

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Held on Thursday, 3 December 2020 at 10.00 am
Virtual meeting via Zoom

PRESENT

Mr D. R. R. Oliver (Chairman)	Mr M. Kiddle-Morris
Mr T. Birt	Mr R.G. Kybird
Miss H. Bushell	Mr I. Martin
Mrs V. Dale	Mr M. J. Nairn
Mr F. Eagle	Mr D. Wickerson
Mr T. J. Jermy	Mrs H Crane (Substitute Member)

Also Present

Mr R. Atterwill	Councillor M. Chapman-Allen
Mr H. E. J. Clarke	Mr S. H. Chapman-Allen
Mr P. Morton	Mr P.D. Claussen
Mr P. S. Wilkinson	Mr P.J. Duigan
Councillor C. Bowes	Mr I. Sherwood
Mrs H. Bushell	Mrs S. E. Suggitt
Mr S.G. Bambridge	Mrs A. M. Webb

In Attendance

Alison Chubbock	- Chief Accountant (Deputy Section 151 Officer) (BDC)
Jason Cole	- Executive Manager People & Innovation
Andrew D'Arcy	- Planning Policy Manager
Rachel Gibbs	- Planning Policy Officer
Andrew Grimley	- Team Leader (Environmental Protection)
Andrew Holdsworth	- Inward Investment Manager
Greg Pearson	- Senior Policy Advisor
Sarah Shipley	- Shared Public Protection Manager
Sarah Wolstenholme-Smy	- Legal Services Manager (Deputy Monitoring Officer BDC)
Simon Wood	- Director of Planning & Building Control
Teresa Smith	- Democratic Services Team Leader
Ruth Tudge	- Democratic Services Officer

173/20 MINUTES

The following amendments were proposed by Councillor Martin:

Minute Reference: 166/20 - Constitution - non-key officer decisions / SIRO / licensing

Ahead of the 2nd paragraph commencing "The Chairman explained..." It was proposed it should read:

"Cllr Jermy raised the issue of recommendation (a) and his concerns with it. Cllr Martin then spoke raising his concerns."

The above amendment would explain what led to the next paragraph

Action By

Action By

“The Chairman explained...” paragraph.

After the next paragraph commencing “Cllr Kiddle-Morris agreed with the Chairman...” replace the paragraph commencing with “Cllr Jermy proposed...” with

“Cllr Jermy proposed that recommendation (a) should be deleted. This proposal was seconded by Cllr Martin. This was approved by the commission. The Chairman then proposed that the other recommendations be accepted which the Commission agreed.”

Minute reference: 167/20 – To receive presentations from the Housing Associations:

Before 2nd paragraph commencing “Cllr Bambridge...” it was proposed that the following should be added:

“Cllr Martin raised a particular issue with Flagship Homes in his ward. These were suffering from a longstanding problem of foul-water and surface water contamination, at times of heavy rain, leading to toilets in elderly people’s bungalows backing up. He noted it had taken 40 minutes for the Flagship phone to be answered so that he could report the latest incident, and a day and half to get a tanker out to drain the problem and let people use their toilets again, and that this was unacceptable in the 21st century. The Chairman asked Cllr Martin to submit the detail of the issue so that Flagship could respond separately on this.

The proposed amendments were seconded by Councillor Jermy and agreed.

Councillor Helen Crane highlighted that whilst she was listed as in attendance, she had not been named under item: 165/20 Non-Members wishing to address the meeting.

Subject to the above amendments, the minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2020 were confirmed as a correct record.

Matters Arising from the minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 20:

Councillor Ian Martin mentioned he had been disappointed that he had not received a response from Adrian Barber, Managing Director (Victory Housing) of Flagship in response to the issues he had raised. Councillor Clarke agreed, stating that the list of stock had not been forthcoming. Councillor Wilkinson explained there had been some IT issues with Flagship which may have caused communication delays.

The Chairman asked Democratic Services Team Leader, Teresa Smith to chase Mr Barber for a response for the outstanding queries.

174/20 APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTES

An apology had been received from Councillor Lynda Turner. Councillor Helen Crane was in attendance as her substitute.

Action By

175/20 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS (IF ANY)

None.

176/20 URGENT BUSINESS

The Chairman stated at the previous meeting the Committee had discussed at length the Constitutional amendments which were being proposed to Council on the 10th December.

At the time it was understood that the Commissions' views, would be referenced in the report to Full Council, however it had been realised that those comments were not present in the report and asked for clarity from the Legal Services Manager.

The Legal Services Manager explained there had been an error and the report had been released without the comments of the Overview and Scrutiny Commission. The report had been amended and would be re-issued.

177/20 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Eagle declared he had been a recipient of a Discretionary Business Grant from Breckland Council earlier in the year.

Councillor Martin stated two Declarations of Interest for transparency purposes. He declared he had been a recipient of a Business Grant from Breckland Council. In addition, his business was directly involved with contaminated land but at no stage had it been or likely to be with the Contaminated Land Team at Breckland Council.

The Legal Services Manager confirmed the above were not Pecuniary Interests in relation to the matters before the Overview and Scrutiny Commission today.

178/20 SCRUTINY CALL-INS (STANDING ITEM)

None.

179/20 NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING

The Chairman welcomed non-Members of the Commission to the meeting.

Councillor Morton asked, as there were a number of electric vehicle charging points across the District, if the Commission could receive a written report stating how well they were being used.

The Chairman asked suggested that this be included in the future work programme.

180/20 BANHAM POULTRY & ENVIRONMENT AGENCY

The Chairman explained that the Environment Agency and Banham Poultry had been unable to send representatives to attend the meeting. However, Banham Poultry had provided a response to the questions

Action By

that were asked by the Overview and Scrutiny Commission which had been attached to the agenda. The Environment Agency had sent in the following statement responding to the questions asked:

1) The company's issues with odour emissions and its steps taken in addressing these, in particular those required by the EA - both which have or have not been implemented to date;

Where we are able, we are willing to discuss our regulatory decisions and actions. As the council will be aware, there is an active criminal investigation taking place regarding activities at the site at Station Road. Therefore, the information we are able to provide at this time is limited to ensure the ongoing investigation is not prejudiced. Over the last two years we have increased our regulatory input into the site. As the council will be aware, the Environment Agency regulates matters that take place within the boundaries of the site given that the operator conducts their activities under the remit of an environmental permit issued under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016. The environmental permit for the site has a number of conditions to control and manage the impact of the operations, to the environment and human receptors. Matters which take place outside of the boundaries of the site are not regulated by the Agency, to clarify these include, but are not limited to:

- Health and Safety regulation, which includes Covid-19 and food safety.*
- The spillage of offal outside of the site boundary which falls into the remit of Norfolk County Council Trading Standards.*
- Planning matters (including site current planning permission, Bunns Bank planning permission, operating hours etc) which falls into the remit of the Council planning department.*

The Agency are aware that there have been concerns raised regarding the odour from the site. We will continue to work with the operator and the community in order to investigate and address these concerns. As an Agency, we make every effort to regulate compliance with environmental permits. We have an action plan with the operator which covers a wide range of actions but generally the actions relate to asking BPL (2018) Ltd to address issues which have the potential to cause off-site odour.

Whilst we continue to investigate the site, we have issued enforcement notices to the operator (most recently in October 2020) and warning letters for some minor infractions of their permit. As stated at the outset, a criminal investigation is currently underway regarding the odour pollution in 2019/20. The progress of this has been affected by the Covid-19 pandemic but is continuing.

2) The company's regulatory requirements, breaches of which it is aware and steps it has taken to remedy those

The company's regulatory requirements are set out in their environmental permit, issued under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016. Whilst we are conducting a criminal investigation, we are also liaising with the operator to address issues identified as

Action By

detailed above.

As the regulator, we act in a fair and proportionate manner that works to protect people and the environment as well as supporting businesses and sustainable economic growth. Underlying our commitment to firm but fair regulation is the principle of proportionality in securing compliance and targeting of enforcement action. You can read about the Environment Agency's position on enforcement, sanctions and offence response options on our website:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/environment-agency-enforcement-and-sanctions-policy>

Councillor Dale said she felt Banham Poultry were trying to address the issues and that the odour had improved but not sufficiently. The factory had been situated in the middle of a housing estate where further housing was planned, and any improvements needed to be done as quickly as possible as it could only get worse.

The Chairman said there was a common law nuisance case law which empowered the Council to take action against any individual or operation that caused nuisance and asked if Breckland District Council had considered nuisance as per common law and whether it was applicable in this case.

The Shared Public Protection Manager, Sarah Shipley said that option was available to the Council but as the Environment Agency already had an active investigation going ahead it would make sense for that to conclude first.

181/20 REVIEW OF THE CONTAMINATED LAND STRATEGY

Councillor Bambridge explained the Council had a responsibility to produce and review the Contaminated Land Strategy regularly to protect the environment and the health of the residents within Breckland. He reminded Members that the current policy, had been available for some time, and explained it was a strategic policy and not a specific one and that it was a timely review in the light of the sustainability discussions.

The Team Leader (Environmental Protection), reiterated that it was an existing policy which was last updated in 2015 and considered Breckland Council's strategic approach to deal with contaminated land across the District.

Councillor Birt thought the Council had an obligation to maintain a public register of contaminated land sites across the District but could not locate this on the website and asked for clarity on whether Breckland should maintain a register for residents to view. He also said on page 56 of the policy the flow chart should be reviewed as he felt it did not flow as it should.

The Team Leader (Environmental Protection) explained Breckland Council did have a statutory duty to maintain a register but needed to be careful not to publish sites that did not have confirmation that they were fully contaminated as it could potentially blight the piece of land in question and cause issues for both the landowner and the Council.

Action By

The register provided on the website listed sites that had been designated as fully contaminated and had issues in relation to the process highlighted in the strategy. The public register confirmed the three aspects that made it a contaminated site. He went on to explain there was a further service offered by Breckland Council to find out previous uses of land and information which was at a reasonable charge to reflect the work of the Council in preparing that information.

The Team Leader (Environmental Protection) confirmed he would take the comments on the flow chart and feedback through the consultation process.

Councillor Birt voiced his concerns that the information on contaminated land sites across the District did not seem publicly available unless at cost.

Councillor Kiddle-Morris said he felt the revised policy was more user friendly and easier to understand. He felt most of the work on contaminated land was as a result of planning applications and felt the wording needed to be amended as the document stated regularly 'current use' and felt it should be looking at and state 'current proposed use' which was what the public were wanting to find out.

Councillor Kiddle-Morris also noted that in paragraph 5.1.1, the second paragraph, second sentence a word was missing.

The Team Leader (Environmental Protection) confirmed they would revisit the wording to see if it could be made more appropriate and amend the missing word.

Councillor Martin stated the strategy seemed straightforward and fulfilled statutory requirements. The main activity across most District councils was in relation to planning applications rather than an active assessment of potentially contaminated sites. He asked if there was a list of priority contaminated sites and if Breckland had the resources to investigate contamination issues. He also stated that word 'historic' needed to be corrected to 'historical' as it affected the meaning.

The Team Leader (Environmental Protection) confirmed there was a list of sites, primarily used to influence how the Council responded to planning applications. He confirmed there were a number of sites that possibly required further investigation but to do this involved heavy financial implications so unless government funding became readily available it was not seen as a priority unless a site posed an immediate issue.

Councillor Martin said he fully understood the financial implications but stated that Breckland Council had a statutory responsibility to investigate and morally must do so should the situation dictate.

RECOMMENDED the draft Strategy for consultation and subsequent approval subject to the comments and points raised above.

Action By

182/20 BRECKLAND SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY

The Executive Member for Customer Engagement & Climate Change Champion, Councillor Ian Sherwood thanked Members and said he was pleased to raise awareness of the Environment & Climate Strategy and valued the input from the Commission. He began by reminding Members that Breckland Council had declared a Climate Emergency. He shared a presentation on what Breckland Council had done so far which included creating a new fixed term post for an Environment & Climate Change Officer and had been allocated a small budget for research and evidence gathering.

Councillor Sherwood informed Members of the three pillars of the strategy:

- We will reduce our own impact as an organisation on the environment
- We will use our regulatory powers to influence behavioural change (e.g. planning, waste & Recycling, environmental protection)
- We will enable our communities to take action for themselves

Councillor Sherwood stated as part of the strategy Breckland Council would also declare a date by which the Council would become carbon neutral.

The Senior Policy Advisor, Greg Pearson went onto explain the guiding principles of what was hoped to be achieved, setting out ideas and the start of a work programme and assured Members that it would be work in progress and changed and adapted as time passed. A key measure to begin with was reducing Breckland Council's own impact on the environment and influence behavioural change and he explained the Local Plan would be key to shaping this change in the future.

The Senior Policy Advisor went on to say enabling communities was also key and would look to have specific sustainability webpages on the Council website and continue to promote Switch and Save activities and promoting insulation schemes for Green Warmth.

Councillor Birt raised concerns on the Council's carbon offsetting and said that despite raising this at the Members Forum it was disappointing to see that it was an option. He also stated it was clear Breckland were tied into a supplier. The producer supplied the electricity had divided into carbon producing electricity and carbon free electricity and the Council had been allocated carbon free. He felt it could be seen as greenwashing. Councillor Birt also volunteered his name to be included to assist with the testing of the carbon literacy training.

Councillor Sherwood acknowledged the points raised on the green electric switch and agreed that whilst it was a positive first step more needed to be done and that there would be a greater opportunity when the council's energy contract came up for renewal but until then the council was limited. He responded to say that although carbon offset was not the council's preferred course of action it could not be ignored

Action By

that some residents could not necessarily make the change due to technological and financial constraints so there was a place for carbon offset at the moment. He went on to say that many ideas and comments came through the Members Panel would be considered when it came to finalising the priorities for the policy.

He also acknowledged Councillor's Birt's offer to assist in being part of the trial for the toolkit.

Councillor Nairn asked if local community buildings could specifically be targeted with the grants available to reduce their fossil fuel. Councillor Sherwood responded to say he would ensure that when the website became available it would direct people to all grants available.

Councillor Eagle suggested that behavioural change is key to this agenda and Councillors should become Leaders within their community. He also mentioned how Hebdon Bridge had invested in electric trade bikes to carry out local deliveries which could be a suggestion for future consideration.

Councillor Morton was pleased to support the ideas but felt quicker action was required. He went on to say that climate change was about reducing carbon and there was a requirement to have a realistic programme for 3 to 5 years which was monitored.

Councillor Martin added that it was a good piece of work thus far and felt that it was something to work towards and support. He felt that the Local Plan would play an important role, he wanted to ensure that viability and being practical would be considered to ensure that requirements would not impact housing delivery in the district.

Councillor Sherwood appreciated Councillor Martin's input in regard to planning and would accept Members' contributions to ensure the balance could be achieved.

Councillor Jermy suggested that should a tree be removed it should be automatically replaced. He also commented that the term Salary Sacrifice could be changed and be equally available for Members as well as Officers.

Councillor Sherwood responded to say he had spoken with the Woodland Trust who suggested that a better measure would be to consider canopy cover. It was important that the right tree was planted in the right place and idea could be to consider tree volunteers to ensure that when a tree was planted it would be maintained sufficiently to survive.

The Chairman commented said that carbon emissions were not the only emission that mattered regarding greenhouse gasses and asked if the policy would look into other measures in the future around other contributors to the greenhouse effect.

Councillor Sherwood agreed carbon was not the only measure and would be relying on experts to ensure all points would be covered going forward.

Action By

Councillor Kybird suggested in relation to the tree canopy, it would be useful to have headline figures to follow, looking at a calculation it would breakdown to allocating 6 and a half square miles of forest or 2 acres per Parish per year to achieve the right carbon offset.

Councillor Birt said the draft policy was disappointingly soft yet the slides more direct and asked the policy had more of an effective approach.

The Commission noted the report.

183/20 5-YEAR LAND SUPPLY UPDATE

The Planning Policy Manager, provided Members with an update of the 5 Year Housing Land Supply for Breckland Council.

Councillor Kybird noted in the appendix for the windfall analysis, the 2011/12 total of 32 should be 302 which gave the total windfalls from 4073 to 4343 and the average from 370 to 395 therefore the 82% should be 80.2% and asked what the cost would be of providing the 19.8% planned delivery.

The Planning Policy Manager responded to say he would check the figures and make the necessary amendments. In response to the question, it was expected that windfalls, especially on major sites would reduce now the adopted local plan was in place, and in addition as it was recommended that Breckland had a robust 5-year land supply it would also reduce speculative windfall.

Councillor Atterwill noted that within the report it mentioned house prices should be maintained and profit margins for developers as opposed to increasing supply and reducing house prices. He felt it would be in everyone's interest to reduce prices to make it more affordable for residents to purchase. He also asked when the strategic housing market assessment was due for review as it could have an impact on delivery.

The Planning Policy Manager informed Members in respect of the strategic housing market assessment, along with other Local Authorities across the county, Breckland Council were waiting on any final decisions from Government on what the new housing requirement would be and would use that as the starting point for a review.

In response to the first question, the Planning Policy Manager stated that housing was delivered by private house builders, who needed to make a profit. It had to be demonstrated that what was being proposed would be prudent and robust. Developers would not build houses where there was no demand or market saturation.

Councillor Atterwill appreciated the response but said he would contact the Planning Policy Manager directly outside of the forum as it posed more questions which he would like to discuss. He went on to say he also had concern that in 3 to 4 years some policies of the Local Plan would be out of date and felt it important that the Local Plan should be reviewed to ensure policies were current. He voiced his concern that the review should be completed as soon as possible or it could lose

Action By

momentum.

The Director of Planning and Building Control, Simon Wood stated the Local Plan was currently up to date, and recent information received from Central Government was aimed at Authorities who were yet to have a Local Plan in place. If reforms were to be significantly delayed the Local Plan would be reviewed.

Councillor Atterwill appreciated the comments but felt Breckland Council was at a stage where the hiatus in the work could not be delayed indefinitely and felt Policies could continue to be reviewed.

Councillor Martin wanted to reassure colleagues that the 5-year land supply statement agreed in November 2019 used the 5% buffer and the current statement was using the same buffer and was therefore was consistent. He agreed with Councillor Kybird and felt the windfalls had been understated. He continued to say that INF03 meant that even if Breckland Council had a 5-year land supply the housing policies would be out of date in November 2022. He also queried that there were a number of appeals in process where the 5-year land supply had been challenged or referenced and asked at what stage was Breckland able to put the statement forward to the relevant inspectors to assist with those appeals.

The Director of Planning and Building Control responded that in respect of the appeals currently within the system they had advised the planning inspectorate of the current position using the draft report and would have reference to that when making a decision. With regard to INF03 there was work being done and work planned to do, to underpin any review carried out over the next 2 to 3 years he stated they were aware of the deadline and the risk it posed and by having the 5-year land supply did not mean they could stop granting planning consents, as that process would need to continue.

Councillor Birt said he was pleased to see the report and noticed the step change in deliveries in two years' time and felt it reflected that Breckland were not in full control of whether it could be delivered or not as profit was driving the number of deliveries. He also commented there was an error in the report on page 86 table 2, the last columns were the wrong way around.

The Director of Planning and Building Control agreed the ability of Breckland Council to insist on delivery was limited but continued to play its part in granting planning consents and would continue to work with Central Government and developers to bring sites forward.

Councillor Clarke welcomed the report and stated it would be challenging to deliver more houses than it had before. He had further comments on the delivery and housing supply figures which he would discuss with the planning team separately. He asked specifically in Appendix 1 of the report, how many major emails had been sent out, how many had been responded to, how many may have altered their figures and had that discount figure been used before.

The Planning Policy Manger responded to say that information on the major sites and the confirmation to the emails were shown in the

Action By

appendix to the 5-year land supply. The report also provided a breakdown of the major sites with those with confirmed delivery and in a separate table those where a response had not been received. Those who did respond, very few amended the figures as it was thought the figures were reasonable. With regard to the Thetford and Dereham delivery figures there had been a significant number of more dwellings with planning permission in Thetford because of the Sustainable Urban Extension but in Dereham there were a number of different sites. The report would be monitored and updated again at the end of the monitoring year in March. He also confirmed that the unconfirmed sites were the sites that had the 25% discount applied on delivery. Where sites had been confirmed it was 100% figure with no discount, and caution had been given to the unconfirmed sites.

Councillor Morton asked if anything further could be done to ensure actual delivery once planning permission had been granted. The Director of Planning and Building Control said the team were working hard to assist where possible and around 9,000 of the homes were with the two SUEs. In Thetford, they were working hard to assist with the delivery of power to bring the SUE forward at a quicker rate and in Attleborough were working with the County Council to deliver the link road. The team were also working with developers and landowners of stalled sites to understand why and assist to unlock to ensure a speedier delivery.

The Commission noted the contents of the 5-year Housing Supply Statement and agreed that it represented the current position of the Council and agreed the recommendations in the report.

184/20 COVID-19 BUSINESS GRANTS

The Inward Investment Manager gave a presentation on the Breckland administered key grant scheme as part of the Government COVID-19 economic response.

It was a nationally prescribed and funded scheme, administered by the Local Authority. Local businesses were encouraged to apply for a grant and subject to meeting the set key criteria, would be in receipt of government grant of either £10,000 or £25,000.

Councillor Crane asked in instances of fraudulent claims, who would pay if the money was unable to be recovered. The Chief Accountant confirmed they were awaiting new guidance on debt collection, but it was expectant that the Government would provide this cover if the Local Authority could not recover the debt.

Councillor Jermy thanked the team for the speedy response but recognised some businesses were not eligible for support and asked if there were any statistics about those not supported and why. He went on to say it could be an opportunity for the Council to create dialogue and build relations with local businesses and asked if there would be capacity and resource to do this.

The Inward Investment Manger explained that the Government had sought feedback throughout the process and for those not falling into the set criteria the Discretionary Grant was available which it was

Action By

believed would capture the vast majority. However, if a Member should be aware of any business which had not been supported by either grant available to contact him. In terms of capacity and resources to engage he agreed the knowledge and engagement with businesses should increase going forward.

Councillor Wilkinson congratulated the team on the logistics of getting this set up so quickly and recognised the information from Councillor Eagle in identifying silent companies and felt going forward it would leave a legacy to helping local businesses improve and linking in with the Market Towns Initiative.

Councillor Eagle thanked the team for the quick turnaround and said for many village halls and local communities it had been an absolute lifeline however he did feel that the language used to communicate with the businesses required further development. During the initial period, many businesses felt excluded from the scheme as it was thought it was directed at larger companies rather than small businesses. He went on to say he felt communication should be clearer to show that it was available to all and to look forward building the dialogue and relationships with local businesses to make Breckland a better place.

The Commission noted the contents of the report.

185/20 OUTSIDE BODY FEEDBACK (STANDING ITEM)

Councillor Kybird stated he had attended a Norfolk County Council meeting of the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, one of the items discussed was an update on suicide prevention in Norfolk and Breckland Council did feature as an area where the rate had increased slightly. Seven months ago, a suicide hotline introduced which was manned 24/7 by clinically qualified personnel and in the first seven months of operations they had dealt with more than 25,000 calls. Councillor Kybird stated he has asked for a more detailed briefing note to be available for the communications team.

Councillor Wilkinson updated the Commission as Breckland's Governor and Board Member at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, King's Lynn. There were still concerns about Covid and currently 49 patients were being treated. Staff had now received the 15-minute test to carry out on themselves to enhance safety for staff and patients which had been rolled out. The hospital was applying through the Government funding on the second phase for a new hospital having missed out on the first one. Breckland Council would support the formal application and residents and councils could help by lobbying officials.

In his capacity on the Breckland Youth Advisory board, Councillor Wilkinson held a successful online conference with eminent speakers from the University of York which went down very well.

186/20 COUNCILLOR CALL FOR ACTION (STANDING ITEM)

Councillor Birt explained Flagship had recently been a victim of a cyber-security attack and tenants had been in contact with him as they were not clear of what was happening and whether it would cause future financial issues. Although Flagship had provided a holding response, he

Action By

felt that it was important the Overview and Scrutiny Commission ask them to attend and respond to questions in more detail as more information was needed for residents.

Councillor Wickerson also raised concern stating that some residents had received letters from Flagship. Whilst Flagship had stated they would make a further statement he felt the Overview and Scrutiny Commission should respond and be in a position to reassure residents and tenants of any risk involved.

The Chairman proposed to invite Flagship to the January meeting to address the questions raised to which Members were in agreement. The holding response received so far would also be appended as an item in the January meeting.

187/20 WORK PROGRAMME

Councillor Kiddle-Morris noted that the Housing Service Review should have been an item on the agenda and asked when it would be re-scheduled. The Executive Member for Health and Housing apologised for the delay and felt it was appropriate to delay the report until absolutely ready. She had been concerned about the implications of the pandemic on the Housing review and felt the major rush for housing was yet to come where residents would need support and with that in mind suggested it should be delayed to the next meeting. The request was supported by Councillor Wilkinson who said some properties were delayed in being ready for residents due to Covid restrictions.

Councillor Kiddle-Morris suggested that the January meeting would be lengthy with the items currently proposed for the work programme and in addition a Councillor Call for Action. He suggested moving the Banham Poultry item. The Chairman was in agreement to move the item to the March agenda.

In addition, the previous request from Councillor Morton for a report on the current usage of electric car charging points installed across the Breckland Council area should be added.

188/20 NEXT MEETING

The arrangements for the next meeting scheduled for Thursday 14 January 2021 at 10.00am were noted.

The meeting closed at 1.15 pm

CHAIRMAN