

Cabinet
Minutes of the Virtual Teams Meeting held on
Monday 7 December 2020 at 10am

Present:

Cllr Andrew Proctor	Chairman. Leader & Cabinet Member for Strategy & Governance.
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 Graham Plant	Vice-Chairman and Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy.
Cllr Martin Wilby	Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.

Executive Directors Present:

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

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the Cabinet meeting and advised viewers that pursuant to The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020, the meeting was being held under new Regulations which had been brought in to deal with the restrictions under Covid 19. Decisions made in the meeting would have the same standing and validity as if they had been made in a meeting in County Hall.

Cabinet Members and Executive Directors formally introduced themselves.

As this would be the last meeting attended by Fiona McDiarmid, Executive Director of Strategy & Governance, before she left Norfolk County Council in December 2020, The Chairman, on behalf of Cabinet and colleagues, placed on record his thanks for all her hard work over the years and wished her well for the future.

1 Apologies for Absence

There were no apologies for absence.

2 Minutes

The minutes from the Cabinet meeting held on Monday 2 November 2020 were agreed as an accurate record.

3 Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest made.

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

There were no matters referred to Cabinet.

5 Items of Urgent Business

- 5.1 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport advised that, for the second year running, Norfolk County Council had come first among its peers in the National Highways and Transport Survey. Over the summer 2020, 3,300 people in Norfolk had been asked for their views on topics such as road safety, highways maintenance, congestion and public transport. The results were ranked against other participating councils from across the country to provide a nationwide picture of how Norfolk was performing and out of the 29 county council and larger unitary authorities, Norfolk had secured first place for overall satisfaction.

Norfolk County Council had also achieved its highest average scores in both satisfaction with traffic levels and congestion and condition of highways which was testament to the hard work and dedication of all the highway and transport teams, with one area where Norfolk County Council had been ranked in first place was “professionalism of staff responding to enquiries”.

Despite the challenges brought about by the covid pandemic, Norfolk County Council had continued to focus its efforts and expenditure on the things people had highlighted as being the most important to them, for example safe roads that were in good condition. One of the biggest schemes made available by the extra government funding which had been secured was the resurfacing of the A1066 near Thetford which had recently been completed.

The survey had allowed Norfolk County Council to identify areas which needed improvement, for example the investment being made in installing LED streetlights on Norfolk’s main roads would help cut electricity consumption and also contribute towards Norfolk’s journey to a net zero carbon emission gain, whilst also improving customer satisfaction with street lighting in future surveys.

The Cabinet Member placed on record his thanks to all the teams in Highways, who did a fantastic job, working in all weathers to keep the county moving.

- 5.1.1 The Chairman endorsed the comments made and the thanks to the Highways teams.

- 5.2 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention highlighted the arrival of the covid vaccine in Norfolk, which was due to be received on 8 December. Norfolk had two vaccination hubs –the Norfolk & Norwich University Hospital and the James Paget Hospital, Gorleston, where facilities were available to store the vaccine at the required temperature. The Cabinet Member thanked the Minister, Helen Whatley, who had ensured care home residents, care workers and vulnerable people were given high priority to receive the vaccine first. Cabinet noted that staff in Adult Social Care had worked with care providers over the weekend of 6/7 December to identify people for the first round of vaccination appointments, which it was hoped would commence in hospitals soon.

The Cabinet Member urged all residents to have the vaccine if they were offered an appointment.

The Cabinet Member placed on record his thanks to all care workers for their continued efforts, adding that Norfolk County Council would continue to support them with advice, outbreak support and also financial support, which it had done since the start of the outbreak.

The Cabinet Member reiterated that the vaccine would take some months to roll out and the spread of the virus needed to reduce before life could return to normal, therefore it was important people did not become complacent as there was still a high risk of infection until the vaccine had been completely rolled out. He asked everyone to ensure they complied with the guidelines and not take risks; and until the full roll out of the vaccine, maintain personal space and wear a mask when in a crowd, whether indoors or outside, which really did make a difference.

- 5.2.1 The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member for the update and also reiterated the need to continue observing the “hands, face, space” guidance and to not become complacent now that a vaccine was close.

6 Public Question Time

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

6.2 Supplementary Question from Jan Davis:

As a supplementary question, Mr Davis asked, as a result of the figures quoted, where the funding was coming from, given the downturn in the projected business rates pool.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport replied that funding for the Norwich Western Link was coming from the Department for Transport and local contributions.

7 Local Member Questions/Issues

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

7.2 Supplementary question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp

Cllr Kemp said that Cllr Wilby's answer was inaccurate and did not address safety, business, residential or tourism needs – he had said Clockcase Lane didn't pass through a settlement, although it did. Clockcase Lane passed through Clenchwarton and had continuous farm frontage. The Cabinet Member had said he wanted safe roads, but Clockcase Lane was a deathtrap for pedestrians caught in front of tankers with no safe refuge. She added there was a need to promote walking and cycling and Clockcase Lane was the route to the famous tourist route, the Peter Scott Walk. As a supplementary question Cllr Kemp asked if the Cabinet Member would come and visit Clenchwarton to see for himself the problems faced.

In reply, the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport said that he would raise the matter with the Local Highways Engineers and the Director of Highways and Waste at County Hall.

7.3 Supplementary question from Cllr Emma Corlett

Cllr Corlett said she completely refuted that what the Cabinet Member had described was biodiversity net gain as replacing mature woodland and habitats established over hundreds of years with new planting was not leaving somewhere in better condition however you tried and spin it.

Given the significant changes in travel patterns that were likely to be long-term as a result of covid and the fact that there was no full environmental impact assessment, Cllr Corlett asked if the Cabinet Member would agree to pause and review the western link decision so that these two vital pieces of information could be properly considered, before council funds were irresponsibly committed based on partial or out of date information.

In reply, the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport said there were no plans to pause the Norwich western link project.

7.4 Supplementary question from Cllr Dan Roper

As a supplementary question, Cllr Roper asked if any such restrictions had previously existed and if so, when they had expired or when they were lifted.

The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services & Asset Management responded that there were no restrictions on whether Holt Hall was required to be used for educational purposes. In the past Local Government had been required to acquire property for specific purposes under specific Acts and then transferred the land internally, for example land purchased for a highways scheme would be bought under Highways Acts and then appropriated across to the housing committee. The only restriction that would matter was a clause on the Title, however in this case the land was purchased unencumbered, so the answer to the question was that there were no restrictions.

7.5 Some written Supplementary questions were submitted by Local Members which would receive written responses.

8 Business Rates Pool – Annual Report 2019-20 and Pooling Decision 2021-22

8.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services providing a summary of the financial benefits of the Business Rates Pool and decisions taken to date in respect of allocating the pool's resources to

economic development projects in Norfolk. The report also provided details of the work undertaken with Norfolk Leaders in submitting an application to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) for a Norfolk Business Rates Pool in 2021-22.

8.2 In introducing the report and moving the recommendations, the Cabinet Member for Finance gave Cabinet some background information on the business rates pool, during which the following points were noted:

- The Business Rates Pool had been in existence for six years and had worked well for Norfolk during that time.
- The Business Rates Pool had allowed the county to retain additional business rates, totalling approximately £28.298m up to 2019-20.
- Last year, as well as the Pool, a pilot scheme had been established which had allowed the Pool to retain 75% of the growth rates, as opposed to 50% previously.
- Funds from pool growth were used for economic development across the county via the Joint Investment Fund (JIF) and the one-off pilot gain had been shared between the individual authorities.
- The list of projects funded by the JIF in 2018-19 and 2019-20 showed the measure of the success.
- Initial returns from the District Councils for 2020-21 were reported to Cabinet on 13 January 2020 and indicated that the county as a whole would show growth in the current financial year above the baseline.
- Support measures by the government had encouraged the District Councils to maintain this view for the current year and although the final outcome would not be known until final returns were received in 2021-22 financial year, the Cabinet Member was confident that Norfolk County Council would continue to benefit from pooling arrangements in the current financial year.
- The additional funds received by pooling had amounted to approximately 3% of the total business rates collected by the county and although useful was not game-changing.
- Under normal pooling arrangements, when an individual authority fell below 92.5% of its baseline funding level, they would move into a safety net position which meant any shortfall was picked up by the remainder of the Pool. Funds were then transferred from the local volatility fund which was subsequently topped up by the other Pool Members.
- A key issue for 2021-22 was how robust the District Councils were in their forecasting, which was largely based on the assumption that the government would continue to support businesses next year in the same way as they had this year, which was high risk. District Councils were at different distances from the safety net, but it would take a less than 5% reduction in forecast growth rates to require three of the seven lower tier authorities to request support from the local volatility fund. If that fund contained insufficient funds, Norfolk County Council would be liable for any shortfall until its own safety net level was reached, meaning a loss of approximately £20m.

8.3 The Chairman endorsed the highlighting of the risks, and also highlighted the leverage which had been received from the pool, as well as the partial funding for the establishment of the Norfolk Strategic Fund, which had been set up in response to the need to provide intervention for the Norfolk economy as a result of the covid-19 pandemic.

- 8.4 The Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy agreed that the fund had proved really useful since it was established, particularly regarding economic development, although as it relied on business rates was an issue as many businesses were struggling to pay their rates as a result of covid-19, or may possibly go out of business.

The Cabinet Member recognised the risks faced by Norfolk County Council if businesses were unable to pay their business rates, which could diminish the pool.

The Cabinet Member supported the recommendations and highlighted that it would be a pity if the Business Rates Pool ceased, as it had funded many infrastructure and business development projects across the county. He added that as soon as possible, he would be advocating maintaining the Pool.

- 8.5 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

1. **Note** the performance of the Norfolk Business Rates Pool and endorse the decisions taken by Norfolk Leaders in respect of:
 - Allocation of the 2018-19 Pool resources; and
 - Allocation of the 2019-20 Pilot resources.
2. **Note** the update on the application for a 2021-22 Norfolk Business Rates Pool, considering the increased risks of pooling in 2021-22 highlighted in section 5 and the potential need to dissolve the Norfolk Business Rates Pool, and delegate to the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services in consultation with the Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance to confirm (or otherwise) the County Council's participation, taking into account the latest available forecasts for pool income and the level of financial risk.

9 Finance Monitoring Report 2020-21 P7: October 2020

- 9.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services, including an exempt appendix, giving a summary of the forecast financial position for the 2020-21 Revenue and Capital Budgets, General Balances and the Council's Reserves at 31 March 2021, together with related financial information.

- 9.2 The Cabinet Member for Finance introduced the report and moved the recommendations, during which the following points were noted:

- The forecast level overspend to the end of October 2020 had been reduced to £1.256m, which was mainly due to a reduction in the overspend by Adult Social Care, which was now £1.9m.
- Children's Services continued to forecast a balanced budget, however, both departments faced considerable additional financial pressures next year as the continuing costs of the pandemic were felt, without receiving equivalent funding from the government to compensate. As a result, Cabinet was being asked to approve the transfer of £2m to each of Adult Social Care and Children's Services business risk reserves, as well as creating a corporate risk reserve.
- In Adult Social Care, arrangements established during the first lockdown had seen Norfolk County Council reimbursed by the NHS for patients who

would normally have received healthcare and who were discharged to the County Council to ensure hospitals had sufficient capacity during the pandemic. Those arrangements would soon cease, however patients remained in the care of NCC and were paid for by NCC.

- In addition, Adult Social Care was also forecasting continued pressure in the forecast purchase of care costs.
- Children's Services was forecasting unfunded pressures in early 2021 due to continuing support for schools, increased costs of transport and ensuring covid-secure provision.
- The covid grant funding received to date was £96.901m.
- The forecast total covid related financial pressures had increased to £108.719m, leaving a net covid-related pressure of £11.818m.
- Of the new funding received £7.262m was in respect of the Contain Outbreak Management Fund (COMF). Cabinet was asked to approve the transfer of £2.645m from this allocation to the District Councils to support compliance with the public health guidance.
- Cabinet had received the exempt appendix to consider recommendation 4 to allocate loan funding to Hethel to purchase additional land.
- Cabinet was also being asked to approve the capital payment of £30k to mitigate Norfolk County Council's card payment system from Global Payments, when their contract ended, and transfer the service to Capita, which the Council had been in contract with since 2019 to manage and support the card payment portal.

9.3 The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member for referencing the exempt Appendix which contained commercial sensitive information. He added that unless anyone wished to refer to the Appendix, Cabinet would not need to move into a private session, as the recommendation was clear as to what the allocation of the loan funding was for and that it was coming from the existing capital programme.

9.4 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention congratulated the Adult Social Care team for its work in moving to a forecast overspend which was within 1% of the budget at approximately 0.7%, which given the circumstances and the challenging year, was an incredible achievement. He referred to the working with partners in the NHS, which had been enabled by the good relationship fostered by NCC with partners in the health service which was a credit to the senior management team and in all levels of the County Council.

The Cabinet Member endorsed the recommendations, particularly the proposal to transfer money to business risk reserve, adding that Norfolk County Council had been fortunate in receiving support from central government, although the future was not clear and being prudent was an excellent proposal, bearing in mind that one of the Key Priorities was to protect vulnerable people.

9.5 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services highlighted that, although the department was on target to break-even on its budget, it could face additional pressures as the service received greater demand for its services.

9.6 The Chairman agreed that the transfer to risk reserves was prudent in the current circumstances and also, regarding the COMF money, the allocation was the first sum of money allocated elsewhere, with the remainder of the COMF budget being considered through the Health Protection Board to ensure the money was allocated correctly.

9.7

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

1. **Approve** the proposed transfers to an Adult Social Services business risk reserve, Children's Services business risk reserve and a corporate Covid risk reserve as set out in paragraphs 2.8, 2.28 and 2.42 of Appendix 1.
2. **Approve** the allocation of a maximum of £2.645m from the Contain Outbreak Management Fund total of £7.262m to District Councils to support delivery of the objectives of the grant, as set out in paragraph 6.1 of Appendix 1 and noting that full details of the planned use of funding will be reported to Cabinet in January.
3. **Recommend to County Council** additional prudential borrowing of £0.030m to be available for the development of software to support the Card Payments programme, as set out in paragraph 4.1 of Capital Appendix 2.
4. **Exempt item: Approve** the allocation of loan funding from within the existing capital programme to Hethel Innovation Limited to purchase additional land as set out in exempt appendix 3, and to delegate the agreement of loan terms to the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance.
5. **Note** the period 7 general fund forecast revenue overspend of **£1.256m** noting also that Executive Directors will take measures to reduce or eliminate potential over-spends;
6. **Note** the COVID-19 grant funding received of **£96.901m**, the proposed use of that funding, and the related expenditure pressures resulting in net Covid-19 pressure of **£11.818m**.
7. **Note** the period 7 forecast shortfall in savings of **£17.685m**, noting also that Executive Directors will take measures to mitigate savings shortfalls through alternative savings or underspends;
8. **Note** the forecast General Balances at 31 March 2021 of £19.706m, before taking into account any over/under spends;
9. **Note** the expenditure and funding of the revised current and future 2020-23 capital programmes.

9.8

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 summarises the revenue outturn position, including:

- Forecast over and under spends
- Covid-19 pressures and associated grant income.
- Changes to the approved budget
- Reserves
- Savings
- Treasury management

- Payment performance and debt recovery

Appendix 2 summarises the capital outturn position, and includes:

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

9.9 **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.

10 **Mid-Year Treasury Management Monitoring Report 2020-21.**

10.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services providing details of the 2020-21 treasury activities and highlights compliance with policy and strategy previously approved in relation to treasury management.

10.2 The Cabinet Member for Finance introduced the report and moved the recommendations, during which the following points were noted:

- Regarding cash balances and cash flow management, the average level of cash balances to date totalled £177m, against £175m in the previous year.
- Cash balances were managed internally and were invested in accordance with the Council's approved authorised lending list, the key objective of this cash flow management was to minimise balances held in current bank accounts at zero interest.
- The forecast average daily liquidity level was approximately £90m.
- Norfolk County Council debt totalled £704m at 30 September 2020.
- Norfolk County Council remained well within the authorised debt limit of £1.068bn for 2020-21.
- The recent reduction of 1% interest charged by Public Work Loans Board meant this was a very competitive area to source funding, although the municipal bond agency continued to be at slightly better levels of interest.
- Despite unprecedented low levels of interest, the Cabinet Member was aware of the pressure on current and revenue budgets of additional interest costs.
- The option to use previous overpayments in the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) to defray repayments would no longer be available after the current financial year, which would increase budget pressures in 2021-22 and beyond.

10.3 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

1. **Endorse and recommend to County Council** the Mid-Year Treasury Management Monitoring Report 2020-21.

10.4 **Evidence and reasons for Decision**

One annex is attached to this report, giving details of treasury management

activities and outcomes, including:

- Investment activities
- Borrowing strategy and outcomes
- Non-treasury investments
- Prudential indicators.

10.5 **Alternative Options**

In order to achieve treasury management in accordance with the Council's treasury management strategy, no viable alternative options have been identified to the recommendation in this report.

11 **CES Compliance and Enforcement Policy**

- 11.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Community & Environmental Services setting out the CES Compliance and Enforcement Policy which provided a framework for a number of services within the CES directorate to ensure the Council worked in an equitable, practical and consistent manner when undertaking regulatory activities and law enforcement.
- 11.2 Although not directly related to the report, the Executive Director of Community & Environmental Services said that Cabinet was aware that there had recently been a couple of confirmed outbreaks of Avian Flu in Norfolk. The Executive Director reassured Cabinet that the Trading Standards Officers were working with the Animal Plant Health Agency Team to bring the situation under control and to support local businesses. Cabinet was also informed that national controls were being brought in, which required all keepers of poultry to bring them indoors from 14 December. The Trading Standards team would continue to work with national colleagues and local business to control the outbreak.
- 11.3 The Chairman passed on his thanks to the Trading Standards Team for their fast responses to both outbreaks and also for how they had kept everyone informed about the latest position.
- 11.4 The Cabinet Member for Communities & Partnerships also highlighted the work the Trading Standards Team carried out regarding Brexit and the covid regulations, all of which had added to their considerable workload.
- 11.5 In introducing the report and moving the recommendations, the Cabinet Member for Communities & Partnerships highlighted that this report was produced annually and had been renamed the "Compliance and Enforcement Policy".

The Service had adopted a compliance by consent policy which worked through four stages of Engagement; Explanation and Encouragement by working with businesses and individuals to help and encourage them to meet and comply with the legislation, but if those failed, a fourth stage of Enforcement would be undertaken.

An additional Annex had been included in the Policy, as Trading Standards had taken on the management of the Safety of Sports Grounds.

- 11.6 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport supported the recommendations in the report, highlighting that the report was an annual review and updated the Enforcement Policy.
- 11.7 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation & Performance endorsed the report, highlighting the importance of the adoption of the four stage enforcement which was the correct way forward.
- 11.8 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:
1. **Approve** the revised CES Compliance and Enforcement Policy at Appendix A and its annex documents (A-1 to A-6).
 2. **Agree to delegate the functions** of the Council for the purposes of the Environmental Protection (Plastic Straws, Cotton Buds and Stirrers) (England) Regulations 2020 and the Air Quality (Domestic Solid Fuels Standards) (England) Regulations 2020 to the Head of Trading Standards by making an addition to the County Council's Constitution Appendix 5 (Scheme of Delegation to Officers).

11.9 **Alternative Options**

A CES wide Compliance and Enforcement Policy is considered to be the most effective way to demonstrate how CES intends to fulfil its regulatory/legal responsibilities. An alternative option would be for each service area within CES to produce its own enforcement policy. However as described in section 1.1 above there is need for consistency in overall approach. This draft Policy does provide for additional (detailed) protocols where necessary or appropriate.

12 Norfolk Strategic Infrastructure Delivery Plan (NSIDP) Refreshed for 2020.

- 12.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Community & Environmental Services setting out the Norfolk Strategy Infrastructure Delivery Plan for 2020.
- 12.2 The Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy introduced the report and moved the recommendations, during which the following points were noted:
- The NSIDP brought together information on the key strategic infrastructure projects required to deliver economic growth in Norfolk.
 - The NSIDP provided a clear message of Norfolk's infrastructure priorities to government and had been recognised as a case study of best practice in supporting housing and infrastructure needs by the Town and County Planning Association.
 - The document would be reviewed annually as information became available and projects progressed to completion.
 - For a project to be included in the plan, it must meet the following criteria:
 - Deliver significant housing and jobs growth.
 - Be identified in existing plans programme.
 - Have a committed route to delivery.
 - The Project was in Local Authority control or interest.
 - The following projects had been added to the 2020 NSIDP:
 - East Norwich Regeneration Area.
 - Great Yarmouth O&M Campus

- Burlingham Country Park
- Smart Energy Technology Institute (SETI).
- Great Yarmouth Outer Harbour
- Great Yarmouth town centre improvements
- The following projects had been funded in the previous year
 - Local full fibre Network
 - Internet of Things Innovation Network
 - Increase Surface Water Capacity, North Lynn
 - Thetford SUE
- The NISDP had been sense-checked by Economic Development officers in September 2020 and had been shared with Norfolk Leaders, who were in support of the Plan.
- The Infrastructure & Development Select Committee had considered and supported the plan at its meeting in November 2020.
- The NSIDP enabled all priority projects to be held in one document, it included the start date and the progress being made to achieve the planned delivery.
- Progress had been made on many projects which had received funding from the business rates pool using a coordinated approach to ensuring projects progressed.

12.3 The Chairman supported the report which focused on the delivery of projects and supported growth across the whole of Norfolk, whilst demonstrating the large investment across Norfolk.

12.4 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport endorsed the report as he felt it was crucial that the correct and appropriate infrastructure was in place to support delivery and growth and the economy across the whole of Norfolk. The Cabinet Member wished to highlight the following projects, which would help put Norfolk where it needed to be with regard to highways infrastructure:

- Norwich Western Link
- Long Stratton Bypass – which was progressing and would make a difference to people living in the south of the county.
- Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing – due to start construction in January 2021.

12.5 The Cabinet Member for Finance also endorsed the report and highlighted the following points in the west of the county, all of which would improve highways infrastructure in his division:

- West Winch housing access road,
- A10 improvements to the south
- Bypass on the A149 at King's Lynn

The Cabinet Member for Finance also wished to highlight the sustainable element of the report, particularly the green loop and the Weavers Way, which were welcomed as well as the Burlingham Country Park, adding that he looked forward to further schemes being added in the future on the green ways project to reutilise many of the disused rural railway lines as commuter routes for cycling and walking into towns across Norfolk.

12.6 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention endorsed the report which showed that, even when faced with the difficult situation currently experienced with the covid pandemic, the County Council had managed to

continue business as usual and produce a list of projects which would have a beneficial outcome for the county.

The Cabinet Member highlighted the town centre improvements in Attleborough which had £4.5m investment; the Snetterton Energy Supply - £3.5m additional investment; Thetford water supply - £9.8m investment; and a sewerage scheme in Thetford - £2m investment. All of these projects were underway, with a further £14m for Thetford in sustainable urban expansion and the ongoing work on the A47. These were all big projects which would deliver infrastructure improvements across Norfolk. The Cabinet Member commended all the work that had been done in producing the report.

- 12.7 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation & Performance endorsed the report, which showed Norfolk County Council was continuing its work, whilst in the middle of a pandemic.

The Cabinet Member also highlighted the change from broadband to digital connectivity, which had proved to be very important during the pandemic; in just over 7 years better broadband for Norfolk had risen from 42% of Norfolk properties to 95% of properties having superfast broadband which offered more people the capacity to work from home.

Mobile phone connections were really important not only for rural areas, but also for tourism, to help people stay connected and a lot of work on a shared rural network had been carried out with mobile network operators to fill the gaps and work with the industry to bring benefits to Norfolk.

More information on the Norfolk and Suffolk Rural Innovation Network and, long range wide area network could be found on the NCC website.

- 12.8 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services welcomed the report which showed the County Council was identifying growth areas and where new schools would be needed in housing growth areas to ensure schools were available when houses were built. The report also covered the need to ensure electricity supplies; drainage and other essential utilities were in place to support housing development.

- 12.9 The Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy wished to place on record his thanks to the Economic Development Team for producing the report, whilst many of them had been redeployed to other areas during the pandemic in helping to distribute PPE and work within communities.

- 12.10 The Chairman endorsed the thanks to the Economic Development team for their work.

- 12.11 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

1. **Approve** the 2020 NSIDP as set out in Appendix A of the report.
2. **Agree** to continue to review and update the NSIDP annually.

- 12.12 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

The NSIDP helps the County Council identify where and when infrastructure

projects could support delivery of growth and the County Council's and other Norfolk Local Authorities' priorities. This allows for informed discussions and will enable work with partners to co-ordinate implementation, prioritise activity and respond to any funding opportunities.

12.13 Alternative Options

If an NSIDP were not to be produced it would be more difficult to retain the inclusive approach to infrastructure planning. It would reduce the ability to keep track of the collective progress of the county's key infrastructure projects. The information in the NSIDP assists in coordinating resources to ensure projects are delivered as planned. Without the NSIDP it would be challenging to maintain the County's approach to infrastructure planning.

13 No Wrong Door

- 13.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Children's Services explaining the rationale of Children's services adopting No Wrong Door, the background of No Wrong Door itself and the expected benefits this would bring to children and young people.
- 13.2 The Executive Director of Children's Services highlighted that the No Wrong Door model was one of three Department for Education sponsored projects, subject to a bidding process and for which Norfolk County Council was successful in securing £5m of funding to enable the development and implementation of the No Wrong Door model in Norfolk. The model was a core part of the five-year transformation programme in Children's Services which had commenced approximately two years ago, and which had already realised benefits, alongside changing the way the department worked.
- 13.3 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services introduced the report and moved the recommendations highlighting that the model was supported by funding from the Department for Education and was a new approach to helping young people. Norfolk County Council was being supported and mentored by North Yorkshire County Council who had a proven track record in this area.
- 13.4 The Chairman endorsed the investment in children's futures as well as how the project would help the transformation programme to build up an integrated service.
- 13.5 The Cabinet Member for Finance endorsed the report, which was innovative and had been effectively implemented. The No Wrong Door policy was a proven scheme through North Yorkshire County Council and would aim to keep the vast majority of young people out of external residential placements, reducing foster arrangements and keeping families together where possible, which was the right aspiration.

The financial implications highlighted how invest to save projects could work if they were implemented effectively and the Cabinet Member said he looked forward to working with the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and the Executive Director of Children's Services to offer support from a financial perspective.

13.6 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation & Performance endorsed the report particularly the focus on young people.

13.7 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

1. **Endorse** the No Wrong Door model, the benefits this delivers to young people and their families and the rationale for the service level decision to implement No Wrong Door in Norfolk.
2. **Acknowledge and endorse** the proposed plan for how No Wrong Door will be implemented in Norfolk.
3. **Support / agree** the decision made by the Children's Services Leadership Team to develop and implement the No Wrong Door Model in Norfolk.

13.8 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

Refer to Section 4 of the report.

13.9 **Alternative Options**

Refer to Section 5 of the report.

14 Norfolk Carers Social Impact Bond: Young Carers and Families Expansion.

14.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Children's Services setting out how Children's Services had the opportunity to join the current social impact bond led by Adult Services to include young carers and their families from April 2021, enabling the support for families to increase, and improve outcomes for children and young people who are young carers.

14.2 The Executive Director of Children's Services highlighted that the department had been given an opportunity to join the current Social Impact Bond, led by Adult Social Care, which would provide an opportunity to support young carers and their families from April 2021. The Bond would offer support for families to increase and improve their outcomes for children and young people who become young carers. An application had been submitted to the Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and to the Life Chances Fund and if successful would attract additional funding of up to £841k, which would provide resources to support families and young carers, particularly focusing on health, wellbeing and education. This initiative was a further example of the department considered how to provide services in a different way to improve outcomes.

14.3 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services introduced the report and moved the recommendations, highlighting that Children's Services would be joining with the work being done by Adult Social Care with their adult carers. This would bring additional funding into the system to support young carers, which it was well known often suffered from poor attendance at school or poor attainment at school. Cabinet noted some funding had been secured from the National Lottery Community Fund.

- 14.4 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention endorsed the report highlighting the huge amount of work carried out by carers to support vulnerable adults and children across Norfolk, much of which was unpaid, unrecognised and under-appreciated by society. He added that having a joined up approach with Adult Social Care and Children's Services, together with the additional funding leveraged to support it was something he fully supported.
- 14.5 The Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy endorsed the proposals, the aim of which was to secure services that reduced inappropriate or excessive caring by children, reduce escalation to statutory services and improve educational outcomes for young carers.
- 14.6 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation & Performance endorsed the report and the recommendations, adding that it was important that all young carers were recognised as some of them were aged 11, 12, or 13 and should be offered as much help as possible to ensure they didn't lose out on their schooling or that their emotional welfare was affected.
- 14.7 The Cabinet Member for Finance supported the proposals, adding that he looked forward to working with the Executive Director in relation to young carers and groups working with young carers in the west of the county.

14.8 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

- **Expand** the Carers Social Impact Bond (SIB) to include support for young carers and their families.

14.9 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

Refer to Section 4 of the report.

14.10 **Alternative Options**

Rather than expand the current SIB to include young carers and their families, the Council could maintain the current contract for the young carers and families service until March 2022 and seek to commission and directly contract a new service after this date.

This will maintain the separation of how carer services are managed and, in addition, young carers will not benefit from the additional LCF funding that would be attracted through joining the SIB.

15 A Social Impact Bond for the Prevention of Homelessness

- 15.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Adult Social Care providing details of the Social Impact Bond which had been approved by Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS) and, if agreed by Cabinet, would result in mobilisation of services in April 2021.
- 15.2 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention introduced the report and moved the recommendations, highlighting that the ambition of the report was to reduce homelessness in Norfolk.

During the pandemic Norfolk County Council had successfully worked with the Norfolk Strategic Housing Authorities, helping partners support the “Everybody In” initiative to provide rough sleepers and those who were homeless with emergency accommodation as a result of the covid outbreak.

Norfolk County Council had signed up to the ‘No Homelessness in Norfolk’ project which would take a long-term strategic approach to reduce homelessness in the county. In the past work had been carried out supporting District Councils by providing funding, although the current agreed tranche of funding was due to cease in March 2021. This project would pick up and move forward from April 2021 and was a way of leveraging an additional £635k of funding to focus on a long-term strategic support for those at risk of, or suffering from homelessness.

The Cabinet Member continued that this was a real opportunity to make progress with the issue of homelessness and continue the work done as a result of the pandemic.

15.3 The Chairman highlighted that this scheme was about system transformation to reduce and hopefully prevent homelessness which would also bring health and social care benefits.

15.4 The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services endorsed the report, which was a way of attracting external funding into the county, also collaborative working between the County Council and the District Councils.

15.5 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

- **Delegate** the approval of the final contract for ‘A Social Impact Bond for the Prevention of Homelessness’ to the Executive Director of Adult Social care and Executive Director of finance and Commercial Services.

15.6 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

See Section 4 of the Report.

15.7 **Alternative Options**

Undertaking this project under the auspices of the LCF provides a unique opportunity to secure additional, external, funding for homeless prevention while providing the scope to explore innovative approaches using an outcomes approach.

The Department of Culture, Media and Sport have approved the bid subject to NCC Cabinet approval. Should that not be achieved it is recommended that the recommissioning of support is undertaken by Commissioners with the reduced amount available.

16 Review of outdoor learning services at Holt Hall.

16.1 Cabinet received the report, including an exempt Appendix, by the Executive Director of Children’s Services setting out that Norfolk County Council had

undertaken a review of its approach to outdoor learning in the county because the current arrangements, which included the council acting as a direct provider of outdoor learning services at Holt Hall, were not financially sustainable.

- 16.2 The Chairman referred to the exempt Appendix which contained commercially sensitive information, which Cabinet Members had received a copy of and considered as part of the decision making process and which would not be considered during the meeting.
- 16.3 The Executive Director of Children's Services introduced the report which set out an ambition to strengthen and broaden access to outdoor opportunities to learn and support academic subjects, life skills and resilience, mental health and wellbeing which was increasingly more important during the current pandemic. It was proposed to adopt a greater enabling, advisory and leadership role, working with and supporting Norfolk County Council schools to help them deliver their duty to provide a full curriculum, although it was hoped this could expand to supporting and advising carers and other agencies working with children and young people to improve their outcomes. The report explained the reasons for shifting from being a provider of residential and day visits from a single location and apply focus across the whole county and beyond.

The Executive Director drew attention to the executive summary which set out the financial challenges of the current model and also a further chance to use resources creatively and influence different ways of exploring the outdoors, particularly for those children and young people in more vulnerable groups.

- 16.4 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services referred to an earlier debate, where it had been suggested there may be a risk of him being seen as pre-determined in the matter, because of comments made, or comments attributed to him in the press. The Cabinet Member stated he was neither predetermined nor biased.

The report included an introduction from Cllr Fisher as the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and the recommendations were that the Council should become an enabler of outdoor learning and discontinue delivering outdoor learning provision at Holt Hall. The Cabinet Member added that, although he supported the recommendations in the report, this was not predetermination and that he had an open mind and would consider all the issues raised in the debate and included in the report.

In introducing the report and moving the recommendations, the Cabinet Member drew Cabinet's attention to the fact that he had received correspondence from people lobbying about Holt Hall, both for the closure and against the closure; teachers identifying the uniqueness of the site and the provision for outdoor learning. A petition to keep Holt Hall open and containing more than 5000 signatures had also been received.

The proposal within the report set out how the County Council could offer outdoor learning more effectively by taking up the enabler role and the promotion of Norfolk as an outdoor learning destination.

The evidence and reasons for decision were covered in the report, which had initially been considered by Cabinet in 2010, with the decision at that time taken to retain Holt Hall until at least 2013. It was again considered in 2016, where it was agreed to increase marketing and promotion of Holt Hall and improve access to it to try to make the site viable. Efforts had been made to promote Holt Hall and pricing had been made more attractive to encourage better use of the facility.

The Cabinet Member drew attention to the breakdown by districts using Holt Hall, which appeared to show that Norfolk County Council was sponsoring a facility that was not used by the disadvantaged people it should be helping and who would be helped better under the new arrangements. The data showed that the biggest users of Holt Hall were from other counties. The second largest user was in the Broadland area, two of the schools in the Cabinet Member's division had used the facility, although the Cabinet Member had not received any letters in support or in objection to the proposals from those schools.

The report also identified that Holt Hall was not being used by Special Educational Needs and Looked After Children and less advantaged children, which meant the children that would benefit most from the facility were not accessing it.

There were a total of 12 other providers of outdoor learning in Norfolk, all offering a similar provision to that at Holt Hall, and all of which could match the facility.

The process of the review was covered in section 5 of the report and set out how schools were asked to make an initial comment on the services that the local authority provided to schools and give their thoughts on what should continue or cease. 32 schools had responded to that consultation.

All schools were contacted again in September 2020 and sent a survey advising that the outdoor learning review focused on Holt Hall had recommenced. 94 completed questionnaires were received in response and all responses had been considered as part of the report.

The financial implications were set out in Section 7 of the report, which identified losses of £270k over the past three years and, together with the report from NPS produced in 2018, had identified a £600k spend to keep the property in good repair and maintenance over a 10 year period.

Section 9 of the report set out the legal implications and highlighted that Norfolk County Council had no statutory duty to provide outdoor learning.

The Cabinet Member also stated he was pleased that the report was being presented to Cabinet in order to aid democracy.

- 16.5 The Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy had also received a number of emails from supporters of Holt Hall. To assist Cabinet in reaching a reasonable conclusion regarding Holt Hall, the Cabinet Member highlighted a number of paragraphs from the report, during which the following points were noted:

- The service provided at Holt Hall by the County Council had been previously considered by Members in 2010. In April 2010, Cabinet had entered into formal consultation on the future of Holt Hall and had decided to continue provision until 2013 on a full cost recovery basis.
- Holt Hall had made a loss year on year since 2013 and in the last three years had lost £270k.
- A marketing scheme had been established in 2016 to promote the facility to all schools and organisations which might use the facility to try to increase the use of facilities at Holt Hall.
- Holt Hall had continued to accommodate a very small proportion of educational visits undertaken by Norfolk Schools with approximately 93% of schools in Norfolk using different provision.
- 4% of residential visits to Holt Hall were from Independent Schools in Norfolk; Great Yarmouth accounted for only 2% of visits.
- The majority of the users of Holt Hall were from outside Norfolk.
- Friends of Holt Hall, which was an independent registered charity, operated a bursary scheme providing one-off grants to give opportunities for disadvantaged young people to engage in environmental and outdoor activities. In 2019-20 17 grants were awarded to the sum of £2,577 which supported 173 young people. In the period 2016 to March 2020 a total of 19 Norfolk Schools had benefited from the bursary scheme.
- Other providers also operate a bursary scheme alongside the Friends of Holt Hall, to support disadvantaged children to attend their provision.

The Cabinet Member said that, in his opinion, the report identified a need which was being supplied by other organisations and Holt Hall was subsidising people from out of the county using the services paid for by Norfolk tax payers. He felt that the County Council should not retain a facility that was predominantly being used by people from outside Norfolk and that there were other companies that offered almost identical services. He added that he supported the proposals in the report that Norfolk County Council should be an enabler for children to access outdoor learning facilities provided across Norfolk, of which there were 12 to 14 providers.

16.6 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation & Performance had also received several emails and had been lobbied about saving Holt Hall. He considered that there was an element of emotional attachment to the bricks and mortar of Holt Hall where parents, grandparents and their children had received outdoor education. The Cabinet Member said that he had read the report in great detail and was conscious of the strength of feeling engendered by the topic and in press reports.

Holt Hall had been purchased in 1946, after the second world war to give inner city children, children in towns and deprived children a break from their environment without affecting their education. Throughout the intervening years and decades circumstances had changed for many people which was good news. Children with SEND; children eligible for free school meals; children with additional languages and ethnic minority children were all under-represented in the number of people using Holt Hall, which was something cabinet needed to take into account when making its decision, as the very children that needed the service were not receiving the benefit of the service.

The report was another example of the transformation programme the Council was undertaking and he felt it was right the County Council should be moving away from being a provider of an outdoor learning service to becoming an enabler to providing services, whilst not competing with other organisations offering a similar service. He felt it was right the Council should change its focus and stated that he fully supported the recommendations in the report.

- 16.7 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention had also received a number of representations regarding Holt Hall, which he felt were important in making Cabinet Members aware of counter arguments to the proposals put forward.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that the proposals were not about Norfolk County Council downgrading or minimising the importance of outdoor learning, it was how the Council could support outdoor learning in the county, by focusing on the outcomes and the work to support outdoor learning. If the closure of Holt Hall meant the Council could offer more support to outdoor learning across the county, then that was a different argument from the one that closing Holt Hall would restrict access to outdoor learning.

The Cabinet Member drew attention to the section in the report titled “Leading Norfolk’s Outdoor Learning Offer” which set out how the three different areas – participants, practitioners, partners and policy makers would be supported by Norfolk County Council in its enabling role. All of these elements would become more important in extending the reach of outdoor learning, which would benefit the largest number of people with the resources at its disposal.

The Cabinet Member stated that on balance, he was happy to support the proposals in the report.

- 16.8 The Cabinet Member for Finance agreed with the comments already made by other Cabinet Members, adding that the key objective in the review was to strengthen and broaden outdoor learning to provide greater enabling work for schools, advisors, carers and other agents across the county. When Norfolk County Council had been responsible for all primary and secondary schools in Norfolk, an outdoor learning centre, such as Holt Hall would be used by all schools. Now the majority of schools were academies or free schools, they could spend their budgets how they saw fit and it was clear that as only 7% of Norfolk Schools used Holt Hall, they did not think Holt Hall met the criteria.

The Cabinet Member said that he was not speaking from a financial perspective, but the report made it clear that Holt Hall under performed its peer group in relation to delivering services to SEND; free school meal children, etc. and was not providing value for money.

The Cabinet Member for Finance said he supported the move to a different system of providing outdoor learning which was a very important part of the curriculum.

- 16.9 The Chairman wished to draw attention to the process of the review which he felt was really important and during which the following was noted:

- The opportunity for the Council to adopt a leadership role for outdoor learning, to make more use of initiatives and to actively promote opportunities for children and young people and their families, schools and community groups in Norfolk, which meant the Council needed to change the way it provided the service was welcomed.
- Section 5 of the report sets out the process for the review into Holt Hall, which had commenced in November 2019, although earlier consideration had been given in 2010 and 2013.
- The background research, engagement sessions and sharing of the start of the review with school leaders via Educate Norfolk had commenced in November 2019, although this work had ceased in March 2020 due to the covid pandemic.
- Work recommenced in July 2020 on a phased review with engagement; questionnaires to schools; regular communication; staff feedback; and engagement with key stakeholders all which had involved a lot of work.
- The summary of feedback from engagement with staff and key stakeholders section of the report summarised the feedback from the engagement sessions with staff and key stakeholders, all of which had been taken into account in the report.
- Regarding alternative options, which was another key element of the process, there were three options considered:
 - Option 1 – Continue to provide outdoor learning at Holt Hall.
 - Option 2 – Explore a partnership approach.
 - Option 3 – Focus on leading an outdoor learning offer for Norfolk.
 All three options set out in the report had been considered, including the advantages and disadvantages of each option.
- When all options had been considered, the conclusion had been reached that the most appropriate option was option 3, which was to focus on leading an outdoor learning offer for Norfolk and to cease provision for learning at Holt Hall.
- All implications of the decision had been considered – the financial; staff and catering services; property; legal; human rights as well as the equality impact assessment, which was a dynamic assessment and would continue as the proposals developed.
- All Health and safety; sustainability and risks had been considered in the decision making process and in the report.

The Chairman stated that, taking into account all the comments made by Cabinet Members about specific implications, he was confident that the process followed by Children's Services leading to the report had been robust, correct and had covered all the relevant issues Cabinet needed to consider in its decision making process.

As the Cabinet Member for Children's Services had moved the recommendations in the report, the Chairman stated he was happy to support the recommendations on the basis that Cabinet was making a decision based on the full facts, which were fully articulated in the report and which had come to a reasoned conclusion.

16.10 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to **agree**:

- That the Council should become an enabler of outdoor learning through providing advice, support and access to resources.

- To discontinue delivering outdoor learning provision from the Holt Hall site, with immediate effect.

16.11 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

See Section 4 of the report.

16.12 **Alternative Options**

See Section 6 of the report.

17 Disposal, acquisition and exploitation of property.

17.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services 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

17.2 In introducing the report and moving the recommendations, the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management highlighted the following key areas:

- The Property Team worked to ensure that the County Council maintained an efficient portfolio supporting service delivery and which achieved a good return for tax payers.
- The report covered surplus land from across the authority. The first five sites in recommendation 1 were areas of land, ranging in size, from parts of the county farms estate. Following the proposed disposal of the five sites, the county farms estate would still exceed 16,000 acres, thereby meeting the minimum requirement as set out in the Norfolk County Council Constitution.
- There were a number of highways holdings now surplus to requirements and which were subject to ascertaining if Crichel Down rules applied (where land was required to be offered back to the previous owner) which was a legal requirement.
- One site at Drayton was being explored with Adult Social Services to see if there was an opportunity for the property to be used to support their service delivery.
- A site at Thorpe End was being considered as suitable for service delivery by both Adult Social Care and Children's Services.
- If Crichel Down rules did not apply, and the potential reuse by either Adult Social Care or Children's services was not realised, it was proposed to dispose of the sites by open market sale through auction or by tender.
- Following the Decision taken by Cabinet regarding Holt Hall, the site was subject to an asset of community value application being considered by North Norfolk District Council, placed by the Friends of Holt Hall, a charity. Norfolk County Council would not oppose the application, but would encourage the Friends of Holt Hall to honestly appraise their business case to consider the viability of operating the site as an outdoor education facility.

- Holt Hall required some significant ongoing investment.
- Any sale of Holt Hall would be at open market value. No valuation or appraisal work had yet been undertaken.
- The disposal of 13 various sites would help to bolster the capital account as the Council recovered from covid, enabling it to support other projects which would benefit Norfolk.

17.3 In supporting the recommendations, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention reiterated the policy of maintaining the size of the county farms estate which he supported, where there was value to be made for the tax payers through development, or other uses support the services provided by the County Council.

17.4 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation & Performance endorsed the recommendations which meant the County Council did not continue to maintain unproductive land when it could be sold and used by others. He added it was important Norfolk County Council land was kept under review and was not held on the off chance it was needed in 20 years time.

17.5 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to agree:

1. **To formally declare 5 former County Farms Estate** sites as listed in the report at Brisley, Litcham, Terrington St Clement, Stow Bardolph and Southery surplus to County Council requirements and instruct the Director of Property to dispose of the properties. In the event for each disposal the disposal receipt exceeds delegated limits the Director of Property in consultation with the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services and Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management is authorised to accept the most advantageous offers.
2. Should Adults Services decide not to reuse the property Cabinet is asked to formally declare the Land at Reephams Road, Drayton (5021/014 part) surplus to County Council requirements and instruct the Director of Property to dispose of the property. In the event the disposal receipt exceeds delegated limits the Director of Property in consultation with the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services and Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management is authorised to accept the most advantageous offer.
3. To formally declare 3 former highway sites as listed in the report at Erpingham, Repps with Bastwick and Swaffham surplus to County Council requirements and instruct the Director of Property to dispose of the properties. In the event for each disposal the disposal receipt exceeds delegated limits the Director of Property in consultation with the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services and Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management is authorised to accept the most advantageous offers.
4. Should Childrens Services and Adults Services decide not to reuse the property at Thorpe End, The Railway Crossing, Great & Little Plumstead (5026/015), Cabinet is asked to formally declare the site surplus to County Council requirements and instruct the Director of Property to dispose of the property. In the event the disposal receipt exceeds delegated limits 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.

5. That, subject to the decision at Cabinet on the future of outdoor learning on the 7th December 2020, which would lead to the property no longer being required for NCC service delivery, Cabinet is asked to formally declare Holt Hall, Kelling Road, Holt NR25 7DU (1049/024) surplus to County Council requirements and instruct the Director of Property to dispose of the property. In the event a disposal receipt exceeding delegated limits the Director of Property in consultation with the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services and Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management is authorised to accept the most advantageous offer.
6. To formally declare Land at Manor Road, North Walsham (1074/034B part) surplus to County Council requirements and instruct the Director of Property to dispose of the property. In the event the disposal receipt exceeds delegated limits the Director of Property in consultation with the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services and Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management is authorised to accept the most advantageous offer.
7. To formally declare Land at Newman Road, Rackheath (5045/015) surplus to County Council requirements and instruct the Director of Property to dispose of the property. In the event the disposal receipt exceeds delegated limits the Director of Property in consultation with the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services and Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management is authorised to accept the most advantageous offer.

17.6 Evidence and Reasons for Decision

Declaring the sites and land holdings surplus to County Council use means that the Corporate Property Team can consider options for the disposal and exploitation of these sites.

17.7 Alternative Options

Declaring sites and land holdings surplus is a result of the sites no longer being required for service delivery. The alternative would be to retain resulting in incurring holding costs for an asset that is not contributing to service delivery.

18 Transfer of Greenpark Academy, Greenpark Avenue, King's Lynn to the Ad Meliora Trust and Transfer of St Edmunds Academy, Kilhams Way, King's Lynn to Norfolk County Council.

- 18.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services setting out proposals aimed at supporting Norfolk County Council priorities of investing in schools to promote high educational outcomes and providing enough school places to meet demand.
- 18.2 In introducing the report and moving the recommendations, the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management asked Cabinet to agree to the transfer of the freehold at Greenpark Academy, King's Lynn to the

Ad Meliora Academy Trust and the acquisition of the freehold of St Edmunds Academy, Kilhams Way, King's Lynn.

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council had gifted 8.7 acres of land at LynnSport, Green Park Avenue, King's Lynn to Norfolk County Council at no consideration in recognition of the demand for primary school places generated by nearby housing development. A new 420 place primary school and nursery had been built on the Greenpark Avenue land and the pupils would move from the existing St Edmunds Academy to the new school, called The Greenpark Academy in January 2021.

The existing St Edmunds Academy freehold site was owned by the Ad Meliora Trust, therefore it was proposed to simultaneously undertake the transfer of the freehold of the new Greenpark Academy site to Ad Meliora Trust and in return transfer the freehold of the existing St Edmunds Academy to Norfolk County Council.

The St Edmunds academy site would then be subject to a separate project to adapt it to support the County Council's special educational schools sufficiency strategy and on completion of the construction work, the site would form the secondary phase of the Fen Rivers Academy SEMH school and be part of the standard lease for the overall site at Kilhams Way to Catch-22 Multi-Academy Trust.

18.3 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

- **Agree** to the transfer of the freehold of Greenpark Academy, Greenpark Avenue, Kings Lynn to the Ad Meliora Academy Trust and the acquisition of the freehold of the St Edmund's Academy, Kilham's Way, King's Lynn and delegate to the Director of Property in consultation with the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services the agreement of the final terms and oversee the completion of the transfers.

18.4 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

The proposals in this report will support Norfolk County Council priorities of investing in schools to promote high educational outcomes and providing enough school places to meet demand.

18.5 **Alternative Options**

There are no reasonably viable options for the proposals.

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

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

The meeting ended at 12.15pm.

Chairman

Cabinet
7 December 2020
Public & Local Member Questions

Agenda item 6	Public Question Time
6.1	<p>Question from Amanda Fox Given the public opposition to the Western Link Road, would council be willing to allow the people of Norwich to decide for themselves on this by putting it to a citizens assembly?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.</p> <p>The Norwich Western Link is an important project for the county, including, but not limited to Norwich - which is why the county council has made it one of its key infrastructure priorities. There have been sustained calls to fill in what people saw as the 'missing link' between the A47 and Broadland Northway for some time, which in turn would take traffic congestion out of local communities and improve journey times and reliability. With significant growth anticipated in and around Norwich, we need to make sure we have the right infrastructure in place so that that Norfolk can grow successfully, continuing to provide a good quality of life for our residents, while also supporting local businesses and the economy. As the government has already stated, this will be even more vital as we recover from the coronavirus pandemic. I make no apology for our ambition for Norfolk and our communities.</p> <p>Three public consultations have been carried out to date on the Norwich Western Link, including the Local Access Consultation which was conducted between July and September this year. In our options consultation in 2018/19, 77% of respondents either agreed or mostly agreed when asked to what extent they agreed there was a need for a Norwich Western Link. There is also strong support for the link to be created from parish and district councils, Norfolk MPs, local businesses and emergency services, amongst others. So there is in fact public support for the delivery of an appropriate Norwich Western Link.</p> <p>A further public consultation on the project is planned for 2021 ahead of the planning application being submitted, and then people will have a chance to comment on the planning application once this has been submitted. The statutory process may also result in a public inquiry before all applicable consents are granted.</p>
6.2	<p>Question 2 from Amanda Fox Wouldn't it be better if all major infrastructure planning decisions were made in this way so that the people of Norwich decide how they would like the city to be shaped in the future.</p> <p>Response: Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.</p> <p>County councillors are elected to represent the whole of Norfolk and its people. There are many aspects we need to consider when deciding what infrastructure is needed in the county, including projected growth, potential risks, benefits and impacts, current and future transport issues and needs, how each project fits within the wider transport network, and relevant local and national policy. We also need to listen to what people are telling us they want and need, and this is done through a range of formal opportunities, such as consultations, but also just by getting in touch with your local councillor. There is often a balance to be struck between conflicting interests and we will always act in the best interests of Norfolk. There are no plans</p>

	currently to change the democratic processes at the county council. Again, I make no apology for our ambition for Norfolk and our communities.
6.3	<p>Question from Jan Davis</p> <p>The 2020/21 budget allocated a total of £4.055m for the Norwich Western Link road broken down into Procurement (£637K), Design (£931K), Statutory process (£1.94m) and Outline Business Case (£544K). A further £2.98m was allocated to acquire land. A total of just over £7m. How much of each of these allocations has been spent to date and how much is allocated for each in the 2021/22 budget?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport</p> <p>To month ending October 2020 the costs for each element are Procurement (£0.338m), Design (£0.524m), Statutory Process (£1.013m), Outline Business Case (£0.326m) for financial year 2020/21. There is a degree of overlap between these activities, and the development of the scheme is in line with the budget allocation.</p> <p>Land acquisitions costs to the end of October are £2.380m and include costs from financial year 2019/20 as well as 2020/21. These are as the result of blight notices served on the Council where the qualifying criteria have been met following the preferred route announcement in July 2019.</p> <p>The budget for 2020/21 is heavily influenced by the design and build contractor procurement process currently underway. Allocations will be recommended as part of the Council budget setting early in the new year.</p>
6.4	<p>Question from Katy Jones</p> <p>As a result of the pandemic we have seen a huge rise in loneliness and isolation across Norfolk, across all ages. Can NCC confirm the plans and investments that they are going to make to address this critical issue which affects the lives, health and well-being of so many people?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Margaret Dewsbury, Cabinet Member for Communities & Partnerships.</p> <p>NCC has always championed initiatives that support residents to overcome loneliness and social isolation, with our “No Lonely Day” campaigns and practical offers like “Just a Cuppa” and activities for young children and their parents’ in libraries. Throughout the pandemic we have offered access to befriending services to our most vulnerable residents, particularly those who have been required to shield for long periods of time. We would expect to resume our offers in services such as libraries as soon as it is safe to do so, and will continue to work with partners to ensure we are reaching out to the people who need us.</p>

Agenda item 7	Local Member Issues/Questions
7.1	<p>Question 1 from Cllr Mick Castle Often sensationalist media stories about flooding featured in our local papers suggest a fragile coastline where Norwich is about to represent the new front-line coastal town with places like Yarmouth under the sea.</p> <p>Do the Cabinet Members agree with me that when it comes to development of a robust Flood Defence Policy for the County we need to quantify actual risk in a rational manner – recognising that there are many thousands of homes in Norwich and our Market Towns at risk of surface/rain water flooding (often overlooked) and that those homes at risk from coastal flooding are actually concentrated in a small number of locations?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Andy Grant, Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste. Yes, I agree that when it comes to the development of a robust policy, it does need to be in a rational and evidence-based manner. The council has assessed the surface water risk against all properties and key infrastructure across the county during the publication of the Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment (PFRA). This has provided comprehensive evidence of the level of surface water risk to our communities and guides our prioritisation of flood risk mitigation work.</p> <p>The policies in our Local Flood Risk Management Strategy have also recently been revised and updated and will be presented to Cabinet in January 2021 for approval.</p>
7.2	<p>Question 2 from Cllr Mick Castle Would the Cabinet Members agree with me that towns like Yarmouth - with upwards of 30,000 living in the seafront area and alongside the rivers Yare and Bure - the priority is to drive forward the Environment Agency's long-term project for improving river flood defences to a 1:200 year standard as that protects existing residents and businesses and also enables new homes and businesses to be developed in areas of the town identified for significant regeneration?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Andy Grant, Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste. The impacts of coastal towns exposed to significant flood risk, such as Gt Yarmouth, forms part of the work embodied with the "Broadlands Futures Initiative". This is a partnership project that draws on expertise from the Environment Agency, Broads Authority and the County Council. As yet, this work has not yet drawn any final conclusions. However, when it does, the appropriate response to address coastal and inland flood risk, highlighted by Cllr Castle, will be identified.</p>
7.3	<p>Question from Cllr Sandra Squire Given the connectivity issues plaguing online council meetings across Norfolk, including this council with members who couldn't connect, were disconnected or couldn't have their camera on during the recent council meeting, a situation which is replicated in district, town and parish councils, does the Cabinet member agree that simply congratulating ourselves on an apparent high level of residents that can receive super fast broadband, is missing the point entirely. That there is a great difference between what is advertised and what is actually received and more needs to be done to look at why these connections are so unstable.</p>

	<p>Response: Cllr Tom FitzPatrick, Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation & Performance.</p> <p>While we know that over 95% of Norfolk residents can now get Broadband running at Superfast (24mbps) or better speeds (as reported by reputable independent sources), we recognise that there is more to achieving good internet speeds than just service availability. Sometimes the speed experienced in the home is less than what's advertised and there can be many reasons for this ranging from faulty fibre connections, wiring or electronics, through to internal cabling, wi-fi setup and device (PC/tablet/phone etc) related issues.</p> <p>There are a number of variables to consider and diagnose in the event of poorly performing internet connectivity speeds and reliability. If you are not getting the speed you are paying for then the first point of call should be to check with your internet service provider and to see if that is the problem. If necessary consider switching provider to one which provides a faster or more reliable service, including wireless options in the 5% of homes where Superfast broadband is not yet available. You should try connecting your laptop directly into your router to get the best performance or use good quality power line or Wi-Fi extenders depending on the nature and layout of your property. Norfolk County Council will soon be launching a chatbot which will give elected members and residents advice on how to get the fastest possible broadband and mobile connections. This will also include the in-home issues such as wired connections, Wi-Fi, use of extenders, how to set up devices and more.</p> <p>The tens of millions of pounds of investment being in full fibre / gigabit capable circuits by Norfolk County Council and multiple private sector companies will continue to improve broadband speed and resilience for all of Norfolk's residents and businesses.</p> <p>It should also be noted that even with a good broadband connection, online services can suffer performance problems if they are over subscribed or not optimally configured. Norfolk County Council is continually reviewing its systems to ensure they are as responsive and stable as possible. Considerable progress has been made since Covid-19 so dramatically changed our ways of working. Teams video performance on Corporate laptops is already much improved and this process of optimisation will continue. Last, but not least are the digital skills that both officers and elected members require to get the best out of the devices, software and connections. Training materials and opportunities remain available on demand for councillors and offers in both recorded and live sessions.</p>
7.4	<p>Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp Norfolk Policy on Speed Management on Single-Lane HGV Access Route Through Clenchwarton</p> <p>Clenchwarton is a Settlement. Clockcase Lane is the single-lane HGV Access Route, passing through Clenchwarton, to the Anglian Water Works.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council's Speed Management Policy says the norm is that HGV Access Routes, passing through Settlements, should be 30 mph, to give priority to protecting local communities, with the possibility of 20 mph in the immediate vicinity of areas with concentrations of vulnerable users. Therefore, Clockcase Lane, an important amenity for pedestrians and cyclists, who are at risk from Tankers, should have a 30 mph speed limit to protect people. Clenchwarton Residents think so. Does</p>

	<p>Cabinet agree?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.</p> <p>Clockcase Lane itself does not pass through a settlement, it is almost entirely rural in nature with two properties at the southern end. This location therefore does not fit the criteria for a 30mph limit however an alternative is to extend the existing 40 mph limit on Ferry Road (up to Bailey Lane) to benefit these two properties. You could choose to progress this option using the Local Member Budget allocated to you. If you wish to consider this further, you can contact your local Highway Engineer.</p>
7.5	<p>Question from Cllr Mike Smith-Clare</p> <p>Can the cabinet member for Children's Services explain why 34% of care leavers/ those still in care aged 16-17 and 49% of care leavers aged 18 and over are not in employment, education and training, and of those how many care leavers across both age groups are the whereabouts unknown?</p> <p>Response: Cllr John Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services.</p> <p>I would like to thank Cllr Smith-Clare for his question as this does identify the change in statistics from September to now and why reporting to the Department for Education only occurs from December onwards. I believe that figures quoted in this question were for September 2020 but the most recent figures show 28% of 16/17 years old children in care and Care Leavers not in Employment Education or Training and 45% of care leavers aged 18-21.</p> <p>Data collected in the first months of the academic year is often not wholly accurate as children and young people aged 16+ are not counted as being in education, employment or training until they have begun their course and there is often a delay in the recording of academic attendance.</p> <p>Councillor Smith-Clare will be aware there are a great many reasons why young people in care or who have left care might face additional barriers to employment, education or training. These include health problems, ongoing mental health challenges, deficits in skills and qualifications and wider social and legal difficulties.</p> <p>As a member of the Corporate Parenting Board the Councillor will also be very familiar with the clearly defined and dedicated working groups within our Corporate Parenting arrangements focussed on this key issue and we are taking forward a range of steps to help more young people leaving care to progress positively to further education or employment. I would like to thank Cllrs Kemp and Squire for their work with this. Those plans include new apprenticeship schemes (including NCC and districts working together for a consistent and across county offer), volunteer and work experience opportunities for younger children to begin to develop their CVs, work with large organisations for guaranteed interview schemes for care leavers to name a few, supported by Members at County and District level . We are also working with our health partners and through our transformation plans to embed clinicians in teams to address mental health and emotional wellbeing will help and know that the CCG plans to provide a dedicated Leaving Care service to support both physical and mental health needs for 18+ which will further help us to address this.</p> <p>We only have one young person we are aware of who is whereabouts unknown and NEET – unfortunately he is an unaccompanied asylum seeking young person who</p>

	<p>came to us directly from Dover Port and left with someone the following day.</p> <p>I am surprised to have received this question from a Councillor who is already part of CPB and should be fully aware of work outlined and if the Councillor has other ideas or proposals which might help this then these would be most welcome either now or at the next meeting where the sub groups will be reporting on their work.</p>
7.6	<p>Question from Cllr Emma Corlett Please can the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Development confirm when the full environmental impact assessment for the Western Link road will be available and how this will form part of the outline business case?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) will be based on the design and build contractor's design and construction proposals. The procurement process for the design and build contractor is in progress and they are expected to be appointed in March 2021. The findings of the EIA will be reported in the Environmental Statement that will be provided as part of the planning application submission in autumn 2021.</p> <p>The Outline Business Case, due for submission early in 2021 is being prepared in accordance with Department for Transport (DfT) guidance and requires a detailed examination of the schemes environmental effects, sufficient for Government to understand the likely impacts and mitigation strategy proposed. The scheme is working to the principles of Biodiversity Net Gain which would leave habitats in a measurably better condition in accordance with Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Metrics.</p>
7.7	<p>Question from Cllr Danny Douglas The Norwich Western Link project stands to receive £1.657m from the 2019-20 Business Rates Funding pool. The refreshed Norfolk Strategic Infrastructure Development Plan on the Cabinet agenda cites the Business Rate Pool as a potential funding source for the development stage of the project. If any one of the Norfolk Councils pulls out of the funding pool as a result of reviewing the impact of the provisional settlement when it is announced, how will this affect the funding of the Norwich Western Link project?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Andrew Jamieson, Cabinet Member for Finance. The Business Rates Pool funding is rates collected for the 19/20 Financial year, has already been collected and agreed. It would make no difference at this stage if a partner withdrew from the arrangement</p>
7.8	<p>Question from Cllr Colleen Walker The budget for Members' Allowances has increased from £878,830 in 2017/8 to £999,540 for 20/21, in total £120,710. This cost increase is far more than the investment needed to keep the operations at Holt Hall. Similarly the costs of new car parking spaces at county hall c£2m in one year dwarf the predicted investment required capital works on Holt Hall over a decade. Can the Leader explain to my residents and Norfolk how these priorities have been determined, as many will find it perverse to use criteria that put Councillors and County Hall car parking above opportunities for young people to study outdoors?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Andrew Proctor, Leader of the Council, Cabinet Member for Strategy</p>

	<p>& Governance.</p> <p>The issues on Member allowances, allowing those who are from a range of backgrounds to represent their communities and provide a diversity of decision making have been well rehearsed. Many Conservative Members have not taken their allowance increase in 2021. All Members who have taken the 2021 increase have prioritised any spending of that over Holt Hall. There is still the need to provide sufficient parking as NCC rationalises its property estate to drive out important revenue savings and transform the way the council will work in the future. NCC has supported Children's wellbeing across the County including a £200k capital contribution to the new YMCA facility in Norwich and substantial investment into education, in SEND schools, working with NSFT to redesign mental health services for children and young people in Norfolk and improving levels of support for young carers. As Cllr Walker is aware Holt Hall attracts only 7% of all residential visits by Norfolk schools, that's 3,000 Norfolk pupils per year, out of a total of 112,000 and is one of several facilities across the County that provide a wide range of outdoor and structured learning for young people</p>
7.9	<p>Question from Cllr Chris Jones</p> <p>The Leader advised Cabinet on 2nd November 2020 that £6,000 had been spent on digital equipment for education from a £150,000 budget for laptops and other digital support, to expand the group of children from disadvantaged families who can access education online and maintain social contact as well as assisting people in financial crisis into work. Can he confirm how many households have benefited from the £6,000 spent, which divisions these households are located in, how the Council will determine who will benefit from the remaining £144,000 and if Councillors will be able to recommend residents in their division who are struggling with IT?</p> <p>Response: Cllr John Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services.</p> <p>The Department for Education (DfE) has launched two schemes to support the distribution of digital devices and 4G routers to vulnerable young people through the current Covid crisis. The first was launched in May of this year and was aimed at care leavers and children with a social worker (0-19) and young people in year 10 who did not have access to a device through another source. This scheme is still active and distributing devices to care leavers and children with a social worker in Norfolk.</p> <p>For the 2020-21 academic year the DfE have extended the scheme to support vulnerable children in Norfolk schools which have been forced to close (or partially close) due to a Covid incident. Digital devices and routers are available, and schools can order machines directly from the DfE. Schools can apply for additional machines above their allocation directly to the DfE depending on the circumstances of the closure.</p> <p>The Virtual school for looked after children for Norfolk is supporting young people in care aged 16-25 to gain access to digital devices and specialist support through their Access to Computers and Technology (ACT) scheme. Younger pupils can be assisted by the virtual school to get access to devices through their school and the Pupil Premium programme.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council are also helping vulnerable young people and families claiming universal credit or who are on low wages to gain access to digital devices and 4G routers via their Norfolk Assistance scheme. The scheme can supply refurbished equipment to assist families in gaining access to the internet to help home</p>

	<p>learning, applying for jobs, as well as reducing isolation and connecting with family and friends. This digital inclusion scheme was approved with £150,000 from the DEFRA funding through Norfolk Assistance Scheme in Sept 2020.</p> <p>An awareness raising campaign was launched by NCC w/c 30th November and has been circulated widely to professional networks, schools and Children's Services teams. Posters and information will be provided through the library service and community venues that children, young people and families attend. A media release and dedicated web page will follow in due course. (see attached publicity material focused on schools and non-schools audiences) A family can make an application themselves via the website or can be assisted by a support worker, social worker, local member etc who can apply on their behalf. Individuals can also contact the CSC who can support an application being made over the phone.</p> <p>Since the scheme launched 30 laptops have been provided to individuals and families supporting their specific needs along with help with connectivity where needed.</p> <p>We anticipate there will be a further increase in the spending on this programme following the campaign and further training being provided to inhouse Childrens Services staff in completing applications on behalf of families. Decisions made on those who access the scheme are based on meeting the eligibility criteria and evidence of financial hardship.</p> <p>Members are able to direct residents to the scheme via this link (awaiting link).</p>
7.10	<p>Question from Cllr Brenda Jones</p> <p>Once again, the Government have failed to address the perilous chasm in Adult Social Care funding at last month's Comprehensive Spending Review. Does Cabinet therefore intend to recommend to Council that it levies the full Adult Social Care precept from April 2021 in order to help balance the books?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Andrew Proctor, Leader of the Council, Cabinet Member for Strategy & Governance.</p> <p>We are still looking at all options as part of the budget preparations for 2021/22. Proposals will be presented at the Budget Council in February 2021 and therefore no decisions have been made concerning the Adult Social Care Precept at this time.</p>
7.11	<p>Question from Cllr Julie Brociek-Coulton</p> <p>The Chancellor's Comprehensive Spending Review did nothing to address the specific financial pressure on our carers, particularly ringfenced money over this Winter. What plans does the Cabinet have to financially support Norfolk's carers in the coming challenging months??</p> <p>Response: Cllr Bill Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention.</p> <p>Thank you for your question. Norfolk's enhanced Carers Matter Norfolk service launched on 1 September 2020, it's focused on providing robust support to carers earlier and improving carer wellbeing. This five-year contract is being delivered via a Social Impact Bond model and is focussed on delivering outcomes-based contracts that are continuously informed by carers themselves.</p> <p>The model combines £1.3m of annual existing Norfolk County Council budgets,</p>

	<p>including £0.16m paid by the local Clinical Commissioning Group. In addition, we will be able to claim up to £4.1m from the Life Chance Fund (LCF), for a total of £10.6m spend for carers over five years. This project effectively protects and locks in our spending of £1.3m on carers support services for the next five years, demonstrating the high level of commitment to tackle what the Council has identified as a high priority, and in addition the opportunity to attract additional funding via the LCF.</p> <p>Furthermore, as part of addressing the unprecedented challenge for social care that Covid-19 presents, the government provided adult social care with funds through the Infection Control Fund. Designed to support with the prevention and control of Covid-19 in care, Norfolk County Council is actively pursuing utilising the current round of funding it to support unpaid carers in their own homes.</p> <p>We have and continue to recognise the extraordinary lengths that they are going to while they support their loved during the pandemic.</p>
7.12	<p>Question from Cllr David Rowntree Barclays bank have announced that they are closing their branch in my division, leaving my residents with no local access to banking facilities. This story is repeated across Norfolk, with banks and building societies withdrawing their services from our towns and suburbs. Can the Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy explain what steps Norfolk County Council is taking to ensure residents across the county have reasonable access to banking facilities?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Graham Plant, Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy. There are currently no plans for the County Council to intervene in providing access to banking. We do lobby for reasonable access for banking for residents.</p>
7.13	<p>Question from Cllr Chrissie Rumsby Could the Cabinet member for Highways and Infrastructure provide a written statement of the performance against targets for Highways teams covering Norwich since the termination of the agreement with Norwich City Council and the service was brought under Norfolk County Council control?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport. Since April, we have introduced a monitoring regime and I am pleased to say that, despite the challenges of the Covid situation, the team are performing well and we are now delivering a consistent service across all highways area teams.</p> <p>Since April, the team have received 1,877 customer queries and responded to 90% of these. The remaining queries are live and are currently being investigated. In addition, 2,622 individual works orders have been raised by the team and these have been or are in the process of being delivered. Contractor performance is also monitored and Norse Highways are above target for the delivery of all highways works, averaging over 96% of works delivered on time.</p> <p>In addition, the 2020 National Highways and Transport (NHT) network survey results have just been issued. I am pleased to report that for the second year running Norfolk County Council has come first among its peers for overall satisfaction. In addition, we were also ranked 1st amongst our peer group for the 'professionalism of staff regarding enquiries'.</p>

7.14	<p>Question from Cllr Dan Roper Is there a legal requirement for the sale of the building or land that any future use of Holt Hall has to be for educational purposes?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Greg Peck, Cabinet Member for Commercial Services & Asset Management. As set out in report detailed work around the disposal has not been undertaken. However, a title report has been commissioned and there are no restrictions that would bind the future use of the land. As vendor, NCC could impose any restrictions on the land although this would obviously limit the market.</p>
7.15	<p>Question from Cllr Steff Aquarone Will the testimonies that were given about the value of outdoor education provided by outdoor learning specialists as part of the consultation on the future of Holt Hall be given due weight or is this decision just about the money?</p> <p>Response: Cllr John Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services. The value of outdoor learning is recognised in the Cabinet report. Section 5.2 notes the background research and engagement with national leaders in this field between December 2019 and February 2020. During this time, we looked at the role played by other councils and this has influenced our view that we should cease being a direct provider. These initial findings were shared with staff and they were invited to comment at this stage. More recently feedback from staff and others has included some positive suggestions of outdoor learning activity beyond Holt Hall. The Norfolk County Council Specialist Outdoor Learning Manager and Adviser will be critical to shaping the future offer. It is not all about the money which is clearly recognised in the report.</p>
7.16	<p>Question from Cllr Brian Watkins How much has the council saved this year through the council staff not being in the office and not incurring expenditure for activity such as car travel?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Andrew Jamieson, Cabinet Member for Finance. The council has saved approximately £3m and this is being utilised by services to support the response to COVID-19.</p>
7.17	<p>Question from Cllr Tim Adams Care providers are struggling during the Covid pandemic to properly protect people with learning disabilities. People with learning disabilities were up to six times more likely to die from Covid-19 during the first wave of the pandemic. Why have they been forgotten?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Bill Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention. Thank you for your question. The short answer is that they haven't been forgotten. Care providers in Norfolk have gone to great lengths to support and protect people with learning disabilities. Adult Social Services has worked closely with all Norfolk's care homes, supported living settings and day services to ensure measures are in place to protect their residents, including strict infection control procedures.</p> <p>For services that support people in the community, we have provided regular, up to date and clear advice about how to limit the spread of the virus during lockdown and</p>

	<p>under the requirements of the national Covid 19 alert levels.</p> <p>Where possible providers are open, with others deciding to provide individual or virtual support under lockdown. Regardless of the number of people a provider supports, we are paying providers at the level paid to them in February (pre-lockdown) to ensure that their income remains at a level enabling them to continue their activities.</p> <p>We have funded extra capacity in the NCC Health and Safety team to assist with risk assessments and we have made funding available from the infection control fund to enable them to make changes and adaptations to reduce infection risk.</p> <p>Where providers need to provide additional support (for example someone living in supported living is unable to attend their usual day service) we are making additional payments to enable them to do so.</p> <p>Respite provision remains open but at a reduced capacity to ensure people can self-isolate for the duration of their stay, in line with national requirements. Where this reduction in capacity has reduced a providers income NCC has provided additional financial support</p> <p>Between March and June a learning disability focused covid positive residential provision was purchased, to reduce infection risk if anyone was unable to self isolate at home (including in an other residential or supported living service). There are plans in place to be able to deploy a similar service at short notice, should it be required over the winter.</p> <p>Throughout the pandemic the learning disability operational social care teams have maintained regular telephone contact with all people with a learning disability who receive NCC services who live in the community. This is to keep in touch, to ensure their ongoing welfare, and to enable practitioners to respond quickly where a situation is deteriorating and identify and deploy support</p>
7.18	<p>Question from Cllr David Harrison</p> <p>How many local community schemes were established across Norfolk to help residents cope during the first wave of pandemic. How many of these are closing and how many would you estimate will still be active after Christmas?</p> <p>Response: Cllr Margaret Dewsbury, Cabinet Member for Communities & Partnerships.</p> <p>Local councils are working closely with their communities to understand the number and capacity of local community organisations and local groups. Due to the nature and size of these organisations it is difficult to provide exact numbers of them, or the number of requests passed to them.</p> <p>All local councils are reporting that there is good and sustained coverage of these groups, and Norfolk Community Foundation is providing support for them through the winter so that they can continue to provide their vital community activities at this challenging time.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council donated £100,000 to Norfolk Community Foundation (NCF) at the beginning of the pandemic to provide support for the community response, and</p>

	<p>more recently have provided £200,000 to NCF to support families in winter hardship. In addition, NCC have also provided Covid funding to Voluntary Norfolk (£60,000) and Community Action Norfolk (£15,000) to work with community volunteers and smaller voluntary organisations and to regularly provide updates as to any additional needs the sector may have and how best to support them.</p>
--	--