

Infrastructure and Development Select Committee

Date: 17 July 2019

Time: 10am

Venue: Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich

Persons attending the meeting are requested to turn off mobile phones.

Membership:

Cllr Barry Stone (Chairman)

Cllr Graham Middleton (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Stuart Clancy

Cllr Jess Barnard

Cllr Claire Bowes

Cllr Tim East

Cllr Brian Iles

Cllr Mark Kiddle-Morris

Cllr Beverley Spratt

Cllr Vic Thomson

Cllr Colleen Walker (Spokes)

Cllr Brian Watkins (Spokes)

Cllr Tony White

**For further details and general enquiries about this Agenda please contact the
Committee Officer:**

Nicola Ledain on 01603 223053
or email committees@norfolk.gov.uk

Under the Council's protocol on the use of media equipment at meetings held in public, this meeting may be filmed, recorded or photographed. Anyone who wishes to do so must inform the Chairman and ensure that it is done in a manner clearly visible to anyone present. The wishes of any individual not to be recorded or filmed must be appropriately respected.

A g e n d a

1 To receive apologies and details of any substitute members attending

2 Minutes

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 29 May 2019.

Page **5**

3 Members to Declare any Interests

If you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest** in a matter to be considered at the meeting and that interest is on your Register of Interests you must not speak or vote on the matter.

If you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest** in a matter to be considered at the meeting and that interest is not on your Register of Interests you must declare that interest at the meeting and not speak or vote on the matter

In either case you may remain in the room where the meeting is taking place. If you consider that it would be inappropriate in the circumstances to remain in the room, you may leave the room while the matter is dealt with.

If you do not have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest you may nevertheless have an **Other Interest** in a matter to be discussed if it affects, to a greater extent than others in your division

- Your wellbeing or financial position, or
- that of your family or close friends
- Any body -
 - Exercising functions of a public nature.
 - Directed to charitable purposes; or
 - One of whose principal purposes includes the influence of public opinion or policy (including any political party or trade union);

Of which you are in a position of general control or management.

If that is the case then you must declare such an interest but can speak and vote on the matter.

4 To receive any items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency

5 Public Question Time

Fifteen minutes for questions from members of the public of which due notice has been given. Please note that all questions must be received by the Committee Team (committees@norfolk.gov.uk) by **5pm Friday 12 July 2019**. For guidance on submitting a public question, view the Constitution at www.norfolk.gov.uk/what-we-do-and-how-we-work/councillors-meetingsdecisions-and-elections/committees-agendas-and-recent-decisions/ask-aquestion-to-a-committee

6 Local Member Issues/Questions

Fifteen minutes for local member to raise issues of concern of which due notice has been given. Please note that all questions must be received by the Committee Team (committees@norfolk.gov.uk) by **5pm on Friday 12 July 2019**.

7 Environmental Policy for Norfolk

Verbal Update by the Chairman of the Task and Finish Group

8 Local Transport Plan 4

Verbal Update by the Chairman of the Task and Finish Group

9 Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service – HMICFRS Inspection Outcomes

Report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services

Page **13**

10 Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service – Emergency Services Collaboration Update

Presentation by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services

11 Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review – Preferred Options Consultation

Report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services

Page **35**

12 Highway Asset Performance

Report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services

Page **55**

13 Proposed updates to Planning Obligations Standards 2019

Report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services

Page **84**

14 Forward Work Programme

Report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services

Page **120**

Group Meetings:

Conservative	9:00am	Conservative Group Room, Ground Floor
Labour	9:00am	Labour Group Room, Ground Floor
Liberal Democrats	9:00am	Liberal Democrats Group Room, Ground Floor

Chris Walton
Head of Democratic Services
County Hall
Martineau Lane
Norwich
NR1 2DH

Date Agenda Published: 9 July 2019



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or (textphone) 18001 0344 800 8020 and we will do our best to help.

Infrastructure and Development Select Committee

**Minutes of the Meeting Held on Wednesday 29 May 2019
10am, Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich**

Present:

Cllr Barry Stone – Chairman

Cllr Danny Douglas
Cllr Phillip Duigan
Cllr Claire Bowes
Cllr Tim East
Cllr Simon Eyre
Cllr Brian Iles

Cllr Mark Kiddle-Morris
Cllr Graham Middleton
Cllr Vic Thomson
Cllr Colleen Walker
Cllr Brian Watkins
Cllr Tony White

Officers Present:

Helen Edwards

Chief Legal Officer (Monitoring Officer), Norfolk County Council

Tom McCabe

Executive Director, Community and Environmental Services, CES

Steve Miller

Assistant Director, Culture and Heritage, CES

Vince Muspratt

Assistant Director, Growth and Development, CES

Sarah Rhoden

Head of Support and Development, CES

Stuart Ruff

Chief Fire Officer

Ceri Sumner

Assistant Director, Community, Information and Learning, CES

Nick Tupper

Assistant Director, Highways and Waste, CES

1. Apologies and substitutions

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Stuart Clancy, substituted by Philip Duigan; Jess Barnard, substituted by Danny Douglas; Terry Jermy, substituted by Colleen Walker and Beverley Spratt, substituted by Simon Eyre.

2. Declarations of Interest

- 2.1 There were no declarations of interest declared.

3. Items of Urgent Business

- 3.1 There were no items of urgent business.

4. Public Question Time

- 4.1 There were no public questions submitted.

5. Local Member Issues / Questions

- 5.1 There was one member question submitted which is attached at Appendix A.

6. Terms of Reference and Working Arrangements

- 6.1 The Committee received the annexed report (6) which set out the terms of reference and parts of the Constitution relevant to the Infrastructure and Development Select Committee and were attached at appendix A of the report.
- 6.2 The Committee noted that to be as transparent as possible, it was necessary to have as little exempt information as possible and to take most reports in the public domain. The Chairman acknowledged that this would be adopted as far as was practicable.
- 6.3 Clarity was given over where sustainable development would sit within the Cabinet governance structure. The Executive Director explained that it would sit within the Infrastructure and Development Select Committee.
- 6.4 The Committee **REVIEWED, CONSIDERED** and **AGREED** its terms of reference included within the Constitution.

7. Key Service Issues and Risks - Presentation

- 7.1 The Committee received the presentation from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services. The presentation outlined the areas of the Community and Environmental Service and identified any key risks and issues within those areas.
- 7.2 The Committee heard that the Chief Fire Officer would oversee the Fire Service finances and operational resources as part of the Integrated Risk Management Plan. If anything fell outside of the budget, there would be necessary conversations through the appropriate channels.
- 7.3 Although the bus networks are generally commercial services, Norfolk County Council had an opportunity to influence factors within the networks. The Committee heard that the Transforming Cities fund was one of those opportunities, working together with the district councils in the Greater Norwich Area. The County Council also played a part in subsidising some routes, awarding grants and funding concessionary fares.

- 7.4 The Assistant Director agreed to provide a list of bus shelters which were owned by Norfolk County Council. Members expressed concern that it was difficult to discover who the owners were. Officers acknowledged this but only held a list of those owned by Norfolk County Council.
- 7.5 There was concern expressed that subsidised routes were becoming unsustainable with fewer passengers, based on recent data. It was felt that this was an important area to be reviewed by the Committee, as well as the general issue of public transport. It was suggested that community transport could be linked into public transport if the programming and timetabling was carefully thought out and organised.
- 7.6 The Committee heard that the gritting routes were reviewed every year due to additional requests for gritting plus new roads opening such as the Broadland Northway. The network for the Winter 2019 was already being prepared to target the gritting where it would be needed most.
- 7.7 Some Members felt that an integrated waste service with disposal would be more efficient and effective than the current set-up. One service would be responsible for the collection and disposal of waste.
- 7.8 There were various organisations involved in stopping fly-tipping; County Council, District Council and Environment Agency. The biggest problem area in terms of increased fly-tipping currently was the 'man with the van' who would pick up rubbish from a household at a cost, and then dump it in the countryside.
- 7.9 The Assistant Director confirmed that a way of recycling paint was being investigated.
- 7.10 As part of the Norfolk and Suffolk Economic Strategy activities were being aligned around that to help promote the local economy in conjunction with district councils. The Select Committee were informed that the Local Enterprise Partnership included representatives from the County Council and district councils.
- 7.11 It was clarified that the responsibility of appointing Members to be representatives to outside bodies lay with the Leader.
- 7.12 The Select Committee **NOTED** the presentation and associated risks and issues of each service area.

8. Policy and Strategy Framework and draft Forward Plan

- 8.1 The Committee received the annexed report (8) which provided details of the relevant policy and strategy framework to enable the Select Committee to develop its Forward Plan and have oversight of policy and strategy development work across relevant services.
- 8.2 The Committee received an update on the Mineral and Waste Local Plan. There had been one round of consultation and Officers were currently considering responses.

The preferred option would be taken to the August meeting of Cabinet after which there would be then another 6-week consultation period. Responses from that would then be gathered when a final plan would be referred to the Secretary of State. There was a 12-month turnover with the Secretary of State, so a final decision was hoped to be received approximately September 2021.

- 8.3 The Committee felt that the plan was in a too advanced stage for a task and finish group to be convened, but the Select Committee felt that they would like to review the plan and add comment before it was presented to Cabinet in August.
- 8.4 The Chairman announced that Highways had been successful in winning an award for upgrading street lights to LED lights and the energy saving that this had generated. Members of the Committee congratulated the team on the award.
- 8.5 There were various points made around transport, including rural transport, car parking around schools and home to school transport and the Local Transport Plan (LTP). It was suggested that all these issues were important and should be collated under one task and finish group which focused on the Local Transport Plan but included the other transport issues. If it was felt necessary that the other transport issues needed deeper research, a group could be set up later.
- 8.6 The LTP task and finish group members were agreed as Cllr Graham Middleton, Cllr Tony White with the Labour and Liberal Democrat member to be advised.
- 8.7 The Committee **REVIEWED** the policy and strategy framework, included the anticipated development work and **IDENTIFIED** appropriate items for inclusion on the Select Committees Forward Plan as follows:
- Minerals and Waste Local Plan review to be reviewed at the July meeting as per Forward Plan.
 - The Local Transport Plan would remain on the Forward Plan to be considered at the July meeting.

9. Norfolk Strategic Infrastructure and Delivery Plan (NSIDP)

- 9.1 The Committee received the annexed report (9) which outlined the main points of the NSIDP and provided detail about the Plan. The Strategic Planning Manager stressed that the plan was produced in partnership. It brings together key strategic infrastructure schemes from other plans and programmes to move them forwards to delivery.
- 9.2 A Member noted that there were more schemes that produced carbon than there were schemes that didn't. The Executive Director explained that infrastructure to support large scale housing or employment development was likely to include infrastructure such as a road, otherwise planning permission may not be granted. Members commented that it would be beneficial for there to be more schemes that benefited people who didn't drive. The Strategic Planning Manager explained that public transport schemes tended to be smaller scale but that reviews of the NSIDP might well include any large-scale infrastructure associated with "Transforming Cities". He also drew attention to a number of rail schemes in the plan.

- 9.3 A Member suggested that a carbon change audit approach and a measure of benefits that affected everyone would be beneficial. The Strategic Planning Manager explained that each project would be subject to its own environmental assessment as part of a separate consenting process
- 9.4 The Strategic Planning Manager explained that schemes were already outlined in Local Plans and the Local Transport Plan or had come through other processes. Therefore, developments in the NSIDP had been through the necessary planning process would be subject to the relevant tests anyway. The Local Transport Plan looked longer term and fed into policy documents about future development.
- 9.5 The Select Committee commented on the plan and **AGREED** that it would review the updated plan in November prior to it being considered by Cabinet in December.
- 10. Response to agreed Climate Change Motion at Full Council on 15 April 2019**
- 10.1 The Committee received the annexed report (10) which was triggered by the climate change motion agreed at Full Council on 15 April 2019. The report provided a position statement on the current activity within the council that could be aligned with the climate change / carbon agenda, with the expectation that it would enable members to make an informed position with regards to further action.
- 10.2 A task and finish group were agreed to be set up with a proposal that it would meet weekly. The Members of the group would be Cllr Barry Stone, Cllr Beverley Spratt, Cllr Jess Barnard with the Liberal Democrat Member to be advised.
- 10.3 The Committee acknowledged that it was important to receive factually based evidence with scientific outcomes and predictions presented to the task and finish group and not to be swayed by opinions and views.
- 10.4 The Chairman explained that witnesses and representatives from the University of East Anglia would be invited as well as a representative from Extinction Rebellion.
- 10.5 The group would scrutinise Norfolk County Council and all associated companies such as Norse, Repton and Hethel.
- 10.6 The Committee **NOTED** the report and **AGREED** the way forward as set out in section two of the report.

The meeting closed at 12.30pm.

Chairman



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020 and we will do our best to help.

INFRASTRUCTURE AND DEVELOPMENT SELECT COMMITTEE QUESTIONS 29 May 2019

5. Public Question Time

None received.

6. Local Member Issues / Member Questions

Question from Cllr Sandra Squire

In April, this Council passed a motion reflecting how seriously we take the protection and management of the environment, how we are going to work with the Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership and to create a Pollinator Action Plan. Is the Committee & wider Council going to engage with Highways England regarding the wholesale environmental destruction of the verges along the A47 & A11 corridors, by spraying them with weedkiller and to prevent them repeating the process in the Autumn. At a time when biodiversity is in crisis, habitat loss for pollinators and other insects is unacceptable and is in stark contrast to how this council manages our road network.

Response

The Environment Service are currently working on a Draft Pollinator Action Plan. An initial internal discussion document has recently been produced. The suggested duration for the initial plan is 2019-2023. It is envisioned that the plan would take the form of a two-part document; the first being the context and the second the proposed actions. Below is a suggested contents list for the plan:

Part 1: The context

- *A Foreword by the Cabinet Member*
- *Why are pollinators so important?*
- *Who is this plan for and what will it achieve?*
- *Why do we need this for Norfolk?*
- *What is currently being done to help pollinators?*
- *Some top tips for managing land to benefit pollinators*
- *Further info*
- *References*

Part 2: The Action Plan

- *Strategic Actions for Norfolk*
- *Actions for the County Council*
- *Communications and partnership strategy for enacting the plan*

An approach to highways verges will be included in the county-wide actions; a draft set of actions for this has been drawn up:

Managing highways verges and Public Right of Ways in a pollinator-friendly manner.

- *Develop a maintenance strategy that ensures the road verges deliver their potential for pollinators (with appropriate consideration of safety issues).*
- *Develop a maintenance strategy for Public Rights of Way that ensures the network delivers its potential for pollinators.*
- *Working with Norfolk Wildlife Trust, promote and extend the Roadside Nature Reserve scheme, designating the most important verges for Norfolk's special biodiversity.*

This work would also include liaising and working with Highways England, and other partner organisations, on how Norfolk wishes to manage verges within the county.

In addition to this plan, the Green Infrastructure planning that NCC is following has as a key element the creation of a network of biodiversity corridors that will act as routes through the landscape for pollinators. This includes the Greenways project aimed at re-using disused railways as cycling, walking and biodiversity corridors. The model for these is the Marriott's Way.

The Action Plan should be developed through close joint working with the Norfolk Biodiversity Partnership and the soon to be reconstituted Local Nature Partnership as an important part of a 25 Year Environment Plan for Norfolk.

Report to Infrastructure and Development Committee

Item No. 9

Report title:	Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service – HMICFRS inspection outcomes
Date of meeting:	17 July 2019
Responsible Cabinet Member:	Margaret Dewsbury (Communities and Partnerships)
Responsible Director:	Tom McCabe (Executive Director, Community and Environmental Services)
Is this a key decision?	No

Introduction from Cabinet Member

The findings of the recent inspection of our Fire and Rescue Service by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services highlighted four areas where we are providing a good service to Norfolk communities. It also highlighted some areas where we need to make improvements.

The improvement journey for the service is already underway and the Chief Fire Officer has updated me on the good progress being made, including: -

- Targeting efforts to reduce the backlog of home fire risk checks, which has already seen the backlog reduced by 53%
- A clear message that any form of bullying and harassment is not acceptable – a joint statement of commitment has been signed by the Chief Fire Officer and the representative bodies. Work on a cultural framework for the service is well progressed, and a programme of staff engagement to develop a shared set of behaviours is almost complete
- An organisational review has started, and all functions will be reviewed over the next 12-18 months. The first phase of this was to develop a new permanent senior leadership team structure and preparation for recruitment to these posts (which will report to the Chief Fire Officer) will start shortly
- Work continues with partners and stakeholders to make better use of our collective resources to deliver outcomes for Norfolk communities. This includes the formal collaboration agreement with Norfolk Constabulary (there is a separate update for the Select Committee on the agenda)

There is more to do, and an Improvement Plan has been developed setting out the key areas of work that will be progressed to address the HMICFRS findings.

I have also been working with the Chief Fire Officer to ensure that the service has the support and resources needed to be able to deliver the activities in the Improvement Plan. The areas which would benefit from additional resource/support have been identified, and we are working through the best way to deliver this.

I want to ensure that there is an opportunity for key stakeholders to be part of developing the Improvement Plan for our service. Therefore, I have brought the plan to the Select

Committee to enable cross-party challenge and input before it is finalised. With the Chairman's permission, I have also invited the Police and Crime Commissioner to be part of this discussion, given that the HMICFRS also inspects Constabularies.

Once the Improvement Plan is finalised, I will be meeting regularly with the Chief Fire Officer to monitor progress against the plan and ensure that we deliver what the Improvement Plan promises. If any areas are identified where additional investment or resource is needed, I will raise the issue with Cabinet (as needed).

Executive Summary

HMICFRS undertook an inspection of Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service (NFRS) in the week beginning 4 February 2019. This is the first time that HMICFRS have inspected fire and rescue services.

The HMICFRS concluded that NFRS is providing a 'good' service in four areas. Overall, NFRS received a rating of 'requires improvement' against the 3 main pillars; efficiency, effectiveness and people.

An Improvement Plan to address the improvement areas identified by HMICFRS has been developed and is attached at Appendix A.

Action required

The Select Committee are asked to review and comment on the draft Improvement Plan set out in Appendix A. In particular, challenge and input is sought around whether the Improvement Plan is robust in addressing the improvement areas identified, and realistic in terms of delivery.

1. Background and Purpose

- 1.1. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) undertook a week long inspection of Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service (NFRS) starting 4 February 2019.
- 1.2. This is the first time that HMICFRS have inspected fire and rescue services across England. Norfolk's inspection formed part of the second tranche of inspections with the third and final tranche currently underway.
- 1.3. In carrying out the inspections of all 45 fire and rescue services in England, HMICFRS look to answer three main questions:
 1. How **effective** is the fire and rescue service at keeping people safe and secure from fire and other risks?
 2. How **efficient** is the fire and rescue service at keeping people safe and secure from fire and other risks?
 3. How well does the fire and rescue service look after its people?
- 1.4. The HMICFRS report sets out their inspection findings. After taking all the evidence into account, a graded judgment is applied for each of the three questions. The four categories of graded judgment are: outstanding; good; requires improvement; and inadequate.

2. HMICFRS Findings

- 2.1. HMICFRS found that Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service is good in the way it responds to fires and other emergencies and good in the way it responds to national risks such as terrorism. The inspectorate also concluded that the service is good at making the service affordable now and in the future and that it is good at getting the right people with the right skills.
- 2.2. Although inspectors found the service is good in how it responds to emergencies, it concluded improvements are required in how the service understands the risk from fire and other emergencies, how it prevents these risks from occurring and how it protects the public through fire safety regulation.
- 2.3. HMICFRS also found that the service is good at ensuring it is affordable, but improvement is required in how it makes the best use of the resources available to it.
- 2.4. Inspectors concluded that the service is good at ensuring it gets the right people with the right skills. Improvement is required in how the service promotes its values and culture, ensures fairness and equality, and how it manages performance and develops its leaders.
- 2.5. Based on their findings HMICFRS have provided an overall graded judgement of requires improvement against their 3 main questions of efficiency, effectiveness and people.

3. Service Improvement Journey

- 3.1. Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service welcomed the report and as well as many of the positive findings and recognition of success, the inspection team have provided recommendations for the service to learn from, which will help the service to continue to improve.
- 3.2. Good progress against the HMICFRS recommendations has already been made and (as recognised in their report) work on many of the areas identified as requiring improvement had started before the inspection.
- 3.3. A number of the inspectorate's findings are common to other fire and rescue inspections especially with regard to, how services protect the public through fire safety regulation and how they promote their values, culture, and ensuring fairness and equality. Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service are working with other services to identify best practice and common solutions.
- 3.4. A draft action plan to address the improvement areas identified by HMICFRS has been developed, and is included at Appendix A.
- 3.5. Once finalised, the Cabinet Member and Chief Fire Officer will meet regularly to review progress against the actions, and to ensure sufficient resource is in place to deliver.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1. There may be a need to for additional resources or investment to deliver the Improvement Plan. In addition, the organisational review will help in identifying areas where working practices could be more efficient and identify capacity to be used on other activities. Work with partners and stakeholders will continue with a view to making the best use of our collective resources, including through

the formal collaboration agreement with Norfolk Constabulary.

- 4.2. If any areas are identified where additional investment or resource is needed, these will be raised with Cabinet (as needed).

5. Resource Implications

- 5.1. **Staff:** It is important that our highly skilled and valued workforce are part of our improvement journey and have the opportunity to be part of the work moving forward. A new engagement strategy for the service is being developed to help ensure that we can work in a way that supports this.
- 5.2. **Property:** None.
- 5.3. **IT:** None.

6. Other Implications

- 6.1. **Legal Implications:** Fire and rescue authorities must give due regard to reports and recommendations made by HMICFRS (section 7.5 of the Fire and Rescue National Framework for England 2018).
- 6.2. **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)** As set out in the Improvement Plan, NFRS are currently undertaking a self-assessment against the national Fire and Rescue Service Equality Framework. Findings from this self-assessment will drive actions to ensure workplaces are inclusive.

7. Action required

- 7.1. **The Select Committee are asked to review and comment on the draft Improvement Plan set out in Appendix A. In particular challenge and input is sought around whether the Improvement Plan is robust in addressing the improvement areas identified, and realistic in terms of delivery.**

8. Background Papers

- 8.1. A full copy of the HMICFRS Inspection report, and further information about the inspection process, can be found on their website at <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/>

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

Officer name: Stuart Ruff **Tel No.:** 0300 123 1383
Email address: stuart.ruff@fire.norfolk.gov.uk

Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service

Improvement Plan in response to the
2019 Inspection by Her Majesty's
Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire
& Rescue Services



Introduction



Stuart Ruff
Chief Fire Officer
Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service

In February 2019 we welcomed a team of Inspectors from Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services (HMICFRS) who assessed our Service across three core areas of effectiveness, efficiency and how well we look after our people.

I welcome the opportunity to learn from HMICFRS's recommendations to help us further improve our service for Norfolk communities.

The effectiveness and efficiency of our whole service is very important to me. Reassuringly HMICFRS have concluded that we are good at delivering our operational duties such as responding to fires and other emergencies as well as being good at responding to national risks such as terrorism. It is pleasing that the HMICFRS concluded that we are good at ensuring our service is affordable and that we are good at getting the right people with the right skills.

We invest heavily in developing our staff to ensure we can deliver a great service and it is notable that HMICFRS also found that "Protection staff receive comprehensive training, qualifications and continual professional development." It is also reassuring that the HMICFRS recognised that our "Staff are well trained, well equipped and knowledgeable" and that "Incident commanders, at all levels, can command fire service assets assertively, effectively and safely".

I really do believe in our service motto of *Let us be judged by our actions*. The report references that there have been isolated occasions where individuals have behaved in a way that does not represent what the service stands for. We will be carrying out further work to understand the reasons for this, including whether there are any underlying factors. We are one team in Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service and we will work across the service to put a new cultural framework in place so that the whole team can understand the behaviours we want and expect from ourselves and our colleagues.

Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service is a fantastic service and we want to ensure we are relevant, capable and agile. We have an ambitious programme of development work to drive improvement which will result in the publication of a new Integrated Risk Management Plan to identify the risks in Norfolk and how we plan to address them, a new cultural framework which will ensure our service continues to be a great place to work and an organisational review which will ensure we organise the resources we have in the most effective way to improve your service in the coming years.

Effectiveness

1. How effective is the fire and rescue service at keeping people safe and secure from fire and other risks.



Requires improvement

Understanding the risk of fire and other emergencies



Requires improvement

Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
The service should improve how it uses information from its engagement with the local community to build up a comprehensive profile of risk in the service area.	<p>Developed a new engagement strategy which will improve how we gather and share information with/from local communities about risk in their area.</p> <p>Changed our processes so that operational data and learning generated by our local crews will be used to test whether we have identified all of the community risks in our Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP).</p> <p>Work is well progressed to develop a new fire prevention community risk profile and annual assessment of activity.</p>	<p>Jointly with Norfolk Constabulary, put a programme of Emergency Services Collaboration public meetings in place. This will be a programme of district based public engagement sessions across the county, giving local communities the opportunity to raise concerns about both the fire and policing related risks in their area, and for us to hear their views and local concerns. It also helps to build a shared understanding of community risk with Norfolk Constabulary.</p> <p>As part of the development of the new IRMP, engaging with charities and business</p>	A community risk profile is intended to demonstrate an understanding and analysis of risks in relation to fire and rescue activity, enabling us to effectively plan our prevention, protection and emergency response services.

Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
		communities to help shape our new community safety strategy .	
The service should ensure that its integrated risk management plan is informed by a comprehensive understanding of current and future risk. A wide range of data should be used to build the risk profile and operational data should be used to test that it is up-to-date.	The existing IRMP (2016-20) used the risk information from the previous Plan (2014-17) rather than review and update it. We are taking a different approach in developing the new IRMP 2020-23; the service is using a wide range of up-to-date data to help build a comprehensive understanding of the current and future risks in Norfolk.	A public consultation on the draft IRMP 2020-23 will be carried out in Autumn 2019 . The final proposed IRMP will be considered by Full Council for approval in February 2020 . The Infrastructure and Development Select Committee and Cabinet will consider the draft prior to final approval.	The IRMP is a statutory document which every fire and rescue service is required to have in place. Development of a new Norfolk IRMP for 2020-23 is underway.

Preventing fires and other risks

● ● ○ ○
Requires improvement

Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
The service should ensure it targets its prevention work at people most at risk. This should include proportionate and timely activity to reduce risk.	We have been working hard to reduce the number of people waiting for a Home Fire Risk Check (HFRC) and have already reduced the backlog by 53%	<p>Targeted work to clear the backlog of HFRCs will continue, and we are introducing new risk based customer service standards to ensure our HFRC visits are delivered in a more timely manner to those most vulnerable from fire.</p> <p>As part of the formal collaboration agreement with Norfolk Constabulary, developing additional opportunities for a shared approach, making better use of our collective resources. This includes the potential for the police to deliver HFRCs and for us to raise awareness of scams and fraud through our existing HFRC visits.</p> <p>Introducing better processes will improve how our prevention services are targeted to people most at risk and will make best use of our resources</p>	<p>The service delivers a wide range of prevention services including the Home Fire Risk Check (HFRC) service which aims to reduce the risk of fire occurring in the home.</p> <p>The service already works with a range of other services and partners to deliver prevention activity, including delivering the #Impact road traffic reduction programme with Norfolk Constabulary, drowning prevention training with the RNLI and safety awareness for children through Crucial Crews.</p>

Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
The service should ensure that staff have a good understanding of how to identify vulnerability and safeguard vulnerable people.	A programme of refresher training for all staff has started to ensure they know how to identify vulnerable people and safeguard them by raising concerns through relevant referral routes.	The programme of refresher training for all staff will continue, and will be completed by March 2020 . Introducing a simplified way for our staff to raise safeguarding concerns.	
The service should evaluate its prevention work, so it understands the benefits better.	The County Council's Libraries and Information Service has developed a tool to help evaluate the impact of the prevention work it carries out with communities and vulnerable people. We are working with colleagues in Libraries to explore how this can be adapted for Fire and Rescue.	Exploring ways to evaluate the full range of prevention work undertaken. This includes considering extending the evaluation already carried out, using the tool developed by libraries and working with partners like Norfolk Constabulary to identify impact of shared activity. We will also work with other Fire and Rescue colleagues, through the National Fire Chiefs Council, to identify best practice.	Evaluation is already carried out on the some of our prevention activity. Making a direct link between prevention work and impact on measures/outcomes is challenging.

Protecting the public through fire regulation

● ● ○ ○
Requires improvement

Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
The service should ensure it allocates enough resources to a prioritised and risk-based inspection programme. This should include its arrangements for providing specialist protection advice out of hours.	An organisational review has started and all functions will be reviewed over the next 12-18 months.	Community Fire Protection will be a priority area for the organisational review. The review will include consideration of how we can improve access to specialist advice out of hours and how resources can best be organised to deliver outcomes.	There is currently a fire safety plan that prioritises inspections on those buildings that present the highest risk to the occupants, should a fire start.
The service should ensure that staff work with local businesses and large organisations to share information and expectations on compliance with fire safety regulations.	In May 2019, NFRS began piloting a service offering training sessions for residential social landlords to educate staff around fire safety and community safety.	Further improvements in business engagement are being considered as part of the development of the new IRMP 2020-23.	
The service should ensure it addresses effectively the burden of false alarms.	Over the years we have successfully reduced the number of mobilisations to unwanted fire alarm signals to commercial premises (of the 241 automatic alarms received from commercial premises in Jan- March only 31 were attended).	Undertake a policy review to identify further opportunities to reduce our attendance at false alarms , and to work with businesses to avoid instances of false alarms taking place. Introduce refreshed guidance for our staff to improve understanding of how to work with businesses to further reduce false alarms.	The service already has a policy of challenging signals for automatic fire alarms from commercial premises such as shops. This policy has successfully reduced the number alarms attended but this reduction has levelled off over the past few years.

Responding to fires and other emergencies

● ● ● ○
Good

Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
The service should ensure it has an effective system for staff to use learning and debriefs to improve operational response and incident command.	We have refocused managers attention on ensuring all operational learning and debriefs are completed on time . This performance will be monitored.	Based on the performance of learning and debriefs, we will consider if further measures are required to further embed this.	After serious incidents we ask our crews to record any of the lessons they have identified. This operational learning is used to improve our response and in our training.

Responding to national risks



Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
The service should ensure its firefighters have good access to relevant and up-to-date risk information. This should include cross-border risk information.	The inspection found that a few of our staff did not know how to access this information on the appliance computers when not attending an emergency. Action is already underway through managers to ensure staff are aware.	As we make amendments and additions to risk information, continue to ensure that this is available to firefighters to access.	Our firefighters have access to the latest risk information through their fire appliance on board computers, including cross border risk information.
The service should arrange a programme of over-the-border exercises, sharing the learning from these exercises.	Our district plans now contain over the border exercises and these are currently being undertaken. This provides an opportunity for all services to share operational learning.	Over the border exercises will continue to be carried out.	We have arrangements for forming a multi - agency response to terrorist related incidents including a multi-agency team that responds to terrorist attacks.
The service should ensure it is well-prepared to form part of a multi-agency response to a terrorist-related incident and that its procedures for responding are understood by all staff and are well tested.	Our joint Police and Fire Communication and Control Room went live on 1 July ; this will improve multi-agency coordination and communication during emergencies, and further strengthen our joint working in response to terrorism.	Continue to ensure staff are aware of the procedures for responding.	The recent publication of new National guidance will provide an opportunity to help improve our staff's understanding of the procedures to follow when responding to terrorism.

Efficiency

2. How efficient is the fire and rescue service at keeping people safe and secure from fire and other risks.



Requires improvement

Making best use of resources



Good

Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
The service should ensure that resources are appropriately allocated to support the activity set out in its integrated risk management plan.	Development of a new IRMP 2020-23 is well progressed.	Resources and capacity will be considered as part of the development of the IRMP. If additional resources/capacity will be needed to deliver priorities within the IRMP, they will be highlighted with Members so that they can be fully considered.	The IRMP is a statutory document which every fire and rescue service is required to have in place.
The service should ensure that it makes best use of the resources available to it, including from elsewhere within Norfolk county council, to increase resilience and capacity.	An organisational review has started and all functions will be reviewed over the next 12-18 months. The first phase of the review was to develop a new permanent senior leadership team structure and recruitment to these posts will start shortly.	Community Fire Protection will be a priority area for the organisational review. The review will include consideration of the resources required and how they can best be organised to deliver outcomes.	The organisational review will identify opportunities for better working with colleagues in the wider County Council.

Making the fire and rescue service affordable now and in the future



Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
The service should ensure it makes the best use of available technology to improve operational effectiveness and efficiency.	Following significant capital investment, we will be rolling out new mobile data terminals to all of our fire appliances in the new year.	<p>Reviewing some of our legacy systems and manual processes to identify opportunities put more efficient and effective arrangements in place, including streamlined digital processes. This includes introducing the new ways of working being developed as part of the County Council's Smarter Working programme.</p> <p>Work with fire and rescue colleagues through the National Fire Chiefs Council to identify opportunities to test and adopt new technology.</p>	Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service is working with other services regionally to share systems wherever possible.

People

3. How well does the fire and rescue service look after its people.



Requires improvement

Promoting the right values and culture



Requires improvement

Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
The service should ensure its values and behaviours are understood and demonstrated at all levels of the organisation.	<p>Over the last few months, work has been undertaken to roll out a new cultural framework for the service, clearly defining the values and behaviours of the service.</p> <p>A joint commitment to ensuring dignity in our workplace has been signed by our Chief Fire Officer, Unions and staff associations. This includes a clear statement that bullying and harassment of any form is not acceptable.</p> <p>A new employee engagement strategy is under development.</p> <p>A further staff survey has</p>	<p>Implementation of the cultural framework across the service. This will embed behaviours and values across the service, including through personal and performance management processes. This will help demonstrate how all staff are equally valued for their contribution in making Norfolk safer.</p> <p>We are in the process of adopting the National Fire Chief Councils Leadership Framework. This sets out and defines the leadership behaviours needed at every level in the Fire and Rescue Service. It also sets out some of the key requirements to</p>	The National Fire Chief Councils has this year published a new Leadership Framework. The cultural framework for the service incorporates this framework.

Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
	<p>been carried out, as part of the County Council wide survey, and the results of this are being analysed.</p>	<p>support and develop people's careers and will be used in our promotion and personal development programmes.</p> <p>We will continue to work with staff and unions to support staff to understand the behaviours we expect, and to feel able to raise any issues. This includes implementing the new employee engagement strategy.</p>	
<p>The service should assure itself that staff understand and have confidence in the purpose and integrity of health, safety and wellbeing policies.</p>	<p>A programme of rolling out wellbeing surveys across all teams in the service is underway. These surveys will help improve our staff understanding of the wellbeing support available to them and how to access it.</p>	<p>Complete the programme of wellbeing surveys by the Autumn 2020.</p> <p>We will continue to work with staff and unions, as above.</p>	

Getting the right people with the right skills



Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
The service should ensure its workforce plan takes full account of the necessary skills and capabilities to carry out the integrated risk management plan.	We have established a new resources board of senior managers which will help to ensure we have effective succession planning arrangements.	To improve our workforce planning, a new workforce strategy will be developed which will take account of the necessary skills and capabilities to deliver our new IRMP 2020-23.	

Ensuring fairness and promoting diversity

● ● ○ ○
Requires improvement

Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
The service should assure itself that it has effective grievance procedures.	The grievance procedure has been changed to so that better data about informal grievances is recorded, to ensure that we are able to review and learn from this information.	Information on the grievance procedure will be monitored regularly by managers and staff groups. Working with staff and representative bodies to build confidence in the procedure.	
The service should assure itself that staff are confident using its feedback mechanisms.	A service wide internal communication staff survey was carried out April. This has shown an improvement in our internal communications when compared to the results of a similar survey carried out in 2018. As a result of the feedback from the survey, new arrangements have been put in place for regular senior management engagement with all teams , including a programme for the CFO and his team to visit all fire stations and other offices.	Undertake a review of our feedback mechanisms to identify further ways we can improve staff confidence.	

Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
<p>To identify and tackle barriers to equality of opportunity, and make its workforce more representative, the service should ensure diversity and inclusion are well-understood and become important values of the service.</p>	<p>A self-assessment against the national Fire and Rescue Service Equality Framework is underway, to identify ways that the service can make the workplace more inclusive.</p>	<p>Implement actions and activities identified through the self-assessment process.</p> <p>Work to attract applications to vacancies from across our diverse communities will continue.</p> <p>To act as a critical friend and to help us track the, we have asked the Local Government Association to undertake a peer challenge of our service at the end of the year.</p>	<p>Nationally, fire and rescue services have found it challenging to attract and retain a diverse workforce. The latest wholetime recruitment campaign has been successful with 25% of apprenticeship firefighters being women.</p>

Managing performance developing leaders

● ● ○ ○
Requires improvement

Areas for improvement identified by HMICFRS	Actions already taken by NFRS	Further actions planned	Background information
The service should ensure its selection, development and promotion of staff is open, transparent and fair.	The recruitment to the new senior leadership team posts will be a national campaign open to both internal and external applicants. A staff consultation on the structure was carried out before it was finalised.	Introducing new panel style promotion interviews across the service. This new approach will provide confidence that the interview stage of our selection process is consistent, fair, open and clear.	For uniformed posts, NFRS uses assessment and development centres as part of the recruitment process, which helps to provide a consistent, open and fair selection process.
The service should put in place an open and fair process to identify, develop and support high-potential staff and aspiring leaders.		A talent management scheme will be developed and implemented. This will be informed by the talent management scheme being developed for the wider County Council and the talent toolkit being produced by the National Fire Chiefs Council.	

Report to Infrastructure and Development Select Committee

Item No: 11

Report title:	Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review – Preferred Options Consultation
Date of meeting:	17 July 2019
Responsible Cabinet Member:	Cllr Andy Grant – (Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste)
Responsible Director:	Tom McCabe – (Executive Director, Community and Environmental Services)

Executive Summary

Norfolk County Council, as Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, has a statutory duty to produce and maintain an up-to-date Minerals and Waste Local Plan which forms the basis for determining any relevant planning applications that are lodged with the authority. The provision of a steady and adequate supply of minerals and the management of waste constitute essential infrastructure to support the economic development of the county.

A review of the current Norfolk Minerals and Waste Plan is being carried out to ensure that the policies within them remain up to date, to extend the Plan period from 2026 to 2036 and to consolidate them into one Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan (M&WLP). This process is the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review which will include two public consultation stages and a formal representations period prior to the submission of the M&WLP to the Secretary of State for examination.

The first public consultation stage, called the 'Initial Consultation' took place in summer 2018. The responses received have been considered in the production of the second public consultation document, the 'Preferred Options'. This report provides information about the proposed 'Preferred Options' consultation stage and includes the proposed planning policies for minerals and waste management development and the proposed mineral extraction sites. The next stage in the process is to consult with stakeholders, including parish councils and the public, on the Preferred Options consultation. The draft document is available at: [Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review](#).

The Council must also prepare and maintain a Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (MWDS) which specifies the Development Plan Documents (DPDs) that the Council will produce together with the timetable for the preparation and revision of the DPDs. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the scheme to be kept up to date. The remaining stages in the production of the M&WLPR will not be in accordance with the adopted timetable in the MWDS. A formal revision to the MWDS is therefore necessary and is attached as Appendix 1.

Actions Required

The Select Committee is invited to:

- 1. Comment on the revised Minerals and Waste Development Scheme and recommend Cabinet resolve that the MWDS shall have effect from 1 September 2019.**
- 2. Comment on the draft Preferred Options document and recommend Cabinet agreement to publish the Preferred Options document for consultation.**
- 3. Comment on the consultation methods proposed in this report and recommend Cabinet agreement to carry out the Preferred Options consultation using the methods detailed in this report.**

1. Background and Purpose

- 1.1. The Norfolk Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies DPD was adopted by Norfolk County Council in 2011. The Norfolk Minerals and Waste Site Specific Allocations DPDs were adopted in 2013, while the Mineral Site-Specific Allocations DPD was updated in 2017 only with regards to silica sand. These adopted plans cover the period to 2026. As the Core Strategy was adopted over five years ago, a review of the three adopted DPDs is being carried out to ensure that the policies within them remain up-to-date, to extend the Plan period to 2036 and to consolidate the three DPDs into one Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan (M&WLP). This process is the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review (M&WLPR).
- 1.2. The first stage in the M&WLPR was a 'call for mineral extraction sites' which took place in July 2017. The sites submitted, together with the existing allocated mineral extraction sites which have yet to obtain planning permission, have been assessed for their suitability for future mineral extraction. The assessment included potential effects to amenity, highway access, the historic environment, archaeology, landscape, public rights of way, ecological designations, geodiversity, flood risk, hydrology, the Water Framework Directive, utilities and safeguarded aerodromes.
- 1.3. The first public consultation stage on the M&WLPR was the 'Initial Consultation' which took place in July and August 2018. The second public consultation will be the 'Preferred Options' stage. This report provides information about the proposed Preferred Options document and consultation stage.
- 1.4. In January 2019 a 'call for waste management sites' took place for proposed permanent waste treatment facilities of over 1 hectare in size with an estimated annual throughput of over 50,000 tpa to be considered for inclusion in the M&WLPR. The six sites submitted have been assessed for their suitability to be allocated as future waste management facilities, but no sites are intended to be allocated in the M&WLPR.
- 1.5. The current Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (MWDS) came into effect on 1 June 2018. The MWDS contains the timetable for the review of the Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (which was adopted in December 2018) and the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review which is currently being produced. This report provides information about the proposed changes to the MWDS.
- 1.6. Norfolk County Council, as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority has a statutory duty to produce a Minerals and Waste Local Plan and to keep it up to date. The government can intervene in local authorities where policies in plans have not been kept up to date. The government also has powers to intervene in the MWDS process, either by directing that a revision take place, or preparing the revision and requiring the planning authority to bring it into effect.

2. Proposals

- 2.1. **Minerals and Waste Development Scheme**
The Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (MWDS) has been updated and Cabinet is recommended to bring the Scheme into effect on 1 September 2019. The Scheme sets out a timetable for producing minerals and waste planning policy documents; the M&WLP and SCI.
- 2.2. The part of the MWDS regarding the SCI is not currently needed because the SCI was adopted in 2018 and is not required to be reviewed until five years after

adoption (2023).

- 2.3. Changes are required to the timetable in the MWDS for the M&WLPR. The MWDS planned for the Preferred Options consultation stage to take place in December 2018 / January 2019. Due to both the number of comments received in response to the Initial Consultation and the inclusion of a 'call for waste management facilities' in the M&WLPR process in January 2019, it has not been possible to undertake the Preferred Options consultation stage at the time anticipated in the adopted MWDS. The consultation is now planned to take place in August and September 2019 as detailed in this report. The revised date of the Preferred Options consultation means that the subsequent stages of the M&WLPR cannot now take place in accordance with the timescales set out in the current adopted MWDS. Accordingly, a revised timescale is required in order to provide a realistic timeframe to undertake further stages of consultation, assess and respond to responses, and undertake the process of examination and adoption.
- 2.4. A revision of the MWDS is therefore necessary and has been prepared by officers: this is attached as Appendix 1. The 2004 Act states that a revision to the MWDS is brought into effect by the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority resolving that the revision is to have an effect from a specified date
- 2.5. A table comparing the current MWDS timetable for the M&WLP with the proposed changes in the revised MWDS is below:

Stage	Date timetabled in the adopted MWDS	Date timetabled in the revised MWDS
Preparation of Local Plan Consultation (Regulation 18)	Initial Consultation: June/July 2018 Preferred Options Consultation: December 2018/January 2019	Initial Consultation July/August 2018 Preferred Options Consultation: August/September 2019
Pre-Submission representations period (Regulation 19)	September/October 2019	May/June 2020
Submission (Regulation 22)	December 2019	September 2020
Hearing commencement (Regulation 24)	March 2020	January 2021
Inspector's Report	July 2020	July 2021
Adoption (Regulation 26)	October 2020	September 2021

2.6. **Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Preferred Options**

A review of the three adopted Minerals and Waste DPDs is being carried out to ensure that the policies within them remain up-to-date, extend the Plan period to 2036 and consolidate the three DPDs into one Norfolk M&WLP. This process is the M&WLPR. The following paragraphs summarise the contents of the Preferred Options consultation document, which has been amended, where necessary, taking into consideration representations received at the Initial Consultation stage. The full draft Preferred Options document is available to view on the Norfolk County Council website at: [Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review](#).

- 2.7. The M&WLP includes a vision and strategic objectives for waste management

and minerals development for the Plan period to 2036. No significant changes have been made to the vision or strategic objectives following the Initial Consultation stage.

- 2.8. The M&WLP includes policies relevant to both minerals and waste management development covering the following issues: development management criteria, transport, climate change mitigation and adaption, The Brecks protected habitats and species, and agricultural soils. No significant changes have been made to these policies. The Initial Consultation document contained a policy on the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development; this policy has been deleted from the Preferred Options document and replaced with text because it repeated the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 2.9. A 'call for waste management sites' was carried out earlier in 2019, which resulted in the submission of six sites proposed for permanent waste treatment facilities. These sites have been assessed and it is concluded that five of them are unsuitable to allocate, whilst it is not necessary to allocate the sixth site because it already has planning permission for a waste management facility and is located on employment land, which would be in accordance with Policy WP3.
- 2.10. The M&WLP includes a forecast of the quantities of waste that need to be planned for over the Plan period to 2036. These figures have been reviewed for the Preferred Options document and an assessment of the existing waste management capacity in Norfolk has also been updated, which concluded that sufficient capacity already exists to accommodate the forecast growth in waste arising over the Plan period to 2036. Therefore, it is not considered necessary to allocate any waste management sites in the M&WLP.
- 2.11. However, planning applications for new waste management facilities are still expected to come forward during the Plan period, both to move waste management up the waste hierarchy and because waste management is a contract driven and competitive industry. The M&WLPR therefore contains criteria-based policies to determine those planning applications that come forward for waste management facilities.
- 2.12. The M&WLP includes a spatial strategy for new waste management facilities, a policy detailing the types of land considered to be potentially suitable for waste management facilities and includes criteria-based policies for the determination of planning applications for the following types of waste management facilities: inert waste recycling, waste transfer and treatment, composting, anaerobic digestion, household waste recycling centres, residual waste treatment, landfill and water recycling centres. Specific policies also cover the design of waste management facilities, landfill mining and safeguarding waste management facilities and water recycling centres. Some of the waste management policies have been amended following the Initial Consultation.
- 2.13. The M&WLP includes the revised quantities of sand and gravel, carstone and silica sand that need to be planned for during the period to 2036 to provide a steady and adequate supply of minerals. Based on the rolling average of 10 years sales data and other relevant local information, the M&WLPR proposes to plan for the same amount of silica sand extraction per annum (750,000 tonnes) as contained in the adopted Core Strategy, whilst a lower rate of carstone extraction per annum (121,400 tonnes) and sand and gravel extraction per annum (1,868,000 tonnes) is proposed to be planned for, reflecting the average extraction rate for aggregates over the last 20 years (1999-2018). This twenty-year period covers a whole economic cycle and is therefore considered to be the most appropriate method to forecast the quantities to be planned for over the Plan period.
- 2.14. Using the forecast annual extraction rate and the existing permitted reserves

(sites with planning permission for mineral extraction), there is a forecast need to allocate sites with an estimated resource of at least 340,200 tonnes of carstone, 20,313,000 tonnes of sand and gravel and 10,500,000 tonnes of silica sand in the M&WLPR. These are lower quantities than contained in the Initial Consultation document because the 20-year average has reduced and data on permitted reserves is now available for 2018, this reduces the period to be planned for up to 2036.

- 2.15. The M&WLP contains a spatial strategy for minerals development. Policies relevant to the determination of applications for minerals development include: borrow pits for construction schemes, agricultural reservoirs, protection of core river valleys, cumulative impacts and phasing of workings, progressive working and restoration, aftercare, concrete batching and asphalt plants and energy minerals. Specific policies also cover safeguarding mineral resources, mineral sites and infrastructure. Some of the minerals policies have been amended following the Initial Consultation.
- 2.16. The assessments of the proposed mineral extraction sites (both those proposed in response to the 'call for sites' and sites currently allocated in the Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD that have not received planning permission) are included in the Preferred Options document and have been revised, where necessary, following the Initial Consultation. The Preferred Options document contains 37 sites proposed for sand and gravel extraction and 19 of these sites are concluded to be suitable to allocate. The estimated sand and gravel resource in the allocated sites is sufficient to meet the forecast need for sand and gravel during the Plan period.
- 2.17. Since the Initial Consultation stage, two sites proposed for sand and gravel extraction have been withdrawn from the process (MIN 79 and MIN 80 at Swardeston) and one site has received planning permission (MIN 76 at Tottenhill). One additional site has been proposed (MIN 213 at Stratton Strawless) which is concluded to be suitable to allocate. Three sand and gravel sites which were initially concluded to be suitable to allocate in the Initial Consultation document, are now not considered to be suitable in the Preferred Options document. The sites that are no longer allocated are MIN 71 at Holt, MIN 204 at Feltwell and MIN 35 at Quidenham. The conclusions for all the other proposed sand and gravel extraction sites have remained the same in the Preferred Options document as contained in the Initial Consultation document.
- 2.18. The Preferred Options document includes one site for carstone extraction (located at Middleton) which is concluded to be suitable to allocate. This one site would be sufficient to meet the forecast need for carstone during the Plan period.
- 2.19. The Preferred Options document includes three sites proposed for silica sand extraction; two of these sites (located at East Winch and Bawsey) are concluded to be suitable to allocate. Site SIL 02 (land at Shouldham and Marham) is estimated to contain 16 million tonnes of silica sand, but is now concluded to be unsuitable to allocate, due to an objection from the Ministry of Defence regarding bird strike risk to aviation safety at RAF Marham. The two allocated silica sand sites only contain 4.2 million tonnes of silica sand and are not sufficient on their own to meet the forecast additional need for 10.5 million tonnes of silica sand during the Plan period. The Single Issue Silica Sand Review of the Minerals SSA, which was adopted in 2017, defined four areas of search for future silica sand extraction. These four areas of search are proposed to still be included within the M&WLPR, with an amendment to exclude some land in the north of AOS E (land to the north of Shouldham) due to the potential for adverse impacts on the setting of heritage assets at Wormegay and Pentney

2.20. **Consultation**

The Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review process includes two public consultation stages and a formal representations period (detailed in the following paragraphs). The planning policy process is front-loaded so that stakeholders are consulted at an appropriate early stage in the process. The responses received during each public consultation stage will inform the next stage in the Local Plan Review process.

- 2.21. The first public consultation stage, the Initial Consultation, took place for six weeks in July and August 2018. In accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement the Initial Consultation was publicised in the following ways: all addresses within 250m of the boundary of a proposed mineral extraction site or area of search were written to directly explaining why they were being contacted, all the consultation bodies detailed in the regulations (including every parish and town council in Norfolk) were written to informing them of the consultation, all consultation documents were published on the Norfolk County Council website, hard copies of the documents were placed in all Norfolk public libraries, as well as at County Hall and the seven main district council offices, and a notice about the consultation was published in the EDP.
- 2.22. Responses to the Initial Consultation were received from a total of 856 people and organisations making 1,518 representations. The majority of responses received were objections to proposed silica sand extraction site SIL 02 (land at Marham and Shouldham) (398 representations of which 385 were objections) and proposed sand and gravel extraction site MIN 38 at Fritton (355 representations of which 347 were objections). All the representations received are available to view on the e-consultation website at: [Initial Consultation Responses](#). The responses received have informed the Preferred Options document.
- 2.23. The next stage in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review process is the proposed public consultation on the Preferred Options document. This stage includes consultation with stakeholders, including parish councils and the public on the contents of the Preferred Options document, which includes policies for the determination of planning applications for minerals and waste management development and the assessment and suitability of the proposed sites and areas for mineral extraction during the period to 2036.
- 2.24. There are a number of organisations which Norfolk County Council is legally required to invite representations from, as part of the Local Plan process in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. There are also a number of organisations which Norfolk County Council has a duty to cooperate with in the plan making process, in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011).
- 2.25. In accordance with the adopted SCI, at each stage the consultation documents will be available to view on the Norfolk County Council website and available for inspection at the main offices of Norfolk's local planning authorities. It is proposed that the consultation period will last for six-weeks. However, this period could be extended to between eight or ten weeks if considered necessary. A longer consultation period would have an effect on the timetable for the remaining stages of the M&WLPR.
- 2.26. In line with the SCI, it is proposed to publicise the Preferred Options consultation in the following ways: all addresses within 250m of the boundary of a proposed mineral extraction site or area of search will be written to directly explaining why they are being contacted, all the consultation bodies detailed in the regulations (including every parish and town council in Norfolk) will be written to directly to inform them of the consultation, all consultation documents will be published on the Norfolk County Council website, hard copies of the documents will be placed

in County Hall and the seven main district council offices, and a notice about the consultation will be published in the EDP.

- 2.27. In addition to the requirements in the Regulations and the SCI, all respondents to the Initial Consultation will be contacted to inform them of the Preferred Options consultation. It is also proposed, at the Preferred Options stage, for at least one notice about the consultation to be placed in each of the locations of the 42 proposed minerals and waste sites and that a press release will be issued. One additional consultation method, which is not currently proposed to be used, would be to hold public meetings or exhibitions about the Preferred Options consultation, however, this would require additional resources in terms of both time and cost.
- 2.28. **Next steps**
- Responses received to the Preferred Options consultation** (this stage) will be used to inform the pre-submission publication version of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan.
- 2.29. **Pre-Submission publication** (May/June 2020) **and submission** (September 2020) – The Preferred Options consultation responses will be considered and will feed into the Pre-Submission version of the plan. The Pre-Submission version will contain the planning policies for use in the determination of planning applications for minerals and waste management development. It will also contain only those sites/areas which are considered suitable for mineral extraction during the plan period and the policies detailing the requirements that a planning application for mineral extraction on each allocated site/area will need to address. The Pre-Submission Publication will go to Cabinet with the recommendation for it to be published to enable representations to be made, prior to submission to the Secretary of State for Communities to carry out an Examination in Public.
- 2.30. **Examination** (January 2021) **and Inspector's Report** (July 2021) – A Planning Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State will conduct the Examination in Public and produce a report regarding the plan's soundness and legal compliance. The dates of examination hearings and receipt of the Inspector's Report will be determined by the Planning Inspector.
- 2.31. **Adoption** (September 2021) – The date of adoption will be dependent on the date when the Planning Inspector's report is received. Assuming that the report concludes that the plan is sound, legally compliant and should be adopted, the Council will then make the decision whether to adopt the document or not. The adopted document would replace the current Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Plan Documents.
- 2.32. **Planning Applications** – Developers wanting to extract minerals from specific sites or land within an area of search allocated in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan will still need to apply for and be granted planning permission before mineral extraction can take place. Applications will be assessed on their individual merits in the light of all relevant development plan policies and other material considerations. Planning permissions are often granted subject to conditions to mitigate potential impacts from site operations and mineral and waste sites are monitored on a regular basis.

3. Impact of the Proposal

- 3.1. The publication of the Preferred Options document for public consultation will enable stakeholders, including parish councils and the public to comment on the contents of the Preferred Options documents, including the policies for the determination of planning applications for minerals and waste management development and the suitability of the proposed sites and areas for mineral

extraction. The comments received will be recorded on the Local Plan e-consultation system and published on the Norfolk County Council website and will inform the Pre-Submission version of the M&WLP. A summary of the comments received and how they have been taken into account will be published in a Consultation Statement and provided to the Secretary of State when the M&WLP is submitted for examination.

- 3.2. As part of the examination of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review a Planning Inspector will assess whether the M&WLP satisfies various statutory requirements imposed by the 2004 Act, including the requirement that the plan has been prepared in accordance with the adopted MWDS. Therefore, a revised MWDS needs to be brought into effect to enable the M&WLP to be legally compliant. Implementation of the MWDS is reported annually in Monitoring Reports which are published on the Norfolk County Council website.

4. Financial Implications

- 4.1. The financial implications of the M&WLPR were included in the EDT Committee Report of May 2018. Amending the MWDS does not change the costs of the remaining stages of the M&WLPR process, but it does change the financial year in which some of these costs will take place, with the most significant costs (associated with the examination of the M&WLP) occurring in the financial year 2021/22.
- 4.2. The timetable for the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review is included within the Minerals and Waste Local Development Scheme (Appendix 1). To minimised publication costs going forward, all stakeholders, including parish councils, will be consulted on-line wherever possible. Notwithstanding these savings, the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review will give rise to additional costs, as follows:
- 4.3. Based on the experience of previous planning policy production, costs for the remaining stage of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review process, including officer time in the collection of evidence, formation of policy and assessment of consultation responses and:

	Year	Estimated costs
Publication of Preferred Options consultation documents (Reg. 18)	2019/20	£4,000
Consultation advertising costs	2019/20	£500
Publication of Pre-Submission consultation documents	2020/21	£4,000
Pre-Submission advertising costs	2020/21	£500
Planning Inspector costs for examination	2021/22	£100,000 *
Programme Officer costs for examination	2020/21	£8,000 *
Venue hire for examination hearings	2020/21	£2,400
Examination advertising costs	2020/21	£500
Adoption advertising costs	2021/22	£500
Adoption printing costs	2021/22	£4,000
Total estimated costs		£124,400
* these costs are unavoidable as part of the M&WLPR process but are not included within the existing revenue budget.		

- 4.4. These costs will vary depending on the level of public engagement with the process and the duration of the examination hearings. The estimated costs are based on eight days of examination hearings. Whilst the daily amount charged for a Planning Inspector has not changed since 2008, it appears that the number of days' work being charged for an examination has increased.
- 4.5. As stated above, consultation will be carried out via the internet and email wherever possible as this maximises efficiencies in both cost and time. However, there will still be a need for some hard copies of consultation documents to be produced and for some correspondence by letter to ensure that the consultation process is accessible to all.

5. Resource Implications

- 5.1. **Staff:** None under the proposed service level.
- 5.2. **Property:** None
- 5.3. **IT:** None under the proposed service level.

6. Other Implications

- 6.1. **Legal Implications:** There is a legal duty under Section 16 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 ("the 2004 Act") to prepare and maintain and Minerals and Waste Development Scheme. The scheme must specify the development plan documents (DPDs) that the County Council will produce, their subject matter, geographical area and the timetable for the preparation and revision of the DPDs. The 2004 Act requires the Council to revise the Scheme when appropriate, and in practice this duty includes ensuring that the scheme is kept up-to-date.
- 6.2. The MWDS will be published on Norfolk County Council's website and made available for inspection as required by the relevant legislation.
- 6.3. As part of the examination of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review a Planning Inspector will assess not only whether the M&WLPR is sound, but also whether it satisfies various statutory requirements imposed by the 2004 Act. These include the requirement that it has been prepared in accordance with the adopted MWDS. Therefore, a revised MWDS needs to be brought into effect to enable the M&WLPR to be legally compliant.
- 6.4. The Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review process must be carried out in accordance with the 2004 Act and other relevant planning legislation. The legal compliance of the Plan will form part of the examination carried out by and independent Planning Inspector in 2021.
- 6.5. **Human Rights implications** The human rights of the local residents are engaged under Article 8, the right to respect for private and family life and Article 1 of the First Protocol, the right of enjoyment of property. When adopted, the policies within the Minerals and Waste Local Plan will be used in the determined of planning applications for minerals extraction and associated development and for waste management facilities. A grant of planning permission may infringe those human rights, but they are qualified rights, that is that they can be balanced against the interests of the community as a whole and the human rights of other individuals. In making that balance it may also be taken into account that the amenity of local residents could be adequately safeguarded by planning conditions.
- 6.6. The human rights of the owners of the proposed allocation sites may be engaged under the First Protocol Article 1, that is the right to make use of their land. However, the right is a qualified right and may be balanced against the

need to protect the environment and the amenity of local residents.

- 6.7. However, it is not considered that the human rights of local residents or the owners of the proposed allocation sites would be infringed by the publication of the Preferred Options Consultation of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review.
- 6.8. **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)**
The Council's planning functions are subject to Equality Impact Assessments. No EqIA issues have been identified with regards to amending the MWDS. The Preferred Options version of the M&WLP is a consultation document and the consultation will be carried out in accordance with the adopted Statement of Community Involvement, therefore no EqIA issues have been identified at this stage. The Pre-Submission version of the M&WLP, which will contain the planning policies and mineral extraction sites/areas for allocation, will be subject to a full EqIA which will be published at that stage. Any sites allocated in the M&WLP will also need to apply for and be granted planning permission before they are able to operate and an EqIA will be carried out at the planning application stage.
- 6.9. **Sustainability implications** (where appropriate)
The environmental implications of the M&WLPR are formally assessed as part of the review process, through the Sustainability Appraisal (which includes a Strategic Environmental Assessment) and a Habitats Regulations Assessment. Both of these assessments must be carried out in accordance with the relevant legislation and include formal consultation stages. An Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report and a Habitats Regulations Assessment (Task 1) were published to accompany the Initial Consultation [available at: [Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review](#)] and will be revised where necessary to accompany the Preferred Options Consultation.
- 6.10. **Any other implications**
None

7. Actions Required

- 7.1. The Select Committee is invited to:
- 1. Comment on the revised Minerals and Waste Development Scheme and recommend Cabinet resolve that the MWDS shall have effect from 1 September 2019.**
 - 2. Comment on the draft Preferred Options document and recommend Cabinet agreement to publish the Preferred Options document for consultation.**
 - 3. Comment on the consultation methods proposed in this report and recommend Cabinet agreement to carry out the Preferred Options consultation using the methods detailed in this report.**

8. Background Papers

- 8.1. Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (June 2018)
Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review (draft Preferred Options Consultation) (2019)
Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review (Initial Consultation) (2018)
Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review (Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report) (2018)
Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review – Habitats Regulations Assessment (Task 1) (2018)
(available at Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review webpage: [Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review](#))

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

Officer name: Caroline Jeffery

Tel No. : 222193

Email address: Caroline.jeffery@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.



Norfolk County Council

Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan

Minerals and Waste Development Scheme

August 2019

www.norfolk.gov.uk



Norfolk County Council

Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan

Minerals and Waste Development Scheme

August 2019

T. McCabe - Executive Director
Community and Environmental Services
Norfolk County Council
Martineau Lane
Norwich
NR1 2SG

www.norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this in large print, audio, Braille, an alternative format or a different language please contact Norfolk County Council on 0344 2800 8020 or 18001 0344 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help

Contents

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Existing Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework	5
3.	Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan	7
4.	Glossary	8
Table 1	Minerals and Waste Development Scheme Timetable 2018 - 2021	9

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Norfolk County Council is the planning authority for minerals and waste matters within the county. Under the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended, all local planning authorities must prepare a Local Development Scheme. Similarly, a Minerals and Waste Development Scheme is prepared by a Minerals and Waste Planning Authority and sets out the programme for preparing planning documents.
- 1.2 The County Council has prepared this Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (MWDS) in accordance with the Act.
- 1.3 The National Planning Policy Framework requires all Local Planning Authorities to produce a Local Plan for their area. Norfolk County Council has produced the following development plan documents (DPDs) to meet this requirement: Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies, Minerals Site Specific Allocations and Waste Site Specific Allocations. All of these documents have been adopted by Norfolk County Council along with a Policies Map. The adopted Local Plan (consisting of DPDs) is the statutory development plan and the basis on which all minerals and waste planning decisions will be made in Norfolk.
- 1.4 The Council has also produced a Statement of Community Involvement, this Minerals and Waste Development Scheme and Monitoring Reports.
- 1.5 The Minerals and Waste Development Scheme is primarily a programme for the preparation of Development Plan Documents. The Scheme sets out which Development Plan Documents will be produced, in what order and when.

2. Existing Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework

- 2.1 The statutory plans for minerals and waste planning in Norfolk are contained in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework. This framework consists of four planning policy documents which together form the Minerals and Waste Local Plan for Norfolk:
- 2.2 **Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies DPD (the ‘Core Strategy’)** - This planning policy document contains the vision, objectives and strategic planning policies for minerals and waste development in Norfolk until 2026. The Minerals and Waste Core Strategy also includes Development Management policies which are used in the determination of planning applications to ensure that minerals extraction and associated development and waste management facilities can happen in a sustainable way. The DPD contains measurable objectives to enable successful monitoring. This document was adopted in September 2011.
- 2.3 **Waste Site Specific Allocations DPD** – allocates specific sites which are available and acceptable in principle for waste management facilities, to meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS4, until the end of 2026. This document was adopted in October 2013.
- 2.4 **Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD** - allocates specific sites which are available and acceptable in principle for mineral extraction and associated development, to meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS1 until the end of 2026. This document was adopted in October 2013 and updated with the adoption of the Single Issue Silica Sand Review in December 2017. The Single Issue Silica Sand Review allocated an additional site and areas of search for future silica sand extraction until the end of 2026.
- 2.5 **Policies Map**
The Policies Map accompanies the Minerals and Waste Local Plan (currently the Core Strategy, Minerals SSA and Waste SSA DPDs). The Policies Map illustrates on an Ordnance Survey base map all of the policies contained in the adopted plans. The Policies Map will be revised and adopted successively each time a DPD that includes a policy requiring spatial expression is adopted. An interactive version of the policies map is available on Norfolk County Council’s website: www.norfolk.gov.uk/nmwdf. The interactive map is the most up to date version of the map available.
- 2.6 The Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework also includes the following documents produced by Norfolk County Council:
- 2.7 **The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)** sets out Norfolk County Council’s consultation strategy for involving local communities in the preparation of Norfolk’s minerals and waste DPDs and in the determination of planning applications submitted to the County Council. The most recent version of the SCI document was adopted in December 2018.

- 2.8 **This Minerals and Waste Development Scheme (MWDS)** which sets out what documents are being produced as part of the Local Plan and the timetable for their production, including consultation stages. The previous MWDS came into force in June 2018.

Authority's Monitoring Reports

- 2.9 The County Council is required to prepare monitoring reports to assess the implementation of the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme and the extent to which policies in the development plan documents are being achieved. In accordance with Part 8 of the 'Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012' the County Council must make available any information collected as soon as possible after the information becomes available.
- 2.10 The County Council assesses:
- progress made in the preparation of the authority's local plans and whether progress made is in accordance with the timetable contained in the development scheme;
 - what action has been taken in accordance with the duty to co-operate with other local planning authorities during the monitoring period;
 - whether it is meeting, or is on track to meet, the targets set out in the development plan documents and, if not, the reasons why;
 - whether any policies need to be replaced to meet sustainable development objectives; and
 - what action needs to be taken if policies need to be replaced.
- 2.11 **Local Aggregate Assessment and Silica Sand Assessment** which is produced annually and includes information on the rolling average of 10 years' sales data, the landbank of permitted reserves and other relevant local information, taking into account the advice of the East of England Aggregates Working Party.

3. Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan

Overview

Role and Subject	To provide the strategic and development management policies for minerals and waste planning in Norfolk until 2036. To allocate specific sites, preferred areas and/or areas of search for mineral extraction in Norfolk until 2036. To provide criteria-based policies for waste management facilities in Norfolk until 2036.
Coverage	The administrative area of Norfolk
Status	Development plan document

Timetable for Review

The Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies DPD was adopted in September 2011. The Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD and the Waste Site Specific Allocations DPD were both adopted in October 2013.

The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 33) states that “Policies in local plans ... should be reviewed to assess whether they need updating at least once every five years and should then be updated as necessary. Reviews should be completed no later than five years from the adoption date of a plan and should take into account changing circumstances affecting the area, or any relevant changes in national policy.”

Therefore, a joint update of all three of the adopted DPDs will be carried out to ensure that the policies within them remain up-to-date, to extend the plan period from 2026 to 2036 and to consolidate the three existing DPDs into one Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan, in accordance with national planning policy.

Stage	Dates
Preparation of Local Plan consultation (Regulation 18)	Initial Consultation: June / July 2018 Preferred Options: August / September 2019
Pre-Submission representations period (Regulation 19)	May / June 2020
Submission (Regulation 22)	September 2020
Hearing (Regulation 24)	January 2021
Inspector's Report	July 2021
Adoption (Regulation 26)	September 2021

5. Glossary

Local Development Documents - A term brought in by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. These are all documents which form part of the Local Plan, both spatial and non-spatial.

Development plan documents – A term brought in by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. These are the spatial planning documents that form part of the Local Plan. These set out spatial planning policies and proposals for an area or topic. They include the core strategy, development management policies, specific site allocations of land and area action plans (where needed).

Local Plan - The plan for the future development of the local area, drawn up by the local planning authority in consultation with the community. In law this is described as the development plan documents adopted under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended). Current core strategies or other planning policies, which under the regulations would be considered to be development plan documents, form part of the Local Plan.

Minerals and Waste Development Scheme Timetable 2018 - 2021

Milestone Plan	2018												2019											
	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
							1	1												1	1			

Milestone Plan	2020												2021											
	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D
					2	2			3				4						5		6			

Key Milestones Plan
1. Preparation of the Local Plan - Regulation 18
2. Pre-Submission representations period - Regulation 19
3. Submission - Regulation 22
4. Independent Examination Hearings - Regulation 24
5. Inspector's report
6. Adoption - Regulation 26

Report to Infrastructure and Development Select Committee

Item No. 12

Report title:	Highway Asset Performance
Date of meeting:	17 July 2019
Responsible Cabinet Member:	Councillor Martin Wilby – (Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport)
Responsible Director:	Tom McCabe – (Executive Director, Community and Environmental Services)
Is this a key decision?	No

Introduction from Cabinet Member

Having a strong infrastructure is recognised in the Council Plan as an essential requirement for a growing Norfolk economy. It is therefore imperative that we monitor the performance of our highway assets in order to spend our budgets wisely, react to changing circumstances and use the money where it is needed the most.

It is important that the way we manage our highway asset reflects the objectives of the Council Plan.

In an ever-challenging environment it is positive that we are managing our asset effectively against the member approved targets and have seen a slight improvement in road condition. It is also encouraging that public satisfaction with highway condition in Norfolk remains consistent. In the 2018 National Highways and Transportation (NHT) Survey we were ranked 3rd overall of 28 shire counties, compared with 7th last year. The decrease in the backlog and a comparatively good public satisfaction result suggests that the current asset management strategy has been effective.

Executive Summary

This report provides an annual summary of how well we are managing our highway assets. Highway asset performance is assessed on an annual basis against a set of previously agreed service level priorities to inform decisions and make the best use of capital expenditure. Revenue budgets, used for general maintenance and repair, are not part of this report. The capital budget for 19/20 is £34 million and the estimated budget for 20/21 is £35 million.

A commonly used measure to indicate how well the asset is performing is by determining a 'backlog' figure, which is the 'gap' between current condition and our service level. We use condition surveys to assess the current road condition. The overall highway asset backlog in June 2019 is £36.4 million. This has decreased from the 2017/18 figure of £37.9 million and indicates a slight improvement in road condition.

The policy and strategy will be reflected in the Transport Asset Management Plan. A report reviewing the Transport Asset Management Plan will be delivered to this committee in November before being presented for agreement at Cabinet in January 2020. Member endorsement of the Asset Management Policy, Strategy and performance measures is a requirement of the Department for Transport's Incentive Fund to receive the full available allocation. In 19-20 the grant allocation was £4.8million.

Recommendations

Select Committees are asked to:

- a) Note the progress against the Asset Management Strategy Performance framework and the continuation of the current strategy and targets (Appendix A and B)**
- b) Endorse the proposed realignment of the Asset Management Policy (Appendix C) with the council plan agreed in May 2019**
- c) Endorse the enhanced detail in the Asset Management Strategy (Appendix D) and revised targets to 2021-22 (Appendix E)**
- d) Note the performance against Key Performance Indicator's in Highway Contracts (Tarmac, WSP & Dynniq) (Appendix F)**

1. Background and Purpose

1.1. Highway Asset Management

- 1.1.1. The Highway Asset Management Policy was agreed by Members in July 2014. The Strategy was reviewed by Members in 14 October 2016 who also approved a performance framework.
- 1.1.2. This allows members to be informed on whether the strategy is delivering the agreed performance targets and take any necessary action to manage changing circumstances such as annual budgets or the regulatory framework. Evidence is in section 2.

2. Proposals

2.1. Current Highway Asset Performance

2.1.1. Asset Condition

- 2.1.1.1. The existing strategy recognises that the current level of funding makes the maintenance of current condition challenging and that in most circumstances the strategy will be to manage a slight deterioration.
- 2.1.1.2. Any shortfall in achieving 2006-07 service levels, or otherwise agreed in 2013-14, is described as a backlog. The overall highway asset backlog at April 2019 is £36.4 million. This is a decrease compared with £37.9 million in 2017/18 and £51.4 million in 2016/17. This has been summarised in Appendix A.
- 2.1.1.3. The backlog has reduced due to the slight improvement in road condition. Following the 'Beast from the East' in February/March 2018 central government provided additional funds of £3.4 million for road repairs and surfacing. The impact of the additional funding is reflected in the condition survey undertaken in the autumn of 2018. A summary on the performance of individual asset types can be seen in Appendix B. A further investment of £12.7 million was allocated to Norfolk in the autumn budget after the condition survey had taken place.

2.1.2. Customer Satisfaction

- 2.1.2.1. The National Highways and Transport (NHT) Network Survey is carried out annually during June, July and August. For the 2018 survey 3,300 Norfolk residents, chosen at random, were asked to rate a range of highway and transportation services, including public transport, walking and cycling, congestion, road safety and highway maintenance.

- 2.1.2.1. Altogether 113 local authorities signed up for the 2018 survey. Norfolk County Council achieved a ranking of 3rd out of 28 county councils that participated in the survey. This is an improvement on our ranking of 7th last year.
- 2.1.2.2. Out of the 28 county councils and larger unitary authorities in the peer group, Norfolk ranked in the top 10 for:
- Condition of highways
 - Highway maintenance
 - Public transport info
 - Ease of access (for disabled people)
 - Local bus services
 - Community transport
 - Pavements and footpaths
 - Cycle routes and facilities
 - Traffic levels and congestion
 - Management of roadworks
 - Traffic management
- 2.1.2.3. Of those indicators contained in our Asset Performance Strategy Measures in Appendix C we ranked:
- Overall – 3rd
 - Condition of highways – 6th
 - Highway Maintenance – 8th
 - Pavements & Footpaths – 9th
 - Street lighting – 17th
 - Satisfaction with public rights of way – 25th
- 2.1.2.4. The survey also gives us an indication of the relative importance that Norfolk residents place on the services we deliver. Respondents are asked ‘For which of the following service areas is it not acceptable to reduce the level of service’. We know from previous results that the service that the public would least want to see reduced continues to be ‘Management and Maintenance of roads’. This helps inform our priorities and reflects the results above.
- 2.1.2.5. The 2019 survey is due to be sent out in June, with the results being released in September, and published in October.
- 2.1.3. **Future Asset Management Policy and Strategy**
- 2.1.3.1. To maintain the full allocation from the Department for Transport (DfT) incentive fund, an asset management policy and strategy must have been developed, clearly documenting the links with corporate vision and other policy documents providing the “line of sight” for the asset management strategy. It must have been endorsed by the Executive and published on the authority’s website. This document must have been published or reviewed in the past 24 months.
- 2.1.3.2. The asset management policy agreed by Members in 2014 now requires alignment with the Norfolk County Council Plan, ‘Together for Norfolk’, agreed in May 2019. The proposal is contained in Appendix C.
- 2.1.3.3. The asset management strategy, refreshed by Members in 2014, now requires enhancement. The proposal is contained in Appendix D.
- 2.1.3.4. The performance framework to monitor the strategy last refreshed by Members in 2016 now requires targets to be provided for the next 3-years. As the Government has not conducted its spending review for beyond 2020-21, we

have made forward projections based upon similar funding. The proposal is contained in Appendix E.

2.1.4. Norfolk Contract Report 2018-2019

- 2.1.4.1. Three main contracts were established in 2014 to help us deliver the highway service in Norfolk. The contractors and employer (Norfolk County Council) manage the delivery of services in accordance with the governance arrangements set out in the contract service information and performance is monitored regularly throughout the year. At the end of each financial year an end of year report is produced summarising the performance of each contract over the previous 12 months. These contracts are Tarmac (for works), WSP (for professional services) and Dynniq (for permanent traffic signals).
- 2.1.4.2. Each contract specifies key targets that each supplier must achieve in the form of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). This year's end of year report confirms that all three contracts have achieved an overall score over 4 (out of a possible 5), which is in the highest band (Band A). In accordance with the contracts all 3 have been award an additional year. The full report, looking at year 5 of each contract, can be found in Appendix F.

3. Impact of the Proposal

- 3.1. The main proposal is to ensure Members endorse the proposed changes to the asset management strategy and policy to align with the council's plan, 'Together for Norfolk'. Member support fulfils criteria in the DfT Highway Incentive Fund to ensure we get the full allocation.

4. Evidence and Reasons for Decision

- 4.1. Our agreed framework to monitor performance shows the previous policy and strategy has been effective. It now requires refreshing and targets to be provided for the next 3 years. As the Government has not conducted its spending review for beyond 2020-21 we have made forward projections based upon similar funding.

5. Alternative Options

- 5.1. Differing proposals could be put forward to utilise investment in different ways across the highway assets. If circumstances change, such as additional funding becoming available, the strategy can be reviewed.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1. The failure to maintain a self-assessed score of 3 within the DfT Incentive fund would lead to the loss of funding of approximately 70% which equates to £3.4 million.

7. Resource Implications

- 7.1. **Staff:** None
- 7.2. **Property:** None
- 7.3. **IT:** None

8. Other Implications

- 8.1. **Legal Implications:** None
- 8.2. **Human Rights implications :** None
- 8.3. **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) (this must be included)**
 - 8.3.1. The Asset Management Policy and Strategy relates to the overall capital investment in structural maintenance. As part of any plans and strategies under this framework, equality and accessibility implications will be considered as a core element.
 - 8.3.2. Individual maintenance schemes will comply with regulations from engineering design manuals, traffic management and liaison with stakeholders. Design and Streetworks processes picks up appropriate design standards and issues regarding maintaining access during roadworks.
- 8.4. **Health and Safety implications :** None
- 8.5. **Sustainability implications:** None
- 8.6. **Any other implications:** None
- 9. Risk Implications/Assessment**
 - 9.1. Potential loss of funding if overall score of 3 not maintained in DfT Highways Incentive fund.
- 10. Select Committee comments**
 - 10.1. Not applicable
- 11. Recommendation**
 - 11.1.
 - a) Note the progress against the Asset Management Strategy Performance framework and the continuation of the current strategy and targets (Appendix A and B)
 - b) Endorse the proposed realignment of the Asset Management Policy (Appendix C) with the council plan agreed in May 2019
 - c) Endorse the enhanced detail in the Asset Management Strategy (Appendix D) and revised targets to 2021-22 (Appendix E)
 - d) Note the performance against Key Performance Indicator's in Highway Contracts (Tarmac, WSP & Dynniq) (Appendix F)
- 12. Background Papers**
 - 12.1.
 1. At the EDT committee meeting on 6 July 2018 approved the recommendations in "Highway Asset Performance" [Report](#) to EDT Committee of and [link to minutes](#)
 2. At the EDT committee meeting on 6 July 2018 approved the recommendations in "Highway Asset Performance" [Report](#) to EDT Committee of and [link to minutes](#)
 3. At the EDT committee meeting on 6 July 2018 approved the recommendations in "Highway Asset Performance" [Report](#) to EDT Committee of and [link to minutes](#)
 4. At the EDT committee meeting on 18 January 2019 Members approved the Highway capital programme and Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP) [Report](#) and [link to minutes](#)
 5. [Local Transport Plan 2011-2026](#)
 6. [Transport Asset Management Plan 2018-19](#)

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

Officer name : Kevin Townly

Tel No. : 01603 222627

Email address : Kevin.townly@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Highway Asset Backlog 2019

		Backlog 2016-17	Budget 2017-18	Backlog 2017-18	Budget 2018-19	Backlog 2018-19	Budget 2019-20
Asset type		£m	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
A roads		8.59	4.384	9.604	3.929	8.795	3.531
B roads		0	1.545	0	2.185	0	1.495
C roads**		0	5.112	0	5.116	0	3.905
U roads**		11.72	4.717	0	4.358	0	3.905
Machine Patching			0.695		0.695		0.767
Capitalised Patching/Potholes ex revenue			7.082		9.844		7.582
Category 1 footways		0.01	0.496	0.008	0.45	0	0.561
Category 2 footways		0.459		0.101		0.148	
Category 3 footways		0		0.11		0	
Category 4 footways		0		0.521		0.165	
Highway Drainage	Maintenance	0.673	0.177	0.673	0.6	0.712	0.584
	Bid Match Pot		0.075		0.075	18.169	0.075
	Improvement (Challenge)	21.123	4.773	17.706			0
	Improvement (Town)		0.634		0.356		0.571
	Improvement (NPIF)		0.4				
	Capitalised Drainage small repairs		0.33		0.33		0.33
Bridges	Maintenance Bridges	8.2	0.505	8.5	0.665	7.8	0.655
	Maintenance Culverts					0.0	0.030
	NPIF		0.03				
	Strengthening	0.315	0.045	0.315	0.08	0.280	0.03
	Assessment etc		0.25		0.055		0.085
	Inspections						0.25
Traffic Signals	small works (ex. revenue)		0.4		0.4		0.4
	Replacement	0.173	0.25	0.299	0.25	0.218	0.5
	small works (ex. revenue)		0.6		0.6		0.6
system			0.02		0.02		0.02
Signs & Post (ex. revenue)			0.2		0.2		0.2
Condition Surveys					0.15		0.15
Park and Ride Sites		0.013	0.025	0	0.4	0	0.04
Area Manager Schemes			0.14		0.14		0.14
Vehicle restraint systems - planned works		0.12	0.092	0.06	0.092	0.06	0.132
Vehicle restraint systems - RTA repairs			0.05		0.05		0.05
Contingencies***			3.665		2.395		5.655
Total		51.396	38.451	37.897	35.491	36.377	34.02

Notes

These figures are taken from the price base for each year, not a common price base. 2018/19 Backlog based upon 1-4-19 prices.

The backlog figure refers to the end of year, 31/3/2019

* Where service condition is linked to condition surveys, the budget need is to recover service condition not just hold condition in year

** These budgets have not been ring-fenced but shared across 'C' & 'U' roads

1 Condition of Highway Assets Summary

1.1 Roads

- 1.1.1 The results from our condition surveys for 2018-19 were ahead of the asset management strategy and performance targets. All roads have all shown a slight improvement against previous year's results.

	2017/18	2018/19		Local Transport Plan roll-fwd. Target
		Agreed Performance Measure target	Actual	
'A' roads	3% (2.55%)	3% (3.4%)	2% (2.08%)	4.2%
'B' & 'C' roads	8% (7.54%)	9% (9.24%)	6% (6.09%)	n/a

Note: Lower is better. Figures in brackets are the actual figures, but these are rounded to the nearest whole number when reported.

- 1.1.2 The A roads show a continued increase in treatment costs against are baseline generating a backlog. The B & C network treatment costs are still below our baseline comparison.
- 1.1.3 Unclassified (U) road condition indicator showed an improvement from 15% to 10% for a 4-year average. The 'U' network treatment costs are now below our baseline comparison and the backlog has been removed.

	2017/18	2018/19	LTP Target roll-fwd.
'U' roads	15%	10%	n/a

- 1.1.4 For 2018-19 we have a backlog on our 'A' roads. Backlogs are shown in Appendix 1;
- 1.1.5 National Statistics 2017-18 provide the most recent comparative data. Our A roads were average, our 'B', 'C' below average and 'U' average.

1.2 Bridges

- 1.2.1 The Bridges HGV score showed marginal improvement and non-HGV score marginal decline, from 2017-8 to 2018-19. Bridge Condition Index Scores were 89.99 and 91.02 on the HGV and non-HGV networks respectively. These scores are currently (May 2019) 90.14 and 90.95.
- 1.2.2 For 2018-19 we have a backlog on our HGV network of £7.832m.
- 1.2.3 One strengthening scheme was completed in 18/19. One bridge still require attention and represent a backlog. This is in the forward programme.

1.3 Traffic Signals

1.3.1 During 2018/19 a total of 13 installations were replaced, consisting of 2 like-for-like replacements, 1 Pelican crossing converted to Zebra crossing and 10 installations were replaced as part of improvement schemes (3 CCAG funded, 6 LEP funded and 1 NPIF funded).

1.3.2 The resultant backlog at the end of 2018/19 is 5 installations, representing a budget of £0.218m.

1.4 Footways

1.4.1 Our 2018-19 showed a marginal improvement in our remaining network, which was better than expected.

Footway Hierarchy	Frequency	Service Level	Condition Level 4 (structurally unsound)	
			2017-18	2018-19
Cat 1	2-year data	12.5%	12.7%	12.1%
Cat 2		25%	25.6%	25.7%
Cat 3	4-year data	30%	30.1%	28.7%
Cat 4		30%	31.6%	30.5%

1.4.3 There is a backlog against our service level for our higher categories footway totaling £0.313m

1.5 Drainage

1.5.1 There are not any formal condition surveys of highway drains. Overall condition is assessed from regular road inspections. The identified schemes are a mixture of small scale local interventions and larger “catchment wide” projects. The Greater Norwich Surface Water Drainage Scheme completed in 2017-18. There is £3,995,350 of identified need remaining in the ‘fringe’ parishes of Hellesdon, Old Catton, and Thorpe St Andrew. No significant build has taken place against the Capital Drainage backlog. Inflation has been applied at 2.62% on 1st April 2019. The improvement drainage backlog has increased as a result

1.5.2 Our members have approved NCC capital funding of £1.5m on ‘Market Town’ Drainage over a 3-year period starting 2017-18. The second significant scheme due for construction is at North Walsham starting in July 2019-20

1.6 Park & Ride Sites and Norwich Bus Station

1.6.1 The service level on these sites is, to fully fund any urgent, essential or necessary structural maintenance works identified by an annual inspection.

1.7 Vehicular Restraint Systems (VRS)

1.7.1 Our service level uses information from structural integrity surveys carried out on the whole stock over a 5-year period. We have adopted a service measure whereby if those sites assessed as priority 1, through risk assessment were not to be funded then they would represent a backlog.

1.7.2 Two schemes have been deferred into 2019-20, with an estimated cost of £60k.

1. **Norfolk County Council's Transport Asset Management Policy**
- 1.1. **Corporate Vision and Strategy**
- 1.1.1. The Norfolk County Council Plan, "Together for Norfolk – an ambitious plan for our County 2019-2025" was agreed in May 2019.
- 1.1.2. The plan outlines how we will invest in Norfolk's future growth and prosperity by:
 - Focusing on **inclusive** growth and **improved social mobility**.
 - Encouraging **housing, infrastructure, jobs and business** growth across the County.
 - Developing our **workforce** to meet the needs of the sectors powering our local economy.
 - This way we can help Norfolk have a **growing economy**, full of **thriving people** living in **strong communities** we are proud of.
- 1.1.3. The plan highlights that a strong infrastructure is important for our growing economy. This is reflected in our service plan which is reviewed on an annual basis.
- 1.2. **Service Plans**
- 1.2.1. Based upon the Council's Strategy each Service produces a service plan which outlines the vision, outcomes and priorities for the coming year.
- 1.2.2. Service committees were commissioned by Policy and Resources Committee to develop Committee Plans which will set out objectives for the year, and specifically demonstrate how each area of the Council's work will change to deliver our Norfolk Futures strategy. An extract from the Highway Service Plans is shown below.

Vision

Manage, maintain & develop Norfolk's highway network, facilitate major development and deliver effective services to support sustainable growth and quality of life to residents.

Outcomes

- A well managed highway network that enables everyone to travel the county freely and easily.
 - A priority road network free from ice and snow
- Delivery of improved infrastructure to promote the Norfolk economy.
 - Reduction in Waste and increase in recycling
 - Maintain and apply local flood risk management strategy.

Priorities

- Maintain the highway at agreed service levels at minimum cost.
- Ensure improvement and maintenance programmes delivered to standards/ time/budget.
- Major projects to deliver better infrastructure.
- Secure successful funding bids
- A47 advocacy
- Review Local Transport Plan and local transport strategies for Norwich, Kings Lynn and Gt Yarmouth.
- Work with partners to ensure planned development is resilient, safe & sustainable
- Reduce the number/severity of road casualties.
- Commercialisation.
- Deliver winter maintenance services.
- Winter PFI successor.
- Implement new City Agency Agreement.
- Reduce flood risk and investigate flood reports
- Secure arrangements for residual waste after 2021

1.3. Norfolk's Transport Asset Management Policy

- 1.3.1. This policy sets out how we manage the asset in accordance with the Councils strategy and as outlined in our service plan.
- 1.3.2. Norfolk County Council recognises that the need for the highway service is universal amongst all its residents, providing access for business, services and promoting well-being. An effective network is essential for a successful economy and society. A value-managed service is essential to ensure the financial sustainability of the Council.
- 1.3.3. Enabling our Councils strategy and vision, together with achieving the priorities in the County Council Plan requires a focus on the availability, capacity, condition and quality of the highway network and associated assets.
- 1.3.4. The key to this will be the ability to make good, informed decisions, utilising a risk-based approach and optimising the contribution to the service provided by the infrastructure.
- 1.3.5. The principles of which are;
- To deliver the statutory obligations of the authority
 - To be responsive to the needs of users' and the community
 - To utilise the available funding to minimise whole life costs
 - To support effective delivery of the statutory network management duty
 - To support and add value to local transport objectives
 - To support and add value to wider corporate policy objectives

- 1.3.6. This policy was adopted by the Environment Development and Transport Committee on 8th July 2014 in response to the paper on Highway Asset Performance. The Transport Asset Management Strategy was approved at this time and refreshed on 14 Oct 2017.

1. **Transport Asset Management Strategy**

1.1. **Main Components**

- 1.1.1. The Transport Asset Management Strategy is built around three main components.
- A defined hierarchy for all elements of the network
 - The legal framework and robust policies and objectives for the service
 - A detailed Inventory of all relevant components of the asset
- 1.1.2. To be effective, these key components are supplemented by the following:
- A comprehensive management system for inspecting, recording, analysing, prioritising and programming maintenance works to optimise their asset management contribution
 - Arrangements to finance, procure and deliver maintenance works, in accordance with the principles of sustainability and best value
 - Arrangements to monitor, review and update as necessary, each component of the strategy and the performance of the strategy
 - A risk management strategy clearly identifying and evaluating the risks and consequences of investment decisions and measures to mitigate
 - A proactive approach to the implementation of innovations and best practice in collaboration with our contractors and other councils
 - Maintain a knowledgeable and robust client to engage with others councils and contractors

1.2. **Detailed Strategy for Transport Asset Management**

- 1.2.1. The Transport Asset Management Policy can be seen in Appendix A.
- 1.2.2. The detailed elements of the strategy are to; -
- 1.2.3.
- Maintaining their condition and preserve their value
 - Utilise asset management practices to ensure protection of the highway infrastructure through the implementation of the Transport Asset Management Plan.
 - Based on whole-life costing, to ensure value for money.
 - Use a preventative approach investing a greater proportion of the available budget to treat roads in the early stages of deterioration.
 - This targets assets that are not currently in need of full structural renewal and proposes to extend the assets whole life by arresting/delaying deterioration.
 - This protects the existing investment, extend the life-cycle and postpone higher cost rehabilitations.
 - It minimises the risk of the highway asset deteriorating over time.
 - Carry out repairs to the most appropriate standards and methods
 - Identify needs against the National Codes of Practice and survey data.
 - Allocate resources based upon assessed needs basis, to
 - Continue to identify improvements in the information and systems necessary to refine this process.

- Seek the required funding by demonstrating the maintenance needs for maximum Government support, through the Local Transport Plan.
- Seek additional funding through the County Council's strategic planning and budget cycle.
- Seek to optimise the benefits of maintenance works by incorporating any appropriate safety, availability or accessibility improvement works at the same time.
- Co-ordinate works to reduce disruption.
- Treat as a priority those hazards that could lead to personal injury or damage to vehicles.

1.3. **Strategy for the Main Asset Groups**

- 1.3.1. It is recognised that the current level of funding makes the maintenance of current condition challenging and that in most circumstances the strategy will be to manage deterioration.
- 1.3.2. The levels of Government grant from the DfT (Needs, Incentive, Pothole) have only been determined until 2020/21. In our projections we have assumed this current level of funding would continue.
- 1.3.3. Pressures can be demonstrated as Members have supported part of the Integrated Transport grant being used to support structural maintenance, which in turn is supporting some work previously undertaken using revenue funding such as patching.
- 1.3.4. **Carriageways**
- 1.3.4.1. Carriageways (roads) are by far the largest of the Council's assets and account for an estimated 85% of the total highways asset value (ignoring land value).
- 1.3.4.2.
 - Extensive utilisation of intermediate treatments such as surface dressing, joint sealing, re-texturing and machine patching. This protects the existing investment, extend the life-cycle and postpone higher cost resurfacing.
 - Use of poly-modified binders and Dense Stone Mastic Asphalt (SMA) to increase the robustness of both surface dressing and resurfacing treatments.
 - Consider the use of recycling to add strength to rural roads and in fenland reduce weight of the pavement
 - Innovation to examine the use of new techniques
 - Scheme selection and Programme development informed by an intelligent client
 - Specification informed by our Norfolk Laboratory.
 - Full condition survey of the network

1.3.4.3. Planned outcome

- 1.3.4.4. Performance targets have been established in the Local Transport Plan (LTP) for the 'A' road network and in the performance framework for all road classifications. These showed a slight decline over the period to 2020-21. We have now adjusted the targets based upon 2018-19 results.

	2018-19		2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
	Actual		Target	Target	Target
'A' roads	2.1%		2.15%	2.18%	2.21%
'B' roads}	6.1%	5.2%	6.46%	6.77%	7.08%
'C' roads}		6.3%			
'U' roads	10.1%		10.8%	11.5%	12%

1.3.4.5. Investment Strategy

- 1.3.4.6. We utilise the HMEP asset management toolkit on an annual basis to iteratively improve our investment strategy using the latest condition data. We have modelled projections by road class. In practice we have found we are out-performing the predicted results.
- 1.3.4.7. The DfT needs based grant is partly calculated on road length for differing classes of road with a local highway authority. The higher classification generating a higher grant per length.
- 1.3.4.8. We spend more per length the higher the function of the road i.e. more on A roads than B roads. This is reflected in proportionally greater percentages of resurfacing on the higher-class roads in the life-cycle necessitated by the heavier use by traffic and goods.
- 1.3.4.9. The investment in our A roads for 2019-20, Resurfacing £1.1m, Surface Treatment £1.9m, Reclamite £0.165m, Joint Seal £0.025m. This represents a budget split between Resurfacing 34% and surface treatment of 66%
- 1.3.4.10. For 2020-21 and beyond this will be Resurfacing £1.35m, Surface Treatment £1.65m, Reclamite £0.165m, Joint Seal £0.025m. This represents a budget split between Resurfacing 42% and surface treatment of 58% as this gives an improved long-term performance.
- 1.3.4.11. The investment in our B roads for 2019-20 and beyond, resurfacing £0.552m, surface treatment £0.943. This represents a budget split between resurfacing 37% and surface treatment of 63%
- 1.3.4.12. The investment in our C roads for 2019-20 and beyond, resurfacing £0.5m, surface treatment £3.8m. This represents a budget split between resurfacing 11% and surface treatment of 88%. The resurfacing investment takes the form of Fen road repairs (medium and shallow recycling) and localised machine patching small schemes.
- 1.3.4.13. The investment in our U roads for 2019-20 and beyond, resurfacing £0.47m, surface treatment £3.8m. This represents a budget split between resurfacing 11% and

surface treatment of 88%. The resurfacing investment takes the form of Fen road repairs (medium and shallow recycling) and localised machine patching small schemes.

1.3.5. **Footways including shared use**

1.3.5.1. These are the second largest of the Council's assets and account for an estimated 7% of the total highways asset value (ignoring land value).

- 1.3.5.2.
- Utilisation of intermediate treatments such as slurry seal and machine patching to protect the existing investment, extend the life-cycle and postpone higher cost resurfacing.
 - Full condition survey of the network
 - Use of Hot Rolled Asphalt (HRA) to increase the robustness of resurfacing.
 - Innovation to examine the use of new techniques
 - Scheme selection and Programme development informed by an intelligent client
 - Specification informed by our Norfolk Laboratory.
 - Full condition survey of the network

1.3.5.3. Planned outcome

1.3.5.4. Performance targets have been established and these show a slight decline over the next 3-year period to 2020-21.

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
	Actual	Target	Target	Target
Category 1	12.10%	12.4%	12.7%	13%
Category 2	25.70%	26.4%	27.1%	27.8%
Category 3	28.70%	30%	31.3%	32.6%
Category 4	30.50%	31%	31.5%	32%

1.3.5.5. Investment Strategy

1.3.5.6. We utilise the HMEP asset management toolkit on an annual basis to iteratively improve our investment strategy using the latest condition data.

1.3.5.7. For 2019-20 we allocated funding of £2.33m; £1.93m for resurfacing/Reconstruction representing longer-term treatments (82.5%) and £0.4m for slurry seal representing intermediate treatments (17.5%). From 2020-21 and beyond this will increase to £2.52m; £2.025m (80%) and £0.5m (20%).

1.3.6. **Highway Structures (bridges)**

1.3.6.1. These are the third largest of the Council's assets and account for an estimated 5% of the total highways asset value (ignoring land value).

1.3.6.2. Planned outcome

	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
HGV	90.14	90	89.8	89.7
Non-HGV	90.95	90.8	90.5	90.2

- 1.3.6.3. There is a small strengthening programme which should complete by 2019-20.
- 1.3.6.4. Performance targets have been established and these show a slight decline in Bridge Stock Condition Index (BSCI) score over the next 3-year period to 2020-21. The bridge strengthening programme is expected to complete in 2019-20.
- 1.3.6.5. Investment Strategy
- 1.3.6.6. The investment in our Bridges (>0.9m dia) for 2019-20, £0.8m, Small Works £0.4m. From 2020-21 this will increase to £1.2m and £0.4m for small works.

1.3.7. **Traffic Signals**

- 1.3.7.1. This is a rolling programme with the intent to manage the level of controllers older than 20 years.
- 1.3.7.2. Planned outcome
- 1.3.7.3. Performance targets have been established and show managing the asset at similar levels as now but from 2019 demand will grow as millennial assets reach their 20-year term.

1.3.7.4.	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
	5	15	17	13

- 1.3.7.5. Investment Strategy
- 1.3.7.6. Annual investment of £600,000 in the replacement programme.

1.3.8. **Street Lighting**

- 1.3.8.1. Our street lighting is managed using a Private Finance Initiative (PFI). As a result, we do not receive support from the DfT maintenance needs grant.

1.3.9. **Drainage schemes**

- 1.3.9.1. In valuation terms drainage is part of the carriageway asset and agreed formulas make an allowance for this.
- 1.3.9.2. Investment Strategy
- 1.3.9.3. Our funding for maintenance schemes is £0.6m pa and £0.33m pa for small scale repairs.
- 1.3.9.4. Additionally, a small allocation of £0.075m is provided for match funding of bids, typically by our Flood & Water team to the Environment Agency. We will bid to the EA for smaller schemes in-year particularly in those cases of internal flooding by surface water.

1.3.10. Sudden Asset Failures

- 1.3.10.1. Whilst the Strategy advocates a planned and risk-based approach to Asset Management, there may be exceptional circumstances in which an asset fails rapidly - beyond prediction.
- 1.3.10.2. No separate reserve is held for these and the any occurrence will be dealt with on a case by case basis. Members may sanction the use of reserves, alternatively our structural maintenance programme across all asset types could be adjusted to meet new priorities.
- 1.3.10.3. The condition of Fen roads is particularly difficult to predict as they can be significantly affected by weather conditions. Fenland areas have soils which are "susceptible to cyclic shrinkage and swelling". This is exacerbated in periods of unusually high or low rainfall and this movement can aggravate cracking and subsidence along roads in affected areas. This can change priorities within 6 months. To have some resilience part of the maintenance fund is ring-fenced for fen road repairs but only allocated to sites in-year to ensure that the changing priorities can be dealt with. We are increasing this annual allocation to £0.5m from 2020-21.

1.3.11. Capital Improvements

- 1.3.11.1. The Norfolk Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2018-28 (County and its partners Districts and LEP) was reported to and endorsed by the EDT committee on the 10th November 2017. It identifies the key infrastructure needed to deliver economic growth in Norfolk. It is a working document that will be reviewed on a regular basis as information becomes available and projects progress through to delivery. The Plan will help Norfolk County Council and partners to co-ordinate implementation, prioritise activity and respond to any funding opportunities.
- 1.3.11.2. At the Policy & Resources Committee on 27 November 2017, Members noted that one of the priorities for the administration was a commitment to invest an extra £20 million in Norfolk's roads.
- 1.3.11.3. It is intended that over a 4-year period 2018-19-20-21-22, the funding would be allocated to delivery of major projects, junction improvements, market town schemes, footways and crossing improvements and a contribution to parish partnership, local Member and PROW.
- 1.3.11.4. Integrated transport funding covers all expenditure on new infrastructure such as improvements at bus interchanges and rail stations, local safety schemes, pedestrian crossings, footways, traffic management, route and junction improvements and cycle paths. It used to be largely funded by the DfT Integrated Transport block Grant. It is now heavily supplemented by other funding sources such as Local Growth Fund, City Cycling Ambition, National Productivity Investment, Community Investment Levy, and Housing Infrastructure Fund.
- 1.3.11.5. These significant supplementary funding sources, enabled the EDT Committee 18th Jan 2019 to approve, from 2020-21 the DfT integrated transport grant would be used to implement a £1.3m programme mainly low-cost improvement schemes including the parish partnership programme, and contributions to developing major schemes.

The remainder of the DfT £4.14m grant being allocated to structural maintenance. In 2019-20 this total £1.142m and in 2020-21 £2.842m.

1.3.12. **Planning Considerations**

- 1.3.12.1. Our Council understand the importance that growth and re- development has on the future of the local area and economy. There is a need to ensure that any new development / change of use promoted through the planning process fully consider the impact on the existing highway network and its future maintenance.

1.3.13. **Data Management and Information Systems**

- 1.3.13.1. In 2016 we implemented new core Highway Management System. We will continue to seek opportunities to use technology to support the service and make efficiencies.
- 1.3.13.2. We have a data Management Plan to ensure our asset data is reviewed, maintained and fit-for purpose to enable us to make informed decisions.

1.4. **Performance Framework**

- 1.4.1.1. A performance framework linked to the asset management strategy and the themes of :

- Condition / or age as proxy for Main Asset groups
- Customer Satisfaction
- Serviceability
- Sustainability (Economic & Environmental)

- 1.4.1.2. This can be seen in Performance Framework Appendix C.

1.5. **Approval**

- 1.5.1. The Transport Asset Management Strategy was approved by members on 14 October 2016 together with the Performance Framework, allied to the strategy for the main asset groups.

1.6. **Review Process Monitoring and Reporting**

- 1.6.1. Highway Asset Performance is reviewed annually and a report shared with members. It covers planned capital structural maintenance of the assets only

- 1.6.2. This report highlights:

- Performance against current service level
- Current service priorities
- Customer Satisfaction
- Funding levels and needs

Options on policies strategies and reviews

- 1.6.3. This allows informed decisions by members.

Asset Management Strategy Performance Measures

Theme		Indicator Description	Vital Sign	Frequency of reporting	15-16	17-18	18-19	Context	19-20	20-21	21-22	Which is better?
Serviceability	Roads	Condition of Principal roads		Annual	2.50%	2.55%	2.08%	National Average for 2017-18 was 3%	2.15%	2.18%	2.21%	Lower
		Condition of classified non-Principal roads		Annual	6.48%	7.54%	6.09%	National Average for 2017-18 was 6%	6.46%	6.77%	7.08%	Lower
		Condition of Unclassified roads		Annual	17%	14.60%	10.10%		10.80%	11.50%	12%	Lower
	Footways	Condition of Footways 1 - Footway Network Survey (FNS) level 4		Annual	16.10%	12.70%	12.10%		12.40%	12.70%	13%	Lower
		Condition of Footways 2 - FNS level 4		Annual	32.70%	25.60%	25.70%		26.40%	27.10%	27.80%	Lower
		Condition of Footways 3 - FNS level 4		Annual	28.90%	30.10%	28.70%		30%	31.30%	32.60%	Lower
		Condition of Footways 4 - FNS level 4		Annual	29.50%	31.60%	30.50%		31%	31.50%	32%	Lower
	Structures	Bridge Condition Index Score HGV		Annual	89.9	89.99%	90.14%		89.99	89.84	89.69	Higher
		Bridge Condition Index Score Non-HGV		Annual	90.92%	91.02%	90.95%		90.78	90.51	90.24	Higher
		Bridge Strengthening number of bridges requiring strengthening		Annual	2	2	1		1	1	0	Lower
Traffic Signals	Traffic Signals controller age no more than 20 years		Annual	6	6	5		15	17	13	Lower	
Street Lighting	% Street Lighting working as planned (lights in light)		Monthly	99.63%	99.31%	99.43%		99%	99%	99%	Higher	
Customer Satisfaction □	NHT Overall	KBI 01 - Overall (local)		Annual	56.2	54	53	3rd (Was 7th) best County	53	53	53	Higher
		KBI 11 - Pavements & Footpaths		Annual	58.8	56	55	9th (was 11th) best County	55	55	55	Higher
		KBI 13 - Cycle routes and facilities		Annual	53.8	49	51	10th (was 20th) best County	51	51	51	Higher
	NHT Walking & Cycling	KBI 15 - Rights of Way		Annual	58	56	54	25th (was 24th) best County	54	54	54	Higher
		KBI 23 - Condition of highways		Annual	43.6	38	33	6th (was 10th) best County	33	33	33	Higher
	NHT Highway Maintenance & Enforcement	KBI 24 - Highway maintenance		Annual	55.8	52	51	8th (was 13th) best County	51	51	51	Higher
		KBI 25 - Street lighting		Annual	62.6	60	60	17th (was 23th) best County	60	60	60	Higher
Safety □		Number of people killed and seriously injured on Norfolk’s roads		Monthly	369	427	456	Member Working Group looking at Road Safety Strategy and future performance measures. Public Health leading				Lower
		Repudiation Rate of Highway Insurance Claims		Annual	81%	81%	71%		81	81	81	Higher
		Winter gritting - % of actions completed within 3 hours	✓	Monthly		85%	82%		80	80	80	Higher
		Highway Safety Inspection carried out on time		Monthly	97.76%	94.20%	95.30%		98	98	98	Higher
		% Priority A defects attended within response timescale (2 hours)		Monthly	96%	85%	89.62%		96	96	96	Higher
		% Priority B defects attended within response timescale (Up to 4 days)		Monthly	98%	87%	91%		98	98	98	Higher
Sustainability (Economic & Environment) □		Street lighting – C02 reduction (tonnes) (Annual emissions)	✓	Annual	10517	7745	6154		5969.38	5790.2986	5616.58964	Lower



Norfolk County Council

Norfolk Contract Report 2018 - 2019

Department: Community and Environmental Services
Service Manager: Grahame Bygrave
Contract Manager: Martin Jeffs
Date: May 2019

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The following report documents the 12 month performance (April 2018 - March 2019) of the following Highways Service Contracts:
 - Tarmac for works
 - WSP for professional services
 - Dynniq for permanent traffic signals
- 1.2. The contracts, which started their first year in April 2014, were developed following a strategic review of the Highways Service. The contracts include specific requirements around performance targets, which was something that Members established as part of the fundamental criteria for the new contracts.
- 1.3. The performance management regime within the contracts specifies key targets that each supplier has to achieve.
- 1.4. The contractors and the employer manage the delivery of services in accordance with the governance arrangements set out in the Contract Service Information. Delivery of services is overseen by the Strategic Contract Management Board and Contract Management Group.
- 1.5. Key Performance Indicators are regularly monitored and reviewed annually as part of an annual report. This report looks back on Year 5 of the contract.
- 1.6. An overview of the annual performance of each contract can be seen in section 2 below. Further detail relating to each contract can be seen in section 3 onwards.

2. Contract Performance Summaries

2.1. Tarmac Performance Summary

- 2.1.1. Tarmac's overall score for Year 4 is 4.50
 - Annual strategic score of 4.50 is within banding A resulting in an additional year adjustment to the service period under the contract. This is a slight increase on the previous year (with a score of 4.18)

- Innovation scored 5.00 which is 143% of the target. This a significant increase in comparison to last year's innovation score of 1.00 which was 14% of target.
- Service Delivery scored highly at 4.41 representing an excellent operational performance against contract measures. This is a particularly impressive performance considering the year-on-year increase in targets under contract.
- Collaborative working continued to score 4.00. Tarmac led British Standards Institution BS11000 standard for collaborative working remains in place including a revised focus of value creation teams across gully cleaning, materials innovation, Early Contractor Involvement (ECI) and collaboration.
- Strong health & safety record continued measured through Accident Incident Rate (AIR) & audit scores. Tarmac's excellent safety performance continues with 2.3 million hours Lost Time Injury (LTI) free. The contract also remains RIDDOR (Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Reporting) free throughout the life of the contract so far.
- An improved year-on-year performance at 5.00 ensuring local supply chain benefit from prompt payment of invoices
- Post Project Review score achieved 106% of target representing a good performance for scheme delivery against an increasing year-on-year target.

2.2. WSP Performance Summary

2.2.1. WSP's overall score for Year 4 is 4.48 which is an improvement on last year.

- The delivery of Contract commitments which were agreed during mobilisation and reviewed annually by the Service Manager scored a 4 out of 5 and was deemed to be a maintained and effective continuation of 'business as usual'.
- Other scores in relation to feedback on the Consultants Management team also scored 4 out 5, with positive comments such as *"Positive, proactive, dynamic, approachable, engineers win-win situations"* and *"Open and trusted, brings a strong personal brand to the management issues raised. Never over-sells the offer and takes responsibility for the value delivered Communicates directly with an open and inclusive style, which aids understanding and builds relationships. Tackles problems early and head-on to avoid need of future un-picking."*
- Last year an improvement notice was issued in respect to the efficiency savings. This year WSP have worked with the improvement plan and, despite a significant increase in the turn over and efficiency target, they have exceeded the efficiency savings required under the Contract.

2.3. Dynniq Performance Summary

2.3.1. Dynniq's overall score for Year 4 is 4.46

- The annual strategic score of 4.46 sees an increase from the previous year. This sees the score firmly in band A like last year, as opposed to band B in 16/17.
- There are no contract changes to report and all performance targets have been achieved.

3. Tarmac – 2018/2019 end of Year Report

3.1. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

- 3.1.1. Overall year end score was 4.50 which results in an additional year to the contract.

3.2. Programme

- 3.2.1. Tarmac's programme strategy this year has been to utilise labour to maximum effect whilst satisfying programme constraints. Tarmac has also revised how they programme more significant schemes with its in-house resource which has had a positive impact when significantly large or complex schemes have extended in the programme or when design issues have required resolution on site.
- 3.2.2. Programme constraints lead to an incredibly busy period over the summer and initially less work in quarter four. During the year, 14 schemes had to be re-programmed for quarter four and a number of larger schemes programmed for quarter four started later than planned. The impact has been felt, in terms of demand for resource putting strain on capacity during the quarter, to ensure work was completed by the end of year. Teams from Tarmac and Norfolk County Council have also had to work collaboratively to successfully deliver the additional pothole funding budget during the same period.
- 3.2.3. Significant improvements have been observed in how Tarmac's operational & commercial personnel and the council's design teams have collaborated. This has been attributed to improvements to the designs themselves as well as the information provided to leverage scheme delivery efficiencies.
- 3.2.4. **Financial Management**
- 3.2.5. A fundamental change in the contract option used for the delivery of the Bridge Maintenance service has been agreed albeit this is subject to finalisation of joint processes that enable efficient administration of the works. This enables the streamlining of the payment procedures and removes excessive commercial administration for both parties while maintaining a cost neutral position for NCC.
- 3.2.6. Overall scheme pain at the end of the year is down on previous years and sits within the 50/50 split parameter, therefore meaning Tarmac will not be required to pay an additional balancing pain payment at the end of the year. This continues the trend of improvement demonstrated over prior years.

3.3. Capital schemes

- 3.3.1. This programme included 56 surfacing schemes with a combined forecast turnover of £4.8 million and 41 footway and drainage maintenance schemes with a turnover of £2.25 million.

3.4. Externally funded & S278 schemes

- 3.4.1. Increasing volume of scheme work continues through improved investment into the area. Local DfT bids and LEP growth funded projects have provided the main source of funding. A significant amount of work has been delivered through year 5 of the contract.

3.5. Additional Monies - Pothole Funding

- 3.5.1. Following the allocation of £12.6 million of funding to address potholes across the county, Tarmac successfully mobilised resources from across its Central and Southern business units to deliver over 36 surfacing schemes in just over 12 weeks, with over 34,621 tonnes of material used to repair potholes across the county. Through its supply chain, it was also able to repair a number of Fen roads with over 14 schemes completed through the programme.

3.6. Routine Maintenance

3.6.1. Patching

Patching continues to perform well with Tarmac investing significant management resource into a local supply chain partner to deliver the service.

3.6.2. Road marking

£0.5 million has been delivered through the contract for routine road marking work.

3.6.3. Cyclical gully cleaning & emergency drainage

£0.85 million has been delivered through the contract for cyclical gully cleaning and emergency drainage work. A collaborative working party consisting of representatives from Tarmac and Norfolk County Council delivered innovation through a risk-based approach rather than cyclical approach to gully cleaning. The efficiencies led to a Highly Commended award at the annual Highways Awards event.

3.6.4. Bridge Maintenance

£0.4 million has been delivered through the contract for Bridge Maintenance work. With effect from 1st April 2019, a trial will take place whereby work will be administered under Option E of the New Engineering Contract 3 as opposed to Option A for task orders up-to the value of £30,000. Option C will remain for task orders in excess of that value. The service will remain cost neutral to the council through an LMO credit.

3.7. Health and Safety

- 3.7.1. Tarmac's work on the contract has now exceed 3 million hours LTI (Lost Time Injury) free and remains RIDDOR free for the contract life-to-date.

3.8. Collaborative Working and BS11000

- 3.8.1. At a corporate level Tarmac has migrated its accreditation of collaborative working relationships from the BSi standard 11000 to ISO44000. Work is being progressed to migrate efforts at a local level also. Throughout 2018/19 the Joint Management

Team consisting of representation from Tarmac, Norfolk County Council, WSP & Dynniq continued to deliver on collaboration with efficiencies and innovation continuing to be managed through value creation teams.

- 3.8.2. In 2019 the collaborative business lead for the project has been transitioned from the Service Manager to Tarmac's Performance and Business Manager and the Joint Management Team has been refreshed. A review of the value creation teams and their objectives is scheduled to take place shortly.

3.9. Information Communications Technology (ICT)

- 3.9.1. Tarmac's works order management system continues to perform well in combination with the council's Mayrise system. Works orders are received, processed (including through their supply chain) and costed accurately in a timely manner. System performance is fully embedded & considered at a mature status.
- 3.9.2. Tarmac continues to collaboratively support the Council's own Information Technology ambitions having demonstrated wider Kaarbontech capability extending beyond cyclical gulley management data to potentially include an improved method of selecting grip cutting and even grass cutting data management.

3.10. Investing in the Community

3.10.1. Norfolk & Norwich Festival

Tarmac continues to support the Norfolk & Norwich Festival by sponsoring the free outdoor programme. In 2019 this included a significant festival sponsorship of £22,000 which brings the total sponsorship over the last five years to £144,000. Tarmac are working closely with the event organisers to maintain a close relationship and involvement during the festival period.

3.10.2. Norfolk County Council OSCA's

Tarmac continues to support the Council's OSCA's ceremony sponsoring the Outstanding Achievement Award and the overall event.

3.10.3. Supporting Employment in the Community

367 volunteer hours have been delivered by Tarmac within the community through a wide variety of programmes. Tarmac continue to act as Deputy Chair for the Norwich for Jobs Steering Committee and chair the new Operations Board & the projects Employers Panel.

Norwich for Jobs is a community of local voluntary organisations working together to give essential knowledge, skills and experience to young people helping them get into work. Six young people are currently undertaking their apprenticeship through the contract. Tarmac continues to exceed its contract commitment to Science Technology Engineering & Mathematics (STEM) Ambassadors from 4 to 6.

There has been significant spend through the local supply chain of £8.1 million ensuring value is retained within the region. £45,000 has been spent across Tarmac through Fast Lane Training Services & Norfolk Labs extending the reach of Norfolk County Council operations beyond the county.

3.11. Innovation

- 3.11.1. Tarmac have made significant improvements to innovation value compared to previous year increasing from 1 KPI point 2017/18 to 5 points 2018/19. Improvements to delivering innovation value through avoiding cost have been delivered by evidencing value engineering as per the innovation strategy outlined as part of last year's review. Value engineering derived cost avoidance innovation value has been achieved through excellent close collaboration between the Council and Tarmac.
- 3.11.2. Further innovation has been delivered through a risk-based approach to the gully cleaning service. Investment has been made in development with Tarmac funding a Highways best practice event. Tarmac have delivered benefit through mitigation of IMT costs that typically would have been chargeable to the Council, they have funded and installed defibrillators in council depots and funded sponsorship of the council OSCA's awards.
- 3.11.3. Tarmac have also invested in an asset management maturity assessment of the council's approach to asset management in line with the code of practice adopted in October 2018. This project is identifying the council's robustness and any potential gaps that may exist in its approach to asset management. This is an on-going project, the innovation benefits of which will be felt in the forthcoming year.

4. WSP – 2018/2019 end of Year Report

4.1. Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

- 4.1.1. Overall year end score was 4.48 out of 5.

4.2. Contract Successes

- 4.2.1. Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing

WSP have been a key player in supporting NCC to appoint a Design and Build Contractor for this Project. In order for the Contractors to bid through the NEC Contract WSP provided Norfolk with a specimen design followed by support to the submitting of the Design Consent Order (DCO)

- 4.2.2. Recruitment

WSP have continued to recruit locally to meet the increasing workload. WSP also suggested a joint recruitment campaign. This entailed joint advertising, interviewing and appointments to both WSP and NCC.

- 4.2.3. STEM for Schools

WSP providing Stemnet training for additional staff. WSP have set up a local Professional Growth Network team (Young Professionals) who are working to deliver local STEM activities in 2019

4.2.4. Upskilling Norfolk

- WSP are improving the level of skilled professional staff living and working in Norfolk. The Contract initially started with 11 staff which has grown organically to meet Norfolk's needs, and currently have over 50 staff based in Norfolk.
- WSP currently have 3 staff undertaking formal training for a level 4 qualification and 2 staff undertaking Degree Apprenticeships in Civil Engineering. At least one more apprentice is to be appointed in summer 2019.
- WSP also supported a further member of staff with time off to attend university on a Degree course which he passed in summer 2018.
- WSP also encourage staff to continue their Professional development and achieve professional qualifications through formal training agreements or mentoring.

4.2.5. Apprentices

WSP now have 2 staff studying on a 5-year Degree apprenticeship course and will be recruiting a further apprentice in the Summer of 2019

4.2.6. City College

- The WSP Commission Manager has been working with both NCC and City College to encourage the College to develop Higher Level apprenticeships in Civil Engineering and has provided feedback on course content, with a view to ensuring the students have a good skill base to help them into employment.
- WSP have taken on 2 students from City College Norwich on 45 day paid work experience

4.2.7. Volunteering

WSP promote their staff to undertake volunteering work and allow them 2 paid volunteering days. Last summer over 20 WSP staff volunteered to support the Whitlingham Trust and spent a day carrying out maintenance activities for the trust.in Trowse and on Whitlingham Lane.

4.3. Efficiencies and Innovation

4.3.1. Last year an improvement notice was issued in respect to the efficiency savings. This year WSP have worked with the improvement plan and despite a significant increase in the turn over and efficiency target they have exceeded the efficiency savings required under the Contract

4.3.2. Best Practice Sharing

- WSP have continued to honour the contract commitment to bring in Technical leads to provide expert advice and support to Norfolk and its

projects.

- WSP have also provided sponsorship for the Norfolk “OSCA’s” and the “Norfolk and Norwich Eco Awards”.

5. Dynniq – 2017/2018 end of Year Report

5.1. Key Performance Indicators

- 5.1.1. The Performance targets have been achieved with an overall score of 4.46. There are no contract issues to report

5.2. Efficiencies Achieved

- 5.2.1. A number of efficiencies have been agreed throughout Y5. In readiness for the control room move, Dynniq introduced the ‘Mobi RMS’ unit that monitors the traffic light faults a fraction of the cost of the old system. This system is GSM and has made the control room move much simpler. This coupled together with the existing IP based UTC system will ease the move.

5.3. Contract Apprentice

- 5.3.1. The apprentice is working out well. They are attending college and receiving hands on training with the operational staff. The apprenticeship is due to be completed in 2019.

5.4. Communications Project

- 5.4.1. Dynniq are monitoring performance daily, along with Norfolk County Council.

Over the next year they are going to complete a plan to future proof the communications project.

5.5. Imtech OPCIS Fault Management system

- 5.5.1. OPCIS, Dynniq’s fault management system, continues to work well as the fault management system for the contract. An alternative has been suggested that could introduce savings for Norfolk. This will be fully investigated once the office move has been completed.

5.6. Collaboration

- 5.6.1. For the first five years, excellent levels of mutual trust and understanding have been developed and achieved at all levels. This is assisting the smooth operation of the contract.

5.7. Commitment

- 5.7.1. The Dynniq senior representative during the entire bid and competitive dialogue process made a commitment to remain involved with the commission. This has

been met fully with both advice and strategic guidance being provided to the local team and the Council in all areas. Jane Heffer is in the role as Service Manager for the Norwich contract, also covering our Lincoln contract as well. Paul Boyden is in the role as Service Supervisor, bringing experience and engineering knowledge to the area. The whole Norwich team are committed to providing an excellent service, this endeavour is displayed in our service KPI results.

5.8. Future plans

- 5.8.1. Dynniq are encouraging discussions with neighbouring Lincolnshire over potential savings when combining services where possible. This is on hold at the moment until the new Lincolnshire NEC4 contract is awarded, due October 2019.

Officer Contact for this report

Name	Telephone Number	Email address
Martin Jeffs	01603 222713	Martin.jeffs@norfolk.gov.uk

Report to Infrastructure and Development Select Committee

Item No. 13

Report title:	Proposed updates to Planning Obligations Standards 2019
Date of meeting:	17 July 2019
Responsible Cabinet Member:	Martin Wilby – (Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport)
Responsible Director:	Tom McCabe – (Executive Director, Community and Environmental Services)

Executive Summary

Following the adoption of the County Council Planning Obligations Standards in March 2019, it was agreed by the Environment, Development and Transport Committee to bring a report to a Select Committee to consider any further potential updates / amendments needed and for these to be taken to Cabinet for final approval if required.

Planning Obligations provide a mechanism for securing developer funding towards infrastructure made necessary by their proposed development i.e. to mitigate the impacts of the development.

This report sets out a series of suggested / proposed amendments to the Standards (see Appendix A) reflecting the Government's proposals on reforming developer contributions and addressing members issues raised at the above Committee in March 2019. These amendments include:

1. removing reference to the pooling restrictions, which will allow the County Council to seek more than 5 obligations for a single infrastructure project or type of infrastructure; and
2. Introducing a monitoring charge on developers to cover the Local Authority's cost of overseeing any S106 work post consent.

In addition, the report suggests further joined-up working with the District Councils to consider the wider implications of the Government's reforms on Developer Contributions in respect of: using planning obligations where CIL is in place to fund the same piece of infrastructure; and the preparation of Infrastructure Funding Statements.

These amendments will allow the County Council to immediately adapt to the Government's proposed reforms, which are scheduled to come into force on 1 September 2019. Any further amendments to the Standards can be incorporated into the annual Standards Review, which will commence early in 2020 and be taken to Cabinet in March / April of that year.

Actions required

- (1) To recommend the amended Planning Obligations Standards (as set out in Appendix A) to Cabinet on 2 September 2019 for approval;
- (2) Agree that officers work with the District Councils to consider the wider implications of the Government's reforms in respect of infrastructure delivery to support growth in the County;
- (3) Note that any further amendments will be incorporated into the next annual review of the Standards for 2020.

1. Background and Purpose

- 1.1. Planning obligations provide a means of securing developer funding towards infrastructure needed to support and mitigate the impact of proposed new development.
- 1.2. **Committee Background** - The County Council's current Planning Obligations Standards (April 2019) were formally adopted by the Environment, Development and Transport (EDT) Committee on 8 March 2019. The Committee also agreed, *inter alia*, that "*an appropriate body such as a Select Committee or Task and Finish Group bring a report of any suggested amendments to Cabinet*". A copy of the report and minutes can be found at this [link](#).
- 1.3. **Update to Legislation** – The March EDT Committee Report referred to the Government's proposals at that time for reforming developer contributions (see paragraph 1.3. of the 8 March 2019 Committee report). In April 2019 the Department for Education published advice on Securing Developer Contributions for Education, which reflected the above proposed reforms.
- 1.4. Legislative amendments (Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL Amendments) Regulations) were laid before Parliament on 4 June 2019. A copy of the Regulations can be found at this [link](#) and are due to come into force on 1 September 2019. The key amendments to the legislation in respect of the County Council's planning obligations role / function are set out in Section 2 below and include:
 - The abandoning / lifting of the pooling restrictions on S106 agreements – i.e. allowing more than five such agreements to contribute towards a single piece or type of infrastructure; and
 - Allowing monitoring fees to be secured by Local Authorities for S106 work.
- 1.5. **Other matters raised by EDT Committee** - In addition, there was discussion at EDT Committee regarding the potential costs to smaller scale builders / development; and the opportunities for delivering social and health care through developer funding. These technical issues and those matters raised by EDT Committee in March 2019 are addressed below and/or in the proposed amended Planning Obligations Standards set out in the Appendix to this report.
- 1.6. **Contributions Secured Update** - Since the Planning Obligations Standards were introduced in 2000 the County Council has entered into some 455 (April 2019) Section 106 agreements covering education, library and fire hydrant provision and these are worth over £152 million. Additionally, in this period developer contributions have been secured through either S106 or S278 agreements towards highway and transport schemes exceeding £81 million (May 2019). A further £6 million has been secured since 2015 towards travel planning. Therefore, in total since 2000 the County Council has secured developer funding towards its infrastructure and services worth over £239 million (April 2019). The County Council produces an annual Planning Obligations Monitoring Statement setting out the above figures and where money has been spent in more detail (see [link](#)). This Monitoring Statement is consistent with the Government's proposals for Local Authorities to prepare an Annual Infrastructure Funding Statement (IFS).
- 1.7. **Internal Audit** - In April 2019 an Internal Audit was undertaken on Developer Contributions and concluded / confirmed the following:
 - The Planning Team ensure they remain up-to date on changes in relevant

- legislation with policies and procedures updated promptly;
- There is a protocol between the County Council and all Local Planning Authorities to ensure that the Council is notified of relevant planning applications;
- The Planning Team notify the relevant service departments promptly of planning applications;
- A central record of S106 agreements is kept and monitored with any trigger points communicated to the relevant service department in a timely fashion i.e. to ensure that the County Council invoices developers at the appropriate time;
- Service departments monitor the use of funds and ensure compliance with the S106 agreement; and
- Monitoring of developer contributions is reported to senior officers and members and made available on the County Council's web-site.

1.8. There were two minor (low priority) recommendations covering (a) credit control procedures – to ensure prompt payment by developers of their S106 monies; and (b) the need to develop a process to provide assurance that any income due to the County Council is being accurately reported. Both these matters are being addressed by officers.

1.9. **Planning Appeals** – The County Council has been successful at all planning appeals it has attended in seeking developer funding, with the Planning Inspectorate recognising that the contributions sought by the Authority are legally compliant with the relevant planning regulations.

1.10. **District Council role** – It is important to note that:

- the final decision as to whether to seek developer funding (planning obligations) is ultimately a matter for the relevant Local Planning Authority (i.e. the respective District Council); and
- the County Council is simply a consultee in the process.

Furthermore, the decision as to whether to develop and charge CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) is entirely a matter for respective District Councils, who will need to prepare a CIL Charging Schedule (i.e. as Charging Authority) and undertake appropriate consultation with infrastructure providers including the County Council if they wish to adopt CIL. Where CIL is in place it is the District Council who will collect CIL and determine where and how it is spent with the limitation that a certain percentage must be passed to the relevant Parish Council (if the area is Parished). Within the Greater Norwich area Members will be aware that there is a partnership arrangement in place between all the District Councils and the County Council relating to CIL spending i.e. enabling CIL funds to be spent on key infrastructure to support housing and employment growth.

2. Proposals

2.1. The table below sets out the key Government reforms to Planning Obligations and the suggested response to them by the County Council:

Government Reforms	Suggested County Council Response
(a) Lifting the pooling restrictions on Section 106 i.e. allowing more than five such agreements to contribute towards a single	Update the County Council's Planning Obligations Standards to acknowledge the proposed lifting of the pooling restrictions thereby allowing the County Council to pool S106

<p>piece or type of infrastructure. In particular the Government accepts the argument that lifting the pooling restriction in all areas would remove barriers to development and could in some circumstances give local planning authorities the ability to secure more funding through s106 to deliver the infrastructure needed to support development;</p>	<p>contributions. In the interests of openness and transparency, as well ensuring legal compliance, the CC will continue to identify infrastructure projects, which S106 monies will fund in order to mitigate the impact of development. See Standards in Appendix: National Guidance (section 2); and projects identified in Sections 4 (Education) and Section 5 (Library).</p>
<p>(b) Clarifying how S106 planning obligations can be used for monitoring and specifically permitting Local Authorities to charge for monitoring obligations. The Government considers that it is a matter for agreement between the District and County Council as how the monitoring fee will be shared.</p>	<p>Update Standards to include a monitoring charge in line with the Government's proposals. See paragraph 3.6 of Standards attached.</p> <p>Ultimately such fees will need to be agreed with both the applicant and the District Council through the S106 process.</p>
<p>(c) Allowing Local Planning Authorities to use both S106 agreements and the Community Infrastructure Ley (CIL) to fund the same infrastructure;</p>	<p>Where CIL is being charged it is suggested that the County Council enter into discussion with CIL Charging Authorities to consider opportunities for using S106 agreements to supplement CIL in order to deliver key County Council infrastructure e.g. roads and schools. Any such use of S106 agreements will need to consider viability issues and be legally compliant.</p>
<p>(d) Introducing Infrastructure Funding Statements (IFS), whereby Local Authorities set out their infrastructure priorities and delivery as well as identifying (monitoring) how monies received have been spent.</p> <p>NB the Government has indicated it will produce further guidance on this matter to assist Local Authorities produce their IFSs</p>	<p>The County Council will need to work with the District Councils to ensure a joined-up approach to infrastructure delivery through developer funding. This can build on existing arrangements relating to the preparation of Local Authority Infrastructure Delivery Plans.</p> <p>The County Council already monitors effectively how it spends its Obligations receipts – although further consideration will be given to this matter once further Government Guidance is published.</p>

- 2.2. The DfE made specific reference in its recent guidance for Local Authorities to seek developer contributions for special education needs and disabilities (SEN) provision. The County Council already makes specific reference to SEN provision in the its Standards but will consider whether separate costs need to be introduced for this sector as part of the 2020 Standards Review.

- 2.3. **Impact on smaller builders / developments** - Issues had been raised at EDT Committee regarding the costs of planning obligations for smaller scale builders / developments. However, it needs to be recognised that the Planning Obligations Standards only apply (as agreed with the District Councils) to development of 20 dwellings or more, unless the proposal is contiguous with another proposal / recent development. (NB this figure is 25 Units in Norwich and Great Yarmouth). There is an agreed Planning Obligations Protocol with all the District Councils in relation to this threshold. The threshold ensures that smaller scale development and self-build are not burdened with these obligations.

It is recommended that these thresholds remain in order to avoid impact on smaller scale builders and self-build.

- 2.4. **Health and Social Care** - In terms of Health Care Provision, the updated April 2019 version of the Standards (Section 6) now makes specific reference to health care and the County Council's role as a public health body. Reference is also made to the Countywide Planning and Health Protocol. The Protocol commits Local Planning Authorities (LPAs), as determining authorities, to engage with all the relevant health care and social care partners; commissioning bodies; as well as the County Council on relevant planning applications.

Notwithstanding the above comments amendments have been made in Section 6 of the Standards in respect of accessible housing, clarifying the County Council's position regarding extra care housing (see Appendix).

The County Council will continue through its Planning and Public Health roles to work with health providers to assist in the delivery health care locally.

3. Impact of the Proposals

- 3.1. The above suggested amendments to the County Council's Planning Obligations Standards will allow the Authority to adapt positively to the Government's reforms to developer funding. It will give greater scope and opportunity for seeking pooled contributions towards key infrastructure including the provision of schools and transport schemes.
- 3.2. Continued close working with the District Councils, both as CIL Charging Authorities and Local Planning Authorities, will help secure key County Council infrastructure and help deliver economic growth.

4. Evidence and Reasons for Decision

- 4.1. The proposed amendments will ensure that S106 contributions continue to be sought effectively in order to address the impacts on County Council services arising from new development. Members will be aware that there is a limited developer "pot" and that contributions sought by the County Council must relate to those areas where the Authority has a statutory role e.g. education, transport and libraries.

5. Alternative Options

- 5.1. The alternative option to agreeing the proposed updates to the County Council's Standards is not to take these amendments forward and instead rely on the existing Standards (March 2019). This alternative option is not recommended as the existing Standards agreed by EDT Committee in March 2019 do not reflect the new Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (Amendment)(England)(No.2) Regulations 2019, which came into force on 1 September 2019.

6. Financial Implications

- 6.1. The proposed amendments will ensure that S106 contributions continue to be sought effectively in order to address the impacts on County Council services arising from new development. Members will be aware that there is a limited developer “pot” and that contributions sought by the County Council must relate to those areas where the Authority has a statutory role e.g. education, transport and libraries.

7. Resource Implications

- 7.1. **Staff:** There are no immediate staff implications
7.2. **Property:** None
7.3. **IT:** None

8. Other Implications

8.1. Legal Implications

Contributions sought in S106 agreements must be compliant with the legal tests set in Reg 122 of the CIL Regulations (2010 as amended). The County Council's Planning Obligations Standards are considered to be compliant with these tests and specific reference to them is made in the Standards.

8.2. Human Rights implications

None at this stage

8.3. Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

A detailed equality impact assessment has not been carried out, however, consideration has been given to equality issues. The amendments to the Standards continue to focus on securing appropriate funding from developers to support infrastructure and community facilities. This has a positive impact on communities in terms of supporting and enhancing provision of services; supporting well-being; and ensuring that the County Council secure the funding needed for infrastructure to help people keep people safe. This has a positive impact across communities including those with protected characteristics.

8.4. Health and Safety implications (where appropriate)

None

8.5. Sustainability implications

Failure to secure adequate developer funding towards necessary infrastructure to support growth could lead to unsustainable development taking place and run the risk of placing an additional financial burden on the Authority to finance any shortfalls in County Council infrastructure such as at schools and on the transport network.

8.6. Any other implications

None

9. Risk Implications/Assessment

- 9.1. The proposed amendments to the County Council's Planning Obligations Standards are required to bring them into line with the changes in CIL Regulations, which came into force on 1 September 2019. Relying on the County Council's existing Standards (April 2019), runs the risk of developer funding not being sought for key infrastructure delivered by the County Council with regard to schools and transport.

10. Action Required

- 10.1. (1) To recommend the amended Planning Obligations Standards (as set out in Appendix A) to Cabinet on 2 September 2019 for approval;
- (2) Agree that officers work with the District Councils to consider the wider implications of the Government's reforms in respect of infrastructure delivery to support growth in the County;
- (3) Note that any further amendments will be incorporated into the next annual review of the Standards for 2020.

11. Background Papers

Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010):

(<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2010/9780111492390/contents>)

Town and Country Planning Act (1990):

(<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukdsi/2010/9780111492390/contents>);

Developer Contributions Reform – Technical Consultation (MHCLG) (2018)

<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/developer-contributions-reform-technical-consultation>

Department for Education - Securing developer contributions for education

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/delivering-schools-to-support-housing-growth>

Highways Act 1980:

(<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1980/66>)

Planning Obligations Monitoring statement (July 2018)

(<https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/rubbish-recycling-and-planning/planning-applications/planning-obligations>)

National Planning Policy Framework (2019):

(<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-planning-policy-framework--2>)

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

Officer name : Stephen Faulkner

Tel No. : 01603 222752

Email address : stephen.faulkner@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.



Norfolk County Council

Appendix A

INFRASTRUCTURE, SERVICE AND AMENITY REQUIREMENTS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

Draft

Planning Obligations Standards

September 2019

General enquiries should be made to Stephen Faulkner (Principal Planner) on 01603 222752 (email stephen.faulkner@norfolk.gov.uk) or Laura Waters (Planner) on 01603 638038 (email laura.waters@norfolk.gov.uk) or Naomi Chamberlain (Trainee Planner) on 01603 638422 (naomi.chamberlain@norfolk.gov.uk)

Infrastructure, Service and Amenity Requirements for New Development

Norfolk County Council Standards – September 2019

1.0 Introduction

1.1. The purpose of this document is to set out clearly the planning obligations requirements the County Council may seek in association with new development. These standards apply to the following County Council services:

- Children's Services
- Library
- Fire Service
- Community Services – Adult Care
- Green Infrastructure and Public Rights of Way
- Other Potential Infrastructure e.g. Household Waste Recycling Facilities

1.2. The highway and transport infrastructure and services directly required from new development will continue to be negotiated on a site by site basis (see section 9).

1.3. Other infrastructure and service requirements will be sought by District Councils for affordable housing, play space, open space etc. A list of District Council contacts is set out in Section 11. In addition other service providers, such as the Police and the various Health Bodies may also seek developer contributions towards improvements to their services.

2.0 National Guidance

2.1 All infrastructure requirements must now be compliant with the legal tests set out in the Community Infrastructure Regulations (2010) (as amended) (Reg 122) and be:

- Necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;
- Directly related to the development; and
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

2.2. Amended Regulations were laid before Parliament on 4 June 2019 (Community Infrastructure Levy (Amendment)(England)(No.2) Regulations 2019) and came into force on 1 September 2019. The amended Regulations follow the Government's Technical Consultation in December 2018 on Reforming Developer Contributions, which covered:

- Lifting the pooling restrictions on Section 106 i.e. allowing more than five such S106 agreements to contribute towards a single piece or type of infrastructure. In particular the Government accepts the argument that lifting the pooling restriction in all areas would remove barriers to development and could in some circumstances give local planning authorities the ability to secure more funding through s106 to deliver the infrastructure needed to support development;
- to clarify how S106 planning obligations can be used for monitoring specifically permitting Local Authorities to charge for monitoring obligations;
- Allowing Local Planning Authorities to use both S106 agreements and the Community Infrastructure Ley (CIL) to fund the same infrastructure; and
- Introducing Infrastructure Funding Statements, whereby Local Authorities set out their infrastructure priorities and delivery as well as showing how monies received have been spent.

These reforms have been included within the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)(Amendments) 2019. The County Council's Planning Obligations Standards below reflect the lifting of the pooling restrictions and the clarification regarding monitoring charges. The County Council is also working closely with all District Councils on other aspects of the CIL reforms.

2.3. The County Council will continue to provide a detailed justification/explanation of any contributions it seeks. The Standard Charges detailed below illustrate the range of facilities, which may be expected from developers as a consequence of the development. Developers will be expected to enter into a S.106 legal agreement with the local planning authority regarding the contributions sought or will be obliged through a planning condition to deliver the on-site infrastructure requirements.

2.4 The Planning Obligations Standards are revised annually taking into account:

- Changes in national guidance/standards;
- Inflation – where cost have changed;
- Any other material considerations.

2.5 These Standard Charges have taken into account the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (2010) and the subsequent amendments.

2.6. The following national guidance has been taken into account:

- National Planning Policy Framework ;
- The Planning Act (2008) – this provides ministers with the power to make the CIL Regulations.

Community Infrastructure Levy

2.7. The County Council will work in partnership with District Councils to develop CIL Charging Schedules and rates. Where a District Council has chosen not to implement CIL or is working towards implementation the County Council will continue to use the planning obligations standards. Where CIL is implemented there is sometimes a need for the County Council to use S106 agreements:

- (a) To secure infrastructure which is not identified as being funded through CIL; and/or
- (b) To deal with the transfer of land (e.g. where there is a need for a new school).

In addition the amended CIL Regulations (2019) now allow authorities to use funds from both the Levy and planning obligations to pay for the same piece of infrastructure.

Therefore in those Local Planning Authority areas (LPAs) , where CIL has been introduced (i.e. Norwich City Council, South Norfolk District Council; Broadland District Council; and King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council), the Standards below would not normally be applied except where:

1. there is agreement with the LPA to use both the Levy and planning obligations for the same piece of infrastructure;
2. the site is in a zero CIL rated location and is reliant on S106 to deliver necessary infrastructure; or
3. the contribution relates to land transfer.

The County Council will expect to be consulted at the application stage on proposals likely to have an impact on County Council infrastructure and services by those District Councils who have adopted CIL Charging Schedules.

NB the County Council is working closely with those LPAs who have adopted CIL, as well as those intending to develop CIL, to ensure that necessary County Council infrastructure is secured and delivered through CIL.

3.0 County Advice

Dealing with Major Urban Regeneration Sites

3.1. The County Council recognises that there will be occasions when not all the infrastructure and services requirements made necessary by the development will be able to be provided by the developer. This is likely to be the case on major urban regeneration sites where there may be exceptional costs associated with site clearance and possibly decontamination.

In such circumstances it may be appropriate for the local authority and other public-sector agencies to assist and facilitate in the development coming forward.

This may involve a reduction in the level of contributions normally sought. This would in practice mean the County Council or other service providers needing to fund in part the infrastructure and services needed.

However, in such circumstances the County Council would need clear evidence that:

- The economics of the site do not allow for all contributions to be met. The County Council would want to see the viability assessment (VA) produced and would need to be satisfied with the VA before waiving any contribution sought; and
- The development is in the wider public interest i.e. will provide a wide range of community benefits such as the removal of derelict land and will provide local services (e.g. schools and healthcare provision) accessible to the community as a whole. In these circumstances the matter would be taken to the relevant County Council decision maker in order to secure agreement to reduce the County Council's infrastructure and service requirements. The County Council recognises that it is the District Council who will determine the application and ultimately decide the content of the S106 agreement.

Use of Bonds

3.2 The County Council may seek from developers where appropriate the use of “bonds” to act as a guarantee where large contributions have been negotiated through the S106 process towards for example, schools, travel planning and transport schemes.

Phasing of payments

3.3. Agreed planning obligations contributions will typically be paid to the County Council in a series of phased payments to be agreed with the applicant and determining authority.

Potential Claw-back of Payments

3.4 Where contributions have been made, the County Council will normally be expected to use the sum of money received for the purposes agreed within 5 years of final occupation. However, for some large-scale developments the period may be extended. If the County Council has not spent the money in this time, then some or all of the contributions will be returned to the developer as agreed in the S106 agreement.

Legal Charges

3.5. The developer will be required to pay the County Council's legal fees for drafting and negotiating the S106 agreement and a solicitor's undertaking must be supplied to the County Council's legal advisor before any legal work is carried out.

The County Council will review all the charges set out in these Standards when they are next updated.

Monitoring Charge

3.6 The County Council will seek a charge towards the administration of the S106 agreements (i.e. covering monitoring of S106 agreements and planning conditions – undertaking sites visits; invoicing; preparation of an Infrastructure Funding Statement; and chasing up any payments outstanding).

The charge will generally be levied at a rate of £500 per obligation on all schemes involving the phasing of payments. On more complex sites the charge will be levied at a rate of 1 % of the County Council's total obligations up to a maximum of £10,000 per agreement.

On major strategic housing sites (typically over 1,000 dwellings), the monitoring fee will be negotiated on a site by site basis reflecting any potential complexities associated with the S106 and the additional work involved in monitoring the agreement over a lengthy time period.

The monitoring charge will normally be payable on commencement of the development.

Where all contributions are payable on commencement the monitoring charge may be reduced.

4.0 Education Provision

4.1. The County Council has a statutory responsibility to ensure sufficient school places in the County for children between the ages 5 and 16 years. It works with other partners to ensure a sufficient supply of 16 – 19 year places many of which are integrated in 11 – 19 year schools. In addition the County Council has a statutory duty to ensure a sufficient supply of pre-school places (e.g. Day Care and/or Early Education provision) for children aged three and four. There is also a duty to ensure free places for eligible two-year olds. Contributions for pre-school provision may be required either for existing pre-schools or purpose built new facilities on a separate site, possibly shared with a school. Existing play groups and nurseries (including private facilities) will be taken into account. Primary phase schools are now able in law to extend their age range to encompass two and three year olds.

4.2. The Education Act 2006 gives the County Council the duty to secure sufficient places in its area. Subsequent legislation has created a platform for the development of a more diverse and more locally accountable school system, supported by a wider range of providers than in the past, particularly through multi-academy trusts.

4.3. The County Council maintains (funds) community schools, voluntary controlled schools; and community special schools. Statutory regulation ensures that governing bodies have delegated authority to run schools. The County Council and the Department for Education have the duty to intervene where a school is at risk of failing. The County Council acts as admissions authority for community and voluntary controlled mainstream schools and co-ordinates “applications and offers” for all mainstream schools, including free schools and academies. The Local Authority co-ordination ensures a fair process for parents and their children, offers an accessible school place to all applicants and seeks to meet parental preference as far as possible.

4.4. The County Council acts as a champion for all Norfolk residents, in respect of all children and young people and their parents/carers. In a diverse educational context, it will broker partnerships to support governors, school leaders and providers in securing the best for the community they serve. Its partnership, school improvement and school intervention activity is exercised in pursuit of the highest quality school provision in all schools in Norfolk.

4.5. The County Council receives capital grant from government to support the supply of places in all schools. It also seeks contributions from housing developments towards the cost of new school places in line with the CIL Regulations referred to above. Where it secures such contributions it may add to them an element of Basic Need funding to enhance the facilities but will not reduce the level of obligations set out in this document.

4.6. The County Council is also, under the Education Act 2006, as amended by the Academies Act 2010, a commissioner rather than a provider of new schools. It has the power to set out the characteristics of a school needed for a new community in order

that providers may identify their capacity to provide that school. All new schools commissioned in this way will be established as Free schools (in law academies). The County Council has to provide the site and funds for such a school, although these will usually be expected to come from the developer(s). The County Council will procure the school building through its OJEU (Official Journal of the European Union) compliant contractor framework and will provide the new building for the successful free school sponsor (multi-academy trust) to occupy.

4.7. New Free schools can also be approved by the Secretary of State. These can add to the supply of places but also can increase the diversity of provision in an area. Where they meet a shortfall of places, they would be supported by the County Council.

4.8. In order to assess the number of new children likely to arise from a new development the County Council has undertaken an analysis of recent development in the County (2018) and cross checked this with Health Authority and School Census data, which has resulted in the use of the following pupil generation figures (based on expected children per 100 dwellings):-

Table 1

Age range	No. years cohorts	Type of school	Multiplier (no. of Children)
2 - 4	2	Early Education	9.7
4 – 7	3	Infant	12.9
7-11	4	Junior	15.2
4 - 11	7	Primary	28.1
11 - 16	5	High	14.5
16 - 18	2	Sixth Form	1.5
Total			53.8

4.9. For the avoidance of doubt the above multipliers have been generated as an average child yield across the whole of Norfolk and will be used to calculate developer contributions for all residential developments. Norfolk County Council reserves the right to use more “local multipliers” if the evidence is available to show that the multipliers are more likely to provide an accurate prediction of pupil numbers in the school system as a whole.

The following allowances are:

- No children are assumed on development comprising 1-bed accommodation or sheltered housing where there is an age-related occupancy condition e.g. restricted to the over 50s. In these circumstances no education contributions will be sought;
- For flats, apartments and maisonettes the above multipliers are discounted by a factor of 50% reflecting the fact that fewer children are likely to arise from these types of dwellings.

Catchment Schools

4.10. The County Council will plan on the basis that pupils generated from any new development would attend the catchment school as set out in its statutory admissions documentation. However, if the catchment school is at full capacity, the County Council may, at its full and sole discretion, consider the next nearest school with places providing:

1. The school lies within the statutory maximum distance a child would be expected to travel (i.e. 2 miles for the age range 5 – 8 and 3 miles for the age-range 8 plus.);
2. The school, if primary phase, is within the same high school designated area as set out in the statutory admissions documentation;
3. There will be no adverse impact on the pupils affected in terms of splitting peer groups (i.e. classmates) or siblings;
4. Existing and planned investment in local schools is not compromised;
5. The route to the school is adequate and safe. Where there is inadequate access the County Council may seek developer contributions towards safe routes to school;
6. The developer addresses the impact of those children having to commute further to school e.g. through the provision of cycle storage and/or to deliver safe routes to school.

Types of Infrastructure Projects

4.11. New housing development will typically put additional pressure on existing schools, which may require the developer providing funding towards one of the following school projects listed below. It should be noted that the list of projects below is not exhaustive.

These projects will need to demonstrate that they satisfy and are in compliance with Regulation 122 (legal tests) and Regulation 123 (3) (restrictions on the use of

obligations) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended). Developer funding will be sought for the following types of infrastructure project:

- 1) New self-contained class block
- 2) Extension to provide additional classroom(s)
- 3) Internal remodelling to provide additional class places
- 4) Additional toilet provision
- 5) Additional group room provision
- 6) Additional curriculum support space
- 7) Additional staff accommodation
- 8) New/extended hall space
- 9) New/extended sports hall
- 10) Multi use games area (MUGA)
- 11) Improvement/extension to outdoor learning space/classroom
- 12) Playground extension
- 13) Provision or extension of changing rooms and/or cloakroom
- 14) New/extended dining capacity
- 15) Kitchen facilities
- 16) Extension or adaptation of science laboratory
- 17) Extension or adaptation of technology rooms
- 18) Additional car parking; and/or cycle storage facilities
- 19) Extension or refurbishment of early years provision
- 20) Specialist accommodation (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities - SEND) for children with additional needs by extension or adaptation

The County Council will not typically identify the precise project at the named school/s until it has sufficient pooled contributions to put together a deliverable / viable project. It is expected that the legal agreement (S106) will indicate that contributions will be spent at a specific school/s in order to increase pupil capacity.

Costs of Infrastructure Projects

4.12 The charges for both extension and new build works (e.g. new classrooms) are derived from a “basic need multiplier” produced by the Department for Education (DfE). The DfE multipliers are based on building cost information received from LAs across the country as a whole. The figures take into account regional variations in prices.

4.13. The DfE provide a range of “basic need multipliers” which take into account the different school age ranges. These multipliers have been translated into a charge per dwelling (see table 2 below) and assume that there is no long-term unfilled capacity at the recipient school (i.e. a worst case scenario). Future pupil forecasts will also be taken into account.

Table 2

Sector	Basic Need Multiplier Cost Per Pupil (2019) (£)	Standard Charge per dwelling (providing there is no unfilled capacity at the local school) (2019) (£)
Early Education (2-4)	14,022	1,360
Infant (4-7)	14,022	1,809
Junior (7-11)	14,022	2,131
Primary Sector (4-11)	14,022	3,940
High School Sector (11-16)	15,664	2,271
Sixth Form (16- 18)	15,664	235
Total		7,806

Therefore the total cost per dwelling for education (extension work only) is £ 7,806 assuming there is no capacity at the recipient schools.

New School Requirements

4.14. The building of a new school or pre-school facility will be sought where there is a significant housing proposal (see new school costs below).

When building a new school the County Council will consider the wider community use of both the school buildings and playing fields, but the use of these facilities will be for the Governing Body to determine.

Developer contributions towards a new school will be sought when:

- the existing catchment area school cannot be expanded any further (e.g. insufficient usable land area); and/or

- the proposed residential development is of such a scale that a new school can be justified. For the purposes of a new primary school the typical threshold needed to sustain a new 1FE (and pro rata) school is around 800 new dwellings. For a High school the level is considerably higher 5,000 – 6,000 new dwellings;

If the scale of proposed development falls below the critical threshold to deliver a 100% developer funded school the Local Authority will seek a pro-rata contribution towards the new build costs where appropriate. However, the County Council would, in such circumstances, need to carefully examine the proposed development in the context of the Local Plan in order to ensure that the wider objectives of delivering a sustainable community are met.

4.15. In the case of a new Primary School, the County Council preference is for 420 place school (2 forms of entry). It would thus expect the free transfer of a suitable site but will make provision for return of some of this land if the school does not need to accommodate 420 places. Site sizes are approximately 2.0 hectares for a 420 place school and 1 hectare for a 210 place school or otherwise in accordance with DfE Building Bulletin 103: Area Guidelines for Mainstream Schools, plus the full cost of construction, including early education provision.

4.16 The same principle above will apply to a new High School and the land requirement will be in accordance with DfE Building Bulletin 103: Area Guidelines for Mainstream Schools.

The costs of a new school will need to be negotiated on a site by site basis and will reflect type of school (primary or secondary); size of school (e.g. whether 1 Form Entry or larger); and the site constraints (e.g. need to have a level/flat site; free from vegetation/trees; good drainage; and secure etc.).

School Capacity

4.17 It should be noted that existing unfilled capacity in the school system will not automatically be credited to developers, except where there is a significant existing unfilled capacity at the recipient school. The County Council in assessing unfilled capacity in the catchment area will also take into account:

- Schools that have been expanded but are filling from their lower year groups;
- Other permitted development in the area; as well as
- Those sites allocated in the Local Plan or any emerging Local Plan but not subject to a planning application

Capacity at local schools is taken from the County Council's records at the time of the formal application and is based on the most recent pupil count at the school.

4.18 It should be noted that relocatable classrooms (e.g. temporary mobile) will not be counted towards the net capacity of the school. Therefore those schools where there are re-locatable classrooms present will normally be considered as being at, or over capacity, and as such developer contributions will be sought.

Education/Children's Services Contributions arising from Affordable Housing

4.19. The approach set out below applies to both housing schemes where affordable housing forms a component part of a larger market housing development and to those schemes which are 100% affordable housing

4.20. The County Council's approach is that it will seek, for the most part, education contributions on the whole housing site including any component of the proposal which may be developed for affordable housing. The reasons for seeking such contributions are:

- Affordable housing may involve a variety of tenure types, for example rented, shared equity or cheaper market housing, and these tenures are as likely, if not more so, to be occupied by families containing children as market housing; and
- Those families moving into a new affordable development will almost certainly have vacated a home elsewhere, which could in turn be occupied by another family containing children. This means the new development could lead in net terms to more families in the area and more children attending local schools.

4.21. However, the County Council does accept that there may be some instances where new affordable housing will not lead to additional children in the area, for example:

1. Where the families being housed are from a shared household (i.e. sharing with a family member). Therefore once they move to the new affordable home the original home reverts back to a single household; or
2. The family being housed live in a nearby bed and breakfast, hostel or other such accommodation provided by the Local Housing Authority thereby not freeing-up any housing stock; or
3. Where there is an occupancy condition precluding children (i.e. accommodation for the elderly).

4.22. Even in these circumstances (1 and 2) there may still be some justification for the County Council to seek education contributions if the family containing children move between school catchment areas (i.e. leading to children transferring schools and placing greater pressure on the recipient school). Therefore it will only be in very exceptional cases that no education contribution, or reduced contributions, are sought in connection with affordable housing proposals. In such cases it will be up to the applicant together with the Local Housing Authority to clearly demonstrate to the County Council

that the affordable housing proposed will not lead to a net increase in the number of children in the respective school catchment area.

Affordable Housing – Claw Back provision

4.23. The County Council recognises that there is an issue surrounding the payment of education contributions for the affordable housing element of a new development. The practical solution would be for a legal agreement to allow for an element of claw-back by the applicant where it can be demonstrated that the provisos set out above are satisfied. The detailed wording of such a claw-back clause will be a matter for respective solicitors to agree, although the principle should be acceptable, as this is consistent with the current Government guidance. The County Council will continue to monitor the implementation of this approach and review the situation when the standards are updated.

5.0 Library Provision

5.1 The County Council under the Public Libraries and Museums Act (1964) has a statutory responsibility to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service. New housing development will put a strain on existing library provision, which may require developer funding towards one of the following library projects listed below. It should be noted that the list of projects is not exhaustive.

These projects will need to demonstrate that they satisfy and are in compliance with Reg 122 (legal tests) and Reg 123 (3) (restrictions on the use of obligations) of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended):

- **A new library building**, fixtures and stock. The provision of a new library is only likely to be sought on major new housing sites/allocations of 3,000 dwellings or more. However, each case will depend on an assessment of the particular requirements in that area and the likely impact of the new development on current provision. The cost of a new library will need to be negotiated on a site by site basis;
- **A library extension** - The cost associated with these works is based on information published by the Museums, Libraries and Archives (MLA) in their “Public Libraries, Archives and New Development – A Standard Charging Approach (May 2010)”. The MLA recommends 30 sq.m. per 1,000 population. The average cost per sq.m. for library provision is £2,020 (RICS East of England Library tender value first quarter 2013). Based on an average household size of 2.4 occupants this gives a figure of £144 per dwelling. In addition there would be a requirement for the extension to be fitted out at £100 per dwelling. This brings the total requirement to **£244 per dwelling**;
- **Major Capital Project** to an existing library facility – this might include provision of new toilets etc. The cost associated with this work is **£244 per dwelling**;
- **Upgrading of existing library facilities**— This may include one or more of the following projects:
 - (a) Refurbish library – including improved decoration and new flooring;
 - (b) Reconfigure internal space (new layout) to increase lending capacity;
 - (c) Refurbish toilet facilities;
 - (d) Improved visitor access to library facility i.e. allowing easier access for those with young children or with mobility issues;
 - (e) External works – such as improved parking; cycle racks etc.

The costs associated with this work is **£100 per dwelling**;

- **IT Equipment; Furniture and Stock**
 - (a) Provision of books at named library or mobile service;

- (b) Provision of “talking books”; DVDs and other leisure materials;
- (c) Provision of “self-service” facilities and other potential IT equipment to increase the opening times and capacity of the library;
- (d) Provision of furniture e.g. book shelves; tables; chairs to increase visitor numbers;
- (e) Provision of computers and computing equipment - including tables;
- (f) Provision of learning equipment / play equipment for younger children;

The costs associated with the above items is **£75 per dwelling**.

The County Council will not typically identify the precise project at the named library until it has sufficient pooled contributions to put together a deliverable / viable project. It is expected that the legal agreement (S106) will indicate that contributions will be spent at a specific library / libraries in order to increase lending capacity.

Type of Library Provision	Standard Charge per dwelling (£)
A new library and stock	To be negotiated
Library Extension and fitting out	244
Major Capital Project to existing library	244
Upgrading of existing library facilities and/or fitting out extension	75 - 100
Equipment and/or Stock	75

The above costs relate to any dwelling (e.g. houses, bungalows, flats and/or apartments). However, contributions will not be sought in relation to residential care homes and student accommodation.

6.0 Adult Social Care and Public Health

Affordable Housing

6.1. The Council wishes to support people who have or may develop care and support needs to be supported in their own home for as long as possible. This means that housing needs to be “future proofed” in terms of being suitable or readily adaptable to that end as a general principle. In addition affordable housing is a key issue for people of all ages and disabilities who use Norfolk County Council services, and this must be accessible and integrated, taking account of access to public transport in terms of location within a site.

A proportion of affordable and market housing should be built to:

- Accessible and Adaptable Standards as set out in the Building Regulations Standards (M4(2)); and
- Wheelchair User Dwelling Standards as set out in the above Standards (M4 (3)).

This would assist in meeting changing needs.

Accessible Housing

6.2. An increasing proportion (25%) of the population is over 65 or disabled. This places pressure on supported accommodation such as sheltered housing, extra care housing and care homes, residential care and supported living and means there is increased demand for more older peoples housing options in the future.

The County Council is committed to reducing residential care home and nursing home dependency for the elderly where they can be supported to remain more independent in their own homes or a housing based supported accommodation setting. It aims to provide care in:

- (a) Peoples own homes;
- (b) Rented accommodation in ordinary housing
- (c) Extra care housing (i.e. with residents living in own accommodation as tenants with staff available on site for emergency unplanned care); and
- (d) Sheltered accommodation with warden provision in those where absolutely necessary.

The Council also recognise that there will be a need for enhancing care homes and nursing homes, in line with population growth. The overall site size and minimum units are likely to be similar to extra care provision.

With regard to working age adults with special needs, the County Council is moving away from over reliance on residential care homes and instead is moving towards “**supported living**” i.e. housing with care (with residents living in their own accommodation as tenants) and single unit accommodation with floating support.

Therefore on larger housing proposals, and on smaller sites where the cumulative effect on services is similar to a larger site, the County Council may ask for a contribution to develop care services, for example:

- To upgrade, expand or convert care homes to supported living accommodation;
- To provide new build extra care housing for the elderly to support housing moves for older people into appropriate housing as care needs increase and their homes become unsuitable;
- To provide new or supported living to meet the needs of new residents to be near their extended family;
- To provide single unit accommodation in general housing with floating support.

This will not be a fixed charge but will be negotiated on a site by site basis, and in the case of care homes or extra care may be based on a land contribution. Any contributions sought will need to fully meet the policy tests set out in the CIL Regulations.

6.3. In addition the County Council would support the District Council as Housing Authority in seeking contributions towards:

- (a) Extra Care Housing Provision for elderly;
- (b) Sheltered Accommodation for the elderly; and
- (c) Supported Living (housing with care) for working age adults with special needs.

Public Health

6.4 The County Council in its Public Health role will consider whether proposed new development requires any contributions towards the general improvement of health. In general it is unlikely that public health will require any contribution, although it may seek to influence the design and make-up of the development in order to encourage healthier living through for example encouraging walking; cycling and the use of public transport.

6.5 It should be noted that under the agreed Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework sit a series of agreements including a County-wide Health Protocol (Agreement 20), which commits Local Planning Authorities (LPAs), as determining authorities, to engage with all the relevant health care and social care partners; commissioning bodies; as well as the County Council on relevant planning applications.

It will ultimately be up to the respective LPA to decide upon seeking any developer funding to specific health care projects such as contributions towards new doctor's surgery / medical facility.

6.6 Such contributions towards capital schemes will not resolve workforce shortages within the NHS or other services. It may however enable surgeries and other services to expand their physical capacity, thereby making recruitment and retention easier in the longer run

7.0 Fire Services

7.1. Developers will be expected to provide fire hydrants to the relevant water main. At least one hydrant will be needed for every 50 dwellings. The minimum cost of a hydrant to fit an 80 – 150 mm main is **£824.00** Therefore the Standard Charge per house towards a fire hydrant is **£16.48**.

7.2. Fire hydrants may also be sought in respect of commercial development at a cost of **£824.00 per hydrant**. The number of hydrants required will need to be assessed on a site by site basis taking into account the mix and type of commercial uses proposed.

7.3. Given that the provision of a fire hydrant will in most cases be on site, the County Council would expect that they are delivered through a planning condition. The fire hydrants ought to be installed at the same time as the rest of the water infrastructure, ahead of any dwellings being occupied, in order to avoid any excessive costs to the developer. The location of the hydrant must be agreed with the Norfolk Fire Service prior to installation. The developer will be expected to initiate the installation of the hydrant through contact with the Water Company and will incur all costs associated with the hydrant and its installation. The following conditions will be sought:

Condition 1 Residential Development:-

No development shall commence on site until a full or phased scheme has been submitted to, and agreed by the Council in consultation with Norfolk Fire Service, for the provision of at least one fire hydrant (served by mains water supply) for every 50 dwellings forming part of the development and no dwelling shall be occupied until the hydrant(s) serving the property or group of properties has been provided to the satisfaction of the Council in consultation with Norfolk Fire Service.

Condition 2 Commercial Development:-

No development shall commence on site until a scheme has been submitted for the provision of 0.75 fire hydrants per hectare (served by a 150 - 180mm main water supply depending on the mix and type of commercial uses) for the benefit of the commercial development in a location agreed with the Council in consultation with Norfolk Fire Service and should meet the requirements of Building Regulations Approved Document B Volume 2 Sections 15 &16 (Fire Hydrants/Water Supplies and Vehicle Access).

The commercial development buildings shall not be occupied until the hydrants have been provided to the satisfaction of the Council in consultation with the Norfolk Fire Service.

Informative

7.4. With reference to Conditions 1 and 2, the developer will be expected to meet the costs of supplying and installing the fire hydrants.

Reason for Condition

7.5. Condition is needed to ensure adequate water infrastructure provision is made on site for the local fire service to tackle any property fire.

7.6. Developers may also be asked to contribute towards additional off-site facilities made necessary by the proposed development. For any off-site requirements the County Council would expect these to be dealt with through a S106 agreement.

7.7 The delivery of on-site fire hydrants should therefore be dealt through the use of planning condition rather than within a S106 agreement.

8.0 Green Infrastructure

8.1. The County Council, in partnership with Local Planning Authorities, expects developers to contribute towards the provision of green infrastructure in line with requirements in the NPPF and local plan policies. Contributions towards green infrastructure should not be confined to monetary obligations but should be considered within the overall design of development and its context.

The principle of green infrastructure is to provide landscape connectivity for people and wildlife as well as, where appropriate, assisting in the protection of designated sites. The County Council therefore expects that green infrastructure provision is considered and secured through on-site open space provision with appropriate connections to the wider off-site GI network. This can be achieved, for example, through strategic Highway planting, enhancements to the Public Rights of Way network and effective use of sustainable urban drainage systems as multifunctional assets.

The County Council's green infrastructure responsibilities include:

8.2. Public Rights of Way - Norfolk County Council has a duty to sign and maintain 3,750 km Public Rights of Way (PROW). New development may directly affect routes through for example:

- Requiring those that exist to be moved or adopted; or
- Creating the need for new ones; or
- Requiring existing ones to be improved.

Where detached ways are proposed it is in the public benefit that they be dedicated as public rights of way. Increased use will be made of off-site routes requiring enhanced maintenance incurring cost to this authority.

8.3 Norfolk Trails – Where development is near to one of the Norfolk Trails, a contribution may be sought to help bring social and economic benefits to the local community with regards to connectivity with the trail infrastructure.

Therefore where proposed development is likely to have an impact on PROW, the County Council will seek to negotiate a contribution which is consistent with the tests set out in the CIL Regulations (2010).

8.4 Habitat Regulation Assessment and ecological networks - In terms of the Conservation of Species and Habitat Regulations 2010 (as amended), new and enhanced Green Infrastructure can be used as mitigation for impacts from recreational disturbance on internationally-designated wildlife sites as a result of new development. Therefore the County Council, in partnership with Local Planning Authorities, expects

developers to contribute towards the provision of a coherent and connected green infrastructure Network.

In addition, Local Authorities have a general duty to protect biodiversity. The County Council, in partnership with the respective District Council, may seek contributions towards improving areas of green space and/or the creation of new habitats in order to maintain, enhance, restore or add to biodiversity interests, where they relate to new housing development as required by the NPPF. Such contributions towards biodiversity interests will assist local authorities discharge their responsibilities under the Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act (2006). Contributions will only be sought where they can be justified in terms of the tests set out in Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations (2010), for example where residents from an individual proposed development site are reasonably likely to adversely impact a County Wildlife Site through increased footfall and where mitigation measures are necessary to address this.

9.0 Highways & Transport and Other Potential Contributions

Highway and Transport

9.1 The County Council, through its role as Highways & Transport consultee supports development where it can be clearly demonstrated that it meets the requirements of the NPPF in being safe and sustainable. With this in mind, developers may be required to provide transport related mitigation to address transport impacts of development. The mitigation measures secured by obligation can take the form of travel planning (See below), public transport provision including infrastructure, measures to improve road safety/capacity, or facilities to enable non-motorised users of the highway.

This can be delivered through financial contributions or physical works within the highway and will be dealt with by both the Planning (S106) and Highways (S278 of the 1980 Highways act) legislation. Highways and Transport mitigation measures will usually be secured by planning condition and are assessed on a site specific basis.

Early engagement with the Highways Development Management service is actively encouraged prior to submission of any planning application.

Travel Planning

9.2 Where it has been identified that a travel plan is required, Norfolk County Council's Travel Plan Guidance sets out the requirements including the travel plan surety bonds/contributions and monitoring fees. The Travel Plan Guidance can be found on the County Council's Web-site: <https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/rubbish-recycling-and-planning/planning-applications/highway-guidance-for-development/travel-plans>

The following two options are available to all developers.

- A travel plan can be delivered by the developer or their 3rd party contractor with the surety bond payable to the County Council.

or

- The County Council can deliver the travel plan for an agreed fee through the S106. This travel plan would be delivered by the AtoBetter project.

Both options will require to pay the monitoring fee to the County Council in respect of monitoring and evaluation of their travel plans.

Household Waste Recycling Facilities

9.3 Norfolk County Council, as a Waste Disposal Authority, has a statutory duty under the Environmental Protection Act (1990) to provide facilities at which residents may deposit their household waste. Each facility must be situated either within the area of the authority or so as to be reasonably accessible to persons resident in this area.

Planned housing growth in Norfolk will place further pressures on existing facilities and will require a combination of new or improved facilities in order to meet future demand. Contributions may be sought to deal with the cumulative impact of a series of both small and large developments.

9.4 NB at this stage the precise figure has not been calculated and would not be implemented until consultation has occurred with the District Councils.

Historic Environment

9.5. Developers will usually be required to meet the costs of protecting or examining and recording the historic environment generally including archaeological remains, historic buildings and other landscape feature through planning conditions or legal agreement.

Climate Change

9.6 Government is encouraging the use of the planning system to reduce the impacts linked with increasing the levels of carbon emission that exacerbate climate change. In due course this may involve contributions to abate these impacts; however, at this stage the precise figure has not been calculated and would not be implemented until consultation has occurred with the District Councils as part of any CIL preparation.

Monitoring of Contributions

9.7. The County Council will closely monitor the contributions collected and ensure that any monies collected and spent are in accordance with the respective S106 agreement. Government proposals indicate that local authorities will be able to charge a monitoring fee in respect of planning obligations. The County Council will review this matter once the new Regulations are finally published.

10.0 Summary of Developer Requirements

10.1. The table below summarises the maximum costs per dwelling for education, library and fire hydrant provision:

Infrastructure/Service Area	Cost per Dwelling (£)
Education*	7,806
Libraries	75 (Minimum)
Adult Care Services	To be negotiated
Fire Hydrant	824 (per 50 dwellings)
Household Waste Recycling Facilities	To be negotiated
Highways and Transport	To be negotiated
Green Infrastructure	To be negotiated
Other Items (relating to Historic Environment and Climate Change)	To be negotiated
Total	7,881 This figure excludes fire hydrants which will be dealt with through condition

* The education figure assumes extension and new build associated with an existing school and does not reflect the construction costs of a new school.

11.0 Contacts

11.1. For general enquiries regarding the County Council's planning obligations standards please call or email Stephen Faulkner (Principal Planner) on 01603 222752 (email stephen.faulkner.gov.uk) or Laura Waters (Senior Planner) on 01603 638038 (email laura.waters@norfolk.gov.uk); or Naomi Chamberlain (Trainee Planner) on 01603 638422 (email naomi.chamberlain@norfolk.gov.uk)

11.2 If you have any queries regarding specific sites please contact the relevant Local Planning Authority below:

District Council		Number
North Norfolk		01263 516325
King's Lynn and West Norfolk		01553 616200
Breckland		01362 656357
Norwich City		01603 212603
Broadland and South Norfolk		01508 533789
Great Yarmouth		01493 846421
Broads Authority		01603 610734

Appendix

Planning Obligations - Best Practice Note

1. **Issues on Major Housing Sites – Outline Scheme**

- 1.1. A significant issue facing the County Council relates to an increase in housing arising from increased densities. While S106 agreements will allow for an increase in housing by ensuring that each additional dwelling over and above a given level contributes on a pro-rata basis (i.e. an uplift clause), they do not typically allow for additional land needed for a school (except on key strategic sites). With a modest increase in housing of between 10% - 15% it is considered possible that a pro-rata increase in contributions would cover any additional build costs associated with the recipient school. However, the level of increase which could come forward (40% plus) on some sites (i.e. reflecting Government aspirations for higher housing densities) may require a larger school site i.e. requiring additional land to that agreed in the S106.
- 1.2. Other issues include Demographic Multipliers - S106 agreements are negotiated on the basis of demographic multipliers produced by the County Council, which are from time to time updated. Therefore it is possible on those S106s agreed prior to the current pupil multiplier that more children will arise from the development than previously thought.
- 1.3. Increase in Build Costs – Estimates of build costs may rise over and above those allowed for through index -linking. The S106 relies on the RICS Building Cost index.

2. **General S106 Issues and Way Forward on Outline Schemes**

- 2.1. The following “best practice” actions are considered appropriate:
 - **Capping the Level of Development** - All S106 relating to outline schemes should have an upper limit/cap placed on them through condition. This cap will need to be agreed between the District the County and the developer and be soundly based on the effective delivery of infrastructure and service (e.g. for education and highway provision);
 - **Uplift charge** – where an uplift charge (overage) is considered appropriate as an alternative to a “cap”, the uplift will be limited to an additional 10% dwellings. Any additional dwellings arising through more intensive development will require a new S106. The uplift will only relate to reserve matters applications.
 - **Demographic Multipliers**– these multipliers will be reviewed on a regular basis and where necessary updated in the County Council's Planning

Obligations Standards. The County Council will ensure that the most up to date multipliers are used;

- **Additional Land for a School** – in responding to District Council Local Plan consultations on site specific proposals the County Council will seek where appropriate additional school land to that required (i.e. contingency site) in order to serve the development in the event that housing numbers increase substantially. The site could potentially be reverted back to the developer if higher densities do not emerge. However, consideration would need to be made to the potential impact of any further housing on local infrastructure and services. In some instances it may be prudent to earmark any “contingency” site for other uses such as open space rather than simply handing the site back to the developer;
- **Build Costs for Schools** - where a new school is needed the valuation will need to be robust and time limited to say three years after the agreement is signed. Thereafter the S106 should allow the costs to be re-negotiated

Report to Infrastructure and Development Select Committee

Item No. 14

Report title:	Forward Work Programme
Date of meeting:	17 July 2019
Responsible Cabinet Member:	N/A
Responsible Director:	Tom McCabe – (Executive Director, Community and Environmental Services)
Is this a key decision?	No
Executive Summary This report sets out the Forward Work Programme for the Committee. Actions required To review and agree the Forward Work Programme for the Select Committee.	

1. Forward Work Programme

- 1.1. The existing Forward Work Programme for the Select Committee is set out in Appendix A, for the Committee to use to shape future meeting agendas and items for consideration.

2. Member Task and Finish Groups

- 2.1. At the meeting in May, the Select Committee agreed that, to help ensure a manageable workload, the Select Committee will have no more than two Member Task and Finish Groups operating at any one time. There are currently two Task and Finish Groups: -
 - **Environment Policy for Norfolk** – Cllr Barry Stone (Chairman), Cllr Bev Spratt, Cllr Jess Barnard, Cllr Stephan Aquarone.
 - **Local Transport Plan** - Cllr Graham Middleton (Chairman), Cllr Tony White, Cllr Brian Watkins and a Labour Group representative (TBC).

3. Financial Implications

- 3.1. None.

4. Resource Implications

- 4.1. **Staff:** None.
- 4.2. **Property:** None.
- 4.3. **IT:** None.

5. Other Implications

- 5.1. **Legal Implications:** None.
- 5.2. **Human Rights implications:** None.
- 5.3. **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) (this must be included):-** N/A
- 5.4. **Health and Safety implications** (where appropriate):- N/A.
- 5.5. **Sustainability implications** (where appropriate): N/A
- 5.6. **Any other implications:** None.

6. Action required

- 6.1. To review and agree the Forward Work Programme for the Select Committee.

7. Background Papers

- 7.1. None.

Officer Contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper, please get in touch with:

Officer name: Sarah Rhoden **Tel No.:** 01603 222867

Email address Sarah.rhoden@norfolk.gov.uk



If you need this report in large print, audio, braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

Infrastructure and Development Select Committee – Forward Work Programme

Report title	Reason for report
Meeting: Wednesday 11 September 2019	
Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service Integrated Risk Management Plan	To consider the draft IRMP (part of the Council's policy framework)
Environmental Policy for Norfolk	To take forward actions agreed at the May Select Committee meeting, to enable a response to Full Council in November.
Residual Waste Procurement Strategy	To get Member recommendation for residual waste procurement strategy for contracts after March 2021.
Street lighting	To receive an update on street lighting in Norfolk, in particular the implementation of new technology e.g. LEDs, trimming/dimming etc.
Forward Work Programme	To review and agree the Forward Work Programme for the Select Committee.
Meeting: Wednesday 13 November 2019	
Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP)	To consider suggested revisions/additions for the TAMP and agree recommendations to Cabinet.
King's Lynn Transport Strategy	To consider the Strategy, which is being jointly developed with West Norfolk Borough Council.
Norfolk Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan	To consider the findings of the review of the Plan, and agree recommendations to Cabinet
Adult Education Strategy	To review the new Strategy and agree recommendations Cabinet.
CES Enforcement Policy	To review the revised policy for the CES Department and agree recommendations to Cabinet.
Forward Work Programme	To review and agree the Forward Work Programme for the Select Committee.
Meeting: Wednesday 29 January 2020	
Norfolk Rail Prospectus	To consider the revised prospectus and agree recommendations to Cabinet
Library and Information Service Strategy	To review the new Strategy and agree recommendations Cabinet.
Forward Work Programme	To review and agree the Forward Work Programme for the Select Committee.
Meeting: Wednesday 11 March 2020	
Norfolk Parking Principles	To consider the updated principles, developed with district councils, and agree recommendations to Cabinet
Forward Work Programme	To review and agree the Forward Work Programme for the Select Committee.

Regular reports

Regular items	Frequency	Requested committee action (if known)
Policy and Strategy Framework – annual report	Annually - May	To enable the Select Committee to understand the relevant Policies and Strategies for the relevant services.
Forward Work Programme	Every meeting	To review and agree the Forward Work Programme for the Select Committee.