they could not reduce their ratio without a Community Governance Review.

Councillor Borrett wondered whether Swaffham would be next as they had the same ratio. He thought that there would be a cost to the Council as there was a lot to do. He asked if a contribution could be sought from the Town Council but was advised that it was the District Council's statutory responsibility. He suggested that the boundary should be sorted out first to address the Carbrooke anomaly before the number of Councillors was reviewed.

The Electoral Services Manager explained that the Council was required to carry out a full Community Governance Review every 12 to 15 years. The last one had been in 2002 and so it would soon be time to start that process. The review would look at boundaries and the number of Councillors. However, any Councils that had been reviewed within the last two years could not be changed.

Councillor Steward thought that other towns and parishes might come forward for review and she was concerned about the cost. She also felt that a notice in the Town Hall and on the website was not enough. There should be a notice in the local paper.

It was pointed out that that would add to the costs.

**RESOLVED** that the review be deferred until the full District-wide review was carried out.

The Chairman noted that all parishes should be given advance notice of the District-wide review to give them time to consider their options. The Electoral Services Manager said that she would inform Members of the timetable for that review as soon as it was known.

**61/13 ADOPTION OF A REVISED 'PROCEDURES POLICY' IN RELATION TO THE LOCAL LAND & PROPERTY GAZETTEER INCORPORATING STREET NAMING & NUMBERING (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

The Public Protection Manager presented the revised procedures policy for street naming and number which had originally been adopted in 2009. The Council had a legal responsibility to regularly review and improve its street naming and numbering service.



**Action By**

The changes listed at 1.7 of the report were highlighted and each one was clarified.

Councillor Bambridge did not like the idea of preferred lists. Parishes held strong opinions and full account should be taken of local views. He also thought that linking the names of properties was acceptable.

The Public Protection Manager advised that the preferred list would be supplied by the parish and could be updated by them as required. The linking of names caused problems for the emergency services and the aim was to avoid that in future.

The Chairman acknowledged that problem and quoted an example in Dereham where there was a Wright Road, Wright Way and Wright Avenue. They often got confused.

Councillor Borrett said that people felt strongly about names which were often integral to the place. He acknowledged the problems for the emergency services but pointed out that linked names could give a clue to the location. He was confused about the rule of names not starting with 'The' or ending in an 's'.

Councillor Carter agreed and said that some names went back hundreds of years, such as 'The Street'.

Councillor Steward asked if there was money in the budget for the repair/renewal of name plates. The Public Protection Manager confirmed that the Council had a legal responsibility to do that and that part of the policy had not changed.

Councillor Williams agreed with the other speakers. A road name change in his Ward had caused problems. He suggested that the parish councils needed to be informed in good time to meet the ten day deadline.

The Public Protection Manager noted that road names were only changed for really good reasons usually following a request from the parish council or emergency services. He acknowledged that the ten day deadline caused problems, which was one of the reasons for introducing the list as it gave the parish time to consider names they would like to be used.

It was noted that developments took a long time to reach fruition and it might be a good idea to start thinking about a name for a new road when the parish council was consulted on the planning application.

The Public Protection Manager agreed that the earlier a name could be sorted out the better. Developers needed a postal address to put utilities onto a site.

Councillor Borrett said that the role of the Ward Representative was

**Action By**

not included in the procedures. They should have a more defined role as they were available all year, whereas it had been noted that some parishes were very small and met infrequently. He also felt that the changes should be guidance only, not mandatory. The key thing was to inject common sense into whether a name should be allowed or not.

The Chairman thought that the procedures should be amended to say that Ward Members would be consulted. He asked how prescriptive the policy was and who would make the decision in case of conflict.

The Public Protection Manager advised that generally such decisions were made in discussions between officers and the Portfolio Holder.

Members felt that the Ward Representative should be involved or that the matter should be determined by Committee if there was a problem.

Councillor Goreham agreed that Ward Members should be informed. He suggested that the old document should be kept and the new document added 'for consideration' but not as definitive guidance.

The Public Protection Manager explained that the changes had been put forward because of existing problems.

Councillor Williams thought it needed to be made easier to understand and suggested it should include a summary. The Public Protection Manager advised that there would be a Question and Answer section on the website referring to the relevant sections of the document.

It was clarified that names could be used but there was a need to be mindful and ensure that families were aware.

**RESOLVED** to defer the policy for amendments including the requirement for early notification of parishes and consultation with Ward Representatives.

**62/13SECONDMENT (ITEM 8)**

The Interim Senior HR Advisor presented the report as the Human Resources Manager had sent her apologies.

The report had been written at the request of the Assistant Director of Commissioning to look at the amount of secondments and whether they posed any risks.

There had only been four secondments in the last two years. The majority had been by staff from the Contact Centre. There was an element of frustration that staff were being employed and trained to

**Action By**

work in the Contact Centre and were then leaving. To overcome that problem it was suggested that a policy be written giving clear guidance on who could apply for secondment.

Councillor Carter acknowledged that secondments could cause disruption to service. In his previous profession as a schoolteacher he had done research which had proven the need for a firm policy with specific restrictions. Very large organisations could cope with secondments, but generally he felt there was little benefit for smaller organisations.

Councillor Williams thought that progress in development should be reflected in the secondment. He asked if Unison had been consulted. It was confirmed that they would be consulted through the LJCC.

Councillor Borrett agreed that a policy was needed and asked for it to be presented to the Committee when it had been written.

**RESOLVED** that:

- (1) HR be commissioned to draft a Secondment Policy for application across the authority, which placed limitations on when an employee could undertake a secondment, relating to the length of time in their substantive role; and
- (2) The Council continued to use secondments, as and when the need arose, within the parameters of the Secondment Policy.

**63/13 NEXT MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 9)**

The arrangements for the next meeting on 8 January 2014 were noted.

The meeting closed at 11.10 am

CHAIRMAN