

Public Document Pack



COMMITTEE: **BABERGH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

VENUE: **ROSE ROOM - ENDEAVOUR HOUSE, 8 RUSSELL ROAD, IPSWICH**

DATE: **MONDAY, 19 MARCH 2018
9.30 AM**

Members

Melanie Barrett
Simon Barrett
Peter Burgoyne
Barry Gasper

Bryn Hurren
Jennie Jenkins
Alastair McCraw
Fenella Swan

The Council, members of the public and the press may record/film/photograph or broadcast this meeting when the public and the press are not lawfully excluded. Any member of the public who attends a meeting and objects to being filmed should advise the Committee Clerk.

AGENDA

PART 1

ITEM	BUSINESS	Page(s)
1	<u>APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTES</u>	
2	<u>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</u>	
3	<u>BOS/17/35 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON THE 22 JANUARY 2018</u>	1 - 6
4	<u>TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COUNCIL'S PETITION SCHEME</u>	
5	<u>QUESTIONS BY THE PUBLIC</u> To consider questions from and provide answer to members of the public on any matter in relation to which the Committee has powers or duties and of which due notice has been given in accordance with the Committee and Sub-Committee Procedure Rules.	
6	<u>QUESTIONS BY COUNCILLORS</u> To consider questions from and provide answer to Councillors on any matter in relation to which the Committee has powers or duties and of which due notice has been given in accordance with the	

ITEM	BUSINESS	<u>Page(s)</u>
	Committee and Sub-Committee Procedure Rules.	
7	<u>BOS/17/36 THE FIVE-YEAR LAND SUPPLY</u>	7 - 34
	Cabinet Member for Planning - Councillor Lee Parker	
	Members to receive a report based on the scoping exercise conducted on the 15 February 2018	
8	<u>BOS/17/37 ALL TOGETHER PROGRAM</u>	35 - 52
	Kathy Nixon – Strategic Director	
	Members to receive a report on the All Together Program	
9	<u>PRESENTATION ON VOIDS</u>	
	Councillor Gasper will be presenting the Service Improvement Plan for the Void Improvement Project	
10	<u>INFORMATION BULLETIN</u>	
	The Information Bulletin is a document that is made available to the public with the published agenda papers. It can include update information requested by the Committee as well as information that a service considers should be made known to the Committee.	
	This Information Bulletin contains updates on the following subjects:	
	There is no Information Bulletin	
11	<u>BOS/17/38 FORTHCOMING DECISIONS LIST</u>	53 - 56
	To review the Council's Forthcoming Decisions List and identify any items to be brought before the Overview and Scrutiny Committee	
12	<u>BOS/17/39 FORWARD PLAN</u>	57 - 62
	To agree the Forward Plan	
13	<u>BOS/17/40 MSDC OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY FORWARD PLAN</u>	63 - 68
	For information	

For further information on any of the Part 1 items listed above, please contact Committee Services on 01449 728461 or via e-mail at Committees@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk.

Introduction to Public Meetings

Babergh/Mid Suffolk District Councils are committed to Open Government. The proceedings of this meeting are open to the public, apart from any confidential or exempt items which may have to be considered in the absence of the press and public.

For more information about this meeting, including access arrangements and facilities for people with disabilities, please contact the Governance Officer on: 01449 724681 or Email: Committees@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

Domestic Arrangements:

- Toilets are situated opposite the meeting room.
- Cold water is also available outside opposite the room.
- Please switch off all mobile phones or turn them to silent.

Evacuating the building in an emergency: Information for Visitors:

If you hear the alarm:

1. Leave the building immediately via a Fire Exit and make your way to the Assembly Point (Ipswich Town Football Ground).
2. Follow the signs directing you to the Fire Exits at each end of the floor.
3. Do not enter the Atrium (Ground Floor area and walkways). If you are in the Atrium at the time of the Alarm, follow the signs to the nearest Fire Exit.
4. Use the stairs, not the lifts.
5. Do not re-enter the building until told it is safe to do so.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

BABERGH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BABERGH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE HELD IN BRITTEN ROOM - ENDEAVOUR HOUSE, 8 RUSSELL ROAD,
IPSWICH ON MONDAY, 22 JANUARY 2018

PRESENT: Barry Gasper - Chairman

Clive Arthey
Bryn Hurren
Fenella Swan

Peter Burgoyne
Alastair McCraw

61 APOLOGIES AND SUBSTITUTES

An apology of absence was received from Councillors Melanie Barrett and Jenny Jenkins and from Peter Patrick – Cabinet Member for Finance.

62 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

None received.

63 BOS/17/29 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20
NOVEMBER 2017

It was RESOLVED: -

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 November 2017 be confirmed as a true record with the following amendments:

Page 5, paragraph 57.3 to be amended to:

The Committee requested that the item: “reviewing the impact, the office move has had on staff and the financial impact of the move to Endeavour House, with the aim of learning points for other future major change activities” be added to the Forward Plan in April.

64 TO RECEIVE NOTIFICATION OF PETITIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
COUNCIL'S PETITION SCHEME

None received.

65 BOS/17/30 DRAFT JOINT MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY AND 2017/18
BUDGET

65.1 The Chair read out to Members questions received from Councillor Alan Ferguson and which was tabled at the meeting. He asked the officers to forward the answers to all Committee Members after the meeting. The Questions and Answers are attached.

- 65.2 The Assistant Director, Corporate Resources responded to Members' requests to forward a detailed breakdown of the Transformation Fund to the Committee Members. In the future a copy of the Quarterly Budgetary Monitoring report was to be forwarded to Members. The report was also available found on the website.
- 65.3 It was clarified that report BCa/17/36 went to Cabinet in December. Report BCa/17/42 went to Cabinet in January and was the most up to date report of the two. Further updates were being added at the final stages before the report went back to Cabinet in February.
- 65.4 CIFCO investments, BMS Invest and it's new staffing structure and the work for Investment and Development were yet to be finalised and were not included in the Budget. The income for the Pre-application Charges had not yet been included either.
- 65.5 Members questioned the Council's deficit and if reserves were still needed to repay this. Members were reassured that the debt was being reduced.
- 65.6 Officers clarified that there was £500,000 in reserve to pay for debt but that this was not a large amount for the size of the Council. The exact distribution of reserves was to be found on page 28, paragraph 13.5. The Transformation Fund balance of £126K was marked as the absolute final reserve.
- 65.7 Members then asked if additional information was going to be added to the report for the installation of Solar Panels and CIFCO. The response was that the Solar panels were included in the General Fund, but as CIFCO was an independent company, it would provide its own report to Cabinet.
- 65.8 Members asked for clarification on the Debt Cap (page 33, paragraph 18.9) and the prediction for the next years and officers explained how the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) had previously been maintained, and that the HRA and 30-year Business Plan were a calculated projection of how the funding would be achieved. The Government's announcement that councils could increase rents CPI by + 1% and had an impact on the HRA's Income and Expenditure for 2020/21 and the Business Plan. It was confirmed that the Debt Cap was fixed by the Government.
- 65.9 In response to Members questions, officers explained that the Universal Credit, which was in operation as a full service now, and rent recovery had not yet had an impact on debt recovery. The Council had a good rent collection system in place and the Bad Debt Provision had been estimated to increase only increase slightly (Page 33, paragraph 19.1).
- 65.10 The In-year Operation Surplus Variance of £766,000 were explained to be mostly due to the revenue contribution from the Capital Program. Currently a review of the housing stock was being undertaken and an estimated Capital Spend of £1100 per property was included in the budget. Currently the Capital Spend was £1300, which was slightly above the national average.

- 65.11 Members discussed the HRA assets and sale of high value properties. The Government was introducing a high value sales levy in 2019/2020 which would have a significant effect on the Business Plan. This levy could be up to £1million per year if the Council decided not to sell the high value properties. The Chartered Institute had advised the financial team to use a figure of £750,000 per year when conduction scenario testing.
- 65.12 The Council could purchase other properties with 100 % of the money from sale of properties, unlike the Right to Buy Scheme which only allowed 30% of the sale to go the Council.
- 65.13 The Assistant Director – Housing was to produce a paper on the HRA testing scenarios and forward this to Member in March.
- 65.14 Members requested that they were informed, when the Council was buying houses in their ward.
- 65.15 The Capital Program investment for Hadleigh Swimming Pool was to remain the same for the four-year forecast (Appendix C, page 41) but as investment opportunities became possible in Babergh these figures would be updated.
- 65.16 Officers explained that four- year ICT hardware and software cost of £200,000 per year was to keep the Council current with ICT developments and to establish Customer Service Access Points in Sudbury and Stowmarket as part of the Customer Service program.
- 65.17 Members debated the income achieved for Waste MRF (page 78) and Recycling (page 72). It was noted that savings had also been achieved under Alignment of Chairman’s Expenses and Course Conference fees for Members.
- 65.18 Members discussed the Off-payroll Staff Costs and referred to the Information Bulleting presented to the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee 18 December 2017. It was clarified that not all the Off-payroll contracts were subject to be proposed by a business case, and that this depended on the reason and payroll grade of the contract.
- 65.19 The Assistant Director – Corporate Services, drew Members’ attention to the graph on page 55 for the Funding Gap, and explained that the New Home’s Bonus projection, was not included in the calculations to create the graph.
- 65.20 The Assistant Director – Corporate Resources as asked by Members to forward the slides from the Cabinet Briefing to Members to clarify the three variations of the forecasts for the General Fund Revenue Account (page 70).
- 65.21 Members were to receive a review of the balance position to reduce the debt deficient once this has been presented to SLT.
- 65.22 Members continued to discuss cost in the Statement of Accounts including:

- Costs for redundancy, staff costs and the annual savings for the integrations between the Councils;
- The cost of launching BMBS;
- The cost of security for the two vacant HQ sites;
- A brief summary of the future of the HQ sites, and that a Business Case for the sites would be brought to full Council for discussion;
- The one-off cost for redundancies as a result of the move to Endeavour House;
- The net income for the Solar Panels of £438,000 for 2018/19.

It was RESOLVED: -

That report BOS/17/30 containing 2018/19 General Fund Budget – Early Indication (Report BCa/17/36) and the Draft Joint Medium Term Financial Strategy and 2018/19 Budget (BCa/17/42) be noted

66 BOS/17/31 INFORMATION BULLETIN

It was RESOLVED: -

That the Information Bulleting be noted.

67 BOS/17/32 FORTHCOMING DECISIONS LIST

It was RESOLVED: -

That the Forthcoming Decisions List be noted

68 BOS/17/33 FORWARD PLAN

Members discussed the Forward Plan and the upcoming review of Planning Application Fees. Councillor Gasper to forward information received from John Foster to the Corporate Manager – Law and Governance.

It was RESOLVED: -

That the Babergh Forward Plan be noted

69 BOS/17/34 MSDC OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY FORWARD PLAN

It was RESOLVED: -

That the Mid Suffolk Forward Plan be noted

Babergh Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting 22 January 2018

Questions received on 13 January 2018 from Councillor Alan Ferguson to be answered at the Committee meeting.

1. We have been given salary costs but what were the redundancy costs (all aspects including pension uplift) of the back office Babergh/Mid Suffolk merger?

Answer: Integration of staffing between Babergh and Mid Suffolk took place over the period 2011/12 to 2013/14. In the Statement of Accounts each year the councils disclose the level of termination payments to officers. The accounts for both councils show total redundancy and pension fund costs of £3.534m over the three-year period. It may be the case that not all of these costs related to integration, so this is the worst-case position. Recurring annual savings from integration total £2.247m, so the payback period of the one-off costs was 1.6 years.

2. What were the costs (in all respects) of the move to Endeavour House? How long will it take to amortise those costs?

Answer: This information will be available in the near future. Officers are finalising a document, to share with all members, which will capture all the costs of the move to Endeavour House and the ongoing revenue projections.

3. To what extent have the costs associated with questions 1 & 2 driving the deficits that we are now facing in FY 2018 to FY 21?

Answer: The one-off costs associated with both of these initiatives have been funded from reserves rather than increasing the base budget. So, whilst they have not contributed directly to the deficits that Babergh is facing in the future, it has reduced the level of reserves that give the Council some resilience to respond to the challenges that it faces.

4. Is there any truth in the rumour that we have an additional (unplanned deficit) as a result of our solar panel installations?

Answer: No. The net income for Babergh in the proposed budget for 2018/19 is £258k. This is lower than the figure quoted at the Babergh Overview & Scrutiny Committee meeting on 22nd January 2018. The figure quoted there of £438k did not include the Minimum Revenue Provision charge, as a result of the borrowing costs, so the correct net income figure is £258k.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 7

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL and MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

From: Corporate Manager – Strategic Planning	Report Number: BOS/17/36
To: Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Date of meeting: 15 March 2018

FIVE-YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To provide greater understanding of the policy context surrounding the five-year housing land supply.
- 1.2 To provide greater understanding of how the five-year housing land supply is calculated.
- 1.3 To clarify the frequency of when the five-year housing land supply calculation is undertaken and how decisions are made.
- 1.4 To identify what actions Councillors can take to ensure the delivery of housing within the five-year period.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 The Committee is asked to make a recommendation to Full Council that the five-year housing land supply is calculated annually following the end of the April to March monitoring period and that a five-year housing land supply statement is produced as soon as is practicable that will form part of the Annual Monitoring Report.

3. Financial Implications

- 3.1 It is necessary to ensure the Councils in undertaking their five-year housing land supply calculation, produce a robust assessment that can be applied in the determination of planning applications whether the Councils have a five-year housing land supply or not. Producing a five-year housing land supply that has not considered all the available information robustly could result in costs against the Councils at a Planning Appeal.

4. Legal Implications

- 4.1 The five-year housing land supply is a requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework to help with boosting the supply of housing. It is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. Local planning authorities are required to undertake Annual Monitoring Reports (AMR) in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended by the Localism Act 2011.
- 4.2 This report has been forwarded to legal services and their response is pending.

5. Risk Management

- 5.1 This report is most closely linked with the Councils' Corporate / Significant Business Risk No. 1b / If we do not have a sufficient appropriate supply of land available in the right locations, then we may be unable to meet housing needs in the district. Key risks are set out below:

Risk Description	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation Measures
1b: If we do not have a sufficient, appropriate supply of land available in the right locations, then we may be unable to meet housing needs in the district.	3 – Probable	3 – Bad	Current local plans in place and call for sites undertaken. New Joint Local Plan consultation undertaken between August and November 2017. Next version of Joint Local Plan will have preferred site allocations.
If the five-year housing land supply update is produced more frequently than annually, then this could mean that some of the information required to calculate the five-year housing land supply is missing and would also increase the amount of resources required to undertake the assessment.	2 – Noticeable	3 – Bad	The Councils currently produce a robust five-year housing land supply statement annually in accordance with national planning guidance and policy and is planned to be undertaken alongside the Annual Monitoring Report.

6. Consultations

- 6.1 None.

7. Equality Analysis

- 7.1 There are no Equality and Diversity implications.

8. Shared Service / Partnership Implications

- 8.1 The strategic planning team produce the five-year housing land supply assessment for both Babergh and Mid Suffolk Districts.

9. Links to Joint Strategic Plan

- 9.1 Supports the housing main priority area and housing delivery key strategic outcome of more of the right type of homes, of the right tenure in the right place.

10. Key Information

- 10.1 This report contains sections as detailed below:

- 1) Policy context.
- 2) Detail of how the five-year housing land supply is calculated.
- 3) Timeframe for updates and how judgement fits.
- 4) Impact that Councillors can make on development being completed.
- 5) Where Councillors could lobby.
- 6) Where Councillors could impact any resource for calculating the five-year housing land supply.

1) Policy context

- 10.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires Councils to identify and update on an annual basis a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide for five years' worth of housing against their identified requirements (paragraph 47). For sites to be considered deliverable they have to be available, suitable, achievable and viable. Beyond that, the NPPF also requires that Councils seek to identify specific developable sites (or broad locations) for long term growth up to 15 years ahead.
- 10.3 In a recent Appeal decision dated 2nd November 2017 involving Gladman Developments Limited and the East Riding of Yorkshire Council, reference was made to a Court of Appeal judgement involving St Modwen Developments in 2016 and the interpretation of a deliverable site. Footnote 11 of the NPPF identifies that for sites to be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years and that development of the site is viable.
- 10.4 National Planning Practice Guidance in paragraph 031 identifies that deliverable sites for housing could include those that are allocated for housing in the development plan unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years. The distinction between deliverability and delivery was considered in the St Modwen Developments judgement and reiterated in the Appeal decision of 2nd November 2017, that the assessment of housing land supply does not require certainty that the housing sites will actually be developed within that period. Therefore *'for a site to be deliverable, it should be capable of being delivered not that it will be delivered'* ¹.

¹ Appeal Decision (2nd November 2017), ref: APP/E2001/W/16/3165930 – Land north and east of Mayfields, The Balk, Pocklington, East Riding of Yorkshire YO42 1UJ, paragraph 12, page 3, <https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate>

However, it is necessary to ensure that sites included in the five-year housing land supply assessment have realistic build-out rates taking into account what the market is delivering in each district.

- 10.5 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF also states that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Legal judgement has held that this means a narrow definition of policies for the supply of housing and should be *'limited to policies only dealing with the numbers and distribution of new housing, and excluding any other policies of the development plan dealing generally with the disposition or restriction of new development in the authority's area.'*² Therefore, a wide range of policies of both the NPPF and the adopted Local Plan should be referenced in the determination of planning applications, and careful consideration will need to be made with regard to the appropriate weight to be applied. However, judgement further states that *'If a planning authority that was in default of the requirement of a five-year supply were to continue to apply its environmental and amenity policies with full rigour, the objective of the Framework could be frustrated.'*³ Decision takers can and should therefore, apply the judgement as to the interpretation of policies in weighing up of the consequences of apply development plan policies.
- 10.6 Where policies cannot be considered up to date, the NPPF (paragraph 11) states that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF as a whole, or specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted. The presumption in favour of sustainable development in paragraph 14 of NPPF also applies where a proposal is in accordance with the development plan, where it should be granted planning permission without delay unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 10.7 The NPPF (paragraph 47) also requires an additional buffer to the five-year land supply depending upon the recent performance of housing delivery. Where delivery has been good relative to the local annual target, a 5% additional buffer should be required on top of the baseline five-year land supply requirement. However, a 20% additional buffer should be applied where persistent under-delivery of housing is identified.
- 10.8 The Joint Local Plan will identify preferred allocations at the next stage of its preparation and these will therefore gain weight in planning decisions as the Plan progresses towards submission to the Government for an Examination in Public. The weight is influenced by the level of objections a proposed site allocation may have received prior to Examination.
- 10.9 Therefore, in calculating a five-year housing land supply for the 2019-24 period, proposed site allocations in the Joint Local Plan will be able to be taken into account.
- 10.10 However, the five-year housing land supply to be calculated for the 2018-23 will not yet be in a position to take these sites into account but will be updated from the 2017-22 position to take into account completions during 2017/18 and existing planning

² <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/uksc-2016-0078.html> / <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2016-0076-judgment.pdf>, - see paragraph 48 on page 20 and paragraph 82 on page 29

³ <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2016-0076-judgment.pdf>, paragraph 83, page 30

permissions and those with a resolution to grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 Agreement being signed.

2) Detail of how the five-year housing land supply is calculated

- 10.11 In accordance with National Planning Practice Guidance paragraph 030 (Reference ID: 3-030-20140306) the starting point for calculating the five-year supply should be the housing requirement figures in up-to-date adopted Local Plans. It goes on to state that '*... considerable weight should be given to the housing requirement figures in adopted Local Plans, which have successfully passed through the examination process, unless significant new evidence comes to light... Where evidence in Local Plans has become outdated and policies in emerging plans are not yet capable of carrying sufficient weight, information provided in the latest full assessment of housing needs should be considered. But the weight given to these assessments should take account of the fact they have not been tested or moderated against relevant constraints...*'
- 10.12 Babergh District Council adopted its Core Strategy in February 2014 and Mid Suffolk District Council adopted its Core Strategy Focused Review in December 2012 both having been tested and examined as a post-NPPF development plans. The Councils published the Ipswich and Waveney Housing Market Areas Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) in May 2017 which is important new evidence for the emerging Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Local Plan. Therefore, the five-year housing land supply has been calculated for both the adopted Core Strategy based figures and the new SHMA based figures. For determining relevant planning applications, it will be for the decision taker to consider appropriate weight to be given to these assessments and the relevant policies of the development plan.

Babergh

- 10.13 A summary of the Babergh five-year housing land supply position as at 1st April 2017 (published June 2017) for 2017 to 2022 is 4.1 years for the Core Strategy based supply and 3.1 years for the SHMA based supply.
- 10.14 In calculating the Babergh Core Strategy assessment for 2017-22 the following key assumptions were made:
- The base date for figures is at 31st March 2017. The period of five-year supply review is 2017/18 to 2021/22.
 - Core Strategy annual dwellings target is 220 dwellings for years 2011 to 2016 and 325 dwellings for years 2016 to 2031.
 - The Core Strategy based five-year period baseline target is = 1,625 (325 x 5).
 - Total new housing completions since the Core Strategy plan start year (2011) = 1,324.
 - Undersupply was calculated against housing delivery performance since the CS plan start year (2011). Total cumulative shortfall to 31st March 2017 was 101 dwellings (1,324 completions delivery – 1,425 housing target).
 - A 20% buffer was considered appropriate based on past delivery record.

- Total net outstanding planning permissions stood at 2,320 dwellings (rounded), of which 480 dwellings (rounded) were small sites of less than 10 dwellings.

Summary of Core Strategy (CS) based five-year housing land supply calculation:

	Babergh land supply targets and buffers 2017/18 – 2021/22		
a	Land supply 2017-22	1,699	
b	CS Baseline Target 2017-22	1,625	
c	CS Based Undersupply (as at 2016/17)	-101	
d	Adjusted five-year target	1,726	(b + c)
e	5% buffer	86	(d x 0.05)
f	Total adjusted target + 5% buffer	1,812	(d + e)
g	Adjusted target + 5% annual figure	362	(f / 5)
h	Five-year supply + 5% (years)	4.7	(a / g)
i	20% buffer	345	(d x 0.20)
j	Total adjusted target + 20% buffer	2,071	(d + i)
k	Adjusted target + 20% annual figure	414	(j / 5)
l	Five-year supply + 20% (years)	4.1	(a / k)

10.15 In calculating the Babergh SHMA based assessment for 2017-22 the following key assumptions were made:

- The base date for figures is at 31st March 2017. The period of five-year supply review is 2017/18 to 2021/22.
- SHMA annual dwellings target is 355 dwellings for the period between 2014 to 2036.
- The SHMA based five-year period baseline target is = 1,755 (325 x 5).
- Total new housing completions since the SHMA plan start year (2014) = 555.
- Undersupply was calculated against housing delivery performance since the SHMA plan start year (2014). Total cumulative shortfall to 31st March 2017 was 510 dwellings (555 completions delivery – 1,065 housing target).
- A 20% buffer was considered appropriate based on past delivery record.
- Total net outstanding planning permissions stood at 2,320 dwellings (rounded), of which 480 dwellings (rounded) were small sites of less than 10 dwellings.

Summary of SHMA based five-year housing land supply calculation:

Babergh land supply targets and buffers 2017/18 – 2021/22			
a	Land supply 2017-22	1,699	
b	SHMA Baseline Target 2017-22	1,775	
c	SHMA Based Undersupply (as at 2016/17)	-510	
d	Adjusted five-year target	2,285	(b + c)
e	5% buffer	114	(d x 0.05)
f	Total adjusted target + 5% buffer	2,399	(d + e)
g	Adjusted target + 5% annual figure	480	(f / 5)
h	Five-year supply + 5% (years)	3.5	(a / g)
i	20% buffer	457	(d x 0.20)
j	Total adjusted target + 20% buffer	2,742	(d + i)
k	Adjusted target + 20% annual figure	548	(j / 5)
l	Five-year supply + 20% (years)	3.1	(a / k)

10.16 Summary of breakdown of land supply

Babergh land supply 2017/18 – 2021/22	Dwellings	
No permission / Allocated sites	110	A
S106 to sign	120	B
Application	0	C
Permission outline	142	D
Permission full	700	E
In construction	257	F
Windfall and small sites	480	G
Permitted sites (c-f) minus 10% for lapse rate	989	H
Total supply (a+b+c+g+h)	1,699	I

10.17 Sites in the land supply trajectory tables as published in the June 2017 AMR were shown as below:

Site Status / Ref	Site Name	Parish	A = allocation W = windfall	Total no. units to be built	Still to build	Phase 1 dwellings (2017-22)	Phase 2 dwellings (2022-27)	Phase 3 dwellings (2027+)
-------------------	-----------	--------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

Mid Suffolk

10.18 A summary of the Mid Suffolk five-year housing land supply position as at 1st April 2017 (published June 2017) for 2017 to 2022 is 3.9 years for the Core Strategy based supply and 3.9 years for the SHMA based supply.

10.19 In calculating the Mid Suffolk Core Strategy assessment for 2017-22 the following key assumptions were made:

- The base date for figures is at 31st March 2017. The period of five-year supply review is 2017/18 to 2021/22.
- Core Strategy annual dwellings target is 415 dwellings for years 2007 to 2012 and 430 dwellings for years 2012 to 2027.
- The Core Strategy based five-year period baseline target is = 2,150 (430 x 5).
- Total new housing completions since the Core Strategy plan start year (2007) = 3,792.
- Undersupply was calculated against housing delivery performance since the CS plan start year (2007). Total cumulative shortfall to 31st March 2017 was 433 dwellings (3,792 completions delivery – 4,225 housing target).
- A 20% buffer was considered appropriate based on past delivery record.
- Total net outstanding planning permissions stood at 2,480 dwellings (rounded), of which 570 dwellings (rounded) were small sites of less than 10 dwellings.

Summary of Core Strategy (CS) based five-year housing land supply calculation:

	Mid Suffolk land supply targets and buffers 2017/18 – 2021/22		
a	Land supply 2017-22	2,443	
b	CS Baseline Target 2017-22	2,150	
c	CS Based Undersupply (as at 2016/17)	-433	
d	Adjusted five-year target	2,583	(b + c)
e	5% buffer	129	(d x 0.05)
f	Total adjusted target + 5% buffer	2,712	(d + e)
g	Adjusted target + 5% annual figure	542	(f / 5)
h	Five-year supply + 5% (years)	4.5	(a / g)
i	20% buffer	517	(d x 0.20)
j	Total adjusted target + 20% buffer	3,100	(d + i)
k	Adjusted target + 20% annual figure	620	(j / 5)
l	Five-year supply + 20% (years)	3.9	(a / k)

10.20 A In calculating the Mid Suffolk SHMA based assessment for 2017-22 the following key assumptions were made:

- The base date for figures is at 31st March 2017. The period of five-year supply review is 2017/18 to 2021/22.
- SHMA annual dwellings target is 452 dwellings for the period between 2014 to 2036.
- The SHMA based five-year period baseline target is = 2,260 (452 x 5).
- Total new housing completions since the SHMA plan start year (2014) = 1,025.

- Undersupply was calculated against housing delivery performance since the SHMA plan start year (2014). Total cumulative shortfall to 31st March 2017 was 331 dwellings (1,025 completions delivery – 1,356 housing target).
- A 20% buffer was considered appropriate based on past delivery record.
- Total net outstanding planning permissions stood at 2,480 dwellings (rounded), of which 570 dwellings (rounded) were small sites of less than 10 dwellings.

Summary of SHMA based five-year housing land supply calculation:

	Mid Suffolk land supply targets and buffers 2017/18 – 2021/22		
a	Land supply 2017-22	2,443	
b	SHMA Baseline Target 2017-22	2,260	
c	SHMA Based Undersupply (as at 2016/17)	-331	
d	Adjusted five-year target	2,591	(b + c)
e	5% buffer	130	(d x 0.05)
f	Total adjusted target + 5% buffer	2,721	(d + e)
g	Adjusted target + 5% annual figure	544	(f / 5)
h	Five-year supply + 5% (years)	4.5	(a / g)
i	20% buffer	518	(d x 0.20)
j	Total adjusted target + 20% buffer	3,109	(d + i)
k	Adjusted target + 20% annual figure	622	(j / 5)
l	Five-year supply + 20% (years)	3.9	(a / k)

10.21 Summary of breakdown of land supply

Mid Suffolk land supply 2017/18 – 2021/22	Dwellings	
No permission / Allocated sites	235	A
S106 to sign	248	B
Application	0	C
Permission outline	252	D
Permission full	510	E
In construction	784	F
Windfall and small sites	569	G
Permitted sites (c-f) minus 10% for lapse rate	1,391	H
Total supply (a+b+c+g+h)	2,443	I

10.22 Sites in the land supply trajectory tables as published in the June 2017 AMR were shown as below:

Site Status / Ref	Site Name	Parish	A = allocation W = windfall	Total no. units to be built	Still to build	Phase 1 dwellings (2017-22)	Phase 2 dwellings (2022-27)	Phase 3 dwellings (2027+)
-------------------	-----------	--------	--------------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------

10.23 In calculating housing completions the following sources of information are used, which can only be robustly obtained on an annual basis:

- Building control completion records within the Councils;
- Building control completion records from external Approved Inspectors;
- Completion information from the National House Building Council (NHBC);
- Council Tax records;
- Site visits undertaken by planning officers; and
- Community Infrastructure Levy commencement form records.

3) Timeframe for updates and how judgement fits

10.24 The five-year housing land supply is linked to the Councils' annual Local Plan monitoring timescales, with the monitoring periods identified as 1st April to 31st March each year. Councils are required to produce annual monitoring reports under section 35 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended. Due to the multiple data sources to collate and reconcile, and the often slow (and less reliable) information provided directly by private Approved Inspectors, agents and developers, the accuracy of the data is substantially more reliable at the end of the financial year period. End of year site checks are used to improve the accuracy of the best available desktop data obtained. In addition, it is important that the Councils' published five-year housing land supply is as realistic and robust as possible. Therefore, the Councils also gather evidence from the site agents / landowners and developers for example with regard to their planned or estimated timescales for housing delivery on the identified sites.

10.25 If a five-year housing land supply is claimed and is not robust, there is a risk of challenge and award of costs against the Councils at a Planning Appeal.

10.26 Calculating the five-year housing land supply on a quarterly or even monthly basis increases the risk to the Councils of being in a position where the information informing the calculation is inaccurate due to the Councils being unable to obtain all the information required. In addition, assessing the information on a more frequent basis would result a considerable increase in the resource requirement on planning officers.

4) Impact that Councillors can make on development being completed

10.27 Councillors can impact the speed of delivery of developments through using funding such as the New Homes Bonus to contribute towards infrastructure development and supporting bids to Government for potential funding streams.

10.28 Councillors could also contact the housebuilders themselves.

10.29 Councillors may also want to consider requiring applicants of major planning applications to submit a statement indicating the anticipated delivery phasing of the proposed scheme.

5) Where Councillors could lobby

10.30 Councillors could lobby the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) and local MPs.

6) Where Councillors could impact any resource for calculating the five-year housing land supply

10.31 Councillors need to be mindful of the staff resource that is required in calculating the five-year housing land supply and that it is more efficient and effective to undertake this on an annual basis.

10.32 Requesting additional updates increases the risk that any five-year housing land supply calculation may be less robust and producing a figure mid-year could also result in the Councils being required to produce a calculation for the five-year period commencing in the next financial year, which could also increase any shortfall in delivery to be accounted for. Additional staff resource would be necessary which could detract from preparation of the Joint Local Plan and supporting communities undertaking Neighbourhood Plans.

10.33 It then requires updating of the databases and exporting reports to determine the number and status of outstanding planning permissions, i.e. not started or under construction.

10.34 If officers are to defend a position at a Planning Appeal, then there needs to be complete confidence in the process by which an interim five-year housing land supply has been reached. However, there would likely be either a) legal challenges from disaffected communities / developers or b) challenges at planning appeals by applicants.

10.35 Furthermore, publication of monthly data has in itself historically resulted in additional enquiries and Freedom of Information / Environmental Information Requests from communities which then takes further valuable resource to manage and respond to.

11. Appendices

Title	Location
(a) 5 year land supply briefing note – August 2015	Attached
(b) Appeal decision: APP/E2001/W/16/3165930	Attached / https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate

12. Background Documents

12.1 Mid Suffolk District Council 5 year land supply briefing note (August 2015) – see appendices

12.2 Babergh District Council Interim 5 Year Housing Land Supply Statement (April 2017) <http://www.babergh.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/AMR/INTERIM-BDC-5-year-land-supply-update-report-April-2017.pdf>

- 12.3 Babergh and Mid Suffolk Joint Annual Monitoring Report 2016 – 2017 (June 2017) <http://www.babergh.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/AMR/FINAL-BMSDC-AMR-2016-17.pdf>
- 12.4 Ipswich and Waveney Housing Market Areas Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) (May 2017) <http://www.babergh.gov.uk/assets/Strategic-Planning/AMR/FINAL-BMSDC-AMR-2016-17.pdf>
- 12.5 Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Local Plans <http://www.babergh.gov.uk/planning/planning-policy/adopted-documents/>
- 12.6 Local Government Association: Plan making – 5 year housing land supply <https://www.local.gov.uk/plan-making-5-year-housing-land-supply>
- 12.7 National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012) https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf
- 12.8 National Planning Practice Guidance <https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>
- 12.9 Appeal Decision (2nd November 2017), ref: APP/E2001/W/16/3165930 – Land north and east of Mayfields, The Balk, Pocklington, East Riding of Yorkshire YO42 1UJ, <https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate> - see appendices
- 12.10 Supreme Court Judgement (10th May 2017) Suffolk Coastal District Council (Appellant) v Hopkins Homes Ltd and another (Respondents) Richborough Estates Partnership LLP and another (Respondents) v Cheshire East Borough Council (Appellant), <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2016-0076-judgment.pdf>

Authorship:
Robert Hobbs
Corporate Manager – Strategic Planning

Tel: 01449 724812
Email:
robert.hobbs@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

5 year land supply briefing note – August 2015

Introduction (requirements of Councils)

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires Councils to identify and update on an annual basis a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide for five years worth of housing provision against their identified requirements (paragraph 47). For sites to be considered deliverable they have to be available, suitable, achievable and viable. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF goes on to state that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of deliverable housing sites. Where policies cannot be considered up-to-date, the NPPF (paragraph 14) states that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts outweigh the benefits, or other policies indicate otherwise, when assessed against the NPPF as a whole.

How is the 5 year supply calculated

The key components of the 5 year land supply are:

- 1) **Annual dwellings target rate** – taken from the Local Plan targets
- 2) **Identified dwellings under-delivery** – if there is a cumulative shortfall of delivery against the Local Plan targets, this must be added to form an adjusted annual target
- 3) **The (additional) buffer rate** – 5% must be further added to the adjusted target where historic delivery has been good, whilst 20% must be added to the adjusted target where there is a record of persistent under-delivery
- 4) **Land Supply** – the total of the identified supply of dwellings on specific deliverable sites which are expected to be delivered within 5 years. Sites of 10 dwellings or more are specifically identified and listed within the annual BDC/MSDC 5 year supply statement. The bulk of this source comes from sites with planning permission and assumed ‘windfall’ rates. Other sites not yet with planning permission could be included, such as site allocations (within Local Plan documents), schemes agreed in principle subject to a s106 agreement, but the Council must have robust evidence to demonstrate that delivery could occur within the 5 year period. The latter point explains why some sites / developments need to be excluded from the published 5 year land supply position.

A summary of the calculation is set out in the example below:

Row	Description	Figure	Calc formula
a	Total Land supply (2015 – 2020)	-	
b	(Adopted) Core Strategy Base Target (2015 – 2020)	-	
c	CS Plan Undersupply (2014/15)	-	
d	Adjusted 5 year target	-	$(b + c)$
e	5% Buffer	-	$(d \times 0.05)$
f	Total adjusted target + 5% buffer	-	$(d + e)$
g	Adjusted target + 5% (annualised figure)	-	$(f/5)$
h	5 year supply +5% (years)	-	(a/g)
i	20% Buffer	-	$(d \times 0.20)$
j	Total adjusted target + 20% buffer	-	$(d + i)$
k	Adjusted target + 20% (annualised figure)	-	$(j/5)$
l	5 year supply +20% (years)	-	(a/k)

Period for review

It should be noted that the 5 year land supply position will tend to be in a state of flux. It will be subject to change as a result of the supply being drawn on (as homes are completed) or other factors, such as changes in the delivery circumstances of sites and schemes. The nature of these changes may thus vary by timing and frequency or their extent and impact of such changes. On this, the NPPF is clear though in requiring local authorities to 'identify and update a supply of specific deliverable sites annually'. A periodic 'snapshot' (in time) approach is thus accepted practise.

The 5 year land supply is inextricably linked to the Council's ongoing Local Plan monitoring timescales. In the past, Mid Suffolk did not have monitoring systems and procedures in place that are usually found in district councils. However, over the last few years, considerable action has been taken to address that shortcoming and systems are now in place equivalent to those as used within Babergh for a relatively long time. The monitoring principally involves gathering information on changes in planning permissions and dwelling starts and completions. This information is gathered over the course of the financial year from the best available records gathered by various sources such as Building Control, Development Management, Council Tax and external Approved Inspectors (AIs).

Due to the multiple data sources to collate and reconcile, and the often slow (and less reliable) information provided directly by private AIs, agents and developers, the accuracy of data obtained is substantially more reliable at the end of the financial year period. End of year on site checks are used to improve the accuracy of the best available desktop data obtained. In addition, it is important that the Council's published 5 year housing land supply stance is as realistic and robust as possible. Therefore, the Council also gathers evidence from the site agents / landowners, developers etc. with regard to their planned or estimated timescales for housing delivery on the identified sites. This is an important stage recognised in the planning guidance, and gives the Council valuable evidence on which to defend projections and assumptions made within the 5 year land supply. Assessments on the deliverability (or otherwise) of housing schemes may well change over time (sometimes quickly), for example, when different landowners do not co-operate in bringing developments forward. Whilst it is necessary therefore to keep such matters under review, this is a time-consuming and onerous task for the Council's officers to undertake.

These various processes and checks take some time and, whilst a mid-year interim position can be calculated, the reliability of this data is far less certain for the reasons set out above. Typically, many local authorities around the country undertake an annual update and recalculation to the 5 year land supply only and regard this as adequate for practical purposes.

Actions in response to the current MSDC 5 year land supply position

Initial attention has been given to a range of potential actions in response with a view to restoring Mid Suffolk's 5 year land supply position to a positive state. Early thinking suggests that such responses would need to span actions working to time periods including short term, medium term and longer term actions. These will need thinking through and discussion between relevant officers from different services and Councillors. In particular, consideration will be necessary as to the likely effectiveness of these and to their resource and other implications. This issue is likely to arise from a number of long term factors, including the current circumstances relating to the existing Mid Suffolk planning policy framework. Given such factors, it should be recognised that identifying quick and readily expedient solutions is anticipated to present a number of challenges. In addition it is considered that managing this situation is necessary for the purposes of handling substantial work demands, media enquiries and collective expectations, hence a suggested new, purpose-built protocol (dealt with in final paragraph below).

Developing the planned approach to tackle this situation

It is important to set this issue into its wider context and within reasonable perspective. In essence, it could be stated that whilst 5 year housing land supply is an important NPPF requirement, it is also a short term element of the wider growth agenda and its delivery.

Timetable

- 19 August: political leaders of the administration to consider updated findings on objectively assessed development needs, initial options for how these might be considered and various possible forms of strategic response, together with spatial approaches towards accommodating this growth (and some cross-boundary strategic planning issues). Discussions to also consider remedial actions in response to current absence of 5 year housing land supply
- End August: extend above discussion to leading administration councillors
- September: Widen options discussion to remaining Conservative group councillors
- End September: initial options discussions with opposition groups councillors

Some Common Myths – Key Messages

The policy position of the NPPF in cases where a 5 year housing land supply is not demonstrated, is as stated above (first paragraph). Accordingly it needs to be emphasised that:

- It does not mean that all policies and provisions of existing Local Plans will be set aside and rendered inoperative (in this case the 1998 Local Plan, adopted Core Strategy and its focused review (2008 & 2012 respectively); and the Stowmarket Area Action Plan). The policies that cannot be considered up-to-date are those dealing specifically with housing supply
- What it does mean is that increased weight needs to be attached to the absence of a demonstrated 5 year housing supply. This accords with the clearly stated NPPF objective requiring local authorities 'To boost significantly the supply of housing' (paragraph 47) and need not be incompatible with the Council's strategic objectives on growth delivery, including that of new homes
- Mid Suffolk's Councillors have already given a clear steer to review substantial elements of its existing policy framework, particularly those policies placing substantial restrictions on new development for its villages and rural areas. In this way, it is planned to sustain the existing pattern of rural communities through much needed new development
- Development proposals still need to represent *sustainable development*, as the NPPF makes clear
- To illustrate this, in Mid Suffolk's case, its Planning Committee considered recent proposed developments (at Stowupland and Bacton) unacceptable and chose to refuse these proposals, whilst recognising that a 5 year supply cannot currently be demonstrated
- Mid Suffolk is certainly not unusual (or untypical) in this situation. Recent research by Savills (June 2015)¹ indicates that nationally approximately 40% of LPAs do not have a five year supply – and in the South East this proportion may be higher
- The important outcome to focus on in this context is not a 5 year housing land supply in itself, it is instead the delivery of new homes

Recent Findings on 5 year land supply for MSDC

- May 2014: MSDC councillors briefed on annual update position as at March/April 2014. At this point councillors were advised that at a calculated 5.5 years supply, the position was marginal and would be likely to be seen as open to challenge by external parties

¹ <http://www.planningresource.co.uk/article/1349620/short-supplies-local-plan-delays-affecting-housing-delivery>

- January / February 2015: interim land supply update produced (in response to planning application at Stowupland). Councillors advised that the land supply was not believed to be in place (at 4.3 / 3.7 years depending on assumptions used)
- March / April 2015: annual update produced in May. Latest position was 3.7 / 3.3 years supply identified (depending on use of extra 5% or 20% buffer)

Suggested Future Approach to the above Considerations

Officers recommend developing a new protocol to deal with these matters, to be subject to consultation with Councillors during its preparation. This would be agreed by Executive committee (MSDC) and Strategy Committee (BDC). Much of the content used within this briefing note could usefully be incorporated into that protocol. Accordingly, although some matters it covers may be subject to debate, the volume of work involved is not considered likely to be unacceptably onerous or time-consuming.



Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 7 August 2017

Site visit made on 16 August 2017

by **S R G Baird BA(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 02 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/16/3165930

Land north and east of Mayfields, The Balk, Pocklington, East Riding of Yorkshire YO42 1UJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Gladman Developments Limited against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref DC/16/03253/STOUT/STRAT, dated 29 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of up to 380 residential dwellings (Use Class C3, including up to 25% affordable housing), local centre with a children's day nursery (Use Class D1); a convenience store with up to 280 sq. m of retail floor space (Use Class A1); a 60 bed care home (Use Class C2); formal and informal public open space to include allotments, community orchard, children's play area, skate park and multiple use games area; structural planting and landscaping; surface water flood mitigation and attenuation and associated ancillary works.
-

Preliminary Matters

1. The application was made in outline with all matters other than means of access reserved. At the opening of the inquiry the appellant requested that means of access be treated as a reserved matter. The local planning authority (lpa) and Pocklington Town Council (PTC) had no objection to this change. No party would be prejudiced by access being treated as a reserved matter and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
2. The lpa do not pursue; that part of reason for refusal (RfR) 2 which relates to the absence of a sequential/retail impact assessment and the third RfR relating to highways impact. The appellant requested that the submitted highways proof and rebuttal proof of evidence be taken as a written submission. PTC provided a written response to the appellant's highways evidence.
3. The appellant submitted a signed S106 Unilateral Undertaking (UU) providing for financial contributions for: bus stops, an Outdoor Sports Facilities Commuted Sum and a Public Spaces Protection Order. The UU also provides for the laying out and management of the public open space and that 25% of the dwellings would be affordable housing (AH) units.
4. An application for a partial award of costs was made by the East Riding of Yorkshire Council against Gladman Developments Limited. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

5. Following the close of the inquiry, decisions on an appeal¹ lodged by the appellant relating to the refusal of outline planning permission for residential development on land at Holme-on-Spalding Moor and an application for an award of costs by the lpa were issued. The parties were given an opportunity to comment on the implications of these decisions for their cases. I have taken the comments into account in coming to my decisions.
6. At the inquiry, the main parties requested that should the Court of Appeal Judgement² into a challenge to the High Court's judgement in the case of St Modwen Developments Ltd and (1) Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (2) East Riding of Yorkshire Council and Save our Ferriby Action Group [2016] EWHC 968 (Admin) be issued before this appeal decision was issued they be given the opportunity to comment on its implications for their cases. I have taken the comments into account in coming to my decisions.

Decision

7. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

8. These are: whether the lpa can demonstrate a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5-years' worth of housing land supply (HLS); the implications for development plan policy and the planning balance.

Reasons

5-year Housing Land Supply

9. Paragraph 47 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing. Lpas are to identify and update annually a supply of deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5-years' worth of housing land against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% or 20% where there has been a record of persistent under delivery of housing. Based on an interim update of the 2016 Strategic Housing Land Assessment (SHLAA), which includes a 20% buffer and adopts the Sedgefield approach to address shortfalls in delivery, the agreed 5-year housing requirement is 11,591 dwellings.
10. Following a round-table session on disputed sites, the appellant identifies a HLS of some 10,610 dwellings (4.86-years) and the lpa identifies a HLS of some 12,666 dwellings (5.46-years). The parties differ on whether a number of sites without planning permission and allocated in the Local Plan³ (LP) can be considered deliverable and therefore are legitimately part of the required 5-year supply. The appellant draws particular attention to LP sites, described as "Jurassic" sites, where there is no planning application activity and no identified commitment from the landowner or a developer to bring the site forward within 5 years. These are sites for some 516 dwellings identified in previous LPs dating from 1996 to 1999 and brought forward into

¹ APP/E2001/W/16/3165880.

² St Modwen Developments Ltd and (1) Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (2) East Riding of Yorkshire Council and Save our Ferriby Action Group [2017] EWCA Civ 1643.

³ East Riding Local Plan 2012-2029, Strategy Document Adopted April 2016 & East Riding Local Plan 2012-2029 Allocations Document. Adopted July 2016.

the current LP and Prospectus⁴ sites for some 1,116 dwellings. In addition, the appellant highlights that the actual delivery of housing has not met projections in the LP or successive SHLAAs. The appellant says that these factors call into question the realism and deliverability of the 5-year HLS.

11. Framework Footnote 11 identifies that to be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within 5 years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Planning Policy Guidance⁵ (PPG) gives guidance on what constitutes a deliverable site for the application of housing policy. Given the dispute relates to allocated sites, the first sub-paragraph of Paragraph 031 is relevant in this case i.e. "*deliverable sites for housing could include those that are allocated for housing in the development plan ... unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within 5 years*". Here, whether the lpa is able to demonstrate a 5-year HLS in accordance with the Framework revolves around the distinction between what is deliverable and what will be delivered.
12. The Wainhomes judgement⁶ confirms that an allocation in an emerging LP may be evidence in support of a conclusion that such sites are deliverable. Here, as the appellant acknowledges, given the LP is adopted the Wainhomes conclusion applies with greater force. The distinction between deliverability and delivery was been considered in the St Modwen Developments judgement⁷. This judgement, a challenge to which was dismissed in the Court of Appeal, highlights that the Framework and the assessment of HLS are concerned with deliverability, which is an assessment of the likelihood that housing will be delivered in the 5-year period on that site. The judgement says, "*The assessment of housing land supply does not require certainty that the housing sites will actually be developed within that period. The planning process cannot deal in such certainties*". I take this to mean that for a site to be deliverable, it should be capable of being delivered not that it will be delivered. Thus as the appellant accepted⁸ the decision maker has to have clear evidence⁹ to show that there is not simply doubt or improbability but rather no realistic prospect that the sites could come forward within the 5-year period.
13. It is not disputed that over successive SHLAAs and by reference to the LP, completion rates have consistently failed to meet estimates of projected delivery. In determining whether an lpa has achieved the requirements of the second bullet point of Framework paragraph 47, the calculation has 2 distinct elements. These are identifying (a) requirement/need and (b) supply and are the second and third bullet points of Framework paragraph 47. The illustration of the expected rate of delivery, the housing trajectory, is separate and dealt with at the third bullet point of Framework paragraph 47. In my view, the illustration of the housing trajectory is different from the assessment of what is deliverable. In light of the St Modwen

⁴ East Riding of Yorkshire Council Housing Sites Prospectus February 2017.

⁵ Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 3-031-20140306.

⁶ Wainhomes(South West) Holdings and (1) The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (1) Wiltshire Council (2) Christopher Ralph Cornell and Sarah Cecilia Cornell. [2013] EWHC 597 (Admin).

⁷ St Modwen Developments Ltd and (1) Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (2) East Riding of Yorkshire Council and Save our Ferriby Action Group [2016] EWHC 968 (Admin).

⁸ X-Examination of Mr Johnson

⁹ Planning Policy Guidance Paragraph: 031 Reference ID: 3-031-20140306.

Developments judgement, the trajectory identifies what is likely to happen and the deliverable supply is an expression of what is capable of happening. Trajectory does not, in my view, go to the process required to determine whether a site is deliverable under the terms of Framework policy. Rather it is, as the St Modwen Developments judgement identifies, that past shortcomings in the supply of land are to be addressed in the manner required by the Framework i.e. through the application of a 20% buffer. In my view not achieving the trajectory does not go to the determination of whether a site is, in planning policy terms, deliverable. Drawing this together, and as reflected in the South Cave¹⁰ and Holme-on-Spalding Moor decisions¹¹, the exercise I have to undertake is to determine whether a site is capable of being delivered as opposed to establishing whether it will be delivered in the 5-year period.

14. Regarding the "Jurassic" and Prospectus sites, many of these sites were assessed as part of the recent Local Plan Examination in 2015/2016. Then the Examining Inspector concluded that a 5-year HLS existed. The Inspectors in the March and August 2017 South Cave and Holme-on-Spalding Moor decisions reached similar conclusions. In preparing the SHLAA, the Ipa has adopted a proactive approach, as reflected by the publication of the Prospectus, and a robust procedure that includes input from a cross-section of stakeholders active in the housing sector. Stakeholder input comes via a Core Group of national and local house builders and a Wider Group of other housebuilders and agents. These inputs add substantial weight to the case that a 5-year HLS exists.
15. Regarding the recent submissions by the House Builders Federation (HBF), clearly its overarching experience in the housing sector is a valuable input into the process. However, in terms of the "Jurassic" sites, the submission does not add to the existing process of the annual review of the SHLAA. Indeed, it appears to reflect the robust process that is already being carried out. More fundamentally, the HBF suggest that for allocated sites to be included within the 5-year supply there should be an identified commitment from a landowner/developer to bring the site forward within 5 years. This reflects the divergence between deliverability and delivery as clarified by the St Modwen Developments judgement. The HBF's suggested criterion is neither reflected in the Framework nor in case law. Moreover, PPG does not support this point. What paragraph 020 of PPG¹² does is indicate that where a developer/landowner input is identified, the decision maker can have a greater degree of confidence in concluding that a site is deliverable. As indicated above, the Prospectus published by the Ipa earlier this year indicates to me a proactive approach bringing sites currently without planning activity to the wider attention of the market. The fact that a site is included in such a document is not an indication that these sites are not deliverable. Indeed it was accepted by the appellant that several of these sites are now the subject of planning activity.
16. Drawing together these points, I agree with the conclusions of the previous Inspectors that neither the absence of: delivery in the past, planning activity and developer/landowner commitment indicates that the disputed sites are

¹⁰ APP/E2001/W/16/3151699.

¹¹ APP/E2001/W/116/3165880.

¹² Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 3-020-20140306.

undeliverable and should not be included within the 5-year supply. Moreover, I note that even if the "Jurassic" sites were discounted, the lpa would still be able to demonstrate a HLS in excess of 5 years.

17. The list of disputed sites has not changed significantly since the South Cave and Holme-on-Spalding Moor inquiries. In addition to the issue of developer commitment, a key component of the appellant's contention that sites should not be included within the 5-year supply is that there is no robust evidence set out within the SHLAA to demonstrate that completions will be achieved within the 5-year period. This contention was before the Inspectors in the 2 previous inquiries and did not persuade my colleagues that having regard to Framework paragraph 47 and up-to-date case law that the sites were not deliverable.
18. With regard to the disputed sites before me, the appellant has, following the Holme-on-Spalding Moor inquiry, undertaken further investigations. This exercise involved contacting the agent/landowner seeking information on their intentions and or the current position. Whilst such an exercise is to be commended, it has not, in my view, materially advanced the sum of knowledge regarding deliverability. In many cases no contact was able to be made, in others there was an indication albeit sparse that discussions were taking place between landowners and developers and in others the information clearly contradicted recent information given to the lpa by the same agents/landowners. The lpa's description of the appellant's position as "*our evidence is the absence of evidence*" is an apt description and does not amount to clear evidence to show that there is no realistic prospect that the sites would not be capable of coming forward within the 5-year period.
19. Taking all of the above factors into consideration, I agree with the recent conclusion of the Inspector in the Holme-on-Spalding Moor decision that that there is no "*...robust evidence to suggest that the SHLAA assessment made, the methodology applied or the up-to date evidence provided by the Council no longer provides a reasonable basis on which to consider the sites deliverable in the terms required by the NPPF.*" Accordingly, I conclude that, for the purposes of determining this appeal, the lpa can demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land.

Other Considerations

Highway Safety

20. Initially the highway authority (HA) objected to the proposal. However, following a reassessment of the Transport Assessment (TA) the HA has withdrawn its objection. The TA is robust and accident data relating to The Balk/A1079 York Road junction does not indicate a material deficiency in the design/operation of the junction. In the absence of objective evidence, I have no reason to conclude that traffic generated by this development would materially affect highway safety.

Landscape

21. The East Riding of Yorkshire Landscape Character Assessment – Selected Settlements Update 2013¹³ examines the finest grain and is the most relevant in assessing the landscape and visual impact of this scheme. The

¹³ This updates the East Riding of Yorkshire Landscape Character Assessment – November 2005.

site is located within Landscape Character Type (LCT) 1 - Flat Open Farmland - Area C, which covers an extensive area to the south of Pocklington. This is a flat undulating landscape consisting of medium sized arable fields. In this relatively featureless landscape, vegetation is limited to small, fragmented woodlands to the south of Burnby Lane and around Willow Waters/Willow Waters Fishery. Public views are largely to the south from The Balk and Public Footpath No. 8 that links it to Burnby Lane. Views to the east and north-east to the Yorkshire Wolds are limited, even in winter, by the dense woodlands along Burnby Lane and around Willow Waters/Willow Waters Fishery.

22. The 2013 Update assesses landscape character sensitivity, visual sensitivity and landscape value as Medium giving an overall landscape sensitivity to change of Medium. Since the 2013 Update, land to the north-west of the appeal site on the opposite side of The Balk has been developed for housing and planning permission has been granted for residential development on land immediately to the north of the public footpath. Noting what the Ipa say about the appellant's Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), I consider the LVIA, the evidence provided by the appellant to the inquiry and the conclusions reached are robust and comprehensive.
23. In terms of landscape character, the change from a featureless agricultural landscape would, at the time of construction, have a moderate adverse impact. Post-construction, with the maturing of the proposed green infrastructure within and on the margins of the site, the overall effect would be that of a minor adverse impact on the landscape character of what is an extensive LCT that has medium sensitivity to change.
24. As to visual impact, the appeal site has a limited visual envelope, which restricts the number of potential receptors to a few dwellings that abut or are close to the site and users of Public Footpath No. 8/The Balk. Given there are unrestricted views over the appeal site, the immediate visual impact of the development would be a major/moderate adverse effect. However, as the proposal is submitted in outline and a substantial amount of green infrastructure is proposed the visual impact of the development could be acceptably mitigated. Post-construction, the visual impact would be no higher than minor adverse.
25. Turning to whether the appeal site should be identified as part of a "valued" landscape and, in the context of Framework paragraph 109, one who's enhanced planning status should be taken account of in the planning balance. All landscapes are valued by someone at some time, particularly countryside that is threatened by development. However, that does not necessarily make it a valued landscape for the purposes of Framework paragraph 109. Although the Framework refers to valued landscapes it does not provide a definition of what type of landscape that might be. Case law and Inspectors' decisions have identified that "valued" means something more than popular, i.e. if it had physical attributes which took it out of the ordinary. The Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA3), provides at Box 5.1 a range of factors that can help in the identification of valued landscapes. These include landscape quality/condition - medium; scenic quality - generally featureless; rarity and representativeness - here the site forms part of an extensive LCT; conservation interests - negligible; recreation value - none on the site;

perceptual aspects and associations - negligible. Drawing these factors together, the overall quality of the landscape in this area is ordinary. Thus the site does not fall to be considered in the planning balance as a "valued" landscape.

Impact on Local Businesses

26. Willow Waters, a private fishery, located adjacent to the site and comprises 2 fishing lakes, several holiday lodges and an owner's dwelling. Separate and located immediately to the south-east are several buildings used for permanent residential accommodation. To the north are 2 large agricultural storage buildings and a large detached house, also, confusingly, called Willow Waters, which is set within dense deciduous woodland (Duck Belt).
27. Only a small part of the fishery in the north-east corner would abut the proposed development. Even then the fishery would be separated from the proposed development by the access track to the agricultural buildings. The illustrative Development Framework Drawing shows a belt of open space located in this area, the extent and nature of which could be determined at the reserved matters stage. In these circumstances, the substantial separation provided by Willow Waters, Duck Belt, the agricultural buildings/land and the proposed open space would ensure that the appeal scheme would have no material impact on the operation or attractiveness of Willow Waters Fishery.
28. PTC and others assert a shortage of town centre car parking suggesting that traffic generated by the development would exacerbate this shortage. I visited the town centre on several occasions at different times of the day. Whilst the centre was busy, on and off-street parking was generally available. This availability was confirmed by a survey undertaken by the appellant in July. Whilst my observations and the appellant's survey are snapshots, they do not bear out the concerns of PTC. Moreover, town centre parking is under the control of the Council who has the ability to ensure that car parking capacity is managed to serve the needs of the short-term shopper/visitor.
29. To address the second RfR the appellant produced a Retail Policy Assessment, which satisfied the Ipa's concerns regarding potential impact on vitality and viability. Although the town centre has limited provision of convenience goods retailing, it appears a vital and viable centre with high levels of pedestrian activity and few vacant units. I have no reason to conclude that these were unique observations. The retail assessment, which was not challenged, does not suggest that this proposal would materially harm the vitality and viability of Pocklington town centre. I have no reason to disagree with its conclusion.

Development Plan Policy

30. LP Strategy Document (SD) Policy S3 identifies a settlement network to be the main focus for growth with, The Major Haltemprice Settlements; Principal Towns and Towns as the top 3 tiers. Development is to be focussed within settlement limits. The objective of defining a settlement network is to "*...ensure that the right level of development takes place in the right place*" i.e. sustainable development. Policy S3 (A) identifies Pocklington as a Town. Towns are to provide the local focus for development to support and

complement the 2 tiers above and the City of Hull. The appeal site is located adjacent to but outside the identified settlement limits of Pocklington. The supporting text to Policy A6 indicates that development will be promoted "*...on suitable sites within the existing development limits and where required on urban extensions identified through the Allocations Document or Neighbourhood Plan*". Policies S3 and AD6 also need to be read together with AD Policy S5 which identifies an allocation of 1,250 dwellings for Pocklington. The allocations under Policy S5 are not a cap and as such the appeal proposal would not be in conflict with Policy S5. The AD has identified and allocated sites within Pocklington. Currently, there is no neighbourhood plan and the allocations document does not identify any required urban extensions. On a fair reading of these 2 policies there is no tension between them and as the appeal site is outside the development limits it is in conflict with AD Policy S3.

31. SD Policy S4 refers to development in villages and the countryside. Policy SD4 part A indicates that outside the Policy S3 settlements development will be supported where, amongst other things, it is of an appropriate scale to its location taking into account the need to support sustainable patterns of development, does not involve significant loss of land and in the case of development in the countryside accords with part C of the policy. Policy S4 part C indicates that land outside the development limits is regarded as countryside and lists several forms of development that may be supported none of which include the appeal. Thus, when this policy is read as a whole, the appeal proposal would conflict with SD Policy S4.
32. Having regard to my conclusions at paragraphs 20, 27 and 29, I consider the proposal would not conflict with the relevant parts of SD Policies S7, EC3 and EC4. The level of AH would be consistent with SD Policy H2. The supporting text to SD Policy H1 identifies that the majority of specialist accommodation needed in the East Riding is for older people and recognises there is relatively little extra care housing provision in the East Riding in relation to the size and growth of the retired population. The development of extra care housing in Towns should be considered where it would meet an identified need. Proposals for specialist accommodation on unallocated sites will be supported where the development is commensurate with the role and scale of the settlement. In terms of the scale of the proposed provision, I consider it would be consistent with the role and scale of Pocklington. As to need for this type of provision on an unallocated site, in light of current proposals/provision within the local area, I consider the evidence does not demonstrate that this proposal would accord with SD Policy H1. Having regard to my conclusions regarding impact on landscape character and visual impact, there would be conflict with SD Policy ENV2, albeit any harm would be limited.
33. As acknowledged by the appellant, SD Policies S3, S4 and S5 are overarching policies. In my view, they go to the heart of the Lpa's objective as expressed in SD Policy S1 regarding sustainable development. Based on my observations and having reviewed the evidence regarding the site's location in relation to the town centre and other facilities, I consider the site is in a sustainable location. That said, the conflict with the overarching LP policies for promoting sustainable development and managing the scale and location of development to achieve that goal leads me firmly to the

conclusion that the proposal conflicts with the development plan when taken as a whole.

Planning Balance and Overall Conclusions

34. The development plan is recently adopted and the Ipa can demonstrate a 5-year HLS. In relation to this proposal the development plan is neither absent, silent nor out-of-date. As such the presumption in favour of sustainable development and the tilted balance provided for by Framework paragraph 14 are not engaged¹⁴. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and S70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 require that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
35. The Framework (paragraphs 6-10) promotes sustainable development, which is defined as having 3 dimensions, economic, social and environmental, these gains to be jointly and simultaneously. Moreover, Framework paragraph 47 spells out the Government's clear message that the supply of housing should be boosted significantly.
36. This proposal to provide up to 380 dwellings of which 25% would be AH would be a boost to the housing supply, and along with the retail unit, a day nursery and a 60-bed care home would bring social and economic benefits. In economic terms the benefits would be employment during the construction, spending by the residents new to Pocklington, the payment of the New Homes Bonus and additional Council Tax revenue. The provision of public open space, which would be available to and benefit existing residents as well and those occupying the development and the green infrastructure, would provide social and biodiversity benefits.
37. Whilst the range of benefits associated with this proposal go towards the achievement of sustainable development, the majority are generic and non-specific and are no more than would be expected from any development. As such these benefits attract limited positive weight. The weight to be attached to benefits associated with the provision of the care home are, given the absence a demonstration of local need, difficult to assess. However, given the indications expressed in the supporting text to SD Policy H1 regarding a general need, its provision is something to which I also attach limited weight. In a district where there is an acknowledged shortage of AH, the provision of up to 95 units would be major boost and a benefit that I attach significant weight to.
38. Drawing these factors together, whilst the benefits contribute to sustainable development they do not address the fundamental issue of location and the material harm to the overarching settlement strategy of the development plan. In my view the development plan objective of achieving sustainable development is underpinned by the settlement strategy espoused through overarching SD Policies SD3 and 4. The benefits are largely generic and as such do not provide a specific justification for the development. Thus notwithstanding the significant weight I accord to the provision of AH, when

¹⁴ Barwood Strategic Land II LLP & (1) East Staffordshire Borough Council (2) Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2017] EWCA Civ 893.

taken together they do not, in my view, amount to considerations that would outweigh the conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole.

39. In coming to the above conclusion, I have taken careful note of the Apostle Oak Cottages appeal decision¹⁵ which has a number of similarities to the case before me. In that case the Inspector attached considerable weight to the Framework objective of boosting significantly the supply of housing and found that notwithstanding the conflict with settlement boundary policy the development would accord with the remainder of the development plan and found it would be in accordance with the development plan as a whole. The Inspector concluded that the benefits of the scheme would significantly outweigh the policy breach. Whilst I am not familiar with all of the details of this case, the Inspector's conclusions are those of a decision maker applying a planning judgement to the circumstances of the case before him. I have done the same in this case but have reached a different conclusion based on the evidence before me as I am entitled to do.
40. Whilst a S106 UU has been provided I have not reached any conclusion on the appropriateness of its contents as I am dismissing this appeal for other reasons.
41. For the above reasons and having taken all other matters into consideration the appeal is dismissed.

George Baird

Inspector

¹⁵ APP/J1860/W/16/3144810 May 2016.

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

John Barrett of Counsel, instructed by Gladman Developments Limited

He called:

M Johnson MRICS, MRTPI.
Managing Director, Johnson Mowat.

L Herring MsC MRTPI (Housing Need & Supply Round Table)
Senior Planner Johnson Mowat.

G Venning MA.
Director, Bailey Venning Associates.

J Evans BA (Hons), PG Dip LA, CMLI.
Associate Landscape Architect, FPCR.

S Carvel MTCP, MRTPI.
Senior Planner, Gladman Developments Limited.

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Charles Banner and Matthew Henderson of Counsel, instructed by Peter Atkinson, Solicitor.

They called:

O Robinson MA, MRTPI.
Principal Planning Policy Officer.

J Hobson BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI. (Housing Need & Supply Round Table).
Planning Officer.

S Hunt BA (Hons), MA, MRTPI.
Principal Development Control Officer.

FOR POCKLINGTON TOWN COUNCIL

David K Hickling BSc, Dip TP, MRTPI.
Planning Consultant.

INTERESTED PERSONS

Mrs D Slights, Willow Waters Fishery.
Mr Hicks, Chairman, Pocklington & Wolds Gateway Partnership.
Mrs S Crooks, East Yorkshire Liberal Democrats.
Cllr D Sykes, Pocklington Town Mayor.
Mr J Brown.
Mr T Jones.
Mr A Pearce.
Mrs S Woodcock.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

- Doc 1 - Costs application by East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
- Doc 2 - Gladman's Response to costs application.
- Doc 3 - List of agreed suggested conditions.
- Doc 4 - Certified Copy of S106 Unilateral Undertaking.
- Doc 5 - Appellant & ERYC revised position on disputed sites post round table session.
- Doc 6 - EYRC 5-year housing land supply 1/4/17-31/3/22, appellant's revised position post round table session.
- Doc 7 - Statement re CIL Regulation tests.
- Doc 8 - Addendum statement re CIL Regulation tests.
- Doc 9 - PTC response to appellant's highways case.
- Doc 10 - Extract from Manual for Streets.
- Doc 11 - Extract from Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot.
- Doc 12 - Extract from Planning Resource.
- Doc 13 - Bundle of documents re refusal of planning application DC/17/01757.
- Doc 14 - Email dated 8 August 2017 York Housing Market Area.
- Doc 15 - Pocklington Residents Survey (2017) Results.
- Doc 16 - Statement by Mr Hicks.
- Doc 17 - Statement by Mr Brown.
- Doc 18 - Statement by Mr Jones.
- Doc 19 - Statement by Cllr. Sykes.
- Doc 20 - Appeal Decision APP/J1860/W/16/3144810.
- Doc 21 - Note from N. Appleton re proposed C2 development.
- Doc 22 - Appellant's opening submissions.
- Doc 23 - Appellant's closing submissions.
- Doc 24 - Lpa's opening submissions.
- Doc 25 - Lpa's closing Submissions.
- Doc 26 - Pocklington Town Council's opening submissions.
- Doc 27 - Pocklington Town Council's closing submissions.

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AFTER THE CLOSE OF THE INQUIRY

- Doc 28 - Appeal Decision APP/E2001/W/16/3165880
- Doc 29 - Costs Decision APP/E2001/W/16/3165880
- Doc 30 - East Riding of Yorkshire Council's response re Appeal/Costs Decision APP/E2001/W/16/3165880.
- Doc 31 - Gladman response re Appeal/Costs Decision APP/E2001/W/16/3165880.
- Doc 32 - Pocklington Town Council's response re Appeal/Costs Decision APP/E2001/W/16/3165880.
- Doc 33 - East Riding of Yorkshire Council's response re St Modwen Developments Ltd and (1) Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (2) East Riding of Yorkshire Council and Gladman response re Save our Ferriby Action Group [2017] EWCA Civ 1643.
- Doc 34 - Gladman's response re St Modwen Developments Ltd and (1) Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (2) East Riding of Yorkshire Council and Save our Ferriby Action Group [2017] EWCA Civ 1643.

Agenda Item 8

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

From: Chief Executive	Report Number: BOS/17/37
To: Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Date of meeting: 19 March 2018

1. RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 Overview and Scrutiny Committee to consider the report and decide what recommendations, if any, that they may wish to make.

ALL TOGETHER PROGRAMME

This report is provided as a summary of the All Together programme. It details, in particular, the financial position for both Councils following the move to Endeavour House, the opening of the new customer access points in Sudbury and Stowmarket; and the opening of the touchdown locations across both districts. In addition, attached is a copy of the Councils' submission to the recent iese Public Sector Transformation Awards which provides wider detail about the impact of the full All Together programme.

Financial Summary

The accommodation changes (including moving to Endeavour House, the creation of enhanced 'one stop shops' for customers in Sudbury and Stowmarket, the creation of a single call centre and a network of seven touchdown points) will deliver savings of approximately £5.8m between both Councils over 10 years (i.e. the term of the lease at Endeavour House).

1. Background

- 1.1. The decision to move to Endeavour House and agree the principles of the emerging Public Access Strategy was taken at Full Council in September 2016. The aim of the Public Access Strategy was to transform the Councils services to be more efficient and reduce costs to both Councils and the public. This decision supports the delivery of the following specific Joint Strategic Plan aims:
- (a) More efficient public access arrangements
 - (b) Digital by design
 - (c) Making best use of land and buildings across the Suffolk system
 - (d) Community led solutions to deliver services and manage assets

2. **Original options appraisal numbers per report in September 2016**

2.1. At the time of writing the options appraisals the current and projected costs associated with the old sites were as follows:

Description	Hadleigh		Needham		Total	
	Revenue Costs £,000	Capital Costs £,000	Revenue Costs £,000	Capital Costs £,000	Revenue Costs £,000	Capital Costs £,000
Annual Running Costs	631		453		1,084	
Catch-Up repairs		365		1,778		2,143
ICT upgrade Costs		500				500
Re-modelling existing building to modern standards		1,700		1,700		3,400
Total	631	2,565	453	3,478	1,084	6,043

2.2. The estimated costs of the shared accommodation in Endeavour House option in the report were as follows:

Description	Revenue Costs £,000	Capital Costs £,000
Annual Running Costs	633	
Fit Out Costs		50
Capital Costs of 2 Satellite Offices		201
Annual Running Cost of Satellite Offices	175	
Total	808	251
Original costs (as above)	1,084	
Saving	(276)	

3. **Hadleigh and Needham costs compared to Endeavour House costs over 10 years**

3.1 The move to Endeavour House is expected to save the Councils in total £5.8m in revenue and capital costs that would have been incurred over a ten-year period, had they stayed in their existing headquarters. The costs below exclude the transformation costs as set out in 4.4.1 below.

Description	2017/ 2018 £,000	2018/ 2019 £,000	2019/ 2020 £,000	2020/ 2021 £,000	2021- 2027 (6 years) £,000	Total £,000
Predicted HQ costs						
Hadleigh & Needham costs	1,084	1,084	1,084	1,084	6,504	10,840

Less Depreciation and Impairment (this does not hit the bottom line in the budget)	(366)	(366)	(366)	(366)	(2,196)	(3,660)
Capital investment (2.1 above)	6,043					6,043
Total						13,223
Future Costs (Move to EH)						
Endeavour House running costs (4.3.1 below)	295	737	758	748	4,020	6,558
One Off Move Revenue Costs (4.4.2 below)	498					498
One Off Move Capital Costs (5.1 below)	335					335
Total						7,391
Total saving over 10 years						(5,832)

4. Revenue

4.1. The revenue costs are in two parts, firstly there are the recurring costs, most of which continue over the term of the lease, except for mileage disturbance and car parking permits, which are payable for up to 3 years, shown in 4.3.1 below. Secondly there are the one-off costs which will be funded from the Transformation Fund, shown in 4.4.2 below.

4.2. The forecast costs are the latest best estimate, but they are still subject to minor change. The final position for the 2017/18 costs will be presented to Members next year as part of the outturn report.

4.3. Recurring costs

4.3.1. The table below shows the total revenue recurring costs (excluding one off costs), over a 5-year period, split between move costs and transformation costs. All costs are split 50:50 between Babergh and Mid Suffolk, except the car parking permits. This is predominately a loss of income in the Mid Suffolk car parking budgets, due to staff working in the Stowmarket Customer Access Point utilising spaces that may have generated income.

Description	2017/ 2018 £,000	2018/ 2019 £,000	2019/ 2020 £,000	2020/ 2021 £,000	2021/ 2022 £,000
Move Costs					
Endeavour House rent, rates and service charge (incl. Gipping Court)	160	332	352	418	484
Sudbury customer access point – increase cost - SLA with Sudbury Town Council	0	37	37	37	37

Stowmarket customer access point rent and service charge	17	34	35	36	36
Touchdown points annual running costs	9	26	26	27	28
File Storage – offsite and microfiche	4	17	17	17	17
Mileage disturbance	68	203	203	135	0
Car parking permits	10	20	20	10	0
	268	669	690	680	602
Transformation costs					
Telephone – including mobile phones and skype	27	68	68	68	68
Total	295	737	758	748	670

4.3.2. 2017/18 is a part year cost, with most costs starting in November 2017. The increase in 2020/21 and 2021/22 for Endeavour House rent, rates and service charge is predominantly due to an increase in the service charge. This is as agreed in the heads of terms, however, to offset some of this cost, the Councils benefited from a 10% reduction in the first year's rent. Other year on year changes are due to inflationary increases.

4.3.3. The stable position by year 5 of £670k is a much better position than the original options appraisal, which forecast running costs of £808k, as shown in 2.2 above. As per the Council report in September 2016, the annual running costs of the old HQ sites excluding depreciation and impairment were £718k, this is therefore an improvement of £48k.

4.3.4. The graph below shows the annual running costs of the Needham and Hadleigh headquarters compared to the annual costs associated with the move to Endeavour House over the 10 years to 2026/17.

Accommodation Running Costs 2017/18 - 2026/27 £,000



4.4. One off Costs

4.4.1. The table below shows the one-off revenue costs split between move costs £498k, and transformation costs £391k, totalling £889k. The transformation costs are not a direct result of the move, as they are costs the Councils would have incurred to help deliver the digital by design aim, set out in the Joint Strategic Plan.

4.4.2. The £815k forecast for 2017/18 is to be split 50:50 between the Councils and funded from their Transformation Funds.

Description	Actual 2016/17 £,000	Forecast 2017/18 £,000	Total £,000
<u>Move costs</u>			
Endeavour House move costs		50	50
Stowmarket customer access point move costs		10	10
Touchdown points move costs		6	6
Customer access points IT kit		7	7

Description	Actual 2016/17 £,000	Forecast 2017/18 £,000	Total £,000
SCC Project engineers – deployment		8	8
SCC Project Engineer –Infrastructure CAP and TDP		6	6
Project support	36	108	144
Move floor printers		3	3
Communications		14	14
Homeworking kit		40	40
Car parking settlement		185	185
Redundancy costs		25	25
Total move costs	36	462	498
<u>Transformation costs</u>			
Scanning and microfiche	21	158	179
Single telephone number one off set up costs and licences	3	6	9
USB headsets		20	20
Decommission Hadleigh server room		28	28
Project Managers	14	136	150
Training – agile working		5	5
Total transformation costs	38	353	391
Total	74	815	889

5. **Capital**

- 5.1. The table below shows the capital budget, the forecast cost and the spend to date. The forecast cost of the move as shown below is £335k compared to the £6,043k the Councils would have incurred if they had stayed in the Hadleigh and Needham premises, as shown in 2.1 above. Again, the one-off costs are split between move costs, and transformation costs. These transformation costs are to be split 50:50 between the Councils. The additional £77k transformation cost pressure is capital spend that has been brought forward from future years because of the move.

	Spend to date (incl 16/17 and 17/18) £,000	<u>Budget</u> £,000	<u>Forecast</u> £,000	<u>Additional pressure/ (Saving) £,000</u>
Move Costs				
Fit out costs of Endeavour House		50	56	6
Fit out costs of Customer Access Points	30	202	155	(47)
Fit out costs of Touchdown Points	17		86	86
Data circuits – Customer Access Points			13	13
Data circuits – Touchdown Points	5		25	25
Total Move Costs	52	252	335	83
Transformation Costs				
SCC Design Engineer - move processes to SCC	25		60	60
Genesys licences	82	65	82	17
Scanning Equipment & Software	10	20	20	0
Tablets and laptops for staff and members	89	190	190	0
Total Transformation Costs	206	275	352	77
Total Pressure	258	527	687	160

This page is intentionally left blank

9th Annual iESE Awards 2018
Celebrating public sector innovation and transformation

DATE: Tuesday, 6th March 2018 at Church House, Westminster, London
 The **deadline for submission is FRIDAY, 26th January 2018**

For help completing this Nomination Form please read the notes section at the end of this document

Award (See Note 1)	7. Innovation Award 2. Reinventing Local Services 3. Working Together	
Organisation (See Note 2)	Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils	
Nominee (See Note 3)		
Contact	Name	Arthur Charvonia (Chief Executive)
	Email address	Arthur.Charvonia@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk
	Tel. Number	01449 72480/ 07712425668
<p>One paragraph overview of your nomination (no more than 100 words). This text will be used in the Awards Nominations Shortlist document, should you be shortlisted for an award by the judges.</p> <p>Babergh & Mid Suffolk District Councils are pioneering the way the public sector works together in a fully integrated way.</p> <p>With a shared Chief Executive and joint workforce, the Councils have become the first districts nationally to move to a joint headquarters and democratic base outside of the areas they serve. Doing so, and using agile working, has revolutionised the way the Councils work - creating a single Suffolk 'public service hub', with the County Council and two CCGs located in the same building.</p> <p>To support these improvements, a revised Public Access Strategy was implemented; making it quicker, easier, and more convenient for residents to contact and engage with Babergh & Mid Suffolk.</p>		
<p>Overview of your nomination – maximum 2000 words (See Note 4)</p> <p>The districts of Babergh and Mid Suffolk form the heart of Suffolk and cover an area of over 1,400 square kilometres. They are predominantly rural in nature, with a number of market towns. Mid Suffolk was recently identified as the 3rd happiest district in England, based on the ONS's headline estimates of personal well-being. According to growth forecasts, the population in Babergh will grow by 10% to 96,400 and that of Mid Suffolk by 20% to 116,700 by 2035. The highest level of increase will be those aged over 65 (an increase of 40%) and by 2025 the number of people aged over 85 is expected to double. To enhance the skills and knowledge of the future workforce in Suffolk, the Councils are investing with their partners to improve educational attainment, with more focus on social mobility.</p> <p>Facing the challenges of the economic downturn, Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils were at the forefront in the new forms of collaborative working. Since 2011 the two Councils have adopted shared approaches and priorities, with a single workforce supporting innovative new ways of working. Major milestones in the past six years include:</p> <p>2011 Appointment of a shared Chief Executive for both Councils</p>		

2013 A single Joint Strategic Plan and Vision that identified shared challenges and solutions (refreshed and reconfirmed in 2016).

2013 The integration of two Councils' staff into one fully integrated workforce saving £2m per annum.

2016 The two Councils adopted a Joint Public Access Strategy (JPAS)

2017 Both Councils adopted the new Leader/Cabinet governance model.

2017 Two new 'One Stop Shop' customer service points were opened in each district.

2017 The two Councils moved into a shared Headquarters at Endeavour House, Ipswich.

In the last six years, the Councils have achieved £13m of cumulative savings. There is now a shared Joint Strategic Plan and outcome-based approach which marks a fundamental shift for both Councils.

The JPAS takes a whole system approach, it celebrates the collaborative commitments with partners enabling early intervention, in doing so this prevents the need for more expensive outcomes which help to reduce demand within the system. It reflects the authenticity of the relationships which the Councils have with their communities to support them to do what they need, whether to create a neighbourhood plan, to deliver much needed affordable homes for local people or to help them preserve and enhance local assets at risk of closing. Together with developing self-service options, this approach allows the Councils to focus more attention on those communities that really need our help.

The Councils are delivering the aims of the JPAS (in support of the outcomes in the Joint Strategic Plan) and have created a enabled, efficient, flexible, agile, innovative, collaborative, and accessible staffing culture.

Delivering this approach and completing such an ambitious and complex transformation to both Councils' ways of working included:

- Assessing different customer segments and how the Councils tailor their offer to give people what they value (which varies according to segment) and focusing resources towards those in need and the vulnerable.
- Developing a customer focussed culture and using this to drive efficiency and productivity.
- Making things 'easier' for both customers and staff.
- Delivering what the public value from the Councils rather than what is not seen as important by them.
- Utilising the power of data, technology and insight through closer collaboration with our ICT partners at Suffolk County Council.
- Implementing and driving consistency in the way the Councils work, requiring a move away from old ways of working to a new operating model.
- Identifying efficiencies and improvements by developing and using a consistent change methodology that supports agile.
- Making system wide interventions across the public sector that reduce cost and deliver better, more targeted, outcomes for our customers.

This strategic approach concentrated on five key access channels, each remaining available for the full term of the strategy. However, through deepening insight into customer capability and behaviour, and supporting communities to support themselves, the Councils are shifting towards more productive channels by stimulating customer interest in easier ways of doing business with the Councils.

These channels are developed based on a whole Suffolk System so that over time complexity about 'who does what' for the customer is reduced. These access channels are:

Face to Face

The creation of a new 'One Stop' Customer Service Point within each district to provide facilities for staff and Councillors to meet the public was paramount to the delivery of the JPAS following the decision to move both Councils headquarters to a shared site which was outside the boundaries of both districts. The Stowmarket site also houses the call centre for both districts. Support from both Leaders of the two Councils was unanimous:

"From day one of this important project we have been clear that for those residents who need it face to face contact will remain sacrosanct. Our work to introduce modern and friendly digital services will ensure communicating with the Councils is easier and more cost effective than ever. We do remain passionate though about providing walk in advice and guidance. That's why we're delighted that we will have a continued presence at the heart of our communities" Mrs Jennie Jenkins, previously leader of Babergh District Council.

"We will be delivering modern and customer friendly digital services to our local residents, many of whom will already be using online services on a regular basis for their banking and their shopping. We have made the decision to end the expensive and inefficient maintenance of two headquarters, but we also recognise the need to continue to have customer service points in the communities we serve." Councillor Nick Gowrley, leader of Mid Suffolk District Council.

Continuing to develop innovative collaboration Babergh District Council Customer Service Point is located in Sudbury Town Hall and is manned by Sudbury Town Council staff who have received training and support from a number of Council staff during the initial opening period this collaboration will continue and develop over time. This provides customers with a 'One Stop Shop' for assistance and contact with all Town, District, and County services.

Telephone

Previously the telephone system used by both Councils included a plethora of numbers causing confusion and frustration for the customers. To streamline the process and ensure the cost of making a call was charged at a local rate, the Councils moved to one phone number which is channelled exclusively through the Contact Centre. This has given the Councils a greater understanding of call handling times, abandonment rates, types of enquiry and the effectiveness of transfers to other parts of the business. Early indications are that progress has been made in reducing the average time to answer calls, and significantly reducing the abandonment rate by 27% comparing April – June 2017 to September - November 2017.

Email

The creation of a single email address for both Councils which are received in the Contact Centre has enabled the service to be improved.

Online – Digital Services

The two Council websites have also been merged to create one clearer, simpler site that improves access from mobile and tablets to existing online services and information that the Councils have. This is an on-going project with further developments in the pipeline.

Webchat and SMS

This will become the final access channel to be developed in the future.

Arthur Charvonia, Chief Executive of Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils, said: *“We aim to make any contact our residents have with the councils as swift and simple as possible.*

“Our new website will ensure that residents can access any service, at any time, from anywhere, while our new phone number will cut down the amount of time callers spend on hold and put residents in touch with the officers they need to speak to. We want everyone in our district to be able to contact us quickly and easily and these new channels make sure that goal becomes a reality.”

Alongside the Public Access Strategy, a review was commissioned on the location of the two Council offices. Following consultation, the decision was taken to have a single location for the integrated workforce. Councillors decided the best option was to move to Endeavour House in Ipswich. This was an ambitious programme involving Councillors and Officers across both Councils working in conjunction with workstream leads from Human Resources, Procurement, Property, Finance, ICT and Information Management, Facilities Management, Governance and Assurance and Communications. As well as working closely with Union Representatives both on the preparation and implementation of the move; and also bringing in new and updated policies for an integrated workforce, with a new Agile Working and Home Enabled Policy.

Below is an indication of the work involved in delivering this major project.

In order to move both Councils into new accommodation at Endeavour House, two new Customer Service Points (as above) and a network of ‘Touchdown points’ were also developed. These are fitted with fully functioning IT equipment and Wi-Fi enabling staff to work in an agile approach across the districts. The Touchdown points are deliberately located within a seven-mile radius from each other across both districts.

All staff have received IT bundles and communication technology which enables agile working.

The philosophy that “Work is something we do, not somewhere we go – it is an activity not a place” has been adopted by staff across the organisations, examples of agile working taking place include:

- Spending a lot of time with residents and communities in the ‘field’
- Working from home on either a frequent or occasional basis
- Using the same office nearly every day, but using different workstations
- Making use of workspaces in partner organisations’ offices or accessing the Touchdown points
- Going to where the work is and working with the people you need to liaise with
- The removal of core working hours

Jointly occupying premises with Suffolk County Council and Clinical Commissioning Groups has provided opportunities to work in collaboration with a number of partners and to further develop links already built across the public sector in Suffolk. A main contributor to this was the IT infrastructure resource required to move existing servers and IT resources across to the one system. However, the main priorities across this project were the welfare of the staff and the business continuity for our communities. These will be covered in more detail in the following sections.

How has the initiative demonstrated innovation? – maximum 1000 words

(See Note 5)

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils had been considering their headquarters accommodation options since the integration of the Councils workforce began in 2013. As a result of work undertaken as part of the JPAS the opportunity to reconsider the location for the headquarters was discussed raising the following recommendations:

- That the status quo was not an option for accommodation and the occupation of both buildings resulted in inefficiencies and costs; and was a block to full integration, and collaboration.

- Future savings and costs were important factors, but more important was the quality of the arrangements for the public, staff, Councillors, and partners.
- Future accommodation must be able to support agile working, team working and collaborative working. There was a strong desire to move on from a traditional local government style.

There were 4 options considered. Appraisals were undertaken for financial viability, benefits, disadvantages, and risks. Each appraisal was compared against a baseline of the current shared running costs under the existing accommodation arrangements. A Socio and Economic Impact Assessment was also carried out in advance on the impact on both Needham Market and Hadleigh (the towns housing the current headquarters) in the event that a decision was made to vacate one or both of the existing offices.

Following Babergh and Mid Suffolk Council meetings the decision to share accommodation in Endeavour House was approved. This is an innovative move to a single location which is outside of the catchment areas of both Councils, and presently only the second such case across the country. Not only has it allowed the Councils to redeploy the workforce to a modern location, it affirms their approach to co-design and work alongside partners within the Suffolk system; the CCG, Public Health, ACS and the VCS with whom they have developed strong and successful partners and whose involvement and cooperation are key to all supporting system change.

This raised several unique issues, with a workforce of over 500 previously based in a variety of locations across both districts the logistics of streamlining these resources could have been seen as an onerous task. However, with the support of the Councillors, the Senior Leadership Team accepted and rose to the challenges.

For this project to be successful communication and ownership was paramount. A number of staff volunteered to be 'Change Champions'. The objective for the Change Champion Project was to provide an opportunity for colleagues across both organisations to become actively involved in finding new ways of tackling problems and dealing with critical issues of real importance to the communities served. The team of colleagues from all different parts of the organisations and with lots of varied expertise and experience explored issues and sought to find new solutions for shaping the new ways of working.

Embracing different ways of working has seen the greatest change undertaken and has had one of the most significant impacts on staff and Councillors. As part of this a policy and working Strategy for agile working was developed, this has led to staff reviewing their existing working pattern and exploring the use of more flexible working within the business needs.

For those who have relocated to Endeavour House a fully integrated hot desk system is in place encouraging staff to move more freely around the footplates, getting to know colleagues who may have been based at other offices. Taking the opportunity to share best practice and work collaboratively with other service areas more naturally.

Suffolk County Council provided IT services to both Councils hence the Senior Leadership Team seconded their Strategic Manager for IT to the project team as it was recognised that a major part of the success of the move to new headquarters was dependant on the redeployment of the IT servers and major IT projects to streamline the services provided to both staff and communities. Following this, alignment was made with SCC's ICT Strategy to make investment under four key themes, namely mobile working, cloud, big data, and social and collaboration tools.

Moving offices also raised the question of how to deal with the number of documents stored across the organisations, with the ambition to work in an agile way. A major project was undertaken to scan all paper records, a total of 1.2 million pages were scanned with 900 boxes of documents being placed into archive storage. To continue with the day to day post a

centralised corporate scanning team was created to scan all post as it arrives and email to teams directly.

Alongside the changes to staff working patterns the use of technology to remain in contact with colleagues regardless of location was also a major factor to the business continuity, with all staff and Councillors being issued with smartphones, laptops / tablets, headsets and Skype for Business. These changes have been well received with numerous teams now regularly using these resources to hold team meetings, and keep in touch with colleagues and Councillors who have chosen to work from home or at one of the touchdown points.

The health and wellbeing of officers and Councillors was also important to the Councils during the months to the run up to the move and subsequently since the move has taken place there have been many initiatives and support groups made available to all including mental and physical wellbeing – for example a lunchtime walking group has evolved and regularly meets to encourage staff to get know the surrounding areas of the new headquarters.

Demonstrate how the initiative has had an impact – maximum 1000 words

(See Note 6)

The move to Endeavour House has provided a platform from which to develop collaborative working within the Public Sector. The 'Public Sector Village' now includes Suffolk County Council, Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils, and NHS Choices – Ipswich, in one building; alongside Ipswich Borough Council and the Crown Court. This has not only been an advantage for our communities but is also enabling a closer working experience for staff, encouraging sharing of best practice as well as creating efficiencies within departments where collaborative working is essential.

"Being responsible for Housing Strategy early on, I saw the benefits of sharing our new work space with key delivery partners such as Public Health, Adult and Community Services, Spatial Planning and Education, to name just a few higher tier authority functions" Gill Cook, Housing Strategy.

As a result of the move to Endeavour House the Councils' former HQ buildings are being appraised for redevelopment. The Councils' are aiming to provide long term housing, social and economic benefits for the local communities and also generate financial return for the Councils'. £50,000 has been received from the One Public Estate Programme to support with feasibility work for options.

In mitigation of the effects of the economic downturn, the Councils will realise estimated savings of approx. £13m over a 10 year period. These efficiencies will enable us to do more for less and continue to provide high quality services to those that need them most.

As part of addressing the needs of the communities a new joint service called BMBS (Babergh and Mid Suffolk Building Services), was introduced within the districts providing all of the housing maintenance services to all of the Councils housing stock, dealing with the day-to-day repairs services, out-of-hours emergency services, empty or 'void' property repairs, and planned maintenance works for kitchens and bathrooms. This new service superseded the previous service which was delivered by both Council staff and external contractors.

The move has also involved a change in working practices for the Councillors, with the incorporation of new technology and the change of location.

An example of a further technological development within this new way of working includes the way customers can now self-serve within the planning department. A new system enables all customers to complete documents online and make payments within the same single transaction. This has been an ambitious project which has included the realignment of back office processes to ensure the finance and planning departments have all the information required. This system will also be developed further for use in other departments such as licensing.

How has the initiative improved the skills and capabilities? – maximum 1000 words

(See Note 7)

The major concern for both Councils was the health and wellbeing of staff. To assist in the smooth transition a number of initiatives have been undertaken, with staff being offered a range of leadership and management courses, as well as coaching and mental health first aider courses to key personnel. Over the past 5 months 52 members of staff have enrolled onto training courses which will enhance the culture of support and nurture within the organisations.

Following the staff consultation process a number of concerns were raised in relation to the move, the implications of agile working, and working in isolation. Collaboration with the Unions produced updated and new policies in relation to these and other HR issues. Further concerns raised included transport, travel arrangements and car parking. The Council again worked alongside the Unions and with the support of ACAS to reach a mutually acceptable solution.

With a greater emphasis on self-service for the communities it was essential that staff and Councillors were comfortable with the change. Briefings were provided to highlight the changes to telephony, and websites, as well as various training sessions on the use of Skype for Business, guides on making the most of the new smartphones, and understanding the capabilities of IT packages available to assist in the day to day life of everyone.

Alongside the improvements made in technology the move also raised challenges in connection with the storage and archive of documents which had be held for a number of years. A major initiative was undertaken to scan and save all documents necessitating new skills and training in the use of document management and information governance.

Having now set up new customer service points, the skills of front line staff have been enhanced to support customers to access Council services. Changes include for example enhanced knowledge around housing repairs, including the development of a diagnostic tool to request works, planning knowledge and support for the completion of forms on line etc, etc.

What was the quality of delivery of the initiative? – maximum 1000 words

(See Note 8)

A measure of the quality of delivery for the move is the success of business continuity for the communities that are served. As a pre-cursor to the move was a questionnaire for all directors and corporate managers in relation to the continued provision of all major front line services ; at which time there were no major issues envisaged.

“As cabinet member for communities I personally found the move to Endeavour House swift and efficient one day I was talking to the team in Needham via email and the next day they were all at Endeavour House. I know any move to any new establishment can have teething problems, but I have only had positive feedback. The building is new and the facilities for staff and Councillors are fantastic. We have IT specialists on site and remotely to keep all staff connected wherever they are working. Officers within the team are working across the district so it really isn’t an issue where the base is situated, and it makes liaising with County staff so much easier and time efficient.” Cllr Julie Flatman, Cabinet Member – Community Capacity Building & Engagement MSDC.

Risk management of such a large and diverse set of projects required robust risk management, this was managed through the programme board, which involved all managers of the workstreams, with regular updates and reviews taking place during the transition.

The improvements to IT services have been noticed across the board, with faster internet connection when working from Endeavour House, the accessibility in person of the helpdesk during office hours has also proven to be a benefit. Changes to the telephony, the use of Skype for Business for all incoming and outgoing calls, has also ensured that the potential for missed calls has been reduced with the use of desk static telephones becoming obsolete.

The housing and tenancy teams have made great strides in the use of digital technology. Reviewing previous working practices has highlighted that each Council worked in slightly different ways. Developing a new system has streamlined and enhanced the service offered, moving away from paper based time consuming processes to a fully automated electronic option.

“Feedback has been very positive from tenants, they are able to complete everything they need without having to come into the office. Tenants can get all the information they need online well in advance including the tenancy agreement. The time saved by the housing team is significant. For example; 8 electronic sign-ups were completed in 1 hour 15 minutes whereas the old manual process would have taken over 10 hours. The new process has helped to free up time for the housing team allowing them to work closer with tenants. Officers can spend more time visiting tenants at the start of their tenancy and addressing any concerns or problems early on. Allocations Officers can simply send a template email rather than having to call tenants to arrange sign-up meetings.” Luke Godley – Involvement and Improvement Support Officer.

For a number of staff the opportunity to redress work life balance through agile working has been an extremely positive step; no longer being restricted to core hours and having the flexibility to work across both districts at various locations, or alternatively if able to work from home has given staff the opportunity to tailor their working arrangements to fit more closely with the communities they serve. For example:

Staff within the Communities team have always had a flexible approach to working with customers, working to accommodate their needs. This has not changed since the move to new headquarters. However, the team recognised that the agile working, e.g. working from home has positively results in a change to their working pattern. A newly found advantage is better time management such as arranging bookings for full days within the communities, leaving from home rather than ad hoc appointments during office days. Varying hours to suit has given staff the freedom to start earlier when working from home, or starting their days later to cover evening appointments. This has had a positive impact on personal time and in some cases negated the need to work additional hours. These changes equate to savings in both staff time and travel costs, with a positive outcome for communities.

How has the initiative made a contribution to the sector – maximum 1000 words

(See Note 9)

With the phasing out of the Revenue Support Grant all Councils face the challenge of continuing to provide first class services to their customers whilst becoming financially self-sufficient.

Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils have taken strides to ensure that they are at the forefront of innovative changes in the delivery of services in the 21st century. Moving and consolidating all staff into shared premises with the County Council, the CCG and Public Health whilst enhancing the way in which we do business with our Communities has been bold and will provide the important platform to transform the way in which the whole ‘Suffolk system’ will meet its challenges and opportunities. Communities have been enabled to become more self-sufficient, tools have been provided for staff and Councillors to work from home, and resources used more effectively to support communities in the most appropriate way.

Ensuring that the Councils remain both resilient and effective within this economic climate is paramount and working collaboratively with partners and our communities allows us to plan strategically, making best use of people and resources. It also brings us much closer to what customers want and expect; better outcomes regardless of who is responsible for delivering the service. It is not only about systems and processes but also Babergh and Mid Suffolk’s willingness to invest to save, to tackle difficult decisions, to understand and utilise intelligence and insights, and to work honestly and authentically with our communities. This will help the Councils to get it right more often, and work more effectively and efficiently to impact positively on the financial health of the organisations. Through a number of working partnerships,

collaboration provides customers with an enhanced service, bringing together services to support, maintain and grow communities.

The use of digital technology across the organisations offers customers a swift, versatile way of communicating and paying for the services they require. Introducing new telephony across the organisations was a bold move, enabling enhanced communication with our customers. This has been supplemented by the use of Skype for Business making best use of our resources. Business continuity was maintained during the busy transition period.

It is imperative to remember however, that a physical presence within the districts is equally important. The introduction of 'touch down' points for staff, Councillors, and members of the public to use to arrange meetings, get advice and support or deal with issues face to face without being restricted to travelling to either public access point, is both beneficial and convenient.

Having undergone these significant changes there have already been many gains as described above for all concerned, these will continue to be realised and monitored. As you would expect Babergh and Mid Suffolk District Councils will not sit on their laurels, there are a number of further initiatives in the pipeline which will complement and continue to enhance the Customer Access Strategy and drive the Councils forward over the coming years.

A final quote from a member of staff;

"Having some flexibility over where and when I work is something I really value here. I get the job done and with Skype I can keep in touch. It's so much more than what many other employers offer their staff."

Please provide a copy of your organisation's logo and at least 2 images that can be used on the evening

Please check this box if you do not wish your information to be used as case study material for future iESE knowledge share events/publications. If used, all information will be attributed to the author organisation.

Please return forms by email to enquiries@iese.org.uk.

If you have any queries regarding the iESE 2018 Awards, please do not hesitate to contact Teresa Skinner on 07889 001266. You can download the form by visiting <http://awards.iese.org.uk/>.

1. Award Category

Your submission may be nominated for more than one award category. The judges reserve the right to move the submission to a category they deem more appropriate. The judges reserve the right to nominate the submission for additional award categories that they deem appropriate.

2. Organisation

The organisation / department or individual that is the subject of the submission.

3. Nominee

If different to the Organisation in note 2, the organisation that is making the nomination.

4. Overview of the nomination

A description including the purpose of the initiative, its start date and the current status.

5. Innovation

A description of why the initiative should be considered innovative. Has the approach taken to delivering the project been original? Will the initiative be deemed to have set new standards for local public service delivery and if so why? Are their best practice lessons from this initiative, if so what and how are they planned to be shared?

6. Impact

Has the initiative in question proven results? Are those results outstanding and do they exceed targets; for example in comparison to other similar initiatives by individuals, departments or organisations?

7. People

Has the organisation shown its commitment to its staff, the customer and its community? Has the initiative developed skills and created a platform for further transformation?

8. Quality of delivery

Was the project well conceived and planned as well as executed well and professionally? Have any big changes in working culture or customer service been implemented smoothly and without disruption?

9. Contribution to the Sector

How has the authority's work positively contributed to local government as a whole? Have they made significant progress in overcoming the issues facing local public services whether financial constraints, regeneration or in helping local businesses? Have they raised the bar in their service area? Will local government now be viewed more positively as a result of this initiative?

Scoring key as follows:

- 0 No reference to the criteria at all
- 1 – 3 Mention of criteria somewhere in the nomination
- 4 – 6 Described at some length, with the relevant information
- 7 – 10 Evidence has been given that it has been done

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL PORTFOLIO HOLDER – CONTACT DETAILS

Name	Portfolio	Telephone No	E-mail Address
Cllr John Ward	Leader of the Council – Economy	01787 210551	John.ward@babergh.gov.uk
Cllr Jan Osborne	Deputy Leader of the Council – Housing	01787 466096	Jan.osborne@babergh.gov.uk
Cllr Tina Campbell	Environment	01473 822290	Christina.campbell@babergh.gov.uk
Cllr Margaret Maybury	Communities	01787 464358	Margaret.maybury@babergh.gov.uk
Cllr Lee Parker	Planning	01787 376073	Lee.parker@babergh.gov.uk
Cllr Peter Patrick	Finance	01787 210346	Peter.patrick@babergh.gov.uk
Cllr Nick Ridley	Assets and Investments	01473 652226	Nick.ridley@babergh.gov.uk

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL PORTFOLIO HOLDER – CONTACT DETAILS

Name	Portfolio	Telephone No	E-mail Address
Cllr Nick Gowrley	Leader of the Council – Assets and Investments	01449 774297	Nick.gowrley@midsuffolk.gov.uk
Cllr John Whitehead	Deputy Leader of the Council - Finance	01473 833279	John.whitehead@midsuffolk.gov.uk
Cllr Gerard Brewster	Economy	01449 073856	Gerard.brewster@midsuffolk.gov.uk
Cllr David Burn	Environment	01379 788712	David.burn@midsuffolk.gov.uk
Cllr Julie Flatman	Communities	01986 798661	Julie.flatman@midsuffolk.gov.uk
Cllr Glen Horn	Organisational Delivery	07889 300907	Glen.horn@midsuffolk.gov.uk
Cllr David Whybrow	Planning	07799 068926	David.whybrow@midsuffolk.gov.uk
Cllr Jill Wilshaw	Housing	01449 781194	Jill.wilshaw@midsuffolk.gov.uk

Forthcoming Decisions list (KEY, EXEMPT AND OTHER EXECUTIVE DECISIONS)

March to August 2018 (Published 6 March 2018)

Unique Ref No:	Decision Maker & Decision Date	Subject	Summary	Contacts:		Key Decision?	Confidential?
				Cabinet Member(s)/MSR	Officer(s)		
CAB19	Cabinet 9/12 April	Review of Statement of Community Involvement	To update the Statement of Community Involvement in respect of the changes arising from the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 and to align with Local Plan making regulations.	David Whybrow Lee Parker	Robert Hobbs 01449 724812 robert.hobbs@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk	Yes	No
CAB20	Cabinet 9/12 April	Food and Safety Service Plan	To agree the way services will be delivered as required by the Food Standards Agency Framework Agreement and the Health and Safety Executive National Local Authority enforcement code.	David Burn Tina Campbell	John Grayling 01449 724722 John.grayling@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk	No	No
CAB23	Cabinet 12 April	Proposed Extension to Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB Boundary	To agree	Tina Campbell	Peter Garrett 01449 724944 Peter.garrett@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk	Yes	No
CAB24	Cabinet 9/12 April	Local Development Scheme	To introduce a revised timetable for the preparation of the Joint Local Plan to reflect further consultation on the document, to be able to incorporate changes to national planning policy, and	David Whybrow Lee Parker	Robert Hobbs 01449 724812 robert.hobbs@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk	Yes	No

			broadly align the timetable with Local Plan preparation in neighbouring local authorities.				
CAB18	Cabinet 8/10 May	To consider Battery Storage at all the Leisure Sites	To approve the Battery Storage at the Council's Leisure Facilities	David Burn Tina Campbell	Chris Fry 01449 724805 Chris.fry@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk	Yes	No
CAB21	Cabinet 8/10 May	End of Year Risk Progress Report	To provide an update on the Significant Risk Register and progress of risk management during 17/18	Glen Horn Peter Patrick	Claire Crascall 01449 724570 Claire.crascall@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk	No	No
CAB25	Cabinet 8/10 May	BMBS Business Plan	To create visibility around the revised business plan and feedback on the first year's performance	Jill Wilshaw Jan Osborne	Justin Wright-Newton 07990 542087	No	No
CAB26	Cabinet 8/10 May	2017/18 Outturn	To approve the 2017/18 Outturn	John Whitehead Peter Patrick	Melissa Evans 01473 296320 Melissa.evans@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk	Yes	No
CAB22	Cabinet 4/7 June	Quarter 4 Performance Exception Report	To seek agreement that the performance report and the performance outcome information adequately reflects the Council's performance.	Glen Horn Peter Patrick	Karen Coll 01449 724566 Karen.coll@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk	No	No
CAB14	Cabinet 6/9 August 2018	Review of Housing Allocations Policy	To gain approval for changes to the Housing Allocations Policy	Jan Osborne Jill Wilshaw	Sue Lister 01449 724758 Sue.lister@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk	Yes	No
CAB11	Council 26 July 2018 Cabinet 6 August 2018	Regeneration Proposal – Former Mid Suffolk District Council Headquarters Site, Hurstlea Road, Needham Market	For debate by Council, determination by Cabinet	Nick Gowrley	Lou Rawsthorne 01449 724772 Louise.rawsthorne@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk	Yes	<i>This report will be heard in private as per Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council) with regards to detailed financial information to enable negotiated acquisitions.</i>

CAB12	Council 24 July 2018 Cabinet 9 August 2018	Regeneration Proposal – Former Babergh District Council Headquarters Site, Corks Lane, Hadleigh	For debate by Council, determination by Cabinet	John Ward	Lou Rawsthorne 01449 724772 <a href="mailto:Louise.rawsthorne@baberg
hmidsuffolk.gov.uk">Louise.rawsthorne@baberg hmidsuffolk.gov.uk	Yes	<i>This report will be heard in private as per Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as it contains information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the Council) with regards to detailed financial information to enable negotiated acquisitions</i>
CAB27	Cabinet 6/9 August 2018	Quarter One Budgetary Control 2018/19	To approve the Quarter One Budgetary Control	John Whitehead Peter Patrick	Melissa Evans 01473 296320 <a href="mailto:Melissa.evans@baberg
hmidsuffolk.gov.uk">Melissa.evans@baberg hmidsuffolk.gov.uk	Yes	No

Key:

 Babergh District Council Only
  Mid Suffolk District Council Only
  Joint – Mid Suffolk and Babergh District Councils

If you have any queries regarding this Forward Plan, please contact Sophie Moy on 01449 724682 or Email: Sophie.moy@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk

If you wish to make any representations as to why you feel an item that is marked as an “exempt” or confidential item should instead be open to the public, please contact the Monitoring Officer on 01449 724694 or Email: emily.yule@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk. Any such representations must be received at least 10 working days before the expected date of the decision.

Arthur Charvonia

Chief Executive



BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

WORK PLAN

BABERGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

From: Henriette Holloway – Governance Support Officer	Report Number: BOS/17/39
To: Babergh Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Date of meeting: 19 March 2018

WORK PLAN FOR 2017/2018

The table below is a draft of the forward plan for the Mid Suffolk Overview and Scrutiny Committee. This table will be reviewed at each meeting and could be amended in the light of new items arising or as a result of items on the Forthcoming Decisions List being selected for scrutiny.

**19 April 2018
Joint Committee with Mid Suffolk District Council
Chair: Barry Gasper**

Topic	Purpose	Lead Officer	Joint Strategic plan reference
Babergh and Mid Suffolk Building Services (BMBS)	12 months review after the implementation of the services This to include reporting back to the committee on progress in implementing the actions drawn up to reduce the days council properties are void.	Justin Wright - Newton Corporate Manager - BMBS	Intelligence based community insight and outcome - focused performance management Strengthened and clear governance to enable delivery Make best use of our existing Housing assets
Staff Turnover and Welfare	Reviewing the impact, the office move has had on staff and the financial impact of the move to Endeavour House, with the aim of learning points for other future major change activities.	Anne Conway Corporate Manager HR & OD Katherine Steel Assistant Director – Corporate Resources	Intelligence based community insight and outcome - focused performance management Strengthened and clear governance to enable delivery Make best use of our existing Housing assets

Updated Joint Complaints Policy	Reviewing the updated Complaints Policy and the impact on the community	Karen Coll, Corporate Manager, Business Improvements Ben Staines, Research and Project Officer – Business Improvements	Intelligence -based Community, insight and outcome – focused performance management
Information Bulletin	Voids times in Council Properties	Sue Lister – Corporate Manager – Housing Options Justin King – Interim Consultant for the Voids Team	Make best use of our existing Housing assets

21 May 2018

Topic	Purpose	Lead Officer	Joint Strategic plan reference
Scoping of Pre-planning Application	To conduct a scoping exercise to review the newly introduced Pre-planning Application	Philip Isbell Corporate Manager – Growth and Sustainable Planning Gemma Walker – Senior Planning Officer	Alternative Service Delivery models
Review of Shared Legal Services	To review the progress and communication following the presentation in December	Emily Yule Assistant Director, Law and Governance	Financially sustainable Councils Manage our corporate assets effectively Enabled and Efficient Organisation
Waste Strategy	Report based on the scoping exercise conducted in February	Chris Fry Assistant Director – Environment and Commercial Partnership	Financial sustainable Councils Intelligence -based Community, insight and outcome – focused performance management

Off-payroll Costs Review	A review of Off-payroll Cost following on from the update presented 18 December 2017	Katherine Steel Assistant Director – Corporate Resources	Financially sustainable Councils Manage our corporate assets effectively
Investment Strategy	To scrutinise the Business Plan before final presentation to Full Council and to make any suggestions felt appropriate (Governance arrangements will be presented to Full council in April)	Louise Rawsthorne Managing Director – BMS Invest	Financially sustainable Councils Manage our corporate assets effectively
Information Bulletin	Voids times in Council Properties	Sue Lister – Corporate Manager – Housing Options Justin King – Interim Consultant for the Voids Team	Make best use of our existing Housing assets

WORK PLAN 2018/19 for Babergh Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

18 June 2018 (Joint)	17 December 2018
SWP – Report on Food Waste Rob Cole – SWP Manager Members to agree the BDC Work Plan for 2018/19 Overview and Scrutiny Training for Members of the Committee	MRF Procurement Process Officer to report back to the committee on the outcome of the MRF Procurement Contract. (JOS/17/8)
23 July 2018	21 January 2019
Voids – A review of the time it takes to re-let a property Waste Strategy	

Members to receive an updated forecast of how to reduce the BDC deficit based on the 1 st quarter of 2017/18 figures Pre-planning Application report	
20 August 2018	18 February 2019
The HQ Sites - The Investment Business Case for the Development	
17 September 2018	18 March 2019
Crime and Disorder Panel meeting Investment Strategy To scrutinise the Business Plan	
22 October 2018	15 April 2019
An update on the Homelessness Reduction Act (2017) (Six months review after the implementation of the Act) CIL Expenditure Framework The Joint Member Panel to be part of the Scrutiny Process Waste Strategy Scrutiny of the outcome of Waste Services Review and possible extension of the Joint Waste Contract, prior of report going to Cabinet. (JOS/17/8)	
19 November 2018	20 May 2019
	Annual review of BMS Invest Business Plan



Babergh Charing Joint Committee



Mid Suffolk Charing Joint Committee

Topics identified for review by O&S but not currently timetabled:

Information Bulletin: Customer Access Activity Update

An update on the customer activity Information Bulletin presented 18 December 2017 **TBC**

Community Grants

Strong and safe communities was asked to report back following a 'health check' of the groups receiving grants. (To be an Information Bulletin) **TBC**

Fuel Poverty

Reporting back to the Committee on the changes incorporated into the Joint Fuel Poverty Strategy – To consider if further action is needed at this stage, in the light of it being incorporated into a Suffolk-wide strategy

CIL

Update on the outcome from the Joint Overview and Scrutiny Committee 18 December 2018

Crime and Disorder Panel meeting

Required to take place at least once a year, provisionally agreed to take place in **September** of each year

Void times in Council Properties – Monthly Information Bulletin

Other topics identified:

- Home ownership review

Authorship:

Henriette Holloway
Governance Support Officer

Tel: 01449 724681

E-mail: henriette.holloway@babberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk



MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL
WORK PLAN

MID SUFFOLK DISTRICT COUNCIL

From: Henriette Holloway – Governance Support Officer	Report Number: MOS/17/41
To: Mid Suffolk Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Date of meeting: 15 March 2018

WORK PLAN FOR 2017/2018

The table below is a draft of the forward plan for the Mid Suffolk Overview and Scrutiny Committee. This table will be reviewed at each meeting and could be amended in the light of new items arising or as a result of items on the Forthcoming Decisions List being selected for scrutiny.

**19 April 2018
Joint Committee with Babergh District Council
Chair: Barry Gasper**

Topic	Purpose	Lead Officer	Joint Strategic plan reference
Babergh and Mid Suffolk Building Services (BMBS)	12 months review after the implementation of the service, in April 2018. This to include reporting back to the committee on progress in implementing the actions drawn up to reduce the days council properties are void.	Justin Wright – Newton Corporate Manager - BMBS	Intelligence based community insight and outcome - focused performance management Strengthened and clear governance to enable delivery Make best use of our existing Housing assets
Staff Turnover and Welfare	Reviewing the impact, the office move has had on staff and the financial impact of the move to Endeavour House with the aim of learning points for other future major change activities.	Katherine Steel - Assistant Director – Corporate Resources (Anne Conway Corporate Manager HR & OD)	Intelligence based community insight and outcome - focused performance management Strengthened and clear governance to enable delivery Make best use of our existing Housing assets

Updated Joint Complaints Policy	Review of the updated Joint Complaints Policy and the impact on the Community	Karen Coll Corporate Manager - Business Improvements Ben Staines, Research and Project Officer	Intelligence based community insight and outcome - focused performance management
Information Bulletin	Voids times in Council Properties	Sue Lister – Corporate Manager – Housing Options Justin King – Interim Consultant for the Voids Team	Make best use of our existing Housing assets

17 May 2018

Topic	Purpose	Lead Officer	Joint Strategic plan reference
Scoping of Pre – planning Application	To conduct a scoping exercise to review the newly introduced Pre-planning Application fees	Philip Isbell Corporate Manager – Growth & Sustainable Planning Gemma Walker Senior Planning Officer	Alternative Service Delivery models
Review of Shared Legal Services	To review the progress and communication following the presentation in December	Emily Yule Assistant Director – Law and Governance	Financially sustainable Councils Manage our corporate assets effectively Enabled and Efficient Organisation
Waste Strategy	Report based on the scoping exercise conducted in February	Chris Fry Assistant Director – Environment	Financially sustainable Councils Intelligence -based Community, insight and outcome – focused performance management

<p>Investment Strategy</p>	<p>To scrutinise the Business Plan before final presentation to Full Council and to make any suggestions felt appropriate</p> <p>(Governance arrangements will be presented to Full council in April)</p>	<p>Louise Rawsthorne – Managing Director – BMS Invest</p>	<p>Financially sustainable Councils</p> <p>Manage our corporate assets effectively</p>
----------------------------	---	---	--

WORK PLAN 2018/19 for Mid Suffolk Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

<p>14 June 2018 (Joint)</p>	<p>20 December 2018</p>
<p>SWP – Report on Food Waste Rob Cole – SWP Manager</p> <p>Members to agree the MSDC Work Plan for 2018/19</p> <p>Overview and Scrutiny Training for Members for the Committee</p>	<p>MRF Procurement Process Officer to report back to the committee on the outcome of the MRF Procurement Contract. (JOS/17/8)</p>
<p>19 July 2018</p>	<p>17 January 2019</p>
<p>Voids – A review of the time it takes to re-let a property</p> <p>Pre-planning Application report</p>	
<p>16 August 2018</p>	<p>14 February 2019</p>
<p>The HQ Sites – the Investment Business Case for Development (TBC)</p>	
<p>20 September 2018</p>	<p>14 March 2019</p>
<p>Crime and Disorder Panel meeting</p> <p>Investment Strategy to scrutinise the Business Plan for BMS Invest CIFCO</p>	

<p>18 October 2018</p> <p>An update on the Homeless Reduction Act (2017) Six months after the implementation of the Act</p> <p>CIL Expenditure Framework The Joint Member Panel to be part of the Scrutiny Process</p> <p>Waste Strategy Scrutiny of the outcome of Waste Services Review and possible extension of the Joint Waste Contract, prior of report going to Cabinet. (JOS/17/8)</p>	<p>18 April 2019</p>
<p>15 November 2018</p>	<p>16 May 2019</p>
	<p>Annual Review of BMS Invest Business Plan</p>



Babergh Chairing Joint Committee



Mid Suffolk Chairing Joint Committee

Topics identified for review by O&S but not currently timetabled:

Universal Credit

To review steps for implementation of Universal Credit and ensure the Council is fully prepared for the roll-out in May 2018 (if scrutinise after May, to check it was fully prepared)
Officers: Amy Mayes and Andrew Wilcock (SCC)

Community Grant

Strong and safe communities was asked to report back following a 'health check' of the groups receiving grants. (To be an Information Bulletin) **TBC**

Crime and Disorder Panel meeting

Required to take place at least once a year, provisionally agreed to take place in **September** of each year.

Enforcement

Enforcement for parking, planning etc to be discussed with Babergh Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Kathy Nixon – Strategic Director to decide how to approach this area.
Community

Transport Services

To scrutinise the services provided by SCC and consider what Overview and Scrutiny can add to these services

Authorship:

Henriette Holloway
Governance Support Officer

Tel: 01449 726481
E-mail: henriette.holloway@baberghmidsuffolk.gov.uk