

**Norfolk County Council
Minutes of the Meeting Held at 10am on
Tuesday 26 March 2024**

Present:

ADAMS Tony	KEMP Alexandra
AQUARONE Steffan	KIDDIE Keith
ASKEW Stephen	KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	LONG Brian
BENSLY James	MASON BILLIG Kay
BILLS David	MORPHEW Steve
BIRMINGHAM Alison	OSBORN Jamie
BORRETT Bill	PECK Greg
BOWES Claire	PENFOLD Saul
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	PLANT Graham
CARPENTER Penny	PRICE Ben
CHENERY OF HORSBRUGH Michael	REILLY Matt
CLANCY Stuart	ROPER Dan
COLWELL Rob	ROWETT Catherine
CORLETT Emma	RUMSBY Chrissie
CROFTS John	SANDS Mike
DARK Stuart	SAVAGE Robert
DAWSON Chris	SHIRES Lucy
DEWSBURY Margaret	SMITH Carl
DUIGAN Phillip	SMITH-CLARE Mike
EAGLE Fabian	STONE Barry
ELMER Daniel	THOMAS Alison
FISHER John	VARDY Eric
FITZPATRICK Tom	VINCENT Karen
GURNEY Shelagh	WALKER Colleen
HEMPSALL Lana	WARD John
JAMES Jane	WATKINS Brian
JAMIESON Andrew	WEBB Maxine
JERMY Terry	WHYMARK Fran
JONES Brenda	WILBY Martin

Present: 60

1. Apologies

- 1.1. Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Paul Neale, Cllr William Nunn, Cllr Jim Moriarty, Cllr Will Richmond, Cllr Carl Annison, Cllr Andrew Proctor, Cllr Ed Maxfield, Cllr Tony White, Cllr David Sayers, Cllr Richard Price, Cllr Nigel Dixon, Cllr Sharon Blundell, Cllr Steve Riley, Cllr Martin Storey, Cllr Graham Carpenter, Cllr Tim Adams, Cllr Judy Oliver, Cllr Rhodri Oliver, Cllr Michael Dalby, Cllr Vic Thomson, Cllr Andy Grant, Cllr Julian Kirk and Cllr Ed Connolly.
- 1.2 The Chair reminded Councillors that meetings of the Council would not normally extend beyond 3 hours unless this was extended in accordance with rule 11. 1 (n) of the Council Procedure Rules, however it was his intention to enact rule 4 (v) and rule 4 (vi) of the constitution once the meeting period had elapsed if any business remained. The practical application of this would be that the meeting continued on a vote only basis.
- 1.3 The Chair also stated he intended to adjourn the meeting after about 2 hours for a short comfort break.

2. Minutes

- 2.1 The minutes of the Council meeting held on the 20 February 2024 were agreed as an accurate record of proceedings and signed by the Chair subject to the following correction:
 - Cllr Lesley Bambridge raised an amendment at item 4.1 (Declarations of Interest), as she had been erroneously recorded as declaring a pecuniary interest instead of an “**other**” interest.

3. Announcements from the Chair and Leader of the Council

- 3.1 The Chair expressed sadness regarding the Princess of Wales’ cancer diagnosis and stated he and Council would be sending their very warmest wishes to Her Royal Highness for a full recovery.
- 3.2 The Chair stated the events he had been involved in could be found on the Norfolk County Council website.
- 3.3 The Chair paid tribute to Air Commodore Kevin Pellatt, who was due to stand down from his position as Armed Forces Commissioner for Norfolk on the 1 April 2024, having served the full five year term. The Chair announced that Andrew Taylor, Warrant Officer Class 1, would begin as the next Armed Forces Commissioner at the start of April 2024
- 3.4 The Leader gave a statement regarding the Norwich Western Link (NWL). Officers had been in dialogue with Natural England to secure a barbastelle bat licence, which would enable the project to proceed. Comments were expected by the 29 February 2024, which was then delayed to the 15 March 2024 due to Natural England struggling with resources. This delay was accepted; however the Leader stated that on the 8 March 2024, updated guidance was issued by Natural England, which had changed the criteria as such that it was extremely unlikely the NWL would secure a bat licence. Without this, the NWL could not proceed. The

Leader expressed disgust and grave concern regarding this development, which had jeopardised the future of the project. Legal advice was being sought by officers, while the Leader had briefed the Cabinet and local MPs. The Leader had also spoken with the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, Steve Barclay MP's Chief of Staff, who was unaware of the change in guidance. The Leader confirmed that the Council would continue with the NWL project and challenge Natural England with every possible means at its disposal.

4. Declarations of Interest

- 4.1 Cllr John Ward declared an "other" interest, as he was currently a director and Chair of the Norfolk Museums Development Foundation.

5. Petitions presented to Council

- 5.1 There were no items of petition for Council to consider.

6. Business (if any) remaining from the last Council meeting

- 6.1 There were no outstanding business items.

7. Questions to the Leader

7.1 Question from Cllr Brian Watkins

- 7.1.1 Cllr Watkins asked if the Leader could provide reassurance to those who would be affected by the proposal to reduce the Minimum Income Guarantee and to validate the seriousness of the consultation by outlining what threshold must be met for the administration to remove the proposal from its budget plans.

- 7.1.2 The Leader stated that as the consultation was ongoing, this question could not be answered, as to do so would prejudice the consultation.

7.2 Question from Cllr Mike Sands

- 7.2.1 Cllr Sands asked if the Leader was planning to continue lobbying either the current government or the next government for the undergrounding or sea laying of power cables due to pass across Norfolk. Additionally, Cllr Sands asked if the Leader was aware that DC transmission as opposed to AC transmission would mean that lighter gauge and cheaper cables could be used in such installations if an appropriate AC/DC convertor was fitted at each end, meaning only a 3% energy loss over a given distance as opposed to a 30% energy loss.

- 7.2.2 The Leader had attended a meeting on this subject, whereupon it was revealed that the technology to make laying cables underground viable did not yet exist. Research was being conducted overseas but this was at the infancy stage. The Leader expressed concerns that the next government may impose new north to south pylon routes across Norfolk while ignoring the views of residents in the county, given that none of the power carried by the pylons would be available to Norfolk residents or business. An ideal longer-term solution would be to offshore or to install such cables underground, which would provide Norfolk with the power network it requires. The Leader confirmed she would continue to lobby

future governments to bring power networks to Norfolk rather than routing power through the county.

7.3 Question from Cllr Jamie Osborn

7.3.1 Cllr Osborn commented that the Cabinet report on the Norwich Western Link (NWL) from the 4 December 2023 referenced that the Council would have to use its reserves and propose further departmental savings to fund the £40m which had already been committed to the project. Cllr Osborn asked the Leader to confirm what work had been conducted to identify where the £40m would come from, given that the NWL appeared to be in severe doubt following the update earlier in the meeting.

7.3.2 The Leader stated that the government had pledged to repay the funding committed by the Council to the NWL, with the first tranches already received from the Treasury. It was understood that if the project was cancelled, a precedent had been set that none of the funding would have to be repaid to the government and the Council would lobby to ensure all costs were reimbursed. However, given that the updated guidance from Natural England had only recently been issued this month, it was too early to say what the outcome would be. The Leader would push to ensure the Council was not adversely affected, while continuing to press on with the NWL project.

7.5 Question from Cllr Maxine Webb

7.5.1 Cllr Webb stated that Cllr Emma Corlett and residents in Town Close division had for several months raised serious safety concerns with the Highways Department for pedestrians on St Stephen's Road. Unfortunately there was an incident last week involving a pedestrian and a bus, which resulted in the air ambulance needing to land on the playing field at Bignold Primary School. Cllr Webb asked if devolution would bring additional funding for further safety measures, in order to redress the failure of the Transforming Cities scheme to transform safety in the area.

7.5.2 The Leader expressed her shock and sadness regarding the incident on St. Stephen's Road. The Highways Department would look into safety measures if they were alerted. The devolution deal included an option to look at new infrastructure, along with the ability to decide where money would be spent. A new board was planned, including the Leader of the Council, district council leaders, the Leader of Norwich City Council, and other interested parties. The board would be able to look at bids and determine the allocation of funding accordingly. The Leader suggested that Cllrs Webb and Corlett lobby the Leader of Norwich City Council regarding this. It was expected that the first £10m tranche of devolution funding would be made available to Norfolk after the Council agreed proposed changes to its governance structure, which was due to be considered at the Council meeting scheduled for the 23 July 2024.

7.6 Question from Cllr Stuart Clancy

7.6.1 Cllr Clancy expressed alarm and disappointment regarding the Norwich Western Link (NWL) update statement, given the detrimental impact on Norfolk's economy and environment if the project did not go ahead. Cllr Clancy asked the Leader if

she could outline the actions being taken to improve the situation and to get the project back on track.

- 7.6.2 The Leader confirmed she had spoken with local MPs, who were similarly displeased with the new report. Contact had also been made with the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs' chief of staff regarding this, with plans being made to lobby ministers. Concern was expressed that the updated guidance from Natural England would result in an effective block on all new infrastructure projects in the south of England and Wales. The Leader had also held a meeting the previous evening with Lord Fuller, the Leader of South Norfolk Council, whereupon he confirmed he had been in discussions with Lord Banner KC, who was investigating instances of infrastructure projects being delayed by legal action. The Leader stated she would also speak with Lord Banner KC and would continue to push for new infrastructure projects for Norfolk.

7.7 Question from Cllr Saul Penfold

- 7.7.1 Cllr Penfold commented that the Disability Network Norfolk Group had raised worrying concerns surrounding the approach of the MIG consultation. The concerns included consultation invitations not being received by care givers, accessibility issues for the visually impaired and drop in sessions not being attended by social care staff. Cllr Penfold asked the Leader to clarify why the consultation process had been haphazard.
- 7.7.2 The Leader acknowledged there had been an issue with the consultation invites but this had been quickly rectified. The consultation was due to run for 12 weeks, with officers ensuring that affected groups had the opportunity to put their views to the Council.

7.8 Question from Cllr Matt Reilly

- 7.8.1 Cllr Reilly commented that the recent government Budget did not reference Norfolk once, nor was there any support announced for residents affected by coast erosion and flooding. Cllr Reilly asked if the Leader was similarly disappointed with the Budget.
- 7.8.2 The Leader stated that while it was not prudent to expect the Chancellor to mention Norfolk every time at the despatch box, extra funding was earmarked for Norfolk through the devolution deal and other guises. There was an ongoing cost of living crisis, therefore meaning that spending had to be carefully managed. The Leader confirmed she would continue to lobby ministers for extra funding and to champion Norfolk's cause.

7.9 Question from Cllr Catherine Rowett

- 7.9.1 Cllr Rowett stated that the Council's Net Zero targets and climate strategy were laudable, but that it was vital that the Council should take the people of Norfolk with it on its journey to a cleaner, happier and zero carbon future, an ambition that most people supported. However, there was grave concern that the government was effectively sabotaging such efforts by changing planning regulations for National Strategic Infrastructure Projects, silencing the views of residents and experts. Cllr Rowett stated the proposed Norwich to Tilbury powerline was a clear

example of this injustice. As residents in Norfolk were keen to preserve nature and listen to experts, Cllr Rowett asked the Leader what she would do to ensure that a future government will restore the rights of the people of Norfolk to have their voices heard, especially when they suggested better ways to deliver the strategic improvements needed in the county.

- 7.9.2 The Leader stated that the Council had an exemplary record of environmental action and policies, which would continue to be augmented. It was important that Norfolk's natural beauty be preserved, but that progress and economic development be allowed to continue unhindered. A common sense approach was required, which the Council was following.

8. Recommendations from Cabinet

- 8.1 The Leader moved, seconded by Cllr Andrew Jamieson, recommendations 1 and 2 from the Cabinet meeting held on the 4 March 2024.

- 8.2 Recommendations 1 and 2 were **CARRIED** on a show of hands.

- 8.3 Council **RESOLVED** the following:

1. **To APPROVE** the increase of £6.259m to the capital programme to address capital funding requirements funded mostly from various external sources as set out in detail in capital Appendix 3, paragraph 1.4 and 4.2 of the Cabinet report as follows:
 - £0.189m increase in External Funding for various Highways schemes.
 - £0.26m allocation of NCC Capital Receipts to support the compulsory purchase of land for County Farms
 - (£0.160m) reduction in External funding for various Children's Services Schools schemes to reflect actual expenditure in projects nearing completion.
 - £1.579m grant funding for 24-25 received from the Department of Education for the expansion of Childcare provision in the County.
 - £0.330m external funding the Corporate Property scheme at Chapel Road.
 - £0.074m for the Norfolk Fire and Rescue Services (NFRS) Vehicle Replacement Programme.
 - £0.053m for the LMS Schools Based capital maintenance programme.
 - £0.460m additional S106 developer contribution to Dereham, Docking, Hopton and Holt.
 - £0.105m additional external funding from Department of Transport and S106 for various Highways maintenance schemes.

- £0.260m additional DfT grant allocated to the Long Stratton Bypass.
- £0.195m additional contribution from Revenue and Reserves for the Hethel Improvement Commission.
- £2.821m funding received from the National Lottery Heritage Fund to offset the inflationary cost pressures on the Castle Keep Museum project.
- £0.018m contribution from Revenue and Reserves to fund the purchase of a new car for the ASC Road Safety Scheme.
- (£0.075m) other minor adjustments to capital schemes.

2. **To APPROVE** the following amendments to the P10 Capital Programme for the following schemes as set out in Capital Appendix 3 paragraph 4.2 of the Cabinet report as follows:

- £4.51m additional funding from the Department of Transport from the Road Resurfacing Fund for local highways maintenance in 2023-24 and again in 2024-25 alongside additional funding for the next 10 years as set out in Appendix 3 paragraph 4.2 of the report.

9. **Cabinet Report (Questions to Cabinet Members)**

9.1 The Leader moved the report of the Cabinet meetings held on the 29 January 2024 and 4 March 2024.

9.2 Council **RESOLVED** to **AGREE** the report.

9.3 **Question from Cllr John Crofts to the Leader of the Council**

9.3.1 Cllr Crofts commented that the current Council's administration ran on a 2021 manifesto with the strapline being 'Delivering a Better Future for Norfolk'. This appeared to be out of step given data illustrating that Norfolk had the worst malnutrition rates in the country, the third worst performing area for GP waiting times in the country, the third worst underspend in dental services in the country, the worst rates of 'children in need' in East Anglia, record levels of fuel poverty, more than 2,000 residents awaiting vital social care and some of the worst rates for fibre optic coverage in the country. Cllr Crofts asked the Leader when exactly the Council would deliver a better future for Norfolk.

9.3.2 The Leader stated that the Conservative Group manifesto for the next set of local elections would outline how the Council had achieved delivered for the people of Norfolk. The Leader expressed her opinion that the current administration had done a good job and that it would be the role of the electorate to decide whether they would be re-elected.

9.4 **Question from Cllr Julie Brociek-Coulton to the Cabinet Member for Children's Services**

9.4.1 Cllr Brociek-Coulton requested an update from the Cabinet Member as to whether the former Angel Road Junior School building had been handed back to the Council, and if a timetable was in place for a sufficiency appraisal so that the site could be converted into a SEND school. Additionally, Cllr Brociek-Coulton asked if the Cabinet Member had any data on the condition of the building due to recent adverse weather and the known condition of the roof. Residents in the division had expressed concern that the site was being neglected.

9.4.2 The Cabinet Member stated that as the lease had not yet been handed back to the Council, no update could be provided until this had occurred.

9.5 **Question from Cllr Jamie Osborn to the Cabinet Member for Finance**

9.5.1 Cllr Osborn asked the Cabinet Member, given the update from the Leader regarding the Norwich Western Link (NWL), what the expected cost of legal action was and how this would be built into the risk contingency for the project.

9.5.2 The Cabinet Member clarified that the Council was not taking legal action against National England, as the issues affecting the project were considered national and not local. There were a number of options the Council had at its disposal to challenge the updated guidance from Natural England; however a solution would be found through the government and not through the courts.

9.7 **Question from Cllr Kemp to the Cabinet Member for Strategy and Governance**

9.7.1 Cllr Kemp expressed concern that a democratic deficit was accruing within the county, as the Administration had omitted West Norfolk from the application for Project Gigabit; the recent Independence Matters business plans largely focused on Norwich and the east of the County and, as a result, Independence Matters had withdrawn funding from West Norfolk Carers, West Norfolk's only Carers' Charity, putting it at risk of imminent closure. Cllr Kemp asked the Cabinet Member how she planned to address the growing democratic deficit towards King's Lynn and West Norfolk from the Council

9.7.2 The Cabinet Member disagreed that there was a democratic deficit, stating that regular meetings were held with the leader of the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk. There was substantial funding allocated to this district by the Council and it was felt that the funding system was as fair as possible. The devolution deal would mean all districts would have a seat at the table to determine spending plans across Norfolk. The Cabinet Member gave assurances that King's Lynn and West Norfolk would continue to receive a fair funding package.

9.8 **Question from Cllr Lana Hemsall to the Cabinet Member for Finance**

9.8.1 Cllr Hemsall stated she was pleased to see in the media that Norfolk County Council was part of a successful class action lawsuit against Apple Inc and asked the Cabinet Member to provide further details of the case.

- 9.8.2 The Cabinet Member stated a settlement of £385m (\$490m) had been secured from Apple Inc. The success of the lawsuit reflected the perseverance and tenacity of the Norfolk Pension Fund, who were appointed as the lead plaintiff in the case. Prior to the lawsuit, the Norfolk Pension Fund were involved in another successful case relating to securities fraud, which saw representatives present before a federal jury in California, resulting in a unanimous verdict and a settlement of £54m secured. The Cabinet Member paid tribute to everyone at the Norfolk Pension Fund for setting precedents among pension funds.
- 9.9 **Question from Cllr Steffan Aquarone to the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport**
- 9.9.1 Cllr Aquarone commented that Norfolk's road surfaces ranked amongst the worst in the country, with the repair backlog bill increasing to £69m last year. In addition, the Council also had the unfortunate accolade as one of the authorities paying the most in compensation to drivers. Cllr Aquarone asked the Cabinet Member if he would concede that the current approach to road repairs in Norfolk was haphazard and not working, and that a more sustainable transport model was necessary for the county.
- 9.9.2 The Cabinet Member disagreed with the comments and question, stating that Norfolk contained some of the best maintained roads in the country. There was statistical evidence which illustrated Norfolk was the best county in the East of England for road repairs. The Council had a strong record on potholes, if an instance was reported correctly through the Norfolk County Council website, it could be cleared within three days if it met the relevant criteria. Norfolk was recently ranked second out of 48 councils for maintaining roads. Further government funding was expected towards potholes.
- 9.10 **Question from Cllr Brenda Jones to the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care**
- 9.10.1 Cllr Jones queried as to why a consultation on changes to the Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG) was going ahead, as the previous consultation had caused financial and reputational damage to the Council. Cllr Jones expressed concern that the organisation of the consultation had been confused, with affected groups not receiving appropriate documentation. No drop-in sessions had been arranged in a large part of North Norfolk. While this had been rectified, concerns had been raised that there was not enough awareness of the sessions. In South Norfolk, a session had been arranged in Diss on the 17 May, but this was the closing date for the consultation and thus would not give enough time for people to decide. Cllr Jones asked the Cabinet Member what evidence the Council had to prove that the MIG consultations was robust and being conducted correctly.
- 9.10.2 The Cabinet Member stated that a decision was taken when setting the Council's budget that further savings were required from Adult Social Care to ensure a balanced budget, due to there being an overspend in the 2023/24 forecast. It was correct to consult affected groups if a proposed saving was agreed in the budget. The Cabinet Member acknowledged there had been issues with documentation, as raised by the Leader earlier in the meeting, and apologised that documents were not sent to advocates and carers. It was not

appropriate to discuss the ongoing consultation further to ensure it was not prejudiced.

- 9.10.3 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care raised a point of information to confirm that social care staff had been present at all drop-in sessions, in response to Cllr Saul Penfold's question to the Leader earlier in the meeting.
- 9.11 **Question from Cllr Jamie Osborn to the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport**
 - 9.11.1 Cllr Osborn stated that a recent study from the A47 Alliance, which was intended to show the need for dualling large sections of the road, had in fact shown that traffic levels had declined by nearly 20% along the stretches earmarked for dualling. Cllr Osborn asked the Cabinet Member if he accepted that he was wrong when he had argued that the A47 needed dualling to cope with increased traffic.
 - 9.11.2 The Cabinet Member disagreed, remarking that traffic levels in Norfolk and nationally were still recovering from the COVID-19 pandemic. Significant growth was forecast for Norfolk in the coming years, with approximately 40,000 new houses to be built in and around Norwich. It was therefore essential that the road network was fit for purpose. The whole route strategy for the A47 aimed to get goods and people quickly from Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft to the East Midlands. The Cabinet Member stated there had been significant underinvestment in the road network in coastal areas over the years.
- 9.12 **Question from Cllr John Ward to the Cabinet Member for Economic Growth**
 - 9.12.1 Cllr Ward commented that Norfolk was now well regarded in the film industry, as locations such as Holkham Beach and Thetford Forest were first choice for many film makers. Cllr Ward asked if the Cabinet Member could outline how the Council could build upon this success to ensure Norfolk was at the forefront of filming locations in the entire UK.
 - 9.12.2 The Cabinet Member acknowledged Norfolk had been a prime filming location over the years, pointing to Thetford being the main location for Dad's Army. There was a significant opportunity to maintain and build upon these successes, as screen tourism was worth approximately £1.9bn to the Norfolk economy. The Council appointed Norfolk Screen, a production company based in Norwich, to take advantage of these opportunities and attract further studios and productions to the county. Supply chains, catering and hospitality would also be improved. The Cabinet Member provided an anecdote that he himself had filmed scenes for a production many years ago in Norfolk, to illustrate his commitment to this cause.
- 9.13 **Question from Cllr Daniel Roper to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste**
 - 9.13.1 Cllr Roper stated that in the run-up to local elections and a general election, the Council and the government would continue to state that flood prevention was of utmost importance to them, which appeared to be out of step with the available

evidence. Cllr Roper asked if the Cabinet Member agreed with Duncan Baker MP's evaluation that the Council was not doing enough to protect residents from the effects of flooding, or if ultimate responsibility lay with the government's reduction of local government settlement.

- 9.13.2 The Cabinet Member disagreed, stating that the recent flooding in Norfolk had been handled dynamically. The Council was liaising with agencies such as the Norfolk Strategic Flooding Alliance (NSFA) to strengthen flooding response towards communities. Partnerships had also been formed with DEFRA and the Environment Agency, which had helped with a memorandum to ensure residents affected by flooding were able to access compensation quicker. A summit on flooding was due to be held with local MPs, with the Council lobbying government to appoint a dedicated Flooding Minister. Partnerships with district councils also improved the response. The Cabinet Member commented that while climate change was an unknown factor when it came to future flooding events, it was certain that it would have an impact on Norfolk. The Council was putting together a package of climate policies to mitigate the worst effects.

9.14 **Question from Cllr Terry Jermy to the Leader of the Council**

- 9.14.1 Cllr Jermy commented that he had met with campaigners from Women Against State Pension Inequality (WASPI) the previous day. Given the report and recommendation from the Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman published on the 21 March 2024 and that Council had unanimously carried a motion in 2023 supporting the campaign, Cllr Jermy asked if the Leader could confirm the Council's position on this issue and whether she agreed that compensation should be paid out to those affected.

- 9.14.2 The Leader stated that the report was a positive development and affirmed that she and the Council would continue to support those affected to ensure they received compensation.

9.15 **Question from Cllr Jamie Osborn to the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport**

- 9.15.1 Cllr Osborn asked if the Cabinet Member would agree, in light of the update on the Norwich Western Link (NWL) from the Leader earlier in the meeting, that it was time to look at a Plan B for the project and what work was required for this.
- 9.15.2 The Cabinet Member stated there was no Plan B for the NWL, as excess traffic in the area could not be routed down existing country roads without substantial upgrade work and the purchase of large acres of farmland. The NWL was the only solution for the pressing issues identified with Norwich's transport infrastructure.

9.16 **Question from Cllr Fran Whymark to the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care**

- 9.16.1 Cllr Whymark stated there was a local charity called Headway Norfolk and Waveney, which supported families and individuals impacted by brain injuries, including stroke. The charity had launched a new pledge campaign, 'One Tick at a Time', which had a primary aim to raise awareness of brain injuries. Cllr Whymark

asked the Cabinet Member if she was aware of the campaign and if she would share her views on Headway.

- 9.16.2 The Cabinet Member confirmed she was aware of Headway Norfolk and Waveney and had received correspondence from the charity. The Cabinet Member was very pleased to raise the issue of brain injuries before Council and would welcome all Members to support the One Tick at a Time pledge. Brain injuries were more common than expected, affecting individuals from all age groups and backgrounds. Such injuries often had significant, long-term impacts on patients' cognitive functions, emotional wellbeing and physical condition. Early intervention, access to support services and community support were key to improving the situation for residents. The Cabinet Member stated she would circulate the document and pledge to all Council Members, requesting that the information additionally be circulated among their divisions and parishes.

10. Recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee and Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee

- 10.1 There were no recommendations from either committee.

11. Recommendations from Committees

- 11.1 There were no recommendations from Committees.

12. Report from the Scrutiny Committee meetings held on the 25 January and 14 February 2024

- 12.1 Cllr Steve Morphew, Chair of the Scrutiny Committee, moved the report.

- 12.2 Council **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the report.

13. Reports from Other Committees

13.1 Report from the Audit and Governance Committee meeting held on the 15 February 2024

- 13.1.1 Cllr Robert Savage, Vice-Chair of the Audit and Governance Committee, moved the report.

- 13.1.2 Council **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the report.

13.2 Report from the Health and Wellbeing Board meeting held on the 6 March 2024

- 13.2.1 Cllr Bill Borrett, Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board, moved the report.

- 13.2.2 Council **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the report.

13.3 Report from the Pensions Committee meeting held on the 12 March 2024

- 13.3.1 Cllr Kay Mason Billig, Leader of the Council, moved the report.

- 13.3.2 Council **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the report.
- 13.4 **Report from the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meeting held on the 26 January 2024**
 - 13.4.1 Cllr Brian Long, Chair of the Planning (Regulatory Committee), moved the report.
 - 13.4.2 Cllr Long expressed disappointment that the most recent meeting of the Planning (Regulatory) Committee, held on 22 March 2024, was declared inquorate. It was believed to be the first such occurrence in the history of the committee. Cllr Long requested that Council Members undertook planning training to ensure the inquorate meeting was a one-off, while also providing Members with a greater understanding of the planning process to aid them with issues in their divisions. This statement was seconded by Cllr Ben Price.
 - 13.4.3 Council **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the report.
- 14. Reports from Select Committees**
 - 14.1 **Report from the Corporate Select Committee meeting held on 11 March 2024**
 - 14.1.1 Cllr Kay Mason Billig, Leader of the Council, moved the report.
 - 14.1.2 Council **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the report.
 - 14.2 **Report from the Infrastructure and Development Select Committee meetings held on the 23 February and 13 March 2024**
 - 14.2.1 Cllr James Bensly, Chair of the Infrastructure and Development Select Committee, moved the report.
 - 14.2.2 Council **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the report.
 - 14.3 **Report from the People and Communities Select Committee meeting held on the 15 March 2024**
 - 14.3.1 Cllr Fran Whymark, Chair of the People and Communities Select Committee, moved the report.
 - 14.3.2 Council **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the report.
- 15. Reports about the business of joint arrangements and external organisations**
 - 15.1 **Report from the Norfolk Joint Museums Committee meeting held on the 2 February 2024**
 - 15.1.1 Cllr John Ward, Chair of the Norfolk Joint Museums Committee, moved the report.
 - 15.1.2 Council **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the report.

15.2 **Report from the Norfolk Records Committee meeting held on the 2 February 2024**

15.2.1 Cllr Michael Chenery of Horsbrugh, Chair of the Norfolk Records Committee, moved the report.

15.2.2 Council **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the report.

16. Specific Business Items

16.1 Pay Policy Statement 2024-25

16.1.1 Cllr Kay Mason Billig, seconded by Cllr Andrew Jamieson, moved the recommendation contained in the report.

16.1.2 Following a debate, Council **RESOLVED** on a show of hands to **APPROVE** the Pay Policy Statement 2024-25.

16.2 Climate Policy for Norfolk

16.2.1 Cllr Eric Vardy, seconded by Cllr Andrew Jamieson, moved the recommendations contained in the report.

16.2.2 During the debate, Cllr Steve Morphew raised a point of order to affirm that Part 5 of the Council's Constitution stated that all policies in the Council's policy framework should have review and expiry dates built into them. Following advice from the Monitoring Officer, Cllr Eric Vardy suggested that the Climate Policy be reviewed in March 2026. This was **AGREED** by Council.

17.2.3 Following the debate, the recommendations in the report were unanimously **CARRIED** on a show of hands.

17.2.4 Having reviewed and commented on the proposed Climate Policy, including the new statement of the council's county-wide net zero commitment, Council **RESOLVED** the following:

1. **To ENDORSE** the Climate Policy to be integrated in Norfolk County Council's Policy Framework.
2. **To AGREE** a related amendment to the Environment Policy to align its wording on the Council's overarching climate commitments with the Climate Policy.

17. Notice of Motions

17.1 Motion 1 – Parish Paths Information Pack – Fit for the Future

17.1.1 This motion was proposed by Cllr Tom FitzPatrick and seconded by Cllr Daniel Elmer:

Walking and cycling are widely considered to be one of the most effective ways to promote regular physical activity, as set out in the County Council's ambitious Walking, Wheeling and Cycling Strategy. Those who engage in healthy transport and activity choices can experience better health outcomes and companies who encourage employees to make these choices have lower staff turnover rates and reduced levels of absenteeism, whilst also seeing improved productivity and employee morale.

As a result, this Council welcomes the £200m government fund to improve walking, wheeling and cycling routes, helping to reduce emissions, boost local economies and create jobs. Adding to the existing ambitious commitment of half of all journeys in towns and cities being cycled or walked by 2030, this is alongside the Council's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP) for many areas across our County.

The way transport systems are built plays a vital role in how successful sustainable transport promotion can be through our villages and wider rural communities, but also in the more urban settings of Norfolk as well. This Council therefore welcomes the schemes totalling over £1m to be distributed across Norfolk to deliver the wants and needs of local parishes and residents as part of the Highway Parish Partnership, along with the work of our Norfolk MP's, in particular Duncan Baker MP, in helping increase public access to footpaths, urban, rural and coastal.

To maintain our work alongside Parish Councils and to ensure local applications for active travel routes and walking routes are successful, our Parish Paths Information Pack should be updated to make it more accessible and reflect the recent initiatives for sustainable transport and physical activity.

This Council will ask the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport to engage with the Norfolk Association of Local Councils (NALC) to canvass its members on how to best meet this aim in relation to footpaths and public rights of way, undertaking and adopting best practices and producing a new Parish Paths Information Pack that is fit for the future.

- 17.1.2 Cllr Steffan Aquarone, seconded by Cllr Rob Colwell, moved the following amendment to this motion:

Walking and cycling are widely considered to be one of the most effective ways to promote regular physical activity, as set out in the County Council's ambitious Walking, Wheeling and Cycling Strategy. Those who engage in healthy transport and activity choices can experience better health outcomes and companies who encourage employees to make these choices have lower staff turnover rates and reduced levels of absenteeism, whilst also seeing improved productivity and employee morale

As a result, this Council welcomes the £200m government fund to improve walking, wheeling and cycling routes, helping to reduce emissions, boost local economies and create jobs. Adding to the existing ambitious commitment of half of all journeys in towns and cities being cycled or walked by 2030, this is alongside the Council's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIP) for many areas across our County.

The way transport systems are built plays a vital role in how successful sustainable transport promotion can be through our villages and wider rural communities, but also in the more urban settings of Norfolk as well. This Council therefore welcomes the schemes totalling over £1m to be distributed across Norfolk to deliver the wants and needs of local parishes and residents as part of the Highway Parish Partnership, along with the work of our Norfolk MP's, in particular Duncan Baker MP, in helping increase public access to footpaths, urban, rural and coastal.

To maintain our work alongside Parish Councils and to ensure local applications for active travel routes and walking routes are successful, our Parish Paths Information Pack should be updated to make it more accessible and reflect the recent initiatives for sustainable transport and physical activity.

This Council will ask the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport to engage with the Norfolk Association of Local Councils (NALC) to canvass its members on how to best meet this aim in relation to footpaths and public rights of way, undertaking and adopting best practices and producing a new Parish Paths Information Pack that is fit for the future.

[This Council will ask Cabinet to develop and publish a comprehensive 'footpath toolkit' which includes a simplified information pack, tools for auditing, repairing/improving existing access, establishing new access, and publicising and promoting paths.](#)

- 17.1.3 Cllr FitzPatrick, the proposer of the original motion, did not accept the amendment and a debate commenced.
- 17.1.4 The amendment was put to a vote. With 22 votes for, 37 votes against and 0 abstentions, the amendment was **LOST** (Appendix A).
- 17.1.5 Following a debate, the substantive motion was put to a vote. With 47 votes for, 0 votes against and 13 abstentions, the motion was **CARRIED** (Appendix B).
- 17.2 Council took a lunch break from 12:20 to 12:47
- 17.3 Upon Council reconvening after lunch, Cllr Steve Morphew proposed that the meeting be extended for a full hour to cover all remaining business. This was seconded by Cllr Mike Sands. The proposal was **LOST** on a show of hands.
- 17.4 **Motion 2 – Wisbech Incinerator**
- 17.4.1 This motion was proposed by Cllr Rob Colwell and seconded by Cllr Alexandra Kemp:

This Council continues to recognise the concerns of residents in West Norfolk and neighbouring authorities relating to the Wisbech Incinerator which has now been granted planning permission by the Secretary of State.

This Council, in line with its commitment in May 2022, where upon it voted in favour of stating its in-principle opposition against the incinerator, reaffirms its opposition to its construction.

This Council commits to do everything in its power to minimise the negative impact this project will have on residents, agriculture, and the environment.

This Council, in order to reassure residents of its May 2022 commitment, will ask Cabinet to consider what support we can provide in any future judicial review of the proposed development.

17.4.2 Following a debate, the motion was put to a vote. With 21 votes for, 32 votes against and 2 abstentions, the motion was **LOST** (Appendix C).

17.5 **Motion 3 – Carer Parking Permits**

17.5.1 This motion was proposed by Cllr Julie Brociek-Coulton and seconded by Cllr Colleen Walker:

Council recognises the vital role played by those visiting people's homes to provide care. Keeping people independent in their homes is a shared vision for care and requires those receiving care to be able to receive timely, trusted and high-quality care. Council also recognises care staff are not highly paid for their skills and our stretched budget means we need to ensure every minute of their time is productively used.

Council is concerned at reports carers may be arriving late for scheduled visits because of time spent looking for places to park. It regrets the potential for carers to become liable for parking fines where they choose to risk parking in restricted spaces such as those with permit parking or loading bays, with no recourse to appeal on the basis of carrying out caring duties under the Council's current Civil Parking Enforcement Guidance Manual. Council further notes that other professions such as window cleaners and chimney sweeps are allowed to park in such areas whilst delivering a service in people's homes.

Council acknowledges that cross-party support for free carer parking was shown in debate secured in Parliament by Damien Moore MP in March 2023. During debate the Minister for Social Care, Helen Whately MP praised free carer parking schemes and encouraged 'local authorities who are not already undertaking similar projects to look and learn from those areas that have implemented their own parking schemes.'

Council believes there are multiple benefits to introducing a parking permit system for care workers based on the scheme currently operated by Dorset County Council to allow carers access limited to the time they are visiting people's homes for care delivery, including:

- Allowing limited access in residential parking zones, loading bays and other places would support the delivery of high quality, timely care;
- Alleviating care workers' concerns about finding a parking space, facing parking fines and claiming parking charge reimbursements from employers would reduce stress, administration and contribute to a more attractive employment offer;
- Minimising the time spent trying to park will enhance the experience of those being cared for by making appointments easier to keep.

Council recognises that to consider introducing such a scheme to Norfolk requires full scoping of demand through engagement with carers and care providers, as well as consideration of any financial implications.

Council therefore requests the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Infrastructure to develop proposals for a Norfolk parking scheme for care workers for consideration by Cabinet via the Infrastructure and Development Select Committee.

17.5.2 Following a debate, the motion was put to a vote. With 21 votes for, 33 votes against and 0 abstentions, the motion was **LOST** (Appendix D).

17.6 **Motion 4 – Proper Funding for Childcare**

17.6.1 This motion was proposed by Cllr Jamie Osborn and seconded by Cllr Maxine Webb:

Childcare providers including nurseries are in crisis due to years of severe underfunding from national and local government. Nationally, the Early Years Alliance estimates that the early years funding shortfall stands at £5 billion. This has driven unprecedented levels of closures of nurseries and childcare providers, including ten in Norfolk in 2019, and three late in Dereham, Diss and Downham Market last year.

When the Chancellor announced the introduction of funded childcare for children from the age of two in 2023, he failed to address the funding gap that is leading to extreme pressure on childcare providers. In 2024, he announced that funding would rise in line with delivery costs, but the Government once again failed to bridge the existing £5 billion funding shortfall for early years education and childcare.

This persistent underfunding means many childcare providers are having to increase their costs, cancelling out any benefits from the “free” childcare hours promised by the Government. Many are having to charge for nappies, food, and milk. Some are even introducing charges on parents for using the “free” childcare hours that the Government should be paying for.

The strain on childcare staff, with many working long hours on the minimum wage, means many are leaving the sector. Childcare staff report being able to

earn more with shorter hours stacking shelves in Asda. The difficulty in recruiting and retaining staff is exacerbated in many cases by a lack of career progression options.

The staffing shortfall means that 68% of childcare providers are already at full capacity. This in turn means that the rise in demand that is expected when “free” childcare for two-year-olds kicks in from April 2024 will not be able to be met with existing capacity. Three quarters of childcare providers that are expecting an increase in demand from April are not planning to increase the places that they offer, due to short-staffing and underfunding, meaning that many parents will be unable to access “free” childcare hours. Nearly one in five childcare providers is planning to opt out of Government-funded schemes altogether by next year, due to the unacceptable pressure the schemes place on them with inadequate funding.

Furthermore, evidence shows that children who receive early intervention and support for emerging and diagnosed Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) in the early years, are more likely to have positive educational experiences, relationships and employment opportunities, in the future. But, last year, only 18% of local authorities in England reported having sufficient childcare for children with disabilities.

Council believes:

1. The £5bn underinvestment and underfunding of childcare is a serious failing in the Government’s approach to the crucial early years of a child’s life.
2. Childcare workers deserve improved pay and career progression options in order to help recruit and retain staff.
3. Well-trained and adequately supported childcare workers offer immense value in the crucial first five years of a child’s life, supporting their social, physical, linguistic, emotional and cognitive development, and enabling parents to work.
4. The closure of childcare providers and the shortage of provision for disabled children is of serious concern for Norfolk.

Council resolves to:

1. Ask the Leader to write to:
 - i. the Chancellor, Secretary of State for Education to call for them to urgently address the £5 billion shortfall in funding for early years provision;
 - ii. all Norfolk MPs to ask for their support on the above.

2. Ask the Cabinet to explore options to increase locally-contributed top-up funding for childcare providers to ensure that Norfolk childcare providers are not forced to close.
3. Ask the Cabinet to further examine and report on the sufficiency of provision for children with emerging and diagnosed SEND.

17.6.2 Cllr Mike Smith-Clare, seconded by Cllr Steve Mophew, moved the following amendment to this motion:

Childcare providers including nurseries are in crisis due to years of severe underfunding from national and local government. Nationally, the Early Years Alliance estimates that the early years funding shortfall stands at £5 billion. This has driven unprecedented levels of closures of nurseries and childcare providers, including ten in Norfolk in 2019, and three late in Dereham, Diss and Downham Market last year.

When the Chancellor announced the introduction of funded childcare for children from the age of two in 2023, he failed to address the funding gap that is leading to extreme pressure on childcare providers. In 2024, he announced that funding would rise in line with delivery costs, but the Government once again failed to bridge the existing £5 billion funding shortfall for early years education and childcare.

This persistent underfunding means many childcare providers are having to increase their costs, cancelling out any benefits from the “free” childcare hours promised by the Government. Many are having to charge for nappies, food, and milk. Some are even introducing charges on parents for using the “free” childcare hours that the Government should be paying for.

The strain on childcare staff, with many working long hours on the minimum wage, means many are leaving the sector. Childcare staff report being able to earn more with shorter hours stacking shelves in Asda. The difficulty in recruiting and retaining staff is exacerbated in many cases by a lack of career progression options.

The staffing shortfall means that 68% of childcare providers are already at full capacity. This in turn means that the rise in demand that is expected when “free” childcare for two-year-olds kicks in from April 2024 will not be able to be met with existing capacity. Three quarters of childcare providers that are expecting an increase in demand from April are not planning to increase the places that they offer, due to short-staffing and underfunding, meaning that many parents will be unable to access “free” childcare hours. Nearly one in five childcare providers is planning to opt out of Government funded schemes altogether by next year, due to the unacceptable pressure the schemes place on them with inadequate funding.

Furthermore, evidence shows that children who receive early intervention and support for emerging and diagnosed Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) in the early years, are more likely to have positive educational experiences, relationships and employment opportunities, in the future. But, last

year, only 18% of local authorities in England reported having sufficient childcare for children with disabilities.

Council believes:

1. The £5bn underinvestment and underfunding of childcare is a serious failing in the Government's approach to the crucial early years of a child's life.
2. Childcare workers deserve improved pay and career progression options in order to help recruit and retain staff.
3. Well-trained and adequately supported childcare workers offer immense value in the crucial first five years of a child's life, supporting their social, physical, linguistic, emotional and cognitive development, and enabling parents to work.
4. The closure of childcare providers and the shortage of provision for disabled children is of serious concern for Norfolk.

Council resolves to:

1. Ask the Leader to write to:
 - i. the Chancellor, Secretary of State for Education to call for them to urgently address the £5 billion shortfall in funding for early years provision;
 - ii. all Norfolk MPs to ask for their support on the above.
2. Ask the Cabinet to explore options to increase locally-contributed top-up funding for childcare providers to ensure that Norfolk childcare providers are not forced to close.
3. Ask the Cabinet to further examine and report on the sufficiency of provision for children with emerging and diagnosed SEND.
4. Identify and promote opportunities for establishing workplace nursery schemes so that employees can take advantage of the tax benefits of childcare part financed through salary sacrifice and request officers to provide a report for consideration by People and Communities Select Committee at their next meeting.
5. Request the Cabinet Member for Economic Growth to include childcare provision and availability as a key strand in the forthcoming proposals for a new economic strategy for Norfolk.
6. Request Cabinet to include an assumption of £10m a year from the County Deal for Norfolk funding for investment in childcare to support capacity and flexibility in the labour market in Norfolk.

- 17.6.3 Cllr Jamie Osborn, the proposer of the original motion, accepted the amendment and a debate commenced on the amended substantive motion.
- 17.6.4 **Three Hour Meeting Time Elapses**
- The Chair announced the three hours allocated for the meeting had now elapsed.
- 17.6.5 The amended substantive motion was put to a vote. With 21 votes for, 33 votes against and 0 abstentions, the motion was **LOST** (Appendix E).
- 17.7 As a result of the three-hour meeting period having elapsed, Council Members agreed to move to the part of the meeting where all remaining business relating to motions or amendments to motions would be considered, moved, and seconded in line with procedure rule 4 (iv).
- 17.7.1 The Chair confirmed he would deal with each motion in turn. Initially he would ask the proposer of the motion if they wanted the motion to go ahead or be withdrawn. If the motion was withdrawn, the Council would continue through the motions in the order they appeared on the agenda, which was by reference to the size of the group. If the motion was not withdrawn, the Chair would consider if there were amendments. If amendments had been submitted, then the Council would vote on those first and then, when those were completed, a vote would be taken on the substantive motion.
- 17.8 **Motion 5 – Footpaths Toolkit**
- 17.8.1 This motion was **WITHDRAWN**.
- 17.9 **Motion 6 – Malnutrition: Time to Act**
- 17.9.1 This motion was **WITHDRAWN**.
- 17.10 **Motion 7 – Experimental Tourism**
- 17.10.1 This motion was **WITHDRAWN**.
- 17.11 **Motion 8 – Flooding Response**
- 17.11.1 This motion was **WITHDRAWN**.
- 17.12 **Motion 9 – Norwich Western Link**
- 17.12.1 This motion was proposed by Cllr Steve Morpew and seconded by Cllr Terry Jermy:
- Council notes the gap between the allocation of funds towards the OBC cost of the Norwich Western Link (NWL), the latest estimate of costs is £273.9m and that no additional funding was made available through the budget on 6th March 2024.

In accordance with paragraph 3.3(c) of Part 11C: Financial Regulations of the Constitution, minimum requirements for preparation of budget proposals including option appraisal and use of whole life costing, comparing the relative costs of the options, over the life of the project.

Paragraph 3.2(a) of the same Part of the Constitution states that the Capital Budget should have regard to proper accounting standards and include a statement of the allocation of resources to different services and projects, how the programme is to be funded, and any impact on the revenue budget.

Council requests:

1. Cabinet to provide an updated options appraisal for the NWL including whole life costings and relative costs, taking account of updated costs and costs of borrowing since the initial options appraisal was undertaken.
2. Cabinet to provide full details of how those whole life costs will be funded and the impact on the revenue budget.
3. Cabinet to provide revised transport modelling using the National Road Traffic Projections 2022 and the latest release of the TEMPro software, which was used to rule out the Pullover flyover project in West Norfolk.
4. Cabinet to provide that information prior to submission of a planning application for the NWL.

17.12.2 The motion was put to a vote. With 20 votes for, 35 votes against and 0 abstentions, the motion was **LOST** (Appendix F).

18. Questions on notice under rule 9.3

18.1 One question was received, from Cllr Alexandra Kemp. A response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport was circulated to Members prior to the meeting and appended to this set of minutes at Appendix G.

19. Appointments to Committees, Sub-Committees and Joint Committees

19.1 There were no appointments to note.

The meeting concluded at 13:38

Cllr Barry Stone
Chair, Norfolk County Council



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

Norfolk County Council - Date: 26 March 2024

**RECORDED VOTE – ITEM NUMBER: 17.1.4 – Conservative Group Motion - Parish Paths
Information Pack: Fit for the Future – Lib Dem Group Amendment**

FOR		AGST	ABST		FOR		AGST	ABST
	ADAMS Tim					LONG	X	
	ADAMS Tony	X				MACKIE		
	ANNISON					MASON BILLIG	X	
X	AQUARONE					MAXFIELD		
	ASKEW	X				MORIARTY		
	BAMBRIDGE	X		X	MORPHEW			
	BENSLY	X				NEALE		
	BILLS	X				NUNN		
X	BIRMINGHAM					OLIVER J		
	BLUNDELL					OLIVER R		
	BORRETT	X		X	OSBORN			
	BOWES	X				PECK	X	
X	BROCIEK-COULTON			X	PENFOLD			
	CARPENTER G					PLANT	X	
	CARPENTER P	X		X	PRICE B			
	CHENERY OF HORSBRUGH	X				PRICE R		
	CLANCY	X				PROCTOR		
X	COLWELL			X	REILLY			
	CONNOLLY					RICHMOND		
	CORLETT					RILEY		
X	CROFTS			X	ROPER			
	DALBY			X	ROWETT			
	DARK	X		X	RUMSBY			
	DAWSON	X		X	SANDS			
	DEWSBURY	X				SAVAGE	X	
	DIXON					SAYERS		
	DUIGAN	X		X	SHIRES			
	EAGLE	X				SMITH	X	
	ELMER	X		X	SMITH-CLARE			
	FISHER	X				STONE	X	
	FITZPATRICK	X				STOREY		
	GRANT					THOMAS	X	
	GURNEY	X				THOMSON		
	HEMPSALL	X				VARDY	X	
	JAMES	X				VINCENT	X	
	JAMIESON	X		X	WALKER			
X	JERMY					WARD	X	
X	JONES			X	WATKINS			
X	KEMP			X	WEBB			
	KIDDIE	X				WHITE		
	KIDDLE-MORRIS	X				WHYMARK	X	
	KIRK					WILBY	X	

Sub-Total

For
Against
Abstentions

Sub-Total

22
37
0

Norfolk County Council - Date: 26 March 2024

RECORDED VOTE – ITEM NUMBER: 17.1.5– Conservative Group Motion - Parish Paths
Information Pack: Fit for the Future

FOR		AGST	ABST		FOR		AGST	ABST
	ADAMS Tim				X	LONG		
X	ADAMS Tony					MACKIE		
	ANNISON				X	MASON BILLIG		
X	AQUARONE					MAXFIELD		
X	ASKEW					MORIARTY		
X	BAMBRIDGE					MORPHEW		X
X	BENSLY					NEALE		
X	BILLS					NUNN		
	BIRMINGHAM		X			OLIVER J		
	BLUNDELL					OLIVER R		
X	BORRETT				X	OSBORN		
X	BOWES				X	PECK		
	BROCIEK-COULTON		X		X	PENFOLD		
	CARPENTER G				X	PLANT		
X	CARPENTER P				X	PRICE B		
X	CHENERY OF HORSBRUGH					PRICE R		
X	CLANCY					PROCTOR		
X	COLWELL					REILLY		X
	CONNOLLY					RICHMOND		
	CORLETT		X			RILEY		
X	CROFTS				X	ROPER		
	DALBY				X	ROWETT		
X	DARK					RUMSBY		X
X	DAWSON					SANDS		X
X	DEWSBURY				X	SAVAGE		
	DIXON					SAYERS		
X	DUIGAN				X	SHIRES		
X	EAGLE				X	SMITH		
X	ELMER					SMITH-CLARE		X
X	FISHER				X	STONE		
X	FITZPATRICK					STOREY		
	GRANT				X	THOMAS		
X	GURNEY					THOMSON		
X	HEMPSALL				X	VARDY		
X	JAMES				X	VINCENT		
X	JAMIESON					WALKER		X
	JERMY		X		X	WARD		
	JONES		X		X	WATKINS		
	KEMP		X			WEBB		X
X	KIDDIE					WHITE		
X	KIDDLE-MORRIS				X	WHYMARK		
	KIRK				X	WILBY		

Sub-Total

Sub-Total

For
Against
Abstentions

47
0
13

Norfolk County Council - Date: 26 March 2024

RECORDED VOTE – ITEM NUMBER: 17.4.2 – Lib Dem Group Motion – Wisbech Incinerator

FOR		AGST	ABST	FOR		AGST	ABST
	ADAMS Tim				LONG		X
	ADAMS Tony	X			MACKIE		
	ANNISON				MASON BILLIG	X	
X	AQUARONE				MAXFIELD		
	ASKEW				MORIARTY		
	BAMBRIDGE	X		X	MORPHEW		
	BENSLY	X			NEALE		
	BILLS	X			NUNN		
X	BIRMINGHAM				OLIVER J		
	BLUNDELL				OLIVER R		
	BORRETT	X		X	OSBORN		
	BOWES	X			PECK	X	
X	BROCIEK-COULTON				PENFOLD		
	CARPENTER G				PLANT	X	
	CARPENTER P	X		X	PRICE B		
	CHENERY OF HORSBRUGH	X			PRICE R		
	CLANCY	X			PROCTOR		
X	COLWELL			X	REILLY		
	CONNOLLY				RICHMOND		
X	CORLETT				RILEY		
X	CROFTS			X	ROPER		
	DALBY			X	ROWETT		
	DARK	X		X	RUMSBY		
	DAWSON		X	X	SANDS		
	DEWSBURY				SAVAGE	X	
	DIXON				SAYERS		
	DUIGAN	X			SHIRES		
	EAGLE	X			SMITH	X	
	ELMER	X		X	SMITH-CLARE		
	FISHER	X			STONE	X	
	FITZPATRICK	X			STOREY		
	GRANT				THOMAS	X	
	GURNEY	X			THOMSON		
	HEMPSALL	X			VARDY	X	
	JAMES	X			VINCENT	X	
	JAMIESON	X		X	WALKER		
X	JERMY				WARD	X	
X	JONES			X	WATKINS		
X	KEMP			X	WEBB		
	KIDDIE	X			WHITE		
	KIDDLE-MORRIS	X			WHYMARK	X	
	KIRK				WILBY		

Sub-Total

For
Against
Abstentions

Sub-Total

21
32
2

Norfolk County Council - Date: 26 March 2024

RECORDED VOTE – ITEM NUMBER: 17.5.2 – Labour Group Motion – Carer Parking Permits

FOR		AGST	ABST	FOR		AGST	ABST
	ADAMS Tim				LONG	X	
	ADAMS Tony	X			MACKIE		
	ANNISON				MASON BILLIG		
X	AQUARONE				MAXFIELD		
	ASKEW				MORIARTY		
	BAMBRIDGE	X		X	MORPHEW		
	BENSLY	X			NEALE		
	BILLS	X			NUNN		
X	BIRMINGHAM				OLIVER J		
	BLUNDELL				OLIVER R		
	BORRETT	X		X	OSBORN		
	BOWES	X			PECK	X	
X	BROCIEK-COULTON				PENFOLD		
	CARPENTER G				PLANT	X	
	CARPENTER P	X		X	PRICE B		
	CHENERY OF HORSBRUGH	X			PRICE R		
	CLANCY	X			PROCTOR		
X	COLWELL			X	REILLY		
	CONNOLLY				RICHMOND		
X	CORLETT				RILEY		
X	CROFTS			X	ROPER		
	DALBY			X	ROWETT		
	DARK	X		X	RUMSBY		
	DAWSON	X		X	SANDS		
	DEWSBURY				SAVAGE	X	
	DIXON				SAYERS		
	DUIGAN	X			SHIRES		
	EAGLE	X			SMITH	X	
	ELMER	X		X	SMITH-CLARE		
	FISHER	X			STONE	X	
	FITZPATRICK	X			STOREY		
	GRANT				THOMAS	X	
	GURNEY	X			THOMSON		
	HEMPSALL	X			VARDY	X	
	JAMES	X			VINCENT	X	
	JAMIESON	X		X	WALKER		
X	JERMY				WARD	X	
X	JONES			X	WATKINS		
X	KEMP			X	WEBB		
	KIDDIE	X			WHITE		
	KIDDLE-MORRIS	X			WHYMARK	X	
	KIRK				WILBY		

Sub-Total

Sub-Total

For
Against
Abstentions

21
33
0

Norfolk County Council - Date: 26 March 2024

**RECORDED VOTE – ITEM NUMBER: 17.6.5 – Amended Green Group Motion –
Proper Funding for Childcare**

FOR		AGST	ABST		FOR		AGST	ABST
	ADAMS Tim					LONG	X	
	ADAMS Tony	X				MACKIE		
	ANNISON					MASON BILLIG		
X	AQUARONE					MAXFIELD		
	ASKEW					MORIARTY		
	BAMBRIDGE	X		X		MORPHEW		
	BENSLY	X				NEALE		
	BILLS	X				NUNN		
X	BIRMINGHAM					OLIVER J		
	BLUNDELL					OLIVER R		
	BORRETT	X		X		OSBORN		
	BOWES	X				PECK	X	
X	BROCIEK-COULTON					PENFOLD		
	CARPENTER G					PLANT	X	
	CARPENTER P	X		X		PRICE B		
	CHENERY OF HORSBRUGH	X				PRICE R		
	CLANCY	X				PROCTOR		
X	COLWELL			X		REILLY		
	CONNOLLY					RICHMOND		
X	CORLETT					RILEY		
X	CROFTS			X		ROPER		
	DALBY			X		ROWETT		
	DARK	X		X		RUMSBY		
	DAWSON	X		X		SANDS		
	DEWSBURY					SAVAGE	X	
	DIXON					SAYERS		
	DUIGAN	X				SHIRES		
	EAGLE	X				SMITH	X	
	ELMER	X		X		SMITH-CLARE		
	FISHER	X				STONE	X	
	FITZPATRICK	X				STOREY		
	GRANT					THOMAS	X	
	GURNEY	X				THOMSON		
	HEMPSALL	X				VARDY	X	
	JAMES	X				VINCENT	X	
	JAMIESON	X		X		WALKER		
X	JERMY					WARD	X	
X	JONES			X		WATKINS		
X	KEMP			X		WEBB		
	KIDDIE	X				WHITE		
	KIDDLE-MORRIS	X				WHYMARK	X	
	KIRK					WILBY		
Sub-Total					Sub-Total			

For
Against
Abstentions

21
33
0

Norfolk County Council - Date: 26 March 2024

**RECORDED VOTE – ITEM NUMBER: 17.12.2 – Labour Group Motion –
Norwich Western Link**

FOR		AGST	ABST		FOR		AGST	ABST
	ADAMS Tim					LONG	X	
	ADAMS Tony	X				MACKIE		
	ANNISON					MASON BILLIG		
X	AQUARONE					MAXFIELD		
	ASKEW					MORIARTY		
	BAMBRIDGE	X		X		MORPHEW		
	BENSLY	X				NEALE		
	BILLS	X				NUNN		
X	BIRMINGHAM					OLIVER J		
	BLUNDELL					OLIVER R		
	BORRETT	X		X		OSBORN		
	BOWES	X				PECK	X	
X	BROCIEK-COULTON					PENFOLD		
	CARPENTER G					PLANT	X	
	CARPENTER P	X		X		PRICE B		
	CHENERY OF HORSBRUGH	X				PRICE R		
	CLANCY	X				PROCTOR		
X	COLWELL			X		REILLY		
	CONNOLLY					RICHMOND		
X	CORLETT					RILEY		
X	CROFTS					ROPER	X	
	DALBY			X		ROWETT		
	DARK	X		X		RUMSBY		
	DAWSON	X		X		SANDS		
	DEWSBURY	X				SAVAGE	X	
	DIXON					SAYERS		
	DUIGAN	X				SHIRES		
	EAGLE	X				SMITH	X	
	ELMER	X		X		SMITH-CLARE		
	FISHER	X				STONE	X	
	FITZPATRICK	X				STOREY		
	GRANT					THOMAS	X	
	GURNEY	X				THOMSON		
	HEMPSALL	X				VARDY	X	
	JAMES	X				VINCENT	X	
	JAMIESON	X		X		WALKER		
X	JERMY					WARD	X	
X	JONES			X		WATKINS		
X	KEMP			X		WEBB		
	KIDDIE	X				WHITE		
	KIDDLE-MORRIS	X				WHYMARK	X	
	KIRK					WILBY		

Sub-Total

For
Against
Abstentions

Sub-Total

20
35
0

**Norfolk County Council
26 March 2024
Item No: 18**

Question under Rule 9.3 - from Cllr Alexandra Kemp

It is universally acknowledged in West Winch and West Norfolk, from resident and business experience alike, from delays, tailbacks, unreliable journey times, personal injury and highway damage accidents, the difficulty, danger -and even impossibility, of turning into residential accesses along the A10 without undertaking a multiple-mile detours, that the A10 in West Winch and Setchey is over capacity.

Yet West Winch is in the deeply unpopular and locally unsupported - Local Plan for an allocation of 4,000 houses. The Mott Macdonald Study of 2014 showed there would be a 1,000 car tailbacks at peak times, queued south from the Hardwick Roundabout, if the 1,100 Hopkins Development goes ahead without a Bypass to take the traffic out of the village before development commences.

So it is scandalous that the West Norfolk Local Plan is worded to allow all 1100 Hopkins houses to be built, before a proper Bypass is constructed and Highways cannot allow it. Because this Council's Sustainable Transport Strategy, which accompanied the West Winch Bypass Funding Application, outlining measures to traffic-calm the A10 to a village road to try to make new development sustainable, cannot be implemented, until the Bypass takes the traffic out of the village.

But the Government has not yet granted funding for the £84 million Bypass and cannot be guaranteed to do so. If building starts without the Bypass, the development would be completely car dependent and unsustainable.

West Winch cannot be let down again as it was by a previous Conservative Government in 1990 when Bypass plans were drawn up but Govt took away the funding but major development followed. Does the Cabinet Member agree with me that the only realistic, sustainable and decent approach for the Highways Authority to take is to oppose major development on the A10 in West Winch and Setchey before the arrival of a fully built-out Bypass, and that provision is needed to bypass Setchey too?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport

I do not agree with the proposal to oppose major development in West Winch. As set out in previous questions to Cabinet (see August 2023), the consultation for the West Winch Housing Access Road (WWHAR) included details indicating up to 300 homes being delivered with a connection to the existing A10, which is consistent with the Highways response to the planning application already submitted by Hopkins Homes.

The Highways response to the Hopkins planning application accepts that some traffic could connect to the northern sections of the existing A10, but this has been capped at not more than 300 new homes.

The Hopkins application includes for the potential for consent to be granted for up to a total of 1,100 homes, but this is subject to significant new highway infrastructure within the development site and new junctions connecting to the A47, which would need to be similar in their location and size to the northern section of the WWHAR project.

In view of the scale of the highway infrastructure that would be required within the Hopkins development it is unlikely that the developer would deliver that, which is why they are working with the County Council and the Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk and will be making a contribution to the WWHAR project through section 106 agreements linked to any planning consents. All parties are keen to complete the WWHAR as soon as possible, and the current timeline for its delivery indicates that very few properties will be completed before the WWHAR is opened. The aim is to deliver the WWHAR and the associated sustainable transport improvements for West Winch as soon as possible, with the current target opening date (subject to government funding being confirmed) being 2027.

The 2014 modelling work completed by Mott MacDonald is now nearly 10 years out of date. More recent modelling has been completed to support the development of the WWHAR project, and this has been further updated with 2022 survey data. It is important that all modelling is based on the most recent information and that is the case for the latest proposals in West Winch.

As indicated above, the current timeline for the delivery of the WWHAR is that it will be completed by 2027, before any significant new housing development, which will minimise any impacts to the existing A10, but will also then enable the planned new housing growth area to be delivered as quickly as possible.

The proposals for the WWHAR include details for sustainable transport which will encourage more active travel and improve non-vehicular links to and from the town centre.

Details about the project have been submitted in a planning application that is due to be published and consulted by the County Planning Authority imminently. This planning application and an Outline Business Case submission to DfT (published on the county council's website) have been progressed as rapidly as possible to enable the new road to be delivered as soon as possible. Every effort is being made to establish the necessary consents and funding for the project to enable construction to start in 2025.