



GREAT YARMOUTH
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Housing and Neighbourhoods Committee

Date: Monday, 24 April 2017

Time: 18:30

Venue: Council Chamber

Address: Town Hall, Hall Plain, Great Yarmouth, NR30 2QF

AGENDA

Open to Public and Press

1 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

To receive any apologies for absence.

2 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

You have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in a matter to be discussed if it relates to something on your Register of Interests form. You must declare the interest and leave the room while the matter is dealt with.

You have a Personal Interest in a matter to be discussed if it affects

- your well being or financial position
- that of your family or close friends
- that of a club or society in which you have a management role
- that of another public body of which you are a member to a greater extent than others in your ward.

You must declare a personal interest but can speak and vote on the

matter.

Whenever you declare an interest you must say why the interest arises, so that it can be included in the minutes.

3 MINUTES 4 - 9

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 2 March 2017.

4 MATTERS ARISING

To consider any matters arising from the above minutes.

5 HOUSING WHITE PAPER 10 - 28

The proposed response to the consultation is attached.

6 ESTATES REGENERATION 29 - 37

An update on the programme following the successful bid.

7 VOLUNTARY SECTOR GRANTS 38 - 46

Proposals for review and future funding.

8 BUILDING RESILIENT LIVES 47 - 55

An update on the response to reduction in housing related support funding and options for the future of services.

9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

To consider any other business as may be determined by the Chairman of the meeting as being of sufficient urgency to warrant consideration.

10 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC

In the event of the Committee wishing to exclude the public from the meeting, the following resolution will be moved:-

"That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12(A) of the said Act."

11 CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES

Details

Housing and Neighbourhoods Committee

Minutes

Thursday, 02 March 2017 at 18:00

Present :

Councillor Carpenter (in the Chair); Councillors Borg, M Coleman, Flaxman-Taylor, Grant, K Grey, Hacon, Mavroudis, Robinson-Payne, Walch and Williamson

Councillor Wainwright attended as substitute for Councillor Waters-Bunn

Councillors Fairhead, Hanton and Wright attended for Item 1 below

Mr R Read (Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods), Mr T Chaplin (Group Manager, Housing Services), Mrs V George (Group Manager, Housing Health and Wellbeing), Mr R Gregory (Group Manager, Neighbourhoods and Communities), and Mr R Hodds (Corporate Governance Manager)

Melanie Craig, Jane Harper-Smith and Tracy Bollard (Clinical Commissioning Group) also attended

1 SUSTAINABILITY & TRANSFORMATION PLAN FOR NORFOLK AND WAVENEY

The Committee received a presentation on the Sustainability and Transformation Plan for Norfolk and Waveney by Melanie Craig the Chief Officer of the Great Yarmouth and Waveney Clinical Commissioning Group.

Following the presentation, Members raised issues in respect of the following :-

- The issue of the lack of consultation with Members of the Council on health issues generally.
- The reduction in financial support for the stroke association.
- The process sued by the CCG in relation to the recent closure of the Greyfriars clinic
- The impact on the provision of services by the proposed financial cuts
- The issue of whether the challenging targets proposed in the Plan would be achievable
- The issue of the CCGs relationship with Norfolk County Council
- The issue of the level of funding with regard to Mental Health support
- The problems that had been created by merging doctors surgeries in the Communities
- The perception that elderly people feel a burden and the issue of improving care of elderly people with issues relating to dignity etc.

The Chair thanked the CCG representatives for their presentations with regard to the Sustainability and Transformation Plan for Norfolk and Waveney and commented that it was hoped that in future there would be improved communication between the CCG and the Borough Council and she also expressed her concern with regard to the language being used in relation to care for the elderly as referred to in the plan. Members agreed that all Members of the Committee should be sent copies of the Power Point presentation made by the CCG representatives.

2 ' HEALTHY HOMES ASSISTANCE ' AND ' I'M GOING HOME ' UPDATES

The Committee received a presentation from the Group Manager (Housing Health and Wellbeing) with regard to :-

- "Healthy Homes Assistance"
- "I'm Going Home"

The Group Manager explained how these initiatives from the Better Care Fund were assisting residents in the Borough. The point was made that any potential funding from the CCG would be welcome in support of these initiatives.

3 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Rodwell and Waters-Bunn.

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest.

5 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on the 19 January 2017 were confirmed.

6 COUNCIL SAFEGUARDING POLICIES

As a result of refreshing the Child Safeguarding Policy and creating new Policies for Adult Safeguarding, Human Trafficking and Domestic Abuse, the Council's Officer Safeguarding Group was asking the Housing and Neighbourhoods Committee to note and approve the Policy and Procedures for publication and implementation. The Committee agreed that training for Members on these Policies should be arranged.

The Group Manager (Neighbourhoods and Communities) reported that the Officer Group is to create a Work Plan for future work to include work around Safeguarding and Procurement / Contractors and around Elected Members. Any work with elected Members will be fitted in with the Organisational Development Planning for Member Development and training.

RESOLVED :

(1) That the Committee agree to the adoption and publication of the four draft Policies (Child Protection updated, Safeguarding Adults Policy, Human Trafficking and Modern Slavery Policy, and Domestic Abuse Workplace Policy) subject to Unison (where appropriate) sign off.

(2) To note that the Organisation plans to create "Designated Safeguarding

Officers" (DSO's) for both child and adult safeguarding enquires and referrals rather than have separate Child Protection and Adult Safeguarding Officers, and new Officers to be recruited in Service Areas where no Safeguarding Officer is currently in place.

(3) To note that any allegations against a Member of staff or representative will now be made to the Head of HR/OD and the HR Manager (to replace the current Deputy Monitoring Officer / Information Manager arrangement).

(4) To note that a comprehensive training programme and information section for staff is planned for 2017 to raise awareness of safeguarding and to fulfil the Council's legal obligations under safeguarding legislation, and training and awareness will be tailored to each team and their roles across the suite of subjects highlighted in the report.

7 CAR ENTHUSIASTS PROGRESS REPORT

The Committee considered the Group Manager (Neighbourhoods and Communities) report which gave an update on the proposed Multi Agency response to the issue of car and motorbike enthusiasts causing anti social behaviour along Great Yarmouth Sea Front.

RESOLVED :

That the Committee note the content of the Group Manger's report and the progress of the Multi Agency Group in tackling the issue of vehicle enthusiasts :-

a) Note that the PSPO has gone live, but awaiting signage before enforcement commences.

b) Note that the Pleasure Beach TRO is being progressed by NCC.

c) Note that work is underway to ensure that adequate numbers of staff are available to enforce the PSPO and that they are trained / supported appropriately.

d) Note the financial implications both for overtime costs and potential income opportunities.

e) Agree to receive a review and update of the first six week enforcement under Op Clarion. This review to include consideration of ongoing commitment to Sunday / weekend enforcement until September 2017.

8 HOUSING & NEIGHBOURHOODS PERFORMANCE REPORT QUARTER 3

The Committee considered the Group Manager (Housing Services) report which provided Performance Data from the Housing and Neighbourhoods Directorate for Quarter 3 of 2016/17.

In discussing the report Members discussed the issues with regard to re-letting of voids.

RESOLVED :

That the Quarter 3 Performance Report be received and noted.

9 PROPOSALS FOR USE OF THE COMMUNITY HOUSING FUND

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods which proposed a plan of action for using the Community Housing fund awarded to the Council in December 2016. Members were reminded that Great Yarmouth Borough Council had received an award from the Community Housing Fund of £652,770 for 2016/17. The funding is specifically intended for Affordable Housing Schemes either delivered by or with a significant involvement of, Local Community Groups on mixed tenure sites which are likely to be of little interest to main stream house builders. The Borough Council will need to demonstrate to the DCLG that the funds are being spent in accordance with the objectives of the programme.

RESOLVED :

(1) That approval be given to procure services to the equivalent of Gold Service support from CLT East at the cost of £35,000, through comparison of providers.

(2) To agree to develop a costed plan for submission by 10th march based on building capacity within identified willing communities to bring forward housing development.

(3) To agree to allocate the majority and maximum amount of funding to a ring-fenced capital pot to enable individual sites to come forward for development, based on a set of criteria to be developed.

10 FORWARD PLAN

The Committee received the Forward Plan for the Housing and Neighbourhoods Committee. Following a request from Councillor Walch, the Committee to agreed on the Forward Plan an item relating to the issue of the costs of evictions of tenants from housing properties and also details of how rent is managed within the housing process. The Committee also agreed to include an item regarding the commissioning process to be considered at the

Committee's April meeting.

11 CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES
(Confidential Minute on this Item)

The meeting ended at: 20:00

Subject: Response to Housing White Paper

Report to: Housing and Neighbourhoods Committee – 24th April 2017

Report by: John Clements, Principal Strategic Planner (Growth Group) and
Tracey Slater, Service Unit Manager (Housing Strategy and Housing Options)

SUBJECT MATTER/RECOMMENDATIONS

Outlines the recent Government Housing White Paper, identifies the key challenges and opportunities for GYBC, and proposes responses to the consultation on the White Paper and associated document.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Committee:

- 1) Note the Housing White Paper, and its significance for GYBC;**
- 2) Agree the responses to the Housing White Paper and associated ‘Build to Rent’ consultation.**

1. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND

1.1 The Government issued its long awaited Housing White Paper in February. This will have a significant impact over time on the Council’s planning and housing functions.

1.2 Most of the content of the White Paper concerns planning, though there are significant housing elements. The key focus is on trying to stimulate more, and faster, housing development.

1.3 There are significant minor divergences from Government policy of the recent past (for example, the effective downgrading of the Starter Home initiative), but in general the overall approach remains to place pressure on local planning authorities

to remove perceived planning obstacles to housing development, encourage new or reinvigorated forms of housing development, and an expectation to provide housing developments purpose-built for rent, often referred to as 'Build to Rent', with its main product 'Affordable Private Rent'.

1.4 The White Paper is over 100 pages long, and contains very many disparate proposals (c.130), many of them without any significant detail. The proposals will be developed over the coming year, and may emerge rather different at the end of the process, with some perhaps not proceeding at all. The White Paper is accompanied with a consultation paper document titled 'Planning and Affordable Housing for Build to Rent'.

1.5 Although limited in some practical details, the White Paper demonstrates the general direction of government thinking and policy. The White Paper will therefore help to inform the emerging Housing Strategy for the Borough.

2. HOUSING WHITE PAPER – MAIN POINTS

2.1 The White Paper is split into four key areas:

- Planning for the Right Homes in the Right Places
- Building Homes Faster
- Diversifying the Market
- Helping People Now

It contains a large number of proposed changes to the planning system, aimed at increasing the rate of housing delivery. It is worth noting that while the content of the White Paper, with immediate effect, can constitute a 'material planning consideration' which may affect decisions on plan-making and on planning applications, most of the proposals are not fully detailed and are the subject of consultation. The key challenges and opportunities of the White Paper can be summarized as:

- Optional increase in planning fees
- More requirements on plan-making including regular reviews
- Standardised approach for calculating housing needs and targets
- Tests and penalties for authorities with poor housing delivery
- Greater weight on housing development needs in decision-taking
- Encouragement of Neighbourhood Plans
- Reforms to developer contributions
- Encouragement of Compulsory Purchase powers
- Support for small, medium and windfall development
- Revised definition of affordable housing
- Emphasis on 'affordable home ownership' and 'Build for Rent' as affordable housing products
- Limitations on use of planning conditions
- Incentivising delivery for developers

3. HOUSING WHITE PAPER – RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

3.1 The consultation includes 38 focussed questions (note that there are further sub-questions) across a range of proposals in the White Paper. The Council's responses to the consultation has been limited to those key areas, where there are likely to be implications for the Borough. The key responses to the White Paper can be summarised as:

- Changes in national policy are leading to further delays
- Support a standardised approach to assessing housing needs
- The housing delivery test is unnecessary (noting existing 5 year housing land supply requirement)
- National policy on 'affordable home ownership' products is likely to greatly reduce new affordable rent tenures in the Borough

(See full response to consultation in Appendix 1)

3.2 Planning and Affordable Housing for Build to Rent – the consultation consists

of 26 focused questions with sub-questions. This intends to make clear the Government's intention to support the Build to Rent market through the planning system. It sets out the proposed policy measures for recognising the rental sector as an enduring feature of the housing market. It should be noted that this sector of housing is still taking shape and any change in policy that will provide a wider understanding of the viability assumptions is welcomed.

(See full response to consultation in Appendix 2)

4. CONCLUSIONS

4.1 The White Paper has important implications for both housing and planning services in the Borough going forward, but there is much uncertainty about the detail of many of its numerous proposals. While some elements are welcome, overall it is not considered to provide GYBC with significant new tools likely to significantly increase housing delivery or better meet the Borough's particular affordable housing needs. At the same time the Borough's failure to deliver against the identified housing needs are set to become more prominent and subject to penalties and sanctions.

4.2 Several key responses have been identified, under both housing and planning services, as desirable to meet its challenges and take advantage of the opportunities it provides.

4.3 The Committees are invited to endorse the draft responses to consultation attached, and note that further consultations with more detail will take place during the year.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Committee:

- 1) Note the Housing White Paper, and its significance for GYBC;**

- 2) Agree the responses to the Housing White Paper and associated 'Build to Rent' consultation.

6. APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Proposed response to Housing White Paper

Appendix 2: Proposed response to 'Planning and Affordable Housing for Build to Rent'

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Housing White Paper, DCLG, February 2017 –

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/590464/Fixing_our_broken_housing_market_-_print_ready_version.pdf

Planning and Affordable Housing for Build to Rent, DCLG, February 2017

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/589939/Build_To_Rent_consultation_document.pdf

Areas of consideration: e.g. does this report raise any of the following issues and if so how have these been considered/mitigated against?

Area for consideration	Comment
Monitoring Officer Consultation:	
Section 151 Officer Consultation:	
Existing Council Policies:	
Financial Implications:	
Legal Implications (including human rights):	
Risk Implications:	
Equality Issues/EQIA assessment:	

Crime & Disorder:	
Every Child Matters:	

Appendix 1

GYBC Draft Response to Housing White Paper

Question 1. Do you agree with the proposals to:

- a. Revise the National Planning Policy Framework to tighten the definition of what evidence is required to support a ‘sound’ plan?**

Strongly support the clarification of what is required, in order to reduce expectations of superfluous or inordinately detailed evidence.

Question 2. What changes do you think would support more proportionate consultation and examination procedures for different types of plan and to ensure that different levels of plans work together?

It should be noted that the potential for legal challenges to plan adoptions, particularly in relation to Strategic Environmental Assessment requirements, is likely to continue to lead to local planning authorities erring on the side of producing too much evidence. Review of the guidance on Strategic Environmental assessment, and in particular eliminating the confusing complication of parallel but not equivalent sustainability appraisal requirements (which tend to lead to inordinate work and excessive data proliferation), would assist greatly in achieving more proportionate evidence. The Government and its predecessors have themselves contributed to slowing down local plan production, by incrementally introducing successive further requirements on a variety of topics.

Question 3 Do you agree with the proposals to:

- a. amend national policy so that local planning authorities are expected to have clear policies for addressing the housing requirements of groups with particular needs, such as older and disabled people?**

This is an example of the Government itself potentially slowing down local plan production, by the introduction of specific requirements that will likely not necessarily be appropriate in every location. While

recognising the importance of these needs, this potentially detailed requirement does not sit comfortably with the proposal at A16 that only key strategic policies (including strategic allocations) are to be compulsory. It would be preferable for national policy to highlight the importance of addressing the particular needs of types identified, it should be left to the local planning authority to determine how this is best tackled.

- b. from early 2018, use a standardised approach to assessing housing requirements as the baseline for five year housing supply calculations and monitoring housing delivery, in the absence of an up-to-date plan?**

Agreement is withheld until the particular proposals are known, but the proposal is supported in principle.

Question 4. Do you agree with the proposals to amend the presumption in favour of sustainable development so that:

- a. authorities are expected to have a clear strategy for maximising the use of suitable land in their areas?;**

Object to the proposal. Planning is about balancing the needs of different areas, time periods, and uses, but the proposal would give precedence to one. This is contrary to good planning and unlikely to lead to sustainable development.

If this approach is pursued, protected landscapes such as the national parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty should be excluded from these requirements.

- b. it makes clear that identified development needs should be accommodated unless there are strong reasons for not doing so set out in the NPPF?;**

Object to the proposal. There could be sound local reasons for not accommodating such development, not covered by the NPPF.

- c. its considerations are re-ordered and numbered, the opening text is simplified and specific references to local plans are removed?**

The clarification of the NPPF would be welcomed, provided it is recognised that the complexities of planning across the different areas country is not amenable to being fully addressed by a brief summary of issues and processes.

Question 5. Do you agree that regulations should be amended so that all local planning authorities are able to dispose of land with the benefit of planning consent which they have granted to themselves?

Agreed.

Question 6. How could land pooling make a more effective contribution to assembling land, and what additional powers or capacity would allow local authorities to play a more active role in land assembly (such as where 'ransom strips' delay or prevent development)?

The key disincentives for local authority involvement in land pooling is that it involves risks to already stretched local authority finances without any realistic likelihood of a financial reward, or even certainty that development will subsequently proceed as envisaged. Were local authorities enabled to develop themselves, there would be a more favourable balance of potential costs, risks and benefits.

Question 8. Do you agree with the proposals to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to:

- a. highlight the opportunities that neighbourhood plans present for identifying and allocating small sites that are suitable for housing?;**

No objection, but it should be recognised that neighbourhood planning can also present challenges and delays in identifying sites for housing: there are advantages to neighbourhood planning, but speed and quantum of housing development is unlikely to be one of them.

- b. encourage local planning authorities to identify opportunities for villages to thrive, especially where this would support services and help meet the authority's housing needs?;**

It is not clear that local authorities have ever done anything but encourage villages to thrive. The phrase is presumably a euphemism for putting further development in them. The Government should be clearer about what it proposes and the justification for this. There is little evidence that small amounts of development added to villages make a significant difference to supporting their services, are likely to house people who grew up in the area, or that the absence of such development this would threaten the ability of villages to thrive. There are other reasons for such development: why not use them?

- c. give stronger support for ‘rural exception’ sites – to make clear that these should be considered positively where they can contribute to meeting identified local housing needs, even if this relies on an element of general market housing to ensure that homes are genuinely affordable for local people?;**

Disagree. The existing policy is adequate. This proposal falls under the heading “Planning for the right homes in the right places”, but the shift in policy proposed as worded would be more likely to result in the wrong homes in the wrong places.

- d. make clear that on top of the allowance made for windfall sites, at least 10% of sites allocated for residential development in local plans should be sites of half a hectare or less?;**

Not supported. A rigid application of 10% will not necessarily be helpful or appropriate in all locations. A 10% requirement of sites is an arbitrary figure and will depend on how many sites in total are allocated in a local plan. Encouragement to make such allocations, with perhaps the 10% expressed as a guide minimum would be more helpful.

- e. expect local planning authorities to work with developers to encourage the sub-division of large sites?; and**

Not supported, again because this is an overly rigidly specified ‘expectation’. It is also not clear what this ‘work’ will amount to, what local authorities would use to encourage such sub-division where it is not already welcome, or whether the opportunity costs of seeking to do so are justified.

- f. encourage greater use of Local Development Orders and area-wide design codes so that small sites may be brought forward for development more quickly?.**

Not supported. Local development orders and design codes can be useful tools, but it is not at all clear their more widespread use would necessarily bring forward sites more quickly, or even where this is the case, that the opportunity costs of the resources involved will be justified.

Question 12. Do you agree with the proposals to amend the National Planning Policy Framework to:

- a. indicate that local planning authorities should provide neighbourhood planning groups with a housing requirement figure, where this is sought?;**

Not supported, because as expressed this is overly rigid. The identification of such numbers is potentially far more complex than the Government appears to appreciate, depending on circumstances and timing, and would be better expressed as encouragement. For many LPAs it may be difficult to provide such a housing figure, as strategically the figure is likely to depend on growth elsewhere within the LPA area – and this will be considered by assessing the opportunities and constraints presented in each settlement and distributed accordingly.

Question 13. Do you agree with the proposals to amend national policy to make clear that plans and individual development proposals should:

- a. make efficient use of land and avoid building homes at low densities where there is a shortage of land for meeting identified housing needs?;**

No. Agree with the sentiment, but overly rigidly expressed.

- b. address the particular scope for higher-density housing in urban locations that are well served by public transport, that provide opportunities to replace low-density uses in areas of high housing**

demand, or which offer scope to extend buildings upwards in urban areas?;

Yes, provided this is suitably flexibly expressed.

Question 16. Do you agree that:

- a. where local planning authorities wish to agree their housing land supply for a one-year period, national policy should require those authorities to maintain a 10% buffer on their 5 year housing land supply?;**

No. This is an unnecessary burden on a proposal that is meant to help speed up the planning process. How would the 10% buffer apply?

Would it be on top of the 5% buffer already required, and on top of 20% for those authorities already persistently under-delivering?

- b. the Planning Inspectorate should consider and agree an authority's assessment of its housing supply for the purpose of this policy?**

No. How will this process take place? How long will it take to 'agree'? This has the potential to slow the process down.

- c. if so, should the Inspectorate's consideration focus on whether the approach pursued by the authority in establishing the land supply position is robust, or should the Inspectorate make an assessment of the supply figure?**

No.

Question 17. In taking forward the protection for neighbourhood plans as set out in the Written Ministerial Statement of 12 December 2016 into the revised NPPF, do you agree that it should include the following amendments:

- a. a requirement for the neighbourhood plan to meet its share of local housing need?;** No. (Not least because of lack of clarity of definition of 'its share of housing need'.) There are a number of Neighbourhood Plans that do not allocate sites for housing. If this is taken forward as a blanket requirement, this may cause problems for example where a draft

Neighbourhood Plan is not taken forward or where it fails referendum. The LPA could be left with a gap in meeting its housing needs.

b. that it is subject to the local planning authority being able to demonstrate through the housing delivery test that, from 2020, delivery has been over 65% (25% in 2018; 45% in 2019) for the wider authority area?

No.

c. should it remain a requirement to have site allocations in the plan or should the protection apply as long as housing supply policies will meet their share of local housing need?

The latter.

Question 19. Do you agree with the proposal to amend national policy so that local planning authorities are expected to have planning policies setting out how high quality digital infrastructure will be delivered in their area, and accessible from a range of providers?

No, these are not development plan matters.

Question 21 Do you agree that:

a. the planning application form should be amended to include a request for the estimated start date and build out rate for proposals for housing?

Yes

b. that developers should be required to provide local authorities with basic information (in terms of actual and projected build out) on progress in delivering the permitted number of homes, after planning permission has been granted?

Yes

c. the basic information (above) should be published as part of Authority Monitoring Reports?

No. It should be up to the discretion of the LPA how the information is used. The Monitoring Report and/or housing land supply statement may be the most appropriate documents.

d. that large housebuilders should be required to provide aggregate information on build out rates?

Yes.

Question 22. Do you agree that the realistic prospect that housing will be built on a site should be taken into account in the determination of planning applications for housing on sites where there is evidence of non-implementation of earlier permissions for housing development?

Yes.

Question 25. What are your views on whether local authorities should be encouraged to shorten the timescales for developers to implement a permission for housing development from three years to two years, except where a shorter timescale could hinder the viability or deliverability of a scheme? We would particularly welcome views on what such a change would mean for SME developers.

The Authority already applies shortened timescales in some circumstances on planning applications, and this appears to have had little effect on delivery.

Question 29. Do you agree that the consequences for under-delivery should be: (a.-e.)

a.-e. No. The government already applies a similar test through the 5 year housing land supply requirement. How would such a 20% buffer be considered in the contest of potential existing buffers on 5 year housing land supply?

Question 31 Do you agree with our proposals to:

a) amend national policy to revise the definition of affordable housing as set out in Box 4?

Yes, whilst these changes in the definition of affordable housing are long overdue when seen in conjunction with the minimum requirement of 10% of all homes on sites should be for affordable home ownership products being proposed (see q 32), will this change in definition truly assist in offering greater choice in affordable housing.

b) introduce an income cap for starter homes?

Yes

c) incorporate a definition of affordable private rent housing?

See answer to Q 31 (a)

d) allow for a transitional period that aligns with other proposals in the White Paper?

Yes so, that there is no confusion or uncertainty with/for Developers.

Question 32. Do you agree that:

a. national planning policy should expect local planning authorities to seek a minimum of 10% of all homes on individual sites for affordable home ownership products?

It is not considered that the policy as worded strikes a balance between affordable products for rent and ownership. In the circumstances of this authority, a blanket policy would likely result in affordable ownership products in many parts of the Borough which are in desperate need of affordable rented products and are heavily constrained by the viability of development to require a further proportion of affordable housing (i.e. large parts of the Borough have a threshold of 10% affordable housing, and this would be taken up by affordable home ownership products, as the proposal is currently worded). Such parts of the Borough would then be reliant on exception schemes. Authorities should be given the flexibility to seek affordable rented products as an

exception to affordable ownership products where there is a clear need.

Question 33. Should any particular types of residential development be excluded from this policy?

Affordable rent should be excluded, and not limited to just on 'Build for Rent' schemes which only seems to include affordable private rent.

Question 36. Do you agree with these proposals to clarify flood risk policy in the National Planning Policy Framework?

Clarification on the application of national flood risk policy is welcomed.

Question 38. Do you agree that in incorporating the Written Ministerial Statement on wind energy development into paragraph 98 of the National Planning Policy Framework, no transition period should be included?

Clarification on wind energy in the National Planning Policy Framework is welcomed.

Appendix 2

GYBC Draft Response to Planning and Affordable Housing for Build to Rent Consultation.

Q 6 : Do you agree with the proposal to refer explicitly to Build to Rent in the National Planning Policy Framework?

Yes

Q7 : Do you think that Government should set a policy expectation on Affordable Private Rent in the National Planning Policy Framework or not? (Please state your reasons)

No should be for the Local Authority to decide based on identified local housing need.

Q9 : Do you consider that Affordable Private Rent could play a useful role in the delivery of affordable housing in the area(s) where you live or operate?

No, as likely that potential scheme numbers required would not be deliverable on sites in Great Yarmouth.

Q11 : Do you consider that there could be unintended consequences of Affordable Private Rent if it is accepted as a form of affordable housing?

Yes, limit further the development of affordable rent properties as part of S106 Agreements.

Q12 : If your answer to Q11 is yes, would these consequences be mitigated by limiting Affordable Private Rent only to Build to Rent schemes?

Yes

Q13 : Do you think it is reasonable for Planning Authorities to specify minimum tenancy lengths in Build to Rent schemes? Please add your reasons and give examples of such agreements where appropriate.

Yes, as would provide an opportunity to introduce more security into the private rented sector for tenants.

Q14: Do you agree that Build to Rent tenancies should be for at least three years (with a one month break option for the tenant after the first six months), for all customers in the development who want one?

Yes

Q15 : Does the definition of Build to Rent set out on page 20 capture all of the appropriate elements (If not, please state why and what criteria should apply)

Yes

Q16 : Do you agree that the National Planning Policy Framework should put beyond doubt that Affordable Private Rent qualifies as affordable housing in Build to Rent Schemes? (If not, please state why)

Yes

Q17 : Do you agree with the proposed definition of Affordable Private Rent set out on page 21? (If not, please state why and what criteria should apply)

Yes agree with the proposed definition.

Q18 : The Government intends to set the parameters of Affordable Private Rent as:

- a minimum of 20 per cent of the homes to be discounted;
- the discount to be set at minimum of 20 per cent relative to the local market;
- the offer of longer tenancy of three years or more;
- the discount to apply indefinitely (subject to a “claw-back” arrangement if Affordable Private Rent homes are withdrawn)

Taken as a whole, are these parameters: (i) reasonable (ii) to onerous (iii) Insufficient? Which, if any of them, would you change and why?

All parameters seem to be reasonable.

Q 20 : The Government is minded to leave determination of eligibility and nomination criteria for Affordable Private Rent to negotiation between the

developer and the local authority. Do you support this position? Will it affect take – up of the policy? Please give your reasons.

As a LA would want to be able to determine the eligibility and nomination criteria with the developer. Possibility that this could affect take – up of the policy.

Q 23 : Should the Government's Build to Rent and Affordable Private Rent policy be identical across the whole of England or does it need to be set differently between London and the rest of England? If it should be set differently, please use the comments box to tell us how and why the policy should vary in London from the rest of England.

Should be different for London, different market conditions and housing needs.

Q 24 : Would it be helpful for Government to produce model clauses (which would not be mandatory) that could be used in S106 Agreements to give effect to Affordable Private Rent?

Yes for guidance only.

Subject: DCLG Estates Regeneration Programme

Report to: Housing & Neighbourhoods Committee

Report by: Robert Read, Director of Housing & Neighbourhoods

Date: 24th April 2017

SUBJECT MATTER/RECOMMENDATIONS

To update Housing and Neighbourhoods Committee on the plans for the use of grant funding awarded by the DCLG under the Estates Regeneration Programme

1. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

The Estates Regeneration Programme was launched in January 2016, when the then Prime Minister announced a programme to improve the life chances of the most disadvantaged by working with a large number of housing estates across the country to radically transform them.

On 26th May 2016, The Council submitted an Expression of Interest in the Government's Estates Regeneration programme, with a view to looking at Estates near the Town centre as they most closely matched the criteria for the scheme.

Following a report to Housing & Neighbourhoods Committee on 28th July 2016, the Council undertook a self-assessment and this was followed up by a visit by the DCLG's team of experts.

At the beginning of 2017, following the publication of the Government's National Strategy for Estate Regeneration, the Council was encouraged to put in an application for a £32m pot of money to fund preparatory and feasibility work on the Middlegate Estate.

A summary of the Government's strategy accompanies this report.

In February 2017 a bid was put in for £320k of funding and on 17th March 2017 it was confirmed that the Council had been successful. Some of the aspects of the proposals that the DCLG were particularly interested in were:

- The strong links between physical and social regeneration represented by neighbourhood management and the Neighbourhoods that Work Programme
- The strong track record of Great Yarmouth in community engagement
- The regeneration being part of a wider programme to improve place, local economy and life chances, e.g. the link to town centre regeneration
- Potential links to housing growth and improvement, represented by the nearby waterfront development prioritised in the Local Plan and potential for an improvement programme for private sector stock

2. Outline of work to be undertaken

The DCLG have identified three stages of the regeneration process.

- Preparation
- Planning
- Delivery

The Middlegate project is at the 'Preparation' stage and as such all options for regenerating the estate are open to being considered. The following programme has been agreed with the DCLG and will be delivered through the Housing Assets Joint Venture Company, GYN:

Deliverable	Commencement/ Completion date
Establish (Internal) Project Team Appoint Development Manager	April 2017
Initial Appraisal & Information Gathering	May 2017

Commence Tenant/Resident Liaison and Member engagement	May 2017
Preparation of tender package for appointment of design and Viability consultants	July 2017
Design/Define project Brief	August 2017
Appoint Design Team (following Resident/member/Project Team interviews)	November 2017
Undertake Area Assessment (Including Thermal Imaging)	December 2017
Area Assessment submission to residents and members	March 2018
Initial Appraisal Options	March 2018
Evaluation and refinement of design and viability appraisal by project team.	April 2018
[Based on reduced options] Explore delivery route options	May 2018
Draft Final Options Report	August 2018
Final Feasibility & Options Appraisal submission	October 2018

In addition to the £32 million released for the preparation stage, the Government has also made £140 million in loan funding available over the length of this Parliament to encourage investment in regeneration from the private sector.

3. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The key financial implication at this stage is the requirement to ensure that the £320k is spent in line with the programme above. No match funding is required, however, there will be a call on officer's time to contribute to the delivery of the programme.

Further financial implications will be assessed as the scheme progresses and indeed one of the key deliverables will be an appraisal of financial models to help bring about the regeneration.

4. **RISK IMPLICATIONS**

The key risk issue at this stage is ensuring that the scheme is seen in a positive light and that communication and community engagement is managed carefully in order to prevent any unsettlement amongst residents of the estate.

This can be managed through the expertise of the neighbourhood management team working with housing staff and local Members.

5. CONCLUSIONS

With reduced revenue and capital resources available within the Housing Revenue Account, competing demands and no major grant funding available, the Estates Regeneration Programme represents an opportunity to explore options for the regeneration of the Middlegate Estate and to link it closely to the Neighbourhoods that Work Programme, wider town centre regeneration and the Council's housing aspirations.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- To note the programme of work agreed with the DCLG
- To include as part of the quarterly update report to Housing & Neighbourhoods Committee.

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Areas of consideration: e.g. does this report raise any of the following issues and if so how have these been considered/mitigated against?

Area for consideration	Comment
Monitoring Officer Consultation:	Through EMT
Section 151 Officer Consultation:	Through EMT
Existing Council Policies:	Corporate Plan
Financial Implications:	As above
Legal Implications (including human rights):	None identified at present though these are likely to arise and will need to be appraised as the

	scheme progresses
Risk Implications:	As above
Equality Issues/EQIA assessment:	The scheme is designed to improve the life chances of all residents and equalities issues will need to be appraised as the scheme progresses
Crime & Disorder:	The scheme is designed to have a positive effect on crime and disorder
Every Child Matters:	The scheme is designed to have a positive effect on the life chances of children and young people



Department for
Communities and
Local Government

Estate Regeneration National Strategy

Executive Summary

December 2016

Department for Communities and Local Government
[Page 34 of 55](#)

Executive Summary

1. Estate regeneration can transform neighbourhoods by delivering well designed housing and public space, a better quality of life and new opportunities for residents. It provides an opportunity both to improve housing for existing residents and to provide much needed new homes, particularly in urban areas, where estates have been built at relatively low densities. We believe estate regeneration has the potential to deliver thousands of net additional homes over the next 10 to 15 years.
2. We recognise that estate regeneration can often be challenging. This national strategy aims to support local partners to improve and accelerate local estate regeneration to deliver more and better quality housing, drive local growth and improve opportunities for residents.
3. We have seen some excellent examples of regeneration schemes in all parts of the country. Whether finished, in delivery, just getting going or still an idea, it is clear that no two schemes are the same and different places face different challenges. A 'one size fits all' national approach is not appropriate. But we think there are three key principles that underpin successful estate regeneration:
 - a. Community engaged as partners
 - b. Support and leadership of the local authority
 - c. Willingness to work with the private sector to access commercial skills and lever in investment.
4. We have seen many estates in need of regeneration, characterised by poor quality housing, unattractive buildings in physical decline, and large areas of underutilised and degraded open space. They are often inward looking and physically, socially and economically disconnected from their surroundings, leading to higher concentrations of social deprivation and lack of opportunities for communities living there.
5. Through a combination of practical advice and guidance, the national strategy addresses the common elements and challenges that most schemes will need to consider. It is particularly aimed at the early stages of regeneration, as schemes move from aspiration and concept to developing tangible options and plans. We know from our discussions that getting this right is critical to the success of a scheme.
6. We recognise that there is already a considerable body of good practice, published guides and reports. We have sought to draw on and signpost these whilst providing guidance where we have identified gaps. Our intention is to add to this resource as we continue to work with schemes.
7. The national strategy has been developed with the Estate Regeneration Advisory Panel, co-chaired by Lord Heseltine and the Housing and Planning Minister. [A list of panel members is here](#). It has also been informed by our discussions with over 100 areas, from all parts of the country that came forward to work with us. We will continue to work with these areas to help them progress their plans.
8. We are grateful to everyone who has given us their time, hosted visits and shared their experiences and expertise. Their input has been invaluable in ensuring the national strategy is grounded in what works in practice.

-
9. The national strategy comprises:
 - a. **Resident engagement and protection:** sets out Government expectations for ensuring that residents are at the centre of re-shaping their estates, in partnership with authorities and developers, and are protected during the lifetime of an estate regeneration scheme.
 - b. **Role of the local authority:** sets out the importance of wider place making, strategic use of public sector land, design and effective use of the planning system.
 - c. **Financing and delivering estate regeneration:** provides options for building a sound financial base, including setting out the key challenges, advice on particular aspects and de-mystifying the processes and terminology.
 - d. **Good practice guide:** steers schemes through all the key stages, from developing the initial idea through to build out and delivery; includes checklists on process design and quality to ensure important issues or stages are not overlooked; provides a framework for overall sequencing.
 - e. **Better social outcomes:** reports on Government's work with four estates on mapping public spend in estates, in the broader context of looking at how estate regeneration schemes can be part of a place based approach to tackling poor life chances.
 - f. **Alternative approaches:** provides advice on community-led housing development as an effective means of putting the community at the heart of housing delivery.
 - g. **Case studies:** illustrate and highlight particularly positive elements from a range of schemes, including design and quality, community engagement and strategic and innovative financing.
 10. Government recognises that without some public investment early on, many schemes will not get off the ground. The estate regeneration funding prospectus enables areas to bid for a share of £140m of loan funding, £30m of enabling grant, and £2m of capacity building funding. This financial support from government is directly targeted at de-risking the early stages of regeneration schemes and providing support to areas for such activities as community engagement, feasibility studies, scoping of proposals and masterplanning. There is also support available for preconstruction activities such demolition and moving residents. More information is in the Funding Prospectus.
 11. Alongside this, where appropriate, estate regeneration schemes can make use of other government measures designed to boost delivery of new homes, particularly in areas of high need. These include the £7 billion that the government has made available to support delivery of new affordable homes, including Shared Ownership, Rent to Buy and Affordable Rent and the £2.3 billion of housing infrastructure funding. Schemes can also benefit from the government's commitment to release land from the government estate and to work with local authorities to release their land, offering the potential to cross-subsidise development at a local level. Local authorities will also be able to make use of changes to planning policy and benefit from the Housing Zones programme.

Subject: Voluntary and Community Sector support services- delivery update
Report to: Housing and Neighbourhoods Committee

Report by: Holly Notcutt, Community Development Manager
Date: 10th April 2017

SUBJECT MATTER/RECOMMENDATIONS

To update the Housing and Neighbourhoods committee on the current activity and delivery through the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise sector commissioned services.

1. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

- 1.1 For more than ten years the council has provided financial assistance in the form of core grants to a range of Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) organisations to contribute to the delivery of their support services. Annual grants were awarded to the same organisations for several years without the need to re-apply, without definite criteria linked to the council's corporate priorities and with limited monitoring and performance management.
- 1.2 In 2013 the council implemented performance management processes, in the form of signed agreements, liaison meeting, project visits, and end of year monitoring forms, to better understand and monitor the impact of the spend.
- 1.3 In August 2015, internal audit recommended that the closed grants process be replaced by an open commissioning process to procure and deliver Support Services from the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector, aligned to Council priorities.
- 1.3 In October 2016 a new process was launched, replacing the previous grants function with a commissioning process, distinguishing service delivery commissioning from grant giving. This was specifically to enable the council to direct resources to current needs and demands and support the delivery of corporate priorities.
- 1.4 In January 2017, four VCSE organisations were awarded funds to deliver VCSE support services for the period of one year.

2. THE CURRENT LANDSCAPE

- 2.1 **The changing role of the VCSE sector:** With recent statutory public services required to undertake efficiency measures, the VCSE sector has

- been recognised as a critical service provider, transforming to deliver public services themselves through range of new and creative approaches.
- 2.2 **With changes to public policy, the sector has also felt a significant impact and an increase in demand** for their services, resulting in the need to provide higher levels of support to increasing volumes of people experiencing complex life challenges, most recently demonstrated through the roll-out of Universal Credit in Great Yarmouth.
- 2.3 **Since March 2016 a range of consultative opportunities were undertaken to identify the key challenges and support requirements for VCSE organisations in the borough.** Information was gathered from a series of in depth consultations, surveys, a voluntary sector workshop and dialogue opportunities developed across the sector to better determine trends, current priorities, opportunities and concerns, including impacts on services, and desired support requirements. This exercise concluded the following priorities for the VCSE sector; *1. Governance advice, 2. Trustee and Volunteer recruitment, 3. Income generation, 4. Effective Communications , 5. Strategic Partnerships.*
- 2.4 **It was identified that good quality, practical capacity building support would be necessary to support VCSE organisations** to develop in the current environment. GYBC have led this agenda for the locality, in recognition of the risk of duplicated efforts across public sector partners and an increasing reliance on the VCSE sector for front-line service delivery.
- 2.5 **GYBC has successfully secured committed resources through pooling budgets in partnership** with Public Health, Adult Social Care, Children's Services, and Great Yarmouth and Waveney Clinical Commissioning Group, developing on the historic VCS infrastructure support service agreement. Within this integrated arrangement, GYBC will steer the development work to ensure local complementarity and alignment.
- 2.6 **The partnership arrangements will have specific focus on small to medium sized local VCSE organisations, ensuring dedicated and practical support** enabling them to; make transitions to new funding and delivery environments, to align activity with the strategic agendas of the commissioning bodies, to maximise collaborative working arrangements between local public, private and VCSE organisations, and to integrate seamlessly with both strategic and grass roots Community Development arrangements in the borough. GYBC is overseeing a pooled Development Fund between NCC and health to provide bespoke training and development

to directly benefit new start -ups, fledgling and small VCSE organisations that may not be directly funded or commissioned through other sources. This fund also supports the provision of a role in Voluntary Norfolk to provide dedicated governance and fundraising and development support to voluntary organisations. Additionally, community development work is funded for grass roots level delivery, providing direct support to community groups. This includes support for accessing grants and fundraising. In the last 6 months (October 2016-March 2017), over £112,000.00 was received by community groups as a direct result of this support. Examples include £60,000 for Great Yarmouth and Gorleston Young Carers, £250 for Young at Heart Senior Citizen's Group, and £10,000 for the MESH Youth Group.

- 2.7 **Quarterly monitoring will be overseen led by the Integrated Commissioning Group** (comprising of funding partner leads) and associated bodies as appropriate, and will take place to monitor and inform the work of the development support service, ensuring it is kept up to date with new and emerging priorities within the locality. Outcomes from Neighbourhoods that Work delivery will also be viewed alongside this monitoring, promoting the integrated approach to supporting the sector and the Stronger Communities agenda.
- 2.8 **Alignment and joint commissioning:** Currently Norfolk County Council is leading on work to explore the opportunities for alignment and the potential for a County-wide approach to commissioning and resourcing Norfolk-wide Advice Services. This has been reinforced by the ongoing work of the Great Yarmouth Locality board, plus the work identified through the NHS Sustainability and Transformation Plan, in mapping advice and support services, localised pressure points and potential or expected impacts. This work has also informed recent discussions about the future of Adult Social Care provision in the borough, where there is currently a proactive exploration of opportunities to develop the way services are delivered in the borough, through direct local alignment and local investment. There is a strong and growing desire from partners to work differently, to localise their approaches and to align resources for maximum benefit. Conditions are therefore prime to be exploring alignment and joint commissioning with our partners, to ensure any newly developed work and delivery does not duplicate or undermine wider plans or arrangements.

3. **VCSE Support Services: 2017-18 Delivery**

- 3.1 **The commissioned organisations will be delivering on the priorities of Advice and Guidance, Crisis Support, and Employment and Skills.** The

commissioned organisations and their associated delivery areas are featured in Table 1.

- 3.2 **All delivery is aligned with GYBC's corporate plan for 2015-2020,** enabling the council to ensure this commissioned service delivery undertaken by VCSE partners and the subsequent outcomes are complementary to the council's strategic vision for the borough. Alignment with GYBC services will ensure complementary delivery and subsequently impact, alleviating demands placed on council services, providing added value.
- 3.3 **Services have been contracted to ensure their delivery is engaged with GYBC's Neighbourhoods that Work programme (Big Lottery funded),** adding value to the delivery and strengthening the transformational agenda, creating more sustainable outcomes for residents and communities of the borough.

Table 1: Commissioned VCSE support services 2017-18			
Organisation	VCSE SS delivery	Themes	Funds
Citizen's Advice Norfolk: Charity providing accredited Advice and Guidance across the county, with a dedicated office in Great Yarmouth.	<p>The service will:</p> <p>Deliver a generalist advice and information service, primarily covering welfare benefits, debt, finance, housing, energy, employment, immigration, consumer and family matters.</p> <p>Provide escalated emergency access to people with immediate need, alongside standard support to deal with issues. Support will also be provided to increase the resilience of people experiencing crises, e.g. Supporting them with budgeting skills, increasing confidence and improving their employability.</p> <p>Recruit and train volunteers, giving them increased confidence, evidenced skills and an enhanced CV to aid job hunting.</p> <p>Services will be accessible will be open to all residents of the borough, accessed through the following channels;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 day a week (weekdays) drop-in and appointment services at CAB Great Yarmouth office • Adviceline telephone advice service • Email advice • Online advice service 	Advice and Guidance Crisis Support Employment and Skills	£33,000
DIAL Great Yarmouth: Independent Great Yarmouth based charity, providing	<p>The service will:</p> <p>Deliver an outreach focussed Advice and Guidance service across the Great Yarmouth Borough, providing face to face support outside of normal working hours. Priority advice will include budgeting, housing, and maximisation of income to ensure that households are in receipt of full entitlement.</p> <p>Recruit and train volunteers from within local communities, who will be supported to work alongside the Advisors, to provide basic advice and guidance in community settings,</p>	Advice and Guidance	£ 21,284

accredited Advice and Guidance to vulnerable people in the borough.	<p>informed by issues facing residents within their own communities.</p> <p>Services will be delivered 5 days per week (including alternate Saturdays) at various locations across the Borough. Delivery locations will be in a range of safe, community based settings. Local communities will be supported to host drop in sessions across the Borough.</p>		
FirstMove Furnishaid: Independent Great Yarmouth based charity, providing information, support and assistance to people who are unemployed, unwaged or on low incomes.	<p>The service will;</p> <p>Deliver education, learning and employability sessions, in partnership with Norfolk Community Learning Services and Great Yarmouth College.</p> <p>This will include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Training and learning activities b) One to one and group employment training c) CV writing support d) Job search and job application support e) Volunteering support and training through specific packages, including mentorship f) The development of a weekly multi-agency support services drop-in, including local business networks and community based partnerships <p>Services will be delivered 5 days per week from the town centre premises.</p>	Employment and Skills	£15,000
Foodbank Plus:	<p>The service will;</p> <p>Develop community hubs: providing people in need or experiencing crises (eg. people</p>	Crisis support	£8,483

<p>A collective Community Based Organisation, from Foodbank origins, directly supporting the progression of beneficiaries of the Foodbanks and the drop-ins through practical and emotional assistance.</p>	<p>who: are homeless, have low or no incomes, have unmanaged health conditions, etc) with regular and direct access to a wide range of statutory and VCS services, within one location (e.g. Herbie's) in addition to providing hot meals, emergency food and hosting the foodbanks.</p> <p>Provide crisis support information: Helpful resources will be developed, providing simple and up to date information for people needing help.</p> <p>Train Foodbank Plus volunteers: people trained to give one to one sign posting and additional support to vulnerable people, ensuring the safe running of all Foodbank Plus support service delivery.</p> <p>Recruit and train Community volunteers: Local residents who use the services will be supported by volunteers to access entry level volunteering opportunities within the hubs.</p> <p>Pilot a 'Fuel Bank': This new area of delivery will be explored, with the aim to help struggling households on prepayment meters to receive a voucher enabling them to reconnect power to their homes during times of crisis.</p> <p>Deliver community learning and social networking opportunities: through a range of activities designed to be educational and social, e.g. eating on a budget, family learning activities.</p> <p>Services will be delivered 5 days per week across Gorleston and Great Yarmouth.</p>		
<p style="text-align: right;">TOTAL £77, 767</p>			

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 There are no financial implications beyond the opportunity to explore joint commissioning possibilities for Norfolk-wide Advice Services.

5. RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 Risks will be managed accordingly. All commissioned delivery has been agreed through specific SLAs. Delivery will be monitored through scheduled liaison meetings, plus an end of year report.

6. CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 Organisations commissioned to deliver services, in line with corporate priorities, have allowed the council to provide additional resource within the borough whilst also accommodating the changing needs within communities. The outcomes from the first complete year of delivery will be presented to the relevant GYBC committee. The additional development support will enable small to medium sized VCSE organisations to receive the support they need to grow, develop and transform, increasing their capacity to deliver their projects and services going forward.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 The committee are asked to note the contents of this report

Areas of consideration: e.g. does this report raise any of the following issues and if so how have these been considered/mitigated against?

Area for consideration	Comment
Monitoring Officer Consultation:	None
Section 151 Officer Consultation:	None
Existing Council Policies:	Corporate Plan
Financial Implications:	As above
Legal Implications (including	None identified

human rights):	
Risk Implications:	As above
Equality Issues/EQIA assessment:	Development support will be offered to all small-medium VCSE organisations, plus those commissioned to provide the support services.
Crime & Disorder:	The scheme is designed to have a positive effect on crime and disorder through creating stronger communities.
Every Child Matters:	The scheme is designed to have a positive effect on the life chances of priority households, including families

Subject: Building Resilient Lives: Reshaping Housing Related Support

Report to: Housing & Neighbourhoods Committee 24th April 2017

Report by: Vicky George Group Manager: Housing Health & Wellbeing

SUBJECT MATTER/RECOMMENDATIONS

This purpose of this report is to provide a short briefing to inform members of the current situation and work being undertaken following Norfolk County Council's decision to reduce housing related support funding across the County.

This report is for information.

1. INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

Norfolk County Council undertook a consultation exercise on the future funding of housing related support called Building Resilient Lives – Reshaping Housing Related. This report is designed inform members of:

- the recommendations agreed by Norfolk County Council (NCC) in February in respect of Building Resilient Lives
- the impact on current services
- the emerging issues for the Council and other service providers
- next steps

2. BUILDING RESILIENT LIVES

- 2.1 Norfolk County Council (NCC) agreed the following recommendations following the consultation – Building Resilient Lives: Reshaping Housing Related Support

- a) Continue to invest £3.2m to fund and maintain crisis accommodation (homeless hostels) for both young people and single adults who are homeless.
- b) Investment of approximately £1.3m in a new community outreach model that will provide support to both older people and those at risk of homelessness.
- c) Decommission services providing housing related support to people living in sheltered housing.
- d) Decommission services providing low level supported accommodation (Move-on) and (peripatetic) floating support and replacement with (community outreach).

2.2 Following the decision officers have been attending a number of meetings to discuss the detail of these recommendations, how they will be taken forward and over what timescale.

2.3 **Impact on Current Services**

2.3.1 *Single Homelessness*

There will be a 20% reduction in funding to direct access hostels from 1st December 2017 and the decommissioning of move-services from 30th November. This decision affects two providers in the Borough.

Bauleah House a direct access hostel with 31 bed spaces. The hostel also provides move-on services accounting for 32 bed spaces, which will be decommissioned. The combined impact of the 20% reduction and decommissioning move-on services will result in a 45% funding reduction for this provider.

Genesis Housing who provide a direct access hostel with 20 bed spaces. They also provide move-on services with 9 bed space, which will be decommissioned. The combined impact of the 20% reduction and decommissioning move-on services will result in a 30 funding reduction for this provider.

2.3.2 *Young People*

There will be a 20% reduction in funding to hostels from 1st December 2017 and the decommissioning of move-services from 30th November. This decision affects two providers in the Borough.

Aspire Foundation Trust a hostel that provides 17 bed spaces.

YMCA supported lodgings providing 20 placements of move-on accommodation.

2.3.3 *Older People*

Services that currently support older people across the County will be decommissioned. This decision will affect

GYBC Outreach Service providing 192 units of floating support to older people who are not supported in sheltered housing. This service will be decommissioned from 31st August 2017

Sheltered Housing Services which across 4 providers accounts for approximately 1175 units of sheltered accommodation; with Great Yarmouth Community Housing being the largest provider with 945 units. These services will be decommissioned from 28th February 2018

2.3.4 *Floating Support*

Services that provide housing related support to vulnerable households and people with low level mental health conditions will be decommissioned. This decision will affect two providers in the borough, Stonham and Together.

2.4 Emerging Issues for the Council

2.4.1 *Homelessness / Young People / Floating Support*

The hostel services are integral to the homelessness work of the council. There is concern that without services to support move-on people will remain longer in hostels and as a result fewer people will be able to access hostels provision.

Decommissioning floating support will have an impact but at this stage it is difficult to quantify. However it is highly likely that there will be increased demand and a greater dependency on council services when floating support services are decommissioned. Tenants and residents being supported currently could fall into crises and there will be no service to help people in the future.

There is also likely to be higher demand for existing voluntary sector advice services e.g. DIAL, CAB, a higher use of primary care services e.g. GP surgeries, A&E and impact on acute health and social care services

Tenants & residents reaching crisis point due to lack of prevention services will create higher demand on a whole range of services.

2.4.2 *Sheltered Housing / Community Outreach*

There will be a loss of core funding for both these services.

The Community Outreach Service will be decommissioned on 31st August 2017 and officers are currently putting in place an exit plan that will see a gradual winding down of the service. Four staff (3.5 FTE) will be at risk of

redundancy unless they can be deployed to other roles within the organisation.

Supporting People funding into sheltered housing will cease in February 2018 leaving just the enhanced housing management service charge. The value of this contract £313,658

Remodelling sheltered housing with significantly reduced funding will have a massive impact on the current cohort of sheltered housing tenants, which will require careful management. A project plan is currently being drafted under 6 work-stream headings:

- Tenants
- Property
- Scheme/Environment
- Service
- Staff
- Finance and Budget

2.8 Next Steps

2.8.1 *Remodelling and Decommissioning of Services*

Council officers have been meeting regularly with NCC Commissioning Officers to discuss how the remodelling and decommissioning of services can be delivered.

Providers of the hostels services have been met with by NCC officers and the council officers to discuss the impact of reduced funding and to start conversations about how services might be remodelled.

Officers responsible for the delivery of sheltered housing and the outreach service have also met with NCC and will be attending a provider meeting this month of all Norfolk providers of affected by the decommissioning decision.

For the outreach service officers in the process of collecting information on current demand and need and will be providing monthly reports to NCC while the service is being scaled down. For the sheltered housing service there is a much bigger piece of work and members will be receiving a report detailing the options for this service at their July meeting.

2.8.2 *Locality Commissioning*

Of the £4.5m remaining there is £1.3m that remains to be invested across Norfolk. The recommendation of NCC is that this is used to deliver a new community outreach model that will provide support to both older people and those at risk of homelessness.

It is proposed that existing locality partnership boards lead on identifying their local 'edge of care' priorities for this investment and potential solutions. This would include:

- where there are gaps that mean people tip into more formal care and support
- where people are at risk of crisis and intervention could prevent or reduce demand for formal care, health interventions and other statutory inputs
- existing local initiatives/services that prevent this
- potential additional funding opportunities
- potential for leveraging support from other organisations
- ideas for using locality assets to make the most impact
- evidence that an approach is likely to be effective

It is recommended that proposal should target needs that have been met in the service areas which are being decommissioned or reduced:

- Single homeless people
- Young people at risk including care leavers and young parents
- People at risk of homelessness including people with mental health

problems

- Older people

Great Yarmouth's locality board met on 28th March and received a short presentation on the impact of the funding decision and agreed to establish a task and finish group that will meet in April to look at the priorities for the borough, which will be then fed back to NCC by mid-May. NCC's intention is to combine this local information with other evidence and test it with a range of stakeholders to inform the overall approach to delivering edge of care interventions across the County.

3. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

As set out in the previous report to this Committee on 8th December there are direct and indirect financial implications for the borough.

3.1 *Direct Financial Implications*

- The outreach service contract is worth £133,000 p.a. There are likely to be redundancy costs for the council unless the staff can be redeployed into other roles.
- The sheltered housing service contract is worth £313,000 p.a. This funding makes up 55% of the overall funding into sheltered housing with the remainder coming from tenants who are not on housing benefit and from a housing management charge. Remodelling this service could also see staff at risk of redundancy unless they can be redeployed.

3.2 *Indirect Financial Implications*

Other council provided services will experience increased demand and also increased operational costs through dealing with issues that are currently

dealt with or managed through housing related support services. Examples include increased ASB, greater demand on services such as repairs, increased dependency on tenancy management services, higher demand for homelessness services, etc

4. RISK IMPLICATIONS

The financial risks could be significant both in terms of losing direct funding and also increased operational costs as highlighted earlier in the report

There are reputational risks as many people will not differentiate between what the borough council funds and what county funds. For example an increase in the incidence of rough sleeping will be viewed as a borough council issue as will a reduction in services such as sheltered housing which are traditionally seen as being provided by the borough council.

5. CONCLUSIONS

There is a great deal of work to do in a very short space of time to deliver the savings required and to secure the borough's share of the £1.3m remaining investment.

Officers will continue to work with locality partners to ensure that the resource available within the system is being deployed to the best effect. This will include looking for other funding opportunities, having a better understanding of what's currently being funded and by who; and a much greater emphasis on jointly commissioning services in the future.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

This report is for information.

7. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Areas of consideration: e.g. does this report raise any of the following issues and if so how have these been considered/mitigated against?

Area for consideration	Comment
Monitoring Officer Consultation:	
Section 151 Officer Consultation:	
Existing Council Policies:	Homelessness
Financial Implications:	Contained in the report
Legal Implications (including human rights):	
Risk Implications:	Contained in the report
Equality Issues/EQIA assessment:	Contained in the report
Crime & Disorder:	Contained in the report
Every Child Matters:	Contained in the report