



AGENDA

MEETING VENUE:

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

Our Ref: HM/L.18

Contact:

Direct Dial: 01362 656381

e-mail: helen.mcaleer@breckland.gov.uk

Date: Monday, 24 August 2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

Members of the Council are hereby summoned to a Meeting of the **District Council** which will be held at **10.15 am on Thursday, 3rd September, 2015** in the **Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

Yours faithfully

Anna Graves
Chief Executive

The Senior Democratic Services 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.

	<u>Page(s) herewith</u>
1. <u>MINUTES</u> To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 9 July 2015.	1 - 7
2. <u>APOLOGIES</u> To receive apologies for absence.	
3. <u>CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</u>	8 - 9
4. <u>LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS</u> To receive a verbal update from Councillor Turner, Deputy Leader of the Council on behalf of the Leader of the Council.	
5. <u>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</u> Members are reminded that under the Code of Conduct they are not to participate in 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 that they have, in relation to an agenda item that supports the Nolan principles detailed within the Code of Conduct.	
6. <u>CABINET MINUTES</u> Unconfirmed minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 14 July 2015.	10 - 17
7. <u>OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION</u> Unconfirmed minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission meeting held on 30 July 2015.	18 - 25
8. <u>PLANNING COMMITTEE</u> Confirmed minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 20 July 2015.	26 - 39
9. <u>AUDIT COMMITTEE</u> Unconfirmed minutes of the Audit Committee meeting held on 31 July 2015.	40 - 45
10. <u>NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE AND OTHER SEATS</u> To receive nominations for any changes to Committee and other seats from political groups. <u>Appeals Committee</u> To appoint John Newton – UKIP Substitute Member <u>Audit Committee</u> To appoint Jennifer Hollis – UKIP Substitute Member <u>General Purposes Committee</u> To appoint Mark Taylor – UKIP Substitute Member	

Licensing Committee

To appoint Denis Crawford – UKIP Substitute Member

Overview & Scrutiny Commission

To appoint John Newton – UKIP Substitute Member

Planning Committee

To appoint Jennifer Hollis – UKIP Substitute Member

Greater Thetford Development Partnership (New outside Body)

To appoint Ellen Jolly as the Council's representative.

Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny Sub Panel

To appoint Lynda Turner as the Council's representative

It has been brought to our attention that the Maharaja Duleep Singh Centenary Trust outside body no longer holds committee meetings and it has therefore been removed as an outside body.

For Information

BRIEFING BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Immediately following the meeting Members are invited to stay in the room for a Briefing by the Chief Executive on the Senior Management Restructure.

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

COUNCIL

**Held on Thursday, 9 July 2015 at 10.00 am in the
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Mr T J Ashby	Mrs S.M. Matthews
Mr S.G. Bambridge (Chairman)	Mrs K. Millbank
Mrs E J Bishop	Mrs L.H. Monument
Mr W.P. Borrett	Mr T F C Monument
Councillor C Bowes	Mr M J Nairn
Mr R F W Brame	Mr J Newton
Mr C G Carter	Mr J.W. Nunn
Mr T R Carter	Mr D R R Oliver
Councillor M. Chapman-Allen	Mrs K. Pettitt
Mr S H Chapman-Allen	Mr R. R. Richmond
Mr H E J Clarke	Mr W. R. J. Richmond
Mr P.D. Claussen	Mr M. S. Robinson
Mr J.P. Cowen	Mr J.D. Rogers
Mr P R W Darby	Mr F.J. Sharpe
Mr P M M Dimoglou	Mr I. Sherwood
Mr P.J. Duigan	Mr W.H.C. Smith
Mr K.S. Gilbert	Mr A.C. Stasiak
Councillor E. Gould	Mr M Taylor
Mrs J Hollis	Mrs L.S. Turner
Mr T. J. Jermy	Mr M. A. Wassell
Mr A.P. Joel	Mrs A M Webb
Mrs E. M. Jolly	Mr N.C. Wilkin
Mr K. Martin	Mr P S Wilkinson

In Attendance

Julie Britton	- Senior Democratic Services Officer
Anna Graves	- Chief Executive
Julie Kennealy	- Executive Director Commercialisation
Teresa Smith	- Democratic Services Officer
Mark Stinson	- Interim Executive Manager Governance (Deputy Monitoring Officer BDC)
Rob Walker	- Executive Director Place

55/15 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 May 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

56/15 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Crawford, Duffield and Hewett.

Action By

57/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 3)

The Chairman had attended a Sports Day experience which had been an excellent day, as had a sports day at the Fred Nicholson School in Dereham.

Members were reminded that the Transition workshop would be held on 15 July and encouraged all Members to attend.

The Chairman informed Members that he would be holding his Civic Reception on 30 September and a Carol Service on the 14 December. He would be grateful to receive raffle prizes for these events to help raise money for the Chairman's charity of the year.

58/15 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)

The Leader had attended a recent Local Government Association (LGA) Annual Conference; the main topics included Devolution, Health and the Financial outlook.

Following the recent budget announcement, work was underway analysing the impact on Breckland and its residents. Some of those announcements included a Public Sector pay rise limited to 1% per annum.

Sunday trading hours could be devolved to the Local Authorities and Elected Mayors but the detail and implications of this were still unknown.

Further planning reforms were to be announced where it was thought the development of Local Plans would be made much simpler and faster; further details were expected shortly.

A National Living Wage of £7.20 per hour would be introduced in April 2016, rising to £9.00 per hour by 2020. All employees at Breckland were currently above this level.

Members and Officers would be considering all implications of the budget and how this could affect the residents of Breckland.

The Riverside project at Thetford was progressing and a time lapsed camera could be accessed using the Breckland Bridge Website – www.brecklandbridge.co.uk.

The Tour of Britain cycling race would be coming through the District this summer and Breckland was offering grants of up to £500 for groups to organise activities which brought together local communities and encouraged visitors to the area.

Councillor Gilbert asked if there would be a full Member briefing once the Planning reforms were known. The Leader said he would ensure that this would take place.

Councillor Jermy said he was grateful for the introduction of the National Living Wage, and asked what could Breckland do to encourage others to follow suit.

Mr Wassell said that this would become a statutory right, and therefore employers would have no choice but to adhere to the National Living Wage with effect from April 2016.

Mr Joel said he was pleased that Breckland would be part of the Tour of Britain cycling race. Old Buckenham had organised a village event to celebrate this with cycling racing around the village green, a fun-fair and beer tents would also be

available to make it a fun day out for all.

Mr Rogers mentioned that Bennetts had asked for an extension to the Section 106 agreement for at least another year, and this should not be allowed.

The Chairman said that whilst this did not form part of the Leader's announcement, the comment would be noted.

59/15 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Councillor Smith referred to Page 20, Item D, of the Planning Committee Minutes 26 May 2015, and said whilst it was not his application, he did have an interest in this.

60/15 CABINET MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 6)

a) Revenue Full Year Financial Performance 2014-15 (Minute No 54/15)

RESOLVED that the actual out-turn of £248,000 be contributed to the Organisational Development Reserve to fund the Transformation Programme.

b) Proposed Disposal of Land at Fairfield, Thetford, (Minute No 55/15)

Councillor Jermy said he had intended to attend the Cabinet meeting on the 9 June, but had not been able to as he had been unwell. He felt that the disposal of this land caused great concern to those on the Fairfield estate as this was leading to the lack of open space.

Whilst the unexpected income was being realised he hoped that the Council would be supportive if a new play area could be identified within Thetford.

Councillor Wassell said that all grants would be considered by the Council through the grants process. He added that in reality the Council did not have any choice with this decision as County Council would have acquired the land using its compulsory purchase powers.

Councillor Borrett added that the piece of land would be used for the local infant school, and therefore would be of a huge benefit to the residents within Thetford. He wanted Members to be clear that this was a win, win situation.

Councillor Hollis raised concern that no consideration had been given to the road on the Fairfield estate as the school was in a cul-de-sac. Councillor Wassell suggested she forwarded her comments to the County Councillor.

c) Adoption

RESOLVED that the unconfirmed minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 9 June 2015 be adopted.

61/15 PLANNING COMMITTEE (AGENDA ITEM 7)

a) Confirmed minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 26 May 2015

RESOLVED that the confirmed Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 26 May 2015 be adopted.

b) Unconfirmed minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 22 June 2015

RESOLVED that the unconfirmed Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 22 June 2015 be adopted.

62/15 GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE (AGENDA ITEM 8)

a) Review of the Economic Development Function (Minute No 40/15)

Councillor Jermy said that Economic Development was an important function to the Council and felt disappointed in the lack of strategic direction to ensure that Economic Development moved forward.

Councillor Wassell said that Economic Development still existed and would continue to work throughout the District bringing funding and opportunity to the District.

Councillor Millbank added that it would be a smaller team.

Councillor Cowen pointed out that the landscape in which Economic Development operated had changed because of the funding streams that were available. The Council was still committed to growth in business and that the strategic direction was currently under development. The Transformation workshop would help to shape the direction.

Councillor Wassell said a position had been added to the Senior Management restructure which would focus solely on the income and prosperity of the District.

The Chairman highlighted, particularly for new Councillors, that all Members were entitled to attend any committee meeting and encouraged them to do so.

Councillors Jermy and Hollis voted against the recommendation.

RESOLVED that:

1. The proposed structure as illustrated at Figure 2 of the report be approved; and
2. Authority be delegated to the Head of Paid Service in consultation with the Leader to take all such consequential subsidiary and incidental action as may be required. The authority to include approving any redundancies and early retirements.

b) Adoption

RESOLVED that the unconfirmed minutes of the Special General Purposes Committee meeting held on 24 June 2015 be adopted.

63/15 APPEALS COMMITTEE (AGENDA ITEM 9)

The Chairman of Appeals thanked Members who attended the meeting as part of their training, and also encouraged other Members to do the same.

RESOLVED that the unconfirmed Minutes of the Appeals Committee

meeting held on 17 June 2015 be adopted.

64/15 LICENSING COMMITTEE (AGENDA ITEM 10)

RESOLVED that the unconfirmed Minutes of the Licensing Committee meeting held on 19 June 2015 be adopted.

65/15 AUDIT COMMITTEE (AGENDA ITEM 11)

- a) Annual report of the Audit Committee (Minute No 26/15)

RESOLVED that the content of the Annual Report of the Audit Committee be noted.

- b) Treasury Management Performance Report 2014/15 (Minute No 27/15)

RESOLVED that:

1. the actual 2014/15 prudential indicators be approved
2. the Treasury Management Stewardship report for 2014/15 at Appendix B and Appendix C of the report be noted.

- c) Adoption

RESOLVED that the unconfirmed Minutes of the Audit Committee meeting held on 19 June 2015 be adopted.

66/15 THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES (STANDING ORDERS) (ENGLAND) (AMENDMENT) REGULATIONS 2015 - REQUIRED CHANGES TO CONSTITUTION (AGENDA ITEM 12)

The Interim Executive Manager Governance presented the report.

The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2015 were brought into force on 11 May 2015.

All Local authorities were required to introduce amended Standing Orders by the first ordinary meeting of the Council.

The key changes, which were required by law, related to the involvement of two independent persons in disciplinary proceedings against statutory officers (Head of Paid Service, Chief Financial Officer and Monitoring Officer) which could result in dismissal.

All of the statutory posts were shared and disciplinary matters were dealt with by a Joint Committee with South Holland District Council (SHDC). As such, each Authority could meet the requirement by inviting their respective Independent Standards appointees to any Joint Appointments and Disciplinary Committee dealing with such matters. SHDC had already approved similar changes to its Standing Orders.

Whilst the Regulations removed certain requirements such as a limit on the time for suspension of a statutory officer, it was considered that the current Standing Orders relating to these matters represented best practice and therefore should be retained.

Councillor Smith said he felt the wording of Standing Order 59 (page 45 of the agenda) should be altered.

Councillor Monument suggested that the wording should be:

Standing Order No. 59

1. Appointment of the Joint Head of Paid Service is subject to approval by the full Councils following consideration of the recommendation of such an appointment by a Joint Committee or Sub-Committee of the Councils.....

Councillor Nunn asked how the Standing Orders differed to those of South Holland District Council. The Interim Executive Manager Governance explained that SHDC did not have Standing Orders as they followed employment procedures which were slightly different. However, in this instance, the provisions were identical.

RESOLVED that subject to the amendment noted above the recommendations be approved as listed in the report.

67/15 DESIGNATION OF MONITORING OFFICER (AGENDA ITEM 13)

The Interim Executive Manager Governance presented the report and asked Members to formally designate the position of Monitoring Officer.

RESOLVED that:

1. Maxine O'Mahony, Executive Director for Strategy and Governance be designated as Monitoring Officer to Breckland Council.
2. The new designation would be effective from 9 July 2015.

68/15 NOMINATIONS FOR COMMITTEE AND OTHER SEATS (AGENDA ITEM 14)

Councillor Hollis asked to replace Councillor Taylor on the Licensing Committee.

It was noted that the nomination under the Joint Appointments Committee, should be for the Joint Appointments Appeals Committee.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) Councillor Wilkinson replace Councillor Dimoglou on the Audit Committee and that Councillor Dimoglou replace Councillor Wilkinson as Substitute.
- 2) Councillor Pettitt replace Councillor Gould on the Joint Appeals Appointments Committee.
- 3) Councillor Ashby replace Councillor Pettitt on the General Purposes Committee and Councillor Robinson replace Councillor Ashby as Substitute.
- 4) Councillor Robinson replace Councillor Pettitt on the Licensing Committee and Councillor Oliver replace Councillor Robinson as Substitute.
- 5) Councillor Pettitt be removed from the Appeals Committee and Councillor Ashby replace Councillor Pettitt as Substitute.
- 6) Councillor Marion Chapman-Allen be appointed as the Council's

representative on the Woodland Trust.

- 7) Councillor Hollis replace Councillor Taylor on the Licensing Committee.

Action By

The meeting closed at 10.45 am

CHAIRMAN

Agenda Item 3

Engagement List – Chairman

7th July, 2015 to 2nd September, 2015

Date	Event	Host
10 th July, 2015	Summer Lunch Reception/Open House	Colonel R. G. Novotny, Commander 18 th Fighter Wing
14 th July, 2015	Official Opening of Brisley Play Area	Brisley Parish Council
17 th July, 2015	Unveiling of the Duleep Family Headstone	Ancient House, Museum of Thetford Life
17 th July, 2015	Environmental Services – Poster Competition – Recycle At Home	Environmental Services – Breckland Council
19 th July, 2015	Civic Service	Mayor and Mayoress of St. Edmundsbury, Councillor Patrick Chung and Mrs. Anna Chung
24 th July, 2015	Summer Reception	Chairman of Norfolk County Council, Councillor Rex Parkinson-Hare
25 th July, 2015	Vintage Car Rally	Adrian Stasiak
25 th July, 2015	Official opening of new Bawdeswell Village Hall	Bawdeswell Village Hall
31 st July, 2015	Any Questions broadcast	BBC Radio 4
1 st August, 2015	Tailgate Style BBQ in honour of new Mayors and Chairman of Councils	Colonel and Mrs. T. D. Torkelson, Commander 100 th Air Refuelling Wing
9 th August, 2015	Civic Service	Mayor of Watton, Councillor K. Birch

Date	Event	Host
15 th August, 2015	VJ Day Commemoration Service	Thetford Town Council
15 th August, 2015	Service of Remembrance and Reception commemorating the 70 th Anniversary of VJ Day	Chairman of Norfolk County Council, Councillor Parkinson-Hare
16 th August, 2015	Opening of Norfolk Accident Rescue Service Fun Sports Day	NARS (Norfolk Accident Rescue Service)
16 th August, 2015	Annual Civic Service	Her Worship the Mayor of Great Yarmouth, Councillor Shirley Weymouth
18 th August, 2015	Tour of Britain Media Bike Ride	Active Norfolk
20 th August, 2015	Preview Evening	Thetford's Great Festival
1 st September, 2015	Mayoral Heritage Walk in Wisbech	Octavia Hill Society Birthplace House

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

CABINET

**Held on Tuesday, 14 July 2015 at 9.30 am in
Norfolk Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Mr M. A. Wassell (Chairman)	Mrs E. M. Jolly
Mrs L.S. Turner (Vice-Chairman)	Mrs K. Pettitt
Mr C G Carter	Mr I. Sherwood
Mr T R Carter	

Also Present

Mr W.P. Borrett	Mr T. J. Jermy
Mr J.P. Cowen	Mrs S.M. Matthews
Mr D M Crawford	Mr J Newton
Mrs J Hollis	

In Attendance

Julie Kennealy	- Executive Director (Commercialisation)(S151 Officer)
Anna Graves	- Chief Executive
Riana Rudland	- Breckland Place Manager
Rob Walker	- Executive Director Place
Rory Ringer	- Democratic Services Team Leader
Julie Britton	- Senior Democratic Services Officer
Beth Roberts	- Pride Officer
Mr Robert King	- Chairman of Croxton Parish Council

Action By

61/15 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

62/15 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

None.

63/15 URGENT BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 3)

None.

64/15 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)

None.

Action By

65/15 NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Councillors J Hollis, S Matthews, B Borrett, P Cowen, D Crawford, T Jermy and J Newton.

66/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 6)

None.

67/15 BRECKLAND COMMUNITY FUNDING APPLICATIONS (STANDING ITEM) (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Executive Member for Place presented the two grant application reports, the first for the Swaffham ESCAPE project and the second for the Dereham Wellspring Family Centre; both of which were being recommended for approval.

The Executive Member for Income & Prosperity thought it was wonderful to see these types of applications coming forward as the people behind them were totally committed.

The Chairman agreed and reminded Members that this was what these Match-Funding grants were all about, supporting community projects.

(a) Swaffham ESCAPE Project

The application from Family Action, Swaffham ESCAPE project, if approved, would support individuals of all ages with mental health issues in their transition to a more independent life and participation within the local community.

The Executive Member for People & Information explained the great work that Swaffham Escape did for the community. He felt that it was a very well-run project and had an excellent team behind it and was keen to see this project supported.

Options

1. Fully fund the application as set out in the report.
2. Part fund the application as set out in the report.
3. Do nothing.

Reasons

The Grant Panel had assessed this application for a large Match-Funding grant and the majority supported this funding request with an overall average score of 18 which was the minimum required score.

RESOLVED that the Revenue Match-Funding application of £6,458.13 towards the cost of providing training sessions for Family Action: Swaffham ESCAPE Community Allotment Project be approved; subject to:

1. confirmation that all funding sources are in place;
2. a maximum of £6,458.13 or 20.86% of the total project costs,

Action By

- whichever is the lowest from the Revenue Match-Funding Reserve;
and
3. any other conditions arising from Member comments on Sharepoint.

(b) Dereham Wellspring Family Centre Extension

Dereham Wellspring family Centre was a group of churches involved in many activities. It was always very well attended and was supported by many organisations.

Options

1. Fully fund the application as set out in the report.
2. Part fund the application as set out in the report
3. Do nothing.

Reasons

The Grant Panel had assessed this application for a Match-Funding grant and the majority supported this funding request with an overall average score of 20.25 which was above the minimum required

RESOLVED that the Capital Match-Funding application of £20,000 towards Dereham Wellspring Family Centre for their building extension and improvements be approved; subject to:

1. confirmation that all other funding sources were in place;
2. a maximum sum of £20,000 from the Capital Match-Funding Reserve or 27.9% of the cost of the project whichever is the lowest;
and
3. any other conditions arising from Member comment on Sharepoint.

68/15 SUPPORTING SUCCESSFUL GROWTH IN THETFORD AND SURROUNDING VILLAGES (AGENDA ITEM 8)

Thetford had been given Growth Point status in 2006 and received notification of the award of Growth Point Funding in 2007. The informal partnership of the Moving Thetford Forward local delivery vehicle was accordingly set up under a Memorandum of Understanding in 2008. The aim of this delivery vehicle was to develop a programme of works and attract match funding to enhance the value of the programme. As at 31/5/2015, £1.3m of match funding had been brought to the programme and the total value of projects (capital and revenue) was £8.5m.

Prior to the presentation of the report, the Chairman advised that there was a requirement to nominate an Executive Member to the Greater Thetford Development Partnership (GTDP) under recommendation No.1 and it was proposed and seconded that Ellen Jolly, the Executive Member for Income & Prosperity be appointed.

The Executive Member for Income & Prosperity said that the main purpose of the paper was for Members to acknowledge the contribution that the Moving Thetford Forward Board had provided over the years.

Attention was drawn to the financial aspects in the report.

Action By

The Executive Director of Commercialisation & S151 Officer reported that agreement had already been reached to fund an independent chairman for the GTDP, the cost of which would be relatively small (circa £3k per annum). She explained that the public sector was often complex and the scale of growth that was planned for the Greater Thetford area was such, it was extremely important for a number of different parties to be involved such as Norfolk County Council, Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) and land owners alongside Breckland Council. Moving Thetford Forward had been established in a very different environment and although it had made a significant contribution, this was altogether a very different set-up for Members to consider. The bids that had been through the Moving Thetford Forward Board would still be funded and the GTDP would be consulted as to alternative funding options the partnership may wish to support.

The Executive Member for Income & Prosperity referred to the subject title and pointed out that most of the development would take place in Croxton, Brettenham & Kilverstone and both parishes had been extremely supportive of this partnership approach.

The Overview & Scrutiny Commission Chairman whole heartedly supported this partnership approach but he felt that the Council should be thinking outside the box. Someone had to lead this and we, as a Council, needed to drive this forward. Members needed the vision, understanding was also key as to how this whole 'place base' approach would transpire - this was Breckland's opportunity to make its mark in Norfolk.

Councillor Jermy knew that growth would continue whether people liked it or not and agreed that discussions should continue as this could not be moved forward in isolation and he welcomed the aforementioned nomination. Referring to the report where the successes made by MTF were mentioned he was well aware that two were missing. He also mentioned the lack of community engagement by the MTF which he felt had been due to lack of representation on the Board. Less than 1% of MTF funding had been put towards regeneration and he hoped that with the new framework this would be addressed.

The Chairman agreed with this statement and he was confident that the funding streams would allow for regeneration.

Referring to Growth Point status, the Chief Executive advised that the Greater Norwich Development Partnership had moved very quickly in relation to regeneration and there was no reason why the GTDP could not do the same. She welcomed all the comments that had been made.

The Chairman agreed as this was a great opportunity for all to work together and put the politics to one side.

Mr King, the Chairman of Croxton Parish Council who was also representing Mr Poulter the Chairman of Brettenham & Kilverstone Parish Council was in attendance and mentioned the GTDPs decision making powers. He also mentioned the doubts that he had in relation to the development being planned and how this would be brought into the partnership.

The Executive Director for Commercialisation & S151 officer advised that no

Action By

one organisation could manage such a range of different initiatives.

The Chief Executive stated that the days of having a single programme manager had gone and bidding with strong governance arrangements and partnerships were more than likely to be successful.

The Overview & Scrutiny Commission Chairman reminded Members that Breckland Council would, as the local planning authority, remain the decision maker and would be there to help guide everything through and help to influence planning decisions; the public would have influence through the GTDP. It was imperative that Members took this all very seriously as Thetford was a very important part of the Breckland District.

Councillor Borrett supported the creation of the GTDP and was pleased to hear that Cllr Jermy was in support too; however, he could not find any mention of how the performance of the GTDP Board was going to be monitored and he asked if there would be an annual report. Scrutiny was suggested but the Executive Director of Commercialisation & S151 Officer advised that the Board's performance needed to be reported to more than just Breckland Council. The measure of affective growth incorporated such matters as how many jobs had been created, retail space, number of houses and school places etc. A decision from a future Cabinet would be required as to how this collective basket of measures should be reported for the whole of the District. The Chief Executive felt that this should be one of the first matters on the GTDP Board's agenda and considered at the partnership's inception. The Executive Member for Income & Prosperity agreed; it was the responsibility of the partnership to determine its own requirements and aspirations and she assured Members that when fully established performance reporting would be one of the first tasks on the agenda. Councillor Borrett hoped that Breckland's representative would push for measureable outcomes.

Julie
Kennealy

Councillor Crawford, the Opposition Leader gave his own support to the establishment of the GTDP and asked that this be moved forward as soon as possible.

Councillor Jermy felt that decision making powers needed further clarity and he asked if the outstanding MTF bids would come back to Breckland for a decision. Members were informed that they would, Breckland Council was responsible for the residual monies in the Growth Point funding pot; however, the GTDP would be consulted on the proposals.

OPTIONS

Option 1 (recommended).

That the Cabinet supports the establishment of the Greater Thetford Development Partnership (GTDP) as a formally recognised outside body contributing to successful planned growth in and around Thetford and nominates its representative.

Then to formally dissolve the Moving Thetford Forward Board and recognise that MTF's role in attracting inward investment for economic development be an integral element of the new GTDP Board's remit. Consult the new GTDP Board on investment proposals for any residual growth point funding not yet

Action By

allocated by MTF.

This would provide a platform for a move to a contemporary model of place based governance that had proved successful in other areas, for example Norwich. The establishment of the sub groups would ensure strong community representation at Board level.

By consulting with the new GTDP about spending proposals for any residual funding the Council would ensure compliance with the decision making processes required of it as an accountable body for growth point funding and its own internal financial regulations.

There was a risk that some bids have been submitted to MTF for consideration and are awaiting the outcome of any request for funding. This risk could be mitigated by ensuring the new GTDP was consulted on any such outstanding proposals and considers the extent to which any such funding requests might be supported by the partnership through a wider range of funding opportunities open to it than had been available to MTF.

Option 2

Continue with the existing Moving Thetford Forward arrangements in addition to the new GTDP arrangements. The current arrangements were out of scale with the remaining programme and the remit of the Moving Thetford Forward Board did not encompass the wider infrastructure and growth. The MTF funding arrangement was always time limited and the formal agreement was now out of time.

The wider growth agenda critical to the sustainable future of the town and surrounding villages were outside the existing Moving Thetford Forward programme.

Option 3

Do Nothing. This would not overcome the current difficulties associated with multi-agency engagement in the wider growth agenda for the town.

REASONS

The funding landscape had changed and without a collaborative multi agency approach, Breckland Council might not secure the inward investment required to deliver the infrastructure pre-requisite to sustainable economic growth.

RESOLVED that:

1. The establishment of the Greater Thetford Development Partnership (GTDP) be approved as a formally recognised outside body contributing to successful planned growth in and around Thetford;
2. Ellen Jolly, Executive Member for Income & Prosperity be formally nominated as the Breckland representative to the GTDP (to be ratified at the next Full Council meeting);
3. Any residual funding from the Moving Thetford Forward Programme (MTF) be earmarked directly towards significant projects that increase

economic activity and opportunity in the GTDP area; and

4. The MTF Board be dissolved and its role in attracting inward investment for economic development be an integral element of the new GTDP's Board remit. The GTDP to be consulted by Breckland Council as the accountable body on proposals relating to allocation of any residual Growth Point funds.

69/15 ANGLIA REVENUES AND BENEFITS PARTNERSHIP (ARP) (AGENDA ITEM 9)

a) ARP Trading Company Restructure (Minute No. 26/15)

The Executive Member for Income & Prosperity explained the background to the Trading Company which had been set up by the two founding partners, Breckland and Forest Heath District Councils who were also the only current shareholders. It had been proposed that the ARP Trading Company should be owned by the six partner Councils with the exception of East Cambridgeshire DC who had not had time to make the decision to join but would hopefully very soon. The Executive Member urged the Cabinet to support the recommendations as she would like Breckland to be in a position to trade with other Councils in future.

The Executive Director of Commercialisation & S151 Officer endorsed the above comments. This was ultimately about being business ready and about getting the partnership to a steady place particularly as the funding streams for benefits were going to be reduced due to the introduction of universal credit.

The Chairman advised that a decision had been made not to admit any further partners to the current partnership but only through the ARPT.

RESOLVED that:

1. Amendments be made to the Company Constitution and Shareholder Agreement to allow the expansion of the ARP Trading Company Ltd to include all full partner councils of the ARP Joint Committee with the exception of East Cambridgeshire.
2. East Cambridgeshire be admitted as a partner of the Company under the same conditions as the six Councils if a request to do so is received before the next Joint Committee.
3. The investment in the ARP Trading Company Ltd in accordance with paragraph 1.5 of the report be approved.
4. Loans of £10,000 each to the Trading Company to cover initial working capital requirements be approved and the Councils Treasury Management policies be amended accordingly; and
5. A person or persons be nominated to represent the authority's interests at Shareholder meetings.

Action By

b) Minutes

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the ARP Joint Committee meeting held on 10 June 2015 be noted.

70/15 NEXT MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 10)

The arrangements for the next Cabinet meeting on Tuesday, 22 September 2015 at 9.30am in the Anglia Room were noted.

The meeting closed at 10.15 am

CHAIRMAN

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION

**Held on Thursday, 30 July 2015 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 S H Chapman-Allen	Mr R. R. Richmond
Mr P.D. Claussen (Vice-Chairman)	Mr D R R Oliver
Mr T. J. Jermy	Mr D M Crawford
Mr A.P. Joel	Mrs A M Webb
Mr T F C Monument	Mr A.C. Stasiak (Substitute Member)

Also Present

Mr S.G. Bambridge	Mr J Newton
Mrs E J Bishop	Mr F.J. Sharpe
Mr W.P. Borrett	Mr I. Sherwood
Mr C G Carter	Mrs L.S. Turner
Councillor M. Chapman-Allen	

In Attendance

Helen McAleer	- Senior Democratic Services Officer
Tracy Miller	- Business Transformation Officer
Greg Pearson	- Corporate Improvement and Performance Manager

44/15 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 26 March 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

45/15 APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillor Dimoglou. Councillor Stasiak was present as his Substitute.

46/15 URGENT BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 3)

The Chairman suggested that Members might need to hold a Special meeting in September to discuss the Constitution Review before it was presented to Council on 3 October. The matter would be discussed under Agenda Item 11.

47/15 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)

No declarations were made.

48/15 NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 5)

Councillors Bambridge, Bishop, Borrett, C Carter, M Chapman-Allen, Newton, Sharpe, Sherwood and Turner were in attendance and were welcomed by the Chairman.

Action By

Action By

49/15 TRANSFORMATION PROGRAMME (AGENDA ITEM 6)

The Corporate Improvement and Performance Manager introduced himself to Members. He was working on developing the Transformation Programme which had four key strategic themes which underpinned the Corporate Plan objectives.

An externally facilitated Workshop had been held on 15 July which had been attended by 20 Members. Posters had set out the four themes and the types of projects they included. Members had been given the chance to feed back on the proposals. The information from that meeting would be distributed to all Members.

There was a further opportunity for Members to comment today and then a draft programme for the next four years would be prepared and presented to Council. Work was still on-going to understand what benefits the projects would bring and how to measure and track those benefits; it was not just about savings. Scrutiny would be involved in tracking the benefits once the programme was agreed.

The Chairman gave a brief overview for the Members that had not been able to attend the Workshop. The key themes that had emerged were:

- how to make the Council more efficient
- whether to sweat assets to generate more revenue
- encouraging people to use different ways to contact the Council (as face-to-face contacts were more expensive)
- a reward/recognition scheme for staff

The real issue was that 50% of residents did not have decent Broadband. There would need to be systems in place for those without good Broadband to be able to contact the Council.

Councillor Bambridge had attended the Workshop and asked that the large amount of suggestions made by Members should be circulated with the other information.

Councillor Joel asked what had happened to the £950,000 the Council had approved for Broadband.

Councillor Richmond had asked the Leader that question and was able to advise that the money would not be released until the British Telecom maps were ready. He noted that the Commercial Property Portfolio generated a lot of money but asked if the true figure of return, with repair and maintenance costs removed, could be provided on an annual basis.

The Chairman explained that the Corporate Improvement and Performance Manager was driving the Transformation Programme and did not have details of costs. One of the Task & Finish Groups should look at how the property portfolio was managed.

Councillor Bambridge referred back to the Broadband money and advised that it was being held in reserve until Broadband had been completely rolled out and would be spent entirely in Breckland.

Action By

Councillor S Chapman-Allen had asked for another, evening meeting for those that could not attend the Workshop. The Corporate Improvement and Performance Manager said that another session could be arranged but timeframes were tight and the draft programme was due to be presented to the September Council meeting.

Councillor Borrett was confused at the lack of a report even if it just provided a framework. He had expected Members to get the feedback from the Workshop to consider and was disappointed that another session had not been arranged. A number of issues had been raised at the Workshop which should be discussed to give Officers a steer. He asked what Members were expected to achieve today.

The Chairman explained that Members had the opportunity to listen to the verbal update and add their thoughts, but the substance of the meeting was really in the next Agenda item. Task and Finish Groups (T&FG) would be set up to look into the four themes in detail. The Transformation Programme would create a new way of working and he wanted all Members to be involved.

The Executive Member for Growth said that the former meeting had provided the structure and today was an opportunity to add substance to that and to set the Terms of Reference for the T&FGs.

Councillor Jermy was a member of the County's Economic Development & Transport Committee (EDT) which covered Broadband issues. He was able to confirm that the second contract had been signed and the first set of detailed surveys had commenced. By the end of 2015 it was expected that 80% of Norfolk would have access to Superfast Broadband. As there were no other Breckland Members on the EDT he would be happy to provide updates, but he suggested that the Council might want a Conservative Member on that Group to help put forward Breckland points.

He too was surprised at the lack of a report and thought that any Members that had not attended the Workshop would struggle to participate in the debate today. However, he thought that there had been good engagement at the Workshop with almost half the Members attending at short notice. With regard to Digitalisation he said it would be silly not to go down that route as the public wanted the Council's services to be more accessible and electronic contact also saved money. However, some people would not want to use that route.

The Corporate Improvement and Performance Manager agreed and said they were looking at ensuring there would be other ways to access services. Digital Access Points would be provided to enable people to use electronic access if they wanted and to provide help to do that, if it was needed. By moving to electronic means of contact it would free up capacity to focus on more vulnerable residents.

Councillor Sharpe asked when the draft report for Council would be available and why it was necessary to submit it to the September meeting.

The Executive Member for People & Information could see that

Action By

Members wanted more time to consider the issues and said the report could be moved back if required. He wanted everyone to have the opportunity to provide input.

Councillor Oliver had not been able to attend the Workshop and asked if it was still possible to put forward ideas. Under the Commercialisation theme and with regard to the problems caused by the Council's lack of a five year housing land supply he suggested that the Council should look at buying land and building itself or lending to Housing Associations, or providing bridging loans for tenants to buy. He was aware that Public Works Loans allowed Councils to borrow large amounts of money at low interest rates and that money could be used to lend on or to build out. He asked if the Council was a Registered Provider. He also asked if the Council was allowed to buy land outside its boundaries and was advised that it could.

The Executive Member for Growth suggested that they speak after the meeting and the Chairman thought it was the sort of topics that the T&FG could look into.

Councillor S Chapman-Allen asked if the intention was to offer services alone or with South Holland and it was confirmed that although the Corporate Improvement and Performance Manager was a joint post and South Holland were at the same stage of developing a Transformation Programme it was different to Breckland's. If it was advantageous to do so, some projects could be run jointly with South Holland or with other partners but the Breckland programme would focus on Breckland residents.

The Executive Member for Growth was very pleased that the programme was looking dynamically at digitalisation. He impressed the importance of the wider effect of that on the rest of the programme. It was the process by which the Council interacted with everything else and it provided the public face of the Council on the website.

Councillor Joel noted that Economic Development was also important and most Councils were putting more money into that whereas Breckland was making it smaller. He hoped it could be supported.

Councillor Borrett was concerned that the Council was spending tax payers' money and there was always a need to look for savings and money should be spent as efficiently as possible. He thought that the Commercialisation of Council services should be looking to create income. For example, King's Lynn & West Norfolk Council had a profitable crematorium. It was not part of their duties as a public body but it raised a lot of money. The Council should be considering how its capital, expertise and land could give other commercial opportunities. It was not just about services, it should be a much broader strand.

The Chairman agreed and said that it was time to take advantage of changes. Central Government would be decreasing the amount of money they gave to Local Authorities and so the Council had to look for ways to raise revenue.

Councillor Webb suggested that the public should be asked what they wanted to see on the website and a wide survey would give more

Action By

weight to any future design.

The Corporate Improvement and Performance Manager advised that the Council already had a lot of technical information from outside agencies which was informing the decision making process.

Councillor Claussen had not been at the workshop. He was concerned that the Council had lost a lot of highly qualified people and would not have the skill set to deliver the future programme.

The Deputy Leader said that she had taken note of the comments made and there would be a response in the future.

The Chairman thanked Members for the points they had made.

50/15 TASK AND FINISH GROUPS (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Chairman set out the four distinct strands of work for the Task & Finish Groups and some of the topics that they should cover.

1. Commercialisation
 - Procurement and Contracts
 - Developing a community waste scheme
 - Maximising the return on assets
 - Trading the Council's services
2. Alignment of Public Services
 - Co-location of public sector services, bringing them into the Council building to provide a seamless service
3. Organisational Development
 - Service design
 - Reward and recognition scheme
 - Organisational development skills, including mobile working
4. Digitalisation
 - Channel Shift
 - Assisted digital

Membership of the four T&FG should be drawn from the whole Council and comprise of seven Members each and a substitute if possible. The Chairmen of the T&FG would be Members of the O&SC as required by the Constitution. Executive Members were not eligible to sit as members of the T&FG but would be very welcome to attend the meetings and provide input.

The Groups would need to talk to as many people as possible to represent the interests of residents.

The Corporate Improvement and Performance Manager agreed to circulate the draft programme after the meeting. He went on to outline the key projects.

Digitalisation

- To provide a new web portal to engage people and to enable 'Book & Pay'

Action By

- To digitalise all Back Office functions (that would be linked to Organisational Design)
- Assisted Digital – to install points to provide a facility for people that needed help or did not have access.

Commercialisation

- How to procure and contract manage
- Meet the Buyer events to grow business
- Consider opportunities to generate income for the Council
- Look at the Asset portfolio

Aligning Public Services

- To have the DWP in the Council building to enable co-working (delivering services in parallel and enabling a single point of contact to address all needs)
- Explore other options for Partnership working with the Health Service, NCC, etc. (The Council owned a number of assets where they could be accommodated).
- Consider other Partnerships.

Organisational Development

- This would closely link with Digitalisation – ensuring services were fit for purpose
- Look at each service and develop it for the future
- Ensure staff were rewarded and recognised and that new skill sets were developed
- Identify learning and development skills and opportunities.

The Executive Member for People & Information suggested that the timescales would be amended to fit with the T&FGs.

Councillor Sharpe thought it was a considerable topic. He asked if the draft report could be brought to Scrutiny before it was presented to Council.

The Chairman explained that the timeframes for the T&FG would be set and their workloads organised. The Groups would report back to Scrutiny. A formal report would then be written with the O&SC's proposals for Council.

Councillor S Chapman-Allen thought that it would be wrong for the four T&FGs to work independently as many of the topics overlapped. However, the Chairman disagreed and said that there was a lot of work and as many Members as possible needed to be involved to represent the residents. There was often a criticism that back-benchers did not know what was happening and this was an opportunity for them to take ownership and have their say.

Councillors S Chapman-Allen and Bambridge both thought that most of the proposals were not new and had been approved before but not progressed. They agreed that it was a fantastic opportunity and hoped that it would get done this time.

The Chairman acknowledged that but said it was a new Council term and a good opportunity for the Members to drive it forward.

Action By

Councillor Claussen needed to be convinced and did not understand how it would work fundamentally. He only cared about Breckland and felt there was pressure to fit with South Holland.

Councillor M Chapman-Allen asked about the timeframe as many Councillors were away on holiday in August which was traditionally a recess with very few meetings scheduled.

The Chairman agreed that the timeframe was critical. As the Executive Member had kindly agreed, the report to Council could be put back to the October or even the November meeting if necessary.

Four Chairmen were identified:

Digitalisation	Terry Jermy
Commercialisation	Adrian Stasiak
Aligning Public Services	Shirley Matthews
Organisational Development	Sam Chapman-Allen

The Chairman asked for an e-mail to be sent to all Members asking for volunteers. He recommended that Members should sit on one Group only as there would be a lot of work in a short period of time. It would be good to get a balance of town and country Members on each Group.

It was suggested that the Group Chairmen should meet with the Officers to agree the framework and what was expected to be achieved and then a timeframe could be agreed. It was hoped that the first T&FG meetings would take place late August/early September.

51/15 HEALTH SCRUTINY (AGENDA ITEM 8)

Nothing to report.

52/15 SCRUTINY CALL-INS (AGENDA ITEM 9)

None.

53/15 COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION (AGENDA ITEM 10)

None.

54/15 WORK PROGRAMME (AGENDA ITEM 11)

The Chairman pointed out that the Task & Finish Groups were not the only items for Scrutiny. There would continue to be Executive Member Portfolio updates at each meeting and the Corporate Plan and Performance would be looked at in future meetings.

The Corporate Improvement and Performance Manager was also responsible for Performance and the new Performance Framework would ensure that the organisation was on track to deliver the objectives of the Corporate Plan. Extensive work had been carried out on a new Performance system which would put all the information in one place with easy to read graphics. Officer training was currently underway.

Reports for Quarters 1 and 2 would be produced from the system in

Action By

time for the October meeting. The Chairman stressed the need for Members to receive the papers in advance of the meeting.

There would need to be an additional meeting scheduled in for September to discuss the Constitution Review. It was a big topic and would be another one-item agenda.

It was agreed that a Special Overview & Scrutiny Commission meeting would take place on 24 September 2015 at 2pm. Venue to be confirmed.

Future items would also include a look at the Council's Governance arrangements.

Members were asked to put forward suggestions.

Councillor Jermy suggested that as the Broadband upgrade list should be available in the Autumn that could be added to the work programme for the November meeting and Karen O'Kane should be invited to attend.

Councillor Stasiak suggested that the Snetterton process should also be scrutinised.

Councillor Claussen thought that Members needed to be updated on the progress of the Local Plan and the Chairman said that communities had been very successfully engaged in the Local Plan process before. He had discussed the matter with the Leader and when the technical details had been sorted and the call for sites consultation was ready it would come to Scrutiny.

The Executive Member for Growth agreed and said that the timetable was key; once that was confirmed he would propose a date for the matter to come to Scrutiny.

The Deputy Leader of the Council reminded Members that they were all welcome to attend and provide input to the Local Plan Working Group meetings.

55/15 NEXT MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 12)

The next meeting would be the Special meeting on 24 September 2015 at 2pm. The venue for that would be confirmed.

The Chairman thanked everyone for an interesting meeting.

The meeting closed at 4.20 pm

CHAIRMAN

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Held on Monday, 20 July 2015 at 9.30 am in
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Councillor C Bowes	Mr K. Martin
Mr R F W Brame	Mr J Newton
Councillor M. Chapman-Allen	Mr F.J. Sharpe (Vice-Chairman)
Mr H E J Clarke	Mr W.H.C. Smith
Mr P.D. Claussen	Mr N.C. Wilkin (Chairman)
Mr P.J. Duigan	Mr P S Wilkinson

Also Present

Mr T. Carter	Mr J.D. Rogers
Mr J.P. Cowen	Mr A.C. Stasiak
Mr K.S. Gilbert	Mr M. A. Wassell
Mr C Jordan (NCC)	

In Attendance

Mike Brennan	Planning Contract Manager (Capita)
Heather Burlingham	Assistant Development Control Officer*
Gary Hancox	Principal Planning Officer*
Hamish Lamm	Principal Planning Officer *
Helen McAleer	Senior Democratic Services Officer
Nick Moys	Principal Planning Officer *
Angela Simmonds	Solicitor
Iain Withington	Planning Policy Team Leader *
Graham Worsfold	NCC Highways Consultant

* Capita for Breckland Council

Action By

74/15 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

75/15 APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

None.

**76/15 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS
RECEIVED (AGENDA ITEM 3)**

All Members had received direct correspondence concerning Agenda Item 8a Carbrooke and Agenda Item 9 (Schedule Item 2) Watton.

77/15 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)

The Chairman noted that Councillors were elected to help their community

and at the weekend he had assumed the role of Town Crier to help Swaffham celebrate its Market's 800th anniversary.

78/15 REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA (AGENDA ITEM 5)

None.

79/15 URGENT BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 6)

None.

80/15 LOCAL PLAN UPDATE (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Planning Policy Team Leader gave a brief update of the information in the agenda. The Council were actively consulting on the Dereham Town Council application for Neighbourhood Planning Area designation. The documents were available on the planning policy page of the Council's web site. Anyone wishing to comment should review the notices and application.

The next meeting of the Local Plan Working Group (LPWG) would take place on Tuesday 28 July 2015 at 10.00am in the Norfolk Room and the agenda for that meeting would be published shortly.

Councillor Claussen felt that the Planning Committee needed a briefing to give advice on what they could and could not do to protect communities from unwanted development. Members understood that they had a duty to the Council and could not overturn recommendations which would lead to expensive costs at appeal. At the moment national policies seemed to be directed at development within the M25 and were not relevant to rural communities.

The Chairman understood his concerns. As an authority the Council was doing what it could. He invited the Leader of the Council to comment.

Councillor Wassell did not disagree with Councillor Claussen's comments and said that he heard similar from every Council. He had raised the issue with the Secretary of State and made him aware of their frustrations.

Councillor Duigan again asked about progress on the Thetford Sustainable Urban Development site. When houses started to be built there it would help the Council's housing land supply situation.

The Planning Contract Manager advised that numerous meetings had taken place to address the various legal issues. The agreement was reaching fruition and the planning permission should be issued at the end of the month.

Councillor Duigan also sought clarification about 'Green Space Designation'. He was advised that it was a term from the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and referred to space that had

importance for local people. Town and Parish Councils had been invited to submit such areas of land and hopefully those sites would get designated in the new Local Plan.

Councillor Clarke echoed Councillor Claussen's comments and said that the national policies made a mockery of Localism. District Councillors were elected to voice local concerns.

Councillor Newton asked for information on the number of brownfield sites which had been approved and refused, year to date and the same information for the number of greenfield sites, compared to 2014.

The information would be provided at the next meeting.

Councillor Smith wholly endorsed Councillor Claussen's comments. The NPPF presumption in favour of development in the absence of the required housing land supply had unbalanced the planning system. In the short term he suggested that Developers should be required to prove that the sustainable criteria applied to their proposals and the three criteria should be considered as a coherent whole. As the Local Plan developed he hoped that a rebalancing would take place.

The Chairman was glad that the Leader had been present to hear Members' concerns.

81/15 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 8)

81/15a CARBROOKE: Bridge Street: New house and garage (resubmission): Applicant: Mr Alexander Bone Reference: 3PL/2014/0687/F

All Members had received direct correspondence.

The application had been deferred from the September 2014 meeting for further information.

The key issues were outlined for the benefit of new Members to the Committee. Although additional details of tree survey and ecological work had been submitted the concluding view was that concerns had not been satisfactorily addressed. Refusal was recommended with an additional reason that insufficient information had been provided to overcome concerns about the effect of the development on bats, reptiles, etc.

Mr Clegg (Objector) said the site was unsuitable for development as it was in an area prone to flooding. There had been sewer failures on occasion. The road access was dangerous being opposite a T-junction with seriously limited visibility which did not meet Highways requirements.

Mrs Bone (for Applicant) said the proposal would provide a modest dwelling in the heart of Carbrooke. There had previously been buildings on the site, which had never been known to flood. The ground floor levels had been adjusted to overcome concerns. Drainage techniques would mitigate surface water run-off. The access had been in existence for

many years and had been used by a horsebox for ten years. The tree report responded in detail to concerns.

Councillor Rogers (Ward Representative) fully supported the proposal. The raised floor level overcame flooding concerns. Visibility requirements could be met and a tree survey had been submitted.

Mr Evans (Agent) confirmed that a tree survey had been submitted with the application and additional details had been provided.

Councillor Claussen asked if the flood risk had been mitigated and was advised that the Environment Agency requested refusal and if Members were minded to go against that advice the application would have to be referred to the Secretary of State.

RESOLVED to refuse the application on the grounds set out in the original report to Committee dated 1 September 2014 and an additional reason of insufficient ecological information.

82/15 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 9)

RESOLVED that the applications be determined as follows:

- a) Item 1: GREAT ELLINGHAM: Land at Attleborough Road: Residential development for 39 dwellings (Revised scheme): Applicant: Orbit Homes (2020) Limited: Reference: 3PL/2014/0683/F

The Chairman clarified comments made by a Parish Councillor about Councillor Smith and Councillor Jordan (NCC) which implied a possibility of pre-determination on the application. There had been a mix up of wording which had since been corrected and there was no such issue.

This application had received a good deal of local opposition. It had been amended several times to try to address the issues but the local objections had not been overcome.

Great Ellingham was a small Service Centre Village with a number of local facilities which would all derive an element of support from new development. The site was not isolated and was close to the centre of the village but it had an open aspect which contributed to the rural character and would be radically changed by the development. However, the design and layout were acceptable and would be a good fit for the surroundings.

Highway safety was a particular concern to local residents and the Parish Council due to the volume of traffic, speeds and impact on the access to the school. Significant amendments had been made including improvements to footways, pedestrian crossing points and a part time 20mph speed limit, and NCC Highways had no objections. There was therefore no basis to refuse the application

on highway grounds.

In conclusion, the development met the requirements of the NPPF and would provide affordable housing. In the Officers' view, on balance the application was acceptable subject to conditions and obligations.

Councillor Jordan (NCC) had been inundated by concerns about the danger of the junction and the safety of residents. The improvements were not good enough. A roundabout was required, or the junction needed to be moved to reduce the danger. It was the wrong place for development and would put lives at risk.

Mr Betts (Parish Council Chairman) explained that the Parish had adopted a policy for small sustainable development of up to 12 dwellings, but they had excluded the Hingham Road area due to safety concerns. Under that policy 40 new homes had been supported in recent months and ten more were coming. The Parish Council's reasons for not supporting the current application were itemised in the report. In short, 39 homes were unsustainable and would unbalance the village. The doctors had no spare capacity, the bus service was not sufficient and the road was not safe. Video evidence of the danger of the junction had been given to the Highways authority.

Mrs Whettingsteel (Agent) noted that planning circumstances had changed and Councils were under pressure to deliver more houses in sustainable locations such as this. The development was of sufficient scale to fully contribute to the village. The scheme would improve the village hall, provide highway improvements, affordable housing and bring funding through the New Homes Bonus scheme. The layout had been carefully designed to be attractive, low density and well linked to the rest of the village. It was a full application and was ready to move forward quickly. The legal agreement had already been drafted.

Councillor Cowen (Ward Representative) was very familiar with the area and aware of the highway issues. He was astounded that the Highway authority said the junction was safe. Growth was already taking place in the village. The issue in this case was scale and a lack of appreciation of the way the village had grown organically over time. This application was just phase one. Potentially nearly 80 dwellings could come forward. The long views and open skies of the site provided a wonderful vista which was precious and would be lost.

The Chairman referred to the video which had been mentioned. Due to technical issues it was not possible to show it to the Committee but he had watched it and it showed the intense amount of traffic in the early morning, outside the school and also a number of articulated lorries which used the junction as a cut through.

Action By

Councillor Sharpe asked if Highways had seen the video and whether it had changed their mind. He also asked if they had only carried out a desk-top study.

Mr Worsfold (NCC Highways) confirmed that the video had been watched. It had not changed their decision and they had carried out a site visit.

Councillor Sharpe asked the Agent about the site area and possible future development. She advised that the red line cut the field in half. The second half had been put forward for inclusion in the Council's site allocation process for the new Local Plan.

Councillor Wilkinson sympathised with the highway problems which happened in many villages in Norfolk. He commended Highways for trying to put safety measures in and asked if there could be a roundabout or change to the junction layout.

Mr Worsfold advised that Highways considered the current access arrangements acceptable but that position could be revised if the applicant put the suggestion forward. Every application was considered on its own merits. There had been one personal injury accident at the site in the last four years.

Councillor Martin travelled the road regularly. The two minor accesses on Hingham Road would have very poor visibility due to the existing bungalow. If the second phase came forward there would be another main access off the busy Attleborough Road.

Councillor Claussen agreed it was a balancing act but noted that Great Ellingham had increased the size of their village by 10% and they were saying it was enough. The proposal would add another community to an existing community.

Councillor Smith asked for the plan of the whole site to be shown, although the Chairman pointed out that it was not relevant to the current application. Councillor Smith thought it should be clarified for Members as it was a substantial area. There had been opposition from the County Councillor, the District Councillor the MP, the Chairman of the Parish Council. Little Ellingham Parish Council had also objected. The village had significant archaeological heritage and big open skies and views. It was the home of the Breckland astronomical observatory and Great Ellingham had been designated as a Dark Sky area. Highway safety was the main concern. The NCC School Safety Officer had commented that it was the worst junction for school children to cross in Norfolk. If the application succeeded it would distort the physical appearance of the village. It was an unsustainable increase. There were no school places, children would have to be transported elsewhere. The letter from the MP advised that the sustainable criteria requirement had been used to refuse applications and Councillor Smith believed that this application

failed the test.

The Chairman asked Mr Worsfold for clarification of the pedestrian refuge to be provided and the details were explained. The crossing in Hingham Road would comprise a dropped kerb. The proximity of that crossing to the junction was questioned, especially in relation to the length of turning lorries. Mr Worsfold advised that it was normal to place crossings close to the junction as it was the preferred crossing place for pedestrians. The position could be reconsidered if permission was granted.

The recommendation of approval was not supported. Councillor Chapman-Allen proposed refusal on grounds of the impact on the rural area and the loss of openness. Councillor Smith seconded that and added that the social and environmental sustainability criteria had not been met.

Members also suggested that highway safety was an issue but were advised that the Highways authority were the experts and they did not object. The Solicitor confirmed that the Inspectorate relied heavily on Highways advice.

The Chairman said that it would be clear in the Minutes that Councillors had concerns and if the second phase progressed it would need to be reviewed.

Councillor Clarke suggested that as residents would have to rely on higher order settlements for facilities the sustainability argument had weight. The Planning Contract Manager agreed that the lack of a full time bus service was less than desirable.

Refused, contrary to the recommendation, on grounds of impact on the rural character of the landscape and sustainability concerns.

- b) Item 2: WATTON: Land at Thetford Road, Thetford Road: Residential development of up to 180 dwellings, provision of recreational facilities, site access and associated works: Applicant: Gladman Developments Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2014/1253/O

All Members had received direct correspondence.

Members were shown an aerial photo of the application site and the position of Wayland Wood was pointed out. An indicative site layout plan and photo montages of existing and proposed views had been submitted and were shown. Planting would help to screen the development. A technical drawing of the proposed roundabout at the junction adjacent Barn Ruche was also shown. The development would consist of mainly two storey and some two and a half storey dwellings.

The issues had been carefully considered. The site related well to

Action By

Watton and the new roundabout and highway improvements were acceptable. However, the level of development was likely to create a hard settlement edge and there was concern about the effect of the development on Wayland Wood. Norfolk Wildlife Trust (NWT) felt that mitigation measures were unsatisfactory. The indicative layout was not considered to be a true reflection of 180 houses and was likely to be much denser. Infrastructure issues had been considered by Statutory Consultees and were considered to be acceptable. The problems at the Doctor's surgery were due to a lack of GPs which was not a planning issue.

On balance Officers felt that the development would have significant harmful impacts and were recommending refusal.

Councillor Gilbert (Ward Representative) said it was nice to be able to support the Officers' recommendation. The harm to Wayland Wood, which was an ancient woodland with delicate ecology, would be irreparable. Watton already had three large developments approved and needed time to absorb those before any more was accepted. The schools and doctors were under pressure and it was totally unsustainable.

Mr Bishop (Town Councillor) said the Town Council were not averse to housing planned in smaller batches. All the recent proposals coming forward would add over 700 houses to the town in just three years. Wayland Wood was the third oldest in England and was in a fragile state. It was habitat to rare plants and birds. With regard to the surgery he noted that Brandon Lewis MP had said that health services should be taken into account. Recruitment was a long-term problem and could not keep pace with development. Finally he noted traffic concerns. 55% of the houses would access the A1075 from the roundabout, but that meant that 45% would have direct access to the A1075 virtually opposite to the Hopkins Home site.

Mrs Stallard (Objector) said that a healthy, thriving community was dependant on a sustainable balance and Watton was a small market town that had seen a significant increase in its population in the last ten years which had created a strain on services and infrastructure. There was a lack of employment opportunities and poor transport and recreational facilities.

Mrs Webber (Objector) was concerned about two developments opposite each other creating a large increase in traffic which would cause danger to children accessing the three schools nearby. The roads were not wide and parked cars added to the problem. The safety of children should be considered.

Mr Shaw (Agent) pointed out that in the context of local and national planning policies the application represented sustainable development. The new roundabout would significantly improve road safety. Addressing the concerns raised he advised that the

Action By

size of the site was not out of scale and would have a lower density than the site opposite. Recreational pressures on Wayland Wood would be limited by the provision of open space on site and there would be a financial contribution to enhance existing rights of way and to provide new ones. The development would also provide a financial contribution to education and affordable housing.

Councillor Wassell (Ward Representative) raised concerns about the myriad of unsuitable applications that the smallest market town in Breckland was having to deal with. The proposal was an example of a Developer trying to take advantage of the inadequacies of national planning policy. The site was directly adjacent Wayland Wood, a Site of Special Scientific Interest which covered 34 hectares and featured many species of trees, birds and moths. It was also the only known location of the Yellow Star of Bethlehem in Norfolk. It must be protected for future generations. The density of the development was too great. He referred to the 200+ letters of objection and emphasised that the residents of Watton were not opposed to all development, but it had to be the right place and the right types of houses. This was the wrong location and the wrong type of houses and the applicant had no local connection whatever.

Councillor Bowes was also a Ward Representative and she agreed with the points raised. She stressed the importance of Wayland Wood which had a history back to the ice age and should be preserved at all costs as a jewel in Watton's crown. To bring suburbia to its edge would be contrary to policy and would significantly change the nature of the area.

Councillor Chapman-Allen was concerned about the loss of good agricultural land. She also supported the objection from the NWT.

Councillor Smith reiterated what he had said under Agenda Item 7. There were certain criteria to be met for sustainability and he felt the application failed to meet the economic and social requirements.

Councillor Claussen congratulated the Officers for recommending refusal. Wayland Wood had to be protected and preserved. If development was allowed to stretch to within 200metres all species would be at risk from predation by cats and dogs. NCC Highways did not take the cumulative effect of developments into consideration and there should be stronger Highway grounds for refusal. He did not believe 40% affordable housing would be provided and asked the Solicitor if the legal agreement would provide any weight in future if viability issues were raised.

The Solicitor explained that legal agreements could be varied and a viability assessment was often a reason for such variation. There was nothing that could legally prevent that.

Councillor Claussen thought that was something else that the Leader should take up with the Minister.

Refused, as recommended.

- c) Item 3: CASTON: Co-Dunkall Ltd, The Barn, Dukes Lane: Erection of storage building with offices (Retrospective): Applicant: Mr Rob Lond-Caulk: Reference: 3PL/2015/0180/F

This was a retrospective application for a storage building with offices which was being used to support building works in the vicinity. The applicant had submitted a planning application for three dwellings on the site which would require the removal of the building. The Parish Council had suggested a temporary permission but that was not felt to be appropriate as the development was considered acceptable.

Mr Blincow (Parish Council Chairman) said the building had been erected in early 2014. During public discussion the applicant had said he wanted to relocate it within nine months. The residents wanted it removed as it caused noise and disturbance. They had agreed that an 18 month permission would be acceptable.

Mrs Gill (Objector) was a resident of Duke's Lane. She supported the agreement for a temporary permission subject to conditions.

Councillor Cowen (Ward Representative) said the applicant and Parish Council had reached agreement and were happy for a temporary permission. If full permission was given he had concerns that the building could be sold and its future use might cause even more amenity issues. The lane was unadopted and the residents had to maintain it.

The Planning Contract Manager thought it laudable that the applicant had agreed to a temporary permission but pointed out that that would create a very weak case for future enforcement action if required as it was a permanent building. He was concerned that whatever the case, removal of the building would be reliant on the applicant's good will. An alternative option would be to refuse the application and give 18 months for the removal of the building before enforcement action was taken.

The recommendation of approval was not supported.

Refused, contrary to the recommendation, on grounds that the building was unsuitable in a rural setting and the nature of its uses were unsuitable for the location. Delegated authority was granted to issue an Enforcement Notice giving 18 months for the removal of the building.

- d) Item 4: THETFORD: Charles Burrell Museum, Minstergate: Replacement of windows, doors, timber cladding, brickwork and re-

pointing to various elevations: Applicant: Breckland Council:
Reference: 3PL/2015/0204/LB

This application had the approval of the Historic Buildings Officer subject to a suitable mortar mix being agreed. The works would preserve and enhance the appearance of the listed building.

Mr Lamb (Chairman of the Trustees of the Museum) said it was getting very shabby and the works should be done as soon as possible. The Trustees hoped that the original ironwork (including the hinges of the doors) could be incorporated wherever possible as they had been manufactured by Burrells.

Approved, as recommended.

- e) Item 5: WHISSONSETT: Land adjacent Mill Lane: Erection of 2 storey dwelling house with detached garage and workshop: Applicant: Mr J Daniels: Reference: 3PL/2015/0401/F

This proposal was on a site well related to the village. There would be limited views of the new dwelling which would be set back on the site and was similar in scale to the adjacent dwelling. It would cause no material harm to the setting. With regard to amenity concerns there was sufficient separation to existing rear gardens and screening in place.

Mr Burton (Parish Council Chairman) had informed parishioners of the application and many had attended the meeting at which it was discussed. All were in favour. The applicant was from a long-standing family in the village.

The Applicant and Agent were present to answer questions.

Councillor T Carter (Ward Representative) said this was housing for a local family which had lived in the village for generations. Their present dwelling was unsuitable for the extended family and no other suitable and affordable housing was available. The land was family owned and friends would help with construction keeping costs low. It was a wonderful opportunity for a young family.

Approved, as recommended.

- f) Item 6: MUNDFORD: Site between 4 and 6 Lynford Road: New dwelling and garage: Applicant: Mr Jack Passant: Reference: 3PL/015/0404/O

This proposal would develop an infill plot between existing houses in a highly vegetated and well screened area. The site was close to Mundford and the impact on the countryside would be negligible. There would be no amenity issues subject to window siting.

Approved, as recommended.

- g) Item 7: BEACHAMWELL: 38-40 Old Hall Lane: Alterations and extensions to existing dwelling, erection of linked dwelling and garage and garages for existing dwellings, including access: Applicant: Mr & Mrs G Bucke: Reference: 3PL/2015/0465/F

Members were shown details of the proposed development compared to the previously refused scheme. The new proposal was considered to have an improved design and to represent sustainable development.

Councillor Wilkinson was Ward Representative and noted that the previous refusal had not come to the Committee. The design had been altered to overcome objections and the proposal would provide improved accommodation for the sitting tenant as well as a new dwelling and would improve the street scene.

Materials would match existing.

Approved, as recommended.

- h) Item 8: ATTLEBOROUGH: Plot adjoining The Paddocks, Leys Lane: Erection of single house and garage on plot adjoining The Paddocks: Applicant: Mr T Taylor: Reference: 3PL/2015/0543/F

This proposal was on a site in a well-defined area of sporadic development. It would not have a significant effect on the rural character of the area. NCC Highways had requested road widening but the applicant was not prepared to accept that. However, improved visibility splays would be provided. An objection had been received raising concerns about the impact of the development on the neighbouring property and the drainage of the road.

Mr Price (Objector) said his main concern was the road which in winter had standing water up to a foot deep. If a septic tank was used grey water might find its way into the drains.

Mr Spencer (Agent) was unaware of the drainage objection as the applicant had not mentioned any problems. A small treatment plant would be used. The applicant had agreed to set back the gates to improve the vision splay and that would effectively provide a passing place.

Councillor Stasiak (Ward Representative) supported the application. It was a good sized plot and would provide a home for a family member to inhabit. Although it was outside the Settlement Boundary it would be surrounded by development in future years.

The Principal Planning Officer advised that Building Regulations would deal with the drainage issues.

Approved, as recommended.

Notes to the Schedule

Item No	Speaker
1	Cllr Jordan – NCC Cllr Cowen – Ward Representative Mr Betts – Parish Council Mrs Whettingsteel – Agent Mr Worsfold – NCC Highways
2	Cllr Wassell – Ward Representative Cllr Gilbert – Ward Representative Mr Bishop – Town Council Mrs Webber – Objector Mrs Stallard – Objector Mr Shaw - Agent
3	Cllr Cowen – Ward Representative Mr Blincow – Parish Council Mrs Gill - Objector
4	Mr Lamb – for Museum
5	Cllr Carter – Ward Representative Mr Burton – Parish Council Mr Daniels – Applicant Mr Harris - Agent
8	Cllr Stasiak – Ward Representative Mr Price – Objector Mr Spencer - Agent
Deferred Item 8a	Cllr Rogers – Ward Representative Mr Clegg – Objector Ms Douglas – Objector Mrs Bone – for Applicant Mr Evans - Agent

Written Representations taken into Account

Reference No	Representations
3PL/2015/0401/F	3
3PL/2015/0543/F	1
3PL/2014/0683/F	69
3PL/2014/1253/O	227
3PL/2015/0180/F	27

83/15 REVIEW OF COUNCIL'S LOCAL LIST (AGENDA ITEM 10)

The Principal Planning Officer presented the report and explained the reason for having a Local List.

The National List of what must be submitted with a planning application provided a bare minimum of information and in most cases additional details were required before a decision could be made. The Local List included those items which most regularly needed to be provided. The list had to be reviewed every two years and the last review had been carried out in July 2013.

Action By

The review ensured that the List was up to date and relevant. Consultations had been carried out on the list through the website and by letter to local agents and agencies. Only three responses had been received and they had been seeking points of clarification. All the proposed changes met legislative requirements.

RESOLVED that the revised Local List for the Validation of Planning Applications be adopted.

84/15 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF PLACE (AGENDA ITEM 11)

Noted.

85/15 APPEAL DECISIONS (AGENDA ITEM 12)

Noted.

86/15 EXCLUSION OF PRESS & PUBLIC (AGENDA ITEM 13)

The resolution was not moved.

87/15 ENFORCEMENT UPDATE (AGENDA ITEM 14)

As the Enforcement Manager was unavailable the update was deferred until the next meeting.

The meeting closed at 2.28 pm

CHAIRMAN

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

AUDIT COMMITTEE

**Held on Friday, 31 July 2015 at 10.00 am in
Norfolk Room, Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Mr W.P. Borrett (Chairman)	Mr T. Ludlow
Mr J.W. Nunn (Vice-Chairman)	Mr K. Stevens
Mr M J Nairn	Mr P S Wilkinson

In Attendance

Julie Britton	- Senior Democratic Services Officer
Alison Chubbock	- Chief Accountant (Deputy Section 151 Officer)
Mark Finch	- Finance Manager
Emma Hodds	- Internal Audit Consortium Manager (IACM)
Julie Kennealy	- Executive Director (Commercialisation)(S151 Officer)
Rob Murray	- Audit Director, Ernst & Young
Alison Riglar	- Assistant Manager, Ernst & Young
Sue Allen	- Standards Officer
Rory Ringer	- Democratic Services Team Leader

**Action
By**

As this was the Finance Manager's last meeting, the Chairman and Members thanked Mark Finch for all he had done for the Audit Committee over the years and wished him well for the future.

31/15 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

The Minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**32/15 ACTIONS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES (STANDING ITEM)
(AGENDA ITEM 2)**

Minute No. 29/15 Work Programme

The Executive Director for Commercialisation and S151 Officer had been asked to provide Members with an update on the Intellectual Property Working Group which had originally been included on the Work Programme but had since been removed.

The Committee was informed that the Group had met on one occasion only and at that meeting the Terms of Reference had been agreed. There was no evidence that any of the actions scheduled for future meeting consideration had been progressed.

All intellectual property rights (IPR) had been previously shared jointly

**Action
By**

between Breckland and South Holland Councils as set out in the Memorandum of Understanding; however, at the Full Council in December 2014 changes had been approved to amend this section.

Emma Hodds, the Internal Audit Consortium Manager had since been asked to look into IPR in relation to staff employment contracts.

Breckland Council had been protected in the Grants4Growth programme in relation to the use of the brand name but in the light of that experience the Executive Director of Commercialisation & S151 Officer had requested the auditors to consider if all staff contracts should include the confidentiality and IPR clause.

Members requested a list of all logos and brand names used for business purposes across all service areas be provided at the next meeting.

Mr Ludlow stated that IPR was not just about protecting the Council's trademarks etc. it was also important for the Council to ensure compliance in terms of the IPR of others. It was agreed that this particular action was an important aspect of the IPR considerations.

Mr Stevens reminded the Committee that the issue he raised in regard to employment contracts was in relation to consultants and whether they would be covered by the Council's IPR. The Executive Director for Commercialisation & S151 Officer advised that consultants came through from a range of agents. Mr Ludlow mentioned consultants' rights – owning the rights to their work which he felt the Council would have to be mindful of.

The Chairman felt that a common sense approach should be applied and suggested that all employees of the Council should be made aware that they could be breaking the law. Mark Finch, the Finance Manager assured Members that the Comms Team was aware of copyright rules. The Internal Audit Consortium Manager pointed out that she was in the middle of looking at software licenses and part of that work included a software inventory.

Mr Ludlow said that all the Committee could do was raise awareness.

The Executive Director of Commercialisation and the S151 Officer stated that with the transparency agenda and the ability to FOI all was becoming increasingly difficult to secure IPR in the public sector. Simplicity was good; therefore, if such matters could not be policed or enforced, then the Council needed to ensure that it had a defensible position. She would request that the Council's IT Users Policy be updated to reflect the Council's requirement for staff to comply with all copyright and licensing rules of others.

Councillor Nairn asked if someone wrote an excel programme would that become the property of the Council. Members were informed that the ICT User Policy was being updated to provide the Council with the relevant protection.

Action
By

33/15 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 3)

Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Hewett and Wilkinson.

34/15 URGENT BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 4)

None.

35/15 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS (AGENDA ITEM 5)

None.

36/15 NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 6)

None.

37/15 ANNUAL REPORT ON STANDARDS ARRANGEMENTS (AGENDA ITEM 7)

Sue Allen, the Council's Standards Officer presented the report.

Members were informed that the report updated the Committee on complaints received by Breckland Council against district, town and parish councillors regarding alleged breaches of the Code of Conduct from 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015.

Under the Breckland Council arrangements it had been agreed that standards issues would be delegated to the Audit Committee and report to update Members be presented annually.

From 1 April 2014 to 31 March 2015, the Council received 11 complaints from members of the public alleging breaches of the Code of Conduct by councillors.

One complaint was against a Breckland Council member, 5 complaints were against town councillors and 5 were against parish councillors.

One complaint had been referred to the Police but after further consideration by them it was determined not to deal with the matter and referred it back to Breckland Council to be dealt with under the Council's arrangements.

The Monitoring Officer consulted with the Independent Person on 10 of the complaints.

No complaints had escalated to either a stage 2 complaint or a stage 3 complaint (investigation and Hearing).

The complaints were in relation to failure to declare an interest, failure to treat with respect, anti-social behaviour towards the complainant, misappropriating council funds and failure to comply with the 7 Nolan Principles.

As far as the Council was aware, all Disclosable Pecuniary Interest

forms were up to date. Mr Ludlow was pleased to hear that all such forms had been updated.

The report was otherwise noted.

38/15 LOCAL GOVERNMENT AUDIT COMMITTEE BRIEFING (WITH QUESTIONS) (FOR INFORMATION) (AGENDA ITEM 8)

This Briefing paper was for information only.

The current contracts with audit suppliers ran until 2017, with a possible extension for up to three years, no announcement had been made about the possible extension as discussions were still on-going. Clarity on this matter would be provided at a future meeting.

The report was otherwise noted.

39/15 AUDIT RESULTS REPORT (AGENDA ITEM 9)

Rob Murray, the Audit Director for Ernst & Young presented the Audit Results report. The report summarised the key findings from the 2014/15 audit and the areas of work highlighted on page 34 of the agenda had since been completed and an unqualified audit opinion on the financial statements had been issued.

He expected to sign the audit opinion that afternoon, two months earlier than in previous years. He thanked the Finance Team for producing this work in such good time.

The report also outlined the audit risks as reported in the Audit Plan. The area in relation to commercialisation would be reviewed in 2016 as it would then be a complete year since the LABV had been initiated.

Members' attention was drawn to page 49 of the Statement of Accounts in relation to the notes to the core financial statements. Audit had identified a number of misstatements which the Team had highlighted to management for amendment. These primarily related to disclosure and presentation items with one classification error; all had been corrected during the course of the audit work and would be amended in the following year.

The Chairman asked if this correction would make much of a difference. Members were informed that it would not as it was just a change in disclosure.

It was noted that the Council had strong arrangements in place for securing value for money (see page 38 of the agenda) and referring to the fees (on page 40 of the agenda), Members were informed that the audit fees had been contained at the level planned; the fees for the non-audit work related to the work that was requested to be carried out on the LABV.

The Audit Results report was otherwise noted.

**Action
By**

40/15 AUDITED STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS 2014-15 (AGENDA ITEM 10)

The Chief Accountant and Deputy Section 151 Officer presented the Statement of Accounts.

Members were reminded of the previous agenda item, the Audit Results report which had included the external auditor's opinion on the accounts and value for money.

The few changes that had been made to the Statement of Accounts since the last Audit Committee meeting on 19 June 2015 had been highlighted at paragraph 1.2 of the report.

The Accounts and Audit Regulations 2011 (as amended) required that the Statement of Accounts be considered and approved by the Audit Committee no later than 30 September each year. At the last meeting the report had detailed the earlier timetable requirements in future years which the Council had already followed for this year and had actually been completed two months early.

The Committee was being asked to approve the recommendations so that the Chairman could sign the relevant documentation to enable the Auditors, Ernst & Young to issue their certificate.

RESOLVED that:

- 1) the audited Statement of Accounts for 2014-15 be approved;
- 2) the Annual Governance Statement (AGS) for 2014-15 be approved; and
- 3) the letter of representation for 2014-15 at Appendix B of the agenda be approved.

The Chairman signed the Statement of Accounts for 2014-15.

41/15 BRECKLAND BRIDGE LTD - LOANS (AGENDA ITEM 11)

The Executive Director for Commercialisation & S151 Officer presented the report which requested that the necessary authority be put in place to allow the Council to exercise its option to finance agreed projects in the approved Business Plan of Breckland Bridge Ltd subject to due diligence. The reason for this request was that specific agreement had not been made for the remaining two schemes within the LABV and the application for Mileham had now been received.

Mr Ludlow asked if these loans would be secured by any assets. Members were informed of how the Breckland Bridge had been set up. There was an agreement in place for a number of types of debt and the Council had the absolute right to take site possession. The Committee was reminded of the very sound advice received and provided by PwC.

Mr Ludlow asked about the Council's requirement to borrow. The Chief Accountant explained that all these potential loans would be short term; therefore, there would be no impact on the Council's longer term CFR

**Action
By**

**Action
By**

based on the current capital estimates.

In response to a question, the Executive Director for Commercialisation & S151 Officer explained that the Council had to lend into the LABV at a commercial rate and a very strict formula had to be applied. The commercial rate calculation was explained.

Councillor Wilkinson drew Members' attention to paragraph 1.8 of the report in relation to the legal advisors that had yet to be appointed. The Executive Director suggested that 'instructed' would have been a better word to use as the Council had retained Trowers & Hamlins to do this work.

The Chairman reminded Members of the amendment that been received for recommendation no. 2 (previously circulated) additional wording to be added to the end: *and update the capital budgets accordingly to reflect the investment and repayment of the loan.* The Finance Manager explained that as the loan was a capital investment the capital budget would need to be updated.

RECOMMEND to Full Council that:

1. the Treasury Management Policy be amended to enable loans to be made to Breckland Bridge Ltd to enable the Council to exercise its option to finance agreed projects (in addition to Riverside funding approved at Full Council on 26 March 2015);
2. any loans to be approved by the S151 Officer on a project by project basis; subject to the project being part of a Business Plan approved by Full Council and the necessary due diligence being undertaken and update the capital budgets accordingly to reflect the investment and repayment of the loan; and
3. the total value of loans not to exceed £5m at any one time and no loans to be made for periods in excess of 2 years without prior approval of the Audit Committee or Full Council.

42/15 WORK PROGRAMME (AGENDA ITEM 12)

Referring to the next meeting in September in relation to the Breckland Training Services Annual report, Councillor Nairn asked if the Committee could be informed of whether full cost recovery had been achieved. Mr Ludlow felt that all cost related activities to generate income should be included so that Members would know whether BTS was operating as a stand-alone business. Councillor Wilkinson believed that with any new business there would be lots of losses before income.

<1> RW

The Work Programme was otherwise noted.

43/15 NEXT MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 13)

The arrangements for the next meeting on Friday, 25 September 2015 at 10.00am in the Norfolk Room were noted.

The meeting closed at 10.50 am

CHAIRMAN