

Cabinet
Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 6 June 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 and Partnerships
Cllr John Fisher	Cabinet Member for Children's Services
Cllr Tom FitzPatrick	Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation & Performance.
Cllr Andrew Jamieson	Cabinet Member for Finance
Cllr Greg Peck	Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management
Cllr Eric Vardy	Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste

Executive Directors Present:

James Bullion	Executive Director of Adult Social Services
Paul Cracknell	Executive Director of Strategy and Transformation
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 introduced themselves.

1 Apologies for Absence

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Wilby, the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport; Cabinet Members wished Cllr Wilby a speedy recovery. Sara Tough was also absent.

2 Minutes from the meeting held on Tuesday 3 May 2022.

- 2.1 Cabinet agreed the minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 3 May 2022 as an accurate record.

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 None.

5 Items of Urgent Business

- 5.1 There were no matters of urgent business discussed.

6 Public Question Time

- 6.1 The list of public questions and the responses is attached to these minutes at appendix A.
- 6.2.1 Jonathan Dunning asked a supplementary question:
- The Council do excellent work supporting care providers; will you consult with employers and trade unions on what they believe is needed to improve retention rates for care providers?
- 6.2.1 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention thanked Mr Dunning for his question and noted that item 10 of the agenda “Delivering a social care quality framework for Norfolk” proposed to do this, with information on how being set out in the report.

7 Local Member Questions/Issues

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

8. Local Transport Plan 4

- 8.1.1 Cabinet received the report setting out the final draft of the Local Transport Plan 4 together with the Local Transport Plan Strategy which had been reviewed alongside development of the Implementation Plan.
- 8.1.2 The Chairman introduced the report to Cabinet:
- The Transport Act 2000 confers a duty on the Council as Transport Authority to prepare a document, or two or more documents together, to be known as the Local Transport Plan.
 - Norfolk County Council’s Plan contains the Local Transport Plan 4 strategy which came before Council in 2021 to set the policy tone and direction in which the Implementation Plan could be developed. The Strategy was adopted, in the knowledge that an Implementation Plan would be required.
 - The revised strategy is in today’s papers. The report also contains the final draft of the Implementation Plan at Appendix B. The two documents came together as the complete Local Transport Plan 4 to be considered together to ensure they complemented each other.
 - The Local Transport Plan 4 is a policy framework document in line with constitutional requirements and the timetable for its consideration was published for all Members and is set out in the report; the matter would also be considered by Scrutiny Committee. As a policy document, it was recommended for Cabinet to recommend it to full Council.
 - There were risks for the authority in not having an up-to-date Local Transport Plan, therefore adopting it now would reduce or remove this risk. It was this approach that has driven the timetable
 - The process taken to reach the current stage was shown in the report.
 - The updated plan would be more accurate on where the Council planned

to be with its transport policy. It would help to meet ambitions and set solid aims to deliver the transport agenda. It would support a vibrant and sustainable economy and good strategic transport connections to make the county a more attractive place for business. It would encourage investment in the county, bringing forward new homes and jobs.

- It would also deliver better connections to reach jobs and training. It would support a greener, more resilient future through implementation of policies and actions to reduce carbon and would encourage switching to active travel and public transport and achieving a switch to clean fuel.
- Many journeys were too long for walking and cycling, and public transport was not viable for many people in rural areas including those with disabilities. The Local Transport Plan 4 supported the bus service improvement plan which aimed to address this.
- The Local Transport Plan would help with future funding bids. It would help the authority prioritise schemes and target activities. It would provide an up to date, transparent position on the rationale for projects and how to deal with issues and measures to bring forward.
- Officers had worked on development of the plan over the course of this year, including consultation on the implementation plan, strategy, and technological assessments supporting development of the plan, principally the strategic and environmental assessments and habitat regulation assessment.
- Waiting for government guidance to be published would mean a delay of 12 to 18 months or longer if government timescales were not met. Assurances had been given that the authority would undertake any work that is needed but it is unknown at present what will be required and whether this will mean the Plan would be reviewed.
- Council was aware of its statutory duty under the transport act 2000 “to take into account any policies announced by HM government and have regard to any guidance issued for the purposes of this paragraph by the secretary of state.”
- The Council was also aware of Government’s strategy of “Decarbonising Transport; Better Greener Britain” and took this into account during preparation of the Plan.
- There was no guidance yet on local transport plans and how to incorporate the statement in the transport decarbonisation plan on how local areas would deliver ambitious quantifiable carbon reductions of transport, taking into account differing transport requirements of different areas.
- Adopting the plan now would allow the Council to move forward with implementation to give a head start in achieving local and national policy objectives.
- The plan and consultation were considered by Infrastructure and Development Select Committee at its meeting on 25 May 2022, as set out in the supplementary agenda. The Committee supported the plan and proposed that the LTP should contain words to the effect that the council look to protect old and disused railway lines for transport use so that they can be used as greenways and active travel and if future circumstances allow, other uses such as rail.
- The local transport plan was not a development plan document and could not protect against future development but could indicate support for using disused railways as corridors for greenways and active travel in the short term. This action would maintain them as corridors and allow, if

appropriate, other uses to come forward.

- This could be dealt with by new action under policy 9 and inserting text in Objective 3: “we will continue to develop our programme for greenways and active travel on disused rail corridors and link it with Norfolk Trails network. This will maintain these corridors as transport routes and maintain the possibility in the longer term should it be considered appropriate that other uses such as rail come forward”.
- The Chairman moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

- 8.2 The Cabinet Member for Finance thanked the Infrastructure and Development Select Committee for their introduction of the plan to save and use discussed railway lines. He noted the importance of this initiative, tying in with the Jubilees Trail Project funded by the Council. He thanked the Lord Lieutenant and Deputy Lieutenants for the work they had done as part of this project.
- 8.3 The Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste thanked the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport and team for the comprehensive plan. He noted the increasing importance of active travel and the vision set out by the Government that half of journeys in towns would be walked or cycled. Many people used cars because local bus services did not suit their needs, so this being addressed in the plan would help make better, cleaner, more active communities and support towards the carbon plan.
- 8.4 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance noted the positive report and that the previous Local Transport Plan 3 was adopted in 2011. Work had been carried out since then including with local planning authorities to ensure sustainable development. He also noted the importance of maintaining the disused railway network.
- 8.5 The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services welcomed the policy and noted the changes which would benefit the Council. He proposed the inclusion of a statement in policy 17 discussing the aim to implement 20mph speed limits outside schools where appropriate. The Cabinet Member for Children’s Services asked for more information on progress of the Trowse Bridge. The Executive Director for Community and Environmental Services replied that the Council was working with partners including the Broads Authority to develop a way to move things forward with Trowse Bridge.
- 8.6 The Vice-Chairman noted that connectivity was being enhanced, giving better, faster and more reliable journeys and putting transport on a net zero trajectory by working in partnership with others. It was important to develop this work in an environmentally friendly way while providing jobs for the future, which was built into this plan.
- 8.7 The Cabinet Member for Finance highlighted policy 4 and 12 in his capacity as Chairman of Norfolk Coastal Partnership; he would like to work with the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste to promote active travel by cycle lanes and other associated priorities in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty along the Norfolk Coast and use funding received to increase bus facilities.
- 8.8 Cabinet **RESOLVED:**

1. To approve and recommend to Full Council that the Local Transport Plan, comprising the Local Transport Plan 4 Strategy and Implementation Plan set out in Appendix A and Appendix B of the report, is adopted, and that this replaces the current Local Transport Plan (LTP3).
2. Cabinet is asked to agree that any further minor changes are delegated to the Director of Growth and Development.
3. To include appropriate wording, with regard to the aim to implement 20mph speed limits outside schools where appropriate. The wording of this would be agreed with the Director of Growth and Development.
4. To insert an appropriate new action in support of Policy 9 and additional text in the narrative under Objective 3: “we will continue to develop our programme for greenways and active travel on disused rail corridors and link it with Norfolk Trails network. This will maintain these corridors as transport routes and maintain the possibility in the longer term should it be considered appropriate that other uses such as rail come forward.”

8.9 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

The legal requirement for the Local Transport Plan (LTP4) Strategy to become the new policy for Norfolk County Council is that both the LTP4 Strategy and LTP4 Implementation Plan are adopted to form the LTP. The adoption of the LTP4 Strategy in 2021 means that the Implementation Plan is required for the LTP4 to become current policy and replace LTP3.

Adoption of the proposed plan will ensure that the county council has an up to date plan taking account of, and reflecting, amongst other things, current legislation and policy requirements; and that the council continues to meet the requirements of the relevant Act.

8.10 **Alternative Options**

Without an updated Local Transport Plan the LTP3 remains policy. LTP4 updates the strategy from LTP3 and is a much better reflection of where the authority wants to be in terms of transport policy.

9. **Norfolk Investment Framework**

9.1.1 Cabinet received the report setting out the evidence base and proposed Investment Framework.

9.1.2 The Vice-Chairman introduced the report to Cabinet:

- In August 2021, Cabinet agreed to commission an investment framework in response to a number of factors including the need to kickstart the economy's recovery following the Covid-19 pandemic, changing policy context set out in the levelling up white paper and the move away from EU funding to a new national financial framework, with more competition for funding, highlighting the need to clearly evidence our challenges but also our scope to contribute to the National economy.
- The plans outlined in the paper seek to ensure that we have a clear framework for investment that addresses the challenges of our time and draws out the priorities that will generate growth in key sectors, supporting the ambition to create a higher skilled and more productive

workforce, as well as harnessing the opportunities to mitigate the impacts of climate change on the Norfolk economy and providing efficient public services to a spatially dispersed population.

- This is a framework that is focussed on delivering long term results over the next 20 years. There are many challenges that we face as a County which will lead to significant transformation of services including reforms for Adult Social Services as well as anticipated whole system change in Children's Services over the next 5-8 years
- The exact interventions are unknown at this stage, but the framework enables us to pilot activities that will tackle some of these pressing challenges and create opportunities to innovate, to carry out preventative measures and to build a workforce that is prepared for the jobs of the future.
- The approach taken towards the Investment Framework was to create an evidence base focussing on the current picture of what Norfolk is like today, and what the future trends are, such as for sector growth. Many things have been tried in the past, but with resources spread too thinly, as has been the case in the past, they haven't been able to deliver the step change required – meaning that the Norfolk economy remains a broadly low wage and low skilled one.
- Our approach means focussing our investments in a few key areas rather than spreading efforts too thinly as in the past which is why we have for the County.
- The framework will support us to achieve Norfolk's levelling up ambitions: to transform our economy, leading a transition to a zero-carbon economy, to grow our skills base, to improve life chances of all residents and to deliver better local services
- The detailed evidence base which underpins the proposals is described at **2.3** and can be found in **Appendix A**, at pages **24-134**. It is the most comprehensive picture of the Norfolk economy to date, and takes account of the implications of the pandemic, sector growth projections, the national and local policy context, and investments already planned.
- Section **2.4** sets out the four high-level challenges that have been identified, based on this evidence and analysis:
 - To create new opportunities for Norfolk's residents by increasing skills and labour market dynamism
 - To provide effective and efficient public services to a spatially-dispersed population
 - To strengthen and future-proof business clusters, to grow the economy and
 - To protect Norfolk's economic and natural assets from climate change
- The report sets out the objectives for the period 2022-26 with examples of possible interventions so its clear how delivery against each grand challenge could be achieved and what success might look like.
- The framework was set out at appendix B of the report on pages 135-164.
- Our approach chimes with the Government levelling up white paper priority to boost productivity, pay, jobs and living standards by growing the private sector, especially in those places where they are lagging. That word 'lagging' is important – we want to drive that step change in pay, productivity, and skills that will put Norfolk on a more equal footing with other areas, and close some of the gaps between us and the regional or national position.

- **But we don't want that growth at any cost** - which is why the fourth Grand Challenge is about mitigating the impact of climate change, and harnessing all our collective efforts – particularly in relation to our cultural and economic assets.
- As mentioned at **2.5**, we have cast the net wide in engaging with partners, to understand the evidence and shape the framework priorities. From MPs to district councils, to businesses and small voluntary and community organisations.
- Feedback from Infrastructure and Development Select Committee was constructive. They stated that:
 - We must ensure that when proposals are brought forward they address inequality and focus on long term impacts
 - We should coordinate the efforts of different organisations such as the DWP and colleges when seeking to help people in deprived communities particularly with the role out of the multiply adult numeracy programme
 - There has been too much individual working and lack of joined up in past which hasn't helped residents being targeted.
 - Government could learn from the rigorous and long term approach taken here particularly in approach to apprenticeships. There are shortages across the board and challenges across all sectors. There are people who want to retrain but there is a high personal cost for this without help.
 - This approach has helped to shape the approach of the shared prosperity fund and will almost certainly help to influence going forwards.
- In terms of how this framework addresses inequalities we are still consulting on examples of interventions that will help deliver the Framework's objectives, with a workshop set for 16 June. Voluntary and community sector bodies are represented on the steering group which will oversee the Framework's implementation.
- In summary, this approach with its detailed evidence base and rigorous approach to drilling down into the major issues for Norfolk, focussed on developing solutions for how they could be tackled, and collaborative working will help to deliver that step change and address the major challenges of our time, in the short, medium and longer term.

- 9.2 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention noted that this framework supported the Government's levelling up agenda and suggested that this piece of work gave us the opportunity to input into negotiations with Government regarding levelling up and we should use it to do so. The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention also noted that health outcomes were affected by employment and prosperity, with one key driver of health outcomes being poverty, therefore this framework would support the health agenda.
- 9.3 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services noted the importance of seeking investment in infrastructure and skills, particularly noting the investment in the successful apprenticeship strategy. Continued investment into careers fairs would also be important as they supported young people into employment.
- 9.4 The Cabinet Member for Finance endorsed the focus on key areas of skills, effective public services, strengthening business clusters and protection of

assets from climate change. He also endorsed the comments on silo working in the past and noted the plans to mitigate this moving forward.

- 9.5 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance noted that the digital aspect of growth had been taken into account to support setting up businesses in remote locations. Project Gigabit would allow people to upgrade their skills and access adult education. The Council's award winning LoRaWAN network was used by lots of businesses in the county and could help all sectors. Provision of a digital hub in Norwich supported new businesses.
- 9.6 The Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste felt the report was visionary and aspirational, noting the four grand challenges and how they could be built on to benefit the whole county. He noted the importance of developing industries other than farming and tourism to support employment in Norfolk.
- 9.7 The Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships noted that the Council was already supporting some aspects of the grand challenges through the work of adult learning who were supporting people to gain new skills and support job opportunities, and libraries working with business groups. This framework would build on this work and build on the economy.
- 9.8 The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management noted that Hethel Innovation Ltd and Scottow Enterprise Park were encouraging Small and Medium-sized Enterprises and small business start-ups, which was supporting young people to get into business.
- 9.9 The Vice-Chairman thanked officers for their work on this framework, engaging with colleges, the University, business and voluntary sector to ensure they had a chance to have a say in how Norfolk was developed moving forward
- 9.10 The Chairman noted the amount of work that had been done collaboratively and that the framework underpinned the work of Better Together for Norfolk.
- 9.11 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to endorse the Investment Framework, prioritise the four areas for county investment, and encourage partners to invest in these shared objectives.
- 9.12 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**
Cabinet agreed the commissioning of this evidence base and framework in August 2021, with the rationale clearly set out in the paper. A strong evidence base, and clearly defined investment priorities, agreed with local stakeholders, would be required to compete for future funding and help the county build back better after the pandemic. The previous evidence-base only existed at a Norfolk and Suffolk level, and was commissioned by New Anglia LEP before the pandemic.

This new evidence base will support us to deliver a seismic shift in approach, seeking to improve pay, productivity and skills levels, and setting a framework for economic intervention. It is already proving invaluable in informing our proposals for a County Deal for Norfolk and will also be shared with district council colleagues and more widely with other partner organisations to support collaborative working towards a shared growth ambition for Norfolk.

Alternative Options

- 9.13 The report in August 2021 outlined the alternative options, including doing nothing and simply responding to calls for funding as they arise. This was not felt to be the best policy, as it would not deliver the strategic ambition to create a step-change in the economic profile of the county.

Alternative priorities could have been chosen for the Investment Framework, but there is a significant evidence-base that confirms that the four 'grand challenges' chosen represent the most important and pressing ones for the county as a whole.

10. Delivering a social care quality framework for Norfolk

- 10.1.1 Cabinet received the report setting out an update on the actions that have been undertaken to date and the proposed direction and governance to build a system approach for social care quality improvement across Norfolk.
- 10.1.2 The Executive Director for Adult Social Services introduced the report to Cabinet
- People in Norfolk deserve access to good quality care
 - Good or Outstanding care in Norfolk was at 70% compared to 83% nationally and 84% regionally. There was a target in Norfolk to reach 85%.
 - A co-production approach had been taken, and the report was open about the challenges faced.
 - Many actions had been taken, as set out in Section 4 of the report, but it was important to note that people and their views would be at the heart of the approach.
 - The report outlined that to reach the target of 85% as described above, 40 residential care homes would need to be improved or asked to leave the market if they were unable to do so and 11 nursing and home support providers.
- 10.1.3 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention introduced the report to Cabinet:
- The report supported the ambition for good quality care for all. It was important to note that the care was provided by independent businesses and not the council.
 - The Care act 2014 gave the council a duty to help influence independent providers to be the best that they can and the council had been looking at this for some time. This framework had been to People and Communities Select Committee and a cross party Member group had been set up to look at issues in the care market. This group came up with recommendations and proposals and an action plan that went back to the Select Committee in 2021 and to the Performance Review Panel, chaired by the Deputy Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention, in 2022.
 - There were 27,000 people employed in care in Norfolk and it was felt the cohesion around training support and recruitment could be pulled together better to increase its effectiveness.
 - It was felt that there was a role for the NHS in this arena, and it was important to challenge and work with them on the services they provided including on dementia care and providing more nursing care, which had a low supply.

- This framework pulled together key areas which had been talked about for some time and aims to work together with partners.
- The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

10.2 The Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste noted that the report recognised issues in the service and was a springboard for action which would benefit communities.

10.3 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance noted that the action plan stated that an aim for Norfolk to be a place where everyone could access good quality social care, and as a county with a higher-than-average older population it was important to work together to achieve this.

10.4 The Chairman noted the importance of co-production work to put this in place.

10.5 Cabinet **RESOLVED**

- To agree the approach for building a system wide strategic framework to secure care quality improvement in Norfolk
- To endorse the proposed governance arrangements for the oversight of this work

10.6 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

The quality of social care provision in Norfolk is low compared to the rest of the region and nationally. A different approach is needed to increase awareness and ownership of the reasons for poorer care quality and a joint approach to addressing change.

10.7 **Alternative Options**

None identified.

11. Capital Schools Programme

11.1.1 Cabinet received the report setting out a refreshed schools' capital programme and the updated financial position on other funding income and borrowing implications for Norfolk County Council.

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

- A formula was in place to determine where schools would be built based on development of housing across the county, influenced by local demographics. This programme of school development was reviewed through the year to see if there was a need for uplifts for specific programmes.
- Developers had pre-purchased some materials, so no issues were foreseen at the time of reporting.
- The letter to Government from Natural England had brought a halt to most housing development so this may impact on the programme as set out.
- Government support for school development over the past years had been positive.
- A report was being taken to the Capital Development Group regarding increasing the standard of insulation in existing schools.

- 11.2 The Vice-Chairman noted the impact of the Natural England letter on housebuilding and the need to address this so development could progress.
- 11.3 The Cabinet Member for Finance congratulated the department for receipt of additional capital funding particularly in relation to the SEND school development programme. This spend would need to be monitored carefully. He noted the issues regarding the delay on house building and noted that paragraph 9.4 of the report raised in an interesting point. The risks of funds not being available due to issues outside of the Council's control were very real.
- 11.4 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance noted that children going to good schools was important for supporting future employment so this report would support development of the Norfolk economy.
- 11.5 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:
- Agree the proposed Schools' Capital Programme for the next three years and beyond, and agree the inclusion of new schemes added
 - Review annually the funding gap taking into account other sources of external funding which have come forward
 - Note the impact of external grant funding received and revised financial profiling for NCC borrowing.

11.6 Evidence and Reasons for Decision

The 'Norfolk multiplier' for new homes is 28.1 primary age children per 100 homes (4 per year group) and 14.5 secondary age children per 100 homes (3 per year group). This is an average, with some parts of the County producing higher numbers and other parts lower. New developments can produce new patterns of place demand, and therefore an average can allow for variation.

Development size	New primary places	New secondary places
500	140	73
800	225	116
1000	281	145
1500	422	218

11.7 Alternative Options

The alternative option would be to only build places within the capital grant. The implication of this is a likely sharp increase in school transport costs and number of journeys across the County to provide school places as children attend schools outside of their catchment area.

12. Creation of GNGB Strategic Investment Fund

- 12.1.1 Cabinet received the report providing the background to the Greater Norwich Growth Board (GNGB) recommendation to drawdown £20m City Deal Borrowing to create a cyclable programme of funding to bring forward the delivery of major community infrastructure projects.
- 12.1.2 The Chairman introduced the report to Cabinet:

- The report was about the opportunity to bring forward major community infrastructure projects following the Greater Norwich Growth Board (GNGB) recommended to draw down £20m City Deal borrowing to create a cyclical programme of funding.
- In June 2021 the GNGB endorsed the in principle draw down of £20m city borrowing to create the cyclical programme of funding to create community infrastructure projects.
- Members of the GNGB were Broadland District Council, Norwich City Council and South Norfolk District Council as planning authorities, Norfolk County Council and the Local Enterprise Partnership, who jointly undertook to repay borrowing and interest through annual instalments from the infrastructure investment fund known as pooled CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy).
- The new strategic infrastructure fund would be used to finance projects sponsored by local district councils working with local developers. Developer contributions for these would be placed into the strategic infrastructure fund and used through the cyclical programme to fund future community infrastructure projects.
- There would be administrative duties for the county council as the lead authority for the city deal loan. The draw down from the public works loan board would be by Norfolk County Council as the GNGB's accountable body.
- The Legal Implications were covered in section 11 of the report.
- Annex 1 of the report set out the background to the Greater Norwich City Deal allowed access to £80m of lower cost loan funding.
- The way the scheme would work was set out from page 408-409 of the report.
- Legal arrangements were set out in section 5 of the report. Managing the cost of the infrastructure fund governance and reporting was set out in sections 6,7 and 8 of the report.
- The Chairman moved the recommendations as set out in the report

12.2 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention noted that this was about leveraging funding for future employment and the County and district councils working together to deliver outcomes for residents. He noted that effective Government policy was being delivered across this joint working and cross-party working arrangement.

12.3 The Chairman noted that there was also a Greater Norwich Growth Partnership and Local Plan; the three planning authorities, Norfolk County Council and Local Enterprise Partnership had worked together on these. .

12.4 Cabinet **RESOLVED**

1. To acknowledge the GNGB proposal to set up the Strategic Investment Fund as set out in Annex 1 of the report.
2. To agree that the County Council will act on behalf of the members of the GNGB as administrator of the £20m City Deal borrowing.

12.5 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

Annex 1 attached to the report provides the details of the GNGB proposal and the associated governance around the subsequent loan process.

This proposal enables the GNGB to accelerate the development of community infrastructure projects within the Greater Norwich area whilst transferring the risk to the district council who act as lead authority for each individual project.

12.6 Alternative Options

To create this new investment fund, no viable alternative options have been identified to the recommendations in this report.

13. Annual Treasury Management Outturn Report 2021-22

13.1.1 Cabinet received the report providing information on the Treasury Management activities of the County Council for the period 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2022.

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

- This report was a backward-looking report giving an overview of the treasury activities for the previous year, 2021-22, and compliance with policy and strategy.
- The Council's gross external debt at 31 March 2022 was £901m including debt for PFI schemes and leasing. The level of actual debt was £854m. Norfolk County Council was committed to pay the unitary charge including debt to PFI providers and lease companies, so the gross debt was higher than actual debt.
- During the year, the council borrowed £110m; £80m as planned plus £30m deferred from 2020-21. This was used to fund previously agreed capital expenditure.
- The council took advantage of historically low long-term borrowing rates to fulfil borrowing earlier. Table 9.3 of the report showed when borrowing occurred, which was mostly in June, July and November 2021. The average cost was 1.78% fixed. Fifty-year Public Works Loan Board loan rates were around 2.4% at 31 March 2022 for comparison. The decision to borrow early therefore contributed £700,000 to savings for the council.
- Paragraph 7.1 of the report showed the bank rates rising after the council had completed borrowing requirements.
- Last month, May 2022, the strategy paper to Cabinet budgeted for an additional £80m of borrowing requirements in 2022-23. In view of this earlier borrowing, the average level of cash balances in 2021-22 was £291m.
- A more forensic approach was being taken to strategic decision making and officers would monitor whether the £80m borrowing would be required in 2022-23.
- Average interest rates earned in 2021-22 were 0.27%.
- Appendix B of the report noted the £5m repaid last year, saving £283,000 of interest. Some of the historic £5m debt repaid had interest of over 9%. Cabinet were asked to note that repayment would rise to over £15m in 22-23 and as table 9.5 of the report showed, would increase to £18.8m in 2024-25 and £25m the following year.
- Interests paid on external borrowing in 2021-22 was £30.904m. Average interest rates paid had fallen from 3.99% to 3.69%. This period of rising repayment levels and interest rates coincided with the end of the period of taking advantage of overprovided MRP had seen the repositioning of how the council accounted for MRP. Capital receipts of £8.9m and voluntary revenue contribution of £1.73m had been used to fund capital expenditure

of short life assets in 2021-22 reducing NRP requirements for future years.

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

13.2 The Chairman noted that this report was backward-looking however also showed expectations of future growth.

13.3 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to endorse and recommend to County Council the Annual Treasury Management Outturn Report 2021-22 as set out in Annex 1 of the report.

13.4 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

The annex attached to the report sets out details of treasury management activities and outcomes for 2021-22, including:

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

The Council's Treasury Management Panel has discussed and endorsed the recommendations in this report.

13.5 **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.

14. **Finance Monitoring Report 2021-22 Outturn**

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

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

- This was a historic report and gave confirmation that a balanced budget had successfully been brought. Nothing was carried over which would impact the ability to bring a balanced budget in March 2023.
- The council's £439.94m net budget had been successfully brought in line with last year's forecast and after transferring £77,000 to general reserves, balances had been increased to £23.84m.
- When the budget was set, reserves and provisions were estimated at £111.8m, but actual balances were found to be higher as a result of grants being brought forward including Covid-19 grants and use of reserves being deferred. Reserves and provisions were £50.5m higher than forecast at £178m. Commentary supplied by Adult Social Services at paragraphs 2.20 and 2.21 of the report were useful to note. 2022-23 would be a difficult financial year and Adult Social Services had therefore built a reserve to manage risk. The service was likely to require funds to manage pressures and wider transformational requirements in 2022-23 and beyond.

- In December 2021, the decision was taken to roll forward £18m of Covid-19 MHCLG grant tranche 5 funding to support the 2022-23 budget. Net total reserves and provisions at March 2022 were therefore £94.058 higher than assumed when the budget was set.
- Underlying pressures in Children's and Adult Social Services were shown in the report; overspend in Children's Services had been reduced to allow a minor underspend at the end of the year. Children's Services had received 100% of the savings budgeted.
- £8.9m of business reserves had contributed to a 91% savings achieved in Adult Social Services and this would be carried forward to next year and would contribute to a continued reliance on reserves. The challenge on Adult Social Services to meet the KPIs was a clear indication of the difficulties meeting the department and similar ones were seen in Children's Services, as set out in paragraph 2.5 of the report. These pressures were known and catered for in departmental reserves.
- Capital finance outturn included capex for 2021-22 of £254.869 of which £111.335m comprised prudential borrowing; total capital expenditure shown on page 543 appendix 3 of the report.
- The financing programme was shown on page 544 table 4 of the report.
- The Cabinet Member for Finance moved a change to recommendation 4 to say "to note" instead of "recommend to full Council" and moved the other recommendations as set out in the report.

14.2 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services was happy to report that a new SEND school had recently been opened in Fakenham.

14.3 Cabinet **RESOLVED**

1. To recognise that the revenue outturn for 2021-22 is a **balanced budget after transferring £0.077m to the general fund**
2. To note the COVID-19 funding available of **£106.490m**, including £27.382m brought forward from 2020-21 and the carry forward of **£31.125m** COVID-19 funding to 2022-23 to mitigate the on-going cost pressures and risks associated with infection prevention;
3. To recognise the saving shortfall of **£3.830m**; being 91% savings delivery in 2021-22, as described in Appendix 1 paragraph 6 of the report;
4. To note that the General Balances at 31 March 2022 be increased to **£23.840m** after a transfer of £0.077m from non-COVID related savings and underspends in Finance General.
5. To note the expenditure and funding of the revised current and future 2022-26 capital programmes, including the addition of £10.653m to the capital programme to address the capital funding requirements from various external sources as set out in Appendix 3, paragraph 1.3 of the report.

14.4 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

Three appendices are attached to the 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 grant income
- Changes to the approved budget
- Reserves

- Savings

Appendix 2 summarises the key working capital position, including:

- Treasury management
- Payment performance and debt recovery.

Appendix 3 summarises the capital outturn position, and includes:

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

Additional capital funds will enable services to invest in assets and infrastructure as described in Appendix 3 section 4 of the report.

14.5 **Alternative Options**

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 further grant or revenue funding has been identified to fund the expenditure, apart from the funding noted in Appendix 3 of the report.

15. **Disposal, Acquisition & Exploitation of Property**

- 15.1.1 Cabinet received the report setting out proposals aimed at supporting Norfolk County Council priorities by exploiting properties surplus to operational requirements, pro-actively releasing property assets with latent value where the operational needs can be met from elsewhere and strategically acquiring property to drive economic growth and wellbeing in the County.
- 15.1.2 The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management introduced the report to Cabinet:
- In November 2021, Norfolk County Council adopted the strategic property asset management framework 2021-22 to 2026-27 as policy. This had links to the council's priorities and Better Together for Norfolk. This framework had been through Corporate Select Committee and Scrutiny Committee before being approved.
 - The framework established the rules, cultures and key principles for management and exploitation of the property portfolio.
 - Appendix 1 of the report showed the outlined principles of the proposed policy covering the procedures which were set out in paragraph 2.1 of the report. On adoption of the policy these would be published on the Council's website
 - The second recommendation was to deal with the extension of a service level agreement with NPS property consultants to deliver property services to the council. As part of good contract management, the Service Level Agreement (SLA) was reviewed regularly, and performance and cost benchmarked. The council asked NPS to propose an extension to the current SLA of 3 years as it provided high quality services to the council and local residents. Fine tuning had been made to the SLA and savings and efficiencies made by NPS which were passed on to the council.
 - The third recommendation was disposal of county farms land. A review of the estate identified 8 land and property assets as surplus to operational

needs. Following a review by the Director of Property they were to be declared surplus to county council use. In each case the corporate property strategy group had confirmed there was no county council service use for the sites. Work would be undertaken to ascertain the value of the assets and it was proposed for them to be declared surplus so they could be disposed of or exploited to derive an income; disposals would be via open auction or tender.

- The fourth recommendation was regarding Thorpe Hamlet Daycare Nursery on the Lionwood Junior School Site, which was an academy school of Inclusive Schools Plus. In line with the approach for former children's centre buildings co-located with schools, it was proposed for a 125 year supplemental lease to be granted to Inclusive Schools Plus at nil rent in respect of the daycare nursery to provide early learning services. This would allow the County Council to meet sufficiency requirements of nursery places in the area.
- The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

15.2 Cabinet **RESOLVED**

1. To reaffirm the current procedures and principles as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report for:
 - Declaring Norfolk County Council property assets (land and buildings) surplus.
 - Disposal, overage and clawback for the disposal of property assets (land and buildings) owned by Norfolk County Council.
 - Third party occupation of Norfolk County Council property assets (land and buildings).
 - Acquisition - Leased in/licensed in property assets (land and buildings), acquisition of freehold property assets (land and buildings).
2. To agree to the extension of the Service Level Agreement (SLA) with NPS Property Consultants for a further three years from 1 April 2023 terminating on 31 March 2026.
3. To formally declare the 8 Land and property holdings from the County Farms estate, as listed in Table 1 of the report, surplus to Council requirements and instruct the Director of Property to dispose. In the event of a disposal receipt for an individual property exceeding delegated limits the Director of Property in consultation with the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services and Cabinet Member for Commercial Services & Asset Management is authorised to accept the most advantageous offer.
4. To agree to the granting of a supplemental lease of Thorpe Hamlet Day Care Nursery, 63 Wolfe Road, Thorpe Hamlet Norwich NR1 4HT (4114/043) to Inclusive Schools Trust for use as nursery and early years provision on the agreed terms.

15.3 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

In respect of the Corporate Property Policies, adoption will improve the understanding of the procedures of disposing and acquiring property.

The reasons for extending Service Level Agreement (SLA) with NPS Property Consultants are outlined in the report.

In respect of leasing out Thorpe Hamlet Day Care Nursery it will ensure the continued use of the site for nursery and early years provision.

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.

15.4 **Alternative Options**

The adoption of the Corporate Property Policies formally acknowledges the current procedures and principles, the alternative would be not to do so.

Not to extend the Service Level Agreement (SLA) with NPS Property Consultants as permitted by the contract would mean the current contract ending 31 March 2023 and staff resources would need to be applied to negotiate a new SLA at a time when the County Council is responding to the challenges of the Covid pandemic and the international situation.

In respect of Thorpe Hamlet Day Care Nursery, no viable alternative.

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.

16. **Appointments to joint committees and internal bodies**

16.1.1 Cabinet received the report setting out appointments to Joint Committees, Internal and External bodies; authority to appoint to these bodies had been delegated to the Leader of the Council by the Council.

16.1.2 The Chairman introduced the report to Cabinet:

- Appendix a set out appointments to internal bodies, working groups and Member Champions.
- Appendix b set out appointments to Joint Committees and External Body appointments.
- The Chairman moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

16.2 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to note that the Leader has made appointments to the appropriate joint committees, internal panels/boards/working groups and external bodies, consulting with Group Leaders as to their appointees, where appropriate.

16.3 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

The Council has delegated authority to the Leader of the Council to appoint to the internal and external bodies.

16.4 **Alternative Options**

None.

17. **Reports of the Cabinet Member and Officer Delegated Decisions made since the last Cabinet meeting**

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

The meeting ended at 11:31

Chairman of Cabinet

Cabinet
6 June 2022
Public & Local Member Questions

	Public Question Time
6.1	<p>Question from Patrick West</p> <p>We have seen significant increases in footfall in and around the Town of Cromer. Our Schools also have a larger number on the roll than in previously as the population has grown.</p> <p>However, It has now been 19 years since we have seen any investment in improvements for pedestrian access, active transport, or congestion relief, despite these increasing pressures.</p> <p>We wish to see some investment on schemes focussed particularly on safer pedestrian access in various locations, but the cost of these works will be beyond Local Members Fund and or Parish Partnership Funding alone. Would you commit to working with us to secure external funding in to address these issues?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport</p> <p>Whilst in many respects the matters you raise are positive, in that they show that Cromer is one of Norfolk's many thriving market towns, I appreciate that increased footfall can bring issues of congestion and there is a need to make sure people can move around the town on foot or bicycle. The county council is keen to work with local councils and others to improve places and to make sure that towns like Cromer can continue to thrive, especially to ensure planned future growth promotes healthy lifestyles and is as sustainable as possible.</p> <p>I will therefore ask officers to make contact with you to discuss the matters you raise and see how we can work together on these issues.</p>
6.2	<p>Question from Jonathan Dunning</p> <p>Regarding item 10 on today's agenda; I am sure Cabinet will recognise that low pay is a factor in poor comparative standards of adult social care in Norfolk so would Cabinet support the payment of the Real Living Wage, as set by the Living Wage Foundation, as a minimum for all those working on NCC adult care contract</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 pay rates are determined by the employers as they seek to attract staff, which means they vary across the county. The Council has consistently supported the care market with above inflation increases (including a 6% increase last year) in the rates that it pays for care, an element of which supports maintaining the National Living Wage (currently £9.50). Some providers have told the Council that they already pay above the Real Living Wage (currently £9.90). Further detail re pay rates will be seen when home care and older adult residential care providers submit their data as part of the Government's "fair cost review", which is required to be completed this year (a 1p increase in pay rates is a cost of c£200,000 to the Council). It is important to remember that pay is not the only factor impacting on recruitment and retention of staff, career progression and job satisfaction are also factors. The Council, in partnership with the European Social Fund, provides free training for staff working in the sector to support development of staff skills and competencies and to provide opportunities for career development. The Council has also invested heavily in supporting provider recruitment and has funded a range of initiatives to support a greater understanding of the wider career opportunities available to people in social care and health sectors. The Council has established a Norfolk Care</p>

	<p>Academy which supports the on-boarding of applicants, supporting them to be work ready and matching them with provider vacancies. Our Norfolk Care Careers website provides a free platform for providers to advertise their jobs as all local advertising signposts applicants to this website.</p>
6.3	<p>Question from Mary Curson Norfolk County Council are developing a Climate Action Plan. Good practice is to engage with local community groups and other interested parties as part of the development process. Will the responsible Councillor and appropriate Council Officers enter into a dialogue with, for example, Norwich Friends of the Earth, to help formulate a robust Climate Action Plan?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste The County Council's Climate Action Plan, following on from the adoption of our new Environmental Policy, will be developed over the coming months in partnership with key organisations including our District Councils, primarily through the Council's role within the Norfolk Climate Change Partnership (NCCP).</p> <p>In order to create a robust Climate Change Action Plan, officers will engage with a wide group of stakeholders and appropriate experts. Elected Members will continue to engage with this vital work through the County Council's committee structures and through the Environmental Member Oversight Group, chaired by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste.</p> <p>Supplementary question from Mary Curson No constituent should have to trawl through pages of documents, across various policies, to establish what climate action is being taken. Will Norfolk County Council's Climate Action Plan be fully budgeted, timed and accessible, with a dedicated net-zero date, not only for the Council's Estate but also the County of Norfolk?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste Norfolk County Council has committed to developing a new Climate Action Plan which will set out our goals, ambitions and targets in a clear and accessible format, including those areas where we will work with other stakeholders and partners across the County, as distinct from our own estate.</p>

**Cabinet
6 June 2022
Local Member Questions**

	Local Member Issues/Questions
7.1	<p>Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp The QEH Management have written to the Leader, asking him to write a letter to the Govt, as Leader of this Council, in support of their Strategic Outline Business Case and have offered to brief him, but have not yet had a reply. Has the Leader written to the Govt in strong support of the SOBC? There is no Plan B for King's Lynn beyond 2030, if Government does not fund the rebuild of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Parts of our hospital could have to close. Last May, this Council unanimously agreed my cross-party Motion to support the QEH in every way possible.</p> <p>Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategy and Governance Thank you for your question. A letter in response to the Strategic Outline Business Case was sent on 24 05 22.</p>
7.2	<p>Question from Cllr Rob Colwell I've heard from residents angry at the lack of walking and cycling routes out of King's Lynn to the east, with the A149 needing an over or under route to allow people to safely explore the beautiful West Norfolk Countryside. Will Councillor Wilby not only meet with me when he is next in the west to see first hand the problem, but reassure residents that this scheme will get the priority and funding it deserves?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport In partnership with the Borough Council we have recently developed a Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP) for King's Lynn. This has highlighted the need for improved crossing facilities over the A149, particularly to the north near Knights Hill and in the south nearer to Hardwick roundabout where we are keen to provide good Active Travel (walking and cycling) routes into the town from the West Winch growth area.</p> <p>We are also keen to update the Kings Lynn Transport Strategy, adopted in spring 2020, to incorporate the LCWIP measures and provide an updated Implementation Plan to guide investment. Subject to an internal growth bid we could commence this work next year.</p> <p>In the longer term, we have a strategic priority to improve the A149. To get government funding for this, the scheme must include extensive public transport and Active Travel aspects and these, of necessity, will include measures to assist pedestrians and cyclists crossing the road</p> <p>Supplementary question from Cllr Rob Colwell With the County Council only receiving £955,000 out of the £2,465,000 it bid for to get funding from tranche 3 of the Government's Active Travel Funding (for walking and cycling schemes) will you now publicise a new list that updates the original proposed schemes showing which ones have now been lost and which ones will go ahead?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport</p>

	<p>As this news has only recently been announced, we will provide an update on the County Council website shortly.</p>
7.3	<p>Question from Cllr Saul Penfold Now that the government policies on discharging patients from hospital into care homes at the onset of the pandemic have been declared "unlawful" can you tell us how many deaths resulted from this in Norfolk and would you like to take the opportunity to apologise to all those who lost loved ones?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention Thank you for your question. I view every Covid related death during this pandemic as a tragedy and I am sure that you do as well. As you yourself state, the policy in question was not made or decided by Norfolk County Council, it is a matter of record that there were 713 Covid related deaths in care homes in Norfolk, it is not possible to know the route of introduction of infections of Covid into a specific setting once we had the levels of community infection we had during the pandemic, infections could come from any route. Care homes are part of Norfolk's communities and infections could come from visitors, staff or other admissions of residents.</p>
7.4	<p>Question from Cllr Brian Watkins The Chairman of the Office for Budget Responsibility has said that the impact of Brexit on the UK economy will be worse in the long run than that of the coronavirus pandemic. Would you accept that the problems caused by Brexit to the economy will be more long lasting and severe than people were led to believe during the referendum?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy Thank you for your question. I do not agree with your assessment. I think that for those who promised immediate economic collapse following the leave vote, which did not happen, there are very few strings to grasp on to now and this question is one.</p> <p>Global finances face a myriad of pressures, not least the war in Ukraine. The UK economy remains strong and is enjoying better rates of growth than many of those who remain within the European Union.</p> <p>Second Question from Cllr Brian Watkins We are all aware that there was a sharp increase in scams during the pandemic, with many older and vulnerable people being put at particular risk. Many will now face cold calling from criminals asking for bank details so that they can illegally obtain the £150 energy rebate, and further Government cost-of-living hardship payments. What help and advice can the Council provide to help protect people against this type of criminal activity?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships The council chairs the Norfolk Against Scams Partnership (NASP), Partners including the police, councils, voluntary organisations and businesses, work together to support residents and businesses in Norfolk to help protect them from scams, doorstep crime and fraud. The partners are committed to work together to raise awareness of scams.</p>

	<p>Together they take a stand against scams by assisting people to protect themselves, helping prevent people from being targeted by criminals; and identifying and supporting any victims of scams. The aims of the partnership are captured in the NASP charter.</p> <p>Criminals are quick to adapt, taking advantage of confusion over financial offers. The Trading Standards service issues scam alerts to both consumers and businesses on a weekly basis and people can sign up to receive a weekly email, detailing the latest scams, via the council website at: www.norfolk.gov.uk/business/trading-standards/scams . Trading Standards, along with other NASP partners will also continue to use media (including social media) opportunities to promote scam awareness and avoidance.</p>
7.5	<p>Question from Cllr Lucy Shires What do you think about people struggling so much with the cost of living crisis that they are having to go to the library to stay warm?</p> <p>Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Governance and Strategy The county's libraries have always provided a safe and welcoming space for residents in need. Where people arrive and have additional worries and financial concern the library teams are able to connect them to wider support offers such as the Norfolk Assistance Scheme. The recent Household Support Fund scheme has allocated £2.2m to specifically support people aged over 65 which should help a significant number of our residents</p>
7.6	<p>Question from Cllr Sharon Blundell Norfolk's Assistance Scheme says "If you have adequate savings to meet your basic living needs, unfortunately your application will be refused." How much in savings is considered adequate?</p> <p>Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Governance and Strategy Norfolk's Assistance Scheme will disregard up to £1,000 in savings. However, discretion may be applied in certain circumstances. For example, an elderly client with specific savings for a funeral.</p> <p>Second question from Cllr Sharon Blundell Can you tell us how people will be able to access the food hubs within the Nourishing Norfolk Network if they can't afford to drive there?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services The food hubs which we have helped to fund, and are developed by the voluntary sector in conjunction with Norfolk Community Foundation, have been located in places where they provide the easiest access for residents in need. In the case of the Breckland bus, there is mobile provision to help reach a wider range of customers. The number of hubs is due to increase over the course of this year with 15 planned to open by the end of 2022.</p>
7.7	<p>Question from Cllr Dan Roper What is the council's current credit rating?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Finance</p>

	<p>Thank you for your question.</p> <p>Like most local authorities, the County Council does not have nor require a credit rating as most of its borrowing is from the Public Works Loan Board. A few local authorities have obtained a credit rating when seeking to raise funding from the capital markets. This is a requirement for a bond issue when tend to be for a minimum of £250m. There is a cost to obtaining and maintaining a credit rating.</p>
7.8	<p>Question from Cllr Tim Adams Can the cabinet member confirm we have the lowest ever levels of roadworks and that there are significant delays in delivering repairs. Are there issues with this contract that we as Councillors need to be aware of?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport. Work on the highway is carried out by a wide range of organisations. For example, gas, water or broadband companies undertaking repairs or laying new apparatus. The recent extensive works on Sweetbriar Road in Norwich were the responsibility of Anglian Water. The County Council does undertake various repairs or improvements, via a range of contracts for the purposes of maintaining and improving the road network.</p> <p>The Highway Capital Programme was approved at Cabinet on 7 March 2022. This detailed the budget for 2022/23 and the next 2 years.</p> <p>We have a large highway capital programme which currently includes major expenditure on the Third River Crossing in Great Yarmouth</p> <p>The recent highway capital programme financial out-turns were; - 2019-20 £69,198,338 2020-21 £96,942,350 2021-22 £103,521,716</p> <p>These figures include a capital maintenance spend of 2019-20 £30,263,759.91 2020-21 £55,314,218.12 2021-22 £45,867,140</p> <p>Capital maintenance funding was boosted in 2020-21 by additional Government grants during the Covid Pandemic.</p> <p>In the last 12 months (June 2021 to May 2022), 97.2% of the highest priority defects (Priority A & Priority B) have been completed within the required timescales. 88.1% of the less urgent defects (Priority C and D) have been completed within timescales.</p> <p>Second question from Cllr Tim Adams What will be the impact of the removal of the £100m Government Weight Management (public health grant) on Norfolk?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention.</p>

	<p>Thank you for your question. The grant was announced as a one-off fund in 2021/2022 and in Norfolk we focused the investment on meeting the needs of BAME communities, people with Severe Mental Health conditions, and in supporting men to manage their weight. These remain key priority groups for the Council and as a result I am delighted to confirm that for the financial year 2022/2023 Norfolk County Council is able continue to fund these services from its core Public Health Grant. Our routinely commissioned T2 Weight Management Service at Slimming World also continues unaffected.</p> <p>In the interests of clarity, it should be noted that the Government's announcement of 1 April 2022 in relation to the additional funding for local authority commissioned adult tier two behavioural weight management services was that this would "not be available in the financial year 2022-23". We do not know the Government's intention in relation to funding in future years.</p>
7.9	<p>Question from Cllr Alison Birmingham In respect of the decision to close Woodside Nursery, can the Cabinet Member for Childrens Services confirm where and when was the decision to close was taken, what alternatives were considered and how will the reduction in places affect the overall provision?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services Our sufficiency analysis indicates there is no shortage of childcare in the local area for September.</p> <p>The nursery has been in financial deficit for a number of years, which meant that this was an unsustainable position.</p> <p>Senior officers reviewed all options in the Spring Term. The council has considered other options to enable the nursery to stay open. These have included increasing income by increasing fees, reducing expenditure, and closing the baby room permanently in February this year to make the best use of the remaining staff. Consideration has also been given to transferring the nursery to another provider, but as there is already a surplus of childcare places locally and a relatively small number of places at Woodside, the best approach for continuity of childcare for families, support for local providers and financial viability was closure. The final decision to pursue closure was made by the Learning and Inclusion Leadership Team on April 22nd 2022.</p> <p>Supplementary question from Alison Birmingham What steps are being made to assist children to move and settle into new nurseries and what plans are there for the site, which will incur costs even if left empty?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services The nursery is not planned to close until 31st August and we expect to maintain provision until this date.</p> <p>Families have been signposted to the Family Information Service who have an up to date detailed list of childcare capacity in the local area. Any parents who make enquires should contact them via 0344 8008020 or email fis@norfolk.gov.uk. Our sufficiency analysis indicates there is no shortage of childcare in the local area.</p>

	<p>The building will be in use until the end of August when the council will consider the options regarding future use.</p>
7.10	<p>Question from Cllr Brenda Jones Can the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention confirm what provisions are written into contracts with private sector care providers to ensure that care staff actually receive all the money paid by the council to improve their terms and conditions and how is this monitored?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention Thank you for your question. As you have said in your question care providers are independent companies and therefore rates of pay are set by them for their employees and will vary from firm to firm across the county. The calculation of the amount the council pays for care will be made up of numerous elements that any company would expect to incur and comes to Cabinet for a decision every year. The specific Covid grants that related to workforce support required a signed return from the provider to confirm that it was spent in line with the conditions of each specific grant. The recent report to the Scrutiny Meeting on May 18th on these Covid related grants contains a significant amount of detail if you require more information.</p> <p>Supplementary question from Cllr Brenda Jones What provisions are written into contracts with private sector care providers to ensure that care staff are adequately trained and how is this monitored?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention The Council's framework agreements have a clause: "The provider must ensure that the number and skills of staff are enough to meet the needs of the residents presently residing in the care (service)". Further clauses go on to reference planned induction, development and training (including specialist training, where required) and effective supervision.</p> <p>The Council's Integrated Quality Service monitor compliance with the contract via comprehensive Provider Assurance and Market Management Solution (PAMMS) audits and focussed Quality Monitoring Visits. From a combination of review of training matrices, interviews with staff and observing practice, evidence is gathered to inform our published reports. Providers are supported to improve and held to account in accordance with our Improvement and Escalation Policy. This exactly replicates the statutory duty imposed on all registered care services under the Health and Social Care Act 2008 which is monitored by the Care Quality Commission.</p>
7.11	<p>Question from Cllr Emma Corlett Can the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention confirm how many patient on patient assaults have been reported to Norfolk County Council Safeguarding between May 2019 and May 2022 relating to NSFT in-patient wards in Norfolk, or Norfolk patients placed by NSFT in out of Trust or Out of Area beds?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention Thank you for your question. The information is not collated in the form that has been asked for in the question and it is therefore difficult to respond in the timeframe</p>

	<p>available. Patient upon patient safeguarding concerns cannot be easily deciphered from the overall NHS NSFT safeguarding referrals received. However the Safeguarding Team is able to examine in depth the NHS NSFT referrals and site locations and feed back to you at a later date.</p>
7.12	<p>Question from Cllr Chrissie Rumsby Can the Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships confirm the approach she will take in engaging and providing a response to the recently published Government White Paper “Reforming Our Fire and Rescue Service”?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships I will be meeting with the Chief Fire Officer and the Assistant Director of Performance & Governance on 08 June to discuss the approach that will be taken in engaging over, and providing a response to, the “Reforming our Fire & Rescue Service” White Paper. We will discuss the correct forum for dissemination of response after this.</p>
7.13	<p>Question from Cllr Jamie Osborn Community energy has the potential to power 2.2 million homes by 2030 and help increase energy security, reduce fuel bills, create local jobs, and reduce carbon emissions. Yet current licensing rules make it virtually impossible for local community energy schemes to get off the ground. The Local Energy Bill which is before Parliament and is backed by over 100 local authorities and over 300 MPs. Will Norfolk County Council add its backing to this bill?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste We are supportive of any initiative that will help increase energy security, reduce fuel bills, create local jobs, and reduce carbon emissions. Norfolk County Council will consider fully the implications arising from any new Government legislation relating to local community energy, including through our Committees, at the Environmental Member Oversight Group (MOG), and through the Net Zero Board, chaired by the Head of Paid Service.</p> <p>On a practical level, Norfolk County Council has commissioned a LEAR (a Local Energy Asset Representation). This is a modelling tool that creates a baseline of energy assets within a local area to help understand energy constraints such as - energy demand, generation, storage and distribution assets, energy network constraints, and social factors like fuel poverty We hope to use this to help develop local energy projects.</p> <p>Second question from Cllr Jamie Osborn How are Norfolk County Council working with Evolution Academy Trust to ensure that the site at Angel Road continues as a site of community value?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children’s Services We are working with Evolution Academy Trust and the Department for Education to secure the return of the site to Norfolk County Council, when future use will be considered in line with policy.</p>
7.14	<p>Question from Cllr Ben Price Over the past year, opposition councillors have asked why there was no carbon assessment in the LTP4 that councillors were asked to vote on in November. We were repeatedly assured that details would be provided in the LTP4 Implementation</p>

	<p>Plan. The plan that is now published contains no quantified detail on how carbon targets are to be met.</p> <p>Does the Committee agree that in order to fulfil the mandate set by the vote in November, the quantifiable carbon reduction associated with actions in the implementation plan should be set out in detail?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport The Local Transport Plan has been prepared taking into account government guidance and sets out a target for carbon reduction together with a range of actions showing how the target will be met including reducing travel, mode shift to active travel and public transport, and a shift to clean fuels such as a switch to electric vehicles. We still await guidance on local transport plans and, as has been consistently stated, this will be given due consideration and any action considered necessary as a result taken. Until guidance is published, we do not know what it might say. It is considered better to move forward to adoption of an up to date plan rather than face a delay of what is likely to be over a year and potentially significantly longer.</p> <p>Supplementary question from Cllr Ben Price The Climate Change Committee states that at least a 12% reduction in total vehicle miles is needed, even with electrification, to meet carbon reduction targets. Why does the Implementation Plan not set quantifiable targets for reductions in total vehicle mileage?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport A range of actions will be needed in order to meet carbon reduction targets, not just a reduction in vehicle mileage. Progress against the pathway outlined in the plan for carbon reduction will be monitored and this will allow the range of actions to be tailored to take account of progress against meeting the target.</p>
7.15	<p>Question from Cllr Paul Neale Following the murder of Bobbi-Anne McLeod, Plymouth Council has established a commission on violence against women and girls and is implementing a training programme across schools, businesses, and social settings such as sports clubs to train men and boys to recognise and challenge misogynistic and inappropriate behaviour targeting women and girls. Will the Cabinet Member explore setting up a similar commission for Norfolk?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for the Leader and Cabinet Member for Governance and Strategy Thank you for your question. It raises some very important issues. I am working with the new Leader of Plymouth Council for the LGA and I will be happy discuss that with him and see if something similar for Norfolk is appropriate.</p> <p>Second question from Cllr Paul Neale Fuel bills are set to rise another £800 in October. Other county and unitary local authorities are collaborating with partners in establishing retrofit advice units to help with insulating homes to permanently bring down fuel bills. Will Norfolk County Council commit to the same to reduce the impact of the price rises?</p> <p>Response from the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste</p>

	We will pick this matter up at the next Environment Policy Member Oversight Group and agree how to address this.
--	--