

Cabinet
Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 5 July 2021
in the Council Chamber, County Hall, at 10am

Present:

Cllr Andrew Proctor	Chairman. Leader & Cabinet Member for Strategy & Governance.
Cllr Graham Plant	Vice Chairman and Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy
Cllr Bill Borrett	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention.
Cllr Margaret Dewsbury	Cabinet Member for Communities & Partnerships.
Cllr John Fisher	Cabinet Member for Children's Services.
Cllr Tom FitzPatrick	Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation & Performance.
Cllr Andy Grant	Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste.
Cllr Andrew Jamieson	Cabinet Member for Finance.
Cllr Greg Peck	Cabinet Member for Commercial Services & Asset Management.
Cllr Martin Wilby	Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.

Executive Directors Present:

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

The Chairman informed attendees that the meeting would adjourn at 11am to join the country in observing two minutes' silence to remember the men and women from the NHS, social care and other key services on the front line who had lost their lives in the service of others during the Covid-19 pandemic. The council had seen first-hand the challenges faced by the care sector and seen from friends and colleagues in the NHS what it had taken to keep the health system on an even footing. On the anniversary of the establishment of the country's health service it was an opportunity to take a moment to look back and celebrate something that our country should continue to be proud of, including the people who put themselves in the service of others every day. Tragically some of these people are no longer with us and it was those people being remembered in the two minutes' silence.

This Cabinet meeting was the first meeting in County Hall since March 2020, with some pandemic restrictions still in place. The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management spoke about the refurbishment of the North Wing and Civic Area of County Hall:

- Many positive comments had been received from people who had seen the new civic area.
- The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management thanked Simon Hughes, the Director of Property, and the property team for their work and thanked Jeannine De Sousa, the Head of Construction, who had project managed the refurbishment with Dave Bentley and the contractor, Mace. Teams had worked hard to deliver the project in 8 months whilst in a pandemic which would normally have taken 20 months.
- Consolidating into key buildings like County Hall would generate revenue savings to reinvest back into key services.
- The North Wing of County Hall was now accessible for those with disabilities, was a more flexible space for use in events and working heating and ventilation was now in place in the Council Chamber.
- This part of County Hall had been near the end of its operational life and the work carried out had provided an accessible, safe and modern facility.

Cabinet Members and Executive Directors formally introduced themselves.

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

2 Minutes from the meeting held on Monday 7 June 2021.

- 2.1 Cabinet agreed the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 7 June 2021 as an accurate record of the meeting.

3 Declaration of Interests

- 3.1 The Chairman declared a non-pecuniary interest as a director to various Council run companies including Norse and Repton Property Developments Ltd.
- 3.2 The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management declared a non-pecuniary interest as a Norfolk County Council nominated director of Hethel Innovation and Property Developments Ltd.

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

- 4.1 Scrutiny Committee had called in the decision made by Cabinet on 6 June 2021 at item 8, "Norwich Western Link". Scrutiny Committee discussed this at their meeting of the 23 June 2021. They decided not to refer this back to Cabinet and decisions made at the Cabinet meeting of 6 June 2021 had been enacted.

5 Items of Urgent Business

- 5.1 There were no items of urgent business.

6 Public Question Time

- 6.1 No public questions were received.

7 Local Member Questions/Issues

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

7.2 Supplementary question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp

7.2.1 Cllr Kemp noted that the lifting of the holding objection on Hopkins Homes was the responsibility of County Highways. An 80% increase in road traffic accidents had been seen around King's Lynn, and the Hardwick Roundabout was an accident cluster point. Cllr Kemp had approached four Parish Councils about setting up a West Norfolk Transport and Infrastructure group to address issues in this area. Cllr Kemp asked whether Norfolk County Council would work with the Borough Council to set up a West Norfolk Transport and Infrastructure group to address the traffic issues in King's Lynn.

7.2.2 The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure replied that Norfolk County Council had been working with West Norfolk and King's Lynn Borough Council on highways issues in the West of Norfolk and would continue to do so.

7.3 Responses to written supplementary questions received for this meeting are attached to these minutes at Appendix B.

8 Appointments to Internal and External Bodies

8.1 This report had been withdrawn from the agenda.

8.2 The Chairman reported that appointments to internal and external bodies were being finalised and interested parties would be notified once these had been agreed.

9 Proposed Framework for Voluntary Community & Social Enterprise (VCSE) Infrastructure Support

9.1 Cabinet received the report discussing the Infrastructure Grant shared between Voluntary Norfolk, Community Action Norfolk and Momentum; the report set out proposals to extend the funding to £250,000 per annum for 2 years to provide enhanced capacity for support in these key areas in recognition of the increased demand that will be placed on the sector in the forthcoming 2 years, and to add an additional, single, one off "support grant" pot of £150,000 to be managed as part of the overall infrastructure grant, to provide grant funding capacity.

9.2 The Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships introduced the report to Cabinet:

- Voluntary groups played an important role in Norfolk and had especially done so during the pandemic when they supported local people of all ages. When many activities had stopped because of pandemic restrictions, voluntary groups had taken on roles supporting people who were isolating and with the vaccination campaign.
- Norfolk County Council thanked these people for their support during this time, and the Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships also gave her thanks to the public and voluntary groups for this support.

- As society emerged from the pandemic, there would be an increasing demand for voluntary sector services. In order to support voluntary and community groups with recovery from the pandemic, Norfolk County Council proposed to continue providing grant funding as well as increase it over the next two years.
- The Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

9.3 The Chairman noted the support given by the voluntary and community sector during the pandemic and endorsed the proposal to continue to provide funding support.

9.4 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention endorsed the comments by the Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships; the support from voluntary and community groups and the population during the pandemic had been “incredible”, and therefore he felt that increasing the grant over the next two years was the right approach to support these groups.

9.5 The Vice-Chairman also agreed with the proposals set out in the report and highlighted the 5 key outcome areas which had led to the proposal to revise the grant, set out on page 53 of the report.

9.6 Cabinet **RESOLVED:**

1. Approve the outcomes to form the basis of the infrastructure grant for the forthcoming 3 years from Oct 2021 to Oct 2024, as set out in para 1.5 of the report.
2. Agree an increase in the VCSE grant from £172k to £285k per annum for the first 2 years of the 3-year grant period starting October 2021 (this figure includes permanent transfer of £35k from adult social care to fund the volunteer portal).
3. Agree to provide one off funding of £150k to be made available to VCSE organisations to access through a VCSE support grant.
4. As part of the Council's commitment to supporting the VCSE sector, task officers to take forward the actions set out in para 2.2 of the report.

9.7 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision:**

Survey feedback from the engagement process, combined with a range of local and national studies highlighted the combined pressure of increased demand, coupled with reduced funding and changes to how VCSE organisations deliver their services, which has led to the development of this proposal. A focussed and transparent Infrastructure support grant is important to support the VCSE sector surviving and thriving during the next 2-3 years. The VCSE sector provides vital support to local communities to keep them safe and well.

9.8 **Alternative Options**

Retain the current grant shape and offer for a further period

This risks not providing the support required and disenfranchising the sector from the infrastructure support available by its lack of relevance to the sector's expressed needs.

Develop an in-house infrastructure support offer.

This would risk destabilising infrastructure support to the sector entirely whilst a new arrangement bedded in. This would have a significant impact and is not recommended given the current uncertainty.

10 Social Infrastructure Fund

- 10.1 Cabinet received the report highlighting the key Social Infrastructure Fund projects from 2020's successful organisations, and setting out the proposed changes around process, funding, criteria and support for applicants. The proposed launch of the 2021 scheme was 12 July 2021, with the closing date at 10 September 2021, with final decisions made week commencing 20 September and offer letters sent out week commencing 4 October 2021.
- 10.2 The Chairman introduced the report to Cabinet:
- This fund had proved its value and worth since its introduction in 2020-21.
 - It was expected that there would be more applications than could be funded however the scoring criteria would ensure that funding was allocated fairly.
 - £1m capital funding had been allocated to this fund and was locked into future budgets.
 - The change proposed for 2021-22 was how the money was allocated; it would be split into two parts, so that 25% of funding (£250k) would be earmarked for smaller projects of between £5k and £50K, and the remaining 75% (£750k) allocated to larger projects of between £50K and £250k, with match funding required for all projects.
 - The Chairman moved the recommendations with an amendment to recommendation 3, which should refer to paragraph 2.5 of the report.
- 10.3 The Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure noted that this would help the Council work with communities across the County and support projects which would help people to come together and when coming out of the pandemic. He welcomed the changes which would support small projects in smaller communities.
- 10.4 The Cabinet Member for Finance agreed that the changes would be a good way to reach out to smaller parish councils and community groups and support such groups coming out of the pandemic.
- 10.5 The Vice-Chairman noted that paragraph 2.3 of the report stated that "objectives and intended impacts of grant applications must align to the Together for Norfolk Strategy outcomes". The Vice-Chairman also noted that it was positive that "additional scoring criteria would be added so projects that proactively support communities to overcome the effects of the pandemic would receive higher scores".
- 10.6 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention felt it was key that Norfolk County Council continued to operate this scheme as it gave a local approach to allow local organisations to bid for funding. He endorsed the Council's commitment to supporting these organisations.

10.7 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance was pleased to note that the report recognised that not all organisations were experts at writing funding applications and that support would be offered to them with this.

10.8 Cabinet **RESOLVED:**

1. To acknowledge the positive impacts that have been made possible by the County Council's £1m investment in social and community infrastructure through the 2020 grants, as set out in Annexe 1 of the report.
2. To agree the proposed changes to the Social Infrastructure Grant Fund scheme criteria and process for 2021, as set out in Section 2 of this report, aimed to provide wider opportunities for VCSE organisations to access this funding
3. To agree the timetable for the 2021 Fund, as set out in para 2.5 of the report, which would see the bidding window for 2021 open on 12 July 2021.

10.9 **Evidence and reasons for Decision**

The changes proposed to the Social Infrastructure Fund are aimed to enable greater opportunities for a wider range VCSE organisations to be able to access this funding to provide benefits to Norfolk communities. The fund enables vital community infrastructure to be strengthened across Norfolk.

10.10 **Alternative Options**

Alternative option would be to not make any changes to the scheme criteria or process for 2021. The scheme ran successfully in 2020 and could operate with the existing criteria and process, however, this means that some organisations and projects would not be considered for funding, particularly small community projects.

11 Authority to enact revenue pipeline programme

11.1 Cabinet received the report setting out details of and asking them to take the executive decision to dispose of existing contracts and let new contracts as set out in the appendix to the report.

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

- The recommendations in this report would give the relevant Director or the Director of Procurement the authority to renew or extend contracts which had been reviewed by the relevant Cabinet Member. This would give additional oversight to the process.
- This would allow the Council to get ahead of new rules coming into place from a Procurement Green Paper seen by Cabinet in February 2021.
- After being examined by department heads, existing contracts would be passed over the procurement team to be renewed, taken in-house or re-tendered.
- Officers must operate within the Council's policy framework taking into account social value, compliance with equalities and value for money.

- The Cabinet Member for Finance moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

11.3 Cabinet **RESOLVED**:

1. To agree:

- To proceed with the procurement actions set out in Annex A of the report.
- To delegate to each responsible chief officer authority to discuss with the contractors concerned the issues around extension of contracts designated herein as open for extension and to determine whether to extend the contracts (with such modifications as the chief officer considers necessary) or whether to conduct a procurement exercise to replace them
- To delegate to the Director of Procurement authority to undertake the necessary procurement processes including the determination of the minimum standards and selection criteria (if any); to shortlist bidders; to make provisional award decisions; to award contracts; to negotiate where the procurement procedure so permits; and to terminate award procedures if necessary.
- That the officers exercising the delegated authorities set out above shall do so in accordance with the council's Policy Framework, with the approach to Social Value in Procurement endorsed by Cabinet at its meeting of 6 July 2020, and with the approach set out in the paper entitled "Sourcing strategy for council services" approved by Policy & Resources Committee at its meeting of 16 July 2018.

11.4 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

Cabinet recommended adoption of the budget and it is now logical that it approves the decisions in respect of contracts needed to deliver the budget. Expeditious execution of the contract pipeline requires the delegations to officers set out in this programme.

Reasons for decisions about individual contracts or groups of contracts are set out at Annex A of the report.

11.5 **Alternative Options**

Cabinet could choose not to approve the delegations set out herein. This would require a plethora of individual cabinet or cabinet member decisions and be likely to delay programme execution: this course of action is not recommended.

12 **Notifications of Exemptions Under Contract Standing Orders**

12.1 Cabinet received the report setting out all exemptions to standing orders granted for the award of contracts valued in excess of £250,000, as required by contract standing orders.*

12.2 The Cabinet Member for Finance reported that the exemptions had previously been reviewed by the Director of Procurement and Director of Governance and the Leader of the Council and were being reported to Cabinet for transparency and to comply with standing orders.

* there was a typographical error in the 'notice of exemptions under contract standing orders' report stating that legal advice from supplier Pinsent Masons was in respect of the "Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing EX61228". This should have read "Norwich Western Link EX61228".

Cabinet agreed this amendment at their meeting of 8 August 2021

12.3 Cabinet **RESOLVED**:

1. As required by paragraph 10.b of Contract Standing Orders, to note the exemptions over £250,000 that have been granted under paragraph 10.a.ii of those orders by the Director of Procurement and Director of Governance in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

12.4 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

N/A

12.5 **Alternative Options**

N/A

13 Health, Safety & Wellbeing Annual Report

13.1 Cabinet received the report providing data and analysis on the Health, Safety and Well-being performance of Norfolk County Council as an employer for the reporting period 2020/21.

13.2 The Chairman introduced the report to Cabinet:

- The three key outcome goals were set out in the introduction on page 93 and would form part of the overall Norfolk County Council people plan and contribute to workforce and organisational development strategic priorities.
- Page 94 of the report gave information on the impact of the pandemic on services.
- 35% of days lost to sickness in 2020-21 were due to mental health related absences.
- 11% of days lost to sickness in 2020-21 were due to musculoskeletal health related absences. The Musculoskeletal Rehabilitation Scheme (MIRS) had saved Norfolk County Council an estimated £0.5m in accident prevention.
- The number of all incidents had reduced but there were still some concerns around the management of incidents. Violence was the biggest cause of incidents and although all directorates had a risk profile in place, some directorate management teams did not actively review and update their profile.
- The Council received an improvement notice in 2020; this was its first received since 2013 and was related to management of an activity delivered for Norfolk County Council by a third party. This notice had now been signed off as fully complied with.
- Trading income had dropped slightly in the past year.
- Areas of focus in the forthcoming year were set out on page 96 of the report.
- The Chairman thanked Derryth Wright, the Head of HR Performance and Governance, who had ensured health and safety was taken very seriously and would ensure high standards continued to be met.
- The Chairman moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

13.3 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

Endorse the proposed actions:

1. The focus and priorities for the Health, Safety and Wellbeing Service for the forthcoming year, as outlined on slide 12 of the report should be:
 - Organisational wellbeing and resilience
 - Refreshing the health and safety management system to reflect and support continued hybrid working
 - Continuing response to the pandemic and integration of infection prevention and control needs
2. The focus and priorities for Executive Directors are:
 - Employee wellbeing and resilience including supporting and enabling managers to build strong, positive relationships with their teams
 - Working with the HSW service to review and confirm NCCs risk appetite within our health and safety management system
 - Reviewing and improving where necessary their health and safety management practices with reference to the specific tactical recommendations outlined on slide 13 of the report

13.4 Evidence and Reasons for Decision

N/A

13.5 Alternative Options

N/A

14 Corporately Significant Vital Signs Report

14.1 Cabinet received the report providing an update on the Council's performance towards achieving its strategic outcomes set out in Together, For Norfolk.

14.2 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance introduced the report to Cabinet:

- The report covered data from the final quarter of last year, 2020-21, which had been during the third pandemic lockdown.
- The percentage of homes with superfast broadband had increased in this quarter.
- The Vital Signs which had not met their target were highlighted in table 1.1 on page 121 of the report.
- In three months' time, a new dashboard would be used.
- The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

14.3 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention discussed the results for indicators related to Adult Social Care; the decision made to accept people with a wider range of complex needs into the reablement service had impacted on the outcome of indicator 202 "% of people who require no ongoing formal service after completing reablement". The reluctance of people to have strangers in their homes during the pandemic meant a number of home visits had not taken place. The pandemic had had an impact on measures across the department.

- 14.4 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services reported that the "New Roots" programme which was coming into practice in Norfolk involved working with families to help children remain with families where possible; it was hoped that this would help improve indicator 403 "Percentage of children starting to be looked after who have previously been looked after".
- 14.5 The Cabinet Member for Finance noted that most of the financial indicators had either met or exceeded targets. However, vital signs 505, "Capital receipts" and 501 "savings targets delivered – by Service" were below target; most savings were being carried forward into the current financial year 2021-22 and the Cabinet Member for Finance expected them to be delivered in this time frame.
- 14.6 The Chairman noted that specific targets would be set for the vital signs 637, "new employee retention", and 615, "HR: % lost time due to sickness", for the forthcoming year.
- 14.7 The Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships noted that indicator 317, "availability of on call firefighters" was above target due to the number of people working at home during the pandemic.
- 14.8 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:
1. Review and comment on the end of year performance data.
 2. Agree the planned actions as set out in Appendices 1 and 2 of the report.

14.9 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

N/A

14.10 **Alternative Options**

Information report.

15 Risk Management Report

- 15.1 Cabinet received the report setting out corporate risks being monitored and treated appropriately in line with the Council's risk management framework with risk-based decisions supporting the Council's recovery, and an annual report of the Council's departmental level risks that departments own and manage with support of the Risk management Officer, as required by the Council's Constitution. This report also summarised the results of the recent independent risk management health check that was carried out by the Council's insurance contractor, the outcome of which was positive.
- 15.2 The Chairman introduced the report to Cabinet:
- The report included a summary of the results of the recent independent risk management health check; a number of operational and strategic recommendations came out of this health check but overall, the review had been positive.

- Norfolk County Council would continue to work through implications arising from the Covid-19 pandemic and follow the Government's recovery roadmap. Rates of Covid-19 were still a concern in Norfolk and in the UK
- Corporate risks continued to be monitored and treated in line with the risk management framework including an annual report of the departmental level risks with support of the risk management officer.
- Paragraph 2.1 of the report gave an overall view that risk management by the Council was sound and effective.
- There was a proposal to close risk RM022A, "Implications of Brexit for Council staff and services", and increase the risk score of RM209, "NCC may not have the employees (or a sufficient number of employees) with critical skills that will be required for the organisation to operate effectively in the next 2-5 years and longer term", from 15 to 20.
- A corporate risk to reflect the Norwich Western Link project was being developed and would be included in the next risk management report to Cabinet in September 2021.

- 15.3 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention spoke about risk RM023, "Failure to respond to changes to demography, funding, and government policy, with particular regard to Adults Services" which was rated red. He explained that this service was driven by people living longer, which was increasing demand for support faster than the Council's Adult Social Care budget was increasing. Due to this country-wide issue, there was national debate about funding for Adult Social Care.
- 15.4 The Chairman spoke about RM029, "NCC may not have the employees (or a sufficient number of employees) with critical skills that will be required for the organisation to operate effectively in the next 2-5 years and longer term". This risk score had increased and was now red. Work was being done to improve skills across and outside of the Council.
- 15.5 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services spoke about RM031, "NCC Funded Children's Services Overspend". Risks in this department were linked as transformation had been slowed. In 2020-21 a balanced budget had been achieved, giving confidence moving forwards. The Government had supported Norfolk's No Wrong Door policy and the New Roots project which was showing signs of providing savings for the Council and improvements for young people.
- 15.6 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance discussed that the number of new staff who had joined the Council during the pandemic was positive. This was partly down to the Council being flexible to meet peoples' needs, however this also meant that people could look elsewhere, and this was a risk that would affect many organisations moving forward. Continuing to be an innovative and transformative Council would help the Council to retain staff and make it a good place to work.
- 15.7 The Vice-Chairman noted that a compelling case needed to be made to Government about investment in Norfolk from the UK shared prosperity fund for replacement of EU funding.
- 15.8 RM032a was being re-scoped with the updating of the resilience framework so that the risk was managed in line with this framework.

15.9 Cabinet **RESOLVED:**

1. To consider and agree the key messages (2.1 and 2.2) and key changes (Appendices A and B of the report) to corporate risks since the last risk management report in April 2021.
2. To consider and agree the corporate risks as at June 2021 (Appendix C of the report).
3. To consider and agree the departmental risk summaries as at June 2021 (Appendix D of the report).
4. To consider the summary of the recent independent risk management health check carried out by the Council's insurance contractor, which reported a positive outcome.

15.10 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

Not applicable as no decision is being made.

15.11 **Alternative Options**

There are no alternatives identified.

15.12 Cabinet adjourned to observe a 2 minute's silence for NHS, Social Care & Frontline Workers' Day.

16 Finance Monitoring Report 2021-22 P2: May 2021

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

- 16.2 The Cabinet Member for Finance introduced the report to Cabinet:
- Taking into account bringing forward £19.274m against estimated ongoing Covid pressures for this financial year, a balanced position was being estimated for the end of the forthcoming financial year, 2021-22.
 - There was uncertainty however, particularly in relation to the ongoing impact of the pandemic. This was seen in Children's Services where home to school transport and social care placements were under pressure and in Adult Social Care where purchase of care was at risk of overspend.
 - It was believed that reserves put in place at end of 2020-21 would cover additional extra spending, and Covid funding for the current year, 2020-21, at £53.7m, was only marginally below current forecast pressures of £55.3m.
 - As part of the drive to ensure spending departments received assistance from finance colleagues, a quarterly capital review board had been set up in 2020, chaired by the Cabinet Member for Finance, to challenge departmental capital spending, filter additional capital spending and ensure existing schemes went ahead on time and on budget. Recommendations from the last board meeting were set out in recommendation 1 of the report.
 - Further additions to the capital programme were proposed, and these were set out on pages 258-259 of the report.
 - The most significant addition to the capital programme was to fund continuing transformation of the Norse Care estate; this £5m programme

would enable Norse to shift their offer to enhanced care from residential care reflecting the changing needs of the population and offering better value for money for the Council, saving the council around £2m in 2021-22 and £1m in 22-23. This was part of the Council's £40m manifesto commitment to sector.

- The Cabinet Member for Finance moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

16.3 The Chairman noted that as shareholder of the company, it was important for NCC to make sure Norse's care offer was right and relevant for the future.

16.3 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

1. To recommend to County Council the addition of **£6.787m** to the capital programme to address capital funding requirements as set out in detail in capital appendix 2 of the report, paragraph 4 as follows:
 - Older People Estate Transformation £5.000m (Appendix 2 paragraph 4.2)
 - Structural repairs to King's Lynn Museum £0.600 (Appendix 2 paragraph 4.3)
 - Better Broadband for Norfolk £0.050m (Appendix 2 paragraph 4.4)
 - Greenways to Greenspaces £0.350m (Appendix 2 paragraph 4.5)
 - Dereham Fire Station (Phase 2) £0.434m (Appendix 2 paragraph 4.6)
 - Emergency Response Vehicles £0.300m (Appendix 2 paragraph 4.7)
 - Card payments Programme £0.053m (Appendix 2 paragraph 4.8)
2. Subject to County Council approval of recommendation 1 above, to delegate:
 - 2.1) To the Director of Procurement authority to undertake the necessary procurement processes including the determination of the minimum standards and selection criteria (if any) and the award criteria; to shortlist bidders; to make provisional award decisions (in consultation with the Chief Officer responsible for each scheme); to award contracts; to negotiate where the procurement procedure so permits; and to terminate award procedures if necessary;
 - 2.2) To the Director of Property authority (notwithstanding the limits set out at 5.13.6 and 5.13.7 of Financial Regulations) to negotiate or tender for or otherwise acquire the required land to deliver the schemes (including temporary land required for delivery of the works) and to dispose of land so acquired that is no longer required upon completion of the scheme;
 - 2.3) To each responsible chief officer authority to:
 - (in the case of two-stage design and build contracts) agree the price for the works upon completion of the design stage and direct that the works proceed; or alternatively direct that the works be recompeted
 - approve purchase orders, employer's instructions, compensation events or other contractual instructions necessary to effect changes in contracts that are necessitated by discoveries, unexpected ground conditions, planning conditions, requirements arising from detailed design or minor changes in scope

- subject always to the forecast cost including works, land, fees and disbursements remaining within the agreed scheme or programme budget.
 - That the officers exercising the delegated authorities set out above shall do so in accordance with the council's Policy Framework, with the approach to Social Value in Procurement endorsed by Cabinet at its meeting of 6 July 2020, and with the approach set out in the paper entitled "Sourcing strategy for council services" approved by Policy & Resources Committee at its meeting of 16 July 2018.
3. To delegate decisions relating to the use of the extended Covid Local Support Grant to the Director of Community Information and Learning, in consultation with the Leader, as described in Appendix 1 of the report paragraphs 5.6 and 5.7.
 4. To note the period 2 general fund forecast revenue **balanced position**, noting also that Executive Directors will continue to take measures to reduce or eliminate potential over-spends where these occur within services;
 5. To note the COVID-19 grant funding available of **£53.767m**, including £19.274m brought forward from 2020-21;
 6. To note the period 2 forecast 100% savings delivery in 2021-22, noting also that Executive Directors will continue to take measures to mitigate potential savings shortfalls through alternative savings or underspends;
 7. To note the forecast General Balances at 31 March 2021 of **£23.763m**.
 8. To note the expenditure and funding of the revised current and future 2021-25 capital programmes.

16.4 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

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

Appendix 1 of the report summarises the revenue outturn position, including:

- Forecast over and under spends
- Covid-19 grant income
- Changes to the approved budget
- Reserves
- Savings
- Treasury management
- Payment performance and debt recovery.

Appendix 2 of the report summarises the capital outturn position, and includes:

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

Additional capital funds will enable services to invest in assets and infrastructure as described in Appendix 2 of the report, section 4.

Delegation of decisions relating to the use of the extended Covid Local Support Grant to the Director of Community Information and Learning, in consultation with the Leader, will enable the grant to be rapidly applied to support vulnerable families as described in Appendix 1 of the report, paragraphs 5.6 and 5.7.

16.5 Alternative Options

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

17 Strategic and Financial Planning 2022-23

17.1 Cabinet received the report setting out details of a proposed budget planning process for 2022-23 but recognised that there may be a need for some flexibility. In this context, the report also provided a summary of key areas of wider risk and uncertainty for Cabinet to consider.

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

- A robust and balanced budget was being delivered as set out in February 2021 without any significant overspend. However, pressures from Covid-19, and others, such as demography and rising costs of care, were a concern. It was therefore important to set out a balanced and sound budget for 2022-23.
- Increased costs in the current year, 2021-22, may be offset by a reduction in spending levels in departments however the pandemic would continue to impact services, and this would need to be reviewed on an ongoing basis
- In the spring 2021 budget, the Chancellor of the Exchequer focussed on the response to Covid and the support business and people may receive, however there were few details on Local Government funding, a fair funding review or business rate reform. It was unlikely that a comprehensive spending review would come forward so a late autumn funding allocation for 2022-23 seemed likely.
- Local Government Funding was not sustainable until an adequate long-term funding solution was provided for Adult Social Care.
- There was a clear mandate to deliver on the key manifesto pledges of: protecting our libraries, museums and recycling centres, investing in new care provision, providing a strong infrastructure backbone for long term economic growth, supporting walking and cycling initiatives, and caring for the environment with a commitment for carbon neutrality by 2030.
- Significant externally generated pressures were set out on page 271 of the report. Last year, 2020/21, the Government stepped up to help the county during the pandemic, but significant pressures still remained.
- This Council's aim to support vulnerable communities throughout the pandemic had been effective. Moving forward, the focus would be supporting the re-emergence of Norfolk's economy particularly in key sectors such as agriculture, leisure, tourism and the care sector.

- Covid-19 would continue to place budget pressures on Norfolk and the Council may need to look to Government for support if these arose; as such the implications in dealing with the £39m funding gap were set out in table 5 on page 276-7 of the report, which was the amount calculated to be needed to balance the local budget if council tax was raised. Savings in the context of what would happen if Council Tax was frozen was set out in table 7 on page 278 of the report, and this would result in a budget gap of £47.9m.
- Adult Social Care were forecasting an additional £21m in cost pressures due to legal requirements and demographic pressures, and from proactive actions taken to stabilise the care market; the £17.7m savings should be seen in context with this.
- The budget would be built on a process for detailed financial plans to safeguard the future finance of Council Services. The full timetable was set out on page 137 of the report.
- The Council would continue to liaise with organisations such as the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government, the County Council Network, the Local Government Association, the Society of County Treasurers and Government Ministers to ensure a sustainable funding settlement was achieved.
- The Cabinet Member for Finance moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

- 17.3 The Chairman noted that budget pressures could not all be funded by Council tax increases or savings. Norfolk County Council had written to the new Secretary of State to remind him of the need for a solution for Adult Social Care funding. He noted that the figures included a 3% pay increase compared to the current employers' offer of 1.5% . The Council would continue to need additional funding for flood alleviation work and would put a case to Government for additional funding.
- 17.4 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention discussed that there were pressures moving forward created by the Council stepping into be a responsible partner in the care sector, for example by committing consistently increased levels of funding to the care market to support them to pay their staff the national living wage. The Council was committed to a high standard of service and support for those relying on services, making setting the budget challenging moving forward. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention supported the leader opening a dialogue with the Secretary of State and Government.
- 17.5 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance echoed the need for a fair and robust financial settlement from Government. The Council had been looking to transform and innovate in the way that it delivered and conducted services; it was important that all transformation achieved best value for money.
- 17.6 The Vice-Chairman endorsed the importance of work to grow the economy, noting that Norfolk's economy had reduced by £2bn during the pandemic. Ensuring that funding which used to come to Norfolk from the European Union was replaced by Government was important so that schemes which helped businesses could continue.

- 17.7 The Cabinet Member for Finance clarified that the £1.5m in the 2020-21 budget to alleviate flooding was a one-off investment to respond to specific needs; this would be repeated if the need arose. “Budget challenge 1” would start the budget setting process off and would start in mid July 2021; 85% of savings due to be delivered were transformation savings and the Cabinet Member for Finance expected that transformation would be a significant way of delivering savings in the coming year.
- 17.8 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:
1. To consider the overall budget gap of £91.876m included in the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) set by Full Council in February 2021, and agree:
 - a. the gap of £39.037m to be closed for 2022-23; and
 - b. the extension of the MTFS by a further year (to 2025-26) and the resulting overall gap for planning purposes of £108.645m. (Section 5).
 2. To review the key budget risks and uncertainties as set out in this report, including the implications of announcements made at the Spring Budget 2021, and the significant uncertainties which remain. (Section 3, Section 5 and Section 13).
 3. To consider the principles of the proposed approach to budget setting for 2022-23, noting that there may be a need for flexibility within both the process itself and the assumptions applied, and agree:
 - a. the process and indicative timetable set out in paragraph 6.1 and Table 8.
 - b. the savings targets allocated to each Department to be found (Table 9), and that these will be kept under review through the budget process, and
 - c. the proposed review of new borrowing within the 2022-23 Capital Programme to ensure affordability.

17.9 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

Since early 2020 the County Council has been responding to an unprecedented financial and public health crisis with significant implications for budget setting, which have (as far as possible) been reflected in this report. In this context it remains essential to continue to engage with Government, MPs and other stakeholders to campaign for adequate and sustainable funding for Norfolk to enable the delivery of vital services to residents, businesses and visitors. As in previous years it is important that Government issues guidance on financial planning assumptions, including indicative funding allocations for 2022-23, as soon as possible. Otherwise there is a significant risk that the Council will be obliged to reduce service levels. The Council's planning within the MTFS forecast is based on the position agreed in February 2021 and it is important to note that this will be kept under review in the event that further evidence about funding or the ultimate longer-term impact of COVID-19 on the Council's finances becomes available. Nevertheless, it remains prudent to establish a process to begin planning for savings at the level required to close the underlying gap identified in February 2021.

The proposals in the report reflect a proportionate response to the challenges and uncertainties present in the 2022-23 planning process and will ultimately support the Council to develop a robust budget for the year.

17.10 **Alternative Options**

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

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

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

The planning context for the Council will be updated if further information becomes available. Final decisions about the overall shape of the 2022-23 Budget, savings, and council tax will not be made until February 2022.

18 **Director Appointments**

18.1 Cabinet received the report providing an overview of the current position and Director appointment for all Council Companies, ensuring transparency about the appointment of Directors.

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

- Financial regulations required Cabinet to approve the director appointments for companies over which NCC had an interest.
- Appendix 1 of the report set out the names of directors and for the purpose of good governance authorisation was required from Cabinet for their appointment as set out in “Financial Regulation 5.10.6” and “Public Contracts Regulations 2015 regulation 12(1)(a)”, detailed on page 289 of the report.
- The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management moved the recommendations as set out in the report

18.3 Cabinet **RESOLVED**:

1. To approve the current Company Director appointments as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.

18.4 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

The information in Appendix 1 of the report concerning Norse Group companies has been confirmed by the Norse Group Solicitor as an accurate reflection of the information concerning directorships for Norse Group companies filed at

Companies House as at 11 June 2021. There may, however, be changes to the information on directors appointed by other local authorities to Norse Group joint venture companies between that date and 5 July 2021. Information in Appendix 1 of the report on non-Norse Group companies has been extracted from a credit report system, and / or Companies House data as at 14 June 2021.

18.5 Alternative Options

No specific alternative options, Cabinet could make alternative Director appointments to those recommended.

19 Disposal, acquisition and exploitation of property

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

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

- Norwich airport industrial estate was jointly owned by Norfolk County Council and Norwich City Council. The site was created out of a joint initiative in 1969 to develop an airport facility and adjoining industrial estate on the site of the former Horsham St Faiths RAF airfield.
- The joint net income for the site was £842,808 for the last financial year (2020/21).
- The site included 120,000m² accommodation, mostly consisting of light and general industrial or warehousing, and the remainder being office space. There were repurposed airport hangars, adapted to meet modern business needs, and most buildings were constructed from the 1970s onwards with ground leases of 60-125 years. There were 15 hectares of vacant lots at this time.
- Norfolk County Council and Norwich City Council had considered how to maximise the use of the industrial estate and found that investment was required in order to maximise its use. Both parties had considered if disposing of the site would be a viable option; the nature of the trust agreement allowed either to achieve this with the other party, or to buy the other party out.
- Pieces of work were carried out to achieve due diligence on the estate and the findings of these were noted in the confidential appendix which Cabinet members had seen but did not wish to comment on in the meeting.
- Three further pieces of work were commissioned, and these are detailed in paragraph 2.8 of the report on pages 304-305.
- Norfolk County Council did not follow a strategy of borrowing money to create income; this was a legacy site and to increase rental income would need significant capital investment.
- Having reviewed the options, Norfolk County Council and Norwich City Council had concluded that disposal of Norfolk County Council's interest in the site was most advantageous to securing the best long-term outcomes. The disposal would also provide opportunities for receipts and savings in holding costs.

- There would be a loss of income however the cost for investment required in the site would greatly exceed this.
- The Cabinet Member for Innov Commercial Services and Asset Management moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

19.3 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

1. Formally declare its property interest in Norwich Airport Industrial Estate, Fifers Lane, Norwich (4102/018) surplus to County Council requirements and instruct the Director of Property to dispose of the property interest. The disposal receipt will exceed delegated limits therefore the Director of Property in consultation with the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services and Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management is authorised to accept the most advantageous offer.

19.4 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

Declaring the property interest in the NAIE surplus to County Council use means that the Corporate Property Team can consider options for the disposal of the property interest in the estate.

19.5 **Alternative Options**

The alternative would be for the County Council to retain its property interest.

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

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

21 Exclusion of the Public

- 21.1 Cabinet resolved **not** to go into private session as they would not need to discuss the exempt appendix to item 19, "Disposal, acquisition and exploitation of property".

22 Disposal, acquisition and exploitation of property - Exempt Appendix

- 22.1 Cabinet had previously read this paper and did not need to discuss the exempt appendix in the meeting.

The meeting ended at 11:41am

Chairman

Cabinet
5 July 2021
Local Member Questions

Agenda item 7	Local Member Issues/Questions
7.1	<p>Question from Cllr Ed Maxfield With the rate of inflation rising above the Bank of England target and predicted to rise further it is widely expected that interest rates will also rise in the near future. What is the financial impact on the Council of a rise of one, three and five percentage points in the rate we are charged, based on current and predicted future levels of borrowing?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Finance The majority of the County Council's existing debt is at fixed interest rates and there will be no impact from an increase in interest rates. The Council's Medium term Financial Strategy includes a budget planning assumption of borrowing of £80m for 2021/22, 2022/23 and 2023/24 based on interest rates of 2.5%, 2.7% and 2.8%. As can be seen from the increase in interest rates over the period, the Council is already planning for an increase in interest rates. The Council's most recent borrowing in June has been below 2%. Any changes to interest rates will be reflected in future revisions to the Medium Term Financial Strategy. Using the planned £80m borrowing for 2021/22, a one, three and five percentage points increase would result in additional interest costs of £0.8m, £2.4m and £4m per annum.</p>
7.2	<p>Question from Cllr Jamie Osborn How can the council ensure the contractor appointed for the Western Link will deliver an objective and trustworthy environmental impact assessment and assessment of carbon impacts when the contractor has a vested interest in not only getting this road built but also in other environmentally-damaging projects such as airport expansion and the Silvertown Tunnel?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste The project must successfully pass through the statutory approvals process, which will consider the Environmental Statement, which takes into account the Environmental Impact Assessment and will include carbon assessments. As such, it is in the interests of both the contractor and Council to ensure a robust and accurate assessment.</p>
7.3	<p>Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp Can NCC fully review its harmful agreement with Highways England for 300 homes on the A10, before necessary highways improvements at the Hardwick Roundabout, the A47 dualling and A10 bypass which Highways England always said must come first? Post-pandemic urban flight and staycations via the North Norfolk Coast Gateway are worsening chronic congestion.</p> <p>NCC's consultants WSP wrote -: 1. West Norfolk is significantly worse than national for people killed or seriously injured on roads. 2... There was an 80% increase in road accidents around Lynn and West Winch. 3... The Hardwick Roundabout is an accident blackspot. 4... 300 Homes will worsen congestion and accidents.</p>

	<p>Put public safety first.</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure No “agreement” has been made with Highways England. Whilst we work with stakeholders in the development process to help bring forward allocated growth, any developer needs to demonstrate the impacts of their housing proposal on the road network to the Borough Council, County Council and Highways England. In this case such information has been assessed independently by all three bodies. Anything deemed unsafe would be identified in this process. The results of these assessments have been fed back to the Borough Council who will ultimately decide what level of development can proceed before the West Winch Housing Access Road (WWHAR) is in place.</p>
7.4	<p>Question from Cllr Mike Smith-Clare Can the Cabinet Member highlight what was done to save Norwich’s Develop training centre?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children’s Services Following the Department for Education’s (DfE) decision to withdraw their contract with Develop EBP, Officers from Norfolk County Council have been working with the DfE, the Education & Skills Funding Agency (ESFA) and other Local Authorities in the Eastern Region to consider the implications and our local and collective response.</p> <p>It is the view of Norfolk County Council that Develop EBPs’ provision for learners has been of good quality and so we have been concerned that the withdrawal of contract could have negative impacts on existing learners being able to complete their programmes and move on to their next planned destinations. Furthermore we have had concerns that the closure of Develop EBP may leave a gap in the provision landscape for future learners, including those with SEND.</p> <p>Following discussions with staff at Develop EBP and with the ESFA we have been assured that existing learners have either already been transferred to other local providers or are approaching the completion of their programmes of study at the end of this academic year and most have plans in place for their next steps. Additional support for learners has been offered by the Local Authority for learners completing their programmes with Develop EBP. Furthermore, we have been assured by the ESFA that learner numbers and the type of education and training provision that has been provided by Develop EBP will transfer to an alternative provider in the Norwich area for September 2021.</p> <p>We have had regular meetings, on an almost weekly basis, with both the other LA’s where Develop operate and the ESFA to explore any possible avenue to avoid the closure. This included a potential merger with another provider to then take on the provision. Unfortunately this proved to not be a viable option. To mitigate the loss of the centre as much as we could we have negotiated with the ESFA for the learner numbers that would have been allocated to Develop for the 21/22 academic year to remain in Norfolk. The ESFA is in the process of agreeing their re-allocation to an alternative Norfolk based provider based upon our recommendation.</p>

7.5	<p>Question from Cllr Chrissie Rumsby Does the cabinet member know how many young people have been temporarily excluded from lessons due to uniform or fashion/haircut rule infringements this year?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services If the exclusion was internal (sometimes called isolation) this is not an official exclusion as the pupil continues to be taught at school. We are unlikely to be informed of this unless the school has sought our support. For most fixed term exclusions where young people are sent home for less than 5 days, these are reported to the local authority on a termly basis. Schools are not required to share with us the level of detail that would allow us to understand how many children have been fixed term excluded for uniform or hair cut issues.</p>
7.6	<p>Question from Cllr Emma Corlett I was pleased the Leader took the opportunity to write quickly to the new Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. Was there a reason he omitted to include the desperate problems with the mental health service and dentistry in Norfolk amongst the urgent issues that need addressing</p> <p>Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategy and Governance Thank you for your question. The purpose of the letter was to congratulate the Secretary of State on his appointment and highlight outstanding correspondence with his predecessor, such as Adult Social Care Funding, Health and Social Care Integration and the desperate need to replace the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. We hope to have a very productive relationship with Sajid Javid going forward, bearing in mind his background working with Local Government and will continue to flag important issues to him.</p>
7.7	<p>Question from Cllr Steve Mophew The sale of the airport industrial estate in my division will result in the reduction in income to the county council that can be spent on services of around £400k a year. How will that shortfall be made up and why is the council proposing to sell rather than invest when borrowing rates are low in order to promote income generation, new businesses and new jobs in one of the more deprived areas of Norwich?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management I would like to thank Cllr Mophew for his question. As he will be aware good asset management is not just about acquisition, but around actively managing portfolios – which includes divesting assets.</p> <p>As Cllr Mophew should be aware, we have been working closely with his colleagues in the administration at Norwich City Council – who will be considering a similar report in the next few days. Options were explored in depth and as the report details the current site will continue to provide a key employment area for this part of Norwich. In reaching this decision we have also considered the level of investment needed for this estate and the potential financial return, as well as where else this funding could be deployed.</p>

	<p>I would be happy to arrange a meeting with him to discuss how we are investing capital receipts into creating new jobs, new educational facilities, and growth into economic opportunities – for example in Great Yarmouth supporting new environmental technology. These are investments that will not only raise the prosperity of the County, but also deliver revenue benefits.</p>
7.8	<p>Question from Cllr Lucy Shires Over the past 12 months, there has been a steady decrease in the percentage of vulnerable children with a Children in Need Plan. When are we likely to see an improvement in service for these children, and what is the impact on those whose plans are out of date?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services Our numbers of children subject to CiN (Children in Need) Plans over a 12 month period has dropped slightly from 1342 to 1291, so a reduction of 51 children or 3.8%. Rather than representing any decline in quality of service and support to these children, it is a result of a combination of factors including;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Overall drop in referrals to Children's Social Care as a result of the pandemic and lockdown periods B. Improved quality of our social work and decision making meaning more cases being appropriately managed by our Family Support teams (an increase of 129 children), and C. Strengthening of our response with greater capacity in the Community and Partnership Service at an early point supporting partner agencies managing emerging need. <p>Regarding the timeliness of our Child in Need Plans, alongside ensuring they are of consistently high quality, it is very much the focus of our Heads of Service this year and is an agenda item at each locality's monthly performance clinic. We are confident that all our Children in Need have a plan, that reviews of the plan are taking place, and that their social workers are working hard with them to achieve good outcomes. However, recording and updating of those plans needs to improve, and it is the expectation that the number of plans recorded on the case management system reaches 80% by the end of July 2021 and 90% by end of September 2021.</p>
7.9	<p>Question from Cllr Dan Roper The Council has announced its plans to save around £40 million from Council budgets in 2022/23, and more than £100 million by April 2025. How will it seek to ensure that the most vulnerable people across the county are best protected against the worst effect of these cuts?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Finance The County Council has a well established process for developing its budget which provides an opportunity for public consultation on all proposals, including those with an impact on service delivery. The Council has a track record of prioritising budget reductions achieved through efficiencies, whilst protecting front line services as far as possible, which in previous years has included taking difficult decisions to raise council tax in order to mitigate the level of budget reductions required. This approach is being maintained in the development of the</p>

	<p>2022-23 Budget and there will be further reports to Cabinet during the coming year on the progress towards developing the 2022-23 Budget. All budget proposals taken forward will be subject to a detailed Equality Impact Assessment which will include recommendations for mitigating actions, to ensure that the impacts of any proposals, and options for how these impacts can be minimised, are fully understood when final budget decisions are taken by Full Council in February 2022.</p>
7.10	<p>Question from Cllr Timothy Adams Will Norfolk do what it can to re-home some of the 3000 Afghan interpreters expected to be come to the UK following the withdrawal of British soldiers, and has any consideration been given by the County Council as to how these efforts might be supported?</p> <p>Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategy and Governance The Afghan Locally Employed Staff (LES) Relocation Scheme is a joint operation between the MOD, the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and Home Office to relocate Afghan nationals and their families who have put their lives at risk to assist the British and US military operations in Afghanistan.</p> <p>To date, 1,362 people have been relocated to the UK. Because of the recent withdrawal of the British and US troops, LES and their family members are now at significant risk due to their perceived allegiance to the West and treachery to the Afghan state and Taliban. The UK government has pledged to receive a further 3,000 individuals by the end of August 2021.</p> <p>In June 2021, Ministers wrote to local authorities to ask them to step forward at pace to support the commitment to LES at risk and their families to provide accommodation and relocation packages. The scheme is funded by the Treasury and administered via the Home Office. Participation is cost-neutral.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council (with the support of district and borough councils) currently delivers a Refugee Resettlement Scheme funded by the Home Office at no cost to the County Council, supporting Syrian refugee families to resettle in the Norwich area. This scheme is nationally recognised by the Home Office and LGA as a model of best practice and there is capacity to support the Afghan Locally Employed Staff (LES) Relocation Scheme.</p> <p>'We have indicated informally that we have offered 5 properties to the Home Office and our offer is currently under consideration for potential matching with LES staff and their families to be relocated to Norfolk. Further properties to be offered to the Home Office by the end of August subject to availability. A formal cabinet decision is in preparation for formalising this position.</p>
7.11	<p>Question from Cllr Brian Watkins With the end to Covid restrictions now in sight, how is the County Council working with local tourist attractions, other district councils, and the hospitality sector to attract more visitors to Norfolk in the coming months?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy Following the successful delivery of the major Norfolk Tourism Recovery Project,</p>

	<p>Norfolk County Council continues to work closely with District partners, Visit East of England, and local Destination Management Organisations (DMOs) to ensure a coordinated approach to the safe reopening of our tourism offer. A Tourism Recovery Best Practice Group meets regularly to ensure a coordinated county approach to tourism, to connect with national tourism bodies including Visit England, and to deliver a range of initiatives to support the sector. Recent work has included developing a Reopening Norfolk Safely toolkit to help tourism businesses open safely, and the recent launch of the new Celebrating Culture 2021 campaign, which highlights the great cultural offers which visitors can safely enjoy across Norfolk and Suffolk. All work continues to be delivered in close cooperation with Public Health to ensure that the tourism sector receives the help it needs, and that our local communities are also fully supported.</p>
7.12	<p>Question from Cllr Steffan Aquarone</p> <p>In the Queens Speech, we saw some welcome hints that there will be investment in preventative public health measures. However, we did not get any indication about timescales for new funding or legislation for social care. Can we hear what this Administration plans to do to continue to ensure this remains on the Government's agenda?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention</p> <p>Thank you for your question. The role of public health, prevention and social care in developing and sustaining healthy communities has never been more important. The pandemic has shown further how crucial our services are in supporting those most at risk in communities and our local Integrated Care System will be the driving force for prioritising prevention.</p> <p>We continue at every opportunity to make the case for investment in social care, including writing to the new Health and Social Care Secretary to urge him to tackle the issue of a lack of long-term, sustainable government funding and reform.</p>
7.13	<p>Question from Cllr Ben Price</p> <p>Given the changes to peoples working habits the pandemic has accelerated, and the need for this council to meet government carbon reduction targets, will the County Council support the introduction of a workplace parking levy in helping to discourage employers devoting land to car parking and increase active sustainable transport, by stating this desire in the emerging local transport plan?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member Highways and Transport</p> <p>The Local Transport Plan draft strategy contains a policy that states "Action will be taken to improve air quality in urban centres, including investigating vehicular restrictions or charging..." This clearly sets out that measures including workplace parking charges, but also clean air zones, ultra-low emission zones or congestion charging, will be considered to improve air quality, and which will also have significant carbon reduction benefits. Considerable work would be required to understand which, if any, might be appropriate to take forward. Further examination of the appropriateness of such measures is being considered in development of the Transport for Norwich strategy.</p>

Written Supplementary Questions requiring written responses from the Cabinet Meeting held on Monday 5 July 2021

Agenda item 7 Local Member questions	
Written supplementary question from Cllr Jamie Osborne	<p>The Constitution (Appendix 16) encourages including “environmental performance as an ‘added value’ criterion, rather than simply setting a minimum standard” in contracts. This includes social and environmental value beyond statutory minima including reducing carbon emissions, air pollutants, and improving landscape.</p> <p>Please provide the detailed scoring matrices used in the NWL tender evaluation, and show how environmental performance above statutory minimums has been scored</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure</p> <p>The evaluation criteria including the approach to social value and environmental considerations are detailed in the report that was agreed by Cabinet on 3 February 2020. Contractors will adhere to the principles set out in Carbon Management in Infrastructure guidance (PAS 2080), the leading specification for quantifying carbon infrastructure in the UK, when designing and constructing the project. Environmental considerations and alignment with the schemes environmental objectives were an important part of the assessment of tenderers quality submissions.</p> <p>The Council does not routinely publish the detailed evaluation information. The successful bidder scored highly on environmental considerations and the tender criteria went beyond the minimum requirements given the nature of the project and the Council’s commitments to an improved environment.</p>
Written supplementary question from Cllr Ben Price	<p>Thank you for your answer. I am interested to know the views of cabinet members at this time, regarding improvements to our transport system, particularly those that could result in lower traffic levels, overall, as a result of a western link road. Could the cabinet member please explain his current view regarding a workplace parking levy and where he sees that fitting in to the overall system?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure</p> <p>The county council fully supports appropriate measures that would lead to reduced carbon emissions and improved air quality. We are well underway with delivery of £32m of sustainable transport measures in Norwich, using funding awarded to us from the government’s Transforming Cities Fund. Alongside this, we have already made commitment to ambitious carbon targets in our adopted environmental policy and the Local Transport Plan coming forward for adoption sets out a policy framework including a draft policy that, amongst other things, says we would take action to investigate vehicular restrictions</p>

	<p>or charging in certain areas. This could include consideration of a workplace parking levy alongside other potential measures to support shifts to healthier and more active travel modes. However, we would need to undertake extensive work to establish whether a workplace parking levy is an appropriate solution to the problems in an area or whether problems might best be tackled through other solutions. At this stage therefore a workplace parking levy <u>could</u> fit into the overall system but we would need to consider whether it is the right solution for a particular area, taking into account its effectiveness in addressing problems, its impact across a range of social, environmental and economic metrics and whether other options might provide a more effective, deliverable and value for money response.</p> <p>We are also due to consult on a new Transport for Norwich Strategy later this year. This will take account of work on the Norwich Western Link and the commitment we have made to taking forward further sustainable transport measures as a part of that project.</p>
<p>Written supplementary question from Cllr Steve Morphew</p>	<p>I look forward to taking Cllr Peck up his offer. I would remind him I am a county councillor not a city councillor, so I am interested in why he didn't explore the option of buying out the city council and investing on behalf of the county council</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management</p> <p>NCC reviewed several options but came (independently) to the same position as Norwich City Council on the future of this asset, that we were best to divest ourselves and invest the receipt to support our wider aims.</p> <p>I look forward to meeting up and we can discuss in greater detail.</p>