

Cabinet Scrutiny Committee

Date: **Tuesday 22 December 2009**
Time: **10am**
Venue: **Edwards Room, County Hall, Norwich**

Persons attending the meeting are requested to turn off mobile phones

Membership:

Mr T Adams	Mr P Morse
Dr A Boswell	Mr G Nobbs
Mr A Byrne	Mr R Rockcliffe
Mr J Dobson	Mr M Scutter
Mr P Duigan	Mr J Shrimplin
Mr R Hanton	Mr T White
Mr C Jordan	Mr M Wilby
Mr J Joyce	Mr R Wright
Mr M Kiddle-Morris	

Parent Governor Representatives:

Mr P East	Dr L Poliakoff
-----------	----------------

Church Representatives:

Mrs J O'Connor	Mr A Mash
----------------	-----------

**For further details and general enquiries about this Agenda
please contact the Committee Administrator:**

Vanessa Dobson on 01603 223029
or email vanessa.dobson@norfolk.gov.uk

A g e n d a

- 1. To receive apologies and details of any substitute members attending**
- 2. Members to Declare any Interests**

Please indicate whether the interest is a personal one only or one that is prejudicial. A declaration of a personal interest should indicate the nature of the interest and the agenda item to which it relates. In the case of a personal interest, the member may speak and vote on the matter. Please note that if you are exempt from declaring a personal interest because it arises solely from your position on a body to which you were nominated by the County Council or a body exercising functions of a public nature (e.g. another local authority), you need only declare your interest if and when you intend to speak on a matter.

If a prejudicial interest is declared, the member should withdraw from the room whilst the matter is discussed unless members of the public are allowed to make representations, give evidence or answer questions about the matter, in which case you may attend the meeting for that purpose. You must immediately leave the room when you have finished or the meeting decides you have finished, if earlier.

These declarations apply to all those members present, whether the member is part of the meeting, attending to speak as a local member on an item or simply observing the meeting from the public seating area.

- 3. Minutes**

- 3.1 To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee held on **24 November 2009** (Page 1)

- 3.2 To confirm the minutes of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting with MEPs held on **27 November 2009** (Page 7)

- 4. To receive any items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency**

- 5. Call-in Item(s)**

The deadline for calling-in any other matters for consideration by the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee on 22 December from Cabinet on 7 December is 4.00pm on 14 December. Notification of any call-in items will follow

- 6. Report on The Pitt Review (NCC Progress Update)**

- 6.1 **Suggested Approach by the Scrutiny Support Manager** (Page 17)

- 6.2 **Joint Report by the Head of Emergency Planning and the Director of Environment, Transport & Development** which looks at the current situation in Norfolk with regard to the recommendations put forward by Sir Michael Pitt in his review of the multi-agency response and recovery following the flooding in June and July 2007 (Page 19)

7. Supporting People in Economic Difficulties

7.1 Suggested Approach by the Scrutiny Support Manager (Page 29)

7.2 Report by the Recession Task Group which provides an update on recent activities the County Council is involved in, which contribute to supporting the economy. (Page 30)

8. Meeting with MEPs (Page 37)
Suggested approach by the Scrutiny Support Manager

9. Forward Work Programme (Page 39)
Suggested approach by the Scrutiny Support Manager

Chris Walton
Head of Democratic Services
County Hall
Martineau Lane
Norwich
NR1 2DH

Date Agenda Published: 14 December 2009

Group Meetings

Conservative	9.00am	Colman Room
Liberal Democrats	9.00am	Room 504
Labour	9.00am	Room 531
Green	9.00am	Room 532



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

The Working Style of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee

(adopted 31 July 2001 and re-affirmed on 7 June 2005)

Independence: Members of the Scrutiny Committee will not be subject to Group whipping arrangements

Member Leadership: Agendas and meetings will be member led.

A Constructive Atmosphere: Meetings will be constructive, and not judgmental. People giving evidence at a Committee meeting should not feel under attack. Experience has shown that an atmosphere of challenge and constructive enquiry is vital to the success of the scrutiny process.

Respect and Trust: Meetings will be conducted in a spirit of mutual respect and trust.

Openness and Transparency: The Committee's business will be open and transparent. In particular, the minutes of Scrutiny Committee meetings will explain the discussion / debate such that they can be understood by an outside reader.

Consensus: Committee Members will strive to work together and while recognising political allegiances, attempt to achieve consensus and agreed recommendations. However scope for minority reports will be permitted.

Impartial and Independent Officer Advice: Officer advice and support will be impartial and independent, as officers support all members of the Authority (and not just the ruling Administration).

Regular Review: There will be regular reviews of how the process is working, and a willingness to adapt if things are not working well.

Programming and Planning: The Committee will have a programme of work and plans for individual meetings. Before each piece of scrutiny work, the committee will agree about the extent of the work, what information they will need initially and which members and officers they wish to see.

Managing Time: Committee meetings will be kept to a reasonable length of time, up to two hours. Also, where it is possible to conduct the Committee's business by circulating information between meetings, this will be done.

Cabinet Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the Meeting Held on 24 November 2009

Present:

Mr A Adams	Mr P Morse (Chair)
Dr A Boswell (Vice Chair)	Mr G Nobbs
Mr J Dobson	Mr R Rockcliffe
Mr P Duigan	Mr M Scutter
Mr R Hanton	Mr J Shrimplin
Mr C Jordan	Mr A White
Mr J Joyce	Mr R Wright
Mr M Kiddle-Morris	

Substitute Members:

Mrs D Irving.

Also Present:

Mr I Monson, Norfolk County Council
Mr D Murphy, Norfolk County Council
Mr M Allen, Head of Environment & Waste Management
Mr K Cogdell, Scrutiny Support Manager
Ms K Haywood, Scrutiny Support Manager
Mr J Hull, Project Director - Residual Waste Services
Mr M Langlands, Media & Public Affairs Manager
Mrs J Martin, Scrutiny Support Manager
Ms V McNeill, Head of Law
Mr C Walton, Head of Democratic Services

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Mr M Wilby (Mrs Irving substituted).

2. Declarations of Interest

2.1 Members declared the following interests:

- Mr Joyce declared a personal interest as a Member of the Waste Project Board.
- Dr Boswell declared a personal interest as a Member of the Waste Project Board.
- Mr Byrne declared an interest in Item 7 as a Member of the Police Authority.
- Mr Hanton declared an interest in Item 7 as a Member of the Police Authority.

3. Minutes

3.1 The minutes of the meeting held 27 October 2009 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair subject to the following amendments:

Forward Work Programme, paragraph 7.4, a, b and c, to read:

- “a) All Member allowances are evaluated by the Independent Remuneration Panel. Its decision relating to allowances is pending, and therefore there is nothing for this Committee to look in to.
- b) All Members are elected to the Council by the public, and the electorate has formed its own judgement.
- c) There is already a clear statutory framework and guidance for dealing with any conflicts of interest that arise.”

Paragraph 7.5, to include the following bullet point opposing the motion:

- “Mr Nobbs said that he believed Member allowances should be discussed and the public would not understand why Members were not prepared to discuss this.”

4. Items of urgent business which the Chair decides should be considered as a matter of urgency

There were no items of urgent business.

5. Call-in Items(s)

No items had been called-in from the 9 November Cabinet meeting.

6. Residual Waste Treatment Project

- 6.1 Members received the suggested approach by the Scrutiny Support Manager, together with a report by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development.
- 6.2 Mr I Monson, Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste, Ms Victoria McNeill, Head of Law, Mr M Allen, Head of Environment & Waste Management and Mr J Hull, Project Director - Residual Waste Services, attended the meeting to answer questions. Mr M Jackson, Director of Planning and Transportation, sent his apologies, as he was unable to attend due to a prior commitment.
- 6.3 Mr Morse, Chair of Cabinet Scrutiny Committee said that Mr Nobbs had circulated a list of possible questions to all Members and whilst Members could ask additional questions, Mr Nobbs' questions did not relate to the scope of this scrutiny, as proposed by the Scrutiny Leads and agreed by this Committee so could not be considered during this scrutiny meeting. However, if Mr Nobbs wished, he could put this forward as a potential future scrutiny item which would be considered in the usual way.
- 6.4 During discussion of the Report, the following points were noted in relation to questions asked by the Committee:
 - 6.4.1 A special purpose vehicle (SPV) is a limited company where generally 15 – 20% of its finance comes from equity providers, with the remaining finance being provided by banks. SPVs are set up to help to ensure that contracts are capable of working for 25 years by dividing up the risks in a project and making those outside the SPV responsible for them, eg sub-contractors or the public sector. Banks also want to make sure that SPVs function correctly so that their debt is paid off so they help to ensure that SPVs are fit for purpose.

- 6.4.2 Parental Company Guarantees could be provided by large companies to smaller companies working under them. For instance the parent company of a sub-contractor may provide a parental guarantee to a SPV.
- 6.4.3 Gateway review is a process where a team of specialists look at the health of a project and determine whether it is fit to proceed to the next stage; this is undertaken by discussions with various internal and external stakeholders. There may be five reviews during a major procurement and outcomes can be graded red, amber or green.
- 6.4.4 The early gateway review for the waste project was delivered by an external team; the project came through strongly with regard to resources, control and clarity of purpose and was classified 'red', which is common for an early review. The gateway review process is now more frequent, undertaken by a fortnightly meeting of a Project Assurance Team; internalising the process allows the focus of scrutiny to be more frequent and lighter touch. In response to a question concerning why the process had been internalised when the grading was 'red', Members heard that as there are only five gateway reviews for major procurements this created risks of major setbacks at key decision points and therefore it was important to have a more frequent and broader range of scrutiny which was being delivered on a fortnightly basis.
- 6.4.5 It was explained that the general approach for risks in major procurements was for those best placed to manage the risk to be responsible for it and that the price of managing some risks added significantly to the overall cost.
- 6.4.6 For the PFI process an Expressions of Interest and Outline Business Case have been approved by the Department of Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) which includes an approval of an affordability envelope.
- 6.4.7 The deliberations and recommendations of the Planning, Transportation, Environment and Waste Overview & Scrutiny Panel were presented to the Cabinet and taken into account alongside the Project Board's recommendations at key decision points in the Waste Project. This added value to the project and was above and beyond the corporate PFI and major project governance requirements.
- 6.4.8 In terms of risk flow, European regulations had changed for this type of project. Previously there had been a 'Negotiated Process' which enabled funders to be introduced at the back-end of the process and which led to a lot of projects being protracted. Now, in the different regulatory regime, 'Competitive Dialogue' was used to involve funders at the start of the process and this helped to clarify the authority's requirements to all from the outset.
- 6.4.9 The authority manages risk through risk assessment, risks are considered throughout all processes and risk registers are received by Overview & Scrutiny Panels. Additional risk assessment was not required, it was more a case of considering risks at the right times. However, the process of risk within a SPV was different; here the authority would now look early on to see that key sub-contractors had, as a minimum, draft Heads of Terms in place. There were other measures in place such as off-take agreements (for areas such as electricity) and Parental Company Guarantees which also related to the risk around an SPV.
- 6.4.10 It was suggested that there should be financial ceilings in place to prevent costs increasing; the affordability envelope approved by Cabinet in February 2009, as part of the Defra approval process, was equivalent to this.

- 6.4.11 Whilst the report contained a lot about lessons learned Members were concerned about what processes had been put in place to ensure that these were passed to other parts of the authority. In response, Members heard that lessons learnt had already been applied, for example the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) processes had been streamlined to remove the early stages, minimum thresholds have been used for shortlisting the strongest and most experienced companies and potential contractors have been made aware of the authority's expectations. An internal Waste PFI Manager Forum has been used to ensure good practice is shared.
- 6.4.12 In response to a question concerning how much liaison existed between Norfolk County Council and other authorities, it was explained that mentoring and sharing of contract documents took place. There is also a possibility that this project will be used as an example of good project governance by Defra. Officers were involved in gateway reviews for other authorities, gave presentations at conferences and worked with authorities such as Suffolk and Cambridgeshire. Mr Monson advised that there were quite a lot of organisations, such as the Regional Waste Forum, where Cabinet Members from different authorities can meet to discuss projects.
- 6.4.13 It was suggested that, ultimately, the responsibility lay with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste and the question was asked how Mr Monson hoped to gain support of the Cabinet because it was important to make this work. Mr Monson said that he fully appreciated how important it was to work together to ensure that the PFI project was put in place. He welcomed this scrutiny of Contract A and said he would pass on any recommendations from this Committee to the Cabinet.
- 6.4.14 The Chair said that there had been lessons identified within the report and this Committee expected the Cabinet to take these on board with the Waste PFI and across department projects.

6.5 Exclusion of the Public

The Project Director - Residual Waste Services presented the following reasoning for exclusion of the public and conclusion in respect of the public interest test:

"The information is considered to be exempt under Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (Information relating to the Financial or business affairs of any person (other than the Authority)).

The public interest test concluded that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information. Disclosing sensitive business and financial information may impact on the Authority attaining best value in future negotiations and disclosing legal argument may prejudice the Authority's position in the event it is subject to legal challenge."

RESOLVED -

The Cabinet Scrutiny Committee agreed that the public be excluded from the meeting under section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

6.6 Return to public session

RESOLVED:

6.7 The Committee agreed:

- To respond to Cabinet setting out a summary of the 'Lessons that can be applied to other major projects', as set out in paragraph 6 of the report.
- To make further recommendations to reflect discussions that had taken place during this meeting, in particular SPVs and cost ceilings.
- Members would like to make sure lessons learnt from this project are being applied to the Waste PFI and this will be a subject of scrutiny by this Committee at a timescale to be agreed.

7. Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) Guidance

7.1 Members received the annexed report (10) by the Scrutiny Support Manager

7.2 Officers were thanked for bringing this item forward which would be greatly beneficial to Members and it was suggested that this be included in the Council's Constitution.

RESOLVED:

7.3 The Committee agreed that this be referred to the Constitution Working Group so that the CCfA can be discussed and any necessary amendments be made to the Constitution, before being agreed at a meeting of Full Council.

8. Forward Work Programme

8.1 Members received the annexed report (11).

8.2 In the light of discussions that took place at the Full Council meeting on 23 November, it was suggested that a scrutiny of Adult Social Services in respect of older people's day care centres and the reorganisation of the provision of dementia care takes place as a matter of urgency.

8.3 With reference to the 19 January scrutiny topic 'Abolition of the Learning and Skills Council', Mr Rockcliffe suggested that representatives from the College of West Anglia and the National Construction College East should be invited to take part in the discussion.

8.4 Mr Nobbs suggested that Mr Williams might be invited to attend the 9 February 2010 meeting, at which the County Farms Policy would be discussed, as he was the previous portfolio holder.

RESOLVED:

8.5 That Overview and Scrutiny Strategy Group should consider, as a matter of urgency, a scrutiny of Adult Social Services in respect of older people's day care centres and the reorganisation of the provision of dementia.

[The meeting closed at 12.05pm]

PAUL MORSE, CHAIR



If you need these minutes 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.

**Cabinet Scrutiny Committee
Meeting with MEPs**

Minutes of the Meeting Held on 27 November 2009

Present:

Dr A Boswell	Mr G Nobbs
Mr A Byrne	Mr R Rockcliffe
Mr J Dobson	Mr M Scutter
Mr P Duigan	Mr J Shrimplin
Mr C Jordan	Mrs A Thomas
Mr J Joyce	Mr A White
Mr M Kiddle-Morris	Mr R Wright
Mr P Morse (Chair)	

Also Present:

Mr S Agnew, Member of the European Parliament (MEP) (UKIP)
Mr A Duff, MEP (Liberal Democrat)
Mr R Howitt, MEP (Labour)
Mr G Van Orden, MEP (Conservative)
Mr B Hannah, Norfolk County Council
Mr R Smith, Norfolk County Council
Mr T Tomkinson, Norfolk County Council
Mr K Cogdell, Scrutiny Support Manager
Ms K Haywood, Scrutiny Support Manager
Mr C Walton, Head of Democratic Services

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Mr A Adams, Mr R Hanton and Mr M Wilby (Mrs A Thomas substituted).

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Matters of urgent business

There were no matters of urgent business.

4. Meeting with MEPs

- 4.1 The Chair welcomed Mr Agnew, Mr Duff, Mr Howitt, Mr Van Orden and members of the public to the meeting of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee and advised that this would not be a traditional scrutiny meeting. Hopefully the meeting would enable councillors and members of the public to have a better understanding of the role of MEPs and also to consider how Norfolk County Council and MEPs could work together for the benefit of Norfolk.

Mr Agnew, Mr Duff, Mr Howitt and Mr Van Orden then introduced themselves to those present.

4.2 To consider the following questions received from members of the public.

4.2.1 Question received from Mr David Porter (present at the meeting):

“Could you please ask what are the benefits of being members of the EU and is the multi-billion contribution value for money?”

Mr Andrew Duff: The benefits of being members of the EU are security, prosperity and democracy. The cost of EU membership amounts to £135b euros per annum which equates to 235 euros per person, per annum - which was good value. The British Government would, in future, have much greater power to change the direction of EU policy which would also strengthen and support research and development - of special importance to Norfolk.

Mr Stuart Agnew: There are no benefits. Whilst the perceived benefits are peace and trade Mr Agnew contended that peace was in place because of NATO. The disadvantages of being members were: (a) the cost (£40m per day) (b) the democratic cost (people govern who cannot be removed – such as the appointment of Baroness Ashton and (c) the loss of control with regard to immigration.

Mr Richard Howitt: The benefits are peace and the trade agreement. As far as migration was concerned, this has its advantages as it enables UK residents to travel and work abroad and the UK also benefits from migrant workers.

Mr Geoffrey Van Orden: The whole question of membership is a complex issue and a cost benefit analysis has never been undertaken. The UK does pay too much; France is the same size and often pays less. The UK pays more than £4bn net per annum and this will rise to over £6bn per annum from 2010. There is also a lot of waste, for example the monthly session in Strasbourg could be ended and there are many other things that could be done that would save millions of pounds. However, it is important that the UK has a foothold in Europe.

4.2.2 Question received from Mr Pat Gowen, North Sea Action Group:

“I would like to ask the four Norfolk MEPs to explain what they are doing to help Norfolk and its people in respect of adopting EU legislation in common with other coastal members to terminate or abate the massive stripping of sand and shingle offshore to Norfolk that is causing escalating coastal erosion and impacting coastal housing, business, environment and the fishing industry.”

Mr Stuart Agnew: This area of dredging is already well regulated and Mr Agnew would not welcome more EU legislation. The Dutch take aggregate from beneath the sea and use it to build up sea defences. What is needed is a proper study rather than opinions.

Mr Richard Howitt: The residents of Happisburgh and Sea Palling are very critical of the dredging that has taken place. Mr Howitt had met with the Environment Agency (EA) to look at the impact of dredging.

Mr Geoffrey Van Orden: This is one of the issues where there are no particular party political differences because many Members are concerned about coastal erosion. However, dredging is more complicated as the causal link to coastal erosion has not

yet been proven. Mr Van Orden and his colleague Vicky Ford MEP have been in touch with the EA, Norfolk County Council and other local councils such as Suffolk and Waveney to consider the possibility of setting up an Interreg Project to look into the effects on coastal erosion.

Mr Andrew Duff: Clearly the coast is increasingly fragile and some botched attempts to defend the coastline have had a detrimental effect. Mr Duff suspects that the Action Group might be correct in terms of dredging. The problem of coastal erosion in Britain is further fractionalised because of the number of authorities dealing with the issue and the management of the coast which is split up in a somewhat chaotic fashion.

4.2.3 Question received from Joanna White (Hannah Lynch presented the question at the meeting):

“Will the MEPs be supporting local charity World Horse Welfare in their campaign to end the suffering of thousands of horses transported in atrocious conditions across Europe to slaughter; will they sign the written declaration currently tabled in the European Parliament?”

Mr Richard Howitt: Has visited the former ILHP at Snetterton, signed the declaration, helped with the appeal and advised on how to take this forward. A lot has been achieved on animal welfare over the years and Mr Howitt congratulated the World Horse Welfare who had done so much to expose the horrific transportation of horses.

Mr Geoffrey Van Orden: Has visited the former ILHP at Snetterton, has signed the declaration and has been very active in animal welfare issues. The problem is not in the UK but on the continent where laws must be enforced. However, it is important that the distinction in terms of the regulations is maintained between transportation of horses for slaughter and registered horses such as thoroughbreds whose owners have an interest in their welfare and understand best the conditions under which they should travel.

Mr Andrew Duff: Confirmed that he had added his support and, together with his delegation, had signed the declaration (173 signatures added). If this declaration achieves 50% of MEPs signatures it would become policy and the Parliament would be obliged to respond. Mr Duff offered congratulations for all the work that had been done on this.

Mr Stuart Agnew: Has signed the declaration. This is a culture problem as in the UK horses are seen as pets but in some parts of the world horses are considered as draught horses or meat. The new legislation would make things difficult for those people who transport horses in the UK. The problem will be further exacerbated when Turkey join the EU.

4.2.4 Question received from Mr Terry Lefevre:

“I would like to know from the MEPs from our area why to get something done about the A11 has taken years and still we wait.”

Mr Geoffrey Van Orden: The EU, fortunately, does not get involved in this aspect of our roads; but is involved in so-called trans-European networks. The A11 does not fit into this category. However, funding has been received to help with upgrades to the A120, A47 and A14. There are alternative ways of lessening road traffic such as getting freight off the roads and onto rail - Network Rail, under consistent pressure from Conservative MEPs among others, has at last been successful in its bid for

improvements to the Felixstowe to Nuneaton rail route which will take freight off the roads.

Mr Andrew Duff: The contract was currently being signed off and the project would be completed by 2013 so there is progress. We cannot always call on Brussels to solve domestic problems - if the British Government and the Treasury cannot afford to improve the A11 it is not fair or appropriate to expect Brussels to address the issue. There is already too much interference from Brussels.

Mr Stuart Agnew: Currently, an enquiry was underway at Elveden Village Hall and Mr Agnew encouraged the questioner to attend this. The Elveden Estate had objected to the 5-way roundabout but this could be dealt with at a later date. The Elveden by-pass should be in place by 2015.

Mr Richard Howitt: Has been actively involved in getting trans-European money for East Anglia which would have a direct and indirect effect for the County. Norfolk has been waiting forty years for the A11 and the biggest problem was the lack of funding. Mr Howitt was concerned that if there was a change of Government the funding for road improvements might be withdrawn.

4.2.5 Question received from Mr Guy Mitchell (present at the meeting):

“Why does EU legislation prevent the British Government from deporting immigrants convicted of serious crimes?”

Mr Andrew Duff: Mr Duff was not certain that the contention of this question is correct. It is correct that we insist on due processes and each case is considered on its merits. There must be an appropriate appeals process and the penalty must be proportionate to the crime. We must also ensure that anyone deported for trial will be fairly treated and will not be subject to torture. Mr Duff supports the process of greater integration and we must ensure we have effective, efficient and fair processes in place.

Mr Stuart Agnew: Some immigrants who commit crime currently go unpunished and the UK should not live with this situation any longer. Members of the EU have signed up to the European Convention of Human Rights and the UK would have to leave the EU if it wishes to address this situation.

Mr Richard Howitt: There are new, rigorous requirements for sex offenders being implemented and Mr Howitt disputed the idea that sex offenders receive support to remain in the UK. 60 people had used the Human Rights Act to avoid deportation and the person in question had been one of these.

Mr Geoffrey Van Orden: This is a very serious problem. 14% of the UK prison population is made up of foreign nationals. There are also terrorist concerns. The problem of deportation do not stem from EU legislation but from the separate European Convention on Human Rights - this needs reinterpretation so that the issue of deporting foreign nationals and terrorists can be properly addressed. Under the Treaty of Lisbon the EU itself will accede to ECHR so that will make changes even more difficult.

4.3 To consider the following question from Members on behalf of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee:

4.3.1 Question from Mr George Nobbs:

“How can we communicate better with our MEPs on key issues, both in terms of supporting them and gaining their support on issues of importance to us?”

Mr Stuart Agnew: Norfolk County Council was doing a very good job in that MEPs had been invited to this meeting; he could not see any way to improve on this.

Mr Richard Howitt: Commended Members and Officers of the Council who have an excellent professional relationship. This must continue to ensure that more money comes into Norfolk. Mr Howitt asked the Scrutiny Committee to consider what the end of the Regional Assembly and the break up of the Learning & Skills Council might mean and whether this might provide opportunities for MEPs to meet with Members and Officers to discuss collaborative arrangements.

Mr Geoffrey Van Orden: Recognised that the basis on which MEPs are elected were not satisfactory in terms of making MEPs closer to their constituents and he would like to see changes in the system. Norfolk County Council is better than most authorities but in terms of communication, people often do not think to turn to MEPs and there is a whole range of issues where MEPs could be helpful as they are lobbyists, campaigners and understand how the system works in Brussels. There are a lot of local projects where more could be done and he asked Councillors to look at how EU funding was being spent because at the moment this was an abstract process. MEPs rely heavily on the media to tell people what they are doing and Mr Van Orden was delighted to see a reporter from the EDP present at the meeting.

Mr Andrew Duff: The East of England had identified what would work functionally and politically but all the authorities in the county must work together to make more connections and ask strategic questions. With respect to the Scrutiny Committee exercise it would be helpful if it was more of a briefing and an exchange of opinions rather than a question time format. More would be achieved if councillors had a chance to speak to MEPs about strategic and political policies and issues.

4.3.2 Questions received from Mr Mervyn Scutter:

- a) What input have our MEPs had to date in the debate regarding the new funding period, and given the value of funding received in recent years, how do MEPs plan to promote Norfolk's access to future funding?”
- b) What would be useful for Norfolk County Council to provide to support the MEPs in lobbying on our behalf to maximise our eligibility?”

Mr Richard Howitt: MEPs must make sure their voices are heard and problems are understood; to do this they had to show that communities have specific problems. Mr Howitt is actively involved in budget reviews. There are 28 different projects around Norfolk who receive European Social Funding and if funding dries up they would lose this. All of us have be part of shaping Norfolk's future.

Mr Geoffrey Van Orden: Many MEPs are engaged in funding issues. They often work with the East of England Brussels Office. It must be made clear that 'EU funds' are essentially British tax payers' money being recycled through Brussels back to the UK and we must pay closer attention to where this money is going and what it is being spent on. A Conservative government will scrap the regional development agency and other such quangos. Small businesses are part of the local economy

and a lot of them need help in various ways – Mr Van Orden has been successful in getting funding for this. Currently there are a number of projects that have received funding and we must continue to seize opportunities. In terms of European Social Funding, Norfolk receives about half per capita funding but in terms of agriculture it receives twice per capita. The rural related parts of the EU budget will drop over the next few years and it is likely that our part of the UK would receive less funding.

Mr Andrew Duff: In the present climate we cannot expect there to be an increase in the total sum of public expenditure but we can expect there to be a transfer from the national to European budget on the ground of economies of scale. The Council should prepare for a gloomy scenario with respect to drawing funding from Brussels. There have been a plethora of projects that are part-funded from the budget in this county and we should enjoy this for the present.

Mr Stuart Agnew: Was very unhappy with the entire system. We are told how to spend money by EERA. Much of this money for projects has to be tied in with other countries in the EU. We don't want to be part of this EU – we want to spend money how we want to and not how we are told.

4.3.3 Question received from Mrs Alison Thomas:

“What support do MEPs need from us to lobby on relevant issues, and what can we do to obtain funding support to meet our transport priorities, such as the NDR and getting the A47 reinstated as a priority designated trans-European Network?”

Mr Geoffrey Van Orden: Getting more funding support is extremely difficult. Network Rail has at last successfully bid for improvements to the Felixstowe to Nuneaton rail route which will take freight off the roads. There is more lobbying to be done and County Councils need to be more active with MEPs to ensure money is being used in a timely way and doesn't miss funding opportunities. One problem to achieving funding is that this is often linked to matched funding. One success has been the Great Yarmouth Outer Harbour but the third river crossing needs to be promoted to deal with the additional traffic that will ensue.

Mr Andrew Duff: Local authorities across the East of England need to be more coordinated and there needs to be greater coherency between MEPs and MPs. MPs are in a strong position to push for a greater draw down of public funding in the county. The A47 cannot be reinstated as a priority project so we could focus more on longer term 'greener' projects such as cycle ways and canal routes and there are areas of research funding that could be applied for.

Mr Stuart Agnew: Decisions should not be made by EERA. The critical thing about the NDR is that it does not quite link up and this will become a problem.

Mr Richard Howitt: The real issue on how to get money for the A47 is about competition in terms of trans-European funding. Regarding collaborative arrangements, the Leader of Norfolk County Council will be on the new Leaders' Board. We have a European Panel but we also need a Collaborative Forum and he asked that the Leader of Norfolk County Council puts forward this suggestion at the Leaders' Board.

4.3.4 Question received from Mr Russell Wright:

“Is there money sitting behind any of the allocations made to strengthen modes of transport that are environmentally friendly which could help improve the rail transport system in Norfolk?”

Mr Andrew Duff: Funding is available through the Trans-European programme but if projects cannot be identified through this programme then the answer is no. It would be more sensible to focus on 2014+ and contracts for funding for practical experiments in improving transport links (such as the creation of green corridors). Funding for sustainable energy programmes is available and in December we will have to consider whether there can be a globally binding treaty to reinforce our capacity to the greening of transport. This is a problem that cannot be solved quickly with subsidies from Brussels.

Mr Stuart Agnew: We have money for the A11 but Mr Agnew could not see anything else being made available. Additional transport links are required because immigration is getting out of control.

Mr Richard Howitt: There is money available, examples being the University of East Anglia research funding for greener public transport, Territorial Corporation funding to help East Port and Direct Transport funding for sustainable transport. Overall Norfolk has received £100m for the period to 2014 and has taken the decision to adapt our economy to a low carbon growth. Short term answers are not the right thing but the authority could get help to introduce a car sharing scheme.

Mr Geoffrey Van Orden: We must get more freight off the roads and on to rail and there has been some success with this. In addition there have been successful bids through, for example the Framework Programme and Civitas 2. The authority has been allocated £5m for alternative fuel trials and cleaner public vehicles (for organisations such as the Police Authority and Fire Service).

4.3.5 Question received from Mr Andrew Boswell:

“Is there any money available to support the higher carbon reduction target that the Eastern Region has set itself (18% reduction by 2010 instead of the 15% reduction that the UK has signed up to)?”

Mr Stuart Agnew: Does not want to see any money spent chasing carbon reduction. 0.038% of carbon is released into the atmosphere and this is important as it increases plant growth. If carbon dioxide increases it would not be a problem; it does not heat up the earth. There must be a proper scientific analysis before we spend money on this.

Mr Richard Howitt: The University of East Anglia have proved without doubt that climate change is a problem and Mr Howitt fully supported the national targets and voted for an increase in targets. We must change to renewable energy and the UK has accepted the biggest increase in this. Norfolk is trying to make itself a beacon region for renewable energy and wind farms and wave technology are important steps forward.

Mr Geoffrey Van Orden: Regardless of the interpretation of science, we must leave future generations a cleaner atmosphere and have energy security. We must therefore rely less on carbon based fuels. We will increasingly import oil and gas but we need to invest in sustainable energy. Mr Van Orden supports nuclear power but

consideration should also be given to other possible renewable options. There is EU funding available to help with these types of activities and an EU project is being considered to promote the use of bio-renewable energy derived from non-food plants. We need to give more young people the necessary training and skills in science and engineering so that we can maintain and develop our energy industry over the coming years.

Mr Andrew Duff: The East of England Office in Brussels can provide information and it deserves our absolute support. The critical problem of the Copenhagen Summit is that we would have to assist non-industrialised countries to accept the costs required to combat climate change. The Commission is asking for a substantial contribution of 30b – 40b euros towards this global ‘price’ and Mr Duff hopes they can make progress with this. The Carbon Trading scheme had failed to provide a sensible price and we need to research the operation of this scheme to see if it can become more of an instrument to assist the collective effort. There must also be an emphasis on saving resources in commerce and farming communities and Norfolk County Council must include this in its own target.

4.3.6 Question received from Mr George Nobbs:

“Why does France receive twice as much arts funding as the UK?”

Mr Richard Howitt: We must ensure that France pays as much as we do. With regard to the arts, money is available and Norwich has previously received funding. The officers of Norfolk County Council are very good at obtaining arts funding from the EU.

Mr Geoffrey Van Orden: France generally receives more right across the board. The UK does not make a high number of bids for culture funding and it might be because these programmes require matched funding. In 2008, the French put in 64 bids (22 successful) whilst the UK put in 22 bids (15 successful) so there is not an enormous discrepancy.

Mr Andrew Duff: 23 projects that have received culture funding over the last 5 – 6 years, including the King’s Lynn Festival, Screen East, the Aldeburgh Festival and the Ipswich Dance Festival. France spends more than the UK on arts and has flourishing facilities in the provinces. However, French citizens pay more tax than UK citizens. There should be more emphasis on cultural policies to break down prejudices and improve our appreciation of different cultures as it would appear that we are going through a nationalistic phase of our history.

Mr Stuart Agnew: Visits the Princess Theatre in Hunstanton regularly and hopes this will never be shut down. France has a different culture to that of the UK and spends more on the arts than the UK does. It is all about matched funding and the Arts Council had a difficult job to do. Mr Agnew hopes better times will return but the Government’s current priorities mean that matched funding will be difficult to find over the next few years.

4.4 Questions from Cabinet Scrutiny Committee members:

- 4.4.1 Mr Rockcliffe said that he was concerned about the waste of money caused by the transfer between Strasbourg and Brussels and he asked whether there was any chance of stopping this waste.

Mr Geoffrey Van Orden: Most British MEPs don't wish to travel to Strasbourg; this was a decision made by the national governments and one at least (France) would not wish this to change. We supported the million-signature petition to scrap Strasbourg and we must keep this campaign going. Furthermore, the European Parliament does not need officers in all European states.

Mr Andrew Duff: Unfortunately, the Conservative Government under John Major agreed to its inclusion in the Treaty so there would need to be a change to the Treaty. A key clause in the Lisbon Treaty is that Parliament can propose changes to treaties so it will now have power to negotiate changes.

Mr Stuart Agnew: £300m of our money was used to effect this change. It is highly inconvenient to get to Strasbourg. It is time to renegotiate but it will require all 27 Member States to call for this change and France will not agree to this.

Mr Richard Howitt: This year we have argued that an extra million tonnes of carbon dioxide has been released into the atmosphere due to MEPs travelling to Strasbourg. The French President would not support the closure of the Strasbourg Parliament as it benefits the French economy.

- 4.4.2 Mr Dobson spoke of the military units based in Norfolk, which is home to the Light Dragoons and also RAF Marham. There used to be tension between the EU and NATO and he asked if the MEPs had any views concerning whether these tensions would rise again.

Mr Andrew Duff: The Treaty says that we can grow a security and defence policy in collaboration with NATO. The French have decided to reintegrate fully to the NATO structure. Catherine Ashton, the new EU vice President and Foreign Minister, cannot send our troops to war; the decision to deploy has to be made by the members of the European Council, who would all have to agree. We can instigate a position where States, who are so politically inclined, can go further towards integration of their armed forces. Mr Duff hopes that the UK will see that it is to its advantage to play a full role in the security of the EU.

Mr Stuart Agnew: If we are going to be at war in foreign countries we must boost our defences. Also, we are building a country called Europe which will have its own army and at the same time we are in NATO. EU politicians will eventually send soldiers to war. Do we want to be part of this?

Mr Richard Howitt: Mr Howitt is deeply proud of the EU Defence Commission which has been involved in events such as Russia's invasion of Georgia, the genocide in the Sudan and rocket attacks by Israel over Palestine. The UK is helping to keep the peace in many countries and British troops are deployed with the agreement of the British Prime Minister. There will be no competition between the EU and NATO.

Mr Geoffrey Van Orden: The armed forces have a very large footprint in Norfolk, being based in Swanton Morley and RAF Marham. Mr Van Orden had visited troops in Iraq and Afghanistan and has seen the excellent work that they do. The EU role in this is a separate matter. Mr Van Orden is opposed to the European Defence Policy because it does duplicate and is detrimental to NATO and brings no added value. This is a political project which allows the EU to play a role on the global stage. There is a difficulty with the EU posturing in order to put an EU label on operations but if you examine each of the policies, none stand up in military terms. The EU has created a problem with NATO of its own making. There are 21 EU

Member States, who are also members of NATO. It is ridiculous that we have to think about the relationship with EU and NATO as they are essentially the same nations. Resources are wasted by the EU in duplicating structures. The specific reason why there is an unhappy relationship between the EU and NATO at the moment is to do with the Cyprus question.

- 4.5 The Chair said that due to lack of time remaining, Members could put questions to the MEPs and he requested that the MEPs provide written answers:
- 4.5.1 Mr Jordan asked, what do MEPs do?
- 4.5.2 Mr Scutter said that recently there had been problems with regard to MPs expenses and also with House of Lords expenses. He asked what MEPs were doing to ensure there is no abuse of their expenses?
- 4.5.3 The Chair asked Members and MEPs to consider how these meetings should be developed for the future and he then thanked the MEPs for attending.

RESOLVED:

- 4.7 That the next Cabinet Scrutiny meeting on 22 December should include a brief agenda item to discuss what had been learned during this meeting with MEPs and to give consideration to the format of future meetings with MEP.

[The meeting closed at 12.15pm]

PAUL MORSE, CHAIR



If you need these minutes 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.

Pitt Review: Progress Update

Suggested Approach by the Scrutiny Support Manager

1. Background

- 1.1 Following a motion at Full Council on 28 July 2008, the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee was tasked with investigating the role to be played by the County Council and the Norfolk Resilience Forum in implementing the recommendations set out in the Pitt Review.
- 1.2 The committee received a report by the Head of Emergency Planning in January 2009 which highlighted the current situation regarding the implementation of the relevant recommendations, possible new legislation and key issues for Norfolk County Council and the Norfolk Resilience Forum. The committee noted the work that Norfolk County Council and the Norfolk Resilience Forum had already undertaken to ensure the Pitt Report recommendations were implemented. A further progress report was brought to the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting on 19 May 2009.
- 1.3 At the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 19th May members agreed that in light of the recommendation within the Pitt Review that all “upper tier local authorities should establish an Overview and Scrutiny Committee to review work by public sector bodies and essential service providers in order to manage flood risk, underpinned by a legal requirement to cooperate and share information”, and having been tasked with this issue originally by full Council, that this issue should remain under the remit of Cabinet Scrutiny Committee in light of the overarching implications for the Council.
- 1.4 The Committee also agreed in May that they wished to receive an update report at this meeting to enable consideration of the progress being made within the multi agency partnership taking forward the Pitt Review’s recommendations.

2. Issues for Consideration

- 2.1 Long term flood risk management is an important issue for Norfolk and the issues raised within the attached report will have long term implications for the County Council. In considering the report the Committee might wish to consider the following issues:
 - The future resource implications for the County Council of managing projects and maintaining long-term flood risk management and planning
 - The role of the County Council in any future partnerships addressing long term flood management
 - How prepared the County Council is to address the issues raised in the attached report and what consideration Cabinet has given to taking them forward.

3. Suggested Approach

It is suggested that the Committee:

- 1) Considers the attached report from the Head of Emergency Planning and the Director of Planning, Transportation and the Environment.
- 2) Considers whether there are any issues that it wishes to raise with Cabinet at this stage

Officer Contact: Karen Haywood
Scrutiny Support Manager
01603 228913



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact the Customer Services Centre on 0344 800 8020 or Textphone 0344 800 8011 and we will do our best to help.

Report on
The Pitt Review (NCC Progress Update)

Joint Report by
Head of Emergency Planning and the
Director of Environment, Transport & Development

This report looks at the current situation in Norfolk with regard to the recommendations put forward by Sir Michael Pitt in his review of the multi-agency response and recovery following the flooding in June and July 2007.

1 Introduction

- 1.1 On the 25 June 2008, Sir Michael Pitt's Final Independent Report into the 2007 summer floods was published. The report called for urgent and fundamental changes in the way the country is adapting to the likelihood of more frequent and intense periods of heavy rainfall. The Pitt report has a number of challenging recommendations, all of which have cross party support, which impact directly on the work of Government agencies, Local Authorities and other organisations.
- 1.2 As well as the Pitt Review Norfolk County Council (NCC) has had further recommendations to implement based on the outcomes from the Norfolk Resilience Forum (NRF) exercises on flooding and also the outcomes from the Norfolk Tidal Surge Incident of November 2007. Some of the recommendations from these events focused on the need for improved community engagement, a major review of flood/rest centre/media plans, staffing levels and training, rest centre and other resources and the need for incident management software and resources to better aid the multi agency management of major incidents.
- 1.3 The aim of this report to Cabinet Scrutiny is to highlight the current situation with regard to implementing the above outcomes, possible new legislation and issues for Norfolk County Council and the Norfolk Resilience Forum (NRF).

2 Background

- 2.1 The flooding that occurred during the summer of 2007 resulted in regional scale flooding in Gloucestershire, Oxfordshire, Yorkshire and Humberside. A wide area of the country was affected and there was a loss in some areas of essential services with almost half a million people left without mains water or electricity. Transport networks failed, a dam breach was narrowly averted and emergency facilities were put out of action.
- 2.2 While fatalities and casualties in the summer 2007 floods were small in number, given the scale of the emergency, it is regarded as something of a near miss as utility failures would have greatly added to the impact and the consequences would have exceeded the resources available to responders.
- 2.3 As a result of the June and July 2007 floods the Government called for an

independent review of the multi-agency response and recovery to be carried out under the leadership of Sir Michael Pitt. On the 25 June 2008, Sir Michael Pitt's Final Independent Report into the 2007 summer floods was published.

- 2.4 It did not end with the summer, as Norfolk faced a potentially catastrophic tidal surge on the 8 and 9 November 2007. Although the surge subsided due to a last minute change in the weather, it did result in the evacuation of residents and hospitals as well as the closure of roads and the main rail line into Great Yarmouth. Localised flooding did take place in an area of the North Norfolk coastal village of Walcott. The sea defences were not breached, but through wind and wave action the high tide overtopped the B1159 promenade defences. The result was flooding to approximately twenty properties with a number of households displaced and the B1159 closed along the sea front in Walcott. As with the summer floods, it should be regarded as a near miss.
- 2.5 In recent years there have been a number of localised surface water flooding incidents across the County as a result of heavy rain such as:
- Flooding of several Norwich roads including Carrow Road, which resulted in the sewers being overtopped, and North Park Avenue.
 - Surface water flooding in the Northgate Street area of Great Yarmouth.
 - Surface water flooding in Sheringham.
 - Surface water and Property flooding in North Walsham.
 - Surface water flooding in Gillingham
 - Surface water flooding in New Buckingham.
 - Roads flooded at Heacham, which effectively split Heacham in two and caused ingress/egress difficulties as well as property damage. During the same weather event flooding also occurred at Sedgeford and Ringstead.
 - Flooding of roads and properties at Watton.
- 2.6 Although some of these and the more recent incidents of November 2009 in Cumbria of course post date the Pitt Review it is further evidence of the increasing weather related issues that are being faced and so strengthens the need to take forward the Pitt Review recommendations, strengthen partnership working and the focusing of resources to better prepare Norfolk for future incidents.
- 2.7 Norfolk County Council, working closely with partner agencies, such as the Environment Agency (EA), district local authorities, utility companies and the Emergency Services, is currently taking forward the relevant recommendations from the Pitt Review. It is worth noting that several of the recommendations with regard to good practice in planning and procedures for resilience forums and emergency planning were already standard practice within Norfolk.

3 Pitt Report and Associated Legislation Changes

- 3.1 In December 2008, the Government published its response to the Pitt report and outlined how it would be taken forward. Several of the recommendations required a change in legislation to fully implement and the vehicle for this was to be the Flood and Water Management Bill. Some of the additional key issues for Norfolk following the publication of the Government's response were:

- Local authorities taking on a leadership role, responsible for ensuring that arrangements are in place to assess and manage flood risk, from all sources, in their areas. The aim was to create clear accountability for local flood risk management and the Lead Authority, in a two tier council this is the County Council, would be responsible for ensuring a number of the Bill actions are implemented through others by consultative working. The EA supports the County in this role and there is a duty on all relevant organisations to cooperate and share information.
- As part of the leadership role all upper tier local authorities should establish Oversight and Scrutiny Committees to review work by public sector bodies and essential service providers in order to manage flood risk. This is a role that has been taken on by the Norfolk County Council Cabinet Scrutiny Committee as a result of a motion placed before a meeting of the Full Council in July 2007.
- A National Flood Emergency Framework was prepared which will be tested through a national exercise in early 2011 (Exercise Watermark) and through the Norfolk Resilience Forum. Norfolk County Council is engaged with the planning of this exercise, will take part and then review any implications for Norfolk flood planning.
- The Government is developing a checklist to assess the effectiveness of emergency facilities such as IT and communications which will form an “expectation set” – this set as well as operational expectations could raise funding issues to ensure that Norfolk facilities meet expectation.
- With regard to funding, £15m from the Pitt fund has already been allocated to the top 50 priority areas - £125k was received by NCC towards the costs for producing a Surface Water Management Plan for Norwich. A further £12m has been identified for funding additional flood risk management work, bids for which had to have been submitted to Defra by the end of November 2009.

3.2 Flood and Water Management Bill: Several of the Pitt Review recommendations require a change in legislation to fully implement and the intended vehicle for this is the Flood and Water Management Bill. A draft Bill was published for consultation which resulted in Defra producing prioritised legislation in order to achieve, in the short Parliamentary Session, the Bill's aims:

“... to provide better, more sustainable management of flood risk for people, homes and businesses, help safeguard community groups from unaffordable rises in surface water drainage charges and protect water supplies to the consumer.”

3.3 Final introduction of the Flood and Water Management Bill will depend on the parliamentary timetable. It is planned to get it through the current session, and as there is cross party support should it not get through during this current session it would go to the next session following the election and still progress. The first reading of the Bill took place on 19 November 2009; the second reading was scheduled for the 15th December 2009.

3.4 The key provisions of the bill will be:

- The Bill deals with some of the recommendations from the Pitt review which required legislation to help implementation;
- Responsibilities for managing all flood risks should be better defined; ultimately it will be about consultative working. Clarity will be needed as to how the lead authority ensures that the responsibility owned by a partner agency is fulfilled. Local Authorities will have responsibility for surface water flooding – the first time this has been assigned in law. It also converts Regional Flood Defence Committees from decision-making bodies to advisory committees, except in relation to the local levy where they retain their decision-making powers, and extends their remit to cover coastal erosion as well;
- Local people will have greater input to shaping local flood and coastal erosion risk management strategies; although it is not currently defined how this is to be achieved;
- Sustainable drainage systems (SUDs) must be approved by a lead authority for new developments to help prevent surface run-off overloading the sewer system. However, it is not yet clear who will take ownership / responsibility of old SUDs;
- The sustainability duty that applies to the Environment Agency will be extended to the other bodies managing flood risk;
- The safety of communities living in close proximity to reservoirs will be improved with modern, risk based regulation;
- New powers will help water companies better control non-essential domestic uses of water during periods of water shortage;
- The interests of water customers will be further protected through a special administration regime for water companies, in keeping with other utility sectors and
- Water companies will be able to operate concessionary schemes relating to surface water drainage charges, thereby reducing the burden on community groups.

4 Current Arrangements

- 4.1 There is no one agency responsible for dealing with drainage which can lead to lead to confusion and frustration from those affected when trying to get problems solved.
- 4.2 To try to clarify some of the problems with ownership, Norfolk County Council, District Councils, Environment Agency and Internal Drainage Boards are signed up to an agreed “Statement of Common Policy – Land Drainage in Norfolk” referred to as the Norfolk Drainage Protocol which looks at who is the responsible organisation for dealing with drainage issues in Norfolk and how we will work together to resolve any drainage issues.
- 4.3 There is still sometimes confusion with regard to ownership of drainage assets and who is responsible for taking action to rectify problems. The current system is also reliant on agencies being in a position to carry out enforcement or works in default where problems occur that are not rectified by owners.

5 Current Progress with the Recommendations

- 5.1 The Norfolk Water Management Partnership and the Norfolk Resilience Forum continue to drive forward many of the Pitt Review recommendations and other issues identified through exercises and incidents.
- 5.2 The Norfolk Water Management Partnership and the Norfolk Resilience Forum are both fully engaged with the Norfolk Climate Change Partnership and particularly the work being done around adaptation to climate change issues and performance against National Indicator NI 188.
- 5.3 Recent publication of the *Flood Risk Regulations 2009* and *Flood risk management: an introduction and checklist for local authorities* from the LGA is currently being reviewed and built in to the Pitt Review workstream. The new Flood Risk Regulations SI 2009 No 3042 came into force on the 10th December 2009 which requires Lead Authorities to produce and map all its Flood Hazard Areas and Flood Risk Areas by the 22nd December 2010 and submit them to the Environment Agency for publication.
- 5.4 Engagement with other authorities at a regional and national level has shown Norfolk to be well placed with its progress in implementing the Pitt recommendations. It will use this engagement across the Region, with the EA and other upper tier authorities to discuss resources/skill implications for Norfolk and across the Region. This will enable the Scrutiny Group to be updated on Regional and Norfolk issues.

Planning and Transportation:

- 5.5 Work is ongoing to implement and take forward some of the Pitt review recommendations in relation to the Norfolk Water Management Partnership, which was created from the original Pitt Action Group and also through the Norfolk Resilience Forum (a multi-agency group set up as part of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 to ensure the integrated emergency management of risks and major emergencies in Norfolk).
- 5.6 On the 26th October 2009, following a request from Defra, a letter and action log update was sent to Defra and Government Offices East outlining the progress to date with the Pitt review recommendations within Norfolk. This will form part of the Government's annual report on Pitt Review progress, which itself was one of the Pitt recommendations.
- 5.7 The Norfolk Water Management Partnership (NWMP), being lead by Norfolk County Council, is now well evolved with 5 meetings held since forming the partnership in April 2009 and enables a joined up approach to water management across the whole County. A draft Terms of Reference (ToR) has been agreed; however a model ToR for the Eastern Region, being developed by the EA, is being awaited until a final ToR is produced. The group is lead by Norfolk County Council Environment, Transportation and Development Department includes members from:
 - All local authorities (county and districts) – various departments represented including Flood Defence, Emergency Planning and Drainage
 - Internal Drainage Boards
 - Anglian Water

- Environment Agency
 - Highways Agency
 - Broads Authority
 - Norfolk Resilience Forum representative
 - The group also liaises with the Norfolk Climate Change Partnership.
- 5.8 The NWMP provided a joint response to the Floods & Water Management Bill consultation and is also establishing a group to evaluate what more is needed in Norfolk to meet potential new legislation requirements; however partnership members are concerned that inadequate new funding will hamper essential progress on this work.
- 5.9 The NWMP is co-ordinating the Surface Water Management Plan (SWMP) for Norwich which is being developed from the new funding allocation recently received following a bid to Defra. A Norwich Project Officer within Environment, Transportation and Development, Environment Group is leading on this project.
- 5.10 The NWMP has put forward a bid as part of the second allocation of PITT funding for development of a SWMP for King's Lynn.
- 5.11 The NWMP has discussed other smaller schemes where known flooding problems exist. The District Councils are considering submitting these schemes for funding bids for drainage improvement works with the full support of the NWMP.
- 5.12 The NWMP recently made a bid for a Water Management Foundation Degree Studentship. The bid was approved but unfortunately the University of the West of England, co-ordinating the placements, could not find a student available to work in the Norfolk Area. The NWMP intends to bid again next year.
- 5.13 The NWMP is producing a skills and capacity matrix to highlight the resources available across the organisations involved in the partnership and identify any gaps.

Norfolk Resilience Forum (NRF):

- 5.14 Many of the recommendations identified by Pitt in connection with the response and recovery to flooding incidents were already common practice in the Norfolk Resilience Forum. A major review and restructure of the Norfolk Resilience Forum is currently coming to an end with the new structure being implemented so as to further enhance Norfolk's ability to respond to major incidents.
- 5.15 With regard to the response to flooding incidents in Norfolk the Strategic Flood Plan for Norfolk, supported by the Norfolk Emergency Response & Recovery Strategy, is already in place and this and the newly produced tactical flood plans, were exercised in October and November as part of the annual NRF multi-agency Table Top Exercise (Exercise Bunyip). There were four multi-agency exercises which took place:
- 13/10/2009 – Central Area (Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk)
 - 14/10/2009 – Western Area (KLWN and Breckland)

- 28/10/2009 – Great Yarmouth
- 27/11/2009 – North Norfolk

The exercises focused on the tactical level response to a coastal/tidal flood incident and the results will be used to inform the final preparation of the tactical level flood plans for Norfolk. The format was a silver table top exercise (TTX) but in support was a “reference table” made up from the voluntary sector, flood wardens, County & District Members and other agencies who could be called upon by the tactical group for resources or information but who would not normally send a representative to silver. Following the updating of the plans from lessons identified during the exercise work will continue on operational and community level plans to further enhance Norfolk’s response and recovery to flooding.

- 5.16 Community engagement continues with multi-agency flood and emergency awareness events taking place throughout the County, including the engagement with community groups such as local faith organisations and the voluntary sector. The NRF also continues to engage with the media to raise the issues of floods and other emergencies; with the local media invited to take an active part in exercises and Warning & Informing planning.
- 5.17 Engagement is taking place with the EA about Reservoir Inundation Plans as upper tier LAs will be responsible for dams within their area. Under current legislation this is not likely to have much impact on Norfolk but following possible changes to legislation through the Floods & Water Management Bill more sites may be identified which will require plans.
- 5.18 The development of Incident Management Software is nearing completion as the project enters user acceptance testing. A review of facilities and communications for use during major incidents is continuing.

6 Issues

- 6.1 Key to the progress of the recommendations and the implementation of upcoming legislation will be the reliance on partnership working and ensuring all agencies are fully engaged in the process.
- 6.2 The Norfolk Water Management Partnership (NWMP) will be required to produce a Local Flood Strategy (LFS), (Environment Agency National Guidance is awaited) through consultation but how we do this with the public is unclear.
- 6.3 The LFS and future Flood Risk Assessments will identify the number of surface water management plans (this could be as many as thirty) required across the County. Each plan is likely to cost in the region of between £50,000 and £100,000. A risk assessment will be undertaken to prioritise these for completion over the coming years. Once the SWMP’s are completed the capital works / schemes to mitigate potential flooding will need to be considered and carried out where appropriate. It is impossible to estimate the costs for any potential work.
- 6.4 In part due to the issues identified with the recent floods the Government is introducing a far more robust regime of auditing and penalties around emergency planning, business continuity and flood risk management. This is being done through new and amended legislation and a large number of

guidance documents and frameworks. This will all bring additional pressure on those departments and organisations involved with implementing the Pitt review and other recommendations.

- 6.5 **Finance:** The work of the Pitt Review is having a financial impact on the Authority. The cost of a SWMP can be as much as around £100K and several will be required for Norfolk, with funding from Defra limited. Additional staff resources are likely to be required to develop the work required to identify the exact requirements of the Bill. Any other funding issues will not be known until the Floods & Water Management Bill is law. Any work that the Authority might be required to do in connection with the approval of future SUD's should come from fees to be charged to the developer / builder (hence self funding). However, the maintenance issues for future and current SUD's remains unclear.
- 6.6 **Staff:** The work of the Pitt Review is having an impact on the Authority, especially as central Government is looking more towards upper tier local authorities to lead and drive forward much of the work. Once the Flood & Water Management Bill has been enacted consideration will be needed for the appointment of a Project Manager to oversee the many strands of the Bill, Pitt Review and NWMP. There is also an issue around the expertise available in flood risk management. Further staffing issues will not be known until the Floods & Water Management Bill is law. The impact on staffing will no doubt be an issue within Emergency Planning and the Department for the Environment, Planning and Transportation.
- 6.7 **Property:** It is not yet possible to fully assess whether there are any property implications, however, consideration might have to be given to upgrading the County Council Emergency Centre.
- 6.8 **IT:** The incident management software currently under development will be hosted on Norfolk County Council servers which need to be resilient to ensure maximum availability during a major incident. A review of facilities has also identified the importance of having systems refreshed and the availability of remote access. There might be a need to purchase a system to record drainage assets and flooding areas to help deliver the Local Flood Strategy. Currently the EA are looking at a national system for this.

7 Other Implications

7.1 Legal Implications:

The future Flood and Water Management Bill will include legislative responsibilities for the Authority; however, until the Bill is law likely issues will not be known. Some possible areas of concern are:

- Sustainable drainage systems will need to be approved by a lead authority. This lead authority may be upper tier local authorities.
- Norfolk County Council is likely to be given the high level responsibility for working with partners to produce a risk based "local flood strategy", based on the national strategy, for flood risk management which is to be developed by the EA. From this strategy an action plan will need to be produced for implementing through the NWMP. However, it is not clear what would happen if partners are unable to meet their obligation which leaves Norfolk

County Council unable to meet its requirements as the lead authority.

- Better clarity is still waited on with regards to the role of Emergency Planning within Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25) with several agencies expecting Emergency Planning Officers to be able to state categorically whether or not developments are suitable within flood areas based on a developers "evacuation plan". There continues the issue of the requirements of PPS25 clashing with the need to develop brown field sites and provide more housing. A workshop took place on the 8th December 2009 to look at the issues around Emergency Planning and PPS25 - additional guidance is currently awaited based on the outputs from the workshop.

7.2 **Human Rights:** None.

7.3 **Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA):** An assessment will be carried out to consider the needs of disabled people and non-English language speakers when carrying out Surface Water Management Planning and the outcomes from the Flood and Water Bill. Assessments area already carried out within Emergency Response and Recovery activities.

7.4 **Communications:** The work of the Pitt Review will undoubtedly have an impact on the Authority, but it is too early, at this stage, to give an accurate assessment of what this may be.

8 **Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**

8.1 The report does not have any direct implications.

9 **Conclusion**

9.1 Much of the work in relation to assessment and prevention, dealt with through the Norfolk Water Management Partnership, is not at this stage being fully progressed until the final details of the Flood and Water Management Bill are known.

9.2 The work has reached a point where to take forward certain recommendations will require additional resources, including staff, to manage projects and maintain long-term flood risk management and planning. Identification of resources will need to take place once the final details of the Flood & Water Management Bill are known.

9.3 New guidance has been published in connection with Emergency Response & Recovery and there is soon to be published a consultation on the enhancement of the Civil Contingencies Act both of which are likely to have an additional impact on the work of Norfolk County Council Emergency Planning and the Norfolk Resilience Forum.

Officer Contact:

Name	John Ellis
Title	Head of Emergency Planning
Telephone number	01603 222014

Name Mike Jackson
Title Director of Environment, Transport & Development
Telephone number 01603 222500



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Rachel Miller on 01603 222016 or Textphone 0844 8008011 and we will do our best to help.

Supporting People in Economic Difficulties

Suggested Approach by the Scrutiny Support Manager

1. Background

- 1.1 In 2008 Cabinet Scrutiny Committee proposed that a scrutiny exercise be undertaken with the objective of identifying what further steps Norfolk County Council could take to support people facing economic difficulties. In light of the economic climate it was agreed that this topic should be pursued as a matter of urgency. This topic was first considered in November 2008.
- 1.2 Following this meeting Cabinet Scrutiny Committee agreed to report their conclusions and make recommendations to Cabinet on the following ways in which the Council could support people and small businesses in the current economic climate:
- i) By accelerating the Capital programme and bringing forward small works
 - ii) By supporting debt advice by raising awareness of the charitable status on the Citizen's Advice Bureau
 - iii) By increasing the resources of the Welfare Rights Unit in Adult Social Services
 - iv) By raising awareness of the Credit Unions
- 1.3 Cabinet considered these proposals in January 2009 along with a report from the Director of Planning, Transportation and the Environment outlining the emerging effects of the economic downturn on the Norfolk economy.
- 1.4 Cabinet Scrutiny Committee received regular updates from Officers earlier this year outlining the progress being made against these recommendations. Members asked that an update report be brought to Committee outlining the progress made in the last six months to this meeting. The attached report from the Recession Task Group updates the Committee on this issue.

2. Suggested Approach

It is suggested that the Committee:

- Considers the attached report from the Recession Task Group
- Agrees if it has completed scrutiny of this issue or if there are further issues it wishes to be addressed.

Officer Contact: **Karen Haywood**
 Scrutiny Support Manager
 01603 228913



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact the Customer Services Centre on 0344 800 8020 or Textphone 0344 800 8011 and we will do our best to help.

Supporting people in economic difficulties

Report by the Recession Task Group

Summary:

This report provides an update on recent activities the County Council is involved in, which contribute to supporting the economy. These activities now form mainstream actions to support Norfolk people and businesses in recovering from the recession and on to further prosperity.

The report includes a number of strategic developments that will support future long term success for Norfolk business and attract further growth. This includes our campaign for the full dualing of the A11; the launch of 'World Class' Norfolk highlighting the fantastic opportunities in Norfolk; as well as our successful bid for funds to support the creation of hundreds of new jobs in Norfolk. The importance of future developments in broadband infrastructure, the import trade and future rail developments were discussed at an important conference on Shaping Norfolk's Future.

A wide range of targeted areas of support have also been provided to residents and businesses to help them deal with the current economic climate or continue to prosper. These include initiatives to protect vulnerable people from loan sharks; support financial inclusion, particularly in rural areas; the development of a Norfolk Financial Inclusion forum; and providing funding for the Norfolk Credit Union to allow access to bank accounts for hundreds of people who would otherwise be disadvantaged in managing their finances without one.

The report summarises the work we have undertaken to signpost residents and businesses to the most suitable support to help them manage their finances and how we are promoting local reputable businesses through our 'Trusted Trader' scheme. The County Council is also looking to extend financial support arrangements for businesses, including the possibility of developing an enterprise loan fund.

We have secured Norfolk's role in the 2010 Tour of Britain cycle race, which will bring a boost to the local economy, showcase the beauty of Norfolk and inspire increased participation in this enjoyable and healthy form of sport.

1. **Background**

- 1.1 At the [7 July Cabinet Scrutiny Committee](#), the Recession Task Group were requested to provide an update at this meeting on the initiatives of the Council.

Note: On 19 March 2009, the Chief Officers Group (COG) set up the Recession Task Group (currently made up of the authors of this report – see officer contacts).

The scope of this group includes:

- Keeping an overview of the range of activities the Council is involved in
- Coordination of current and future activities across the Council and with partners
- Developing and planning strategy in conjunction with COG and Cabinet
- A point of reference for scrutiny functions
- Developing and managing communications of our response to the recession
- Leading engagement with partners on joint initiatives

1.2 **Economic context for Norfolk**

The effect of the recession on the Norfolk economy can be gauged from a number of high level indicators.

1.3 **Unemployment rates**

The Job Seekers Allowance (JSA) monthly claimant count in Norfolk rose by 249 to 17,648 in October 2009. This figure is 6,500 higher than October 2008 but lower than the highest claimant count recorded during this recession of 18,680 in March 2009.

The percentage of the working age population in the county claiming JSA is now at 3.5%, compared to a high of 3.7% in March and 2.2% a year ago.

In terms of age and duration of unemployment, Norfolk has considerably higher levels of longer term JSA claimants (over 12 months) than both the regional and national averages (12.8% compared to 10.7% and 11.5% respectively) – up to 2,255 from 1,220 a year ago. Conversely, Norfolk has a much lower proportion of claimants that have been unemployed for under 6 months (63.7% compared with around 66.5%) – although this figure has increased from 8,130 in October 2008 to 11,210. The October figures also show that the number of young people out of work (5,460) is at its highest level since the early 1990's and at 31%, the county has a higher proportion of 18-24 year olds claiming JSA than the region and Great Britain as a whole.

1.4 **Business starts**

New VAT-registered enterprises have fallen sharply in the county. Figures for 2008 have just been published by the Office for National Statistics and show a significant drop from 3,380 in 2007 to 2,765 last year.

1.5 **Notified redundancies**

There have been 6,186 redundancies notified to JobCentrePlus in Norfolk since July 2008. The hardest hit sectors have been manufacturing and insurance/financial services. The number of notifications in November 2009 was 248 – this compares with 418 in November 2008.

2.1 **Supporting Norfolk through the recession**

Here are some examples of how we are helping Norfolk residents and businesses through the recession and in support of future economic growth:

Section A – strategic developments

2.2 **World Class: Normal for Norfolk**

In September, the County Council and partners launched a campaign to champion Norfolk not just as a fantastic place for a holiday, but also a world-class business destination.

World Class: Normal for Norfolk is using television, online and poster adverts plus an interactive website and media coverage to champion the county and bust myths about Norfolk. The campaign aims to ensure Norfolk is at the forefront of the minds of UK business leaders as they seek to reinvest in the wake of the recession.

There has been favourable reaction in the media and online, with a very big increase in positive comments about Norfolk in blogs, forums, Twitter etc (and a reduction in neutral coverage).

2.3 **From recession to recovery - Shaping Norfolk's Future Conference**

Shaping Norfolk's Future, the county economic development partnership, held a conference on 20 November, 'From recession to recovery'. The conference debated a number of key issues to support future economic growth in Norfolk, including our 'World Class Norfolk' campaign, Broadband, the Eastport, rail developments as well as guidance for businesses recovering from the recession.

At the event a new guide to accessing bank finance was launched. The leaflet includes ten key steps businesses should use when seeking investment and other useful information.

2.4 **Support for the A11**

We were one of five organisations to give evidence in favour of the A11 at the public inquiry into the Highways Agency's £135 million scheme held in Elveden between November 25 and December 4.

Norfolk and Suffolk County Council sent representatives to appear in before the inquiry Inspector and were joined by representatives from Shaping Norfolk's Future, Norfolk Chamber of Commerce and the Gateway A11 East group. All the representatives gave evidence about why the proposed scheme must go ahead for the sake of the Norfolk economy.

2.5 Promotion of self employment opportunities

We are working closely with Business Link and other partners to develop a countywide action plan to encourage more people to consider the option of self employment.

'Enterprise Norfolk' will record, adopt and integrate existing good practice to develop low cost enhancements to existing programmes and proposing new programme elements to reflect local needs. This will allow funding, publicity and promotion to be streamlined and simplified.

Section B – support for individuals

2.6 Manage your finances

Since its launch in January 2009, residents and businesses have been accessing information at www.norfolk.gov.uk/managingyourfinances at a rate of up to over 900 a month. The website acts as a 'one stop shop' to signpost consumers and businesses to the support available.

In association with the Eastern Daily Press (EDP), in May 2009 we published and distributed 'Manage your finances' – a free reference guide to beating the recession aimed at helping people manage their money. Approximately 70,000 hard copies of the guide have been distributed. The guide is also available to download from the County Council's website and from the EDP website.

To support the campaign Adult Education ran Debt Management Workshops at venues throughout the county.

We have raised awareness of the resources available via events, strip ads and articles in publications/local newspapers, posters, and stakeholders/partners. Business cards containing key information have been distributed to frontline officers within the County Council to give to people who they identify may benefit from help to manage their finances.

2.7 Money Matters: A support guide to rural financial inclusion

'Money Matters', a support guide to rural financial inclusion was launched at the Royal Norfolk Show on 1 July. The guide gives local authorities and our local strategic partnership members the information and guidance needed to effectively promote financial inclusion in rural areas. The guide:

- Introduces the concept of financial inclusion and describes the challenges and opportunities it presents in rural areas.
- Identifies financial exclusion 'hot spots' in rural areas and clearly presents the scale and depth of the challenge.
- Demonstrates how to promote financial inclusion in rural areas through a collection of good practice case studies.
- Helps policy makers and programmers working on financial inclusion to consider and address rural circumstances.

2.8 Successful 'Future Jobs Fund' bid

We learnt in July that our bid for £2.3m from the £1 billion Department for Work and Pensions 'Future Jobs Fund' was successful. Recruitment of the 356 entry-level jobs in the county is underway. A strong partnership exists between us, employers and JobCentre Plus, which has contributed to the success of the project. The jobs created are targeted at long-term claimants of Jobseeker's Allowance (JSA) and all contain a recognised training element or clear employability outcome for the participants. The jobs created will be based mostly within social enterprises and the following sectors: green construction, clerical, gardening, plastering, painting and decorating.

We led the bid for £2.3m funding on behalf of the Norfolk County Strategic Partnership (NCSP), which brings together more than 300 representatives from the public, private, voluntary and community sectors across Norfolk.

We have also put in bids to fund further six-month jobs from April and October 2010. We are optimistic that these will also be approved when the next rounds of funding are announced in the New Year. This has an estimated value of £2.2m and will lead to the creation of a further 350 jobs. This will allow employers from the initial bid, together with new partners who have noted the success of the programme, to continue to strive to improve the employment prospects of lower skilled JSA claimants across the county. The second bid will focus on areas of high unemployment (particularly lone parents), in addition to continuation of the 18-24 year olds project. If these bids are successful, we will have secured £6.76m to create 1,040 jobs in the county.

2.9 Norfolk Credit Union

We have worked closely with Norfolk Credit Union (NCU) and funded the establishment of the East of England's first Credit Union Current Account (CUCA). Nationally, around one in five people do not have access to a bank account for a variety of reasons and this puts them at a significant financial disadvantage. The CUCA is available to everyone in Norfolk and is a direct response to the financial difficulties we know many people are facing.

The CUCA was launched in early November and has only been live for several weeks. Volunteers from NCU have been busy fielding many enquiries from the initial radio and newspaper articles. They have sent out around one hundred application forms and already there are 15 active accounts with many more in the pipeline. The original target was 100 active accounts by the end of March but the expectation now is to far exceed this. In their three year rolling business plan, which goes to the Board for its annual update approval in December, they now have a target of 750 CUCA members by the end of September 2010.

NCU is working hard to get the publicity and supporting information to all their branches and key partners. Most have it but NCU has been working on the basis of a soft launch to ensure systems are working and their processes are working properly.

The establishment of the Norfolk Credit Union Current Account has been made possible by a £150,000 grant from the County Council, with the account run by NCU, and backed by the Co-operative Bank. The account will allow:

- Salary, pensions or benefits to be directly paid into it.
- Access to money via the Link ATM facility.
- The set up of direct debits, standing orders, funds transfers and bill payments.
- Payment of goods in shops and on the internet, where displaying the VISA Debit sign.
- The obtaining of cash-back in shops displaying the VISA Debit sign.

The Communications Unit will work between Christmas and New Year, traditionally a 'quiet' time for news, with Norfolk Credit Union to highlight to the public the advantages of being an account holder and the success of the project so far.

2.10 Supporting business success

Trading Standards has provided a range of targeted business support activities, including free business skills training, up to date information and advice via the (online) Norfolk Business Matters bulletin, and the launch of the Norfolk Trusted Trader scheme, aimed at providing opportunities for reputable local businesses via the Council's trader assurance scheme.

2.11 Protecting the vulnerable

The County Council in partnership with Birmingham City Council have a specialist team of Trading Standards Officers whose objective is to identify criminals who target vulnerable people and involve the provision of extortionate and illegal lending – using fear, violence and intimidation to enforce those debts. As part of this work a Financial Inclusion Partnership Officer in Norfolk has the task of helping victims and supporting the development and use of alternative forms of lending such as local credit unions. The officer seeks to improve links and associations between the agencies who provide support to the public. A dedicated victim support and helpline is provided.

2.12 Enterprise loan fund

The County Council is considering providing some funding from its reserves to expand the ability of Community Development Finance Initiative Providers. These are organisations that provide an alternative source of loan funding to businesses that may have had difficulty finding support from conventional sources. There are two providers covering Norfolk and each provides schemes to help a range of businesses. A specification has been produced that was sent to two potential providers to ascertain whether the idea – to establish a Norfolk County Council backed loan fund – is viable and if so which of the two bidders is best placed to deliver the project. The proposals have been received back and are being evaluated.

2.13 Tour of Britain

Following the highly successful 2009 Tour, which saw visitor numbers increase substantially, yet again, across the UK, planning is now underway for the 2010 Tour. This is exciting because for the first time in many years Norfolk is to host a stage thanks to a contribution from Norfolk County Council. We are currently working with Tour organisers to devise a route that will be as challenging as possible, whilst taking in as many of Norfolk's iconic locations as possible. The route will be developed through consultation with key partners and will be announced later in 2010.

Through supporting the delivery of the race itself as well as a wide range of supporting events and activities, locally organised, the three key objectives are:

- To attract a significant number of people to Norfolk to view the stage, thus...
- maximise the economic benefit to Norfolk through increased visitor spend, and...
- increase participation in cycling through increased awareness of the benefits of the sport.

3. **Equality Impact Assessment**

This report is not directly relevant to equality as it does not make proposals directly affecting equality of impact or outcome.

4. **Section 17 – Crime and Disorder Act**

There are no implications within this report for the Crime and Disorder Act.

Officer contact

If you have any questions about matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Officer name	Telephone number	Email address
David Collinson	01603 222253	david.collinson@norfolk.gov.uk
Fiona McDiarmid	01603 223810	fiona.mcdiarmid@norfolk.gov.uk
Mark Langlands	01603 222973	mark.langlands@norfolk.gov.uk



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

Meeting with MEPs
Suggested approach by the Scrutiny Support Manager

1. Background

- 1.1 At the last meeting of Cabinet Scrutiny Committee members met with MEPs from the Eastern region. The purpose of the meeting was:
- To identify how the County Council and MEPs can work together for the benefit of Norfolk
 - To understand the role of MEPs, how they operate and the links with the County Council.
 - To identify what the European Union legislates upon and the impact for Norfolk.
 - To identify and seek the views of the MEPs regarding the current issues affecting the County
 - To establish what proactive steps the County Council can take to ensure that it receives the maximum benefits from European funding.
- 1.2 At the suggestion of the Committee questions were invited for the MEPs from members of the public, District Councils and members of the Youth Parliament. Out of a total of eight questions from members of the public, five were selected by the Group leads for consideration on the day. Those not selected have been forwarded to the MEPs to respond directly.
- 1.3 This Committee has previously met with MEPs on an annual basis. With this in mind the Chair has suggested that it would be useful to use this meeting as an opportunity to capture the thoughts of the Committee so that they can be fed into the process for next years meeting.

2. Issues raised by MEPs

Following the meeting, those MEPs that attended were asked if they had any comments that they wished to feed into this process. Geoffrey Van Orden MEP responded by saying how much he had enjoyed the meeting and asked that the following be considered in any future meeting:

- MEPs should have the opportunity for a 2 or 3 minute introduction at the start of the meeting
- To encourage more members of the public to attend then maybe the meeting could be held in a more central location
- Members of the public should be given the opportunity to ask a brief supplementary question of one or more of the MEPs
- There was limited space for MEPs at the table in the meeting

Andrew Duff MEP also raised an issue within the meeting itself suggesting that it would be helpful if any future meetings could be more of a 'briefing and an exchange

of opinions rather than a questions time format'. He also suggested that more would be achieved if councillors had a chance to speak to MEPs about strategic and political policies and issues.

2 Issues for consideration

2.1 As a basis for discussion the Committee might wish to give consideration to the following:

- Were the objectives for the meeting, as outlined above, appropriate,
- Were the objectives met?
- Could the style of the meeting have been improved?
- Were there any areas of questioning not pursued that should have been?
- Could we have improved the ways in which we involved the public?
- Are there any other outside bodies that you would like to specifically invite in the future?
- Is there any further information that it would have been helpful to have before the meeting?

3. Suggested Approach

It is suggested that the Committee uses the issues raised in section 2 above as a framework for discussion to inform any future meetings with MEPs.

Officer Contact: **Karen Haywood**
 Scrutiny Support Manager
 01603 228913



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact the Customer Services Centre on 0344 800 8020 or Textphone 0344 800 8011 and we will do our best to help.

Forward Work Programme

Suggested Approach by the Scrutiny Support Manager

1. Forward Work programme Issue

- 1.1 At the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 24th November it was suggested that a scrutiny of Adult Social Services in respect of older people's day care centres and the reorganisation of the provision of dementia care should take place as a matter of urgency. It was agreed that this issue would be raised at the Overview and Scrutiny Strategy Group meeting.
- 1.2 The Overview and Scrutiny Strategy Group met on 10th December and agreed that this issue should remain within the remit of Cabinet Scrutiny Committee and that draft terms of reference for the scrutiny be brought to this meeting. This item will be considered elsewhere on this agenda.

2. Suggested Approach

The Committee is asked to consider the Forward Work Programme at Appendix A and agree whether there are any scrutiny topics to be added or deleted.

Officer Contact: **Karen Haywood**
 Scrutiny Support Manager
 01603 228913



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact the Customer Services Centre on 0344 800 8020 or Textphone 0344 800 8011 and we will do our best to help.

APPENDIX A**Cabinet Scrutiny Committee: Forward Work Programme**

Meeting date	Topic	Objective	Report from
19 January 2010	Child Poverty Abolition of the Learning and Skills Council	Update on recommendations of the Working group agreed by Cabinet on 5 th May 2009. To examine: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How well prepared the County Council is to take on the responsibilities of the LSC.• What the County Council is doing to influence other bodies that will be fulfilling the role of the LSC.	Director of Children's Services and Head of Economic Development Head of Adult Education and Director of Children's Services
9 th February 2010	Proactively reducing youth crime County Farms Policy	To examine the respective roles of Children's Services and partner organisations in early intervention and prevention of youth crime and identify any gaps. Update regarding the progress of the recommendations of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee Working Group	Consultation primarily with members of the Children & Young People's Partnership – representatives will also be invited to attend the meeting Managing Director of NPS Property Consultants and Cabinet member for Corporate and Commercial Services
16 th March 2010	Private Finance Initiative	To examine: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• How the County Council has benefited from PFIs• If the County Council has been correct in assessing the benefits/risks of PFI	Director of Corporate Resources

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What lessons we have learnt from PFI 	
20 th April 2010	<p>Scrutiny of large project processes to establish best practice</p> <p>Contract Monitoring</p>	<p>To examine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What lessons can be learnt from large project processes • How can we establish best practice for future projects <p>To examine:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How NCC monitors contracts and organisations • What lessons we can learn from best practice across the Council • How we monitor our sub contractors • What the County Council's contract standards are 	<p>Director of Corporate Resources</p> <p>Director of Corporate Resources</p>
Following the 2010 General Election	Meeting with MPs	Objectives to be agreed.	Scrutiny Support Team