

Scrutiny Committee

Agenda

Members of the Scrutiny Committee:

Cllr G Minshull (Chairman)
Cllr B Bernard
Cllr J Hornby
Cllr R Savage
Cllr J Wilby

Cllr V Clifford-Jackson (Vice Chairman)
Cllr B Duffin
Cllr J Rowe
Cllr T Spruce

Date & Time:

Wednesday 31 March 2021
9.30am

Place:

To be hosted remotely at: South Norfolk House, Cygnet Court, Long Stratton, Norwich, NR15 2XE

Contact:

Jessica Hammond tel (01508) 533706
Email: democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk
Website: www.south-norfolk.gov.uk

PUBLIC ATTENDANCE:

This meeting will be live streamed for public viewing via the following link:

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCZciRgwo84-iPyRImsTCIng>

If a member of the public would like to attend to speak on an agenda item, please email your request to democracy@s-norfolk.gov.uk, no later than 5.00pm on Monday 29 March 2021.

Large print version can be made available

If you have any special requirements in order to attend this meeting, please let us know in advance.

AGENDA

1. **To report apologies for absence and to identify substitute members;**
2. **Any items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency pursuant to section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act, 1972.** Urgent business may only be taken if, “by reason of special circumstances” (which will be recorded in the minutes), the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion that the item should be considered as a matter of urgency;
3. **To receive Declarations of Interest from Members;**
(Please see guidance form and flow chart attached – page 4)
4. **Minutes from the meetings of the Scrutiny Committee held on 27 January 2021 and 11 February 2021;**
(attached at page 6)
5. **Briefing Report on how the planning system assesses flooding issues**
(report attached – page 18)
6. **Annual review of the Scrutiny Committee 2020/21**
(report attached – page 36)
7. **Scrutiny Work Programme, Tracker and Cabinet Core Agenda;**
(attached – page 48)

Working Style of the Scrutiny Committee and a protocol for those attending

Independence

Members of the Scrutiny Committee will not be subject to whipping arrangements by party groups.

Member leadership

Members of the Committee will take the lead in selecting topics for and in questioning witnesses. The Committee will expect members of Cabinet, rather than officers, to take the main responsibility for answering the Committee's questions about topics, which relate mainly to the Council's activities.

A constructive atmosphere

Meetings of the Committee will be constructive, and not judgmental, accepting that effective overview and scrutiny is best achieved through challenging and constructive enquiry. People giving evidence at the Committee should not feel under attack.

Respect and trust

Meetings will be conducted in a spirit of mutual respect and trust.

Openness and transparency

The Committee's business will be open and transparent, except where there are sound reasons for protecting confidentiality. In particular, the minutes of the Committee's meetings will explain the discussion and debate, so that it could be understood by those who were not present.

Consensus

Members of the Committee will work together and, while recognising political allegiances, will attempt to achieve consensus and agreed recommendations.

Impartial and independent officer advice

Officers who advise and support the Committee will give impartial and independent advice, recognising the importance of the Scrutiny Committee in the Council's arrangements for governance, as set out in the Constitution.

Regular review

There will be regular reviews of how the overview and scrutiny process is working, and a willingness to change if it is not working well.

Programming and planning

The Scrutiny Committee will have a programme of work. Members will agree the topics to be included in the work programme, the extent of the investigation to be undertaken in relation to resources, and the witnesses to be invited to give evidence.

Managing time

The Committee will attempt to conclude the business of each meeting in reasonable time. The order of business will be arranged as far as possible to minimise the demands on the time of witnesses.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AT MEETINGS

When declaring an interest at a meeting Members are asked to indicate whether their interest in the matter is pecuniary, or if the matter relates to, or affects a pecuniary interest they have, or if it is another type of interest. Members are required to identify the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates. In the case of other interests, the member may speak and vote. If it is a pecuniary interest, the member must withdraw from the meeting when it is discussed. If it affects or relates to a pecuniary interest the member has, they have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public but must then withdraw from the meeting. Members are also requested when appropriate to make any declarations under the Code of Practice on Planning and Judicial matters.

<p>Have you declared the interest in the register of interests as a pecuniary interest? If Yes, you will need to withdraw from the room when it is discussed.</p>
<p>Does the interest directly:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. affect yours, or your spouse / partner's financial position? 2. relate to the determining of any approval, consent, licence, permission or registration in relation to you or your spouse / partner? 3. Relate to a contract you, or your spouse / partner have with the Council 4. Affect land you or your spouse / partner own 5. Affect a company that you or your partner own, or have a shareholding in <p>If the answer is "yes" to any of the above, it is likely to be pecuniary.</p> <p>Please refer to the guidance given on declaring pecuniary interests in the register of interest forms. If you have a pecuniary interest, you will need to inform the meeting and then withdraw from the room when it is discussed. If it has not been previously declared, you will also need to notify the Monitoring Officer within 28 days.</p>
<p>Does the interest indirectly affect or relate any pecuniary interest you have already declared, or an interest you have identified at 1-5 above?</p> <p>If yes, you need to inform the meeting. When it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but you should not partake in general discussion or vote.</p>
<p>Is the interest not related to any of the above? If so, it is likely to be an other interest. You will need to declare the interest, but may participate in discussion and voting on the item.</p>
<p>Have you made any statements or undertaken any actions that would indicate that you have a closed mind on a matter under discussion? If so, you may be predetermined on the issue; you will need to inform the meeting, and when it is discussed, you will have the right to make representations to the meeting as a member of the public, but must then withdraw from the meeting.</p>

**FOR GUIDANCE REFER TO THE FLOWCHART OVERLEAF.
PLEASE REFER ANY QUERIES TO THE MONITORING OFFICER IN THE FIRST
INSTANCE**

DECLARING INTERESTS FLOWCHART – QUESTIONS TO ASK YOURSELF



Agenda Item: 4

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a remote meeting of the Scrutiny Committee of South Norfolk District Council, held on Wednesday 27 January 2021 at 9.30am.

Committee Members Present: Councillors: G Minshull, V Clifford-Jackson, B Bernard, B Duffin, J Hornby, J Rowe, R Savage and J Wilby

Cabinet Member Present: Councillor: J Fuller

Other Members in Attendance: Councillors: D Bills, M Dewsbury, J Easter, M Edney, G Francis, J Halls, K Kiddie, N Legg, L Neal, J Overton and V Thomson

Officers in Attendance: The Assistant Director of Regulatory (N Howard), the Assistant Director of Planning (H Mellors), the Assistant Director of Individuals and Families (M Pursehouse), the PR Manager (J Pyle), the Emergency Planning Officers (J Bloomfield & S Faraday-Drake) and the Senior Governance Officer (E Goddard)

Also in Attendance: Mr N De Spon (from Ashwellthorpe Parish Council)

1278 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Regarding the Briefing Report on the recent flooding (minute 1280), Cllrs V Clifford-Jackson, B Duffin, J Halls, J Hornby and G Minshull declared that they had been lobbied by residents.

Cllr V Thomson declared an “other” interest as the Chairman of the Development Management Committee.

Cllr J Fuller declared an “other” interest as the Leader of the Council and a Cabinet Member.

1279 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held on 21 December 2020 were agreed as a correct record.

1280 BRIEFING REPORT ON RECENT FLOODING IN SOUTH NORFOLK

The Chairman advised the Committee that it was required to consider the Council's response to the recent flooding and its responsibilities going forward. He explained that a separate Scrutiny Committee meeting would be held to consider the planning considerations regarding flooding prevention.

Members noted that Norfolk County Council, as the Lead Local Flood Authority, was convening a series of meetings with strategic partners across Norfolk, to conduct a wider investigation into the recent flooding.

The Portfolio Holder, Cllr J Fuller, introduced the report which provided background and briefing information to assist the Committee with its initial considerations. He relayed a number of residents' experiences of the recent flooding, and he stressed the importance of determining what the Council could have done better. He thanked members and officers for their quick and effective response to the recent emergency situation.

The Assistant Director of Regulatory and the Assistant Director of Individuals and Families presented a verbal briefing to the Committee, which included:

- Definitions of the three types of flooding
 - Coastal/tide flooding
 - River flooding
 - Surface water flooding
- An outline of the different authorities and agencies (including South Norfolk Council) involved in the prevention of, and response to flooding
- An outline of the flooding incidents seen across South Norfolk between 23 December 2020 to January 2021
- Figures on:
 - Fire and rescue service calls per hour between 23-24 December 2020
 - The number and types of flooding incidents attended between 23-26 December 2020
 - Parishes within the South Norfolk District with 5 or more properties flooded
- Estimates on the number of properties impacted by flooding in the South Norfolk District
- South Norfolk Council's emergency incident response, including suggestions on improvements that could be made going forward
- Summary of the sandbag situation at South Norfolk Council

- Summary of the help and support provided by South Norfolk Council

Mr De Spon, on behalf of Ashwellthorpe Parish Council, outlined some of the flooding issues, experienced by some of the residents of Ashwellthorpe, which highlighted ongoing issues with insufficient culverts, ditches not being maintained and an inadequate pumping station.

The Chairman thanked Mr De Spon for his contributions and suggested that he email him with further details of the issues raised, so that he could forward them on to Norfolk County Council.

During a discussion on the causes of the recent flooding, members felt strongly that the lack of maintenance of ditches and culverts by landowners and / or the County Council / Environment Agency, significantly increased the risk of flood, and that the maintenance of these areas would have resolved some, if not all of the flooding risks.

Members noted that councils and the Environment Agency had provided flood warnings and had requested that maintenance work be carried out. Officers explained that the Council did not have any legislative powers to force landowners to carry out riparian work or maintain/clear ditches and culverts, and that they could only contact landowners to make them aware of their responsibilities. Members noted that the Council had previously carried out some maintenance works on areas most at risk of flooding at its own cost, but officers stressed that the Council had no powers to fine people, re-charge for work or carry out work without a landowner's permission.

Members put forward the suggestion for the appointment of an Environmental Protection Officer who would investigate maintenance issues, such as blocked ditches and culverts and contact landowners as part of their role. It was noted that Broadland District Council had an out-of-hours environmental health scheme in place for receiving calls or reports of incidents which could be investigated further, however the Assistant Director of Regulatory stressed that this was a very different role to the one being proposed.

In response to a query, the Emergency Planning Officer advised members that South Norfolk Council worked with neighboring authorities, as part of the Multi-agency Co-ordination group response to incidents, such as the recent flooding. Members noted that there had been no requirement for the Managing Director to convene the Council's Emergency Committee, as the flooding was handled by the local coordination group of agencies.

Members commented on the importance of officers providing members with live updates as incidents progressed, which would enable them to give relevant advice to local residents.

Some members stressed that extremes of weather were becoming more common and whilst work on the prevention of flooding was vitally important, there was also a need to address climate change.

The Chairman referred to previous workshops provided by the Council to support town and parish councils to devise or update their local emergency response plans and resilience response groups. It was proposed that these workshops be repeated, and this suggestion was supported by the members of the Committee.

In response to a query, the Assistant Director of Regulatory advised the Committee that there was a Tactical Flooding Response Plan in place across the county, and that no shortfall had been found in the current Plan. He informed members that an item had been added into the Council's 2021/22 Delivery Plan, to promote and seek the expansion of current emergency plans.

One member raised concerns that the public were not aware of key flood related information, and the Committee agreed that officers should produce an article for the Council's Link Magazine, providing a range of key information and advice regarding flooding.

Discussion turned to sandbags, and it was noted that these were often thought as, as the main prevention tool for flooding. Members were advised that sandbags were only useful to divert running water away from properties or to slow down the flow of water, and it was explained that that sandbags had been in some cases a misleading solution to flooding. It was also noted that sandbags deteriorated under UV light and could not be easily stored long term. Members were advised that not all councils provided sandbags to residents; some chose instead to encourage residents to obtain sandbags themselves.

After further discussion, the Committee agreed that sandbags should be provided to residents when needed, but that the Council should be able to control distribution. It was suggested that the Council's sandbag policy be reviewed and that alternative methods of flood defenses be researched.

The Committee expressed its gratitude to the officers, emergency services and volunteers involved in the response to the recent flooding and it was,

RESOLVED

1. To note the contents of the report;
2. To request that officers prepare a report focussing on the planning considerations regarding flood prevention in respect of the consideration of planning applications, to be presented to the Committee on 31 March 2021; and
3. To recommend that:

- a. Officers prepare an article for the Link Magazine providing the public with information on flooding support and Floodline.
- b. Officers consider the appointment of Environmental Protection Officer(s) and/or Emergency Incident Officer(s) to provide a response on-site in the event of an emergency situation (including flooding) or an out of hours community protection complaint (eg, noise). Consideration also to be given whether these officers could assist with ensuring that work to ditches etc is completed by landowners with riparian rights.
- c. The Council provides training workshops to Town and Parish Councils to support them to devise or update their local emergency response plans and resilience response groups.
- d. Officers review the Council's policy regarding the provision of sandbags across the District and research alternative methods of flood defense.

1281 SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME AND CABINET CORE AGENDA

The Committee noted the Work Programme and Cabinet Core Agenda.

The Chairman confirmed to Members that a report focussing on the planning considerations regarding flood prevention would be brought to the Committee at its meeting on 31 March 2021.

(The meeting concluded at 11.28 am)

Chairman

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a remote meeting of the Scrutiny Committee of South Norfolk District Council held on Thursday 11 February 2021 at 9.30am.

Committee Members Present:	Councillors: G Minshull (Chairman), B Bernard, V Clifford-Jackson, B Duffin, J Hornby, J Rowe, R Savage and T Spruce
Apologies for Absence:	Councillor: J Wilby
Substitute:	Councillor: M Wilby
Cabinet Member Present:	Councillor: J Worley
Other Members in Attendance:	Councillors: D Bills and T Laidlaw
Officers in Attendance:	The Director of Resources (D Lorimer), the Assistant Director of Finance(R Fincham), Chief of Staff (H Ralph), Senior Finance Business Partner (M Bussens) Capital Accountant (H Craske), Senior Governance Officer (E Goddard) and the Civic Officer.

1282 2021/22 BUDGET

(a) Capital Budget Strategy and Capital Programme 2021/22 to 2025/26

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources introduced the report, which he described as an ambitious and enthusiastic five year capital programme totalling £52.4m.

The Programme included funding for improvements to the Leisure Centres, £6.5m for the Waste Depot, £900,000 for Disabled Facilities Grants (funded by Government grant) and £429,000 for Town Centre Improvements in Harleston (financed using grant money from the Norfolk Strategic Fund). The investment in ICT infrastructure would also represent a large portion of the Capital Programme and was being carried out in collaboration with Broadland

District Council. Big Sky Developments, would require funding of £7.45m in 2021/22 and would be repaying loans from the Council by 2024 of £21m.

The Capital Programme would be financed by £10m from reserves, £20m in capital receipts, £5m in Government grant and £15m would be borrowed, both internally and externally.

The Assistant Director Finance asked members to note that the report consisted of two elements; the Capital Strategy and the proposed Capital Programme for 2021/22 to 2025/26.

Members raised a number of queries and in response were advised the following:

- The expenditure on leisure facilities would be prioritised on the level of urgency for the work to be done. These would be assessed on a case by case basis. Appendix B of the report listed the work to be undertaken, but they would remain under review during the pandemic.
- The £7.45m loan to Big Sky Developments in 2021/22 was mainly to cover construction costs. Member were asked to note that most development companies borrowed to fund construction and that this borrowing resulted in a better investment return than the Council could achieve elsewhere.
- If the Council was to borrow to fund the Capital Programme it would be at a fixed rate to ensure that it was protected from interest increases.
- The 2021/22 waste depot refurbishment/replacement budget of £2.5m would be funded from the recently established earmarked reserve. This provisional scheme might take a number of years to come to fruition depending on whether a refurbishment or replacement option was the preferred way forward.

A member noted that there had been significant underspends against the capital budget in previous years and he suggested that this threatened the credibility of the Capital Programme. A significant example of this was Big Sky Developments, which had large underspends on its budget over a number of years. He asked if members considered that the company was delivering, both the much needed housing in the District and the return on investment required by the Council? He suggested that if the return on investment had been achieved it could have negated the need to increase Council Tax by £5.

He also suggested that the Capital Programme should reflect the aspirations set out in the Delivery Plan and that this should be monitored on a regular basis by the newly created Commercial, Trading, and Customer Focus Policy Committee to ensure that it remained on course.

In response, the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources advised the meeting that the Portfolio Holder for Governance and Efficiency and the

Portfolio Holder for Customer Focus had recently been appointed as non-executive directors to the Board of Big Sky Developments and would be available to update members on non-confidential progress with projects being undertaken.

In respect of the suggestion that the £5 increase in Council Tax could be covered by other funding sources Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources asked the Committee to note the funding gap in the Medium Term Financial Plan and emphasised that now was the time to invest in the local economy through Big Sky Developments, to address homelessness and hardship at a time of national crisis. It was also noted that the Government had consulted on allowing a £10 rise in Council Tax, but it had been decided that the Council would not make such an increase.

The Director of Resources added that a number of projects were listed as provisional in the Capital Programme, as they were long term projects that required working with partners and so were not always in the gift of the Council to deliver according to a timetable.

A member noted that working with partners on such large and complex projects as the Norwich Research Park and the Long Stratton bypass, inevitably led to slippages in their completion.

Voting was carried out by way of a roll call and with 8 in favour and 1 against, it was agreed:

TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL approval of

- a) the Capital Strategy (Appendix A of the report); and
- b) the Capital Programme for 2021/22-2025/26 (Appendix B of the report).

(b) Revenue Budget and Council Tax 2021/22

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources introduced the report and highlighted the main issues to note in the Revenue Budget.

The net budget requirement for the 2021/22 was £15.503m. Although staffing had been mostly static or reduced there were a few areas where numbers had increased although, this had generally been at no additional cost to the Council. For example, all Community Connectors were funded by Primary Care Networks (NHS) and an additional District Direct officer was being funded by Adult Social Care.

There was an anticipated year end favourable variance of £2.1m against the current budget.

The revenue budget took account of Covid-19, which would have a long lasting impact on residents, businesses and the Council's operations. For

2021/22 the budget included provision for £794,000 of additional expenditure to respond to the pandemic. This was fully funded from Government grants.

There was also a new one-off Lower Tier Services Grant of £447,000 that had been introduced by the Government in response to the current exceptional circumstances.

The Council was drawing up a recovery plan for leisure services as it was recognised that the public benefit that leisure provided would be an important part of the Council's support to enable a healthy recovery from the pandemic.

The report proposed that South Norfolk increased its Council Tax for a Band D property from £155.00 to £160.00 for 2021/22. This equated to a 3.23 percent rise.

The Committee was also asked to note that it was proposed to increase most discretionary fees and charges in line with inflation, based on the September RPI figure of 1.1 percent.

In response to number of queries, the Committee was advised the following:

- The budget was built on a number of assumptions about the level of Government funding, the New Homes Bonus and the outcome of the Fair Funding amongst a number of others. There were, therefore, too many variables to estimate confidently when the funding gap in the Medium-Term Financial Plan would be closed.
- The Government would no longer allow local authorities to borrow from the Public Works Loan Board to support the acquisition of assets primarily for yield. However, the Council invested to deliver economic and other community benefits (rather than primarily for yield). Furthermore the Council had a number of other sources of borrowing available to it, including the Municipal Bonds Agency.

The Assistant Director for Finance advised the meeting that officers were working to improve and develop the budget papers each year. For example, the revenue budget papers for 2020/21 now showed the main changes to the base budget. If required the last full year actuals could be added for next year. However, there was a balance to be struck between providing enough information to allow members to review the budgets and providing so much information that the key messages were lost.

Unfortunately, the current year Quarter 3 performance report, which was usually on the same agenda as the budget papers and provided performance monitoring information in respect of calendarised budgets (and estimated outturn figures), had not been available for the February Cabinet.

In response to several queries, the Committee was informed that:

- They would be provided with an estimate of the savings that had been

made by the reduction in members' expenses during the pandemic, following the meeting.

- The delays to some scheduled audits were due to pressures both within the Council and with the auditors during these unprecedented times. Work was ongoing to ensure that as much as possible was done to mitigate these delays.
- It was acknowledged that the response to the budget consultation was low, with only 23 respondents. It would be investigated to determine if data protection laws would allow the Council to use email addresses of residents held for other purposes to be used for an electronic survey to increase the consultation response next year.

Voting was carried out by way of a roll call and it was unanimously agreed:

TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL

- a) The approval of the base budget; subject to confirmation of the finalised Local Government Finance Settlement figures which may necessitate an adjustment through the General Revenue Reserve to maintain a balanced budget. Authority to make any such change to be delegated to the Assistant Director of Finance;
- b) The use of the revenue reserves as set out in Appendix E of the report;
- c) That the Council's demand on the Collection Fund for 2021/22 for General Expenditure shall be £8,037,280 and for Special Expenditure shall be £7,192;
- d) That the Band D level of Council Tax be £160.00 for General Expenditure and £0.14 for Special Expenditure.

(c) Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2021/22

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources introduced the report, which set out how the Council managed its borrowing, investments and cash flows.

The Council had £33.5m in treasury investments and £24m invested in loans to wholly owned Council companies. The anticipated return on investments in 2021/22 was £56,300.

Members' attention was drawn to the criteria for Council investments, which set out money and time limits on where the Council made its investments and the institutions they were made with.

The Council had set a prudential limit of £30m on its borrowing, so the £15.5m that the Council was proposing to borrow over the medium term was well within the limit and affordable.

The Assistant Director Finance added that although the Council would have permission to borrow, it would only do so when there was certainty that it would need to.

Cllr V Clifford-Jackson in the Chair.

A member drew attention to the list of approved countries for investment and suggested that in the light of the recent unrest in Hong Kong it should be removed from the list.

In response to a query about the operational boundary for external debt, the Assistant Director Finance advised the meeting that this was a limit beyond which borrowing was not normally expected to exceed. To go any higher than this figure would require the formal agreement of Council. The operational boundary for 2021/22 was £35m and the authorised limit £40m. However, it was expected that any borrowing would be far below this figure, as it would only be reached if all of the projects on the Capital Programme came to fruition during this period, which was very unlikely.

In answer to a query, the Director for Resources confirmed that the Council would be under borrowing 2021/22, as it would be using its cash (internal borrowing), instead of incurring external debt.

In response to a question in respect of the maturity structure of borrowing, the Assistant Director Finance explained that this required the Council to have no more than 50 percent of its borrowing due for repayment in under 12 months. This was to ensure a range of maturities, so any refinancing required was spread out over a longer period of time. This indicator was more relevant to councils with a large borrowing portfolio than to South Norfolk, which was currently debt free.

Voting was conducted by way of a roll call and it was unanimously agreed:

TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL:

- a) The Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2021/22;
- b) The Treasury management Policy Statement 2021/22 (Appendix 1 of the report);
- c) The Annual Investment Strategy 2021/22 (Appendix 2 of the report);
- d) The Treasury Management Practice (TMP1) (Appendix 3 of the report);
- e) The Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation (Appendix 4 of the report);
- f) The Prudential Indicators (Appendix 5 of the report);
- g) The Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement (Appendix 6 of the

report)

A vote was also conducted on the proposal to remove Hong Kong from the list of approved countries for investment and with 7 for and 1 abstention it was agreed:

TO RECOMMEND TO COUNCIL

That Hong Kong be removed from the list of approved countries for investment in the Treasury Management Practice (TMP1) document (Appendix 3 of the report)

1283 SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME AND CABINET CORE AGENDA

The Chairman noted the Development Management Flooding item that was on the agenda for the 31 March 2021 meeting of the Scrutiny Committee. She advised the meeting that Lord Dannatt was currently chairing an inquiry into flooding at the County Council and it was hoped that any findings made available from this could be fed into the 31 March meeting, so that members could explore what was being done for the prevention of flooding.

(The meeting concluded at 11.00 am)

Chairman

BRIEFING REPORT ON HOW THE PLANNING SYSTEM ASSESSES FLOODING ISSUES

Report Author(s): Helen Mellors
Assistant Director Planning
01508 533789
hmellors@s-norfolk.gov.uk

Tracy Lincoln
Development Manager
01508 533814
tlincoln@s-norfolk.gov.uk

Portfolio: Stronger Economy

Ward(s) Affected: All wards

Purpose of the Report:

Cabinet on 11th January 2021 requested that the Scrutiny Committee consider the recent flooding across the District during the end of December 2020. This report follows a previous briefing on the flood incidents and gives an overview on how the planning system assesses flooding issues and will cover:

- how planning policy is formulated
- how decisions are made in the development management process, including how we engage with statutory consultees
- how we ensure compliance with a planning permission.

Recommendations:

1. To note the contents of the report.
2. Consider whether the additional measures set out should be employed.

1. Summary

- 1.1 Development is strategically directed to areas of lowest probability of flooding in accordance with national guidance.
- 1.2 Flood risk and drainage is further considered in detail at a site specific level for any submitted planning application following national and local policy, non-statutory technical guidance and input from statutory consultees responsible for flooding and drainage. This requires the development to ensure it does not increase risk of flooding elsewhere but has no requirement for a development to address existing flooding in the locality.
- 1.3 The role of the Lead Local Flood Authority as statutory consultee could be strengthened to provide bespoke comments on all their statutory requirements rather than relying on standing advice. South Norfolk Council and Broadland councils employ a Water Management Officer and most of this post's capacity is taken up reactively commenting on planning applications. About 5% of the role's capacity is available typically to provide local engagement, advice and support work to existing residents and businesses in areas of local flooding concern. Since the local flooding in December 2020, advice and support work has been prioritised and, inevitably, this has impacted on capacity to comment on planning applications.
- 1.4 A series of measures are identified in the report, where, within the scope of the planning legislation, the Council could strengthen its position in respect of assurance drainage schemes are delivered in accordance with scheme design and performance and management and maintenance

2. Current position/findings

How planning policy is formulated

- 2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) covers planning and flood risk (paragraphs 155-165) within section 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change. It makes it very clear that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). It doesn't however rule out development but states where it is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- 2.2 Strategic policies should be informed by a strategic flood risk assessment (SFRA) to guide where development should be allocated. This was carried out for the Joint Core Strategy (JCS) and informed the current allocations. A new SFRA has been commissioned for the new Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) which is at Regulation 19 stage at present. A SFRA will direct development away from areas as higher risk, which is those flood risk areas in zones 2 and 3 on the Environment Agency flood maps.

- 2.3 Strategic policies should then be informed by that risk assessment and should manage flood risk from all sources. They need to assess cumulative impacts in, or affecting, local areas susceptible to flooding, and take account of advice from the Environment Agency (EA) and other relevant flood risk management authorities, such as the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and internal drainage boards.
- 2.4 All plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development taking into account the current and future impacts of climate change – so as to avoid, where possible, flood risk to people and property. The aim of the sequential test is to steer development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding.
- 2.5 When an application is submitted it is then considered in accordance with not only its strategic policies but Development Management policies. These policies will indicate when a local flood risk assessment and sequential test is submitted to assess the direct impacts of the development.

How applications are determined in relation to flood risk and drainage

- 2.6 The role of the Local Planning Authority (LPA) is to determine planning applications in accordance with national policy, the development plan, relevant guidance and taking into account advice from statutory consultees (Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) or the Environment Agency (EA) where relevant) in addition to any other planning material considerations.
- 2.7 For the purpose of determining planning applications there are two areas that need to be considered. 1. The Flood Risk, which is defined by classification into Flood Zones by the Environment Agency; and 2. How sites accommodate their surface water drainage without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- 2.8 Paragraph 163 and 165 of the NPPF set out the key requirements LPAs must have regard to when considering flood risk and drainage in planning applications. When determining planning applications, LPAs should for all types of development:
- Ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere.
 - Only consider development appropriate in areas at risk of flooding where it can be demonstrated that within the site;
 - the most vulnerable development is located in areas of lowest flood risk,
 - development is appropriately flood resilient and resistant,
 - it incorporates Sustainable Urban Drainage Scheme (SuDS) (which is a surface water drainage scheme developed in line with ideals of sustainable development. It is a scheme that takes into account water quantity (flooding), water quality (pollution), amenity and biodiversity issues which are collectively referred to as sustainable drainage)
 - that any residual risk can be safely managed,
 - safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate as part of an agreed emergency plan.

2.9 Footnote 50 of the NPPF states that a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) is required for

- all development in Flood Zones 2 and 3
- development in Flood Zone 1 where the proposal is 1 hectare or greater
- land has been identified by the EA as having critical drainage problems
- land has been identified within any Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) that may be at increased risk of flooding in the future
- or land that is subject to other sources of flooding where development would introduce a more vulnerable land use

Attached as Appendix 1 is the guidance taken from the National Planning Practice detailing what needs to be submitted with a FRA and what should be considered.

2.10 In respect of applications submitted in areas at risk of flooding (Flood Zones 2 and 3, or Flood Zone 1 where the Environment Agency has notified the LPA as having a critical drainage problem) or for sites of 1 hectare or more, developers must undertake a site specific flood risk assessment to accompany applications for planning permission. This includes a requirement to carry out a sequential test (and exceptions test where necessary) which directs development to the lowest probability of flooding unless there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zone 1. Where development is necessary, there is a requirement to make it safe without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

2.11 In respect of addressing drainage from new development and ensuring it does not increase risk of flooding elsewhere, the general principles that are required to be achieved are:

- Development proposals are required to demonstrate how they address their drainage requirements without increasing flood risk elsewhere.
- Developments are acceptable where the run off rate from the site does not exceed existing greenfield run off rate.
- New development schemes are not required to address existing flooding issues in the locality.
- Drainage schemes are not required to be designed to eliminate all flooding from all rainfall events.
- When designing SuDs in developments generally the aim should be to discharge surface run off as high up the following hierarchy of drainage options as reasonably practicable i.e. infiltration, to a surface water body, then to sewer.
- Proposals are required to demonstrate how the drainage system is to be managed and maintained

2.12 The LPA consults relevant consultees including statutory consultees (further details of the statutory consultees set out in the section below) to inform the technical advice in respect of the flood risk and drainage of the proposal. This is taken into account when considering the proposal against national and local planning policies and technical guidance. Where development falls below the

statutory thresholds, the Council will utilise standing advice for officers to assess and consider the drainage and flood risk of schemes.

- 2.13 It should be noted, and as set out in the briefing report on recent flooding in south Norfolk reported to Scrutiny on 27th January 2021, the existing surface water drainage network across South Norfolk involve complex networks of run-off and capture systems, pipes, drains and outfalls – some dating from Victorian times. These loose interconnecting arrangements were rarely designed to cope with the most exceptional rainfall events. New developments cannot address the existing network, they must however ensure that the runoff rate from the site is no greater than existing greenfield rates. Management of existing ditch networks remain, i.e. in most part a riparian responsibility for the adjacent land owner of the ditch.
- 2.14 Decisions are made based on assessment of the drainage strategy for each application, following consultation and representations from the community and based on the requirements of planning policies and the technical guidance.
- 2.15 Permission would usually include a condition requiring the drainage scheme to be installed as per the agreed scheme, or where a more high level strategy is agreed on an outline application, require further detailed scheme to be agreed either at reserved matters stage or prior to the commencement of the development.

Engagement with Statutory consultees and their duties

- 2.16 The Environment Agency are the Statutory consultee for major planning applications in Flood Zones 2 or 3 or Flood Zone 1 where the Environment Agency has notified the LPA as having a critical drainage problem.
- 2.17 The Lead Local Flood Authority, a function of Norfolk County Council, are the statutory consultee for major applications with surface water drainage and this came in to force in April 2015, prior to this, the role being carried out by the Environment Agency.
- 2.18 A major application includes the following:
- The provision of dwelling houses where the number of dwelling houses to be provided is 10 or more; or the development is to be carried out on a site having an area of 0.5 hectares or more and it is not known whether the number of dwelling houses to be provided is 10 or more
 - The provision of a building or buildings where the floor space to be created by the development is 1,000 square metres or more
 - Development carried out on a site having an area of one hectare or more
- 2.19 Norfolk County Council Lead Local Flood Authority have set a higher internal threshold for bespoke comments (due to the need to ensure that the resources of the LLFA are focused where they can make the biggest contribution to mitigating and reducing local flood risk). A copy of the current document can be found at <https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/-/media/norfolk/downloads/rubbish-recycling-planning/flood-and-water-management/guidance-on-norfolk-county-councils-lead-local-flood-authority-role-as-statutory-consultee-to-planning.pdf>, although note that the LLFA are currently updating the document due to be published in Spring 2021.

2.20 The LLFA thresholds for bespoke comments are:

- Residential developments with greater than or equal to 100 dwellings;
- All development with an area greater than or equal to 2 Hectares;
- Any major development applications that have a local flood risk and are on an obvious flow route or include extensive surface water or fluvial flooding on the site. Significant ponding of surface water over a large proportion of the site boundary also falls within this category.
- Sites adjacent to, or within, areas with records of local flooding (as evidenced and provided by the LLFA).

2.21 Any application that doesn't meet this internal LLFA threshold but where the LLFA are a statutory consultee, the LLFA provide standing advice only to assist the LPA in determining the application.

2.22 It would benefit the LPA if the LLFA were to provide bespoke comments on all major applications rather than directing the authority to standing advice.

2.23 Other relevant consultees are Anglian Water where a connection with a public sewer is proposed, or where it is proposed for Anglian water to adopt SuDs; The Environment Agency, if the drainage system directly or indirectly involves the discharge of water into a watercourse; the highway authority for an affected road; the internal drainage board, if the drainage system may directly or indirectly involve the discharge of water into an ordinary watercourse.

How the LPA uses standing advice

2.24 The Local Planning authority utilises standing advice from the LLFA applied by experienced officers with a working knowledge through dealing with complex drainage matters.

2.25 The council, together with Broadland, has a part time Water Management Officer (20 hours per week) who has extensive local knowledge and experience, and who comments on minor planning applications (less than 10 dwellings or minor commercial). This is a role not found in other district councils in Norfolk. The Water Management Officer spends around 95% of their available time commenting on flooding implications of planning applications.

2.26 The use of standing advice for major applications is not ideal and there would be benefits of the LLFA providing bespoke comments for their statutory duties.

How we ensure compliance with a planning permission

2.27 Conditions attached to any permission as advised by statutory consultees will generally be either: "to carry out the development as per the approved scheme" or for further details to be submitted and agreed. When the latter then further "agreement will be sought by the statutory consultee". A condition placed on a permission should be considered in light of paragraph 55 of the NNPF which states they should be necessary; relevant to planning and; to the development permitted; enforceable and; reasonable in all other respects.

- 2.28 The developer is then expected to carry out the development in accordance with approved details. There is no further inspection carried out by officers to ensure the approved details have been technically carried out by the developer on the ground. This is the case for all permissions. There are requirements for Building Control whether performed by a Local Authority Building Control body (LABC) or an Approved Inspector (AI) to check that certain elements of a building project works comply with the Building Regulations. It is the responsibility of the builder/applicant to request an inspection at the appropriate time. Generally, surface and foul water draining systems will be inspected by a LABC or an AI where the system falls within the boundary of the project. In addition, soakaway arrangements will be required to meet a performance level demonstrated by a percolation test. Where a drainage system is situated in the highway, below a public footpath or forms part of an adoptable sewer, these will be inspected by Anglian Water. If a SuDS has been implemented then this will be checked by the LABC body or AI, unless it is wholly situated in the 'highway'.
- 2.29 The Highway Authority have responsibility to ensure adopted roads, as part of any scheme are adequately drained.
- 2.30 Where foul and surface water systems are to be adopted by Anglian Water they require an approvals process with the developer to ensure the scheme is designed and delivered to an adoptable standard. There is now the ability for Anglian Water to adopt SuDS features (beyond the traditional piped system), however we are not aware that this has been widely taken up by developers and could be improved and encouraged more at the pre-application stage by the LPA. This would have the benefit of putting management and maintenance to Anglian Water.
- 2.31 When a breach of planning is reported then this is investigated in accordance with the Council's Enforcement Policy and advice from technical consultees will be sought to remedy the situation.
- 2.32 It is ultimately the developer's responsibility to ensure the permission is built out as per the approved plans. It is suggested that the Council could add further conditions to any permissions to have more assurance on the scheme being built out as per the agreed scheme, as follows:
- Confirmation from the contractor/developer that the scheme has been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme
 - With respect to any management plan, written confirmation that any maintenance requirements are carried out on an annual/timing basis.

Is the planning system working and suggested improvements?

- 2.33 It is considered that in general the planning system is working to address its statutory requirements. However, planning is only dealing with on site drainage and does not address shortfalls within the existing ditch networks. As outlined in this report drainage schemes are found to be acceptable by the LPA where they meet the requirements of the LLFA and the non-statutory technical guidance

including the greenfield run off rate. This also sets the relevant rainfall events that must be accommodated by the development and includes a requirement for climate change to be accounted for. Should Members consider that these nationally prescribed standards do not address the changing climate situation this could be a matter for lobbying government to change the design requirements.

- 2.34 As set out in respect of monitoring compliance, to add additional assurance that schemes are completed in accordance with the approved details, the Council could seek that all developers submit a verification report to demonstrate that the drainage has been installed and meets the design requirements in terms of performance. The role of the council's Water Management Officer could be expanded in the future, and the budgeted staffing hours increased, to provide:
- some capacity for mid-development compliance monitoring,
 - provide for more proactive local engagement in areas of local flooding concern
 - increase the staffing capacity to offer flooding advice and support to existing residents and businesses.
- 2.35 From experience of developments in the district, how sites are managed during construction, before the drainage scheme is fully implemented, can cause issues. Where sites constraints are such that this could result in potential flood risk issues, the Council has in these instances required interim measures during construction and could place more emphasis on this approach on a wider scale.
- 2.36 The success of well designed drainage schemes for new developments to a large degree relies on effective management and maintenance. We have had some instances where management of on-site surface water drainage features is not effective. A more prescriptive approach to management and maintenance of schemes could be taken to ensure that individual tasks, nature and frequency etc are listed.
- 2.37 It would benefit the LPA if the LLFA were to provide bespoke comments on all major applications rather than directing the authority to standing advice. It would also be beneficial to engage the developer with Anglia Water at the pre-application stage in respect of the adoption of SuDs to ensure they then take on and adopt.

3. Other options

- 3.1 No proposals or options are presented in this briefing report.

4. Issues and risks

- 4.1 This report offers background and context to support Scrutiny Committee's considerations in conjunction with other papers previously presented.
- 4.2 **Resource Implications** – this briefing report does not make any proposals or detail any issues or risks with specific resource implications.
- 4.3 **Legal Implications** – this briefing report does not make any proposals or detail any issues or risks with specific legal implications.

- 4.4 **Equality Implications** – this briefing report does not make any proposals raising equality implications.
- 4.5 **Environmental Impact** – this briefing report addresses environmental considerations but does not contain any proposals.
- 4.6 **Crime and Disorder** – no specific crime and disorder implications have been identified.
- 4.7 **Risks** – this briefing report does not in itself give rise to any specific risks.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1 That this report and the accompanying verbal briefing be noted.

6. Recommendations

For Scrutiny Committee to:

- 6.1 Note the contents of the report.
- 6.2 Consider whether the additional measures set out should be employed.

Background papers

None

Appendix 1

What is contained in a Flood Risk Assessment

Below are extracts from the National Planning Practice guidance including:

1. Guidance on what the LPA need to check in an assessment
2. Preparing a flood risk assessment: standing advice
3. Site-specific flood risk assessment: Checklist

1. What the Local Planning Authority need to check in an assessment

When reviewing flood risk assessments, you should look at:

- how flood risk affects the proposed development
- whether the [development type is inappropriate](#) for the proposed location
- whether the measures proposed will make the development safe throughout its lifetime
- whether the proposed development will be appropriately flood resistant and resilient
- whether the proposed development will increase flood risk elsewhere

Refer to [preparing a flood risk assessment: standing advice](#) to help you check whether:

- flood risk assessments contain all the information you need
- the applicant has followed the standing advice
- the applicant has met the extra flood resistance and resilience requirements where necessary

2. Guidance – from the planning practice Guidance - Preparing a flood risk assessment: standing advice

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-assessment-standing-advice#vulnerable-developments-standing-advice>

Local planning authorities should use this guide to check the:

- flood risk assessments they receive contain the correct information
- applicant has followed the standing advice

You need to follow [standing advice for vulnerable developments](#) (including change of use) with a [flood risk vulnerability classification](#) of:

- 'more vulnerable' in flood zone 2 (except for landfills, waste facility sites, caravan or camping sites)

- 'less vulnerable' in flood zone 2 (except for waste treatment sites, mineral processing sites, water treatment plants and sewage treatment plants)
- 'water compatible' in flood zone 2

Use the [advice for minor extensions](#) to complete an assessment for a minor extension in flood zone 2 or 3. A minor extension is a household or non-domestic extension with a floor space of no more than 250 square metres.

Find out [what flood zone your development is in](#) on the Environment Agency's flood map.

If your development is not covered by the standing advice in this guide:

- read [flood risk assessment for planning applications](#) and [flood risk assessment check-list](#)
- consider asking the Environment Agency for [pre-application advice on flood risk](#)

Research your development site

For all developments covered by standing advice, you should do the following research before starting your flood risk assessment:

- [contact the Environment Agency](#) for information about flood risk in your area
- contact your [local planning authority](#) through the planning portal or check its website for its strategic flood risk assessment
- check if your development is [within 20 metres \(m\) of a main river](#) on the Environment Agency's flood map

Check if you need to do a sequential test and exception test

Before you start a flood risk assessment, check if you need to carry out the [sequential test](#). The sequential test compares your proposed site with other available sites to show which one has the lowest flood risk. If the sequential test has been satisfied you need to check if the [exception test](#) also needs to be done.

What to include in your assessment

For all developments covered by this standing advice, your flood risk assessment should include:

- your site address
- a description of your development
- an assessment of the flood risk from all sources of flooding for your development, plus an [allowance for climate change](#)
- the estimated flood level for your development
- details of your flood resistance and resilience plans
- any supporting plans and drawings
- any information the relevant standing advice tells you to include

The estimated flood level is:

- a river flood level with a 1 in 100 or greater annual probability
- the tidal flood level with a 1 in 200 or greater annual probability
- plus an [allowance for climate change](#)

You may be able to get the estimated flood level from the Environment Agency or your local planning authority. If not, you'll need a flood risk specialist to calculate this for you.

Your written flood risk assessment can be in any format, but should include the relevant plans, surveys and assessments. Check with your local planning authority as it may use specific software, for example, for producing detailed hydraulic models.

Advice for minor extensions

You need to provide a plan showing the finished floor levels and the estimated flood levels.

Make sure the floor levels are either no lower than existing floor levels or 300 millimetres (mm) above the estimated flood level. If they are not, ask your local planning authority if you also need to consider [extra flood resistance and resilience measures](#).

State in your assessment all levels in relation to Ordnance Datum (the height above average sea level). You may be able to get this information from the [Ordnance Survey](#). If not, you'll need to get a land survey carried out by a qualified surveyor.

Your plans need to show how you're going to ensure the development is not flooded by surface water. An example of this could be to divert surface water away from the property or by using flood barriers.

If your minor extension is in an area with increased flood risk as a result of multiple minor extensions in the area, you need to include an assessment of the off-site flood risk. Check with your local planning authority if this applies to your development.

Make sure your flood resistance and resilience plans follow the guidance on [improving the flood performance of new buildings](#).

Standing advice for vulnerable developments

For all relevant vulnerable developments (for example, more vulnerable, less vulnerable and water compatible), you should follow the advice for:

- surface water management
- access and evacuation
- floor levels

Surface water management

Your plans for the management of surface water need to meet the requirements set out in either your local authority's:

- surface water management plan where available
- strategic flood risk assessment

They also need to meet the requirements of the approved building regulations [Part H: drainage and water disposal](#). [Read section H3 rainwater drainage](#).

You need to get [planning permission](#) to use a material that cannot absorb water (for example impermeable concrete) that is larger than 5 square metres in a front garden.

Access and evacuation

You need to provide details of your emergency escape plans for any parts of a building that are below the estimated flood level.

Make sure your plans show:

- single storey buildings or ground floors that do not have access to higher floors can access a space above the estimated flood level (for example higher ground nearby)
- basement rooms have clear internal access to an upper level (for example a staircase)
- occupants can leave the building if there's a flood and there's enough time for them to leave after [flood warnings](#)

Floor levels

You need to provide both the:

- average ground level of your building
- finished floor level of the lowest habitable room in your building

Ground floor levels should be a minimum of whichever is higher of:

- 300 millimetres (mm) above the general ground level of the site
- 600mm above the estimated river or sea flood level

State in your assessment all levels in relation to Ordnance Datum (also known as height above average sea level). You may be able to get this information from the [Ordnance Survey](#). If not, you'll need to get a land survey carried out by a qualified surveyor.

If you cannot raise floor levels above the estimated flood level, you need to consider [extra flood resistance and resilience measures](#).

Extra flood resistance and resilience measures

Follow the extra flood resistance and resilience requirements for developments in flood risk areas where ground floor levels are lower than the estimated flood level for the site.

Water depth up to 300mm

The design of the building or development should keep water out as much as possible. You should use materials that have low permeability (materials that water cannot pass through, for example, impermeable concrete).

Water depth from 300mm to 600mm

The design of the building or development should keep water out (unless there are structural concerns) by:

- using materials with low permeability to at least 300mm
- using flood resilient materials (for example lime plaster) and design (for example raised electrical sockets)
- making sure there's access to all spaces to enable drying and cleaning

Water depth above 600mm

The design of the building or development should allow water to pass through the property to avoid structural damage by:

- using materials with low permeability to at least 300mm
- making it easy for water to drain away after flooding
- making sure there's access to all spaces to enable drying and cleaning

Submit your flood risk assessment

Submit your completed flood risk assessment with your [planning application](#) to your [local planning authority](#).

The local planning authority will review your flood risk assessment and tell you if it's satisfactory. Planning applications that do not have a satisfactory flood risk assessment may be refused.

3. Site-specific flood risk assessment: Checklist

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-and-coastal-change#Site-Specific-Flood-Risk-Assessment-checklist-section>

1 - Development site and location

You can use this section to describe the site you are proposing to develop. It would be helpful to include, or make reference to, a location map which clearly indicates the development site.

- a. Where is the development site located? (eg postal address or national grid reference)
- b. What is the current use of the site? (eg undeveloped land, housing, shops, offices)
- c. Which Flood Zone (for river or sea flooding) is the site within? (ie Flood Zone 1, Flood Zone 2, Flood Zone 3). As a first step, you should check the [Flood Map for Planning](#) (Rivers and Sea). It is also a good idea to check the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the area available from the local planning authority.

2 - Development proposals

You can use this section to provide a general summary of the development proposals. It would be helpful to include, or make reference to, an existing block plan and a proposed block plan, where appropriate.

- a. What are the development proposal(s) for this site? Will this involve a change of use of the site and, if so, what will that change be?
- b. In terms of vulnerability to flooding, what is the vulnerability classification of the proposed development? See [Table 2](#) of this guidance for an explanation of the vulnerability classifications.

c. What is the expected or estimated lifetime of the proposed development likely to be? (eg less than 20 years, 20-50 years, 50-100 years?). See [paragraph 026](#) of this guidance for further advice on how to assess the lifetime of developments for flood risk and coastal change purposes. (It may also be advisable to seek advice from the local planning authority).

3 - Sequential test

For developments in flood zones 2 or 3 only. (If the development site is wholly within flood zone 1, you can skip this section and go to section 4).

You can use this section to describe how you have applied the sequential test (if needed as set out in [paragraph 158](#) of the National Planning Policy Framework) to the proposed development, and the evidence to demonstrate how the requirements of the test have been met. See [paragraph 033](#) of this guidance for further information. (You are advised to contact the local planning authority to confirm whether the sequential test should be applied and to ensure the appropriate level of information is provided).

a. What other locations with a lower risk of flooding have you considered for the proposed development?

b. If you have not considered any other locations, what are the reasons for this?

c. Explain why you consider the development cannot reasonably be located within an area with the lowest probability of flooding (flood zone 1); and, if your chosen site is within flood zone 3, explain why you consider the development cannot reasonably be located in flood zone 2. See [Table 1](#) for definitions of the flood zones.

d. As well as flood risk from rivers or the sea, have you taken account of the risk from any other sources of flooding in selecting the location for the development?

4 - Climate Change

How is flood risk at the site likely to be affected by climate change? (The local planning authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment should have taken this into account). Further advice on how to take account of the [impacts of climate change in flood risk assessments](#) is available from the Environment Agency.

5 - Site specific flood risk

You can use this section to describe the risk of flooding to and from the proposed development over its expected lifetime, including appropriate allowances for the impacts of climate change. It would be helpful to include any evidence, such as maps and level surveys of the site, flood datasets (eg flood levels, depths and/or velocities) and any other relevant data, which can be acquired through consultation with the [Environment Agency](#), the lead local flood authority for the area, or any other relevant flood risk management authority. Alternatively, you may consider undertaking or commissioning your own assessment of flood risk, using methods such as computer flood modelling.

a. What is/ are the main source(s) of flood risk to the site? (eg tidal/sea, fluvial or rivers, surface water, groundwater, other?). You should consider the flood mapping available from the [Environment Agency](#), the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the area, historic flooding records and any other relevant and available information.

- b. What is the probability of the site flooding, taking account of the maps of flood risk available from the [Environment Agency](#), the local planning authority's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and any further flood risk information?
- c. Are you aware of any other sources of flooding that may affect the site?
- d. What is the expected depth and level for the design flood? See [paragraph 055](#) of this guidance for information on what is meant by a "design flood". If possible, flood levels should be presented in metres above Ordnance Datum (ie, the height above average sea level).
- e. Are properties expected to flood internally in the design flood and to what depth? Internal flood depths should be provided in metres.
- f. How will the development be made safe from flooding and the impacts of [climate change](#), for its lifetime? Further information can be found in paragraphs [054](#) and [059](#) (including on the use of flood resilience and resistance measures) of this guidance.
- g. How will you ensure that the development and any measures to protect the site from flooding will not cause any increase in flood risk off-site and elsewhere? Have you taken into account the impacts of [climate change](#), over the expected lifetime of the development? (eg providing compensatory flood storage which has been agreed with the Environment Agency).
- h. Are there any opportunities offered by the development to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding? See paragraph [050](#) of this guidance for further advice.

6. Surface water management *

You can use this section to describe the existing and proposed surface water management arrangements at the site using [sustainable drainage systems](#) wherever appropriate, to ensure there is no increase in flood risk to others off-site.

- a. What are the existing surface water drainage arrangements for the site?
- b. If known, what (approximately) are the existing rates and volumes of surface water run-off generated by the site?
- c. What are the proposals for managing and discharging surface water from the site, including any measures for restricting discharge rates? For major developments (eg of 10 or more homes or major commercial developments), and for all developments in [areas at risk of flooding](#), sustainable drainage systems should be used, unless demonstrated to be inappropriate – see paragraphs [079-086](#) of this guidance for further advice.
- d. How will you prevent run-off from the completed development causing an impact elsewhere?
- e. Where applicable, what are the plans for the ongoing operation and/or maintenance of the surface water drainage systems?

7. Occupants and users of the development

You can use this section to provide a summary of the numbers of future occupants and users of the new development; the likely future pattern of occupancy and use; and proposed measures for protecting more vulnerable people from flooding.

- a. Will the development proposals increase the overall number of occupants and/or people using the building or land, compared with the current use? If this is the case, by approximately how many will the number(s) increase?
- b. Will the proposals change the nature or times of occupation or use, such that it may affect the degree of flood risk to these people? If this is the case, describe the extent of the change.
- c. Where appropriate, are you able to demonstrate how the occupants and users that may be more vulnerable to the impact of flooding (eg residents who will sleep in the building; people with health or mobility issues etc) will be located primarily in the parts of the building and site that are at lowest risk of flooding? If not, are there any overriding reasons why this approach is not being followed?

8. Exception test

You can use this section to provide the evidence to support certain development proposals in flood zones 2 or 3 if, following application of the sequential test, it is appropriate to apply the exception test, as set out in [paragraphs 159](#) of the National Planning Policy Framework. See [paragraph 035](#) of this guidance for further information on the exception test. It is advisable to contact the local planning authority to confirm whether the exception test needs to be applied and to ensure the appropriate level of information is provided.

- a. Would the proposed development provide wider sustainability benefits to the community? If so, could these benefits be considered to outweigh the flood risk to and from the proposed development? See [paragraph 037](#) of this guidance for further information.
- b. How can it be demonstrated that the proposed development will remain safe over its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere? See [paragraph 038](#) of this guidance for further information.
- c. Will it be possible for the development to reduce flood risk overall (eg through the provision of improved drainage)? See [paragraph 050](#) for further advice.

9. Residual risk

You can use this section to describe any [residual risks](#) that remain after the flood risk management and mitigation measures are implemented, and to explain how these risks can be managed to keep the users of the development safe over its lifetime. See [paragraph 042](#) of this guidance for more information.

- a. What flood related risks will remain after the flood risk management and mitigation measures have been implemented?
- b. How, and by whom, will these risks be managed over the lifetime of the development? (eg putting in place [flood warning and evacuation plans](#)).

10. Flood risk assessment credentials

You can use this section to provide details of the author and date of the flood risk assessment.

- a. Who has undertaken the flood risk assessment?
- b. When was the flood risk assessment completed?

Other considerations

- Managing surface water

The site-specific flood risk assessment will need to show how surface water runoff generated by the developed site will be managed. In some cases it may be advisable to detail the surface water management for the proposed development in a separate drainage strategy or plan. You may like to discuss this approach with the lead local flood authority (see [paragraph 006](#) of this guidance).

Surface water drainage elements of major planning applications (eg of 10 or more homes) are reviewed by the lead local flood authority for the area. As a result, there may be specific issues or local policies, for example the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy or Surface Water Management Plan, that will need to be considered when assessing and managing surface water matters.

It is advisable to contact the appropriate lead local flood authority prior to completing the surface water drainage section of the flood risk assessment, to ensure that the relevant matters are covered in sufficient detail.

Proximity to main rivers

If the development of the site involves any activity within specified distances of main rivers, a flood risk activity permit may be required in addition to planning permission. For non-tidal main rivers, a flood risk activity permit may be required if the development of the site is within 8 metres of a river, flood defence structure or culvert. For tidal main rivers, a flood risk activity permit may be required if the development of the site is within 16 metres of a river, flood defence structure or culvert. Details on obtaining a Flood Risk Activity Permit are available from the [Environment Agency](#).

Paragraph: 068 Reference ID: 7-068-20140306

Revision date: 16 11 2016 [See previous version](#)



Annual review of the Scrutiny Committee 2020/21

Introduction by Cllr Graham Minshull, Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee

I am pleased to present this Annual Report of South Norfolk Council's Scrutiny Committee.

A variety of issues were scrutinised by the Committee this year, however there have been no Task and Finish Groups. Any South Norfolk member or parish council can suggest a topic for investigation or review by the Committee and all are welcome to attend our meetings.

The Scrutiny Committee was initially disrupted by the coronavirus pandemic at the beginning of the year, however we have been able to resume virtually with considerable success, which has also meant that our meetings are available to the public online.

The Joint Scrutiny Committee that was established to oversee the collaborative working between South Norfolk and Broadland District Councils has not met in the last year as it has not been required.

I would like to thank all the officers who contribute the information and research required for our committee work, and the Senior Governance Officer, Emma Goddard, for her support and for co-ordinating everything so effectively.

This year I was also delighted to welcome to scrutiny Cllr Jack Hornby to replace Cllr Josh Worley.

I commend the report to the Council.

Graham Minshull, Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee

Working style of the Scrutiny Committee

Independence

Members of the Scrutiny Committee will not be subject to whipping arrangements by party groups.

Member leadership

Members of the Committee will take the lead in selecting topics for and in questioning witnesses. The Committee will expect members of Cabinet, rather than officers, to take the main responsibility for answering the Committee's questions about topics, which relate mainly to the Council's activities.

A constructive atmosphere

Meetings of the Committee will be constructive, and not judgmental, accepting that effective overview and scrutiny is best achieved through challenging and constructive enquiry. People giving evidence at the Committee should not feel under attack.

Respect and trust

Meetings will be conducted in a spirit of mutual respect and trust.

Openness and transparency

The Committee's business will be open and transparent, except where there are sound reasons for protecting confidentiality. In particular, the minutes of the Committee's meetings will explain the discussion and debate, so that it could be understood by those who were not present.

Consensus

Members of the Committee will work together and, while recognising political allegiances, will attempt to achieve consensus and agreed recommendations.

Impartial and independent officer advice

Officers who advise and support the Committee will give impartial and independent advice, recognising the importance of the Scrutiny Committee in the Council's arrangements for governance, as set out in the Constitution.

Regular review

There will be regular reviews of how the overview and scrutiny process is working, and a willingness to change if it is not working well.

Programming and planning

The Scrutiny Committee will have a programme of work. Members will agree the topics to be included in the work programme, the extent of the investigation to be undertaken in relation to resources, and the witnesses to be invited to give evidence.

Managing time

The Committee will attempt to conclude the business of each meeting in reasonable time. The order of business will be arranged as far as possible to minimise the demands on the time of witnesses.

Index

1	Introduction – by the Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee	(page - 1)
2	Working style of the Scrutiny Committee	(page - 2)
3	The membership of the scrutiny committee 2020/21	(page - 4)
4	The scrutiny year	(page - 5)
5	The scrutiny tracker & outcomes 2020/21	(page - 8)
6	A quick guide to scrutiny	(page - 12)
7	Public involvement	(page – 12)

The membership of the Scrutiny Committees 2020/21

At South Norfolk Council the scrutiny function is carried out by the Council's Scrutiny Committee, the Joint Scrutiny Committee and any Scrutiny Task and Finish Groups that it may appoint to investigate specific issues in greater depth.

The Scrutiny Committee is made up of councillors from the political groups that make up the Council. Only non-cabinet members can be on the committee and this allows those members to have an active role in the Council's decision-making process. The Committee is chaired by Cllr Graham Minshull, who is a member of the Conservative party which is the majority party at South Norfolk Council. The Committee's Vice-Chairman is Cllr Vivienne Clifford-Jackson, who is a member of the Liberal Democrat Party. The Scrutiny Committee is made up of nine Councillors and membership is as follows:

Members of the Scrutiny Committee:

Graham Minshull (**Chairman**)

Vivienne Clifford-Jackson (**Vice-Chairman**)

Brendon Bernard

Barry Duffin

Jack Hornby

Jeremy Rowe

Robert Savage

Trevor Spruce

Jenny Wilby

Other non-executive members also took part as substitute members as and when required

South Norfolk Council Members on the Joint Scrutiny Committee:

Graham Minshull (**Joint Chairman**)

Brendon Bernard

David Bills

Barry Duffin

Daniel Elmer

Robert Savage

The Scrutiny Year and how it operates at South Norfolk

What is scrutiny and how does it select topics for scrutiny?

Scrutiny is an essential part of ensuring that the Council, its partners and other public bodies remain effective and accountable. Scrutiny can examine and monitor all or part of the activity of a public sector body with the aim of improving the quality of public services. Scrutiny ensures that executives are held accountable for their decisions, that their decision-making process is clear and accessible to the public and that there are opportunities for the public and their representatives to influence and improve public policy.

Predominantly, Scrutiny Committee carries out most of its work in relation to the work of the Council. It undertakes this through scheduled reviews of decisions and policies that have been agreed by the Cabinet in order to hold it to account. In addition, Scrutiny considers call-ins. A summary of decisions made by Cabinet is published immediately after each meeting of Cabinet and any three members of the Council may call-in a decision for Scrutiny to consider, which effectively means the decision is delayed until Scrutiny can examine the decision at its next meeting. After examination, Scrutiny can decide to recommend an alternative option or endorse the decision of the Cabinet. There was no call-ins for the period that this Annual Report covers.

To assist and progress the Council's collaboration with Broadland District Council, a formal Joint Scrutiny Committee was constituted. This Committee meets on an ad-hoc basis, linked to the key stages in the collaboration, however has not met for the period that this Annual Report covers.

Support for the Scrutiny function

The Senior Governance Officer provides advice to both members and officers and supports the Scrutiny Committee and the various Task and Finish groups that may be set up. Democratic Services Officers produce agendas and clerk the meetings. Senior officers and managers of the Council are expected to attend Scrutiny Committee and present reports at the request of the Committee. In addition, Cabinet members are often present to aid the Committee's understanding of a particular item, which makes scrutiny more effective and constructive.

Policy Committees

Policy development is undertaken by the Council's Policy Committees. This enables a clear segregation between scrutiny and policy development. In the past, the Scrutiny Committee supported the development of policy, whilst also evaluating and assessing policies at an early stage. This structure affords the Scrutiny Committee a more independent role when challenging service delivery. In addition, the Scrutiny Committee may still appoint Task and Finish Groups to look at matters in more depth when required.

The Policy Committees feed directly into Cabinet and make recommendations based on their research and findings. Working on a formal and informal basis, these Committees are flexible to programme their work around upcoming policy and can focus on specific areas of the Council.

The work programme for Scrutiny Committee

The Scrutiny Committee has a structured work programme that sets out the investigations and reviews that will be carried out and reported to Committee, which is decided by members. There are also opportunities for parish councils to suggest topics for the Committee to look into.

Members of the Council are able to raise topics by way of a simple form or discussion with the Chairman or the Senior Governance Officer. Potential reports are assessed by way of the Council TOPIC analysis which evaluates the merits of scrutinising the issue in terms of Timeliness, Objectives, Performance, Interest and Corporate priorities, as outlined below.

- T** Is this the right **time** to review this issue and is there sufficient **Officer time** and resource to conduct the review? What is the **timescale**?
- O** What is the reason for review; do officers have a clear **objective**?
- P** Can **performance** in this area be improved by input from Scrutiny?
- I** Is there sufficient **interest** (particularly from the public)? The concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen for scrutiny.
- C** Will the review assist the Council to achieve its **Corporate Priorities**?

Joint scrutiny bodies

Norfolk County Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (HOSC): South Norfolk Council has a member representative who sits on the Norfolk County HOSC plus one substitute member. For the period 2020/21 the member representative has been Councillor Nigel Legg.

The role of the Norfolk County HOSC is to look at the work of the clinical commissioning groups and National Health Service (NHS) trusts and the local area team of NHS England. It acts as a 'critical friend' by suggesting ways that health related services might be improved. The Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee considers all matters relating to the needs, health and health related-services of the population of Norfolk. It scrutinises services that have an impact on the health of Norfolk's citizens and challenges the outcomes of interventions designed to support the health of Norfolk people

Please follow the link to the Norfolk County Council website for papers and minutes concerning the above:

http://norfolkcc.cmis.uk.com/norfolkcc/Committees/tabid/62/ctl/ViewCMIS_Committee_Details/mid/381/id/22/Default.aspx

Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny Sub Panel: South Norfolk Council has a member representative who sits on the Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny Sub Panel plus one substitute member. For the period 2020/21, the member representative has been Councillor James Easter.

The role of the Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Partnership Scrutiny Sub Panel is to:

- Scrutinise the actions, decisions and priorities of the Norfolk Countywide Community Safety Crime and Disorder Partnership in respect of crime and disorder on behalf of the (County) Community Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel

- Scrutinise the priorities as set out in the annual Countywide Community Safety Partnership Plan
- Make any reports or recommendations to the Countywide Community Safety Partnership and/or where considered appropriate to the communities Committee.

The work of the Scrutiny Committee and outcomes

The scrutiny tracker provides an overview of the work carried out by the Scrutiny Committee over the last 12-month period. This demonstrates that scrutiny investigation can not only produce outcomes in terms of feeding into the decisions that are made but that it can also play a valuable role in informing and developing knowledge for members.

Scrutiny Committee Recommendation Tracker 2020/21

Date	Topic	Responsible Officer	Resolution and Recommendations	Progress	Outcome
5 Aug 2020	REVIEW OF MARKET TOWNS CONFIDENCE CAMPAIGN	Assistant Director of Economic Growth	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To note the contents of the report; and 2. To recommend that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Officers consider the suggestions put forward by the Committee and provide feedback at a future meeting in six months' time. b. Cabinet considers future free parking in the Council's car parks during the COVID-19 pandemic, in order to encourage continued local support of the market towns. 	<p>Officers have reviewed this and have reported back to the Committee via email</p> <p>Recommendation withdrawn at mtg on 9 Sept 2020. Officers to keep watching brief, and will report as above</p>	Members were able to review the work undertaken in order to support the reopening of businesses in the Market Towns. This will enable the Council to effectively respond to a future second wave of the virus, which could lead to further lockdowns. In addition, the review allows lessons to be learned and ways of working adapted accordingly.
9 Sept 2020	REVIEW OF COVID 19 RESPONSE	Assistant Director Governance and Business Support, Chief of Staff, Assistant Director Finance , Assistant Director Individuals and Families	<p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Note the response of the Council to support the District's communities and businesses during the COVID-19 pandemic; and 2. Endorse the key learning identified in the report 	<p>No further action necessary</p> <p>No further action necessary</p>	<p>The Committee was able to assess key areas of the Council's response to the Covid-19 pandemic:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the governance arrangements put in place to support the Council's response; 2. the support provided to residents and businesses; and 3. the financial implications of the coronavirus. <p>The report provided the key learning that officers had identified</p>

Date	Topic	Responsible Officer	Resolution and Recommendations	Progress	Outcome
					and members were able to endorse these without the need to make further recommendations.
21 Dec 2020	MEMBER LED FUNDING	the Assistant Director of Individuals and Families, and the Communities Senior Manager	<p>It was resolved that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Members funding has been spent in accordance with the ground rules. 2. The scheme has been shown to have a positive impact on the local community and is reducing the demand on Council services as outlined by the examples given. 	No further action necessary	<p>The Committee was able to assess whether the decisions taken by members regarding the allocation of their funding was in line with the ground rules. This enables the Council to ensure good governance of the Scheme.</p> <p>Members were also able to evaluate the impact on the scheme on both the local community and demand on Council services. The Committee was pleased to note the positive effect that the funding had realised via the projects that Councillors had assisted.</p>
27 Jan 2021	BRIEFING REPORT ON RECENT FLOODING IN SOUTH NORFOLK	Assistant Director – Regulatory & Assistant Director of Individuals and Families	<p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To note the contents of the report; 2. To request that Officers prepare a report focussing on the planning considerations regarding flood prevention in respect of the consideration of planning applications, to be presented to the committee on 31 March 2021; and 3. To recommend that: 	<p>No action necessary</p> <p>Report to be prepared by the Assistant Director - Planning</p>	Councillors were able to fully consider the organisations and bodies responsible for flood prevention, and review the Council's response to the recent flooding in the District.

Date	Topic	Responsible Officer	Resolution and Recommendations	Progress	Outcome
			<p>a. Officers prepare an article for the Link Magazine providing the public with information on flooding support and Floodline.</p> <p>b. Officers consider the appointment of Environmental Protection Officer(s) and/or Emergency Incident Officer(s) to provide a response on-site in the event of an emergency situation (including flooding) or an out of hours community protection complaint (eg, noise). Consideration also to be given whether these officers could assist with ensuring that work to ditches etc is completed by landowners with riparian rights.</p> <p>c. The Council provides training workshops to Town and Parish Councils to support them to devise or update their local emergency response plans and resilience response groups.</p>	<p>Accepted by officers. An article will appear in <i>The Link</i>, following a leaflet being produced by the Norfolk Strategic Flooding Alliance.</p> <p>Accepted - discussions are ongoing.</p> <p>This is referenced in the Service Delivery Plan, under Community Emergency Planning, by way of seeking to promote emergency planning to Town and Parish Councils.</p>	

Date	Topic	Responsible Officer	Resolution and Recommendations	Progress	Outcome
			d. Officers review the Council's policy regarding the provision of sandbags across the District and research alternative methods of flood defence.	Accepted - this will be reviewed and reported back to Scrutiny Committee members	
31 March 2021	DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT – FLOODING	Assistant Director - Planning & Portfolio Holder for Stronger Economy	<i>To be completed</i>		

A Quick Guide to Scrutiny

Recommendations and Reporting

Once Scrutiny has reviewed work that has taken place, recommendations are sometimes made and reported to the Cabinet for consideration, or made directly to officers. This is usually done as part of the relevant report or paying regard to the minutes of the Scrutiny Committee in informing the final decision. Recommendations should strive to be, as much as possible, specific measurable achievable relevant and timed - SMART.

What happens next?

Once agreement to a scrutiny recommendation has taken place, whether it be something that officers have agreed to, or the Cabinet, this should not always be where the scrutiny process ends. It is good practice for the Scrutiny Committee to set a review date to receive an update from the relevant portfolio holder on the cabinet or officers, on the progress that has been made towards implementation of the Scrutiny Committee's recommendations.

Scrutiny Task and Finish Groups

Task and Finish Groups are time-limited focus groups that report their review findings to the main committee or Cabinet and are supported by relevant officers of the council and or outside contributors.

If a Task and Finish Group is to be set up in place of a full committee review taking place, interested members should volunteer to be involved. It is usual that task & finish groups are not politically balanced unless a strong need exists. This is because the main Scrutiny Committee which is balanced has to agree the findings, or delegates the Task & Finish Group on behalf of the whole committee to report directly to the cabinet. Actually, it is much more important to appoint those members with an interest or expertise in the issue, irrespective of political groups.

Public involvement

Meetings of the Scrutiny Committee are usually as informal as possible and as well as scrutiny members, are attended by portfolio holders, officers, partners and anyone else who can assist with the work and provide evidence for reviews. Members of the public are also welcome to attend meetings of the Scrutiny Committee and can participate at the discretion of the Committee's Chairman.

Getting in touch with Scrutiny

If you are a member of the public and wish to find out more about the scrutiny process and the committee, or if you have any queries regarding this Annual Report, please feel free to contact Emma Goddard, Senior Governance Officer by sending an email to: egoddard@s-norfolk.gov.uk. If you have any topic suggestions for scrutiny please raise this first with your local Councillor, who details can be found here: <https://www.south-norfolk.gov.uk/your-councillors>

Scrutiny Committee – Work Programme

In setting future Scrutiny **TOPICS**, members are asked to consider the following: **T**imely – **O**bjective – **P**erformance – **I**nterest – **C**orporate Priority

T Is this the right **time** to review this issue and is there sufficient **officer time** and resource to conduct the review? What is the **timescale**?

O What is the reason for review; do officers have a clear **objective**?

P Can **performance** in this area be improved by input from Scrutiny?

I Is there sufficient **interest** (particularly from the public)? The concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen for scrutiny.

C Will the review assist the Council to achieve its **Corporate Priorities**?

Date of meeting	Topic	Organisation / Officer / Responsible member	Objectives
12 May 2021	<i>No items scheduled</i>		
16 June 2021	Early Help Approach	Assistant Director – Individuals & Families; and Portfolio Holder for Better Lives	The Committee to consider and review the Council's Early help Approach and the future model and make any recommendations to Cabinet. Partners in the Hub to also be invited to attend the meeting.
21 July 2021	<i>No items scheduled</i>		
25 Aug 2021	Call-in only		
29 Sept 2021	Environment Strategy	Environment Manager and Portfolio Holder for Clean & Safe Environment	Scrutiny Committee to review the effectiveness of the Strategy and assess whether outcomes have been achieved. To make recommendations as appropriate.
3 Nov 2021	<i>No items scheduled</i>		
8 Dec 2021	<i>No items scheduled</i>		
19 Jan 2022	<i>No items scheduled</i>		
10 Feb 2022	2022/23 Budget & Longer-Term Financial Strategy	S151 Officer; and Portfolio Holder for Finance & Resources	Scrutiny Committee to consider the Council's 2022/23 budget and the recommendations of Cabinet. Members to also formulate a recommendation to Council regarding the budget for consideration at its meeting later in February 2022.
23 Feb 2022	Call-in only		

Date of meeting	Topic	Organisation / Officer / Responsible member	Objectives
30 March 2022	<i>No items scheduled</i>		
5 May 2022	<i>No items scheduled</i>		
TBC	Market Towns Strategy	Assistant Director – Economic Growth; and Portfolio Holder for Stronger Economy	Members to review the new Market Towns Strategy and receive an update on the success of the <i>Confidence Campaign</i> and how the Council has assisted traders and businesses since start of the COVID-19 outbreak

Scrutiny Recommendation Tracker 2020/21

Date	Topic	Responsible Officer	Resolution and Recommendations	Progress	Outcome
5 Aug 2020	REVIEW OF MARKET TOWNS CONFIDENCE CAMPAIGN	Assistant Director of Economic Growth	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> To note the contents of the report; and To recommend that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Officers consider the suggestions put forward by the Committee and provide feedback at a future meeting in six months' time. Cabinet considers future free parking in the Council's car parks during the COVID-19 pandemic, in order to encourage continued local support of the market towns. 	<p>Officers have reviewed this and have reported back to the Committee via email</p> <p>Recommendation withdrawn at mtg on 9 Sept 2020. Officers to keep watching brief, and will report as above</p>	Members were able to review the work undertaken in order to support the reopening of businesses in the Market Towns. This will enable the Council to effectively respond to a future second wave of the virus, which could lead to further lockdowns. In addition, the review allows lessons to be learned and ways of working adapted accordingly.
9 Sept 2020	REVIEW OF COVID 19 RESPONSE	Assistant Director Governance and Business Support, Chief of Staff, Assistant Director Finance , Assistant Director Individuals and Families	<p>RESOLVED</p> <p>To</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Note the response of the Council to support the District's communities and businesses during the COVID-19 pandemic; and Endorse the key learning identified in the report 	<p>No further action necessary</p> <p>No further action necessary</p>	<p>The Committee was able to assess key areas of the Council's response to the Covid-19 pandemic:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the governance arrangements put in place to support the Council's response; the support provided to residents and businesses; and the financial implications of the coronavirus. <p>The report provided the key learning that officers had identified and members were able to endorse these without the need to make further recommendations.</p>

Date	Topic	Responsible Officer	Resolution and Recommendations	Progress	Outcome
21 Dec 2020	MEMBER LED FUNDING	the Assistant Director of Individuals and Families, and the Communities Senior Manager	<p>It was resolved that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Members funding has been spent in accordance with the ground rules. 2. The scheme has been shown to have a positive impact on the local community and is reducing the demand on Council services as outlined by the examples given. 	No further action necessary	<p>The Committee was able to assess whether the decisions taken by members regarding the allocation of their funding was in line with the ground rules. This enables the Council to ensure good governance of the Scheme.</p> <p>Members were also able to evaluate the impact on the scheme on both the local community and demand on Council services. The Committee was pleased to note the positive effect that the funding had realised via the projects that Councillors had assisted.</p>
27 Jan 2021	BRIEFING REPORT ON RECENT FLOODING IN SOUTH NORFOLK	Assistant Director – Regulatory & Assistant Director of Individuals and Families	<p>RESOLVED</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To note the contents of the report; 2. To request that Officers prepare a report focussing on the planning considerations regarding flood prevention in respect of the consideration of planning applications, to be presented to the committee on 31 March 2021; and 3. To recommend that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Officers prepare an article for the Link Magazine providing the public with information on flooding support and Floodline. 	<p>No action necessary</p> <p>Report to be prepared by the Development Management Manager</p> <p>Accepted by officers. An article will appear in <i>The Link</i>, following a leaflet being produced</p>	Councillors were able to fully consider the organisations and bodies responsible for flood prevention, and review the Council's response to the recent flooding in the District.

Date	Topic	Responsible Officer	Resolution and Recommendations	Progress	Outcome
			<p>b. Officers consider the appointment of Environmental Protection Officer(s) and/or Emergency Incident Officer(s) to provide a response on-site in the event of an emergency situation (including flooding) or an out of hours community protection complaint (eg, noise). Consideration also to be given whether these officers could assist with ensuring that work to ditches etc is completed by landowners with riparian rights.</p> <p>c. The Council provides training workshops to Town and Parish Councils to support them to devise or update their local emergency response plans and resilience response groups.</p> <p>d. Officers review the Council's policy regarding the provision of sandbags across the District and research alternative methods of flood defence.</p>	<p>by the Norfolk Strategic Flooding Alliance</p> <p>Accepted - discussions are ongoing</p> <p>This is referenced in the Service Delivery Plan, under Community Emergency Planning, by way of seeking to promote emergency planning to Town and Parish Councils.</p> <p>Accepted - this will be reviewed and reported back to Scrutiny Committee members.</p>	

Date	Topic	Responsible Officer	Resolution and Recommendations	Progress	Outcome
31 March 2021	DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT – FLOODING	Development Management Manager & Portfolio Holder for Stronger Economy	<i>To be completed</i>		

CABINET CORE AGENDA 2021

Date	Key	Title of Report	Responsible Officer	Portfolio Holder	Exempt
19 Apr		Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework Update 2021	Paul Harris	Lisa Neal	Exempt
		Review of Policies	Rodney Fincham	Josh Worley	
		Lease for Car Parking at Norwich Research Park	Nina Cunningham	Lisa Neal	
	Key	South Norfolk Use of the Strategic Fund	Tig Armstrong	John Fuller	Exempt
	Key	Review of Bawburgh Temporary Stopping Place for Gypsies and Travellers	Kevin Philcox/ Leigh Booth	Yvonne Bendle	
	Key	Ella May Barnes Building	Tig Armstrong/ Nina Cunningham	Lisa Neal	Exempt
	Key	Village Clusters Housing Allocations	Paul Harris	Lisa Neal	
	Key	Leisure Restructure	Simon Phelan	Alison Thomas	
		Breathing Space Legislations	Rodney Fincham	John Fuller	
	Key	Covid Recovery Plan	Rodney Fincham / Leigh Booth	John Fuller	
	Key	HR and Payroll Services	Emma Hodds	Josh Worley	
	Key	Internal Audit Consortium	Emma Hodds	Josh Worley	Exempt
		Council AGM 17 May 2020			
1 Jun		Re-design of Care and Repair and Disabled Facilities Grant service element of Integrated Housing Adaptations Team	Leah Booth/ Kevin Philcox	Yvonne Bendle	
		Tree Management Policy	Tig Armstrong	Lisa Neal	
		Q4 Performance, Risk and Finance Report	Sinead Carey	Josh Worley	
		Review of Materials Recovery Facility Contract	Simon Phelan	Michael Edney	
5 Jul		Anti-Social Behaviour Strategy and Enforcement Policy	Nick Howard/ Tony Cooke	Michael Edney	

Key decisions are those which result in income, expenditure or savings with a gross full year effect of £100,000 or 10% of the Council's net portfolio budget whichever is the greater which has not been included in the relevant portfolio budget, or are significant (e.g. in environmental, physical, social or economic) in terms of its effect on the communities living or working in an area comprising two or more electoral wards in the area of the local authority.