



**GREAT YARMOUTH**  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

## Scrutiny Committee

**Date:** Thursday, 31 October 2013

**Time:** 18:30

**Venue:** Supper Room

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

### AGENDA

**Open to Public and Press**

#### DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

You have a PERSONAL INTEREST in a matter being discussed at a meeting IF

- It relates to something on your Register of Interests form; or
- A decision on it would affect you, your family or friends more than other people in your Ward.

You have a PREJUDICIAL INTEREST in a matter being discussed at a meeting IF

- It affects your financial position or that of your family or friends more than other people in your Ward; or
- It concerns a planning or licensing application you or they have submitted
- AND IN EITHER CASE a reasonable member of the public would consider it to be so significant that you could not reach an unbiased decision.

If your interest is only PERSONAL, you must declare it but can still speak and vote. If your interest is PREJUDICIAL, you must leave the room. However, you have the same rights as a member of the public to address the meeting before leaving.

<b>1</b>	<b><u>Minutes</u></b>	<b>3 - 6</b>
	To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 3 October 2013	
<b>2</b>	<b><u>Efficiency Support Grant Project Plan</u></b>	
	(to follow)	
<b>3</b>	<b><u>Role of Ward Councillors</u></b>	
	The Cabinet Secretary will give a verbal update at the meeting	
<b>4</b>	<b><u>Boarded up Derelict Houses</u></b>	<b>7 - 18</b>
	To consider the attached	
<b>5</b>	<b><u>SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2013-14</u></b>	<b>19 - 22</b>
	To consider the attached	
<b>6</b>	<b><u>Vauxhall Bridge</u></b>	
	The Cabinet Secretary will give a verbal update at the meeting	
	<b><u>Salisbury Road Call-In</u></b>	<b>23 - 27</b>
	The Committee is advised that Councillor Stone has exercised his right as the Chairman of Scrutiny to call in the above item which was considered by Cabinet on Wednesday 16 October 2013	
<b>7</b>	<b><u>EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC</u></b>	
	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.	
<b>8</b>	<b><u>PIPs</u></b>	
	Details	

# Scrutiny Committee

## Minutes

Thursday, 03 October 2013 at 18:30

### **Attendees:**

Mrs Mary Coleman (Member), Mr Bert Collins (Member), Mr Ronald Hanton (Member), Mr Jim Shrimplin (Member), Mr Barry Stone (Member), Mrs Marlene Fairhead (Member), Mr Charles Marsden (Member), Mrs Kerry Robinson-Payne (Member), Mr Jamie Smith (Member), Mrs Barbara Wright (Member)

### **Apologies for Absence:**

Mrs Sue Hacon (Member), Mr Michael Castle (Member), Ms Marie Field (Member)

### **Absent:**

No Members Absent

Also in attendance at the above meeting were:

Councillor Sutton attended as a substitute for Councillor Castle

Councillor B Coleman attended as a substitute for Councillor S Hacon

Robert Read (Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods) - attended for item 2

Trevor Chaplin (Group Manager Housing Services) - attended for item 2

Graham Hollingdale - attended for item 2

Councillor Williamson - attended for item 3

Daren Barker (Conservation Officer) - attended for item 3

Jane Beck (Director of Customers Services) - attended for item 4

Jane Ratcliffe (Chief Executive Officer) - attended for item 5

Councillor T Wainwright - attended for item 5

Seb Duncan (Director of Resources Governance and Growth) - attended for item 5

Councillor Jeal attended as an observer

Robin Hodds (Cabinet Secretary)

Karline Smith (Senior Member Services Officer)

## **1 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 August 2013 were confirmed.

## **2 PM007A - Voids Repairs**

The Committee considered the Director of Community Housing and Neighbourhoods report on voids repairs. He reported that over the last couple of years there had been an increase in the average void turnaround time in Council Housing Properties. A review had been carried out along with a visit to Norwich City Council where some lessons were learnt around overall management and how different contractors work as they have a more focused joined up approach. It was reported that the Council was having to fit more kitchens than they wanted to. It was also found that the Council was having to do catch up works after the property was let resulting in rent free periods for tenants. A Member asked for clarification on the normal length of time that a property would be empty and it was reported that this would depend if the tenant had died and a family member kept hold of the keys. It was pointed out that once measures had been put in place the void times would reduce.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted, and that an update be provided at a Scrutiny Committee in six months time.

## **3 Vauxhall Bridge**

The Committee considered the Conservation Officer report. The Conservation Officer reported that the Vauxhall Bridge project had been a very complicated project with difficult ownership and was multi funded and was therefore not a normal project in terms of the project arrangements.

The Conservation Officer reported that the partnership went through a robust tender process but there were time constraints for the tender process and that the Preservation Trust was the accountable body.

A Member asked if there was a conflict of interests between Great Yarmouth Borough Council and Norfolk County Council.

The Conservation Officer stated that he did not know if there had been a conflict of interest but in hindsight a contractor with Heritage or listed building experience should have been selected as savings may have been achieved.

A member asked to see the minutes of the partnership meetings.

The Conservation Officer stated that the previous Head of Planning had spoken highly of the contractor as they had worked on bridges and had a good track record.

The Conservation Officer was asked what his role was in the project and he reported that this was as the Project lead.

Councillor Williamson reported that in the last month an attempt had been made to set up a charitable trust but as Sustrans was a charity this was not possible. They had suggested writing a bid for them to be submitted to the Heritage Lottery Fund to pay

for phase two.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted, and the issues detailed be addressed at the next meeting.

#### **4 PIPs**

The committee considered the Director of Customer Services report on Pips. The Director of Customer Services reported that she had received a letter from NPLaw which detailed Sutton Media's response and that the original request to relinquish the licence had not been formally done.

A Member asked for clarification as to the relationship between the Greater Yarmouth Tourist Authority and Great Yarmouth Borough Council and the position of the Chief Executive of the GYTA. The Director stated the Council's Tourism Manager was currently the CEO of the GYTA.

The Committee discussed the level of outstanding fees owed to the Council. The docs also clarified that advertising was sold through Sutton Media and payments should have been paid to GYTA. A question was raised as to why a county court summons had not been issued on the GYTA for non payment of outstanding debts. The documents clarified that this had been dealt with under the Sundry debt procedure. The CEO confirmed that she had not been requested to pursue the debt.

The documents confirmed that the arrears owed to the Borough Council should be paid by the end of the year.

In response to a question from a member of the public about the GYTA relinquishing the licence, the Chairman stated if the GYTA had relinquished the licence to Sutton Media it was likely that they would not have received any outstanding funds owed to them.

RESOLVED:

That this item be deferred to the next meeting and the Chief Executive of GYTA be requested to attend the next meeting and that the committee be furnished with GYTA minutes and any other relevant documentation.

#### **5 Management Structure**

The committee considered the report on the outstanding questions in respect of the management structure.

A Member stated that the report stated £387,000 ongoing savings and consultancy fees of £36,800 and asked if there would be any more consultancy fees to pay in the future. The Cabinet Member (Transformation and Regeneration) stated that there was £3/4m savings in the first year and that the consultancy fee's were a one off cost.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

**6     Role of Ward Councillors**

The Cabinet Secretary reported that a meeting would be held next week and that an update on this meeting would be given at the 31 October 2013 Scrutiny meeting.

**7     WORK PROGRAMME 2013-14**

It was agreed that the following issues be addressed at the next meeting:-

- Efficiency Support Grant Report
- Key Performance Indicators
- Interim Report for St Georges and Pavilion
- Role of Ward Councillors
- Vauxhall Bridge
- PIP's
- Boarded up derelict houses

**8     Any other business**

There was no other business.

The meeting ended at: 20:00

**SUBJECT:** To review the reason for the number of boarded up houses in the Borough and possible future course of action to bring them back into use.

**Report to:** Scrutiny Committee 31<sup>st</sup> October 2013

**Report by:** Tracey Slater - Service Unit Manager (Housing Strategy and Housing Options)

## **1.0 Background**

For the purpose of this report I will take boarded up houses to be those that we would consider to be empty. To my knowledge and the knowledge of colleagues working in Environmental Health, Planning Enforcement and Building Control the number of empty homes actually boarded up are few and far between. At the current time there does not appear to be any hotspots for boarded up properties in the Borough.

It is something that as a Local Authority we would do as a last resort should the owner not be in a position to secure the property themselves. If this did become necessary, works would need to be carried out at the Council's expense. We would then look to recover the costs from the owner, often necessitating a charge being put on the property until it is sold. On average action is normally taken by the Council to board-up 5-6 properties per year.

For a number of years the Borough has had a multi-agency Joint Enforcement Group consisting of Council Officers, the Police and the Fire Authority. It meets on a quarterly basis to discuss properties known to a number of different departments/agencies where, by joint working a solution can be sought. It is likely that the properties discussed could be boarded up or empty.

In February 2012 a business case was made for an Empty Homes Project and initial capital funding of £250,000 was given to target empty properties that had been identified as pilots for the scheme. An Empty Homes Project Board consisting of Members and Officers was established to look at these potential opportunities.

See Appendix 1 for full details of business case made.

It also became possible for us to utilise funding made available by the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) in late 2012 to bring additional empty homes back into use. Once purchased and improved, it would be our intention to let via our Housing Options service to local households.

See Appendix 2 for Cabinet report on this opportunity

## **2.0 Work to date.**

Since January 2013 the owners of 860 empty properties have been written to with details of the different schemes that we have to assist them bring their empty property back into use. 406 of these have now been brought back into use either through intervention from GYBC or through natural progression.

To-date one boarded-up property on Hall Quay in the Council's ownership has been converted into three units which, we are due to start using as temporary accommodation for homeless families in the next month. Another boarded up property at 124/125 Nelson Road Central has been successfully purchased and is currently awaiting planning permission to be converted into 5 flats which, will also be used as temporary accommodation for homeless families when completed.

All monies that have been allocated on this project have now been spent and it would be our intention to bid for additional capital funding for 2014/15 to continue this work.

Work to identify suitable empty properties for the HCA funding has complemented the Council's Empty Property Project and we are currently proceeding with the purchase of 3 two-bedroom properties and another four properties which are subject to Compulsory Purchase Orders. These properties are more likely to be those seen to be boarded up.

### **3.0 Future course of action.**

Work will continue in the identification of empty properties and making contact with the owners to encourage them to bring their property back into use.

However, it is worth noting that the property market has become more buoyant over the last six months and properties are now more likely to be able to be sold on the open market.

Since 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 changes have taken place with the payment of Council Tax on empty properties and as a result we have seen a number of longer term empties i.e. 2 years plus thus qualifying for Council Tax at 150% being brought back into use.

Changes in the payment of Housing Benefit from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013 whereby, a property is seen to be under-occupied have also affected the size of property that we are now actively looking to purchase under the HCA funded scheme. Currently we are looking only at 2 bedroom properties for this scheme.

Members are encouraged to let us know about empty/boarded up properties in their Ward.

Continue to explore all funding opportunities to bring empty properties back into use.

Continue with the multi-agency Joint Enforcement Group.



## **Empty Homes High Level Business Case**

Author	Jane Beck, Tracey Slater, Alan Warnes
Date	February 2012
Version	2.0
Document Status	Final

### **Current position**

---

© Great Yarmouth Borough Council 2007.

This document contains Great Yarmouth proprietary information and must not be copied, reprinted or reproduced in any form, either wholly or in part, nor should any method or technique or any other part or aspect of the content of this document be disclosed to any person without the written consent of Great Yarmouth Borough Council.

There is currently an average of 550 empty properties within the Borough at any one time. Of these 391 currently relate to properties which have been empty 6 months or more. Within the borough the number of empty properties has remained constant over the last 3-4 years.

## **1.0 Background**

- 1.1 Previously projects have been funded from Central Government to undertake large scale refurbishments within identified areas (SHARP 1 & 2, SHIP). These projects have delivered significant improvement to both individuals and the community, bringing back into use properties and increasing standards of living across the areas.
- 1.2 Funding specifically in relation to empty homes has been secured from the Housing and Communities Agency. Two bids have been successful identifying 37 empty properties which will be brought back into use over the next three years.
- 1.3 There is clearly a need within the Borough to be more proactive around empty properties to continue the work from SHARP and SHIP but to deliver suitable housing alternative for the citizens of the Borough.
- 1.4 The SHARP projects dealt with 20 empty properties and helped create about 120 new units of accommodation.
- 1.5 The authority currently leases accommodation for use by the Housing Options team as emergency temporary accommodation. The cost of leasing these premises currently has an average of £300,000 per annum and options for alternative solutions are considered as part of this business case

## **2.0 Essential Business Requirements**

- 2.1 To reduce the number of empty homes by a minimum of 10% per annum.
- 2.2 To bring back into use for the benefit of the community long term empty properties.
- 2.3 To improve the impact of empty properties on the community.
- 2.4 Operate a pilot project to ensure value for money and sustainability.
- 2.5 Provide and manage good quality temporary accommodation to proactively manage this obligation at reduced revenue costs to the authority

### **3.0 Objectives**

- 3.1 Target specific properties and areas to ensure highest impact on community.
- 3.2 Undertake a cost benefit analysis on each property to ensure options for each property are clear and recorded.
- 3.3 Set up a project board to manage/agreed action with properties.
- 3.4 Utilise existing resources to identify and act to acquire and manage properties using Strategic Housing, Private Sector Housing, NPLaw and Property Services skills.
- 3.5 Reduce the number of long term empty homes in the borough.

The following options have been considered as part of this business case:

1. Do Nothing – To continue with the current level of empty properties.
2. Utilise Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) with immediate resale.
3. Utilise CPO with the options to either auction or refurbish the property with the potential to operate as: emergency temporary accommodation for Housing Options; Shared Ownership Scheme; resale.

### 3.0 Options

Option	Pros	Cons	Cost
1.Do nothing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No increased costs to the Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Empty homes numbers within the borough remain unchanged.</li> <li>Loss of income for empty properties with numbers impacting New Homes Bonus (NHB) and 10% reduction on C/Tax bill.</li> <li>No additional access to NHB funding.</li> <li>No potential reduction in anti-social behaviour</li> <li>Impact empty homes have on Tourism</li> <li>Costs in relation to Environmental Health – securing/inspecting properties.</li> </ul>	Cost neutral but if empty properties increase this will impact the NHB in further years.
2. CPO and immediate resale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPO's can be time limited to ensure properties are brought back into use with agreed timescales.</li> <li>Opportunities to bring back into use long term empty properties.</li> <li>Ability to target problem properties.</li> <li>C/Tax increased income</li> <li>Reduced anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>CPO's can trigger owners into action to bring properties back into use themselves.</li> <li>Access to the NHB for all properties brought back into use.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Properties without a disrepair notice could incur additional costs in relation to CPO.</li> <li>Possibility some owners may have issues with CPO process.</li> <li>With direct resale the loss of control over management of the properties, timescales to bring back into use and how the property might be reused.</li> </ul>	£100K

## Empty Property Project

Option	Pros	Cons	Cost
3. CPO with options to refurbish, offer shared ownership or resale.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities to bring back into use long term empty properties.</li> <li>• Ability to target problem properties.</li> <li>• C/Tax increased income</li> <li>• Reduced anti-social behaviour.</li> <li>• Access to the NHB for all properties brought back into use.</li> <li>• Option to utilise as a replacement for Temporary Accommodation leases which begin to end 2013.</li> <li>• Control over the management of the properties.</li> <li>• Potential to sell and recoup/increase income on original sale cost through utilisation of schemes to benefit local people.</li> <li>• Reduction in overall cost of temporary accommodation.</li> <li>• Opportunity to offer shared ownership through a variety of options.</li> <li>• Opportunity to create adapted properties.</li> <li>• Opportunity to extent the variety of temporary accommodation available.</li> <li>• Flexibility to sell properties on should the need diminish.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost to Capital Budget to start project.</li> <li>• Possibility that properties will not sell on if necessary, this can be mitigated by ensure the market is well researched and a full cost benefit analysis is undertaken on each property.</li> </ul>	Capital investment pot of £250K available as required annual return approx £55K plus NHB

## 4.0 Proposal

- 4.1 To work with owners to bring properties back into use utilising all available options including the ability to CPO properties is necessary.
- 4.2 To initiate a project to investigate, action and undertake CPO's of empty properties, in appropriate circumstances, for the benefit of the borough to reduce the overall number of empties within the area.
- 4.3 To utilise these properties to the maximum advantage either through re-sale, refurbishment and reuse or shared ownership.
- 4.4 To undertake a cost benefit analysis on all properties within the project to ensure both highest impact for the community and best value for the Authority.
- 4.5 To initiate a project board, to include Member representation, to consider and agreed the actions to ensure the most proactive and efficient operation of the project.

## 5.0 Benefits/Costs

### Option 2 – CPO and Re-sale

	Legal costs, advertising notices per property	£2,850
	Compensation payment to owner would be MV of property plus 7.5% if applicable.	
5.1	<b>Total Costs per property averaged over 50 properties</b>	<b>£2,850</b>

### Option 3 – Used as temporary accommodation

	Property identified to be retained for Temp Accom – CPO plus MV (£45,000 for example purposes only 3 bed terraced)	52,225
	Average refurbishment costs based on information from previous projects	20,000
5.1.1	<b>Total Cost</b>	<b>72,225</b>
	<b>Income</b>	
	LHA benefit income from Temporary Accommodation	<b>(5,940)pa.</b>
	LHA Management Fee	<b>(480) pa.</b>
	Capital Interest Charge plus repayment of debt per annum 6.5%	<b>4,695 pa.</b>
5.1.2	<b>Income per annum based on above example</b>	<b>(1,725)pa.</b>
	<b>Additional income NHB for 6 yrs £8,400</b>	<b>(1,400)pa.</b>

- 5.1.3 A typical cost to refurbish a typical 3 bed terrace house is in the order of £20,000. As identified by the SHIP project more significant problems, as in Southtown, would be in the order of £30,000. If reconfiguration of internal layouts was required to provide new self-contained units of accommodation the costs incurred would be in the order of £35,000 per unit based on the conversion of ex hotels / guesthouses. Any conversions of this nature would provide additional units and although not costed as an example would also be subject to a full cost benefit analysis.

Option 3 – CPO and refurbish for Shared Ownership

	Property identified to be retained for Temp Accom – CPO plus MV (£45,000 for example purposes only 3 bed terraced)	52,225
	Average refurbishment costs based on information from previous projects	20,000
	Less Capital from Shared Ownership scheme – MV of property after refurbishment (example only)	(37,000)
5.1.4	<b>Total benefit value</b>	<b>35,225</b>
	<b>Income</b>	
	50% rental income	<b>(2,784)pa.</b>
	Capital Interest Charge plus repayment of debt per annum 6.5%	<b>2,290 pa.</b>
5.1.5	<b>Income per annum based on above example</b>	<b>(494)pa.</b>
	<b>Additional income NHB for 6 yrs £8,400</b>	<b>1,400 pa.</b>

## 6.0 Recommendation

- 6.1 Identify target properties as pilots for the scheme.
- 6.2 Commence a Great Yarmouth Borough Council Empty Homes Project with an initial Capital investment of £250,000 to be drawn down as required.
- 6.3 Instigate a project board incorporating representation from Members, Technical, Financial and Managerial experience.

Subject: Housing and Communities Empty Homes Funding

Report to: CMB/EMT - Monday 30<sup>th</sup> April 2012  
Cabinet – Wednesday 9<sup>th</sup> May 2012

Report by: Head of Wellbeing Services

This report seeks approval for capital funding to utilise and opportunity with the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) to bring back into use empty homes.

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 As a Local Authority with Registered Provider status, we have approached the HCA for the Empty Homes allocation, originally allocated to Local Space to bring back into use empty properties in Great Yarmouth (25), to be transferred to Great Yarmouth BC. The approval of the Empty Homes Pilot project has dramatically changed the position of the authority and as such opened up the opportunity to take over this funding.
- 1.2 Great Yarmouth's proven track record in the delivery of projects such as SHARP 1&2 and SHIP have strengthened the authorities position in being able to bid for this funding. There is experience in-house of enforcement, specifically including Compulsory Purchase Orders should the owners of empty properties not wish to work in partnership with the LA
- 1.3 The SHARP projects dealt with over 20 properties and helped to create 120 new units of accommodation.

**2. CURRENT POSITION**

- 2.1 There is still a need within the Borough to be more proactive around empty properties to continue the work from SHARP and SHIP and now enhance the prospects on offer from the Empty Homes Pilot to deliver as many housing options as possible for the residents of Great Yarmouth.
- 2.2 In March 2012, a business case was made for the setting-up of a Great Yarmouth BC Empty Homes Project. The funding from this project will compliment the work to be undertaken with the funding from the HCA.
- 2.3 We are progressing in earnest with identifying the owners of empty properties and this will then inform the progress of both projects.
- 2.4 The original funding round for the HCA projects closed on the 23<sup>rd</sup> January at which time the successful bidder was Local Space with funding allocated from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Marcy 2012 to deliver 25 properties over a three year period.
- 2.5 With the notification that Local Space was unable to take up their allocation the Authority stepped in to try and ensure that the funding for Great Yarmouth wasn't lost to another area.

- 2.6 As a direct result of the Empty Homes Pilot project the HCA have acknowledged that Great Yarmouth Borough Council are in a position to be allocated the funding direct and this process is currently being given final panel consideration by the HCA and the outcome should be known by June 2012.
- 2.7 It is likely that funding from the HCA would not be finally released until August 2012 thus putting the team some 6 months behind schedule, it is therefore recommended that Capital Funding for this project is agreed subject to final HCA approval to give the team the ability to identify properties at the earliest opportunity and be ready to action the agreed 5 properties in the first year.
- 2.8 Properties acquired and refurbished with this funding will be let in accordance with the Authorities' local housing allocation policies, providing another affordable housing option for local residents. Once let the properties will be managed in-house.
- 2.9 This funding opportunity will allow us to bring back into use more long term empty properties (6+ months), complementing the existing work already on-going in connection with empty properties in Great Yarmouth. Often these properties attract anti-social behavior so, benefits occur for the wider community when the property is brought back into use as well as the opportunity to provide another affordable housing option for the local community.

### 3. COSTINGS

- 3.1 The HCA bid has been submitted utilising the costings undertaken by Local Space and therefore represents a higher cost model. Investigations undertaken in relation to the Empty Homes Pilot project identify an initial property purchase price 30% lower than the Local Space estimate which was not based on specific local knowledge or previous experience.
- 3.2 A total of 25 units overall are proposed with delivery as follows:

Year 2012/13 = 5 units  
 Year 2013/14 = 10 units  
 Year 2014/15 = 10 units

	Empty Property identified for HCA scheme – average total cost including compensation payment for CPO, renovations cost and fees as identified by Local Space	92,750
	HCA Funding per property	(17,000)
	<b>Income</b>	
	LHA benefit income	<b>(5,949)pa.</b>
	Capital Interest Charge plus repayment of debt per annum 6.5%	<b>4,924 pa.</b>
5.1.2	<b>Income per annum based on above example</b>	<b>(1,025)pa.</b>
	<b>Additional income NHB for 6 yrs £8,400</b>	<b>(1,400)pa.</b>

#### 4. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 Subject to final approval by the HCA to allocate a total maximum capital allowance of £1,893,750 over a three year period to finance the purchase and refurbishment of a total of 25 units.

##### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:**

£1.9 million capital funding to be available as follows:

- 2012/13 - £378,750
- 2013/14 - £757,500
- 2014/15 - £757,500

##### **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Compulsory Purchase Orders could be utilised if a negotiated way forward can not be achieved.

Does this report raise any legal, financial, sustainability, equality, crime and disorder or human rights issues and, if so, have they been considered?	Issues	
	Legal	Yes
	Financial	Yes
	Risk	Yes
	Sustainability	Yes
	Equality	No
	Crime and Disorder	No
	Human Rights	No
	Every Child Matters	No

Y:\HMLS\MemberServices\Robin Hodds\Reports\Master Report To Committees (New) - February 2008.doc

## SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

### WORK PROGRAMME 2013/14

SUBJECT	ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED	DATE OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	RESPONSIBLE OFFICERS/MEMBERS
Management Structure	To review the Management re-structure including all levels of management to examine the structure's resilience and if it is fit for purpose.	July 2013	Chief Executive Officer Leader
Efficiency Support Grant (ESG)	To review how the ESG will be spent on discretionary services or otherwise and what are the plans when ESG has ended.	September 2013	Director of Resources, Governance and Growth Deputy Leader
Senior Management Performance	To review the processes in place for reviewing Senior Management performance.	August 2013	Chief Executive Officer Leader
Tourism Review – Great Yarmouth Market Gates Travel Information Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entrances to Great Yarmouth</li> <li>Lack of toilets at the bus station</li> <li>Signposting</li> <li>Cleaning of pavements</li> <li>Pigeon droppings</li> </ul>	Sub-Committee set up to report direct to Scrutiny Committee  June/July 2013	Director of Customer Services J Wiggins (Norfolk County Council) Owners of Market Gates Network Rail First Bus

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED</b>	<b>DATE OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE OFFICERS/MEMBERS</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shop doorways</li> <li>• Adshel Shelter</li> </ul>		Town Centre Partnership
Review of Golden Mile Activities Including the Marina Centre	Review of area of Golden Mile including the Marina Centre.	TBA	Group Manager – Property Cabinet Member (Resources)
Budget Monitoring	Review and maintaining of Council's budget book.	Quarterly	Head of Resources, Governance and Growth
Review of Key Performance Indicators	To review and scrutinise existing services or functions of the Council.	Quarterly	Chief Executive Officer Leader
Town Centre Partnership Accounts & Report	To review the activities of the Town Centre Partnership.	Annual	Town Centre Manager
St George's Chapel and Pavilion	Structural faults found in Pavilion Café Building, and Consulting Engineers are investigating in consultation with the builders own engineers. Awaiting outcome of this investigation. Works to Chapel are almost complete. Review of overall situation, including original contract details.	August 2013	Conservation Officer Leader Peter Hardy

<b>SUBJECT</b>	<b>ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED</b>	<b>DATE OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEE</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE OFFICERS/MEMBERS</b>
North Beach Area – Britannia Pier to Salisbury Road (Incl The Waterways)	Review of future use of this area.	TBA  (NB: Yarmouth Area Committee to look at this first)	Group Manager (Property)
Land Holdings	Review of ground rent and leases for land holdings owned by the Council (except South Denes).	October/November 2013	Group Manager (Property)
Role of Ward Councillors	Review of Role and Activity of Ward Councillors.	July 2013	Cabinet Secretary  Group Manager (Governance)  Group Manager (Neighbourhoods)
Vauxhall Bridge	Review of programme of works to refurbish the Vauxhall Bridge.	August 2013	Conservation Officer  Director of Resources, Governance and Growth Chairman of GY Preservation Trust
Boarded Up Derelict Houses	To review the reasons for the number of Boarded Up Houses in the Borough and	September/October 2013	Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods

SUBJECT	ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED	DATE OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEE	RESPONSIBLE OFFICERS/MEMBERS
	possible future courses of action to bring them back into use.		Group Manager (Housing Services)
Public Information Pillars	Review of operation of the PIPs. (As agreed by Council on 23 July 2013.)	TBA	Group Manager (Tourism) Director of Customer Services

Ref: REGH/JB

W:\Central services\Member Services\MemberServices\Robin Hodds\Misc\SCRUTINY COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME 2013-14 (Rev 14.08.13).doc

**GREAT YARMOUTH BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**NOTICE OF CALL-IN**

**Report Number:**\_\_\_ COM 3 \_\_\_\_\_

**Subject:** Development of Council owned land off Salisbury Road

**Date of Consultation:** 16 October 2013 \_\_\_\_\_

The following three Members of Council give notice that the above proposed decision(s) should be referred to the Scrutiny Committee for consideration.

**Signed:**(1) Councillor Barry Stone (Scrutiny Committee Chairman)

(2)

Councillor Jim Shrimplin

(3)

Councillor Mary Coleman



**Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**The reason (s) for this Call-in is/are as follows:-**

No feasibility study has been carried out as to whether this is a cost effective way to develop this land. Has the option of a leasehold rather than a gift of the freehold been investigated and if so what was the outcome of that investigation? Could we as a Council benefit from future income if we keep the freehold?

Has the possibility of the NIF building the development and then selling the houses to an Association been investigated?

**NOTES:**

- (1) This notice must be signed by either the Chairman or any three Members of the Council (excluding Cabinet Members).
  - (2) Members should be aware that, as part of the call-in procedure and to avoid any unnecessary call-ins, a valid reason(s) will need to be given at the Scrutiny Committee for that call-in and, therefore, it is advisable for Members to contact the relevant officer to satisfy any minor queries or to discuss the proposed reason for the call-in prior to the formal submission of this form.
  - (3) Members should note that in order to make this call-in valid the reasons for the call-in MUST be specified in writing above.
- (NB) Members should note that, in accordance with Article 6, paragraph 6.5.3 of the Constitution, if the Head of Central Services is of the opinion that the call-in process is being abused, he may refuse to deal further with the call-in.

**Subject:**

Proposal for the development of Council owned land at Salisbury Road, Great Yarmouth.

**Is this decision for:**

Cabinet	Yes	Is it a Key Decision?	No
Single Member	No	Is it a Key Decision?	No
		Portfolio Holder:	Councillor Penny Linden
or a Key Decision for an Officer			No

**Date for Decision:**

16<sup>th</sup> October 2013

**For publication/  
Not for  
publication?**

**If not for publication, why is the information exempt?**  
Paragraph 9, Schedule 12A Local Government Act 1972  
Confidential items relating to a development agreement therefore, not for publication.

**Report by:**

Tracey Slater, Service Manager (Housing Options and Housing Strategy)

## **Matter for decision**

### **1. BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 This site was initially discussed at Cabinet on 19<sup>th</sup> September 2012 as a reference from the Yarmouth Area Committee where approval was given to apply for outline planning permission for bungalows for the over 55's on the site.
- 1.2 In January 2013 following a meeting with the Ward Councillors, it was agreed that the best way forward would be to approach Housing Associations to see if they were interested in developing the site.
- 1.3 There was also discussion on the proposed age covenant and in light of the restrictions this would place in terms of the allocation of the properties, it was decided that an option might be to give Housing Associations when looking to develop the site the option to relax the age restriction but remain sensitive to the surrounding area in the type of property built.
- 1.4 Three Housing Associations initially expressed an interest in looking at the potential development of the site with the premise that the site would be offered for free to allow the development of affordable housing. However, only one Housing Association, Saffron Housing Association have proceeded with the production of plans for the site.

### **2. CURRENT POSITION**

- 2.1 The scheme that is being proposed by Saffron Housing Association would see a total of 12 units built on the site:
  - 2 x 2 bedroom 4 person houses
  - 2 x 2 bedroom 4 person bungalows
  - 8 x 1 bedroom 2 person bungalows
- 2.2 This scheme provided the best fit for the site and provides affordable housing of the size/type currently in the most demand and that we have a shortage of.

### **3. PROPOSALS**

- 3.1 Initial discussions have been undertaken by Saffron Housing Association with the Planning Officer and Highways Officer and work is underway by our Valuers to understand if there are any formal accesses for existing properties onto the site.
- 3.2 Once this work is completed satisfactorily, a date will be set by Saffron Housing Association for pre-planning public consultation.

<b>Existing relevant Council policies:</b> Housing Allocations Policy
<b>Budget details:</b> All feasibility work has been carried out at nil cost to the Council.
<b>Consultations:</b> Pre-planning public consultation will take place.
<b>Financial Implications:</b> The site will be transferred to Saffron Housing Association at nil cost as the Council's contribution to the development as affordable housing.
<b>Legal Implications:</b> None at present
<b>Executive Board or Director Consultation:</b> Approved by Executive Management Team
<b>Possible options and recommendations</b> That subject to any outstanding matters being resolved, the site be transferred to Saffron HA at nil cost to allow the development of 12 affordable housing units.
<b>Background Papers</b>
Cabinet Minutes 19 <sup>th</sup> September 2012

**Notes:**

- (1) Non confidential reports to Executive must be publicly available for five days beforehand.
- (2) Non confidential reports dealing with key decisions to be taken by a single Executive Member or Officer must be publicly available for five days before the decision is taken. Whether or not such a report is confidential, a copy must be given as soon as practicable to the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Chairman.

**For Member Services Department Use**

Report No.

Date circulated to Members of Council

Expiry of call in

Called in

COM 3

18 October 2013

28 October 2013

<b>Subject</b> <b>Development of Council owned land at Salisbury Road, Great Yarmouth</b>
<b>Decision</b>  <p>That,subject to any outstanding matters being resolved, the site be transferred to Saffron Housing Association at nil cost to allow the development of 12 affordable housing sites.</p>
<b>Reasons</b>  <p>To allow the development of this site.</p>
<b>Options Considered and Rejected</b>  <p>None</p>
<b>Conflict of Interest</b>  <p>None</p>

Does this report raise any legal, financial, sustainability, equality, Crime and Disorder or Human Rights issues and, if so, have they been considered?	Issues	
	Legal	No
	Financial	Yes
	Risk	No
	Sustainability	Yes
	Equality	Yes
	Crime and Disorder	No
	Human Rights	No
	Every Child Matters	No

Y:\HMLS\MemberServices\Robin Hodds\Reports\Decision Form New - February 2008.rtf