

---

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**CABINET**

**Held on Tuesday, 1 July 2014 at 9.30 am in  
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

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

**Also Present**

Mr T R Carter	Mr R.G. Kybird
Mr P.J. Duigan	Councillor M. Chapman-Allen
Mrs S.M. Matthews	Mr A.P. Joel
Mr M J Nairn	Mr K. Martin
Mr M. S. Robinson	Mrs J A North
Mr S.G. Bambridge	E. Spicer
Mr T. J. Jermy	

**In Attendance**

Riana Rudland	- Community Development Manager & Interim Environmental Services Manager
Paul Jackson	- Planning Manager
Maxine O'Mahony	- Director of Commissioning
Robert Walker	- Assistant Director of Commissioning
Vicky Thomson	- Assistant Director - Democratic Services
Julie Britton	- Senior Committee Officer
Margaret Bailey	- Senior Accountant Capital and Treasury
Mark Finch	- Assistant Director of Finance
Jessica Woodhouse	- Internal Consultant - Business Development
Emily Spicer	- Senior Waste and Recycling Officer
Julie Kennealy	- Executive Director
Sarah Robertson	- Planning Policy Officer*
Martin Pendlebury	- Director of Planning & Business Manager *
Laura Apps-Green	- Community Development Officer

**Action By**

**53/14 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 13 May 2014 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**54/14 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 2)**

An apology for absence was received from the Chief Executive.

**Action By**

**55/14 URGENT BUSINESS (AGENDA ITEM 3)**

None.

**56/14 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS (AGENDA ITEM 4)**

None.

**57/14 NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 5)**

Mesdames M Chapman-Allen, S Matthews, J North and Messrs G Bambridge, T Carter, P Duigan, T Jermy, A Joel, R Kybird, K Martin, A Joel and M Robinson.

**58/14 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (IF ANY) (AGENDA ITEM 6)**

None.

**59/14 BRECKLAND COMMUNITY FUNDING APPLICATIONS (STANDING ITEM) (AGENDA ITEM 7)**

The Vice-Chairman and Executive Member for Community & Environmental Services presented the report and summarised the funding recommendations that had been made by both the Match Funding and Pride Funding Grant Panels between March and May 2014. She also drew attention to the two recommendations to Cabinet on the allocation of Match Funding for two new funding applications. Both applications stood very strongly against the Corporate Plan.

Referring to the North Elmham application, the Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development stated that the local communities had aspired to build a village hall and he fully supported the application and wished them all the best.

Councillor North was in attendance for the Attleborough Boxing Club application. She said that the boxing club was an excellent facility that was open to all across the District. The club itself opened 4 years ago and had a very good reputation. It attracted Boxers from not just for Norfolk but from all over the country. The application was for a fitness room extension which would be built alongside the existing building and she hoped that Cabinet would support it.

The Executive Member for Corporate Services and Quality Assurance said that he would certainly be voting for the Attleborough application. He had had dealings with this club in some respect as the coach lived in his village. He felt that the club was very worthwhile as it taught youngsters discipline, self respect and self reliance and challenged youthful aggression.

The Executive Member for Communications, Organisation Performance, Development & Public Protection supported the applications as both had been well researched and informed. He could foresee the good work and help these facilities would provide. He drew attention to section 1.5 of the

**Action By**

report where the smaller grants awarded had been listed and felt that the grants system should be further advertised as he knew that some groups would be unaware of the funding available. He thanked the Executive Member for her support.

Mr Labouchere was in attendance and was allowed to speak in relation to the North Elmham application. He had been delighted and very grateful to hear that Cabinet would be supporting these applications particularly in relation to North Elmham. The three separate halls in the village currently provided meeting points for 54 working clubs and societies and the hope of one brand new village hall being built on village land would be a fabulous opportunity.

The Vice-Chairman pointed out that the Council had received new applications amounting to £30k and the Council had given out over £4.5k grant funding in support of the WW1 centenary celebrations. She said that the remit for grant funding was far and wide and she encouraged all to use up her available pot of money.

The Executive Support Member for Planning, Building Control & Housing said that no grants would have been given if it was not for the support of the Ward Representatives who supported their communities.

The Executive Member for Corporate Services and Quality Assurance reminded Members that there were also other ways that the Council supported community groups and he mentioned the recent Garboldisham Post Office application.

**Options**

1. Fully fund one or both of the funding applications as set out in the report.
2. Part fund one or both of the funding applications as set out in the report.
3. Do nothing.

**Reasons**

- The applications meet Breckland Council's corporate objectives.
- There is secured match funding or the ability to raise funds towards both projects.
- The projects will create valuable community facilities.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) The Capital Match Funding application of £20,000 towards a £72,000 project for the development of a Strength and Conditioning Room extension for Attleborough Boxing Club be approved, subject to:
  - a) a maximum sum of £20,000 or 27.8% of the cost of the

**Action By**

- project, whichever is the lower;
- b) confirmation that all other funding is in place; and
  - c) any other conditions arising from Member comment on Sharepoint.
- 2) The Capital Match Funding application of £20,000 towards a £895,906 project for building a replacement community hall in North Elmham be approved, subject to:
- a) a maximum sum of £20,000 or 2.2% of the cost of the project, whichever is the lower;
  - b) confirmation that all other funding is in place; and
  - c) any other conditions arising from Member comment on Sharepoint.

**60/14 FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT AND DATA PROTECTION ACT POLICIES (AGENDA ITEM 8)**

The Executive Member for Finance & Democratic Services presented the report and highlighted the policies as two matters of great significance.

Members were being asked to support the recommendations as it would ensure that the Council's policies were up to date and reflected current legislation.

**Options**

- 1. Do nothing – if the Council did not update its policies then this could lead to a breach of legislation to which the Council would be potentially liable.
- 2. Approve the revised policies – revised policies would ensure that the Council was compliant with both Acts and any recent changes to legislation and guidance.

**Reasons**

The revised policies would promote openness, transparency and accountability throughout the Council. The current policies were out dated and were in need of an update.

**RESOLVED** that the revised Freedom of Information Policy and Data Protection Policy be approved.

**61/14 BRECKLAND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE AND VIABILITY ASSESSMENT (AGENDA ITEM 9)**

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development presented the report that asked the Cabinet to consider the options on the progression of a Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule (CIL). He asked

**Action By**

that the recommendations be amended as the CIL was going through hiatus at the moment in relation to guidance and regulations not matching up.

The Planning Policy Officer stated that the Planning Policy Team had been through a considerable amount of work which included a consultation in 2013. Since the Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule was consulted upon, further viability evidence had been undertaken in response to some of the representations received. This work particularly aimed to address the concerns of Norfolk County Council. The work looked to exclude education contributions from CIL and instead fund them through S106 Agreements. However, the additional viability work showed that it would not be viable within Breckland to seek a larger S106 Agreement to fund education in addition to a CIL charge for individual dwellings.

The Planning Policy Officer provided Members with a detailed overview of what the amendments to the CIL regulations would mean to Breckland Council. These amendments came into force on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2014 and had been reviewed so that their impact upon the potential CIL in Breckland could be considered. It was noted that this was the 7<sup>th</sup> version of regulations received. The key amendments were:

- Delaying the restrictions on pooling of S106 agreements from April 2014 to April 2015
- Exemptions from CIL for Self-Build properties. This included both traditional self-build dwellings and those commissioned by individuals to use as their sole or main residence plus in-kind payments
- Allowing the phasing of CIL
- Allowing CIL to be set by size of development, not just by type (or Use Class)

The report at Appendix A showed that the amendments to the CIL regulations were likely to lead to a reduction in the amount of money Breckland Council could expect to raise through this charge. The reduction to the CIL pot primarily related to the exemptions for self build dwellings. These dwellings would predominately relate to windfall schemes for individual dwellings. Overall this could lead to a reduction in the CIL pot by up to 39.8% over the remainder of the plan period to 2026. The money raised through CIL over the remainder of the plan period would be £6.86 million.

A key difference between CIL and S106 Agreements was the meaningful proportion of CIL that would go to Town and Parish Councils. If Cabinet was mindful not to progress CIL in Breckland, Town and Parish Councils would not receive a meaningful proportion of the money to put towards infrastructure with their Parish.

Parishes with an adopted Neighbourhood Plan would receive 25% of the CIL receipts, whilst parishes without such a Plan would receive 15%; however, this would be capped at £100 per council tax paying dwelling per year.

In relation to future S106 Agreements, from April 2015, the use of such

**Action By**

agreements would be restricted to five or less obligations for any single type of infrastructure. The CIL regulations were clear that the pooling restrictions on planning obligations related to either projects or types of infrastructure.

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development explained the difference between S106 agreements under the new regime and CIL regulations. S106 agreements he classed as almost immediate money, whereas CIL would be more like a 'drip feed' into a pot. S106s could now be made more specific whereas in the past such agreements had to be passed to Norfolk County Council and spent somewhere in Norfolk and not necessarily in Breckland. He urged the Cabinet to suspend the CIL for the time being and asked for his amended recommendations to be agreed:

1. To agree option 3 and halt the production of CIL at the present time; and keep a watching brief on the CIL regulations; and
2. authorise the Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development and the Leader to recommence the process if the situation changed.

He advised that the second recommendation would mean further consultation would have to take place even though timescales were very short, and it was still not clear whether CIL had to be in place after April 2015.

Councillor Bambridge said that although he was not in favour of CIL he would like assurance that whatever sort of levy the Council put in place would go the local communities.

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development agreed entirely with the aforementioned comment and pointed out that there was a pot of money already available for the installation of children's new play equipment in villages. He advised that S106 Agreements from April 2015 would be solely for building around actual buildings.

Referring to page 38 of the report, the Opposition Leader asked if there was any news on what South Norfolk District Council had decided. He also asked if Breckland Council would be disadvantaged for the postponement. He felt that this had cost a great deal of money not just for Breckland Council but for all Councils and he asked if there would be any recompense from the Government.

Members were informed that all authorities had to pick up the costs and as far as neighbouring authorities were concerned, Broadland had had a CIL in place since 2012 and had noticed a considerable 'drop off'. In his opinion, S106s were far easier to manage compared to CIL. The Planning Policy Officer advised that South Norfolk was charging CIL and had been since April 2014; however, South Norfolk had joined with three other authorities.

In response to a question, the Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development explained that S106 agreements would be used alongside a CIL and a formula had to be used. The Planning Manager gave his

**Action By**

advice on the advantages and disadvantages of whether a CIL should be pursued.

The Executive Member for Planning, Building Control & Housing referred to the timescales and was concerned about what would happen if CIL was suspended and then three months down the line the Council decided to go ahead.

Councillor Martin said that he would prefer a blanket charge all over the District. The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development advised that if there was a blanket charge put in place a viability assessment would have to be carried out.

**Option 1**

Cabinet agree to the publication of the Draft Charging Schedule and Regulation 123 list for the statutory six week publication. Further to this Members also agree for the Charging Schedule and any minor modifications to be submitted for public examination with an Independent Examiner following agreement from the Council Leader and the Executive Member for Assets and Strategic Development.

- **Advantages** – This option would see the Council continuing the preparation of CIL. To continue with this option would reduce the risks associated with the restrictions on the pooling of s106 agreements that will take effect from April 2015.
- **Disadvantages** – This option would commit the Council to continuing with a CIL charging schedule and would need to be weighed against the amount of money which would be raised by CIL to support infrastructure. The recent changes to the regulations had seen reductions in the amount of money to be raised to approximately £6,857,535 over a 13 year period. This represented a reduction in 39.8% from previous estimates. Furthermore, there were risks associated with the review of the CIL regulations in 2015 and the potential for further changes depending on the outcome of Parliamentary Elections. Notwithstanding this, the reduced CIL pot would also have implications on the provision of critical infrastructure to support planned development in Breckland. It was likely to lead to the need for the Council to make decisions regarding the prioritisation of infrastructure provision and could lead to the delay in some infrastructure being provided.

**Option 2**

Cabinet to agree to the Draft Charging Schedule and Regulation 123 list for public consultation and to bring back the Charging Schedule to Members before submitting it for examination.

The advantages and disadvantages for this option were the same as for Option 1; however, the following additional advantages and disadvantages had also been identified.

- **Advantages** – All Members of Cabinet would be able to consider

**Action By**

any representations received in regards to the charging schedule and review their implications on the charging schedule.

- **Disadvantages** – This option had the potential to delay the timetable for the production of CIL which could lead the adoption of CIL to be beyond the April 2015 deadline for the pooling of s106 agreements.

**Option 3**

Members agree to halt the production of a Community Infrastructure Levy for Breckland for the present time. The Draft Charging Schedule would not be agreed for public consultation.

- **Advantages** – Halting the production of CIL and continuing with a negotiated S106 approach provided greater assurances on the deliverability of key infrastructure. This approach avoided having to wait for funds to build up in the CIL 'pot' before infrastructure could be funded/ delivered. The implementation of CIL was likely to incur additional costs to the Council. These costs included a public examination, provision of new ICT systems/adaptations of existing ICT systems and potentially new staff resources to facilitate the collection of CIL receipts. S106 agreements would still be needed to secure affordable housing and also in circumstances where developments were exempt from CIL due to the level of on-site infrastructure needed. The CIL regulations allowed the Council to retain 5% of CIL receipts to cover administrative costs. This needed to be considered against a potentially diminishing level of CIL receipts over the plan period to 2026. When considering the cost of implementing, undertaking and monitoring CIL, the 5% was unlikely to meet all of this. As such, any additional cost above the 5% would need to be borne by the Council.
- **Disadvantages** – The restrictions to the pooling of s106 agreements in April 2015 has the potential to reduce the amount of money raised through S106. If the Council decided not to continue with the implementation of a CIL charging schedule this could lead to a reduction in funding for infrastructure. If the Council decided not to implement a CIL charging schedule, this would have implications for Parish Councils within Breckland. The CIL regulations saw 15% of the total CIL receipt being past onto Parish Councils. This rose to 25% if the Parish Council had a Neighbourhood Plan in place. Parish Councils were not however eligible for a proportion of money raised

**Reasons**

It was recommended that Members endorsed Option 3 of the report which would halt the production of CIL at the present time. Endorsing this option would not preclude Members from reconsidering CIL at a point in the future should the housing and commercial markets improve. Furthermore, this option reduced the cost to the Council of setting up and implementing CIL for a limited potential return for infrastructure provision. Option 3 also reduced the risks associated with the reduction in funds

**Action By**

from CIL to provide critical infrastructure.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) the production of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) be halted for the present time and a watching brief be kept on the CIL regulations; and
- 2) the Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development and the Chief Executive be given delegated authority to recommence the process if the situation changed.

**62/14 CROXTON NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - PLAN AREA DESIGNATION & CROXTON, KILVERSTONE & BRETtenham NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN - PLAN AREA DESIGNATION (AGENDA ITEM 10)**

The purpose of the report was for Members to consider any strategic issues or consultation responses and to formally designate the Croxton, Kilverstone and Brettenham Neighbourhood Plan area.

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development highlighted the Neighbourhood Plans and explained the differences between the two.

Members were being asked to approve Option 1 of the report due to the fact that the proposed boundary was considered appropriate to be designated without any modification and would include the whole of the land that formed part of the Thetford Strategic Urban Extension (SUE). The impact of additional Neighbourhood Plan policies on the SUE would not be realised until later.

Councillor Chapman-Allen said that a colleague Ward Member had worked on this matter and had urged the Cabinet to support Option 1.

Councillor Kybird mentioned the guidance issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) on Neighbourhood Plans and felt that the report gave rise to two different types of Plans that required two different types of policies.

The Executive Member for Finance & Democratic Services felt that it was the Parishes wish to have a shared vision for the future of the villages that fell outside the SUE and had felt that the best way forward would be to combine policies to allow for a cohesive and strategic vision.

The Opposition Leader said that Thetford was intrinsically linked to these parishes and felt that this matter should be taken forward in a more joined up way.

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development stated that Breckland Council had no control over submissions of Neighbourhood Plans as anyone could apply. There had been nothing to stop Thetford and the aforementioned parishes submitting a Plan in its entirety; however, these two parishes had worked together and had decided that they wanted one of their own. The detail of whether it would be compliant with Thetford's Neighbourhood Plan would be included in their policies.

**Action By**

Members' attention was drawn to section 3.4 of the report where it highlighted the legalities of excluding land within the SUE as adopted in the Thetford Area Action Plan.

Option 1

To consider the content of this report to confirm the joint Neighbourhood Plan area as submitted by Croxton, Kilverstone and Brettenham Parish Councils as set out at Appendix A and reject the single Croxton Neighbourhood Plan area.

Option 2

To consider the content of this report and confirm an amended joint Neighbourhood Plan area of Croxton, Kilverstone and Brettenham **excluding** land identified as part of the Thetford Sustainable Urban Extension and reject single Croxton Neighbourhood Plan area.

Reasons

It was recommended that Cabinet endorsed Option 1. This was due to the fact that the proposed boundary was considered appropriate to be designated without modification.

An amended boundary could be designated that reflected the joint Croxton, Kilverstone and Brettenham submission with the exception of land falling within the Thetford Urban Extension. However, this was not recommended as it was considered that the potential for any strategic concerns to be mitigated through positive engagement with the Council and the promoters of the Sustainable Urban Extension.

Endorsing a single Croxton Neighbourhood area would result in a disjointed approach to future policy affecting the Urban Extension and inhibit the ability of a joint Neighbourhood Plan covering the three parishes to be identified.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) the amended Croxton, Kilverstone and Brettenham Neighbourhood Plan areas as shown at Appendix B of the report be endorsed; and
- 2) the single Croxton Neighbourhood Plan area be rejected.

**63/14 BROADBAND BRECKLAND INVESTMENT (AGENDA ITEM 11)**

Members were made aware that Superfast Broadband (defined as 24Mbps+) was emerging as a priority infrastructure within Norfolk. It had been estimated that the current Rural Broadband programme would deliver returns of £20 for every £1 invested. Better Broadband for Norfolk (BBfN) was a multi-million pound partnership between Norfolk County Council and BT which was currently implementing the initiative within Norfolk. The current program would provide access to Superfast Broadband to 83% of Norfolk properties by the end of 2015. In addition,

**Action By**

the programme would also ensure that every property had access to at least 2Mbps. It was emphasised that currently only county wide figures were available but from research it would appear that both the coverage and indeed the gaps were spread evenly across Norfolk. The actual figures for each District would only become available early in 2015 once BT had completed its survey work.

This was an exciting opportunity to improve the coverage within Breckland; the Government had offered Norfolk a further £5.59 million and the Local Enterprise Partnership was seeking match funding for this from the Department of Transport. If this funding was secured, the estimate was that a further 7% of Norfolk properties would have access to Superfast Broadband; this would bring total coverage of up to 90%. The County Council had sought an additional £4 million of further funding for Norfolk. It had also received ministerial approval for this, subject to local match funding. The County Council had allocated a further £1 million. District Councils had been offered the opportunity to participate in the improvement of Superfast Broadband by agreeing in principle to allocate funds. It was hoped that this would increase the coverage of Superfast Broadband to 95% across Norfolk. It should be noted that:

- Breckland funding would only be used in Breckland Council
- Breckland Council would have an input as to the priorities for investment with the District
- If at this point it was considered that the investment did not represent good value for money the Council need not proceed
- In terms of areas that were adjacent to Breckland's borders with other Districts, Breckland Council would work with these authorities to ensure that Breckland Council received the maximum for the investment that was initially made.
- District funding would be used during 2016/17 and 2017/18.
- As this covered so many facets of what Breckland did as a District Council, the Chief Executive together with the Leader would lead on this project.

Based on the county wide estimates that Breckland Council had been provided with (and Members were asked to note that until early 2015 these were the best figures it could get), Cabinet was requested to recommend to Full Council an in principle agreement to provide funding of up to £950,000 to deliver the project across Breckland. This amount would be transferred from the Council's Organisational Development Reserve and earmarked for Broadband Partnership Funding for call down in 2016/17. It was likely that the actual amount required would be less; however, as the amount committed could not be increased once the in principle agreement had been made, and because of the actual gaps in coverage, the actual cost would not be known until early 2015. The commitment had to be made now, and the Leader of the Council did not want to miss out on maximising the benefit to Breckland residents by agreeing a lesser amount.

Not much more information was available neither was there any data available as to the actual areas that would be funded by the District monies, it was only the current commercial initiative that was underway. Once BT had completed its surveys, the necessary information would be released to the Council, under a Non-Disclosure Agreement, the actual

**Action By**

locations could not be covered. Breckland Council would then decide which areas offered the best returns for its investment; this would involve factors including social, economic, commercial, educational, access to services and many others. Breckland Council was the first District Council in Norfolk to progress this opportunity through the democratic process, thus hopefully securing maximum advantage for its residents.

Councillor Bambridge supported the proposal as the shortage of broadband in the area was very well known. He did ask however, if there would be other suppliers being used apart from BT, if there would be further discussions prior to the monies being committed and what would happen to the villages that did not fit into the investment. Councillor Bambridge said that he knew of other companies that could provide WIFI and he wanted some of his communities to have access to this funding.

In response to the first question, the Leader advised that BT was covered by a commercial initiative. As far as out of reach areas were concerned, there would be some form of mechanism to enhance current broadband speed but these areas would not have access to Superfast Broadband.

The Executive Support Member for Corporate Services and Quality Assurance felt that this initiative was vital for Breckland and felt that the risk of doing nothing was greater as the lack of broadband could affect many businesses and stifle growth.

The Executive Member for Planning, Building Control & Housing said that everyone was living in a digital age even most school work had to be completed on line. This initiative would encourage prosperity and was vital for the area.

The Executive Member for Corporate Services & Quality Assurance said that the risk of doing nothing would be far more damaging to Breckland Council. He touched on the social scope that Broadband would have an impact on. It would certainly, in his opinion, allow diversification and employment in rural areas not forgetting the importance in regard to education. Also, it would overcome social isolation and allow those people to have greater access to services and allow the elderly to remain in their own homes. Further to this he felt that if Breckland Council did not support this initiative it could distort house values in rural areas and therefore, he strongly endorsed what was being proposed.

The Vice-Chairman agreed and pointed out that estate agents were now including broadband details on their properties.

Councillor Joel reported that Old Buckenham High School pupils were all from rural areas and without faster broadband they would not be able to access school work. He felt that BT should be marketing this initiative more.

The Opposition Leader said that from some points of view this was very good but he could not believe that so many areas were still cut off and he struggled with the fact that public money was being used for a private service. He questioned the amount that BT was putting in, in times of massive funding cuts. He felt that having a roof over ones head was more important and he hoped that this boldness could be replicated in

**Action By**

other areas. He reminded Members of the 'Could We Should We' exercise that the Council went through but now it had £1 million to spend on Broadband. He felt that the timing and process was very odd.

In response the Leader advised that the timing had been forced upon the Council and if it did not go ahead, the chance would be lost. He reminded Members that the towns had adequate Broadband but the villages did not.

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development pointed out that economic development was not a statutory duty and was cost neutral. He knew of a number of businesses that had to use satellite to talk to their suppliers/buyers and he also knew of some people who would prefer to work from home. To attract more businesses to the area was vital.

The Executive Member for Finance & Democratic Services felt it was the Council's responsibility to be encouraging this initiative but this should not be classed as Breckland paying for broadband as these monies would be matched. She felt that it would be an excellent use of money and an excellent investment that would bring its own rewards.

The Executive Member for Communications, Organisational Performance, Development & Public Protection said that he was cautious of spending council tax payers' money; however, Members had to look at the broader picture. This was a contribution up to, and what were the alternatives, would the Opposition Leader prefer Breckland to be the 'black hole' of Norfolk? He drew attention to section 1.1 of the report and asked Members to replace the word UK with Breckland and also referred to section 4.1.2 of the report where it stated that this investment would have a significant impact on the ability of households and businesses in rural areas to take advantage of the opportunities offered by Superfast Broadband which in his opinion was all positive issues. He also drew attention to section 5.3.5 which highlighted the additional jobs this initiative would create, not forgetting the additional income. He felt that the case had been made and the assurances had been provided and Breckland Council needed to ensure that its residents received the same as Norfolk.

The Executive Member for Corporate Services and Quality Assurance was concerned that the Opposition Leader did not see that this investment was a good use of council tax payers' money for rural areas; although he felt that his concentration on housing was a very important point. In his defence, the Opposition Leader felt that his views were in danger of being misrepresented and said that all he was trying to get across was that this initiative should be privately funded not publically funded particularly at a time when services were being cut and it was in fact, a question of priorities.

Councillor Carter said that the Council should not be accused of spending money unwisely and reminded Members of the monies that Norfolk County Council would be putting in.

The Leader mentioned the return residents should get from the investment.

**Action By**

**Options**

To take no action was not considered to be appropriate given the levels of no and poor availability across the District, even after the first round of Better Broadband for Norfolk deployment.

**Reasons**

To support the delivery of Super Fast Broadband across as much of the District as possible and provide benefits to both the residential and business community.

An in principle agreement to match fund was required to secure the additional £4million offered by government to be included as part of second phase procurement over the summer 2014

**RECOMMEND** to Council that:

- 1) Breckland Council supports the Norfolk County Council Superfast Broadband (SFBB) project and agrees, in principle, to provide funding of up to and not exceeding £950,000 to deliver the project across the Breckland District; and
- 2) £950,000 be transferred from the Organisational Development Reserve to the Community Projects Reserve and be earmarked for Broadband Partnership Funding for draw down in 2016/2017.

**64/14 REFERENCE FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION (AGENDA ITEM 12)**

None.

**65/14 NEXT MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 13)**

The arrangements for the next meeting on Tuesday, 9 September 2014 at 9.30am in the Anglia Room were noted.

**66/14 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC (AGENDA ITEM 14)**

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

**67/14 PROPOSED EXTENSION TO THE DOMESTIC GARDEN WASTE COLLECTION SCHEME AT BRECKLAND COUNCIL (AGENDA ITEM 15)**

The Vice-Chairman presented the report and introduced Emily Spicer, the Council's shared Senior Waste & Recycling Officer.

The report described the proposal to extend the domestic garden waste collection service and Members were furnished with the information

**Action By**

needed in order to reach an informed decision.

The Senior Waste & Recycling Officer responded to Members questions.

**Options**

See report

**Reasons**

See Report.

**RESOLVED** that the recommendations as listed in the report be approved.

**68/14 LABV PROJECT (AGENDA ITEM 16)**

The Executive Member for Assets & Strategic Development introduced the report.

Officers from the LABV Project Team were in attendance to answer questions.

The reasons for the recommendations were highlighted and Members were provided with a detailed overview of the report.

**Options**

See report.

**Reasons**

See Report.

**RECOMMEND** to Council that the recommendations as listed in the report be approved.

The meeting closed at 11.05 am

CHAIRMAN