

Cabinet
Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 8 November 2021
in the Council Chamber, County Hall, at 10am

Present:

Cllr Andrew Proctor	Chairman. Leader & Cabinet Member for Strategy & Governance.
Cllr Graham Plant	Vice-Chairman and Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy.
Cllr Margaret Dewsbury	Cabinet Member for Communities & Partnerships.
Cllr Tom FitzPatrick	Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation & Performance.
Cllr Andy Grant	Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste
Cllr Andrew Jamieson	Cabinet Member for Finance.
Cllr Greg Peck	Cabinet Member for Commercial Services & Asset Management.
Cllr Martin Wilby	Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.

Executive Directors Present:

James Bullion	Executive Director of Adult Social Services
Paul Cracknell	Executive Director of Strategy and Transformation
Helen Edwards	Monitoring Officer and Director of Governance
Simon George	Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services
Tom McCabe	Executive Director of Community & Environmental Services and Head of Paid Service.
Sara Tough	Executive Director Children's Services

Cabinet Members and Executive Directors formally introduced themselves.

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Bill Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention.

2 Minutes from the meeting held on Monday 4 October.

- 2.1 Cabinet agreed the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 4 October 2021 as an accurate record of the meeting.

3 Declaration of Interests

- 3.1 No interests were declared.

4 Matters referred to Cabinet by the Scrutiny Committee, Select Committees or by full Council.

4.1 No matters were referred to Cabinet.

5 Items of Urgent Business

5.1.1 The Chairman raised three items of urgent business:

5.1.2 The first item of urgent business was an urgent report published in the second supplementary paper titled "Disposal, acquisition and exploitation of property". This report would be taken after item 17 of the agenda.

5.1.3 The second item of urgent business was an announcement about the Norfolk Bus Service improvement, which would be given by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport; see paragraph 5.2 below.

5.1.4 The third item of urgent business was a confidential report titled "Confidential decision relating to a wholly owned company" which would be taken after "Reports of the Cabinet Member Delegated Decisions made since the last Cabinet meeting". Cabinet would be asked to recommend excluding the press and public from discussion of this item on the grounds that it was exempt under the Local Government Act 1972.

5.2 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport gave an announcement on the Norfolk Bus Service Improvement Plan:

- The Council had published the Norfolk Bus Service Improvement plan. This would enable bus operators and the Council to work together to improve bus services through simplifying ticketing, providing greener buses, improving bus stops, implementing bus priority measures and more frequent bus links to areas of work and commerce.
- It was intended through implementation of this plan to make public transport easier to use and a first-choice mode of transport.
- A full consultation would be launched in January 2022 so that people could give their views on what was important to them regarding public transport and accessibility.
- The Council would find out how much funding they would receive from the Government for this work by the end of the financial year 2021-22.

6 Public Question Time

6.1 The list of public questions and the responses is attached to these minutes at Appendix A.

7 Local Member Questions/Issues

7.1 The list of Local Member questions and the responses is attached to these minutes at Appendix B.

7.2.1 Cllr Paul Neale asked a supplementary question:

- Parish Councils had discretionary funding and were offered match funding by Norfolk County Council for highways improvements, in addition to Division Members' allowances. In non-parished areas with a high demand for improvements, Cllr Neale asked whether the Cabinet Member would offer Local Members a similar allowance by doubling the discretionary funding.

7.2.2 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport replied that the Parish Partnership scheme had been a very successful scheme over the past years; the extra Local Member budget had been increased to £10,000 so that each local Member could address priorities in their own division in partnership with local groups for highways issues.

7.3.1 Cllr Alexandra Kemp asked a supplementary question

- The response to her question about reducing spend on Children's Centre leases was that there were no plans to change this activity across the county. Cllr Kemp noted that investing in young people and resilient families was key to the county's wellbeing and asked if targeted youth support would be extended to areas of need such as wards within the 10% most deprived in the country

7.3.2 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services agreed to discuss further with Cllr Kemp and provide a written response.

8. Better Together, for Norfolk 2021-25

8.1.1 Cabinet received the report introducing the refreshed Norfolk County Council strategy "Better Together, for Norfolk 2021-2025" which made clear the Council's intent and represented the Council's strategic priorities.

8.1.2 The Executive Director of Transformation and Strategy introduced the report to Cabinet:

- The strategy presented with the report would be taken to Full Council at the end of November 2021 for approval.
- The policy environment and evidence base responding to recovery and issues related to the pandemic were reviewed.
- Engagement was carried out with partners through an engagement event with over 100 participants, "Rising to the Challenge Together" where priorities were reviewed. The public were engaged with through a resident panel survey and work with organisations.
- The Executive Director of Transformation and Strategy thanked Cabinet Members and Executive Directors for taking part in workshops involved in shaping the document.
- The strategy document presented with the Cabinet report would be amended before being presented to Full Council to take into account any issues discussed at the meeting and address minor issues around proof reading.

8.1.3 The Chairman introduced the report to Cabinet:

- The strategy was a living document which had been shaped by Cabinet Members and Executive Directors at the Rising to the Challenge Together event. The strategy had been refreshed, building on what went before and recognising that the previous 18 months had an impact on the lives of people, how the organisation works and what needed to be done to respond to challenges, building on strengths developed during the pandemic.
- During lockdown in 2020 some plans had to be put on hold, but long-term aspirations for the County didn't change. Norfolk strived to be one of highest performing counties in the country, overseeing economic growth and creating jobs for residents while cherishing the environment,

countryside and heritage.

- Every opportunity offered would be taken to ensure a good deal for Norfolk, to build a stronger, greener, fairer, more inclusive and more sustainable future for the County.
- As part of the strategy, it was important for Norfolk to be a place where people could start life well, live well, and age well with a vibrant economy, being entrepreneurial, supported by the right jobs, training and infrastructure. It was important for communities to be safe, healthy, empowered and connected with their independence respected and preserved.
- The strategy described levelling up and how the Council would make the most of this central policy through creating conditions for people to have good and healthy lives, removing barriers and discrimination for equal lives while ensuring Norfolk claimed its share of investment to drive growth and prosperity.
- The strategy was structured around five strategic priorities:
 - **A vibrant, clean and sustainable economy:** this was about creating high value jobs, growth, investment and infrastructure and digital connectives
 - **Better opportunities for children and young people:** prioritising better opportunities for children and young people, raising educational attainment and creating better employment opportunities
 - **Healthy, fulfilling and independent lives:** supported by themes of levelling up health, living well and better local services
 - **Strong, engaged and inclusive communities:** supporting and empowering urban, rural and coastal communities
 - **A greener, more resilient future:** recognising the physical environment, access to quality spaces and building community resilience on the way to net zero
- The strategy would inform what the council would do and how it would work with partners and would be an opportunity for leadership to agree common priorities and objectives, inform investment choices and the basis for delivery plans with clear measures for success. It would provide opportunities for working together with partners and central government to achieve common goals for a better future for Norfolk
- The Chairman moved the recommendations as set out in the report

8.2 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services endorsed and supported the policy noting the aspects of the strategy outlining better opportunities for young people. Given the impact of the pandemic on young people and families it was important to move forward with a positive message and for young people to know the council was behind them.

8.3 The Vice-Chairman noted that the priority for a vibrant and sustainable economy indicated the importance of ensuring a clear vision for Norfolk. The Vice-Chairman endorsed the aspects of the plan clearly setting out how outcomes for children would be improved.

8.4 The Cabinet Member for Finance commented that it was vital that processes were "de-siloed" across the County to ensure a better financial deal for Norfolk. Changing the relationship between public services and working with partners in the local public sector and voluntary sector would be key to this as implementation must be supported across the County.

- 8.5 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance noted that it was important to be ahead of the curve in ensuring digital technology was in place across the County, working with Government departments and district councils to ensure communities were empowered and rural communities were levelled up through provision of broadband, mobile telephony and other digital innovation, working with partners across the sectors.
- 8.6 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport noted information in the strategy on infrastructure and digital connectivity. He was pleased that the Council would be working to lobby for critical infrastructure such as dualling of the A47 and completing the Norwich Western Link which would improve Norfolk's economy and safety of the County's roads.
- 8.7 The Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste noted that the strategy was fundamental for the environmental policy to enable partners to work together to achieve net zero; working with neighbouring counties had allowed ideas to be brought forward. He also noted that the Flooding Alliance was based on the same principles so organisations could work together to bring about changes.
- 8.8 The Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships shared that the fire service was engaged in the plan, and had purchased 10 electric response vehicles to trial contributing to a reduction in emissions
- 8.9 The Chairman thanked Cabinet Members for their positive comments and noted that the document would be finalised before submission to Full Council.
- 8.10 Cabinet **RESOLVED**
1. To approve the Norfolk County Council strategy "Better Together, for Norfolk 2021-2025" as set out in Appendix 1 of this report
 2. To recommend the strategy to Full Council, to be adopted as part of the County Council Policy Framework

8.11 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

There is significant evidence nationally of the impact of Covid-19 on individuals, communities and businesses. In Norfolk, the strategy and priorities are informed by:

- National and local evidence on issues arising from the crisis
- ONS and Public Health data on different impacts of Covid-19
- Economic analysis by the Office of Budget Responsibility and the Bank of England
- Strategic foresight analysis of future impacts of Covid based on emerging forecasts
- Outputs of engagement events, such as the Rising to the Challenge Together common priorities
- Feedback from nearly 1000 members of the Norfolk residents' panel survey
- Priorities and outcomes identified through strategic partnerships
- Priorities identified within departments and reflected in "plans on a page" developed in April 2021 and engagement with Department Leadership Teams
- The ambitions and goals defined by Cabinet and Executive Directors

The strategy also seeks to respond to the government's policy agenda, with a particular focus on Levelling Up, Build Back Better: a plan for growth, and a range of policies on the future of health and social care.

8.12 **Alternative Options**

N/A

9 **Natural Norfolk: Progress on delivering the Environmental Policy**

- 9.1.1 Cabinet received the report setting out progress updates and proposed commitments relating to the Natural Norfolk programme and to Scope 1, Scope 2 and aspects of Scope 3 carbon emissions.
- 9.1.2 The Executive Director for Community and Environmental Services noted that many strands of activity were set out in the report. Section 4.6-4.23 showed how the Council would engage with the supply chain on their performance in this important area.
- 9.1.3 The Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste introduced the report to Cabinet:
- Norfolk County Council had adopted its new Environmental Policy in November 2019; since then, the Council had made progress in its commitment to achieving net zero across its estate by 2030, and in its work relating to the wider environment.
 - Key achievement to date were; reducing carbon emissions from Council buildings by 19%, reduced transport emissions from Council lease cars by 65%, 22,000 streetlights converted to LED, saving 12.5 tonnes of carbon, planting of 50,000 trees and promoting active travel as a preferred mode of transport.
 - The report showed how the Council would push further and faster to meet its ambitious target of net zero across its estate by 2030.
 - Over the coming months, the Council would work to achieve its 1 Million Trees for Norfolk planting pledge, create a local nature recovery plan for the county, ceasing to buy petrol or diesel vehicles for council use, purchasing 10 electric rescue vehicles, ceasing to buy oil and gas boilers for council buildings, shifting information onto the Cloud, transferring more streetlights to LED, developing a countywide cycling and walking plan, installing on-street charging points, and working with public transport contractors to reduce carbon emissions.
 - The recommendations set out in the report would change the way in which the County Council worked.
 - The Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste moved the recommendations as set out in the report.
- 9.2 The Cabinet Member for Finance pointed out that the document was timely in conjunction with COP26 and was a precursor to setting out the position before the passing of the Environmental Bill in Westminster. Norfolk County Council would be confirmed as the responsible entity for water management, cleaner air, waste management, biodiversity through nature recovery and protected landscape management. The Council would need authority and funding to

execute this responsibility and would lobby for funding to do this. A well-articulated procurement strategy would be key to carbon reduction; section 5 and annexes A and C of the report would be the basis for successful delivery of cost-effective carbon reduction as reductions would arise in large part due to contract changes. Gross emissions from buildings and streetlights fell by 46% due to changes in contracts and improvements in emissions from waste resulted from procurement of better contracts, for example.

- 9.3 The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management discussed that there had been a 68% reduction in the council's building estate carbon footprint since 2017. The council was also looking to make better use of technology to reduce travel on its estate and had seen carbon emissions from water consumption fall by 42% and taken the opportunity to deliver the biggest benefits such as installing LED lighting and improving insulation. £49,000 in external funding had been received to look at further decarbonisation of the estate, including at council buildings such as Gorleston Library, the Museum of Norwich at the Bridewell, and Gressenhall Farm & Workhouse. The County Hall refurbishment included many changes such as improvements to insulation, intelligent LED lighting and photovoltaic panels on the roof; other sites had fossil fuel heating systems removed and there were now 40 sites with low carbon heating in place. County Farms would support tenants to reduce their carbon footprint through schemes such as planting trees and planting more food to support with a decrease in food miles.
- 9.4 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services reported that work was underway with contractors to look at how the efficiency of new school buildings could be improved. The report presented to Cabinet was positive, identifying what had been done and what would be done in the future to reduce the County's carbon footprint, and he hoped that other large employers would take other similar steps.
- 9.5 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance spoke about the contribution of digital and transformation measures to the reduction in carbon footprint by moving information to the Cloud, reducing the need for electricity for local servers. Use of digital technology allowed buildings to be used less and in different ways. Digital solutions could be used to ensure planted trees were growing well, to monitor river levels and people's safety in the homes, reducing the number of miles needed to be driven by people delivering services.
- 9.6 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport reported that 195 streetlights would be upgraded to LED in Great Yarmouth. 15,000 streetlights would be upgraded by 2023 in addition to the 22,000 already upgraded which allowed carbon emissions to be cut and save money.
- 9.7 The Vice-Chairman noted that the report showed the proposals would result in a material reduction in greenhouse gases. The evidence and reasons for the decision indicated that these would work in line with the Better Together for Norfolk objectives.
- 9.8 The Chairman noted that in context with the LGA report, "local path to net zero", procurement was a key power that councils had to deliver net zero, councils had been delivering solutions to local problems for centuries, were asset owners,

and were conveners to bring together local partners. Norfolk received £6.5m in community renewal funding with a focus on environmental projects aligning with net zero objectives.

9.9 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to

1. Agree the proposed next steps in respect of Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions set out in the report and summarised in Annex A of the report.
2. Agree the proposed next steps in respect of other aspects of the Environmental Policy set out in the report and summarised in Annex B of the report.
3. Agree the proposed next steps in respect of Scope 3 emissions set out in the report and summarised in Annex C of the report.
4. Recognise that the Norfolk Pension Fund is committed to understanding and monitoring its exposure to climate related risks as a materially significant financial factor via its Investment Strategy Statement, as part of its wider fiduciary responsibilities. This includes regular oversight and formal monitoring of climate related exposures within the fund's public equity portfolios across a number of key metrics.
5. Commission the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services to report to Cabinet about the options for setting formal low carbon objectives in relation to companies where the County Council is the majority shareholder.
6. Agree the following matters with respect to the financial and procurement framework for carbon reduction.
 - a. Acknowledge that sustainability of transport investments is determined via Department for Transport evaluation tools.
 - b. Agree that in respect of non-transport investments there will not be a maximum payback period for carbon reduction projects where the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services agrees that the net present value of the project is positive, after allowing a reasonable contingency for risk.
 - c. Commission the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services to provide further guidance to Executive Directors on the use of a carbon 'price' in option appraisals for non-transport projects.
 - d. Commission Executive Directors, in consultation with the Director of Procurement, to evaluate contracts within their services as they fall due for replacement or extension, and proposals for new contracts, in order to:
 - i. identify any potential to reduce carbon emissions;
 - ii. consider the optimum balance between price and carbon reduction opportunities which can be achieved; and
 - iii. ensure that any identified cost pressures linked to carbon reduction in respect of their services are provided for within the Council's budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy.
 - e. Commission Executive Directors, in consultation with the Director of Procurement, to evaluate planned capital projects within their services, and capital contracts as they fall due for replacement or extension, in order to:
 - i. identify any potential to reduce whole-life carbon emissions;
 - ii. consider the optimum balance between price and low carbon which can be achieved; and

- iii. ensure that any identified cost pressures linked to carbon reduction in respect of their capital projects are provided for within capital budgets.
- f. Ask the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services to propose changes to the Contract Standing Orders and the Financial Regulations to enact recommendations 6a-6e above.
- 7. Agree that Natural Norfolk should be taken forward and developed as a vehicle for visible leadership on nature recovery and the environment including as a communication platform for the promotion of demonstrator projects and outreach initiatives such as the Gressenhall Environmental Hub.
- 8. Agree that the Council will continue to work in partnership in delivering the wider net zero ambitions for the region, providing leadership and support wherever possible, including working closely with Suffolk County Council, District Councils, the Norfolk Climate Change Partnership and the Integrated Care System

9.10 **Evidence and reasons for decision**

See section 7 of the report

9.11 **Alternative Options**

Cabinet could decide not to adopt the proposed Scope 1 and Scope 2 commitments. This would require more drastic action later to achieve the net zero commitment by 2030, and result in greater cumulative carbon emissions.

Cabinet could decide not to adopt the proposed Scope 3 commitments. This would not be congruent with the carbon neutral commitment.

Cabinet could decide not to approve the next steps related to the broader environmental policy. This would cause progress on delivering against the policy to stall.

Cabinet could decline to adopt the proposed financial and procurement framework, with the consequences set out at 7.4 above.

10 **Schools' Capital Programme**

- 10.1.1 Cabinet received the report setting out a summary of existing schools' capital funding sources, a summary of progress against the programme approved in August 2020, a schedule of schemes in the approved programme for 2021-2024+, a refresh to the profile of projected NCC borrowing to support the agreed programme and profile of anticipated expenditure based on current information.
- 10.1.2 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services introduced the report to Cabinet:
 - Paragraph 2.2 identified the basic sources of income such as Government grants and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).
 - Page 86 of the report identified what priorities there were, mainly in the Costessey area; Ormiston Academy and Sprowston Academy had now been expanded.
 - Approved schemes were shown on page 87 of the report and the formula

used for deciding when to build a new school.

- The Cabinet Member for Children's Services moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

10.2 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance was pleased to note that the Council was putting money into the future of the children of Norfolk by expanding and building schools when needed.

10.3 The Vice-Chairman commended this interesting report showing how the decision is made on how to develop and build new schools.

10.4 The Cabinet Member for Finance noted that £120m would be spent on new SEND (Special Educational Needs and Disabilities) schools funded from Norfolk County Council's budget which would provide positive outcomes to young people in Norfolk.

10.5 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to

- Endorse the proposed Schools' Capital Programme for the next three years and beyond, including new schemes added
- Agree to continue to review annually the funding gap, taking into account other sources of external funding which have come forward
- Endorse the impact of external grant funding received and revised financial profiling

10.6 Evidence and Reasons for Decision

The 'Norfolk multiplier' for new homes is 28.1 primary age children per 100 homes (4 per year group) and 14.5 secondary age children per 100 homes (3 per year group). This is an average, with some parts of the County producing higher numbers and other parts lower. New developments can produce new patterns of place demand, and therefore an average can allow for variation.

Development size	New primary places	New secondary places
500	140	73
800	225	116
1000	281	145
1500	422	218

10.7 Alternative Options

The alternative option would be to only build places within the capital grant. The implication of this is a likely sharp increase in school transport costs and number of journeys across the County to provide school places as children attend schools outside of their catchment area.

11 Norfolk Safeguarding Children Partnership Annual Report 2020-21

11.1.1 Cabinet received the report introducing the annual report summarising the work of the Norfolk Safeguarding Children Partnership between 1 July 2020 and 30 June 2021.

11.1.2 The Executive Director for Children's Services introduced the report to Cabinet:

- The report reflected changes in working together guidance in 2018, which established 3 statutory partners, the local authority, Police and Health to work together to own the plan and oversee the delivery of multi agency safeguarding arrangements in the County.
 - The report encompassed learning from the National safeguarding practice review panel and included the positive ways partners worked together during the pandemic when many services had shut down.
 - The partnership had invested in scrutiny and had produced a children's version of the plan in association with the "In Care Council", which was circulated to Cabinet Members.
 - The priorities for 2022 were protecting babies, neglect and child exploitation.
- 11.1.3 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services introduced the report to Cabinet:
- The Cabinet Member for Children's Services thanked partners, the NHS and the Police for their work on this report.
 - The young person's plan was an important development; the young people who were involved in its production had said they wanted to be involved in more projects like this and that they appreciated the positive message.
 - The Cabinet Member for Children's Services moved the recommendations as set out in the report.
- 11.2 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance felt it was positive to have a report from young people as it was important that adults listened to young people, as highlighted in the report.
- 11.3 The Chairman felt the report and plan demonstrated that a considerable amount of work was being carried out by the partnership.
- 11.4 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to
- 1) endorse the content of the report
 - 2) proactively share this report with partner organisations with whom they have contact and actively encourage their involvement with NSCP's work
 - 3) ask all elected members to proactively promote this report using their social media accounts.
- 11.5 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**
- A recent review of the Reform to Safeguarding Arrangements conducted by Sir Alan Wood (the Wood review, published May 2021) places clear accountability to the three statutory partners for governance arrangements for their local plan. The annual report is a key mechanism for holding the partners to account.
- As noted in the report, the National Panel also undertake an annual analysis of annual reports to monitor the national response to the safeguarding system.
- 11.6 **Alternative Options**
- N/A
- 12 Norfolk Safeguarding Annual Report for 2020-21 – Safeguarding adults during a global pandemic**
- 12.1.1 Cabinet received the report summarising the work of the Norfolk Safeguarding

Adults Board, the wider partnership's adult safeguarding activity during 2020/21 and work done to safeguard those at risk of abuse and harm in very challenging and fast changing circumstances of the response to the Covid-19 pandemic.

12.1.2 Heather Roach, Chair of Norfolk Safeguarding Adults Board, introduced the report to Cabinet:

- The Norfolk Safeguarding Adults Board was a statutory board comprising the Local Authority, police, health partners and other partners.
- Safeguarding for adults related to adults with care and support needs such as dementia, learning disabilities or other needs who may be experiencing harm or abuse and were unable to protect themselves due to their needs.
- The report included the period at the start of pandemic; in this time, safeguarding remained in focus, and the board managed business through an executive group which met frequently and via virtual board meetings which commenced in July 2020.
- Professional curiosity was important and in line with this the "see something, hear something, say something" campaign was launched
- No safeguarding adult reviews had been published in the reporting period.
- There was more demand, more complexity and stretched resourcing across the adult safeguarding landscape. It was noted as important for all partners to intervene early and work collaboratively with other boards involved in safeguarding.

12.2 The Chairman suggested a further report was brought back to Cabinet in 3-4 months' time, updating Cabinet on progress on work undertaken by the Norfolk Safeguarding Adults Board.

12.3 The Executive Director for Adult Social Services thanked police, health and all other partners who were involved in safeguarding over the past year.

12.4 The Chairman moved the recommendations as set out in the report and added a third recommendation for Heather Roach to return in 3-4 months with a report on progress.

12.5 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to

- a) Agree the contents of the annual report 2020/21
- b) Promote the work of NSAB to NCC partner organisations and stakeholders
- c) Ask the Chair of NSAB to return in 3-4 months' time with a further report providing an update on progress.

12.6 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

N/A

12.7 **Alternative Options**

None identified

13 Integrated Community Equipment Service (ICES)

13.1.1 Cabinet received the report setting out arrangements for the Integrated Community Equipment Service contract, providing equipment to enable children and adults who require assistance to perform essential activities of daily living, to

maintain their health and autonomy to live as full a life as possible.

- 13.1.2 The Executive Director for Adult Social Services introduced the report to Cabinet:
- This service was essential for the independence of adults and children
 - The contract was a formal partnership between health partners, Norfolk County Council and Suffolk County Council and would be a 10 year contract
 - There was now a higher need for the service and more environmental issues as well as higher technological opportunities.
- 13.2 The Chairman noted that through the re-procurement the Council were looking to deliver more from the contract as set out on page 63 of the report and achieve greater value for money.
- 13.3 The Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste endorsed the report, and noted that, in the past, working equipment had been taken to recycling centres. Therefore, he was pleased to see changes had been made to ensure that equipment would continue to be used when it was still in working order.
- 13.4 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to
- a) Approve commencement of this essential re-procurement, delegating responsibility to the Executive Director of Adult Social Services, in conjunction with key stakeholders, including the Head of Procurement, to award the contract
 - b) Delegate responsibility to the Adult Social Services Director of Commissioning to manage the re-procurement

13.5 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

This re-procurement will proceed in accordance with Public Contract rules

13.6 **Alternative Options**

There is no option to not expose this service to formal re-procurement, the only options are in relation to method. The preferred method is competitive dialogue as detailed within 8.1.1 of the report.

14 **Limited Company Consents**

- 14.1.1 Cabinet received the report setting out proposals for the creation of a new company and appointment of Directors.
- 14.1.2 The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management introduced the report to Cabinet:
- The creation of new limited companies required consent of Cabinet.
 - It was proposed that the new limited company, Bowlers Green Estate Management Ltd, be created and NCC directors appointed as set out in appendix A of the report.
 - Repton Property Developments Ltd needed companies to be set up to manage agreed areas of development such as open spaces and private roads in accordance with section 106. The proposed company would be owned and controlled by Repton until after sale of all the plots. After this time responsibility for the estate would be transferred to residents of

Bowlers Green to own and run.

- The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services had reviewed the list of directors and agreed they were suitable
- The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

14.2 **Cabinet RESOLVED**

1. To approve the formation of a new subsidiary company of Repton Property Developments Limited, Bowlers Green Estate Management Ltd.
2. Once created, approve the appointment of NCC directors to the new company as detailed in Appendix A of the report.

14.3 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

This is a common approach for the management of open space and private roads on new estate.

14.4 **Alternative Options**

No viable alternative.

15 **Business Rates Pool – Annual Report 2020-21 and Pooling Decision 2022-23**

15.1.1 Cabinet received the report providing an overview of the 2020-21 Business Rates Pool, as well as providing an update on the potential for a 2022-23 Pool.

15.1.2 The Cabinet Member for Finance introduced the report to Cabinet:

- The decision to retain the levy on business rates growth for use in supporting economic growth had supported the county well.
- If approved this initiative would provide an additional £6m for the County.
- It was clear from previous years that the best value was achieved from supporting strategic schemes across the county rather than splitting the pool. 44% of the fund would be overseen by the County Council's economic development team so they would be able to supply oversight into developing plans.
- Last year, 2020-21, the Council did not oversee development of a pool due to uncertainty caused by the pandemic.
- Use of funds in 2020-21 as set out in appendix 1 of the report showed how key infrastructure schemes were primed across the county to promote economic growth and key financial wellbeing.
- Proposals for use of the pool in 2022-23 were covered in section 5 of the report. The pool would be split over 7 districts and the County Council if approved by Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities and not revoked by the districts, the balance retained by the Council would be used across the county for overall economic development
- The Cabinet Member for Finance moved the recommendations as set out in the report

15.2 The Chairman noted that the Council would look to ensure the Council's share was used in a strategic manner.

15.3 The Vice-Chairman noted that, moving forward, the bulk of the funding would be

used for economic development across the county with some going to districts to invest in schemes in their areas.

15.4 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to

1. Note the performance of the Norfolk Business Rates Pool and endorse the decisions taken by Norfolk Leaders in respect of the allocation of 2020-21 (and prior year) Pool resources (section 3);
2. Endorse the use of Norfolk County Council's share of the 2020-21 retained levy (as shown in Table 1), noting that that a reconciliation process and potential adjustment (including a claw back of overpayment) may be required in the event of audit adjustments to District 2020-21 NNDR3 returns being made (section 4); and
3. Endorse the application and governance arrangements for the 2022-23 Norfolk Business Rates Pool (section 5).

15.5 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

N/A

15.6 **Alternative Options**

N/A

16 Finance Monitoring Report 2021-22 P6: September 2021

16.1.1 Cabinet received the report giving a summary of the forecast financial position for the 2021-22 Revenue and Capital Budgets, General Balances, and the Council's Reserves as at 31 March 2022, together with related financial information.

16.1.2 The Cabinet Member for Finance introduced the report to Cabinet:

- At the end of September 2021, pressures building in demand led departments had come to a fore with a projected overspend in children's services of £3.5m, partially offset by a reduction in interest payments.
- This overspend was largely demand led; the key drivers, social care placements influenced by home to school transport and education trading were caused by pressures which should be mitigated as we start to stabilise post pandemic.
- The Executive Director and leadership team would work to partially offset the overspend over the remainder of the financial year 2021-22.
- The delivery of 2 further manifesto pledges was confirmed: £10m for the new Pot Hole Fund for Highways and £1m for the Road Safety Community Fund. These, along with ongoing capital projects where successful lobbying had resulted in funding being awarded to the county were shown in appendix 3 of the report
- The Cabinet Member for Finance moved the recommendations as set out in the report

16.2 The Chairman noted that the key information in the report discussed the work to be carried out to reduce the overspend so a net budget could be delivered and savings could continue to be delivered.

16.3 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services discussed the robust system in

place in Children's Services to manage budgets. Children's Services was a demand led service and investment in transformation had resulted in a reduction in spend, which would continue to be delivered. Covid-19 had had an impact on the budget of the department and on the mental health of young people, increasing pressures. Building new Special Educational Needs and Disabilities schools would support reducing the spend on home to school transport as well as benefiting children who would not have to travel as far to school.

- 16.4 The Chairman acknowledged it was important to ensure the right provision was provided for children through working with providers and ensuring the right prices were charged for services
- 16.5 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport welcomed the money for the Pot Hole Fund which would improve highways across the county and the Road Safety Community Fund which would improve road safety for all highway users in Norfolk.
- 16.6 Cabinet **RESOLVED**
1. To recognise the approval by County Council of the recommendation to fund the following Highways projects:
 - £10m for the new Pot Hole Fund for Highways spread across 4 years (as set out in Appendix 3 – Table 1)
 - £1m for the Road Safety Community Fund to be funded by the County Council (as set out in Appendix 3)
 2. To recommend to County Council the net addition of £1.724m to the capital programme to address capital funding requirements as set out in detail in capital Appendix 3, paragraph 4.1.
 3. Subject to County Council approval of recommendation 2 and given County Council approval of recommendation 1, to delegate:
 - 3.1) To the Director of Procurement authority to undertake the necessary procurement processes including the determination of the minimum standards and selection criteria (if any) and the award criteria; to shortlist bidders; to make provisional award decisions (in consultation with the Chief Officer responsible for each scheme); to award contracts; to negotiate where the procurement procedure so permits; and to terminate award procedures if necessary;
 - 3.2) To the Director of Property authority (notwithstanding the limits set out at 5.13.6 and 5.13.7 of Financial Regulations) to negotiate or tender for or otherwise acquire the required land to deliver the schemes (including temporary land required for delivery of the works) and to dispose of land so acquired that is no longer required upon completion of the scheme;
 - 3.3) To each responsible chief officer authority to:
 - (in the case of two-stage design and build contracts) agree the price for the works upon completion of the design stage and direct that the works proceed; or alternatively direct that the works be recompeted
 - approve purchase orders, employer's instructions, compensation events or other contractual instructions necessary to effect changes in contracts that are necessitated by discoveries, unexpected ground conditions, planning conditions, requirements arising from detailed design or minor changes in scope

- subject always to the forecast cost including works, land, fees and disbursements remaining within the agreed scheme or programme budget.
 - That the officers exercising the delegated authorities set out above shall do so in accordance with the council's Policy Framework, with the approach to Social Value in Procurement endorsed by Cabinet at its meeting of 6 July 2020, and with the approach set out in the paper entitled "Sourcing strategy for council services" approved by Policy & Resources Committee at its meeting of 16 July 2018.
4. To recognise the period 6 general fund forecast revenue **net overspend of £3.379m**, noting also that Executive Directors will continue to take measures to reduce or eliminate potential over-spends where these occur within services;
 5. To note the COVID-19 funding available of **£84.027m**, including £23.381m brought forward from 2020-21;
 6. To recognise the period 6 forecast of 95% savings delivery in 2021-22, noting also that Executive Directors will continue to take measures to mitigate potential savings shortfalls through alternative savings or underspends;
 7. To note the forecast General Balances as at 31 March 2022 of **£23.763m**.
 8. To note the expenditure and funding of the revised current and future 2021-25 capital programmes.

16.7 Evidence and Reasons for Decision

Three appendices are attached to this report giving details of the forecast revenue and capital financial outturn positions:

Appendix 1 summarises the revenue outturn position, including:

- Forecast over and under spends
- Covid-19 grant income
- Changes to the approved budget
- Reserves
- Savings

Appendix 2 summarises the key working capital position, including:

- Treasury management
- Payment performance and debt recovery.

Appendix 3 summarises the capital outturn position, and includes:

- Current and future capital programmes
- Capital programme funding
- Income from property sales and other capital receipts.

Additional capital funds will enable services to invest in assets and infrastructure as described in Appendix 3 section 4 of the report

16.8 Alternative Options

In order to deliver a balanced budget, no viable alternative options have been identified to the recommendations in this report. In terms of financing the proposed capital expenditure, no further grant or revenue funding has been

identified to fund the expenditure, apart from the funding noted in Appendix 3 of the report.

17 Strategic and Financial Planning 2022-23

- 17.1.1 Cabinet received the report representing a key milestone in the development of the 2022-23 Budget providing an opportunity for Cabinet to consider saving proposals prior to wider consultation.
- 17.1.2 The Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services stated that, as set out in paragraph 14.1 of the report, “after reviewing the currently available information, the Section 151 Officer anticipates recommending that Members agree the maximum council tax increase available within the referendum threshold, plus the deferred amount from 2021-22”.
- 17.1.3 The Cabinet Member for Finance introduced the report to Cabinet:
- The spending review had provided a multi-year settlement which, assuming it was mirrored by a multi-year settlement in local government spending review, would help the council set a sustainable medium term financial strategy
 - Protection of services at this time was paramount along with delivering the Council’s promise to protect the environment and ensure infrastructure was in place to deliver Norfolk’s economic development.
 - £24.5m new savings proposed so far was intertwined with transformation programmes; the Adult Social Services vision was to support people to be independent, resilient and well. Prevention and early intervention, development of alternative to care and more in-house care was helping Children’s Services to control costs over the medium term. Both these demand lead departments were impacted by the pandemic and needed to catch up.
 - Cost pressures included social care costs and demand pressures linked to covid-19 impacts and other demographic pressure including home to school costs, and inflation pressures such as energy, fuel and utilities.
 - Norfolk County Council welcomed the Government announcement of £4.8bn funding for local authorities. However, £4.8bn had become £1.6bn per year with no uplift for inflation which may include other grants and payments, for example it was unclear whether funding for national insurance would be included. No additional funding for Covid-19, no uplift in the public health grant, no resolution of the high needs block deficit and no progress on fair funding or review of business rates reform had been received.
 - Details of other announcements such as funding of youth services or support for families were being awaited so the final figure to be received from government could vary. Executive Directors would be asked to identify up to a further £5m savings in the short term should Government funding prove insufficient once announcements were made mid-December 2021.
 - A multiyear settlement would allow management to look at transformational savings by a review of how services were delivered and how people were used, as shown in recommendation 7. External analysis was in place to optimise use of staff and to consult more widely on service and delivery in 2022.
 - Last year, 2020-21, £18m was retained in a general covid reserve in case

funding for additional Covid-19 pressures was not continued in the forthcoming financial year. This would help with the pressures referred to above.

- Government confirmed that it expects demographic and unit cost pressures to be met through council tax, social care precept and long-term efficiencies. Each year demographics represented an £18-20m cost increase for Norfolk
- SR21 set out that £3.6bn of social care reform funding would go to Local Authorities, but additional cost pressures associated with this remained to be fully understood once central Government had provided details.
- Growth in core spending power figures quoted in SR21 included social care reform funding therefore the core spend was driven by social care increase assumed to be a 3% annual increase. Grant funding was increasing in real term by 0.6% depending on inflation of 2.2%.
- Government expected councils to meet all cost pressures from 2023-24 from council tax and savings, and Norfolk would rise to this challenge. Without further external funding for local authorities, the Council believed this would be unsustainable for Local Authorities across the country and therefore would continue to work with MPs and lobby for additional funding for future years of spending reviews to meet additional cost pressures without ongoing reliance on unsustainable tax increases
- It was prudent to recommend that council followed the central guidance of recommending a 2.99% increase in council tax consisting of a 1% adult social care precept increase and 1.99% council tax increase.
- The Cabinet Member for Finance moved recommendations 1-7 and 9-13 as set out in the report.
- The Cabinet Member for Finance moved an amendment to recommendation 8 as follows: *“To note the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services’ advice about the sustainability of the Medium Term Financial Strategy position (section 13), noting also the wider uncertainty about funding levels and cost pressures for 2022-23. Recommendation 5 sets out Cabinet’s intention to seek, as planned, a total council tax increase of 2.99% for 2022-23 made up of 1.99% general council tax and 1.00% adult social care precept and therefore in that context to agree to consult the public on that level of increase”*

17.2 The Chairman noted the responsibilities around demand led pressures in Adult Social Services and Children’s Services which would continue. It would be important to look at efficiency of operation, cost base and ways of working. All local authorities across the country were also facing difficult financial positions and it was also the case that residents were facing an increase in national insurance contributions, an increase in cost of living and an increase in interest rates. However, it was necessary to support the Council’s financial position and he supported and seconded the amendment to recommendation 8.

17.3 The Vice-Chairman noted that over the past years of austerity, councils had made many financial and efficiency savings. Over the past years, Adult Social Services and Children’s Services had not received adequate funding from central Government, resulting in money being taken from other services to fund these essential services. Cabinet would therefore continue to lobby government for adequate funding for these services.

17.4 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance noted the

importance in continuing to seek funding from Government for services and carrying out a full review of how services operate.

- 17.5 The Chairman reported that a meeting had recently been held with Norfolk MPs to discuss the issues raised regarding funding, and such meetings would continue to be held.

17.6 Cabinet **RESOLVED**

1. To consider and comment on the County Council strategy as set out in section 2 and how the Budget process is aligned to the overall policy and financial framework;
2. To consider the potential implications of Government announcements about Social Care, the considerable uncertainty remaining in respect of these, which may result in additional cost pressures in the medium to longer term, and agree that these should be reflected, where possible, in the 2022-23 Budget;
3. To consider the latest details of announcements made at the Spending Review 2021 and Autumn Budget 2021, and note that the outcome of these national funding announcements, alongside the Local Government Finance Settlement, will have potentially significant impacts on the 2022-23 Budget position, which will not be fully known until later in the process;
4. To consider and agree for planning purposes the latest assessment of significant areas of risk and uncertainty around emerging budget pressures for the 2022-23 Budget and Medium Term Financial Strategy, which remain to be resolved and which may have a material impact on budget planning (paragraph 13.4);
5. To confirm that Cabinet's intention is to seek, as planned, a total council tax increase of 2.99% for 2022-23 made up of 1.99% general council tax and 1.00% adult social care precept deferred from 2021-22;
6. To direct Executive Directors to seek to identify further recurrent savings of £5.000m and to report to Cabinet in January 2022;
7. To agree to undertake a full review of how the Council operates to deliver its future services and strategy;
8. To note the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services' advice about the sustainability of the Medium Term Financial Strategy position (section 13), noting also the wider uncertainty about funding levels and cost pressures for 2022-23. Recommendation 5 sets out Cabinet's intention to seek, as planned, a total council tax increase of 2.99% for 2022-23 made up of 1.99% general council tax and 1.00% adult social care precept and therefore in that context to agree to consult the public on that level of increase
9. To consider and agree the proposed savings as set out in sections 7-12 (tables 5-10) to be taken forward in budget planning for 2022-23, subject to final decisions about the overall Budget in February 2022, noting the level of savings already included from the 2021-22 Budget process (table 2);
10. To agree that public consultation (as set out in section 5) and equality impact assessment (as set out in section 21) be undertaken on the 2022-23 Budget and saving proposals as set out in sections 7-12 (tables 5-10), and the level of council tax and Adult Social Care precept for 2022-23, as set out in section 14 and table 11;
11. To note the responsibilities of the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services under section 114 of the Local Government Act 1988 and section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003 to comment on the

robustness of budget estimates as set out in section 13, and having regard to the level of savings required for 2023-24, to direct Officers to bring forward proposals to support early development and identification of saving proposals for 2023-24 with a focus on transformational activity;

12. To agree the proposed next steps in the Budget planning process for 2022-23, and the remaining Budget planning timetable (Appendix 1); and

13. To note and thank Select Committees for their input into the Budget development process for 2022-23 in July, and to invite Select Committees to comment further on the detailed saving proposals set out in this report when they meet in November 2021 (section 23).

17.7 Evidence and Reasons for Decision

The County Council continues to engage with Government, MPs and other stakeholders to campaign for adequate and sustainable funding for Norfolk to continue to deliver vital services to residents, businesses and visitors. The Council looks forward to Government issuing guidance on financial planning assumptions, particularly indicative funding allocations for 2022-23, as soon as possible. The Council's MTFS planning builds on the position agreed in February 2021 and this continues to be updated as more reliable information about cost pressures and funding impacts emerges through the process. The proposals in the report reflect a prudent response to the challenges and uncertainties present in the 2022-23 planning process and will ultimately support the Council to develop a robust budget for the year.

17.8 Alternative Options

This report forms part of the framework for developing detailed saving proposals for 2022-23 and at this stage no proposals have been agreed, meaning that a range of alternative options remain open.

In addition, there are a number of areas where Cabinet could choose to consider different parameters for the budget setting process, such as:

- Considering alternative approaches to the development of savings from those proposed.
- Adopting an alternative allocation of targets between services, or retaining a higher or lower target corporately.
- Considering an alternative timetable within the time constraints required to develop proposals, undertake public consultation, and meet statutory deadlines for the setting of council tax.
- Changing assumptions within the MTFS (including the level of council tax) and therefore varying the level of savings sought.

Final decisions about the overall shape of the 2022-23 Budget, savings, and council tax will not be made until February 2022, when they will be informed by Local Government Finance Settlement figures, forecasts supplied by District Councils, and the findings of EQIA and public consultation activity.

The deliverability of all saving proposals will continue to be kept under review by the Section 151 Officer as further detailed implementation plans are developed and up until final budget setting proposals are presented to Cabinet in February 2022.

18 Disposal, acquisition and exploitation of property

18.1.1 Cabinet received the report setting out proposals aimed at supporting Norfolk County Council priorities by exploiting properties surplus to operational requirements, pro-actively releasing property assets with latent value where the operational needs can be met from elsewhere and strategically acquiring property to drive economic growth and wellbeing in the County.

18.1.2 The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management introduced the report to Cabinet:

- This proposal was required to be brought to Cabinet for approval due to the length of the proposed lease
- It was proposed that the adjoining academy, Synergy Multi Academy Trust, would run the childcare centre which was on the same site. The site was already run as a nursery, Litcham Childcare Centre.
- The proposal was the only suitable option for use of the site.
- The lease was proposed to be on the same terms of the existing lease and for rent to be nil.
- The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

18.2 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to agree to the granting of a supplemental lease of Litcham Child Care Centre, Weasenham Road PE32 2QT to Synergy MAT for use as nursery and early years provision on the agreed terms.

18.3 Evidence and Reasons for Decision

This proposal ensures the continued use of the Litcham Child Care Centre for nursery and early years provision.

18.4 Alternative Options

No viable alternative.

19 Reports of the Cabinet Member and Officer Delegated Decisions made since the last Cabinet meeting:

19.1 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to **note** the Delegated Decisions made since the last Cabinet meeting.

20 Exclusion of the Public

20.1 Cabinet was asked to exclude the press and public from the meeting on the grounds that the report "Confidential decision relating to a wholly owned company" and was presented with the results of the public interest test.

20.2 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to exclude the press and public for discussion of the report "Confidential decision relating to a wholly owned company" on the grounds that it was exempt under paragraphs 1 & 2 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.

21 Confidential decision relating to a wholly owned company.

- 21.1 Cabinet received the urgent, confidential report by the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services.
- 21.2 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to agree the recommendations as set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 11.59

The Chairman

Cabinet
8 November 2021
Public & Local Member Questions

Agenda item 6	Public Question Time
6.1	<p>Question from Jennifer Tabecki</p> <p>The Association of Directors of Environment, Economy, Transport and Planning (ADEPT) recognises that there are key barriers to local government being part of the framework which must deliver the Government's Statutory Carbon Reduction Target.</p> <p>These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Insufficiency of funding and the complexity of funding streams, with reliance on competitive bidding and 2. lack of local expertise <p>130 councils have already signed up to the Association's (ADEPT) Coalition who's 'Blueprint for Accelerating Climate Action for a Green Recovery at the Local Level' aims at pressurising central government to work to overcome these barriers, including proper local funding.</p> <p>Will Norfolk County Council add their name and influence to this Coalition?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste Norfolk County Council acknowledges the need for both additional external resources and the development of in-house capacity and skills in the delivery of our goals relating to net zero.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council has also prioritised working in partnership with expert organisations and bodies including the Tyndall Centre, UEA and with key organisations locally, including District Councils and Suffolk County Council.</p> <p>The Council's role as part of the Norfolk Climate Change Partnership (NCCP) is also very helpful both in delivering our own organisational strategy, and in coordinating a successful countywide approach in terms of securing external resources and in developing new skills and technologies to support our delivery.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council is an active member of ADEPT and will continue to work with this body on important matters such as this one.</p>
6.2	<p>Question from Sarah Eglington</p> <p>Recognising that nearly 80% of councils have declared a climate emergency, including our neighbouring counties of Suffolk, Cambridgeshire and Lincolnshire, Norwich Friends of the Earth would like to ask how Norfolk County Council can justify not doing so?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste The report to Cabinet on the Environmental Policy sets out the significant amount of work already successfully completed in terms of climate change, as</p>

	<p>well as setting out the hard work which still lies ahead if we are to reach our goal of achieving net zero across our council estate by 2030, and in fully supporting our partners across the county. As previously stated, our focus remains on delivery.</p> <p>Supplementary question from Sarah Eglington</p> <p>If Norfolk County Council are acknowledging that there is a climate crisis and are satisfied that the aspirations stated within their environmental policies are achievable, when will they be publishing their baseline statistics against which they will measure success, and the target dates by which that success must be achieved?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste</p> <p>The report detailing progress on the Environmental Policy sets out the Council's achievements to date, many of which are of national significance.</p> <p>Details of the Council's progress around Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions are included in the report, whilst Annex A of the report – Summary of Commitments for Scope 1 and Scope 2; Annex B – Summary of commitments for the Environmental Policy, and Annex C – Summary of commitments for Scope 3, set out the next steps for the Council in terms of priorities for achieving net zero across our estate by 2030.</p> <p>A further update on progress including emissions monitoring will be provided to Council in the New Year.</p>
6.3	<p>Question from Daryl Long</p> <p>What action is the County Council taking regarding tree replacement in Norwich and when? Having taken over this responsibility from the City Council, the County Council appears to be taking no responsibility for tree replacement within a realistic timeframe. As we lose our trees we gain more tarmac and parked cars. Budget pressures cannot be offered as an excuse, there must be a designated and protected budget to ensure all trees are replaced and, indeed, more planted. The environmental impact of city trees, or lack of, is well understood. If you understand the need for cycle paths then you must understand the need for trees in our city.</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste</p> <p>The Council has a countywide action plan to plant an additional 1 million trees across the whole county. We also aim to replace trees that have been removed, subject to identifying a suitable location and funding being available. Where these are removed due to highway improvement schemes, usually a greater number of trees are planted as replacements. For highway maintenance, the current funding position does mean that we will prioritise replanting in conservation areas. The time taken to replant will depend on a number of factors, such as other proposed works, whether the location is suitable and funding. Tree planting tends to be done in a limited time window each year and that will also affect the timescale for replacement.</p>

**Cabinet
8 November 2021
Local Member Questions**

Agenda item 7	Local Member Issues/Questions
7.1	<p>Question from Cllr Paul Neale</p> <p>For the last 11 years, due to a backlog of highways maintenance, the council has reallocated approximately 67% of the Integrated Transport allocation into Highway maintenance. This means about £30m of local highways improvements have not been possible, things like zebra crossings, road safety signage, traffic calming measures, and changes to waiting or parking zones. In 2017 county members were allocated annual discretionary budgets to tackle some of these but in total only £2.85m has been made available. That's only 9.5% of what would have been available in those 11 years. Could the council increase discretionary budgets to a realistic workable amount to meet the back log in our districts.</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport</p> <p>The local member discretionary budgets have recently been increased from £6,000 per year to £10,000, totalling some £840,000 available per annum. The scope of the funding has been widened this year to include environmental initiatives such as the installation of electrical vehicle charging points and tree planting.</p> <p>Following the recent Budget, we are currently awaiting details of Norfolk's allocations for highway structural maintenance and improvements. It is understood it will be a 3-year settlement.</p> <p>These will inform the recommendations in the Highway Capital Programme report 2022-25 to Cabinet, planned for March 2022. It will include consider the proposed balance between maintenance and improvement spend. However, it remains prudent asset management to focus on maintaining Norfolk's highways asset whilst a maintenance backlog exists.</p>
7.2	<p>Question from Cllr Jamie Osborn</p> <p>Recommendation 8 of the report states that: "the Council will continue to work in partnership in delivering the wider net zero ambitions for the region". There is nothing in the report that details what work has been going on so far, progress on reducing area-wide emissions, or pathways to net zero. It appears that no effort has been made to assess what emissions reductions are needed or how they will be achieved. Can the cabinet member present me with evidence that this work has been undertaken?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste</p> <p>The report detailing progress on the Environmental Policy includes several nationally recognised, major pieces of work which have</p>

	<p>involved successfully working with partners, including development of the Natural Capital Compendium for Norfolk and Suffolk, working with UEA and Suffolk County Council; the development of a new Pollinator Action Plan for Norfolk; and the Wendling Beck Exemplar Project (WPEP).</p> <p>Annex C of the report – Summary of commitments for Scope 3 in the report also sets out the further work we will do in terms of carbon reduction beyond the Norfolk County Council estate.</p> <p>The County Council also continues to be a key member of the Norfolk Climate Change Partnership (NCCP), whose work including coordinating action towards net zero, is vital to ensuring a consistent countywide approach which maximises our ability to secure additional resources and to upskill the workforce.</p> <p>The benefits of Norfolk County Council supporting such a collaborative approach can be evidenced in our very recent successes in securing Community Renewal Funding to help Norfolk deliver a number of net zero initiatives across the county:</p> <p>Energy Solutions at Hethel Net Zero Norfolk - Sustainable Travel Network Road to Net Zero Business Support</p> <p>Supplementary question from Cllr Jamie Osborn Over the 15 years since 2005, average carbon emissions in Norfolk declined 27%, an average of less than 2% a year. To reach net zero even by 2050, emissions will have to be cut by more than 13% year-on-year. Acknowledgment of that fact is missing from the Environmental Policy. Will the council commit to this science-based target of at least 13% year-on-year reduction area wide?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste The approach of the County Council is clearly set out in the report, including in the three appendices at the end of the report.</p>
7.3	<p>Question from Cllr Steff Aquarone What does the Cabinet member think about the Swedish approach to road accidents: to start from the premise that the only acceptable number of road deaths and injuries is zero - and work back from there, shifting the onus from the individual driver, to a societal responsibility placed upon authorities and manufacturers to design out risks?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport</p> <p>Over the last 30 years Norfolk has had a good record in reducing road casualties. Traditionally this has been through treating identified accident 'cluster sites' with engineering measures. Whilst the long-term progress is good, over the last decade this has stalled, both in Norfolk and nationally. With accident cluster sites being harder to identify, we have already changed this approach.</p> <p>Both the Department for Transport and this Council have adopted the 'Safe</p>

	<p>System' strategy for road safety. This represents current best practice in road safety and is derived from the Swedish Vision Zero and Dutch Sustainable Safety strategies. 'Safe System' is based on the underlying principles that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • human beings make frequent mistakes that lead to road collisions; • the human body by nature has a limited ability to sustain collision forces with known tolerance to injury thresholds; and • it is a shared responsibility between stakeholders (road users, road managers, vehicle manufacturers, etc.) to take appropriate actions to ensure that road collisions do not lead to serious or fatal injuries. <p>In Norfolk, we have developed a route-based approach to road safety which aims to reduce road user risk proactively. This involves a video drive through of the route which is then sent to the Road Safety Foundation who code the identified roadside and geometric hazards and use modelling software to identify counter measures which will be most cost effective in reducing the likelihood of a fatal or serious injury. The recommended counter measures are captured in a Route Improvement Report and will form the long-term road safety improvement plan for the road in question. Lower cost measures will be funded by the local safety schemes budget and some interventions may be cost effectively delivered in conjunction with other planned maintenance schemes.</p> <p>In the first instance we are applying the safe system approach to Norfolk's major road network but in the long term intend to treat all Norfolk's A and B class roads.</p> <p>Second Question from Cllr Steff Aquarone: Joy Baker was the Norfolk woman who was taken to court repeatedly because she home educated. She was persecuted, abused, and at one point had her children taken away from her before she finally won her case against the council. Monday 15th November marks the 60th anniversary of this victory. Will he join me in recognising Joy Baker Day on 15th November and supporting parents where they wish to home educate their children?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services Norfolk county council fully recognises the right of parents to home educate their children. Joy Baker blazed a trail for current policy which we welcome. For many years we have maintained a small team to support families who have chosen to educate their children at home – called Services to Home Educators. Not all local authorities do this as there is no statutory duty to do so. We value and respect the decisions that parents make. We continue to invest in this support and have recently expanded the team to ensure that we are able to provide as much support as we can to families, not least during these more challenging times.</p>
7.4	<p>Question from Cllr Tim Adams How many people are there currently resident in social care homes across Norfolk that have been rated as requiring improvement or inadequate by the</p>

	<p>Care Quality Commission?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention</p> <p>Thank you for your question. As you are obviously aware, Care Homes are independent businesses regulated by the Care Quality Commission and it may be better to address this question to them. I can however say that there are 332 residential and nursing homes across Norfolk; of these 81 are judged as requiring improvement and 17 as inadequate.</p> <p>As you would expect, where there are concerns about quality of care we impose restrictions on placements, and these are only lifted once our Integrated Care Quality Team is satisfied that risks or actions have been addressed. We do also offer support to independent care businesses to improve (which many accept), this is outlined in my response to question 7.5.</p>
7.5	<p>Question from Cllr Brian Watkins</p> <p>With the current level of staff in quality assurance it takes 2 years for the staff to get round all the care providers. Clearly this is unacceptable to ensure that the whole system is robust and for the public to have confidence in it. By how much will the Cabinet member be seeking to increase social care quality assurance this year to protect vulnerable patients?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention</p> <p>Thank you for your question. As Cabinet Member I rely on the advice and guidance of the Officers, as is right and proper in this sort of situation. Norfolk's in-house quality assurance team works alongside the Care Quality Commission (CQC). It uses a risk based approach which gives the team alerts and early warning to be able to target support to strengthen quality. The audit approach is a nationally recognised method (known as PAMMS) and is supported and increasingly relied on by the regulator. Although this enables all services to be audited within two years, the Council adopts a targeted risk-based audit approach which prioritises higher risk and enables more frequent audits in some cases. Our approach both holds providers accountable for quality deficits and enables restrictions to be place, where appropriate, but importantly it enables support to improve. As well as responding to early indications of declining quality, the joint health and social care team is proactive in training, advice and best practice support.</p> <p>The integrated team was expanded in 2019, with further investment this year to provide a total of 16 quality monitoring officers and two temporary provider engagement officers. In addition, two temporary posts have been agreed, which will increase the provider support element of the work. This is particularly important where providers are struggling due to workforce and leadership shortages.</p> <p>Equally important is that this team is not the only source of quality assurance. The team supports the drive for improvement across the sector, but works closely and collaboratively with operational teams, with safeguarding teams, and our colleagues within health and the CQC. It is critical for good quality</p>

	<p>assurance and improvement that reliance is not placed on a single team. Therefore, a continued priority is the development of a quality culture across all our staff, partners and providers through training, shared information, commissioning practices, the work of organisations such as Healthwatch and supporting feedback from people who use services.</p>
7.6	<p>Question from Cllr Lucy Shires In Social Care the average spend per worker on training is £150 per year compared to £1,500 in the NHS. What will the Cabinet member be doing in Norfolk to address this disparity?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention Thank you for your question. I have long recognised the significant disparity in funding between health and social care, whoever is in power at Westminster. As a result of this disparity we have sought out extra funding for training and successfully secured up to an extra £7.58 million, including up to £3.79 million from the European Social Fund, to deliver a large-scale programme of training and mentoring to the social care (and health) workforce across Norfolk and Suffolk. The <u>Developing Skills</u> project, which is a partnership initiative, offers a wide range of fully funded opportunities, including functional skills and developmental qualifications. The main aim of the project is to empower people working in our social care sector to develop new skills and confidence. This will enable them to continue providing high-quality care to local people.</p> <p>More broadly, Norfolk County Council has worked with local social care providers and other stakeholders to develop a <u>Workforce Strategy</u> and Implementation Plan for Adult Social Care, which includes a range of priority actions aimed at improving recruitment and retention within the sector over the next five years. This strategy will link into, and add value to, positive activity already underway across local providers as well as developments with national policy and funding.</p>
7.7	<p>Question from Cllr Saul Penfold Will the County Council seek to run a scheme like North Norfolk District Council's tree giveaway day?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste Norfolk County Council has set the ambition of planting 1 million trees over five planting seasons. In order to deliver this ambitious programme, the Council has developed a strategy with partners from the public and private sector, including our District Councils.</p> <p>A number of programmes have already been developed to encourage local communities and schools to plant trees in their local environment, and the Council has developed a new Environmental Hub at Gressenhall Farm & Workhouse where a community nursery is being established for members of the public to learn about caring for trees and to collect trees for planting in their own locality.</p> <p>Through our Tree Planting Pledge, with other Local Authorities, we will work with North Norfolk District Council to ensure that their schemes for engaging</p>

	<p>and supporting tree planting in their areas complement other plans elsewhere across the county so that we can collectively deliver our collective targets for this important programme.</p>
7.8	<p>Question from Cllr Sharon Blundell At the People Select Committee it was made clear that progress on achieving a better rate of EHCP completions could be hampered by capacity issues in Educational Psychology teams. What is the process for reviewing this capacity?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services The capacity of Educational Psychology teams to contribute to the assessment process of an Education Health and Care Plan is a national issue. There is a shortage across the country. In Norfolk we have agreed ambitious trajectories to improve the timescale in which we complete EHC plans. At each stage of our planning we review existing capacity and acknowledge that we need more Educational Psychologists if we are achieve our ambition of 90% of plans in timescale. We buy time from agencies wherever we can and we enhanced our local capacity in order to achieve our improved outcomes. We have an established a trainee scheme for Educational Psychologists in Norfolk which is leading to us training and recruiting more Educational Psychologists to take up posts with us. In line with our ambition to achieve even better timescales for assessment and to meet need earlier, we are continually seeking more Educational Psychologists to work directly with us, as are most other local authorities.</p> <p>Supplementary question from Cllr Sharon Blundell When will the result of the review become publicly available?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services The review process with regard to capacity is ongoing and as demand rises this has an impact. The national shortage means that we have an ambition to recruit as many as we can, but like most authorities we struggle to do so.</p>
7.9	<p>Question from Cllr Dan Roper What was put into the Covid care packages that were sent out to residents?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships Norfolk has taken an holistic approach to providing support to households either Shielding (Clinically Extremely Vulnerable) or Self Isolating. Wherever possible we have made use of volunteers to carry out emergency shops and medicine collections and provided support using Local Council Community Hubs.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council purchased 5,151 food boxes (following investigation into costs from a number of suppliers to ensure the best combination of value for money and provision of acceptable nutritional standards).</p> <p>We purchased a range of food parcels from different suppliers, which we then supplemented with a range of items specific needs (we did this in conjunction with local council community hubs) this included fresh food, bread, milk, Baby food, nappies, hygiene products as well as foods specific to dietary</p>

	<p>requirements such as Gluten free and Vegan.</p> <p>The majority of the pre-packaged food parcels were from Morrison's and these contained the following</p> <p>Custard creams Wine gums Simmer Sauce Cheese mix Chilli Con Carne Mix Semi Skimmed Long life Chicken Breast chunks Morrisons vegetable soup Morrisons tomato soup Napoli Kidney Beans Pear Halves Fray Bentos meatballs Chickpeas in water Morrisons tuna chunks Morrisons fusili Easy cook basmati rice Sweetcorn Branston Beans 4 pack Corn Flakes Pataks Tikka Masala kit Passata Tomato and Basil sauce Toilet roll – 4 rolls wrapped</p> <p>Supplementary Question from Cllr Dan Roper How much did the council spend on them overall?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships The total cost of these parcels was £194,000 this was funded with money from central Government to support Shielding and Self Isolation, and supplemented with generous donations from local food suppliers in Norfolk.</p>
7.10	<p>Question from Cllr Rob Colwell Since the updated Norfolk Local Flood Risk Management Strategy Policy Review 2021 was published highlighting at Policy Undertaking Commitment 12: Water Company Liaison, that Risk Management Authorities will work closely with water companies in partnership to reduce the occurrence of public sewer flooding, I wondered what recent representations the Cabinet member may have made to Anglia Water in relation to protecting our 9 precious Norfolk chalk streams?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste The Norfolk Strategic Flooding Alliance (NSFA) was set up by Norfolk County Council (as Local Lead Flood Authority) in February 2021, chaired by Lord Dannatt. The Alliance comprises all parties with responsibilities for water management, including the Environment Agency and Anglian Water, and recognises the benefits by working closely together for maximising benefits to</p>

	<p>residents and the environment.</p> <p>This is being demonstrated in the first tranche of local NSFA flood sites, identified for investigation and resolution, where some of the problems have been exacerbated by inundation of the Anglian Water foul systems.</p> <p>In addition, and specifically in relation to the River Burn, a chalk stream, the NSFA has set up a working group which is seeking funding to develop a catchment wide approach to reduce flooding and make the best use of water.</p> <p>Supplementary question from Cllr Rob Colwell Will the Cabinet Member join me in expressing his utter disgust in local Tory MPs in voting against measures to protect our Norfolk rivers and beaches?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste The prime responsibility for water quality in the county rests with the Environment Agency, and we will continue to work closely with the Environment Agency, and all other relevant bodies, on all matters relating to Norfolk's rivers and beaches.</p>
7.11	<p>Question from Cllr Ben Price During 2020, there were hundreds of sewage spills from water companies into Norfolk's rivers. In Thorpe Hamlet, where we have seen an increase in public river use, drains located at Bishopsbridge Rd, Elm Hill, Riverside Rd and Chalk Hill Rd had a combined 720 spills, lasting for 12,000 hours during 2020. That is equivalent to a continuous flow of waste into the Wensum for every minute of that year, and more! Almost all Norfolk MPs voted against laws to prevent water companies dumping sewage. What action will the Leader of this council take to stop this pollution, so that he sends the right message to those MPs and river users?</p> <p>Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Governance and Strategy Thank you for the question. One of the most prolific causes of sewage entering our waterways in Norfolk is during times of high rainfall and flooding. I am glad that over the past twelve months NCC has, alongside Lord Dannatt, formed and lead a strategic response to this issue. We have, alongside other organisations provided funding and leadership to address many specific flooding issues. My division is particularly affected by this so I am glad to see action on the ground. In terms of representation to our MPs we have briefed them on this issue at our regular meetings and made them aware of local concerns. This is a serious matter, especially in the months coming and we will continue to press not only our MPs but all organisations who have a role in flood prevention and dealing with sewerage to take proactive action to prevent not only floods but damage to our waterway ecosystems.</p> <p>Supplementary question from Cllr Ben Price The council has an ambition to have planted in Norfolk one million trees by 2025. Residents of Norwich regularly contact Green councillors lamenting tree losses on highways located outside conservation areas, with no guarantee that they will be replaced. In the Environment Policy you state by March 2022 planting season this council will have facilitated the planting of 51,884. At this</p>

	<p>rate you will not hit your target in the 5 year period, but in 38.5 years. Could the cabinet member please explain what mechanism will be introduced to dramatically increase the planting program from currently around 26,000 a year to 316,039 a year to meet the 2025 target?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste Despite the significant impact of Covid-19, the County Council has successfully planted more than 50,000 new trees across the County in line with our tree-planting strategy, and my thanks go to the officers, partners and local residents involved in delivering this impressive performance.</p> <p>We will continue to deliver the Council's commitment to delivering 1 Million Trees for Norfolk over the coming planting seasons, operating on the key principle of the 'right tree in the right place', to maximise the potential of the newly planted trees to thrive.</p> <p>In order to help deliver this ambitious goal, we have created a new Environmental Hub, including tree nursery for native Norfolk trees, at Gressenhall Farm & Workhouse. We also continue to work closely with many local and national partners, including the Environment Agency, DEFRA and the Woodland Trust, and we remain confident that this target is achievable.</p>
7.12	<p>Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp Residents and I ran a passionate campaign in 2018, to save South Lynn Children's Centre. Post-pandemic, we need to intensify its use for parent and toddler groups. Invest in Youth Worker on-site support for young people at risk. Unmet needs are placing more pressure on the police. But Supplementary Agenda p31 says: We are developing a Building Assets Strategy to deliver savings from reduced spend on leases and associated revenue costs; this proposal is focussed on a review of current Children's Services occupied buildings, to reduce usage or release space that is no longer required. Can the Administration confirm it will safeguard South Lynn Children's Centre.</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services This site is and remains an ECFS base, with services delivered by our partner Action for Children. There are no plans to review or change this activity or operating bases across the County.</p> <p>As Cllr Kemp will be aware, there are a number of minor technical issues to work through on the existing lease, but all partners are seeking to resolve these and they do not affect the ongoing occupation and delivery of the service.</p>
7.13	<p>Question from Cllr Mike Smith-Clare Can the Cabinet Member for Children's Services confirm how many of the total number of Norfolk 16 to 19-year-olds currently identified as NEET are also identified as being a carer?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services We do not have information identifying young carers in this group, so we are</p>

	<p>unable to provide an accurate figure of 16-19 year olds who are NEET and carers. All our guidance advisers have had training in how to identify a Young Carer, their legal & statutory rights, the types of support available and how to make a referral for a Young Carers Assessment. Where we are aware of young carers at risk of NEET or NEET, we work with the relevant teams to provide enhanced support.</p> <p>Supplementary question from Cllr Mike Smith-Clare How many of the 16 to 19-year-olds identified as NEET have left a course that they started in September 2021 and are receiving information and guidance to help them back into training and/or employment?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services It is too early to provide this information. We are in the very initial stages of receiving the first data from post 16 providers of students who have left their provision. We have arrangements with all the providers to receive this data on a monthly basis from November onwards. Once the data is received we contact all of the students who have left to ascertain their current situation and to offer guidance and support for them to re-engage in alternative provision.</p> <p>Historically more young people drop out after the October half term and the Christmas holidays so a better indication of the percentage of young people leaving provision and their subsequent status is taken at the end of February.</p>
7.14	<p>Question from Cllr Brenda Jones Please can the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention confirm how much money will care homes operated by the Jeasal Group receive from the latest round of Infection Control Fund money Norfolk County Council is to receive from Central Government?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention Thank you for your question. I am really pleased that The Round 5 Infection Control and Testing Fund for Norfolk is £7.327m. This funding will provide financial help to support safe infection control practices within Norfolk care provision until March 2022. The funding has just been received and all providers have been contacted to enable them access to this latest round of financial support.</p> <p>Planned payments in relation to infection control, testing and vaccination funding will be £563.57 per bed in residential care home settings. Jeasal Residential Care Services currently supports 61 people in Norfolk residential care homes, the majority of whom are private self funders, it is important to recognise that the funding is to support ALL care provision and is based on the number of registered beds in operational homes.</p> <p>Supplementary question from Cllr Brenda Jones What steps has Norfolk County Council taken to audit the use of Infection Control Fund payments made to Jeasal and all other private sector care providers since it was first paid in May 2020?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health</p>

	<p>and Prevention</p> <p>Thank you for your question. All infection control funding is subject to the providers entering into a Grant Agreement with the Council. This requires an undertaking that the funding will only be spent on the allowed criteria. At the end of each funding period each care provider is required to complete a declaration with any underspends returned to the Council, these declarations can be subject to audit.</p>
7.15	<p>Question from Cllr Terry Jermy</p> <p>Street lighting remains the County Council's main source of electricity consumption. As the report for the Cabinet Meeting confirms on page 57, just 41% of NCC's streetlights have been converted to LED - approximately 22,000 lights - this is hugely disappointing given the obvious opportunities to save carbon and money. Can the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management confirm when the Council will achieve 100% of its lights being converted to LED?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste</p> <p>The Council has invested significantly since 2008 in modernising our streetlighting assets including upgrading 22,000 streetlights to energy efficient LED alternatives. Alongside this, the Council has a policy of not adopting new streetlighting unless there is a proven safety need. Where streetlighting is operational, we have implemented dimming or part night lighting on suitable routes when usage is low to further enhance our energy and carbon savings.</p> <p>We are currently delivering a significant £8.5m LED upgrade programme to upgrade a further 15,000 main road streetlights by 2023, which will increase the number of LED streetlights to around 37,000 or 70% of our overall stock, reducing our energy and carbon emissions by a further 5 million kWh and 1,200 tonnes of CO2 per year. The upgrade of these 15,000 units is targeted to the main road traffic routes which have the highest net gain in terms of energy consumption and savings due to the need for higher lighting levels and more stringent standards. In parallel with our current upgrade programme, we are reviewing the financial and contractual viability of converting the remaining stock of mainly residential type streetlights to LED, and officers are currently developing the business case and programme for this additional investment in LED lighting.</p>
7.16	<p>Question from Cllr Chrissie Rumsby</p> <p>What assurances can the Cabinet Member for Children's Services give that cuts to the budget for the schools library service will have no detrimental impact on the school provision of libraries to children in Norfolk, especially given the need to make up for lost learning during Covid-19 lockdowns?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services</p> <p>For the 14% of schools who have continued to buy the service it is clear they have valued the additional support and resources. However we know that schools have libraries and have developed reading resources aligned to their curriculum planning. We are confident that through the structured reading programmes that all schools have in place, children will be supported to catch up in their reading.</p>

7.17	<p>Question from Cllr Emma Corlett There is virtually no mention of the climate in the budget report to Cabinet. What impact will the budget proposals have on the carbon reduction targets of the Council?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Finance The Council has made very substantial progress on reducing carbon emissions. For example, compared to 2016/17, gross carbon emissions from our buildings and streetlights have reduced by 46%, and net carbon emissions by 82%. The paper to this cabinet meeting entitled "Natural Norfolk: Progress on delivering the Environmental Policy" sets out proposals for changes in the financial framework to support the achievement of net zero, whilst Annexes A and C set out concrete actions for substantially reducing carbon emissions.</p> <p>As stated in the budget paper, further work will be undertaken so that as far as possible any cost pressures linked to environmental policy and carbon reduction activities are reflected in the Budget and Medium-Term Financial Strategy presented to Cabinet in January 2022. Sustainability issues in relation to any new 2022-23 budget proposals will need to be further considered once initiatives are finalised as part of budget setting in February 2022.</p>
7.18	<p>Question from Cllr Colleen Walker At its meeting in September 2021 the Leader advised Council that the Local Transport Plan would be brought to the full Council meeting in November 2021 via Cabinet. Why is it not therefore on the agenda today?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport? The LTP was approved by Cabinet on 6 September to recommend to council. As set out at Council on 27 September, prior to presenting to council, the LTP was reviewed against recent published guidance and to undertake a final review to assure ourselves of legal compliance. That process has now been completed and it has been concluded that the LTP can go direct to the next meeting of Full Council.</p>
7.19	<p>Question from Cllr Rhodri Oliver Can the cabinet confirm that it is not agreeing the figures for increases in the ASC precept of 1% in the years 23-24, 24-25 and 25-26 shown in Table 11 under the alternative level for consultation following SR21?</p> <p>Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Governance and Strategy Once the council like others has its provisional settlement of government funding, likely to be mid-December, a view will then need to be taken on the structure of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.</p> <p>Supplementary question from Cllr Rhodri Oliver Can the cabinet confirm the total number and revenue cost per annum of all new hires of personnel made by the county council in the last 12 months</p> <p>Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Governance and Strategy</p>

	<p>The County Council had 1,200 (978 Full Time Equivalent (FTE)) new starters in the last 12 months. These will include substantive and temporary contracts. A large number of the new starters will be offset by leavers. The combined cost of the new starters on an annualised basis (including an assumed 25% for on-costs) would be approximately £29.5m out of a total payroll of £258m and total FTE of 6,469. Funding for these posts will be from a range of sources including external to the council.</p>
--	--