



Norfolk County Council

Minutes of the Meeting Held on 28 September 2009

Present: Mrs S C Gurney in the Chair

Mr A D Adams	Mr J M Joyce
Mr S Bett	Mr M A Kiddle-Morris
Mr W P Borrett	Mr M C Langwade
Dr A P Boswell	Mr S R Little
Mr J S Bremner	Mr I J Mackie
Mr M P Brindle	Mrs J Mickleburgh
Mr A J Byrne	Mr I A C Monson
Mr D R Callaby	Mr J Mooney
Mr J A Carswell	Mr P D Morse
Mr M R H Carttiss	Mr D Murphy
Miss C L Casimir	Mrs J A Murphy
Mrs J R M Chamberlin	Mr G Nobbs
Mrs M Chapman-Allen	Mr W J Nunn
Baron M Chenery of Horsbrugh	Mr R E Parkinson-Hare
Mr S M Clancy	Mr J H Perry-Warnes
Mrs D M Clarke	Mr P K Rice
Mr P G Cook	Mr R C Rockcliffe
Mr D Cox	Mr J D Rogers
Mr A J Dobson	Mr M J Scutter
Mr S Dorrington	Mr N C Shaw
Mr P Duigan	Mr J R Shrimplin
Mr S Dunn	Mr R A Smith
Mr T East	Mr B H A Spratt
Mr R A Edwards	Ms A Steward
Mr T S C Garrod	Dr M Strong
Mr A J Gunson	Mrs A M Thomas
Mr B J Hannah	Mrs H Thompson
Mr R C Hanton	Mr A D Tomkinson
Mr D G Harrison	Ms J S Toms
Mr D Harwood	Mrs C M Walker
Mr M Hemsley	Mr J M Ward
Mr J R Herbert	Mr A M White
Mr H A S Humphrey	Mr M J Wilby
Mrs S E L Hutson	Mr A T Williams
Mr B J M Iles	Dr F C Williamson
Mrs D Irving	Mr R J Wright
Mr C Jordan	

Total present: 74

Apologies:

Apologies for absence were received from Mr R Bearman, Mr B J E Collins, Mr N Dixon, Mr G R Jones, Mr B W C Long, Mr A J Proctor, Mr P A G Wells and Mr A J Wright.

1. Minutes of the previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2009 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments:

Report of the Cabinet Meeting held on 23 June 2009: Integrated Performance and Finance Monitoring Report – Year End 2008/09, paragraph 3: Add: 'Mr Williams said that Cabinet would consider all options.'

Report of the Cabinet Meeting held on 13 July 2009: Local Member Issues/ Members Questions, paragraph 2.3: second and third paragraphs, 'Police Authority' should read 'Police'.

Report of the Cabinet Meeting held on 13 July 2009: Procurement of Phase One of the Residual Waste Treatment Project – Contract A, paragraph 11: Paragraph (i), p.14, amend 'energy and waste' to read 'energy from waste'.

2. Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman reminded Council that Commander Brigadier Jim Richardson would be addressing the Council on current issues within the Armed Forces and the contribution made by troops and reservists from the Eastern Region at the close of this meeting.

The Chairman announced she had attended the following events:

- The renaming of St Margaret's House in King's Lynn to Hanse House in recognition of the fact that it was the only remaining Hanseatic building in the country.
- The launch of 'World Class Norfolk' at the Institute of Directors in Pall Mall, London; a campaign that aims to help bring 5000 high value jobs into the county.
- 'Quest Seekers' – visits to local libraries to hand out certificates to young people.

The Chairman had also hosted the following events:

- Reception for Chinese visitors from Xuhui, who were on an educational exchange.
- Battle of Britain reception at County Hall. This had been well received by all who attended and the Chairman wished to thank RAF Honington for providing the parade and also the Chairman's Officer, Catherine Wilkinson and the Democratic Support Manager, Susan Farrell.

As a point of order, the Chairman advised that the Report of the Cabinet meeting of 27 July 2009 had not been included on the original Council agenda and, as Chairman, she had agreed to accept this as an item of urgent business on the grounds that it would be inappropriate to wait until the next Council meeting in November before members were able to ask questions relating to that meeting. This item would therefore be taken as the first report under Item 6 of the agenda.

The Chairman advised Members that in relation to the declarations of interest for Item 4, the Standards Committee had considered whether members who have prejudicial interests may debate and vote on a motion to retain the status quo in Norfolk and that it had been determined that they may. Therefore, there was no

need for members to declare their interests on this matter, nor withdraw from the debate.

Mr Nobbs asked the Chairman to clarify the statement that the Standards Committee had met to determine this motion because as a member of the Standards Committee he had not attended any such a meeting. In response, the Chairman advised that the Standards Committee had met on 2 July and had given dispensation for this matter to be discussed at Full Council. Therefore, as this was a similar motion, it would be allowed. The Chairman said that her ruling on this matter was final, in accordance with Procedural Rule 22.

3. Declarations of Interest

The following Members declared interests.

Item 6, Report of the Cabinet meeting held on 27 July 2009, Flood Sirens, paragraph 1:

- Mr A Tomkinson, personal interest as a member of the Police Authority.
- Mr R Rockcliffe, personal interest as a family member owns property at North Beach, Heacham.
- Mr H Humphrey, possible personal interest (which is being considered by the Head of Law) as he is a member of the Police Authority.
- Mr P Rice, personal interest (and also the Report of the Cabinet meeting held on 10 August 2009) as he lives in the flood risk area and recently worked for Norfolk Constabulary.
- Dr M Strong, personal interest as an unpaid volunteer flood warden for Wells and unpaid volunteer representing North Norfolk senior flood wardens on the Norfolk Resilience Forum (Voluntary Sector).
- Mr R Hanton, personal interest as he is a member of the Norfolk Constabulary.
- Mr B Hannah, personal interest as a member of the Police Authority.
- Mr A Byrne, personal interest as a member of the Police Authority.
- Mr J Perry-Warnes, personal interest as a member of the Police Authority and also a member of North Norfolk District Council.
- Mr B Iles, personal interest as a member of the Police Authority.
- Mr D Harwood, personal interest as he owns a property within the flood risk area.
- Mr S Bett, personal interest as a member of the Police Authority.

Item 6, Report of the Cabinet meeting held on 10 August 2009, Shoreline Management Plan, paragraph 3:

- Mr B Hannah, personal interest as a member of the Police Authority and a Member of North Norfolk District Council.

Item 6, Report of the Cabinet meeting held on 10 August 2009, Raising Aspirations through Sport, paragraph 5:

- Mr T East, personal interest as a Norwich City Football Club Shareholder and a supporter of the Club for fifty years.

4. Motion by Mr D Cox

The Chairman said that under the Council's Constitution, the subject matter of this motion was a matter for Cabinet, rather than Full Council. However, she was content to exercise her discretion as Chairman to permit the motion to be debated at this meeting in order to assist Cabinet in its consideration of this matter.

Mr Cox then moved the following motion, which was seconded by Mr Murphy:

"The Labour Government is currently undertaking a major review of local government in Norfolk. Norfolk County Council has consistently argued that such a review is unnecessary and that any resultant proposals would involve considerable expense and administrative change at a time of economic recession.

Norfolk County Council therefore resolves to:-

- a) Support the current local government structure of Norfolk.
- b) Agree that the process of LGR in Norfolk has been flawed and as a consequence should now be shelved.
- c) Work with Borough and District councils in support of a further judicial review once the Secretary of State has received the Boundary Committee's recommendations (subject to the advice of Queen's Counsel as to the merits and chance of success).
- d) In the event that the Secretary of State should decide to bypass the LGR review process and seek to impose a politically driven solution in respect of Norwich's original unitary bid, oppose it vigorously.
- e) Pursue the spirit behind the recent Conservative Party proposals for efficient and effective local government, with all other Norfolk Councils to maximise joint working and procurement at all levels, building upon the work that originally commenced three years ago on the Norfolk Shared Services agreement, with the objective of obtaining the greatest possible value for money and simplifying the delivery of services to the public."

Mr Scutter moved an amendment to the motion that the five elements contained within the motion should be considered separately. This was seconded by Mr Joyce.

RESOLVED that following a vote on the above amendment (13 in favour, 49 against, 7 abstentions), the amendment was LOST.

Members then considered the substantive motion.

Following debate members voted on the original motion and with 52 in favour, 14 against and 5 abstentions the motion was CARRIED. **RESOLVED** accordingly.

5. Cabinet Recommendations – 13 July 2009

Norfolk Children and Young People's Plan 2009-2011

Mr Cox moved the recommendations from the Cabinet.

The Chairman said that written responses would be sent to Mr Rice concerning the costs involved in producing the publication and Mr Scutter concerning the process for producing the brochure, which Mr Scutter said contained errors.

RESOLVED:

To approve the Children and Young People's Plan 2009-2011.

6. Cabinet Recommendations – 14 September 2009

Mr Cox moved the recommendations from the Cabinet.

RESOLVED: To approve:

- 1) The establishment and role of the Overview and Scrutiny Strategy Group.
- 2) The Terms of Reference of the Overview and Scrutiny Strategy Group, as follows:
 1. Co-ordinating the scrutiny work of the County Council to avoid duplication between the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee, Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the individual Overview and Scrutiny Panels and ensure that connections are made between the work of each. Notwithstanding the above, it is the intention that Overview and Scrutiny Panels will handle any items within their purview;
 2. To ensure that the scrutiny forward work programme of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee and Overview and Scrutiny Panels are developed to reflect corporate priorities;
 3. Providing an opportunity to discuss progress and share good practice;
 4. Providing an opportunity to ensure that key Members participate in scrutiny related training;
 5. To appoint members to working groups agreed by OSPs and Cabinet Scrutiny Committee in accordance with nominations from Scrutiny Group Leads of political Groups that are entitled to the places under the political balance agreed and in doing so to consider whether there are any overlaps with other elements of the scrutiny decision making process that should be reflected in the membership appointed.
 6. To consider draft terms of reference for any working groups proposed by OSPs and Cabinet Scrutiny Committee;
 7. To consider whether any working groups established by HOSC have implications for any of the Council's Scrutiny Bodies and to make recommendations on any cross over in membership.
- 3) That the Terms of Reference of the Overview and Scrutiny Strategy Group be included in the Norfolk County Council Constitution and that the Review of the Constitution Working Group established by the Corporate Affairs Overview and Scrutiny Panel be requested to consider and make recommendations on any further implications arising from this change to the Constitution.'

7. Report of the Cabinet Meeting held on 27 July 2009

In moving the report, Mr Cox drew Members' attention to key items and invited questions.

Public Questions and Local Member Issues/Member Questions, paragraph 1.1, Flood Sirens

Dr Strong said that whilst she understood that time was at a premium, Norfolk County Council had not met the statutory requirements for consultation as it had not involved Parish Councils in discussions or the development of the Sustainable Communities Act (SCA) submission. Further, Dr Strong said that the Council should have consulted with bodies which currently perform that function, such as the Police and the Environment Agency, as to a transfer of power. Dr Strong asked whether these bodies had been consulted specifically on the SCA submission, and if so what responses had been received.

Mrs Walker asked why Parish Councils were not consulted and what the consequences of this would be.

In response, Mr Humphrey, Cabinet Member for Fire and Community Protection, advised that the deadline for the SCA submission deadline was only a few days after the Cabinet meeting of 27 July and there had not been sufficient time to consult with individual parish councils on the SCA, however parish and town councils together with the Police and the Environment Agency had been part of the flood siren consultation. Mr Humphrey said that whilst he accepted that the submission could have been delayed six months until the next round to allow for all parish councils to be consulted, it had been decided that progress needed to be made as soon as possible. During the consultation process it had been indicated that some parish and district councils might wish to have ownership of the sirens and therefore a letter had been sent to parish councils where there were flood sirens to ask if they wished to take control of these.

Flood Sirens in Norfolk, paragraph 3, 3.1.4

Mr Shrimplin suggested that any local exercise relating to the management of flooding emergencies should not simply include a test of the Environment Agency's Floodline Warning Direct service, but should also include an exercise using flood sirens as a comparison.

In response, Mr Humphrey said that the Fire & Community Protection Overview & Scrutiny Panel had voiced concern about the Floodline Warning Direct service and had requested that the Environment Agency look at the effectiveness of the service during any flooding exercise.

RESOLVED: to note the report.

8. Report of the Cabinet Meeting held on 10 August 2009

In moving the report, Mr Cox drew Members' attention to key items and invited questions.

Public Questions, paragraph 1.1

Mr Joyce asked when the Council intended to make provision for on-line access to planning applications and appeal documents. Further, he asked whether declarations of interest could be viewed on-line.

In response, Mr Cox said that on-line access to planning applications would be made available in the next twelve months and work was underway to allow applications to be viewed on-line. Mr Cox noted that declarations of interest are noted in the minutes of meetings which are already available on-line. The next

meeting of the Standards Board would be considering whether to put the Register of Interests on-line in a designated web area.

Public Questions, paragraph 1.3

In relation to the Cromer, Runton, Aylmerton and Felbrigg, 20, 40 and 50mph Speed Limit Orders 2009, Mr Perry-Warnes requested that the authority's highways engineers visit the site at some time in the future to look again at this section of the A148 from Cromer to Upper Sheringham and Bodham and he recommended that speeds be further reduced here.

In response, Mr Gunson, Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation, said that all roads were visited regularly by engineers but decisions concerning the reduction of speed limits were not taken lightly; decisions were made only following an enormous amount of discussion.

Local Member Questions, paragraph 2.1

Mr Hemsley asked what measures had been taken to engage the community to support the Government's 'Clean Energy Cashback' scheme. Further, he said that Cambridgeshire County Council had successfully placed wind farms on their County Farms land which had generated an income of £2M and he asked what was happening concerning situating wind farms on NCC's County Farm land.

In response, Mr Williams, Cabinet Member for Corporate and Commercial Services, said that the authority's approach would be to support offshore wind farms; the review of County Farms would not include wind turbines on the land as no appetite had been detected for these. Cambridgeshire County Council had received £2M from its farms overall, including some returns from wind energy.

Overview and Scrutiny Panel Issues, paragraph 3

Dr Strong referred to the authority's Sustainable Communities Act submission; she said the principal aim of the proposal had been to compel the Environment Agency and the police to fully engage with affected parish and town councils, and the Norfolk Flood Wardens and she asked whether this Administration had any hope that these bodies would co-operate with the parishes, town councils and the Flood Wardens.

Mr Humphrey said that he hoped it had been accepted that the Environment Agency and the Police would fully engage with the communities concerned however he was sure that Dr Strong's question related to the use of sirens. The Police and Environment Agency had made their position clear and he was not confident that the flood sirens would be included as a part of the emergency flood plans. Better understanding and awareness of emergency plans was essential and funds being freed from sirens and used to enhance community awareness would help to ensure better protection for the people of Norfolk.

Mr Bremner asked the following questions:

- i) Were complaints about Care Force still being received?
- ii) It had been reported that Care Force had offered all its care staff guaranteed hours of employment sometime during July/August – why was this not part of the contract in the first place?
- iii) Why wasn't the Care Force contract monitored from the outset?

- iv) Were the Quality Assurance team meeting the Care Force users and also following care workers to make sure that they are working properly?
- v) Care Force was offering new safe slippers for all service users – does the Cabinet Member consider that this is adequate recompense?
- vi) What financial recompense is to be received by this Council from Care Force for its failure to deliver adequate services to contract?
- vii) Why did it take six months to send out questionnaires?
- viii) Why weren't the County Council prepared for difficulties with the contract's hand-over to Care Force?
- ix) Why didn't Council officers ensure that Care Force were ready?
- x) Would the Cabinet Member say sorry to those affected?

In response, Mr Harwood, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services, said that complaints concerning Care Force were now in line with those received for all other contracts but that Care Force would be continually monitored. In February 2009, as soon as the authority became aware that there were problems, officers had started to monitor the situation. The current contract allows for the authority to receive compensation and it did put in place measures where visits to clients had been missed. The original contract had been awarded following a tender exercise, as required by law but the authority has no say on the contracts between Care Force and its employees. With reference to the slippers being supplied, this was down to Care Force; it was not an issue for this authority. Apologies had already been expressed to everyone concerned but the authority did act in the best faith. Whilst consideration was given to removing Care Force's contract, the authority was now happy with the way services were being delivered but this would be subject to continuing monitoring.

As a point of information, the Chairman confirmed that Mr Mowle, the previous Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services, had apologised to those affected and his apology had appeared on the front page of the EDP newspaper.

Mr East asked Mr Gunson whether it was true that Government Department for Transport (DfT) officials had delayed the decision on the Northern Distributor Route (NDR) until at least Christmas, as they wished to see more evidence that public transport and non-road alternatives had been fully examined. Further, he asked whether this would delay the delivery of the Joint Core Strategies of members of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership, as they were inextricably linked to the delivery of the NDR.

Mr Little asked why alternative models to the Northern Distributor Route (NDR) had not been sought.

In response, Mr Gunson said that the DfT had requested a range of further technical work be undertaken and information on what the authority had done with regard to testing alternatives to the NDR. The DfT had promised a decision concerning the NDR by Christmas but if this was not forthcoming then the Joint Core Strategy would be delayed.

With reference to the 360 jobs created in Norfolk, Dr Boswell asked whether consideration had been given to creating apprenticeships and jobs in green / renewable areas.

In response, Mr Iles, Cabinet Member for Economic Development advised that the 360 jobs had now been taken up and the authority would now be applying for another £2.2M for the second phase of the scheme which would lead to another 360 jobs. Mr Iles said that he would provide a written answer concerning the number of jobs in green/renewable areas.

Dr Strong thanked the Chairman of the Planning, Transportation, Environment & Waste Overview & Scrutiny Panel and the officers concerned for supporting the view that parishes and individuals should be given the time and opportunity to be appraised of how the Hunstanton to Kelling Shoreline Management Plan would impact on their stretch of the coastline.

Raising Aspirations through Sport, paragraph 5

Mrs Walker asked why the Council had agreed to fund Norwich City Football Club (NCFC) with a sponsorship agreement.

Mrs Clarke said that the £200,000 funding allocated to NCFC would have been better targeted to more vulnerable young people. Further, Mrs Clarke asked how the £100,000 being retained by the Council would be spent.

Mr Scutter asked whether, in the present economic climate, the £200,000 funding allocated to NCFC was safe and also whether the funding would be safe if the ownership of the Football Club changed.

In response, Mr Cox said that the authority must consider a number of issues such as the key Local Area Agreement National Indicator (NI) 'Obesity in Children'. Although there is much activity across the County involving Stakeholders, the growth in childhood obesity meant this indicator has had to be revised upwards. Although NCC works to reduce the rate of obesity in children through 'Active Norfolk' and PE co-ordinators in schools, he hoped that this innovative partnership with NCFC would have an impact to help the authority achieve this key NI target. NCFC would be able to deliver work through the Norwich Football Academy (NFA) and NCC's logo would be included on all posters etc alongside a statement that NFA's work was supported by NCC. The NFA would also be holding a world cup event at NCFC, touring the County and organising a football contest with a place at the Football Academy as a prize. It was hoped that this association would motivate and enable vulnerable or disadvantaged young people to become involved in sporting activities. Mr Cox confirmed that £200K would be made available over two years and a further £100K could then be made available to support the work. Mr Cox said that it must be recognised that a successful NCFC would bring economic benefits to the City and County. Finally, Mr Cox confirmed that the authority did have financial security regarding the funding allocated to NCFC and a full review would take place at the end of the football season.

Service and Financial Planning 2010/11 to 2012/13, paragraph 6

With reference to the projections for 2011-12 and 2012-13 which assumed a 0% council tax increase with no compensating income from the Government, Mr Morse asked whether the national Conservative party policy had changed, or whether this was a one-off?

In response, Mr Cox said that there had been a considerable deterioration in the country's finances over the last year and the administration had assumed a prudent and realistic flat rate Government grant for planning purposes.

Mr Morse noted that this Council has lost £97M over the last four years and he said that if this 'damping' continued it could be reasonably assumed that this would increase to £25M in 2010-11.

In response, Mr Cox said that NCC received £20M less than it needed and there had been no firm commitment from any political party to change the damping mechanism. However, a strong case would be made that this be changed.

Validation of Planning Applications: Local List of Requirements, paragraph 9

Mr Little asked how the authority intended to implement, and more particularly strengthen policy relating to climate change, to ensure it is complied with.

RESOLVED: to note the report.

9. Report of the Cabinet Meeting held on 14 September 2009

In moving the report, Mr Cox drew Members' attention to key items and invited questions.

Local Member Questions, paragraph 2.3

With reference to Chapel Road Special School, Mr Scutter asked how the authority provided up-to-date communications with schools to keep them fully informed and what arrangements were in place regarding the refurbishment of the Chapel Road Special School.

Mr Bremner asked what the outcome had been of the urgent discussions held to consider the alternative options available for the replacement of Chapel Road Special School.

Mr Brindle said that Charles Burrell High School had also been removed from the Building Schools for the Future (BFS) funding and he asked for assurance that NCC would move quickly to find a site to enable building to commence.

In response, Mrs Hutson, the Cabinet Member for Children's Services, said all members were dismayed at the loss of an opportunity to apply for funding for both the Chapel Road Special School and the Charles Burrell High School in Thetford. This funding came to the authority through Partnerships for Schools who had recently taken over all the capital funding of the Department of Children, Schools and Families and this appeared to have caused major problems similar to those previously caused by the Learning & Skills Council. Mrs Hutson said the authority kept in close contact with Special Schools, especially so as the authority was developing Special Educational Needs (SEN) Strategy proposals. As for the future, Mrs Hutson said that the Capital Priorities Group had authorised the funding of a specific feasibility study to find the right site for the new Chapel Road Special School and every possible option to find alternative funding would be considered. With regards to the Charles Burrell High School, Mrs Hutson said that the authority was working closely with the Growth Point Education Partnership; the issue was to find the right site and this still had not been settled because issues had arisen (such as stone curlews). There were some extremely enthusiastic sponsors for the Academy and Mrs Hutson assured members that there was a great deal of work ongoing and a determination to move forward on these vital projects.

Norfolk County Council Organisational Framework 2009-2012 , paragraph 5

Mr Morse noted that the Framework concurred with Liberal Democrat thinking on a number of things including devolvment and community engagement and strengthening the role of the Local Councillor and he asked when the Leader, would bring forward proposals on devolved budgets for councillors to work with Town and Parish Councils.

In response, Mr Cox said that he was very keen to devolve responsibility and County Councillors would play a key role within the devolution. Detailed work would be carried out which would include the principles on how this work would be carried out. He recognised that there could be direct benefits to communities but there must be caveats to this.

‘Norfolk Forward’ – Implementing a Programme of Change for Norfolk County Council, paragraph 6

With reference to an email circulated from Mr Spratt concerning a possible proposal to outsource Children’s Services, Mr Morse asked whether any work had been, or would be done, on looking at the option of outsourcing Children’s Services.

In response to Mr Morse’s question, Mr Cox said that there were no plans whatsoever to outsource Children’s Services. However, he could not give a categorical assurance that this would never be looked at as it would be wrong to rule anything out at this stage.

Mr Spratt said that that he would be meeting with the Director of Children’s Services about this; he had not discussed this with the Cabinet. However, he believed that there were issues that needed to be given consideration, such as the Looked After Children overspend costs.

In response to Mr Spratt’s point about looked after children, Mrs Hutson said that a lot of work had been undertaken to find ways to keep this cost down; the authority does try to avoid sending looked after children out of County.

Integrated Performance and Financial Monitoring Report – Quarter 1, 2009-2010, paragraph 7

Mr Scutter asked, as the Looked After Children budget was expected to be £5M over budget, what plans the Administration had to improve in-County provision.

Mrs Clarke sought assurances that the Cabinet was confident that its budget setting processes were adequate.

In response, Mr Williams said that the budget showed savings of £1.72M but there were signs of pressures within Adult Social Services and Children’s Services and therefore Chief Officers were looking to recover this balance. The Leader and Cabinet Members would be considering the budget and reviewing processes.

10. Move to Suspend Council

At this point in the council proceedings, Mr Nobbs said that it was discourteous for the Council to keep Commander Brigadier Jim Richardson waiting any longer and he moved to suspend Council to allow the Brigadier to address Council. Mr Carttiss seconded Mr Nobbs’ proposal. With 29 votes in favour of suspending Council, 26 votes against and 3 abstentions, this motion was CARRIED.

The meeting was therefore suspended at 12.33pm and reconvened at 1.10pm.

11. Report of the Cabinet Meeting held on 14 September 2009 (continued)

Residual Waste Treatment PFI Project – Shortlist Approval, paragraph 15

On behalf of Mr East, Mr Joyce asked whether Mr Monson, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste, believed that the evaluation scores and ranking for the short listing of Contract B, presently based on the financial status, the technical experience and other legal implications, would be reversed when later in the process the environmental considerations, planning difficulties and the social disamenity factors were taken into account. Further, he asked whether Mr Monson agreed that of the four short listed companies, only Amey/Cespa with its MBT/AD + gasification technology was a serious contender, as the other three companies were based on incinerating waste; a positive disincentive to recycling.

In response, Mr Monson said that he could not agree with either of Mr East's questions, he was confident in the authority's evaluation process. All shortlisted companies were worthy to be included and would provide more detailed plans to be evaluated.

RESOLVED: to note the report.

12. Report of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee Meeting held on 28 July 2009

RESOLVED: to note the report.

13. Report of the Personnel Committee held on 14 September 2009

RESOLVED: to note the report.

14. Report of the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 3 September 2009

RESOLVED: to note the report

15. Report of the Planning (Regulatory) Committee Meeting held on 11 September 2009

RESOLVED: to note the report.

16. Matters considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Panels

RESOLVED: to note the report.

17. Report of the Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee held on 23 July 2009

RESOLVED: to note the report.

18. Appointments to Committees/Panels for the Ensuing Year

Mr Cox moved the report and noted the following appointments made by the Chief Executive under delegated powers:

- Ms A Thomas to replace Mr A Adams on the Adult Social Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel;

- Mrs M Chapman-Allen to replace Mr B Borrett on the Adult Social Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel;
- Mr S Dorrington to replace Ms D Irving on the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee;
- Mr J Perry-Warnes to replace Mr P Wells on the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee;
- Mr G Cook, Mr T Garrod, Ms D Irving and Mr J Perry-Warnes as substitutes for the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee;
- Mr G Jones to replace Mr P Morse on the Pensions Committee.

The meeting concluded at 1.24pm.

CHAIRMAN



If you need this Agenda in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Vanessa Dobson 0344 800 8020 or 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.