

Cabinet

Minutes of the Meeting held on Wednesday 12 January 2022 in the Council Chamber, County Hall, at 10am

Present:

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

Executive Directors Present:

James Bullion	Executive Director of Adult Social Services
Helen Edwards	Monitoring Officer and Director of Governance
Simon George	Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services
Tom McCabe	Executive Director of Community & Environmental Services and Head of Paid Service.

Cabinet Members and Executive Directors formally introduced themselves.

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Paul Cracknell, Executive Director for Transformation and Strategy, and Sara Tough, Executive Director for Children's Services.

2 Minutes from the meeting held on Monday 6 December 2021.

- 2.1 Cabinet agreed the minutes of the meeting held on Monday 6 December 2021 as an accurate record of the meeting.

3 Declaration of Interests

- 3.1 No interests were declared

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

4.1 No matters were referred to Cabinet.

5 Items of Urgent Business

5.1 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention spoke about the impact of Covid-19 on Adult Social Services:

- Pressures on the NHS and the amazing work of staff in the NHS and social care were well documented. The vaccination programme had been a great success and had helped these sectors.
- There had been less focus on the hidden pressures in adult social services and the wider care sector. Social work teams were in the centre of efforts to bring people home from hospitals or into a care setting to complete their recovery and connecting people with care so that they could regain their independence. Workers were handling 120 cases per week which was 80% higher than pre-Covid.
- Support was increasingly harder to provide because of home care agencies and care settings experiencing high staff sickness and staff self-isolating meaning they were unable to take as many new referrals as the Council would like, and Covid-19 outbreaks in care settings increasing; outbreaks had increased from 70 last week to 100 in the week of this meeting.
- Norfolk First Support were stepping in to fill gaps in home care where possible, but this gave them less capacity to fill their reablement duties.
- Norfolk County Council had commissioned extra beds and 1500 extra hours of home care per week and put staff back into hospitals and additional staff in hubs to help with hospital discharge; the council was also aware that families were stepping up to provide more support to family members.
- The Council had passed on one off Government funding so providers could a 6% pay rise until March 2022. Subject to Cabinet agreement at their meeting on 31 January 2022, an uplift was proposed to allow providers to continue to pay this moving forwards.
- This situation was unprecedented but temporary and the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention recognised and acknowledged the extraordinary efforts of staff and care providers.
- People could still contact adult social services who would respond to urgent need.
- A backlog of work would build up as the service prioritised the most urgent cases; there were 800 people on the interim care list and 2500 people on the holding list. After the current peak of Covid-19 had passed, the service would need to restore and rebuild, and the Executive Director of Adult Social Services was developing a recovery plan.

5.2 The Chairman thanked everyone involved in these difficult circumstances and recognised the significant pressures in the care market at this time.

6 Public Question Time

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

7 Local Member Questions/Issues

- 7.1.1 The list of Local Member questions and the responses is attached to these minutes at Appendix B.
- 7.1.2 Two written supplementary questions were received and were responded to in writing after the meeting. These supplementary questions and responses are attached to the minutes at appendix C.
- 7.2.1 Cllr Alexandra Kemp asked a supplementary question:
- Cllr Kemp believed that the answer to her question was not accurate. She stated that the response said that the Chairman couldn't comment as this would be fettering the planning application issue.
 - Cllr Kemp noted that the Borough Council had put in a planning objection and stated that the Council were ignoring planning advice from the Head of Planning, stating that Cambridgeshire, Fenland and King's Lynn had all made statements objecting to the proposal. She felt that Norfolk County Council could also do the same.
 - She asked if the Chairman had read the All-Parliamentary Group on Air Pollution's report calling for a moratorium on new incinerators she had sent to him, noting the risks to children's health and the food chain. She asked if Cabinet was more concerned with making deals with MVV to make profits for Norse environmental above children's health in Norfolk.
- 7.2.2 The Chairman recognised Cllr Kemp's concerns however stated that some of her comments were out of order. He stood by what he said in response to Cllr Kemp's substantive question, that the Council did not want to be fettered in putting in a full response when a planning application was put forward.
- 7.3.1 Cllr Watkins asked a supplementary question:
- Cllr Watkins asked The Cabinet Member for Children's Services if he would like to support the Liberal Democrats' call for parents to receive a £30 voucher for every day children missed school, to help pay for catch up tutoring.
- 7.3.2 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services responded that this was the first he had heard of this and would not support any such proposal without further investigation as to where the money would come from

8. ASD Service Review – Transformation and Prevention in Adult Social Care

- 8.1.1 Cabinet received the report setting out proposals for the next phase of Promoting Independence, the Adult Social Care transformation programme.
- 8.1.2 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention introduced the report to Cabinet:
- The increasing pressures across the Country and Norfolk for adult social care were well known. The Government had made an announcement for extra funding, and it was important to ensure that social care received a corresponding slice of the extra money which would be raised.
 - To make the services offered to people sustainable for the future, adult social services had been working under a promoting independence model,

supported by service users and residents of Norfolk. The aim of this was to keep people in their homes for as long as possible, which was what people said they wanted.

- It was important to continue to review the model to ensure it met the needs of the population of Norfolk and was using all opportunities that became available over time.
- If the steps outlined in the paper were not taken, there was a risk that the service would not be able to meet demand.
- This was an invest-to-save project. To produce a project with a large fee it was important to justify the benefits to service users and the Council and the benefits of this project outweighed the costs.

8.1.3 The Executive Director for Adult Social Services gave an introduction to the report:

- Service users had fed back to the Council on a regular basis that there was a need for a preventative approach; often the service was meeting people too late and intervening in the last curve of life. It would be possible to work with people in the 10 years prior to this when they were in touch with health and other services, where steps could be taken to promote independence.
- Challenges included how to integrate with the NHS locally. The Council's front door was currently separate from the NHS front door; there was an intention for this to be integrated and to join up with the NHS both digitally and in practice.
- The reform agenda of social care meant that there would be increasing expectations on councils to deliver change and a new means test. Councils would have a wider role for working with more people with a care need.
- Switching to a joined up digital approach across health, housing and social care would mean joining up many systems and a change partner would be needed to facilitate this.
- It had been found that of 49% of people who present at the front door showed the potential to have their need prevented, reduced or delayed, and of these, 39% could have been more independent through the use of community resources. Work with the voluntary sector was therefore vital as part of this project.
- Benefits for the project included: digital changes to help people manage their own care; a named person for each service user; new relationships with doctors; a more transparent service; the ability to localise services; and a co-production model developed with service users
- The cost was a reasonable one to bring about the proposed changes; the savings brought through the proposals would provide headroom to bring about further investments

8.1.4 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention summed up the introduction:

- The proposals in the report would provide residents with a better service, a simpler experience of dealing with the NHS, adult social care and social care and would allow them to be well and independent for longer
- The Independent Care System would go live in July 2022, so the timing was right to move forward with these proposals.
- The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention moved the recommendations as set out in the report

- 8.2 The Vice-Chairman agreed that this was an important project. Promoting independence was focussed on improving demand and this had achieved £61m savings over the past five years. The Vice-Chairman pointed out that phase two of the promoting independence project was about Living Well and Changing Lives with eight core ambitions for Adult Social Care as set out on page 77-78, paragraph 1.6 of the report. The Vice-Chairman discussed the policy change signalled through the White Paper, as set out on page 49 of the report. Diagnostic work carried out with Newton Europe was detailed on page 50 of the report and the results of analysis carried out with Newton Europe and Adult Social Services which was shown in paragraph 3.1 on page 51 on the report.
- 8.3 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services noted that residents had stated that they want independence; Children's Services had found, through its work with families, that the earlier interventions were made the better the offer that could be provided for families and service users. Newton Europe had a proven record of working with Local Authorities and it was important to refresh services on a regular basis. With the new Integrated Care Service coming in later in 2022, he felt this was an ideal time to bring move forward with the proposals in the report.
- 8.4 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance felt that the proposals in the report would give a better outcome for the people of Norfolk and allow lessons to be learned that could also be used across the County more widely. He felt comments in the press were saddening, noting that this was about using a partner to provide a better outcome and transform services. Page 55 of the report, paragraphs 5.7-5.9, stated what was being done to promote people's independence and working with children's services. A cultural shift was being seen, with people using technology more, such as through online self-service technology.
- 8.5 The Cabinet Member for Finance noted the importance of working with partners to provide a better service to residents. There was a contingent fee of up to £6.3m with minimum savings of £9.3m recurrent savings per year. It would be important to monitor the benefits over the next 5 years of reduced cost and wider benefits to the rate of growth to the demographic profile
- 8.6 The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management felt that working with a strategic partner with a record of delivery would help improve the efficiency of service while saving money and fully supported the proposal.
- 8.7 The Chairman noted that this piece of work would be a major transformation with a strategic partner, and the contingent fee would give a significant advantage to the council. The intention of the proposals was to improve service quality, independence and provide a different operating model, especially in the digital way of working. Joint working with the NHS was vital, and a single point of contact was a recognised want of service users. Closer working with the voluntary sector was important and would build on work carried out over the past years. The proposals would bring about a cultural change by providing a better service through a co-production model, with key targets of promoting independence, prevention and early help. It would be key moving forward to ensure strong governance and project oversight were in place.
- 8.8 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

- a) Agree the aims and objectives of the next phase of Promoting Independence – Adult Social Services Transformation programme, as set out at section 1.8 of the report.
- b) Agree to the engagement of Newton Europe as a strategic change partner to implement a new target operating model for Adult Social Services as set out in section 2.0, section 6.5 and section 8.1 of the report.
- c) Agree that ASSD will work in partnership with the corporate Strategy and Transformation Team to ensure the benefits of transformation are fully realised for Norfolk, as set out in section 5.0 of the report.

8.9 Evidence and Reasons for Decision

See section 4 of the report.

8.10 Alternative Options

See section 5 of the report.

9 Admission Arrangements for the School Year 2023/24

9.1.1 Cabinet received the report setting out the admissions co-ordination scheme for all schools and to the admissions policy for all Community and Voluntary Controlled schools for determination.

9.1.2 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services introduced the report to Cabinet:

- Each year the Council is required to determine the admissions scheme and admissions policy for schools in Norfolk.
- The proposed schemes and timetable set out in the report met requirements of the School Admissions Code and associated legislation
- If changes to these schemes were required, the Council would be required to consult. There were no changes proposed this year, 2023-24 so there was no need to consult.
- Details of admission arrangements, timetable and revised policies were set out in appendices A-D of the report.
- The Cabinet Member for Children's Services moved the recommendation as set out in the report

9.2 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to determine the Admissions arrangements for the school year 2023/24.

9.3 Evidence and reasons for decision

The co-ordination scheme follows the model scheme set out in the School Admissions Code and admission policies for Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools have been developed to fully comply with the School Admissions Code.

Norfolk County Council is under a statutory duty to determine admission arrangements by 28 February each year. If these cannot be determined, the Secretary of State has the power to impose a co-ordination scheme.

Parents who are refused admission are entitled to appeal to independent admission appeals panels. Since 2010 appeal panels have been required to

consider the legality of admission arrangements as part of this process. Our arrangements have not been referred by the Independent Appeal Panels to the Office of the Schools Adjudicator (OSA) as part of this regular review.

Additionally, parents can refer our determined arrangements to the OSA. This has not occurred since 2014 when our arrangements were confirmed as compliant. Parents dissatisfied with the outcome of their appeal can refer concerns to the Local Government Ombudsman but again no concerns have been expressed regarding the co-ordination scheme or admissions policies.

The majority of parents gain a place at a preferred school for their children.

9.4 **Alternative Options**

None

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

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

The meeting ended at 10:57

The Chairman

Cabinet
12 January 2022
Public & Local Member Questions

Agenda item 6	Public Question Time
6.1	<p>Question from Paul Andell</p> <p>Gas Hill is a unique topographical feature of Norwich, the average gradient is 10.7% and it is popular with walkers, cyclists and joggers. Due to its steep gradient it is avoided by many vehicles but those that do use it need to negotiate an awkward narrow junction with St Leonard's Road at the summit. Would Cabinet consider the closure of Gas Hill from the junction with William Kett Close to all but essential service and emergency vehicles. This would allow for the development of a "green corridor" linking Riverside and potentially Kett's Heights where proposals are being considered to re-open a pathway via the escarpment to William Kett Close.</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport</p> <p>It is agreed that the gradient and road width from William Kett Close to St Leonard's Road is such that some drivers may choose to avoid using Gas Hill. The suggestion to close this section has some merit, although as drivers are already choosing to avoid Gas Hill, an enhanced environment already exists for active travel. As such closing the upper section of Gas Hill by means of a Traffic Regulation Order would have limited impact.</p> <p>In terms of the injury accident history at St Leonard's Road junction, there has been one slight injury accident in the last five years. On this basis alone it would not be a priority to investigate further.</p> <p>Supplementary question from Paul Andell</p> <p>Norfolk's Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan encourages active travel (walking and cycling) to promote healthier lifestyles and improve the environment. An objective of the plan is to identify and prioritise improvements to facilitate active travel. Does Cabinet agree, that by restricting motorised traffic to Gas Hill active travel would be encouraged and improved to part of the Broads Circular Leisure cycle route.</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport</p> <p>The Broads Circular Leisure cycle route is part of our promoted leisure routes on the Norwich Cycle Map using existing quiet routes. Any closure of the route for motorised vehicles would need to be assessed for its network impact and it is currently not on our priority Active Travel interventions for Norwich.</p>
6.2	<p>Question from Kate King</p> <p>As the decision makers of Norfolk County Council are taking forward their Environmental Strategy please can cabinet tell me whether they have enlisted the support of other ambitious local government leaders by signing up to the UK100 Clean Energy Pledge? They will of course be aware that, while up to 40% of the UK's carbon emissions are from domestic heating, other forward thinking councils are looking at the extremely complex challenge of retrofitting existing housing stock to alleviate this problem and are beginning to implement some far reaching schemes.</p>

Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste

Norfolk County Council's current priority is to collaborate with other Local Authorities in Norfolk as a member of the Norfolk Climate Change Partnership. Joint working and information exchange is already progressing extremely well through this officer group, but it is acknowledged that membership of UK100 could add a very useful national dimension to our efforts to tackle climate change. For this reason, this matter will be presented to the next Environmental Policy cross-party Member Oversight Group, Chaired by Councillor Andy Grant and due to be held in February, for those Elected Members to consider.

Supplementary question from Kate King

Given the complexity of retrofitting compared with installation at the build stage, can the council assure me that all new planning applications take this into account by making renewable energy heating systems mandatory in all new-build schemes, wherever it is within their range of scope to do?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste

Responsibility for planning applications relating to housing sits within the remit of District authorities.

**Cabinet
12 January 2022
Local Member Questions**

Agenda item 7	Local Member Issues/Questions
7.1	<p>Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp To the Leader. I sent you the All-Parliamentary Group on Air Pollution's report calling for a moratorium on new incinerators, because of risks to public health and the food chain.</p> <p>Recent research shows matter from incinerators found in children's toenails, associated with childhood leukaemia. Dioxins from incinerators have been found in eggs 10 km away. The Secretary of State has just refused a new incinerator in Kent. The Welsh Govt has a moratorium on incinerators in Wales. Will NCC join all other host authorities, King's Lynn, Fenland and Cambridgeshire, and say it is against MVV's proposed incinerator on the West Norfolk border?</p> <p>Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Governance and Strategy Thank you for your Question. As Cllr Kemp will understand we do not set Council policy in responses to questions to Cabinet. This will be done at the right time, in the right place with the right information.</p> <p>Although the proposed site is in Cambridgeshire you are correct in that Norfolk County Council is one of the four 'host' local authorities that will make comments on the DCO as a planning authority.</p> <p>There is a large amount of very detailed information, that the applicant will have to put forward at that . This includes environmental impact assessment; biodiversity; landscape; flood & water management; human health through a full Health Impact Assessment; traffic and transport to name but some.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council haven't had that information yet as the planning application process is not yet under way and so it would be premature and possibly fetter NCC's role in the planning process to do as you ask at this stage.</p> <p>Ultimately it will be for the relevant Minister to take the decision on whether or not it should go ahead, assuming an application is actually made, not the local authorities.</p> <p>When we have all this information and detail then the County Council will be in a position to make its views known.</p> <p>Whilst we wait for the appropriate time for NCC to take part in the planning process it should be noted that in December 2021 7 London Borough Council's awarded contracts to construct an energy from waste facility in the North of London, so we should not take former positions of Government (Kent) as an indication of future intentions.</p>

7.2	<p>Question from Cllr Brian Watkins Can you tell us how many school classes have had to be cancelled due to staff absences this week due to Covid?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services We are not aware of any classes cancelled. However, here is no requirement for schools to notify the local authority as they have plans in place through the contingency framework to move seamlessly to remote learning if necessary</p>
7.3	<p>Question from Cllr Tim Adams What level of staff absences due to Covid are there in Norfolk's social care system at the moment?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention Thank you for your question. As you are aware most social care staff are not employed by Norfolk County Council.</p> <p>In Norfolk's social care system the data shows that 7.8% of nurses are absent with 0.6% due to COVID and 9.2% of social care workers are absent with 1.7% due to COVID. The accuracy of this data is dependent upon the quality and timeliness of completion of the tracker by individual care organisations.</p> <p>Supplementary Question from Cllr Tim Adams Can you please detail the current availability (with a comparison to other authorities in the East of England) of the level of respite care that is available for carers set against the demand from carers for that care?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention Norfolk County Council commissions both planned respite which can be booked in advance, and unplanned respite which is arranged in an emergency situation when informal care breaks down.</p> <p>It is worth remembering that respite takes a number of forms and is not always in a care home or other care setting, but can instead be a break for a carer, such as a sitting service so they can have time to themselves for social or other activities.</p> <p>In terms of bed-based respite for older people, there are 12 dedicated respite beds at the following places across Norfolk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lydia Eva Court, Great Yarmouth (2 Enhanced Respite beds) ▪ Ellacombe, Norwich (3 Enhanced Respite beds) ▪ Bishop Herbert House, Norwich (2 Physical Disabilities Respite beds) ▪ Barley Court, Norwich Housing with Care scheme (1 Standard Respite bed) ▪ Weavers Court, Diss Housing with Care scheme (1 Standard Respite bed) ▪ St Edmunds, Attleborough (1 Standard Respite bed) ▪ Munhaven, North Norfolk (1 Enhanced Respite bed) ▪ High Haven, West Norfolk (1 Enhanced planned bed for West locality use only) <p>It is important to note that as well as these facilities many people chose to organise</p>

	<p>their respite through a direct payment, making their own independent arrangements.</p> <p>For people with learning disabilities, we currently have 28 places available through 9 providers. In December there were 775 nights available and 316 nights were booked (an occupancy of 41%). This is an increase in occupancy based on previous months.</p> <p>Respite, like the rest of the health and social care system, has been affected by COVID. Planned respite for older people was paused originally from April 20 in response to Covid. It was reinstated in Oct 20 for a few weeks and then paused again, until we reinstated all available planned respite provision from July 21. The availability of planned respite beds continues to be impacted, where certain homes are closed due to a COVID outbreak. Some planned breaks for people with learning disabilities were cancelled in December 21 – this was either because people using respite and / or staff have tested positive for COVID and because of ‘emergency’ respite demands over the Christmas period.</p>
7.4	<p>Question from Cllr Rob Colwell</p> <p>Following national government cuts to the Environment Agency meaning they are drastically scaling back river quality testing for Norfolk Rivers like the precious chalk river Gaywood, will NCC commit to financially supporting individual river catchment plans and habitat restoration with other key stakeholders?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste</p> <p>As per NCC’s Environmental Policy we fully support any measures which improve the quality of water systems in Norfolk. We have demonstrated this support by supporting local projects via the Norfolk Coast Partnership such as the 9 Chalk Rivers Project which provided over £1million of habitat restoration to important chalk rivers in Norfolk, and more recently the project ‘Norfolk’s Two Chalk Rivers – Restored, Revitalised, Resilient’ which has recently been approved for funding. Water, rivers and their catchments and the associated habitats are recognised as vital natural assets for the county and, as such, are included in our work on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Norfolk which is being developed over the next 2 years. Through this approach, we are committed to working with stakeholders on improving these essential natural assets as part of the County’s overall natural environment.</p> <p>Second question from Cllr Rob Colwell</p> <p>Can you tell us how many people there are on the unmet care needs list and for what reasons they are on the list?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention</p> <p>Thank you for your question. I assume you mean the “Interim Care List”. There are around 860 people on the Interim Care list, the list is dynamic and changes each day.</p> <p>People are on this list for a variety of specific reasons which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals who are either being supported by families, carers or our in-

	<p>house Norfolk First Support, while we work to arrange longer term homecare</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People in residential care who want to return home • People who are waiting for a different pattern of call times, or who want to change their provider. • People who are temporarily in hospital but with an open care package (but it does not include people who are in hospital and ready for discharge). <p>The Council has set up a dedicated central team to take action to get the right care for people on the transfer of care list.</p> <p>Since the outbreak of COVID the number of people in this situation is much higher than pre-pandemic, when we would typically have seen around 150 people in this situation. This is despite the commissioning of thousands of extra hours of home care, and many additional places in home care. The system is experiencing the impact of the current surge in demand, the staffing and sickness issues in the health and social care sector due to COVID.</p>
7.5	<p>Question from Cllr Chrissie Rumsby</p> <p>Does the Leader agree Norfolk residents have a right to food no matter what their circumstances?</p> <p>Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Governance and Strategy</p> <p>The UK has a welfare state to make sure that people are supported. To complement that I am glad to say that in Norfolk we have run an outstanding Norfolk Assistance Scheme (NAS) as part of the Household Support Fund to support residents throughout the pandemic with food packages and supporting school children with meal vouchers outside of term time.</p> <p>The NAS already provides hardship support to Norfolk residents who are struggling with their living costs. The type of support that NAS provides is tailored to the individual needs of each household. It can include food vouchers, help with buying school uniforms and gas or electricity meter pre-payments.</p> <p>We have also invested in additional advice capacity that NAS can refer to. This means that as well as one-off financial support, people struggling with their finances will find it easier to access debt and welfare advice and support to find longer term solutions.</p> <p>Using the important relationships we have built up to deliver Covid support, Norfolk County Council has worked with district councils and the VCSE sector to put together a strong support offer using this one-off funding from the Department for Work and Pensions Household Support Fund.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £2.4m for free school meals - those eligible received £55 in vouchers for the Christmas period (a top-up on the usual £15 per week) and will receive £15 for the February half-term break. • £1.2m for Norfolk Assistance Scheme (NAS) – an extension of the county council’s existing scheme to provide emergency financial help, essential household goods and advice and support. • £1.4m to district councils for community support

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £1m of support targeted to voluntary and community groups, via Norfolk Community Foundation. Norfolk's voluntary, community and social enterprise (VCSE) organisations as well as town and parish councils and faith groups, will be able to apply for £50 vouchers for groceries / household essentials to distribute to those in need. • £500,000 –for local support with food.
7.6	<p>Question from Cllr Emma Corlett</p> <p>The Norwich Western Link is losing support, increasingly recognised as too damaging and too expensive. If, as I hope, it doesn't go ahead people need to get around without damaging the environment and those communities blighted by rat running still need relief. Can the Leader confirm what plan B is?</p> <p>Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Governance and Strategy</p> <p>The Norwich Western Link continues to have wide support and there is no evidence that it is losing support.</p> <p>We are in agreement that there are significant traffic congestion issues in communities to the west of Norwich and, with population and job growth in Greater Norwich, they will continue to worsen unless we take action.</p> <p>Early in the project, we sought input from representatives of those affected communities to identify objectives which any solution to address these traffic issues should address. We then went through a very thorough options assessment process in 2018 and this process is documented in a report published on our website. This found that non-road-based solutions, such as additional bus services, would be less likely to be successful at achieving these objectives than a road-based link. So we have taken, and will continue to take, an evidence-based approach to this project to deliver the best all-round solution for the Norwich Western Link, including its environmental mitigation proposals.</p> <p>It's important to mention that I and my cabinet colleagues fully appreciate the positive difference the Norwich Western Link will make to so many people in Norfolk. Removing traffic congestion from small unsuitable roads and reducing journey times are the direct benefits but there are many more benefits too. These include helping ambulances and other blue light services reach people more quickly in emergency situations, helping to improve road safety and air quality close to people's homes by taking traffic out of residential areas, supporting our businesses by making journeys more efficient, reducing transport costs and making it easier for customers to reach them, and enabling people living in areas currently blighted by traffic to walk and cycle and generally have a better quality of life.</p> <p>I would add that the new link road gives us opportunities to maximise the benefits it will create through other sustainable transport measures, both close to the route in rural communities as well as in suburban and urban areas of Norwich. This is something that we are planning to deliver as part of the Norwich Western Link project but also through the development of measures under the recently agreed Transport for Norwich Strategy.</p>

7.7	<p>Question from Cllr Brenda Jones</p> <p>The People and Communities Select Committee and the Adult Services review panel exist to help develop new policy. Yet today's agenda includes a report on the future of Adult Social Care that has not been to either, nor have the public or partners had the chance to comment. Why not?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention</p> <p>Thank you for your question. As you are aware Adult Social Services has had a very clear vision and direction for a number of years, which is widely known and supported. The report to Cabinet today is not a new policy but an operational project which affirms that strategy and highlights areas of focus which are not new and have been considered and influenced in many ways – including through People Select Committee, through feedback from people who use services, through research and engagement, and underpinned by data and evidence.</p>
7.8	<p>Question from Cllr Maxine Webb</p> <p>At November's Infrastructure and Development Select Committee meeting the Director of Active Norfolk committed to remove and replace the inaccurate statement about children aged 5-16 with a disability and long-term health condition "activity levels of those young people are the same as those without one" which appears on page 9 of the Active Norfolk strategy. To date this has not happened; could the Cabinet Member for Communities & Partnerships please confirm when this will be rectified?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships</p> <p>Whilst the statement is not materially inaccurate, we accept that it could be misleading. This has now been removed from the Active Norfolk strategy, pending a review of its presentation.</p>
7.9	<p>Question from Cllr Jamie Osborn</p> <p>Norwich City council has withdrawn its support for the NWL after it requested evidence of five criteria being met but that evidence was not provided. The criteria included air quality, decongestion, investment in public transport, cycling and walking, and mitigation of wildlife and landscape impacts. Does the Cabinet Member acknowledge that the county council has been unable to provide the required evidence regarding these impacts of the road?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport</p> <p>The City Council's position was set out in the June 2021 reporting to the County Council's Cabinet. All of the criteria that have been set out by the City Council will be either included in the planning application for the NWL or in the action plan that will be developed for the recently approved Transport for Norwich Strategy (TfNS) - see Cabinet report for December 2021. Ahead of the planning application being submitted we will be completing a consultation on our proposals, and I would therefore encourage the City Council to review its position when the details for these are available. The Action Plan for the TfNS will be finalised later in the year and we will continue to work closely with the City Council on its development, as we have already for the adopted TfNS.</p> <p>Supplementary question from Cllr Jamie Osborn</p>

	<p>Millions of people around the country will have seen BBC Countryfile's exposé of the failure of wildlife "mitigation" measures installed around the NDR. The council's response that more surveys are needed was contradicted by the evidence of expert ecologists. Does the Cabinet Member now acknowledge that the council's road-building kills bats and that the "mitigation" measures installed are a vast waste of money?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport</p> <p>All of the measures installed along the NDR (Broadland Northway) were agreed with the statutory environmental bodies and the project was the subject of a very thorough and independent examination in public prior to the necessary orders being approved. The Development Consent Order for the NDR includes provisions for up to 15 years of monitoring of some of the environmental mitigation features for the project. The early monitoring completed to date since opening the NDR is published on the County Councils website and it can be seen within those reports that further monitoring is required to assess the success or otherwise of the features introduced. You will see in the reporting that the mitigation measures are being used by wildlife, so it is incorrect to suggest that they are a waste of money or that the road is responsible for killing bats.</p>
7.10	<p>Question from Cllr Terry Jermy</p> <p>It has been suggested to me that Cllr Peck is not counting the numbers of cars parked on the new county hall car park site because he is embarrassed at the lack of use and waste of scarce resources. Can he tell me how he measures value for money for this scheme in the business case prepared under paragraph 6.7 of the Financial Regulations?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management</p> <p>As Cllr Jermy will be aware, not least from responses to similar questions, there has been a global pandemic underway. Which has meant that all offices (including ours) have either been following the Prime Minister's instruction to 'work from home where you can' or following national health and safety guidance operating with a significant reduction in usable desk space. As we emerge from the pandemic, following the successful vaccination programme; nationally we will start to see a slow return back to previous usage patterns – whether that be on the train network, footfall in our major cities, and indeed the use of County Hall.</p> <p>I make no bones that our offices (and indeed car parks) have been quieter than usual, but there is a good public health rationale.</p> <p>In terms of Value for Money – we have and will continue to consolidate offices and functions onto the County Hall estate, providing a more efficient and lower cost estate, whilst delivering environmental benefits from this key recently refurbished building. We are clear that we will need parking, alongside other modes of transport, to support the staff, visitors and partners who use County Hall. This is not something to be embarrassed about – but is delivering real savings for the taxpayer</p>
7.11	<p>Question from Cllr Paul Neale</p> <p>Our adult social care system is in meltdown because of inadequate funding from the government to recruit and maintain dedicated skilled staff to run it. The</p>

Government has recently given Norfolk County Council a one off payment of £600,000 to prop up our crumbling adult social care services. NCC's cabinet member is quoted as saying that he is really pleased the government has taken on board our requests for extra support yet he should be pressing the government for what is needed not praising them.

Is the cabinet member actually aware of how much we need long term to give adult social care that is fit for purpose?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention

Thank you for your question. As you would expect the case for extra resources is being continually made by Norfolk County Council because the pressures on the social care system are immense due to the current wave of Omicron infections.

We have been met with some success recently with the extra £5.2 million pounds Workforce Grant and the £600k Omicron Grant which we have put straight out into the Care Market and I make no apology for praising both our own staff and those in the wider care sector for the way they are continuing to support people.

At the same time we have, and will continue to take every opportunity to set out for Government the urgent need for long-term sustainable funding for the sector, and particularly the need for parity of investment with the NHS. COVID has clearly demonstrated the critical role that social care plays in the wider health and social care system.

Second Question from Cllr Paul Neale

As the council has recently lost two judicial review cases, incurring high public costs, will the Cabinet commit to make the adjustments to the LTP4 requested by Leigh Day Solicitors in its letter to the Council dated on 21 December, and also undertake to not in the meantime hold the plan out to any third party as a completed and fully adopted plan?

Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport

The council has adopted a revised Local Transport Plan (LTP) strategy and committed to the development of an implementation plan. Until the implementation plan is adopted the current LTP remains LTP3 and by virtue of s108(3b) of the Transport Act 2000 the council is required to have regard to LTP3 in complying with its duty under s108(b).

That does not negate the need for the council also to 'carry out their functions so as to implement' the policies contained within LTP4 in accordance with s108(1)(b), this is because LTP4 contains policies which have been developed under s108(1)(a) of the Transport Act 2000. As such an appropriate level of weight will be given to the LTP4 strategy in decision-making by the council.

In development of the implementation plan the council will give due consideration of, and review and where appropriate revise, LTP4 Strategy to ensure that our legal duties are met and that the documents therein are consistent.

7.12	<p>Question from Cllr Steff Aquarone Can the Leader of the Council explain why he has not made a statement despite the repeated requests from the Eastern Daily Press on the claims that Councillor Borrett twice struck a horse during a hunt over Christmas?</p> <p>Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Governance and Strategy I accept that the media enjoy harassing politicians as they see that as part of their role. There is little point in commenting on an allegation that has no substance, which has been demonstrated by the relevant bodies taking no action.</p> <p>Second question from Cllr Steff Aquarone Can the Cabinet Member confirm what impact the successful achievement of NCC's stated net zero ambitions will have on Norfolk's carbon emissions?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste NCC has made a public commitment to reducing its estate emissions to net zero by 2030. This commitment is an important signal that NCC recognises and seeks to be part of the national effort for the UK to be net zero by 2050. Gross emissions falling under the scope of NCC's net zero target were around 7,200 tCO₂e for the year ending March 2021 (down from over 12,800 tCO₂e in 2016/17). This represents around 7.5% of total public sector estate emissions in the county (including hospitals, schools etc). Furthermore, the contribution of public sector estate emissions Norfolk's territorial emissions is estimated to be around 2%.</p> <p>Therefore, we appreciate that NCC is only directly responsible for a small part of Norfolk's overall emissions. Nevertheless, we believe that setting and delivering on our estate net zero target sets an important example. The October Cabinet paper on Environmental Policy set out an ambition to go further through influencing our supply chain, through working in partnership with other public sector organisations in Norfolk and through helping Norfolk residents to reduce their transport emissions through supporting better passenger transport, active travel and the transition to electric vehicles.</p>
7.13	<p>Question from Cllr Ben Price Recently, some councils have committed to leading the effort to become "deforestation-free" by trying to eliminate use of products that contain palm oil linked to deforestation. Chester and Oxford councils are working with schools and businesses to help them reduce the use of harmful palm oil. Will Norfolk do the same, including via wholly-owned companies such as Norse?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste We are aware of the impacts of palm oil production on tropical forests, and how it has become a key component in a range of products, with an estimated 50% of supermarket products containing it. It is widely acknowledged that the key issue isn't with the product itself, but where this crop has been planted. It is for this reason that the Defra set up the UK Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil. As a result of this initiative, it is worth noting that the bulk of palm oil now imported into the UK is derived from certified sources (UK Roundtable on Sustainable Palm Oil Annual Report). However, NCC has committed to look at reducing the environmental impact of its supply chain wherever possible, and will continue to monitor this issue, and, in terms of school meals, Norse will continue to source good quality ingredients from sustainable sources, and locally wherever possible.</p>

Second Question from Cllr Ben Price

The role of adult services is to care for the welfare of our county's citizens. Does the cabinet member for Adult Social Services believe that empathy for the welfare of all living things is a prerequisite to be a fit and proper person to perform this role, and, in light of the recent claim by anti-hunt activists that he hit his horse twice with the handle of his hunting crop, while on a hunt, should he now tender his resignation?

Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategy and Governance

Cllr Borrett has done and continues to do an excellent job as Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention and he has my full confidence in that role. The allegation was purely that, it has not been substantiated and it was determined that no action was necessary by the relevant bodies.

**Written Supplementary Questions requiring written responses from the Cabinet Meeting held on
Wednesday 12 January 2022**

	<p>Agenda item 7 Local Member questions</p>
	<p>Supplementary question from Cllr Maxine Webb In light of your response, please explain why the statement is not materially inaccurate, when the review is expected to be completed by and will an update be provided to the next Infrastructure Development Committee as this issue was raised at the last meeting.</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships It is difficult to be definitive as there is no single source of information which provides the complete picture, but the DfE data we have indicates that over 90% of children and young people in England that have a learning problem or disability that make it more difficult for them to learn are educated in “mainstream” schools.</p> <p>So, it is right that the Active Lives Child Survey does not cover those children in Special Schools, pupils that will often have the most complex needs. However, the survey sample does cover schools where the vast majority of children with learning problems or disabilities attend. So it is reasonable to caveat / interpret the survey results with this in mind, but I think the Active Lives Child data on children and young people with a disability remains useful and is materially accurate.</p> <p>Our review of how we present this information will be completed before the end of February. We will continue to prioritise our work in making it easier for children with SEND and those with a disability to experience the benefits of an active lifestyle, which clearly is our primary aim.</p>
	<p>Supplementary question from Cllr Brenda Jones Given that this is policy development, part of the very reason we have select committees, why hasn't the People and Communities Select Committee been involved in the detail of this proposal and when will the supporting evidence be published?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention People and Communities Select Committee has already helped to shape this next phase of transformation for adults social services through its policy shaping and influencing work. Since May 2019, it has considered and made input into prevention approaches, approaches to supporting carers, integration with the NHS to deliver better experience for people, technology approaches, Care Market – performance, shaping, operational resilience (during Covid) and engagement. The Cabinet report included an appendix which summarised the supporting evidence from the diagnostic work.</p>