



**Norfolk** County Council  
at your service

## Council

Date: **Monday 19 January 2009**

Time: **10.00am**

Venue: **Council Chamber, County Hall, Norwich**

**Persons attending the meeting are requested to turn off mobile phones.**

### Prayers

### To Call the Roll

### AGENDA

1. **Minutes**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on (Page )  
24 November 2008

2. **To receive any announcements from the Chairman**

3. **Members to Declare any Interests**

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

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

4. **Notice of Motion**

- 4.1 Notice of the following motion has been given in accordance with Rule 10 of the Council Procedure Rules:-

Notice by Mrs B J Lashley, seconded by Mr J M Joyce

“This Council resolves that every report to members shall include a paragraph on the climate change issues in relation to the matters under discussion in the report.

The Climate Change Strategy, which this Council has developed and agreed with the District Councils in Norfolk, is to be launched on 6th February. It is right, therefore, that we now show we are serious about implementing our strategy. Such a reference in each report would indicate that consideration of climate change issues is embedded in our deliberations and decision-making, and would act as a prompt to both officers and members.”

5. **Cabinet Recommendation**

Meeting held on 5 January 2009 (Page )

6. **Standards Committee – Appointment of Independent Member**

A panel of the Standards Committee is to interview candidates for the vacant Independent Member position on 15 January 2009. The Relevant Authorities (Standards Committee) Regulations 2001 state that a person may not be appointed as an Independent member of a Standards Committee unless the appointment is approved by a majority of the members of the authority.

The Chairman of the Standards Committee will report to Council on the outcome of the interviews and recommend a candidate for appointment.

7. **County Council Elections June 2009 – Appointment of Returning Officer**

Report by Head of Democratic Services (Page )

8. **Programme of Meetings for 2009**

Report by Head of Democratic Services (Page )

9. **Reports**

**Cabinet**

Meeting held on 1 December 2008	(Page	)
Meeting held on 5 January 2009	(Page	)

**Cabinet Scrutiny Committee**

Meeting held on 25 November 2008	(Page	)
Meeting held on 16 December 2008	(Page	)

**Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

Meeting held on 27 November 2008	(Page	)
----------------------------------	-------	---

**Standards Committee**

Meeting held on 20 November 2008	(Page	)
----------------------------------	-------	---

**Personnel Committee**

Meeting held on 1 December 2008	(Page	)
---------------------------------	-------	---

**Planning (Regulatory) Committee**

Meeting held on 14 November 2008	(Page	)
Meeting held on 19 December 2008	(Page	)

**Joint Committees**

• Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee meeting held on 27 November 2008	(Page	)
• Joint Museums Committee meeting held on 21 November 2008	(Page	)
• Norfolk Records Committee meeting held on 21 November 2008	(Page	)

**Review Panels**

Items considered by Review Panels (for information only)	(Page	)
--	-------	---

10. **Appointments to Committees etc (Standing Item)**

- a) To note any appointments made by the Chief Executive under delegated powers:-

Mrs S.A.F Rice to replace Mr B.H.A Spratt on the Adult Social Services Review Panel

- b) To consider any proposals from Group Leaders for changes to committee membership etc

11. **To answer Questions under Rule 8.2 of the Council Procedure Rules**

12. **To Answer Questions relating to the Norfolk Police Authority**

Notice of the following question has been given in accordance with Rule 9 of the Council Procedure Rules:-

12.1 Question by Mrs C M Ward to the appointed person to respond – Mr Stephen Bett:

“A recent survey showed that few people are aware of the opportunity to participate in making decisions about the way crime is tackled in their ‘communities’ through the network of safer Neighbourhood Action Panels. Additionally 44 percent of respondents said that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with community policing.  
What action will be taken to improve participation and what if anything can Norfolk County Council do to assist?”

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

Date Agenda Published: 8 January 2009

**For further details and general enquiries about this Agenda please contact the Assistant Head of Democratic Services:**  
Greg Insull on 01603 223100 or email [greg.insull@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:greg.insull@norfolk.gov.uk)



If you need this agenda in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Greg Insull

Tel: 01603 223100

Minicom 01603 223833

Email: [greg.insull@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:greg.insull@norfolk.gov.uk) and we will do our best to help

## Norfolk County Council

### Minutes of the Meeting Held on 24 November 2008

**Present:** Mr W J Northam in the Chair

Mr A D Adams	Mr J M Joyce
Mr J R Baskerville	Mrs B J Lashley
Mr D A Baxter	Mr C B A Lloyd Owen
Mr S W Bett	Ms I V Macdonald
Mr R G Blower	Mr I J Mackie
Mrs H A Bolt	Ms M McKay
Mr A J Byrne	Mrs R V G Monbiot
Mr D R Callaby	Mr I A C Monson
Mr M R H Carttiss	Mr P W Moore
Ms J R Chamberlin	Mr B Morrey
Mr B J E Collins	Mr P D Morse
Miss E J Collishaw	Mr C M Mowle
Mr J L Collop	Mr S P Murphy
Dr B C Connell	Mr G Nobbs
Mr D R Cox	Mrs T I Paines
Mr S Dunn	Mr J H Perry-Warnes
Mr T East	Mr J F Pitt-Pladdy
Mrs J Eells	Mr A D Pond
Mrs I E Floering-Blackman	Mrs S A F Rice
Mr R F Goreham	Mr R C Rockcliffe
Mr J R Gretton	Mr J D Rogers
Mr A J Gunson	Mr D Rye
Mrs S C Gurney	Mr M Scutter
Mrs B M Hacker	Mr J Shrimplin
Mr P T Hacon	Mr B H A Spratt
Mrs G P Harris	Mr M Taylor
Mr D Harrison	Mr A D Tomkinson
Mr P Harwood	Miss J Virgo
Mr G B Hemming	Mr T J Wainwright
Mr J A Holmes	Mr B R Walker
Mr C T M How	Mrs C M Walker
Mrs J A Howe	Mrs C M Ward
Mr C Hull	Ms S J Whitaker
Mr H A S Humphrey	Mr A M White
Mrs S E Hutson	Mr A T Williams
Mr B J Iles	Mr A J Wright
Mr C R Jordan	Mr M E Wright

**Total present: 74**

## **Apologies:**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr C Armes, Mrs J Brown, Mr B Hannah, Mrs S Matthews, Mrs H Panting and Mr N Shaw.

### **1. Minutes of previous meetings**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2008 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following:

Item 4, 7<sup>th</sup> paragraph, delete the sentence: "The Administration had also taken the necessary steps to negate the lower than expected government grant received last year."

Item 5, (Re-Use of Former Lakenham First School Site), amend to read: "In response to concern raised about traffic flow on a specific day in the vicinity of the former Lakenham 1<sup>st</sup> School (now the Steiner School), Members noted that this was considered a one-off, with problems alleviated once the School Travel Plan was fully operational."

Item 6, (Final Report on the Joint Scrutiny Review of Local Bus Services), amend the second sentence to read: "He asked that consideration be given once again to setting up a Joint Bus Policy Group."

Item 6, (Partnership Working), amend to read: "The Labour Group Leader thanked the Planning and Transportation department for agreeing to continually monitor partnership working on a two-year rolling programme."

The minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2008 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following:

Item 3, page 15, penultimate paragraph, amend the third sentence to read: "The Labour Group were against a single unitary proposal and strongly believed that the current arrangements were in need of change."

### **2. Chairman's Announcements**

#### **Welcome**

The Chairman welcomed students and staff from Cromer High School and North Walsham High School who were observing the meeting.

#### **Visits to Units of the Sea, Air and Army Cadets**

The Chairman announced that he had recently visited Units of the Sea, Air and Army Cadets. At Watton, the Chairman met with two Officers from RAF Honnington, who had given up their own time to help train the Cadets.

#### **Reception for Headteachers and Teachers from Shanghai, and students from Norway**

The Chairman announced that he had hosted a reception for Headteachers and Teachers from Shanghai and also students from Norway. There were

now thirty-two schools in Norfolk that have developed strong ties with schools in the Shanghai area.

### **Chairman's visit to Norfolk, Virginia, USA**

The Chairman announced that both he and Mrs Northam had visited Norfolk, Virginia, USA, as guests of the Norfolk Sister City Association.

### **Corporate Assessment and Joint Area Review**

The Chairman expressed his congratulations to all officers and members on the very positive outcomes of the Audit Commission's Corporate Assessment of the County Council and the Joint Area Review of Children's Services. The reports show that the County Council is performing consistently well across all its services and this was testament to all the hard work carried out by the Council's staff and their continued efforts to improve services.

## **3. Declarations of Interest**

The following declarations of interest were made:

Miss Collishaw declared a prejudicial interest in the Motion at Item 4.2 of the agenda, as a member of her family owns a pharmacy.

Mr Murphy declared a personal interest in paragraph 5 of the report of the Cabinet 10 November 2008 meeting, 'Progress Report on Starting Out Day Nursery and Woodside One Neighbourhood Nursery in the Thorpe Hamlet and Heartsease Children's Area', as one of his grandchildren attends the Thorpe Hamlet Nursery.

Mrs Ward declared a personal interest in paragraph 6 of the report of the Norwich Highways Agency Committee 25 September meeting, 'Norwich Growth Point Scheme – Grapes Hill Public Transport Improvement', because she owns a property backing onto Grapes Hill.

## **4. Notice of Motions**

### **4.1 Notice of Motion by Mr C Hull**

The following notice of motion was proposed by Mr Hull, seconded by Mrs Hacker, in accordance with Rule 10 of the Council Procedure Rules.

"This Council welcomes the Department for Children, Families and Schools (DCFS) free school meals pilot in primary schools announced on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2008.

It agrees that, in the midst of mounting concern about children's health and its link to children's capacity to learn, having at least one health meal per day, particularly for those from disadvantaged backgrounds, can have a crucial effect on learning and behaviour.

Whilst noting the continued good work of the Healthy Schools Team, this Council recognises the challenges of providing high quality food across all Norfolk schools.

It also notes that where local schemes providing free school meals to all primary school children within an area have been initiated, studies have shown that the children are more likely to be better behaved and are better able to learn.

This Council therefore agrees to:

1. Make every effort to seek pilot status from the DCFS for specified areas within Norfolk that meet the criteria.
2. To look to further enhance the successful work of the Healthy Schools Team, particularly with regard to nutrition information and education within the primary school setting, and local sourcing where possible.”

The Chairman indicated that under the Council Procedure Rules, the motion stood referred to Cabinet for consideration.

- 4.2** Miss Collishaw left the meeting for the following item as she had declared a prejudicial interest.

**Notice of motion by Mrs J A Howe**

The following motion was proposed by Mrs Howe, seconded by Mr Pitt-Pladdy, in accordance with Rule 10 of the Council Procedure Rules.

“This Council:

Opposes the new Pharmacy White Paper proposal that GP surgeries should no longer be able to dispense medicines to if the surgery dispensary is within a mile of a pharmacy.

Recognises that many patients would, therefore, have to get their prescriptions from a chemist.

Believes this would have a detrimental effect, particularly on those in rural areas who can currently collect their prescriptions from their GP surgery.

Notes that where GP surgeries currently provide dispensing services these are often very highly valued by patients; that many rural GP surgeries also offer delivery services to those patients who are unable to travel even short distances due to their health needs or a lack of public transport facilities and that some of these services would also cease under the new proposals.

Notes, in addition, concerns from local practitioners that the resulting loss of income for surgeries may also lead to a reduction in patient services such as minor surgical procedures, which are at present subsidised by dispensing income.

Regrets that this contradictory aspect of the Government’s proposals may remove choice in a system that is intended to increase patients’ options and notes that these concerns were also expressed by both Conservative and Liberal Democrat MPs in the House of Commons Adjournment debate on 19<sup>th</sup> May.

Notes, finally, that in NHS Norfolk’s area 29% of patients benefit from GP dispensing services compared to less than 7% nationally so the proposed changes would therefore have a more significant effect on patients in Norfolk than in many other parts of the country.



Resolves, therefore, to write to local MPs and the Minister of State for Public Health to register the Council's opposition to the proposed change and to ask them to press the Department of Health to withdraw this part of the white paper proposals."

Following debate the motion was CARRIED. **RESOLVED** accordingly.

#### **4.3 Motion by Ms S Whitaker**

Ms S Whitaker moved, seconded Mr T Wainwright, the suspension of Council Procedure Rule 10.1, in accordance with Rule 11p of the Council Procedure Rules.

**RESOLVED:** to suspend Council Procedure Rule 10.1.

Ms Whitaker then moved the following motion, which was seconded by Mr Wainwright.

"This Council is concerned to hear that the National Express intends to down grade the rails service from London to Norwich.

The proposals will mean yet further reduced quality of service and it is questionable if this meets the criteria as set out in January 2004 when the franchise was agreed for seven-year duration.

Norfolk County Council is concerned that these proposals will

- Lead to job reductions in the region
- Result in the closure of the call centre
- Axe the award winning restaurant car

Such a recipe cannot be one of improving services despite the increase in ticket fares and the increased rail revenues of 9pc.

Rail users have had to deal with a poor service due to maintenance issues and low investment in vehicles, which combined have resulted in severe delays in services.

These additional measures will not add to the quality of service that Norfolk residents desire.

Norfolk County Council calls upon National Express to reconsider its proposals and live up to the expectation of the franchise it has signed to deliver and to provide a quality service for customers."

Mrs Chamberlin moved an amendment to the motion, seconded by Mr Tomkinson that replaced the final paragraph above with –

"Norfolk County Council demands that National Express reconsiders its proposals and lives up to the expectation of the franchise it has signed to deliver and to provide a quality service for customers."

Ms Whitaker indicated that she was willing to incorporate the amendment into her motion.

Mr Tomkinson then called for a second amendment to the motion, seconded by Mr Pond, that an additional final paragraph be included in the motion -

“Further, that Norfolk County Council calls upon the Department of Transport to enforce the conditions of the franchise.”

Ms Whitaker indicated that she was willing to incorporate the amendment into her motion.

The motion, as amended became the substantive motion and following debate was CARRIED.

**RESOLVED:**

“This Council is concerned to hear that the National Express intends to down grade the rails service from London to Norwich.

The proposals will mean yet further reduced quality of service and it is questionable if this meets the criteria as set out in January 2004 when the franchise was agreed for a seven-year duration.

Norfolk County Council is concerned that these proposals will

- Lead to job reductions in the region
- Result in the closure of the call centre
- Axe the award winning restaurant car

Such a recipe cannot be one of improving services despite the increase in ticket fares and the increased rail revenues of 9pc.

Rail users have had to deal with a poor service due to maintenance issues and low investment in vehicles, which combined have resulted in severe delays in services.

These additional measures will not add to the quality of service that Norfolk residents desire.

Norfolk County Council demands that National Express reconsiders its proposals and lives up to the expectation of the franchise it has signed to deliver and to provide a quality service for customers.

Further, that Norfolk County Council calls upon the Department of Transport to enforce the conditions of the franchise.”

Ms Whitaker, as Chair of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee agreed to a request from Mr Monson to include a scrutiny of National Express on the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee forward work programme.

## **5. Cabinet Recommendations**

In moving the above report from the 15 September Cabinet meeting, Mr Cox, Leader of the Council, drew Members’ attention to the Cabinet recommendation that Review Panels be renamed Overview and Scrutiny Panels.

**RESOLVED:** that Review Panels be renamed Overview and Scrutiny Panels to more accurately reflect their purpose and reinforce the change in emphasis resulting from the Review of Review Panels to embed scrutiny into the work of the Panels.

**6. Change of Date of 2009 County Council Elections - Recommendation from the Overarching Group.**

Mr Cox moved the recommendation from the Overarching Group that the 2009 programme of meetings be revised.

Ms Whitaker queried whether the revised programme caused any difficulties with regard to the pre-election purdah period. The Chief Executive confirmed that the programme did not cause any such problems.

Ms Whitaker further suggested that the date of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting planned to take place on 29 December 2009 be changed.

**RESOLVED:** to approve the revised programme of meetings for 2009.

**7. Report of the Cabinet Meeting Held on 15 September 2008**

**Member Questions, paragraph 2.3**

Mrs Paines noted the response from the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services concerning the health care of people living in Thetford and in response Mr Mowle, the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services confirmed that the majority of people living in outlying districts attend the West Suffolk hospital for treatment.

**Review Panel Issues, paragraph 3**

Mr Collop said that the County Council should strengthen its scrutiny functions because Cabinet Members do not always feed back information from Cabinet to their respective Review Panels and in some cases they do not attend relevant Review Panel meetings.

In response, Mr Cox said he would ensure the reporting back of information to Review Panels was enhanced. Mr Gunson, the Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation said that officers were required to include details of Review Panel discussions in relevant reports to the Cabinet.

**Norwich Northern Distributor Road (NDR), paragraph 6**

Mr Gunson said that a planning application finalising the design of the NDR would be ready for submission at the end of December and Cabinet would receive a report at the January 2009 meeting. He said it was hoped that work on the NDR would commence in 2010. Mr J Joyce's support for a complete NDR was noted but Mr Gunson advised Members that this would not be possible due to the special environmental status of the area around the River Wensum.

**Carrow (formerly Trowse) Fire Station, paragraph 11.1**

Mr Humphrey, the Cabinet Member for Human Resources, Finance, Property & Corporate Affairs confirmed that the County Council does own the Bethel Street Fire Station.

### **Restorative Approaches at Norfolk County Council, paragraph 12.2**

Mr Cox said that the Norfolk Local Government Association (LGA) had endorsed the report, which provided information on the use of restorative approaches. Mr Cox also advised Members that Mr B Hannah had been appointed as the County Council's Champion for Restorative Approaches.

### **The Scrutiny Process at Norfolk County Council: Cabinet Scrutiny Committee Working Group, paragraph 13**

Mr Hull referred to the above report and noted that the Corporate Assessment had highlighted the need to make improvements in the Council's scrutiny processes. He asked how these improvements would be taken forward. In response, Mr Cox said that in talking to Members, the Audit Commission had concluded that current scrutiny processes were not quite right. Therefore, the Working Group's Recommendation 11 would include an enhanced Forward Plan of key decisions and an action plan would be put in place in relation to Recommendations 19 and 20.

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

## **8. Report of the Cabinet Meeting Held on 13 October 2008**

### **Urgent Business – Norfolk County Council Lending to Icelandic Banks, paragraph 1**

Mrs Lashley asked whether it was intended to undertake a review of the Council's Treasury Management Policy. Mr Morse said that Members had a responsibility for ensuring sound financial management of the Council and they therefore required support to understand the complexities of financial management.

Mr Humphrey said that the Treasury Management Policy would be received at the 5 January 2009 Cabinet meeting and consideration would be given to Member involvement at that time. The Council's advisers had, up until March 2008, advised the Council to invest in the Icelandic Banks. The Council has a duty to achieve a good return from funds invested and during regular financial briefings Members had been advised that the Council's investments were doing well.

Mrs Hacker asked what the Council intended to do to help the people of Norfolk during the current financial crisis. Mr Humphrey stated that the Council aims to pay its invoices within thirty days and funding had also been invested to help Post Office owners to decide whether their businesses could continue without a post office. The Council would also be looking at other ways to help local businesses.

### **Norfolk Climate Change Strategy, paragraph 9**

Mr J Joyce commented on the screens in the entrance foyer at County Hall, which displayed energy savings. Mr Monson, the Cabinet Member for Waste Management and the Environment confirmed that Norfolk County

Council was well positioned to improve on its energy savings and the strategy was taking shape extremely well.

**Community Infrastructure Fund 2: King's Lynn South Transport Major, paragraph 10**

Ms Macdonald welcomed Cabinet's submission of an Expression of Interest for £5.3 million to fund a major package of transport improvement measures for King's Lynn, but she voiced concern that illegal parking in King's Lynn was not being policed which was causing problems to both shop owners and members of the public.

Mr Gunson said that prior to the Local Government Review (LGR) a scheme had been agreed for parking enforcement throughout the County. Car parking was a District Council responsibility but a proposed solution had been held back because of the uncertainty surrounding the outcome of the LGR.

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

**9. Report of the Cabinet Meeting Held on 10 November 2008**

**Member Question, paragraph 2**

Mr Pitt-Pladdy said that he was pleased with the response received from Mr Gunson concerning the annual review of mileage rates for volunteer drivers and the increase in this rate from April 2008. In response, Mr Mowle said that volunteer drivers were greatly valued but no decisions had yet been taken concerning next year's budgets.

**2008-09 Finance Monitoring Report, paragraph 4**

Mr Collop said that the 2008-09 Finance Monitoring Report should have a wider audience and he voiced his concern that, in the current financial climate, if savings were reduced there would not be enough funds remaining to cover possible shortfalls. He said he was not confident that savings made through vacant staff posts would cover possible shortfalls and he requested reassurance that any shortfalls that arose could be met.

Mr Humphrey said all Review Panels would be involved in financial management during the budget round of meetings to be held early in 2009. At the present time the Council could only assume the level of funding it would receive from the Government. Mr Humphrey said he could not give the reassurance requested that any shortfalls could be met, because the amount of funding to be received from the Government was, as yet, unknown. However, he paid tribute to the work of the Chief Officers and confirmed that Members would have the opportunity for input during the round of Review Panel meetings that would consider the Council's budget.

**Progress Report on Starting Out Day Nursery and Woodside One Neighbourhood Nursery in the Thorpe Hamlet and Heartsease Children's Centre Area, paragraph 5**

Mrs Hacker said that in the current financial circumstances it would be difficult to expect nurseries to implement their debt recovery policies against the poorest families.

In response, Mrs Monbiot, the Cabinet Member for Children's Services said that the Council had previously subsidised these two nurseries but the Council had a duty to ensure that people who access these services pay for them and therefore people would be required to pay the fees on a regular basis.

**Standard Transport Charge – Response to Consultation Exercise and Next Steps, paragraph 9**

Mr Harrison said that concern had been expressed at the Planning, Transportation, the Environment & Waste Review Panel meeting about concessionary bus passes and the costs of these to the District Council.

Mr Gunson advised Members that the Government allocates between £170 - £220k per year of funding to District Councils for park and ride schemes. The contributions that the District Councils would be asked to make to these schemes would therefore be capped at no more than the level of funding they received from the Government.

**Regional Funding Allocation, paragraph 10**

Mr Moore requested reassurance that infrastructure improvements would continue, despite the limited Regional Funding Allocation being offered for infrastructure improvements. In response, Mr Gunson said that some of the funding for new roads or road improvements would be used for infrastructure improvements.

**Report of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee Working Group: County Farms Policy Report of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee, paragraph 11**

Mr Morse, a member of the County Farms Working Group, voiced his concern that this very thorough report had been sent back to the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee. He noted the comments made by Mr Humphrey that the report was 'fundamentally flawed' due in part to the fact that NPS had not reviewed the report prior to its publication. He asked Mr Humphrey to confirm whether he was suggesting that all the recommendations contained within the report were flawed.

Mr Nobbs said he was appalled that this report, which encompassed a thorough piece of scrutiny work, lauded by the Eastern Daily Press (EDP), had subsequently become a "bad report".

Mr Collop said that the work undertaken by the cross-party working group had been very interesting and informative. The Group had met with many people, including officers from NPS and farmers and everyone had the opportunity to provide information to the Group.

Mr Shrimplin said the County Farms Scrutiny had been an exhaustive piece of work and the Members of the Working Group had undertaken a thorough investigation.

In response, Mr Humphrey confirmed that not all 32 recommendations contained within the report were flawed, but the report was flawed because it did not follow its own evidence. NPS had not been allowed to see the report before it was published and the report contained incorrect information. One conclusion, for example, stated that the relationship between NPS and tenants had broken down, but 94% of tenants had stated that this was not the case. The Cabinet Member noted the report's statement that the Property Reference Panel had not met for a year and he confirmed that during that time decisions were taken concerning County Farms. The Cabinet had taken the decision that the report should be reconsidered by the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee to ascertain whether the report outcomes were justified. Mr Humphrey confirmed that the County Council did wish to continue with County Farms and that the Leader of the Council had confirmed this decision, at the recent Cabinet meeting.

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

**10. Report of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee Meeting Held on 30 September 2008**

Ms Whitaker said that attempts had been made to interfere with the outcomes and recommendations made during the County Farms scrutiny. The County Farms Report would now be sent back to the 16 December Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting where the recommendations might be strengthened.

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

**11. Report of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee Meeting Held on 17 October 2008**

Ms Whitaker informed Members that Norfolk County Council was the only county council that scrutinised its MEPs. This scrutiny was recognised as a model of excellence.

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

**12. Report of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee Meeting Held on 28 October 2008**

Ms Whitaker informed Members that there had been a long and detailed discussion of the Council Council Investments and Cabinet had been asked to consider setting up a cross party Investment Panel.

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

13. **Report of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting Held on 4 September 2008**

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

14. **Report of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Meeting Held on 16 October 2008**

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

15. **Report of the Standards Committee Meeting Held on 15 October 2008**

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

16. **Report of the Personnel Committee Meeting Held on 22 September 2008**

**Modern Reward Strategy Project (MRS), paragraph 1.1**

Mr Moore declared a personal interest as a member of UNISON.

Mr Scutter asked about the likely impact of the Modern Reward Strategy on the Council's individual departments and he requested details of the outcome of the MRS when it becomes available. Mrs Rice expressed concern that the Council might lose very good employees due to salary reductions, and that this should be considered in any future report on the outcome of MRS.

Mr Cox said that Members would receive information concerning the MRS outcome when it becomes available. In the meantime, he assured Members that he expected the MRS costs to be within the planned budget and the vast majority of staff would be unaffected by the outcome of the project and the current earnings of those staff whose salary would be reduced would be protected for a three year period.

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

17. **Report of the Personnel Committee Meeting Held on 13 October 2008**

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

18. **Report of the Audit Committee Meeting Held on 18 September 2008**

The Chairman of the Audit Committee informed Members that the Council had received an unqualified audit opinion from the Council's External Auditor.

**Security of Physical Records, paragraph 5.1**

Mr Scutter noted the statement there had been 'no reportable incidents of inappropriate use or loss of physical records at Norfolk County Council'. He referred to an item in the local newspaper which stated that there had been a leak of information. Mr Baxter agreed to provide a written response to all Members in explanation.



**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

**19. Report of the Planning Regulatory Committee Meeting Held on 5 September 2008**

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

**20. Report of the Joint Highways Agency Committee Meeting Held on 25 September 2008**

**RESOLVED:** to note the report.

**21. Matters considered by Review Panels**

**RESOLVED:** to note report.

**22. Appointments to Committees etc (Standing Item)**

**RESOLVED:** to note the following appointments made by the Chief Executive under delegated powers:-

- i) Mr A White to the Planning, Transportation, the Environment & Waste Review Panel in place of Mr B Iles.
- ii) Mr C How to the Adult Social Services Review Panel in place of Mrs S Gurney.

**23. To Answer Questions relating to the Norfolk Police Authority**

Notice of the following questions had been given in accordance with Rule 9 of the Council Procedure Rules:-

**23.1 Question by Mrs C Walker to the appointed person to respond – Mr S Bett:**

“Norfolk County Council has, with public money, supplied a Flood Siren system. Will Norfolk Police Authority, which is also publicly funded, now cooperate to ensure that the siren system is properly used and operated to assist the public awareness of any future flood evacuation alert?”

In response, Mr Bett gave the following answer:

“I thank Mrs Walker for her topical question. What she asks is not within the Police Authority’s powers, so no.

This is a serious matter, and I and my fellow members of the Police Authority treat it thus. So too, does the Norfolk Constabulary who are responsible for the operational and professional aspects of policing this County.

That, legally and constitutionally, is a matter for the Chief Constable or his officers when dealing with the particular circumstances at the time. This will be done in conjunction with a whole host of other agencies, including the Environment Agency, the Emergency Planning Officers, and the Chief

Executives' of County and District, to name but some who are likely to be involved.

The Deputy Chief Constable has, via the columns of the EDP, responded openly as to the Constabulary's position. This is a job for the professionals and not a bunch of amateurs. The Police know they will be held to account if they do not get it right.

However, if we are to rely on the gut instinct of everyone on the bandwagon, then that way lays mass panic, the very scenario where the public expect us to get things right.

The 1953 floods were a disaster and the resultant psyche of fear regarding flooding rightly runs deep in Norfolk, but life and technology moves on.

The sirens were last used when King's Lynn was under threat in 1993. The then 'Gold' Commander was Chief Superintendent David Reeve. David has recently joined the NPA as an independent member. He tells me that they were an "unmitigated disaster" and he faced significant criticism for the panic and unstructured impact they had on the community. Worse still, the streets and roads of King's Lynn were filled with 'rubbernecks' who came to King's Lynn and blocked the streets etc so that the emergency services could not get about. Nor could the lorries with essential supplies, including sandbags, get into the Town!

Our most recent and significantly successful experience was back in November 2007 when the North Norfolk coast, and particularly Great Yarmouth, was threatened by severe gales and high tides with a predicted tidal surge and the likelihood of large scale flooding. The Norfolk Constabulary, coordinating other agencies, did a splendid job. Targeted evacuation meant that, had the forces of nature not suddenly abated, such an approach would have undoubtedly saved lives and significant personal trauma. It was done in a controlled and orderly fashion. The Government's C.O.B.R.A. Safety Committee sat and Norfolk was praised for the highly professional way the potential crisis was handled. The sirens were not sounded at any location.

That said, in no way do I seek to downgrade the impact of the people of Walcot. The judgement call left the community partially exposed. The agencies need to reassure them that in future the modelling will be improved to take account of the impact of specific combinations of wind and tide and the resultant wave effect – which, I am told, caused the specific ingress affecting them. I do not have a mandate to speak for the Environment Agency, but I am told that their modelling has been upgraded accordingly.

We are talking about serious issues of life and death, and of the efficient professional management of a potential crisis. I for one would not wish to rely on 1950's technology and the vagaries of an indiscriminate system which, if I am fortunate to hear it, tells me nothing and could induce a panic reaction when what is actually needed is a controlled and targeted evacuation.

Mr Chairman, I have sought to give a considered and proportionate response to Mrs Walker's question. I conclude by saying that last Monday I attended a meeting at the Houses of Parliament at which the DCC and David Reeve met with the three coastal MPs (all other Norfolk MPs were notified and invited)

and their advisers. They were given a full and frank brief on the likely operational approach to the future use of these sirens. The outcome of that meeting was widely reported. In effect, the Constabulary will not bind themselves to the deployment of the County Council's sirens in a flood scenario. However, if the County Council voluntarily continue to maintain some or all of them, it will be a matter for the Police to determine if they are to be activated, taking account of all the best available information. The Police cannot envisage when they would use the sirens, for reasons I have given today."

Mrs Walker made a supplementary point that the 2007 floods in Great Yarmouth had been averted only by two inches. People recognised the flood siren sound and when to evacuate they did not, however, fully understand how the Floodline operated.

**23.2 Question by Mrs G Harris to the appointed person to respond – Mr S Bett:**

"What will be the impact of the move to the PFI funded Police Investigation Centres on the future finances of Norfolk Police Authority and what is the equivalent in terms percentages of Council Tax levied on the ratepayers of Norfolk?"

In response, Mr Bett gave the following answer:

"Norfolk Police Authority following a Best Value Review of Custody and Police Surgeons initiated the Police Investigations Centres Project (PIC); police cells to you and me. An initial scoping review in 2002 recommended that, with the potential for significant Home Office support, a Private Finance Initiative (PFI) solution should be explored. Suffolk and Cambridgeshire were also reviewing their custody provision and had concluded that improvements were needed to bring their facilities up to acceptable standards and to provide future additional cell capacity. From this, a collaborative project was agreed and the Home Office agreed to provide PFI grant.

The initial approval from the Home Office was in 2005. Since then, a considerable amount of work has been undertaken to seek potential bidders and to examine the detailed elements of the project, looking at the existing service and budgetary provision. Legal issues, technical issues, design issues and service issues have and are still being examined, in addition to looking at the financial elements of bids and future affordability. The project is managed by a joint Project Team on behalf of Norfolk and Suffolk Police Authorities. Cambridgeshire has since withdrawn from the project, although discussions are still continuing about their possible use of some of the King's Lynn facilities to service Wisbech and its environs.

It is currently anticipated that the project will reach a financial and contractual close next May. The new facilities should come on stream in 2010. Capital and revenue costs for all the new facilities will be shared with Suffolk. At this stage, I cannot give information on the impact of the project on future budgets and Council Tax, as there are still many detailed and commercially sensitive issues under consideration. It is principally for that reason I am not able to give a direct answer to Mrs Harris.

Police Authorities are mandated in law to seek the benefits of collaborative working, a principle that the Norfolk Police Authority and I strongly support, in the absence of the right solution of mergers. The PIC project is a positive example of collaborative working which has the strong backing of both Authorities and the Home Office. A press release on the appointment of a preferred bidder will be made shortly and further details on the overall finances of the project will, as I have already said, be available at a later date."

Mrs Harris made a supplementary point that she was disappointed not to receive the figures requested, but understood why the information could not be forthcoming at this time.

The meeting concluded at 1.09pm

**CHAIRMAN**



If you need these minutes in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Vanessa Dobson on 01603 223029 or minicom 01603 223833 and we will do our best to help.

**RECOMMENDATION FROM THE CABINET MEETING  
HELD ON 5 JANUARY 2009**

1. **Dealing with Obstructions on the Highway within a Defined Area of Cromer**
  - 1.1 Cabinet has received a report seeking approval for the delegation of powers to North Norfolk District Council to issue permits to enable traders to place items on the highway and for the enforcement of the new code, within a defined area.
  - 1.2 The Cabinet resolved to **recommend** that the County Council delegate to North Norfolk District Council the powers in section 149 of the Highways Act 1980, within the areas defined in Appendix B of the Cabinet report, commencing on a date to be determined by the Director of Environment, Transport and Development and on such terms as he shall approve in consultation with the Head of Law.

**Note by Head of Democratic Services**

**All members have previously received a copy of this report at item 10 of the Cabinet agenda papers for the meeting on 5 January 2009. Please bring this report with you to the meeting.**

Daniel Cox

Chairman

**County Council Elections June 2009 – Appointment of a Returning  
Officer**

**Report by the Head of Democratic Services**

The Representation of the People Act 1983 requires the County Council to appoint an officer of the Council to be the returning officer for elections of councillors of the county. This post has traditionally been undertaken by the Chief Executive, who has, in turn, appointed District Council officers to discharge the functions on his behalf. This reflects the arrangement whereby the District Councils administer the County Council elections on behalf of the County Council.

It is RECOMMENDED that the Council appoint David White, Chief Executive to be the returning officer for the County Council elections scheduled for June 2009 and for any subsequent by-elections.

## **Programme of Meetings for 2009**

Report by Head of Democratic Services

### **1.0 Audit Committee**

- 1.1 At the Council's meeting in November 2008, approval was given to a revised programme of meetings for 2009. This was done to take account of the revised date of the County Council elections, which will now be held on 4 June 2009
- 1.2 The revised programme included switching the date of the Audit Committee meeting previously scheduled for 25 June, to 23 July. However, it has subsequently been pointed out that the Committee must meet before the end of June in order to fulfil the legal requirement to approve the Council's Statement of Accounts by 30 June each year. It is therefore proposed that the meeting be moved from 23 July to Monday 29 June 2009 at 2.00 p.m.

### **2.0 Cabinet and Cabinet Scrutiny Committee**

- 2.1 At the Council's meeting in November 2008, it was suggested that consideration be given to bringing forward the date of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting scheduled for 29 December 2009. As a Cabinet meeting is scheduled for 14 December 2009, any move forward of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting would need to be mirrored by a move forward of the Cabinet meeting in order to retain the 2-week gap that allows the call-in process to operate effectively.
- 2.2 Following discussions with the Leader and the Chairman of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee, it is proposed that both meetings be brought forward by one week. This would mean the Cabinet meeting switching to 7 December and the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting to 22 December. The Personnel Committee meeting scheduled for 14 December would also move to 7 December. These changes will mean it will be necessary for the meeting of the Great Yarmouth Area Committee scheduled for 7 December to be changed and it is suggested that it be moved to 30 November.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the changes to the programme of meetings for 2009 be approved as proposed in this report

**REPORT OF THE CABINET MEETING  
HELD ON 1 DECEMBER 2008**

**1. Public Question**

- 1.1 Mr Smalley asked about a mineral extraction allocation designated MIN 93, having been identified in the consultation document - Preferred Options for the Minerals Site Allocations, and its impact on the lives and homes of residents living in Pentney. The Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation explained that the list of potential sites was not generated by the County Council. Minerals developers, land owners and their agents were asked to propose land that they wished to be considered for future minerals development and many may have been encouraged to do so by the government. He confirmed that officers were currently summarising the responses and the next stage would be to assess all of the sites to identify which ones were the preferred sites for future minerals development. The current intention was that the list of preferred sites would be considered by Cabinet in the Spring, before a further round of consultation.
- 1.2 Ms Carlo sought confirmation that Table 5.4, showing the Highways Impacts for the Preferred Route, as set out in the Northern Distributor Route (NDR) Business Case Forecasting Report, contained a spreadsheet error which resulted in traffic increases being under-estimated and traffic reductions being over-estimated. The Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation explained that the document referred to was a technical document to demonstrate that the traffic model was robust. It was not intended to provide a full representation of traffic forecasts or assess the effects of the NDR and he did not accept that there was any error in the data. He confirmed that, within the built up area on Salhouse Road, North Walsham Road and Wroxham Road, the traffic flow would decrease after the NDR was built and the complementary Norwich Area Transport Strategy measures were in place; demonstrating that the case for the NDR was compelling.

**2. Member Question**

- 2.1 Mr Morse asked about spreading financial risk by the County Council investing with a range of organisations. He sought comment on whether there should be a limit on how much of the Council's investment should be in a single economy (excluding the UK) so minimising any such risk. In reply, the Chairman confirmed that a report on the Cabinet agenda considered enhanced member involvement and reporting in relation to the County Council's treasury



management investment process. The case for geographical diversification of the County Councils investments would be considered by members as part of their review of the Treasury Management Strategy. He confirmed that the total number of counter parties with whom the Council deposited money varied day-by-day along with the value of investments. Presently, the Council's investments were held with some 30 different counter parties who met the Council's high credit rating criteria.

- 2.2 Mr Morse asked, as a supplementary question, about the advice being offered by Butlers and Arlinghouse and whether the Council's contract in advising on investment matters would be reviewed when Butlers' current contract expired. In reply, the Chairman confirmed that this would be the case and added that the intended Member Treasury Management Group would also consider this matter.

### **3. Review Panel Issues**

- 3.1 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services mentioned two matters which had arisen at the latest Children's Services Review Panel -
- A decision by Redbridge Council regarding foster carers who smoked. The Review Panel's view was that if a decision were to be taken to formulate a policy on smoking it should be brought to the Children's Services Review Panel, as part of its overview and scrutiny role.
  - Looked After Children. Concerns had been raised about the high numbers of children involved and the Cabinet Member read out an extract from a Family Support Plan report put to the Review Panel clarifying numbers of children in care over time, showing that there was clear and full data on these children and showing too the associated costs both for those coming into and leaving the service.
- 3.2 The Cabinet Member for Fire and Community Protection commented on two matters raised at recent meetings to note that -
- The matter of flood sirens was raised and there was a continued refusal by both the Police and Environment Agency to use the sirens
  - A Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting on Helping Norfolk's Citizens in Difficult Times had raised several positive points for supporting people during these difficult economic times.

### **4. Corporate Assessment and Joint Area Review 2008**

- 4.1 The Cabinet has welcomed confirmation of the outcomes from a number of major inspections for Norfolk County Council - the Corporate Assessment, the Joint Area Review of services for children in Norfolk and an inspection of the Youth Offending Team. It has endorsed the

arrangements for taking forward recommendations for improvement as set out in section 3.1 of the Cabinet report. The Cabinet has also supported the decision by the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services to write to all staff in Adult Social Services and thank them for achieving 3\*excellent with excellent prospects for improvement in the annual report by the Commission for Social Care Inspectorate for this service.

**5. Integrated Performance and Finance Monitoring Report - 2nd Quarter 2008-09**

- 5.1 The Cabinet has received the annexed report (9) which monitors progress in key areas for improvement including aspects of the Local Area Agreement, for which the County Council is the lead responsibility. The report also covered investments made and the monitoring of revenue and capital budgets. In noting the report, the Cabinet asked all Review Panels to continue to monitor all Performance Indicators in the Corporate Improvement Plan and to identify any actions required.

**6. Asset Performance Report 2008**

- 6.1 Cabinet has received a report summarising the highways, ICT and operational property assets. This report superseded the Annual Property Performance Report and set out the required maintenance priorities for highway, ICT and property assets. It also set out the performance of the operational property against the National Property Performance Management Indicators. The Cabinet agreed to support the development of methods of addressing the issues raised, particularly maintenance of the portfolio, the environmental impact of the use of the property portfolio, and value for money.

**7. Reporting of Treasury Management Activity**

- 7.1 The Cabinet has received a report on member involvement and reporting in relation to the County Council's treasury management investment process. The Cabinet has agreed to endorse existing governance and reporting arrangements with respect to treasury management, to separate reporting to the Cabinet and Council of both the Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy and the Treasury Management Annual Report and to establish an All Party Treasury Management Panel to:
- monitor recovery of the Councils Icelandic investments
  - consider and comment on the draft Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy prior to its submission to Cabinet and full Council
  - receive detailed reports on the Council's treasury management activity, including reports on any proposed changes to the criteria

- for “high” credit rated institutions in which investments are made and the lending limits assigned to different counterparties
- receive presentations and reports from the Council’s Treasury Management advisers, Butlers
- consider the draft Treasury Management Annual Report prior to its submission to Cabinet and full Council.

7.2 It was noted that this Treasury Management Panel should operate for an initial period of 12 months, following which it would be reviewed in the light of prevailing market conditions, including recovery of the Icelandic investments.

## **8. Annual Corporate Parenting Update**

8.1 In introducing this report, the Cabinet Member for Children’s Services re-emphasised its importance, suggesting that it be sent to each member of the Council as it clearly set out the legal standing in relation to corporate parenting. The Cabinet Member then went on to make a statement in relation to recent cases in the media and the safeguarding of children. The Cabinet then noted the report.

## **9. Expression of Interest for a new Academy to replace Earlham High School in Norwich**

9.1 The Cabinet has approved the submission of the Expression of Interest for a new Academy to replace Earlham High School in Norwich and has delegated to the Cabinet Member for Children’s Services the authority to approve any final changes. In addition, the Cabinet approved consultation on closure to proceed in accordance with statutory requirements, as part of the feasibility stage of establishing the academy.

## **10. The Hewett School: Proposal to Acquire Trust Status**

10.1. The Cabinet has noted that a “trust” school is, technically, a foundation school with a charitable foundation, with a significant number of Norfolk schools already having charitable foundations including all Church of England and Roman Catholic voluntary aided schools and schools such Great Yarmouth VA High School. It also noted that a governing body of any community school which wished to pursue trust status could do so by consulting widely on the proposal and issuing statutory public notices.

10.2 The Cabinet has therefore agreed that Hewett School be given admitted body status under the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 1997 if the trust proposal goes ahead. It also noted that the County Council would have a voting representative on the trust board.

## **11. Building Schools for the Future**

- 11.1 The Cabinet has received a report on the latest developments in the government's Building Schools for the Future strategy for secondary and special schools. It has agreed that a revised Expression of Interest be submitted to the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) with a prioritised list of schools projects, noting too the opportunities it provided for making a major contribution to the transformation of secondary education in the county.
- 11.2 During discussion on this item, the Local Member for Guiltcross Division addressed the Cabinet, speaking on behalf of the Headmaster and Chairman of Governors of Old Buckenham High School and requested Cabinet's agreement to a reconsideration of the timing of the rebuild of this school. In rejecting this request, members noted that the guidelines covering this programme were very strict and very clear; the overriding priority for schools was to include only those with the lowest performance levels and highest levels of social deprivation. Subsequent phasing of schools could only be on the basis of geographic groupings. Old Buckenham High School could not be brought forward at this stage because further clarification was needed from DCSF and, equally, matters relating to housing growth and planning issues in the area still needed to be resolved.
- 11.3 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services stated that this should be seen as a good news story, the Expression of Interest gave the Council a good chance of getting in early and kick starting this exciting initiative.

## **12. Fairstead Community Primary School, King's Lynn: Outcome Of Consultations On The Proposed Change Of Age Range**

- 12.1 The Cabinet has received a report on the outcome of consultations to change the age range for Fairstead Community Primary School from 5-11 to 3-11, to incorporate a nursery into the school.
- 12.2 Local Member for Gaywood South addressed the Cabinet in relation to this report. He spoke in support of the proposals, advising of the progressive thinking and approach of the current Head Teacher and stating that this could be a big improvement opportunity for the school.
- 12.3 The Cabinet has agreed to proceed with the proposal, authorised officers to issue a public notice and, if no objections to the public notice are received, the Director of Children's Services will determine the outcome and implement the proposals.

**13. Docking Church of England Primary School (Foundation): Outcome of the Statutory Public Notice For The Proposed Change Of Age Range**

- 13.1 The Cabinet has agreed proposals to change the age range of Docking CE Primary School range from 5-11 to 3-11, to be implemented in January 2009.

**14. Queen's Hill Primary School, Costessey: Outcome Of The Statutory Public Notice For The Proposed Change Of Age Range**

- 14.1 The Cabinet has agreed that proposals to change the age range of Queen's Hill Community Primary School and establish a nursery will be implemented in January 2009.

**15. The 14-19 Agenda - Changes To Arrangements For 16-19 Education And Training**

- 15.1 The Cabinet has received a report setting out details of proposed national changes to the commissioning of education and training provision for 16-19 year-olds and has agreed:
1. Norfolk County Council's participation in a formal 'sub-regional grouping' with Suffolk County Council, Cambridge County Council and Peterborough City Council for the purpose of joint commissioning of further education provision in the sub-region.
  2. To endorse the principles underpinning the model of collaboration and the governance arrangements of the sub-regional grouping and that the detailed arrangements for the establishment of the sub-regional grouping be delegated to the Director of Children's Services.
  3. That the Director of Children's Services bring a further report to the Cabinet on the financial implications for the establishment of arrangements for sub-regional grouping once the detail and information is available and before the final collaborative model is determined.

**16 Re-use of former Dowson First/Mile Cross Middle site, Norwich**

- 16.1 The Cabinet has agreed to dispose of the former Dowson First/Mile Cross Middle site which had become vacant as a result of reorganisation, noting that the buildings were not suitable for any alternative Children's Services or County Council uses and thus alternative uses had been investigated. Opportunities for an affordable housing solution were explored through discussions between officers of Children's Services, NPS Ltd and Norwich City Council in their Strategic Housing capacity. As a result, Broadland Housing developed

a scheme for 49 affordable homes – a mix of flats, two, three and four bedroom houses as well as ground floor homes which would be mobility friendly.

- 16.2 The Cabinet has, therefore, agreed to dispose of the site on the basis set out in the Cabinet report with a view to the capital receipts being used to support the Children's Services capital budgets for Norwich reorganisation. In addition, it was agreed that the decision on final details of the sale to Broadland Housing Association be delegated to the Chief Executive and the Cabinet Member for Human Resources, Finance, Property and Corporate Affairs.

**17. Phase 2 Residual Waste Treatment Project – Reference Project & Affordability Assessment**

The Cabinet has approved the selection of an Energy from Waste Reference Project and agreed to proceed with a Public Finance Initiative procurement on the basis of an affordability range of £266m to £382m, confirming its commitment to meet this affordability gap.

**18. Minerals and Waste Development Framework Fourth Annual Monitoring Report**

The Cabinet has endorsed the findings of the Annual Monitoring Report and confirmed that the report be submitted to the Secretary of State. In addition, it agreed that a report be presented to Cabinet in January 2009 on the options available for proceeding with the Minerals and Waste Local Development Documents, in light of changes to legislation and government guidance. In supporting the recommendations, the Cabinet Member for Waste Management and the Environment commented that DEFRA needed to be made aware of the upset this new process (the preferred options and site allocations listings) had caused, to prevent it happening again in future years.

**19. Nar Ouse Regeneration Scheme – Economic Development Support**

The Cabinet has agreed to support the Nar Ouse Regeneration Scheme through the provision of £200,000 from the Economic Development Strategic Sites fund to enable the relocation of a High Pressure Gas Main, running through the middle of the preferred location of the new College of West Anglia. This relocation was essential to release the full economic potential of the Nar Ouse employment area.

**20. ICT Plan 2009/10**

- 20.1 The Cabinet has approved the 2009/10 ICT Plan and noted the basis of funding. The 2009/10 ICT Plan is the fourth such plan, all of which have been based on the principle that they 'self-fund'.

**21. Compliments and Complaints During 2007/08**

**21.1 The Cabinet has:**

1. Noted the report and figures relating to the Ombudsman and general complaints for the year to 31st March 2008
2. Asked that a progress report be presented in six month's time, setting out improvements made against changes being introduced now and in response to concerns raised in the Ombudsman's letter
3. Requested that the compliments and complaints data be split, in future, to show information relating to waste management under a separate heading

**22. Appointments to Committees etc**

- 22.1** The Cabinet has agreed to the appointment of Mrs T Paines on the Fire Joint Consultative Committee, replacing Mrs C Walker with immediate effect.

Full details of the discussion on this or any other item can be found in the minutes for this meeting.

**VICE-CHAIRMAN  
HARRY HUMPHREY**

**REPORT OF THE CABINET MEETING  
HELD ON 5 JANUARY 2009**

**1. 2008-09 Finance Monitoring Report**

- 1.1 The Cabinet has received the latest projected outturn for the 2008-09 Revenue Budget, the 2008-09 Capital Programme, General Balances forecast at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009 and forecasts for the Council's Provisions and Reserves at 31<sup>st</sup> March 2009. It has agreed to write-off one debt totalling £6,019.48.

**2. Motion to Council on 24th November 2008 - School Meals**

- 2.1 Mr Hull presented a motion he had put to the Council meeting in November, explaining the reasoning behind his recommendations.
- 2.2 In responding to the motion, the Cabinet Member for Children's Services confirmed that Norfolk should be well placed to participate in this national school meals project as it was the fifth most deprived county overall. She supported the motion put by Mr Hull but added that it was difficult for the service to allocate money for this initiative at this time, however, she did recognise that every effort should be made to continue to support the uptake of free meals in schools and to ensure that those eligible to receive it did so.
- 2.3 Cabinet has therefore agreed that:
1. Children's Services continue to monitor the DCSF pilot and ensure that Norfolk benefits from its findings
  2. Children's Services ensure that access to free school meals is effectively publicised to parents
  3. The Healthy Schools Programme and the Transforming school food teams continue their active work in promoting healthy eating in all Norfolk's schools.

**3. Joint Core Strategy – Next Steps**

- 3.1 The Cabinet has received a report setting out recommendations from the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) Policy Group on an emerging Joint Core Strategy and including a favoured option for major growth in the Norwich area. Cabinet has endorsed the GNDP proposals for taking forward the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland,



Norwich and South Norfolk, however, Cabinet members raised some concerns.

- 3.2 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Transportation commented that, whichever option was taken, all were dependent on the provision of adequate infrastructure. He gave his support for the agreed option but added that no option would proceed without significant government contribution, including road schemes, and no option was without risk.
- 3.3 The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Efficiency commented that the increase in housing would take up large tracts of high quality land at a time when it was essential to food production, adding that the land also had unique landscape properties which were essential too for the holiday and tourism industry.
- 3.4 Finally, the Cabinet Member for Children's Services added that the reference to education in the report did not openly reflect the major concerns for its provision in Norfolk. She stated that when the matter came before the Children's Services Overview and Scrutiny Panel members would look closely at the proposals and reflect fully their detailed views in this respect.

#### **4. Regional Spatial Strategy Review – EERA Request for Strategic Planning Authority Advice**

- 4.1 The Cabinet has received a report outlining work carried out under the East of England Regional Assembly's (EERA) request for advice to strategic authorities to inform the Review of the Regional Spatial Strategy for 2031. EERA has required testing of four housing growth scenarios ranging from continuing the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) residual growth rates to the upper end of the national housing projections, applied locally on the basis of the current RSS distribution.
- 4.2 The Cabinet noted that figures in the Cabinet report relating to Great Yarmouth had been revised down for the current assessment of growth capacity and now included an additional 400 and not 1,600 dwellings up to 2031.
- 4.3 The Chairman commented that the National Planning and Housing Advice Unit was much mistaken if it felt the forecasts proposed for Norfolk were deliverable and his view was that Norfolk would be covered over if this was brought to fruition. Norfolk was a special place which held much valued agricultural land and such excessive development would ruin this county's historical character and nature.
- 4.4 The Cabinet has therefore agreed that, subject to amendment to reflect the revised information on dwellings in Great Yarmouth, the report be submitted to EERA together with the Technical Appendix and subject to sign off by all District/Borough Councils in Norfolk during January 2009, with the inclusion of the following comments:

- Norfolk is already facing a huge challenge to deliver the 78,700 homes required in the current East of England Plan. Any increase on this number is unreasonable and unattainable and will be rejected by Norfolk County Council.
- The Review actually requires Norfolk to test whether it can accommodate between 20,700 and 67,000 extra homes up to 2031 at annual average rates of between 4,150 and 6,160. Average completion rates in Norfolk have been around 3,300 since 1993 and that included the period of recovery from the last recession and the boom building years. Planning for houses that cannot be delivered will have significant negative impacts, for example, on the delivery of supporting infrastructure. Market delivery should be a major factor in the RSS Review.
- The extra levels of growth would result in greater impact on the environment and local communities, and widen the infrastructure funding gap. There is considerable anxiety about the ability to generate sufficient jobs and economic growth proposed by the NHPAU 67,000 additional dwellings which requires building an annual average of 6,160 homes a year which is simply not credible.

4.5 Cabinet has also agreed that Section 5 (5) Advice relating to any updates for the RSS Policies for key centres for development and change be considered by Cabinet on January 26.

## **5. Making Libraries a Safe and Welcoming Place**

5.1 The Cabinet has received a report outlining the recommendations of the Economic Development and Cultural Services Review Panel held on 18 November 2008 which had agreed to forward the report and findings of the Scrutiny Working Group on Making Libraries a Safe and Welcoming Place.

5.2 The Chairman of the Working Group, Mr G Nobbs, and two Working Group members, Mrs S Rice and Mr J Joyce, presented the findings and recommendations to the Cabinet. The Working Group Chairman commented on the decision, by the Head of Law, to exclude some 19 pages of the Working Group's final report and noted that they had contained comments from library service staff, in part, critical of the way the service had dealt with the issues that the Group investigated. The Working Group Chairman addressed each of the 10 recommendations from the Working Group in turn, noting the report and comments by the Head of the Library and Information Service and explaining why the Working Group continued to stand by its recommendations. He concluded by inviting Cabinet to consider whether to reject this scrutiny because it dared to suggest that things

were not 100% perfect and that there were some genuine problems that needed to be addressed.

- 5.3 The Head of Libraries and Information Service confirmed a range of actions which are in place to support staff and help customers in Norfolk's libraries, and new actions which have been taken including additional briefing sessions with staff, clarification of information on plasma screens and discussions with the Department for Culture, Media and Sports as to amending Bylaws. She also confirmed that she would continue to review the recommendations and ensure that libraries were a safe and welcoming place for everyone.
- 5.4 The Cabinet Member for Cultural Services read out an email sent by the Head of Law to the Working Group Chairman setting out her view on why elements of the information gathering process had not been included in the reports before the Review Panel and Cabinet. He went on to state that the Service acknowledged the recommendations and it was untrue to suggest that the Service rejected the report; members were given this response at the Review Panel meeting in November 2008. He advised that officers would continue to work on the Working Group's recommendations and had already begun to implement change.
- 5.5 The Cabinet noted the report and the annexed reply contained in the Cabinet report from the Head of Service and noted that the Service acknowledged the recommendations contained within the report.

Full details of the discussion on this or any other item can be found in the minutes for this meeting.

**CHAIRMAN  
DANIEL COX**

**Report of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting held on  
25 November 2008**

**1. Items of urgent business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency**

The Chair advised Members that at the County Council meeting held on 24 November, a Motion had been taken concerning National Express's intention to downgrade the rail service from London to Norwich which would lead to job reductions in the region, result in the closure of the local call centre and axe the award winning restaurant car. The Chair of the Committee had agreed that Cabinet Scrutiny Committee scrutinize National Express's decision.

**2. 2008-09 Interim Report on Norse**

- 2.1 The Committee received the suggested approach by the Scrutiny Support Manager and the report by the Managing Director, NPS Property Consultants Ltd, which responded to issues and questions from the Group Leads.
- 2.2 Mr A Williams, Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Efficiency, Mr M Britch, Managing Director of NPS Property Consultants Ltd and Mr P Hawes, Managing Director of Norfolk County Services (NCS) attended the meeting to provide information to the Committee.
- 2.3 The Managing Director of NPS Property Consultants Ltd gave a short presentation to Members concerning the Norse Group of companies.
- 2.4 Members offered their congratulations to the Norse Group on its achievements and successes including its community work, 'Learning Lift Off' and its donations to the Theatre Royal. It was suggested that the presentation by the Managing Director of Norfolk County Services (NCS), which gave information on where NPS/NCS started, should be presented to all interested Members.
- 2.5 Members agreed that the Committee should undertake pre-scrutiny of the Norse Group Final Accounts and the issue concerning the single Shareholder at either the 21 April or 19 May 2009 Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting. The Managing Director of NPS Property Consultants Ltd agreed to send a copy of a recent presentation on the Norse Group to Members on CD/DVD.

**3. Supporting people in difficult economic times**

- 3.1 The Committee received the report by the Scrutiny Support Manager which outlined Norfolk County Council services, activities and initiatives which have a direct or indirect impact on the support available for the people of Norfolk in the current economic circumstances, and offered a suggested approach for the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee in its scrutiny of this topic.

- 3.2 Mr R Rockcliffe, Cabinet Member for Fire and Community Protection, Ms I Bennett, Welfare Rights Manager, Mr H Bullen, Corporate Revenue Manager, Mr D Collinson, Head of Trading Standards, Mr M Hand, Economic Strategist, Mrs C Money, County Strategic Partnership Officer, and Mr S Wiseman, Chief Executive of the Norwich and West Norfolk Citizen's Advice Bureau (CAB) attended the meeting to provide information to the Committee.
- 3.3 Following discussion, it was agreed not to set up a Working Group.
- 3.4 The Committee further agreed to report their conclusions and recommendations back to the Cabinet on the following ways the Council could support people and small businesses in the current economic climate:
- i. By accelerating the Capital Programme and bringing forward small works.
  - ii. By supporting debt advice by raising awareness of the charitable status of the CAB and by supporting staff secondments to the CAB.
  - iii. By increasing the resources of the Welfare Rights Unit in Adult Social Services.
  - iv. By raising awareness of Credit Unions.

#### **4. Cabinet Scrutiny Working Groups: Update**

##### **4.1 Child Poverty Working Group**

Members noted that the Child Poverty Working Group had received background briefings on the picture of child poverty in Norfolk and agreed to adopt an updated work programme. In order to obtain feedback from partners, a request had been made for an agenda item at the forthcoming Children's Services stakeholder conference. This event would provide a forum for discussion and the Working Group would attend this session to receive feedback in person. It had also been agreed to commission a third party to promote an on-line survey to gain wider feedback from children and families. The next meeting of the Working Group would take place on 9 February 2009.

##### **4.2 Outcome of the 'Monitoring Corporate Improvement Themes' Working Group**

The Working Group agreed that its task was to identify some principles/processes that would strengthen the delivery of future corporate improvement programmes. The next steps would be:

- To choose two areas which the Audit Commission had commended the Council for in the Corporate Assessment and one area that had been identified as needing improvement. The area for improvement chosen by the Working Group is Customer Service Standards.
- Officers who led the relevant improvement theme work shaped by the Peer Review would be asked to supply the Working Group with information about processes/activities undertaken to raise performance in those areas. The aim of the exercise would be to help the Working Group learn what worked and what didn't. The Working Group agreed to meet in January 2009 to look at that information and to question the officers.
- The Working Group will agree some recommendations to make to Cabinet, to inform and strengthen the forthcoming improvement planning.

## **5. Forward Work Programme**

- 5.1 The Committee received and noted the Forward Work Programme.
- 5.2 The Committee agreed that the scrutiny of National Express's decision to downgrade the rail services from London to Norwich should be considered at the 16 December Cabinet Scrutiny meeting.
- 5.3 The Report from the County Farms Working Group, received by Cabinet, had been sent back to Cabinet Scrutiny Committee with the request that the Committee should look at the evidence against the recommendations made to Cabinet. Members requested that as much information be obtained as possible from NPS and also from the Portfolio Holder, Mr Humphrey, concerning their criticisms of the Report. The County Farms Report, and accompanying information would be considered at the 16 December Cabinet Scrutiny meeting.

Details of the full discussion can be found in the minutes of the meeting.

**Ms Sue Whitaker**  
**Chair, Cabinet Scrutiny Committee**

**Report of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting held on  
16 December 2008**

**1. National Express**

- 1.1 The Committee received the suggested approach by the Scrutiny Support Manager.
- 1.2 Mr Denby, Head of Corporate Affairs at National Express East Anglia and Mr Cumming, Principal Integrated Transport Planning Officer, attended the meeting to provide information to the Committee.
- 1.3 Mr Denby provided a written response to Member questions and gave a presentation entitled 'Developing our railways'.
- 1.4 Members agreed that the outcome of this scrutiny should be reported to the Department of Transport and therefore the relevant minute from the meeting would be forwarded to them. The main points from the discussion are as follows:
  - Member comments would be fed back into the National Express review process concerning the retention of a breakfast/evening meal service in the restaurant car.
  - Many partners were involved in making improvements to stations (such as Great Yarmouth and North Walsham) and they must work together and liaise with local members.
  - The Norwich to Cambridge line had proved very disruptive at Attleborough where the level crossing gates are closed hourly, causing great disruption. It was recognised that level crossings were a main source of delays to trains and Network Rail have formed a partnership with Norfolk County Council and others to seek solutions to level crossing issues, which may lead to upgrades, bridge installations or the closure of some crossings; he agreed to feed Member concerns back to the partnership.
  - Major engineering work would continue to be undertaken on the Norwich to London line and that for the next 2 – 3 years Sundays would be affected by this work although on a reducing basis. National Express was also looking to offer passengers the option of travelling all the way to London by train (with a change of train at Ely or Cambridge) as an alternative option, thereby avoiding the need to travel part of the journey on a bus/coach, on some Sundays when the usual route to London was affected by engineering work. National Express is also pressing Network Rail to make the Norwich – Ipswich – London route one of the first to benefit from a new maintenance strategy which would reduce the number, length and frequency of occasions when the route is affected by service alternations due to engineering work.
  - With reference to possible reductions in the number of people travelling by train due to the current economic climate, Mr Denby explained that the Association of Train Operating Companies has indicated that the growth in the number of passengers travelling had reduced significantly over the last few months. Job

losses had not yet manifested themselves but it was expected that these would show in the New Year.

- The number of staff employed in Norwich in Customer Relations would be similar to the current level.
- There was currently no spare capacity to increase the number of trains going into Liverpool Street but in the longer term there were possibilities for improved capacity.
- There were plans to recruit additional staff at the Newcastle Call Centre.
- Regarding the line speeds between Sheringham and Norwich, one way that the speed of the line could be increased would be for the train to stop at fewer stations on the route, but this would not be acceptable to the passengers who use this line for journeys within the route. Alternatively, Network Rail could be lobbied to enhance line speeds. National Express would look for opportunities to push for faster train times on this route.
- All National Express proposals were DDA compliant.

## **2. County Farms Policy**

- 2.1 The Committee received the report and the suggested approach by the Scrutiny Support Manager, together with responses from the Managing Director of NPS Property Consultants Ltd and the Cabinet Member for Human Resources, Finance, Property and Corporate Affairs. Members noted that the County Farms Report, which had been received by the Cabinet meeting held on 10 November 2008, had been referred back to the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee with an invitation to review the recommendations and to reconsider the conclusions contained within the report.
- 2.2 Mr Humphrey, Cabinet Member for Human Resources, Finance, Property and Corporate Affairs, Mr Weavers, Asset Management Director and Mr Crossley, Head of Rural Estates, Disposals and Site Survey attended the meeting to provide information to the Committee.
- 2.3 The Chair said that the County Farms Working Group had undertaken a great deal of wide ranging work but the report had been returned to Cabinet Scrutiny Committee with the criticism that the recommendations could not be substantiated. It had not been possible to include every single piece of evidence in the report as it would have become unwieldy. The Chair said that the majority of the Working Group had re-examined the report and were satisfied that no changes were required. The Chair said that Cabinet Scrutiny Committee Group Leads' recommendation was that this Committee should look again at the recommendations contained within the County Farms Report on a page by page basis to ascertain if any of the recommendations should be changed. The Committee agreed to consider the recommendations on a page by page basis.
- 2.4 The Committee agreed that the following recommendations should remain unchanged:  
Recommendations 1 – 10.  
Recommendations 12, 14 – 33.
- 2.5 The Committee agreed that the following recommendations should be changed as follows:



Recommendation 11 to be corrected to read:

“The retained Estate should remain at an absolute minimum of 16,000 acres, subject to the provision in recommendation 13 regarding affordable housing.”

Recommendation 13 to be amended to read:

“Any future disposals should be restricted to property that has been identified as being surplus in the Management Strategy Plans or where a price markedly above market value can be obtained. In either case, the proceeds should be shared, with 25% of revenue and capital receipts being re-invested in the Estate, including the purchase of additional land to maintain or increase the overall size of the Estate. The only exception to this should be the use of land for affordable housing, in which case a net disposal of land (as opposed to effective exchange) should be considered.”

- 2.6 Following the above amendments the Committee agreed that the Working Group’s Final Report should be referred back to the Cabinet for consideration. Further, Members agreed that the Committee should make a response to the Cabinet points raised by the Managing Director of NPS and the Cabinet Member for Human Resources, Finance, Property and Corporate Affairs. The Working Group should meet to consider the points and clear the response with the Chair of the Cabinet Scrutiny Committee before inclusion in the response to the Cabinet.

### **3. Supporting people in difficult economic times**

- 3.1 The Chair gave a verbal update on progress since the last Cabinet Scrutiny Committee meeting on 25 November.

### **4. Cabinet Scrutiny Working Groups: Update**

No working group meetings have taken place since 25 November 2008.

### **5. Forward Work Programme**

- 5.1 The Committee received and noted the Forward Work Programme.
- 5.2 The Committee agreed that the proposed scrutiny of Members of Parliament be removed from the Forward Work Programme.

Details of the full discussion can be found in the minutes of the meeting.

**Ms Sue Whitaker**  
**Chair, Cabinet Scrutiny Committee**

**Report of the Meeting of the  
Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
Held on 27 November 2008**

**1 Informal Consultation on Three NHS Norfolk Draft Strategies**

- 1.1 Until 22 January 2009, the NHS Norfolk Board are holding informal consultation on three draft commissioning strategies that set out priorities to meet the following national targets: (a) Maternity Commissioning Strategy 2008-2013 (b) Children's Commissioning Strategy 2008-2013 and (c) Sexual Health Strategy.
- 1.2 The Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Mrs Bevan Jones (NNDC) have been authorised to clear the Committee's response to these national targets that are not at this stage about specific changes to services on the ground, which would be subject to statutory consultation requirements.

**2 The Member Awayday of 20 November 2008**

- 2.1 Officers are preparing a report and action plan on the outcomes of the Member Awayday held on 20 November 2008 which will be circulated to Members.

**3 The Centre for Public Scrutiny**

- 3.1 The Centre for Public Scrutiny has offered the Committee an expert adviser for a free half-day health scrutiny support session on a range of topics, one of which is "Joint Strategic Needs Assessments and World Class Commissioning". This will be held at County Hall on the 18 March 2009.

**4 Service Commissioning for People with Eating Disorders**

The Committee agreed to invite Mark Weston, Assistant Director for Mental Health and Learning Difficulties, NHS Norfolk, to attend its next meeting to explain the Primary Care Trust's response to a Coroner's report and recommendations about improving commissioning of services for people with eating disorders.

**5 Diabetes – Children's Services and Foot Screening Services**

- 5.1 The Committee received a report about the Children's Diabetes Service and the Foot Screening Service for people with diabetes and received evidence from several witnesses.
- 5.2 The following key points came out of the discussion:
- There was a high rate of Type 1 diabetes in Norfolk (a little under twice the average incidence in the UK). Those who entered Norfolk for any length of

time were as likely to contact Type 1 diabetes as those who had lived here all their lives. The reasons for the dramatic increase in the number of children under 16 with Type 1 diabetes were unknown. The matter was being researched.

- Following concerns raised previously by the Committee, the commissioning of diabetes care for children and young people had been made one of the key priorities within the NHS Norfolk Commissioning Strategy.
- NHS Norfolk had identified a need for a Specialist Diabetes Support Centre.
- NHS Norfolk was looking at investing in training practice nurses to deliver an adequate service within primary care.
- The Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust had taken on an additional 1.5 wte specialist diabetes posts, plus an additional one day a week administrative support post. The additional staffing would bring the level of staffing in line with guidance set by the Royal College of Nurses and enable the Diabetes Service to meet minimum national standards.
- Members were concerned as to whether complying only with minimum standards would provide a publicly acceptable level of service in a county that was struggling to cope with a dramatic increase in the number of children with diabetes.
- The witnesses said that Diabetes Services were struggling to cope with the increasing number of children and families seeking psychological support. They said the majority of adolescents with diabetes experienced significant depressive illness, behavioural problems and family dysfunction. They added that more needed to be done to provide children with long-term care and support. They pointed out that short-term mental health support for those with diabetes had only a limited affect.
- The witnesses went on to say that there needed to be more resources to follow up on children who did not attend appointments for psychological support. These were usually the most vulnerable children and the ones most likely to develop complications and early death.
- A home visit after diagnosis was considered vital to families.
- Members commented that more needed to be done to provide dedicated psychological support for families in schools. Members wanted to have details as to the number of children waiting to receive psychological support for Type 1 diabetes and average waiting times for this kind of support.
- It was pointed out by the witnesses that links between the NHS and Children's Services had improved since the introduction of a common assessment framework. Tensions did, however, remain between the different expectations of clinicians and those working in Children's Services concerning the capacity of each organisation to respond to the diabetes needs of children.
- Members commented that the pathway for diabetes care was different across

the county. A Diabetes Network for the whole county would provide a greater degree of consistency.

- The witnesses said that there were set procedures that had to be followed by all those involved in the field of child diabetes before a multi-agency meeting could be put in place with the parents/carers to ensure the correct level of support.
- Members were concerned that children and families were not getting the help they needed from the NHS or Children's Services unless the need to supply that care became a child protection issue.
- Members said that it would have been helpful if the witnesses had been prepared to give examples in the meeting of how recent changes in the Diabetes Service and in the Foot Screening Service had led to service improvements. Without such evidence Members were reluctant to close their consideration of the subject of child diabetes at this time.

5.3 The Committee agreed to set up a Scrutiny Task and Finish Working Group to examine the children's diabetes service and the foot screening service (including retinopathy screening) for people with diabetes in more detail, and appointed Members to serve on that group.

## **6 How We Manage Death and Dying**

6.1 The Committee received a progress report on the implementation of their recommendations for improvements in end of life and palliative care services in the county and received evidence from several witnesses.

6.2 During the course of discussion the following key points were made:

- It was noted that NHS Norfolk had spent approximately £1.2m of a ring fenced sum of £2.2m of additional investment for end of life care issues arising from management cost savings dating back to PCT reconfiguration in 2006. NHS Norfolk was looking to ring fence the remaining £1m for use on end of life issues in the next financial year. It was said that this could be spent on addressing issues around education and training and bereavement services.
- Witnesses said NHS Great Yarmouth and Waveney took the Healthcare Commission's annual health check results very seriously and was disappointed that it had not met with the care standard for "dignity and respect", with particular regard to patients with end of life needs. Witnesses said that the health check had not directly assessed the quality of services provided by the PCT. Witnesses said that the health check was an administrative check, which sought evidence of the administrative processes by which the PCT assessed itself of service quality. The PCT was fully committed to providing people with real choices as to where they could spend the end of their lives. The witnesses said that NHS Great Yarmouth and Waveney had invested in end of life care by employing end of life facilitators and taking on additional bed capacity in the community.

6.3 The Committee agreed to seek an update report on end of life issues from NHS Norfolk and NHS Great Yarmouth and Waveney in no more than six months time.

## **7 Prevention of Suicide in Norfolk**

7.1 The Committee received a report about initiatives to reduce the level of suicide in Norfolk, which was higher than the regional average and received evidence on the matter from several witnesses.

7.2 During discussion the following key points were made:

- The witnesses said NHS Norfolk was setting up a suicide audit trail with GPs.
- Members said there needed to be close working with Housing Agencies.
- Members also said more needed to be done to publicise the route that people could take to receive assistance with feelings of suicide. This was particularly important in reducing the number of suicides by young men.
- It was noted that NHS Norfolk and NHS Great Yarmouth and Waveney were developing written guidance prevention strategies for suicide. The draft strategy for the NHS Norfolk area would be presented to the NHS Norfolk Board early in 2009.
- Norman Smith of the Norfolk Bereavement Support Group spoke about how he was looking to launch in January 2009 a new charity called “Lifeline” that would offer one-to-one befriending support, which the Samaritans were no longer able to provide. In reply to questions he said that the group had plans to publicise their activities and raise funds from grants and charitable sources.

7.3 The Committee agreed that NHS Norfolk, NHS Great Yarmouth and Waveney and Norfolk and Waveney Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust should provide Members with an update on progress with initiatives to prevent suicides and that this information should be included in a future edition of the NHOSC briefing note.

## **8 The Impact of Housing on Physical and Mental Health**

The Committee received the final report of the Working Group looking into the impact of housing on physical and mental health, and this was presented to Members for approval. The Committee approved the report and agreed to send it to the seven Norfolk District Councils, Norfolk County Council, NHS Norfolk, NHS Great Yarmouth and Waveney and Norfolk and Waveney Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust with a recommendation that they refer it to the Local Area Agreement Outcome Champion for a response within three months and to the Health and Wellbeing Partnership for information.

**Mrs Janice Eells**  
**CHAIRMAN**

**Report of the Standards Committee  
Meeting of 20 November 2008**

- 1. Appointment of Further Members of the Committee**
  - 1.1 Interviews for the appointment of a new independent Member of the Committee are taking place on 15 January 2008 and the Chairman of the Committee will be making a verbal recommendation in relation to the appointment at the Council Meeting to which this report relates.
  - 1.2 Mr Hull will also serve on the Committee as a Member of the Green Party.
- 2. Consideration of the Government consultation on changes to the Model Code of Conduct for Members and the introduction of a code of conduct for officers.**
  - 2.1 The report sought the Committee's views on the Government proposals to revise the model Code of Conduct.
  - 2.2 In response to the questions in the consultation that related to extending the Code of Conduct to cover Members' behaviour in their private capacity Members agreed that the extension should be limited to certain types of criminal offence only. They did not agree to the addition of a further general principal and they asked for the Department for Communities and Local Government to be very clear in the legislation about what constituted a criminal offence for Code of Conduct purposes and what did not.
  - 2.3 In response to the questions that related to the introduction of an Employee Code of Conduct it was noted that the County Council's own conduct rules for employees already covered all the key areas referred to in the consultation. However, Members agreed that a uniform Code applying to all authorities might be helpful, that it should apply to all employees and that the registration requirements should only apply to members of the Chief Officers Group, the County Management Team and members of the Senior Managers Forum.
- 3. Steps taken to publicise the Standards Committee and the Complaints Process.**
  - 3.1 A report was given on steps taken to publicise the work of the Committee and the complaints process, as a result of previous comments made by the Committee to do so.

- 3.2 The website had been updated with regard to how to make a complaint and the Members involved. Members of the Committee were asked to access the site to see how easy it was to navigate and find out information and feed back to the Assistant Head of Democratic Services.

MRS JACQUELINE MIDDLETON

CHAIRMAN

STANDARDS COMMITTEE

<p><b>Report of the Personnel Committee Meeting held on 1 December 2008</b></p>
---

**1. Senior Manager Responsibilities – Head of Human Resources**

- 1.1 The Committee considered and approved the contents of a report, containing exempt information, by the Director of Corporate Resources and Cultural Services relating to the contractual arrangements of individuals and.

**2. Senior Manager Responsibilities – Other Senior Managers**

- 2.1 The Committee considered and approved a report, containing exempt information, by the Head of Human Resources relating to the contractual arrangements of individuals.

**Harry Humphrey**  
**Vice-Chairman**  
**Personnel Committee**



NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL

19 January 2009

**REPORT OF THE PLANNING (REGULATORY) COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD ON 14 NOVEMBER 2009**

1. **Enforcement Action:**
  - 1.2 **Great Witchingham: Clayhall Farm, Lenwade C/5/2007/5005: Variation of Condition 3 of Broadland District Council's permission and other variations to the rendering plant. Banham Compost Ltd**
  - 1.3 The Committee authorised the Director of Planning & Transportation to issue an enforcement notice requiring total demolition of the building and removal of the plant constructed and containing all other necessary requirements approved by him in consultation with the Head of Law.
2. **Minerals and Waste Applications referred to Committee for Determination**
  - 2.1 **C/2/2008/2006: West Dereham: Grange Farm: Proposed replacement quarry with processing of aggregates, recycling and landfilling of inert wastes and restoration back to near original ground levels: Frimstone Limited**
  - 2.2 Subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure vehicle routing eastward from the site to the A134, the Director was authorised to issue a planning permission subject to conditions including time limit, landscaping, phased working and restoration, inert waste only, hours of working, archaeological investigation, construction of access and visibility splay, Environment Agency requirements, control of noise, dust, lighting, and aftercare.
  - 2.3 **C/6/2008/6003: Borough of Great Yarmouth: Caister-on-Sea: Site north-east of Caister Bypass: Proposed borrow pit: J S Bloor (Sudbury) Ltd**
  - 2.4 The Director was authorised to issue a decision notice granting planning permission, subject to conditions concerning a one year time limit; hours of working; revised haul route; protection of the public right of way; protection of water vole habitat; archaeological requirements; a site waste management plan and conditions as required by the Environment Agency; control of noise and dust; location and height of stockpiles; the requirements of the Internal Drainage Board, and working, restoration and aftercare.

3. **C/7/2007/7032: Variation of conditions 2 (site layout) and 9 (landscape scheme) of Planning Permission C/7/2007/7021 to amend the layout of the compound, install and additional engine and erect a single storey office building. Aldeby Landfill Site, Oaklands Gravel Pit, Common Road**

- 3.1 The Director was authorised to issue a decision notice granting Planning permission for the proposals, subject to conditions concerning time limit, construction vehicle routing, site layout, ground levels, removal of permitted development rights, retention of acoustic fencing, noise control, monitoring and maintenance of landscaping.

4. **Development by the County Council**

**Seething Parish – Application Y/7/2008/7016 – Construction of a new three class base school with activity hall, servery and administration /staff rooms. Construction of new access road and on-site parking. Change of use of agricultural land to education use. For Director of Children’s Services**

- 4.1 Subject to the views of the Secretary of State, the grant of planning permission was delegated to the Director of Planning and Transportation subject to conditions providing for:
- Completion and retention of the site access and the parking and servicing areas before the building is brought into use
  - Approval and completion of the off site highway works before the building is brought into use
  - Approval of a construction management plan before the development is commenced and its subsequent implementation
  - Implementation and retention of the approved landscape scheme and tree protection
  - Approval and implementation of a School Travel Plan

5. **Appeal Decisions**

- 5.1. **Beetley Quarry, Beetley, C/3/2007/3012: Extraction of sand and gravel with continued processing of mineral and use of haul route & C/3/2007/3042: Continued use of concrete batching plant, Barker Bros Aggregates Limited**

- 5.2 The appeal decisions were noted and the developments would be reflected in the monitoring programme.

6. **Marlingford: Former Sand and Gravel Pit, Colton Road, Colton. C/7/2007/7006: Restoration of south west corner of former quarry using inert wastes : R G Carter**

- 6.1 The appeal decision and observations were noted and would be considered when determining any similar applications in the future.

**Derek Baxter  
Chairman  
Planning (Regulatory) Committee**

19 January 2009

**REPORT OF THE PLANNING (REGULATORY) COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD ON 19 DECEMBER 2008**

1. **Heartsease – Application Y/4/2008/4023 – Heartsease Open Academy proposed demolition of existing academy school and construction on a new academy, with adjoining sports centre; floodlit multi-use games area; new vehicular and pedestrian access arrangements; retention and remodelling of existing school hall to provide car and motorcycle maintenance training facility. For the Director of Children’s Services.**
- 1.1 The Director of Planning and Transportation was authorised to grant planning permission subject to conditions providing for:
  - Further details of under storey planting and implementation and maintenance of landscaping
  - Tree protection during construction
  - Satisfactory layout and construction of the parking and servicing areas in accordance with the submitted plans prior to occupation of the new school
  - Approval of a construction and traffic management plan prior to commencement of the development and its subsequent implementation, to include specification of hours of work
  - Construction accesses to be in place prior to commencement of development and their subsequent reinstatement
  - Existing site boundary on Salhouse Road and Heartsease Lane to be set back and intervening land between the site and highway to be adopted by the Highway Authority before the commencement of the development and the construction of the shared use footpath / cycleway thereon to be constructed prior to occupation of the new School
  - Review and implementation of School Travel Plan to include provision of phased development of additional cycle parking
  - Details of external lighting to be submitted and approved to include provision for lockable switch control to floodlighting to the Multi Use Games Area
  - The School building and Sports Centre hereby permitted shall only be used between the hours of 07.00 hours to 22.00 hours
  - The vehicle maintenance training building shall only be used between the hours of 8.30 am and 9.00 pm Monday to Friday and 8.30 am to 12.30 pm on Saturdays and shall not be used on Sundays or Bank Holidays
  - No power tools, machinery or vehicles shall be used or maintained

outside the vehicle maintenance training building nor operated within the building when doors and windows are open

- Levels of any ground contamination to be monitored during construction and remedial measures undertaken where necessary. Such measures to be approved in writing by the County Planning Authority
- Surface water runoff generated by a 1 in 100 year storm to be controlled so as not to exceed runoff from the existing site
- Provision of a surface water infiltration basin and permeable finishes to parking areas and the Multi Use Games Area
- Adoption and maintenance of the surface water drainage elements
- Playing fields as shown on submitted plan to be protected during construction
- Phasing and provision of playing pitches as set out in submitted plans
- Community use scheme to be approved
- Assessment of quality of playing pitches and subsequent maintenance
- The construction and operation of the development shall achieve a minimum of 10% of energy requirements from renewable or low carbon sources

**Derek Baxter**  
**Chairman**  
**Planning (Regulatory) Committee**

**Report of the Norwich Highways Agency Committee  
Meeting Held on 27 November 2008**

1. **Little Bethel Street Highway And Footpath Improvements**
  - 1.2 It was essential to the scheme that vehicles were prevented from mounting the pavement with raised kerbs, and there was concern about the damage vehicles had caused to the tarmac surface on the pavements. The proposals included the removal of the whole carriageway and its reconstruction.
  - 1.3 Concern was expressed that the bus companies were no longer using Bethel Street and that buses might never use this route in the future. Members were advised that it was still accessible by all but the largest vehicles and that the use of the route was up to the operators.
  - 1.4 The report was noted.
2. **Objections To The Traffic Orders For The Mount Pleasant /Albemarle Road/ The Cedars**
  - 2.1 During a lengthy discussion the Committee acknowledged the complex issues and the need to find the best solution possible.
  - 2.2 The Head of Transportation and Landscape (Norwich City Council) undertook to write to members of the Committee to apprise them of the work on the school travel plans, which included encouraging the use of park and ride schemes.
  - 2.3 It was agreed:
    - To approve the proposal for a 20mph speed limit in Mount Pleasant, Albemarle Road and The Cedars;
    - To acknowledge that the decision on whether to introduce a 'no entry' restriction in Mount Pleasant is a finely balanced one, and if approved, will increase the volume of traffic in Albemarle Road and Christchurch Road;
    - That the proposal for a 'no entry' restriction into Mount Pleasant from Newmarket Road would not be implemented.

- To continue to work with the local schools to encourage parents and children to use alternative modes of transport other than the private car.

### **3. Bowthorpe Road Speed Management Scheme – Fieldview Junction**

- 3.1 It was agreed not to introduce the traffic order to extend the double yellow lines at the Fieldview junction at this time.

### **4. An Updated On Local Bus Service Issues and Performance**

- 4.1 It was expected that real time information systems would be available on services in the city early in 2009.
- 4.2 Concern was expressed that buses were unpunctual and that punctuality was important to encourage people to use buses when coming into the city. If bus services were more punctual it would make car use less attractive.
- 4.3 General improvements to the bus service performance were noted.

### **5. Norwich Park and Ride Fare Changes**

- 5.1 The rationale behind reducing fares for single car occupants to make park and ride more attractive to them, therefore reducing the number of car journeys into the city was explained. Members were advised that park and ride use was monitored and this would include the impact of the changes included in the proposed fare changes.
- 5.2 The Head of Passenger Transport confirmed that discussions with the Transport Concessionary Authority would continue.
- 5.3 The amendments to the fares structure, with changes taking place in January 2009 were noted.
- 5.4 The existing Traffic Regulation Order at the Airport Park and Ride site to meet the operational requirements of the shift in fares structure were agreed.

### **6. Highways Improvement Programme**

- 6.1 Councillor Lubbock welcomed the report and said that the pedestrian crossings on the Ring Road and Unthank Road were long overdue. She requested that officers sent her further details about the scheme to extend the footpath in Leopold Road.
- 6.2 It was agreed to:
- Endorse the proposed submissions for Local Transport

Plan (LTP) funds for 2009/10 and 2010/11 as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report

- Ask the County Council's Cabinet to consider this Committee's submission for LTP funding as part of the overall highways and transportation capital programme for the coming years;
- Note the non-LTP schemes for the City that are detailed in appendix 3 of the report.

## **7. Performance Monitoring Of The Highways Agency Agreement**

- 7.1 It was agreed to receive the performance results and note that generally performance results for the 2008/2009 financial year compare reasonably well against targets.

## **8. Major Roadworks – Regular Monitoring**

- 8.1 It was agreed to note the report.

**Tony Adams**  
**Chairman**

**Norwich Highways Agency Committee**



**Report of the Meeting of the  
Norfolk Joint Museums and Archaeology Committee  
held on 21 November 2008**

**1 Gressenhall Farm and Workhouse Museum**

- 1.1 The Joint Committee are sad to report that the Suffolk Punch Queenie, a familiar sight at Gressenhall Farm and Workhouse for over a decade died recently. The Ivy Child Charitable Trust has kindly offered £7,000 to buy and harness a replacement shire horse.
- 1.2 Members spoke about the popularity of the activities that had been held at Gressenhall Museum during the summer and the improvements in Museum access arrangements for event days.

**2 The Work of Norfolk Landscape Archaeology (NLA) and the Historic Environment**

- 2.1 The Joint Committee received a PowerPoint presentation about the Historic Environment and the work of Norfolk Landscape Archaeology, covering the period September 2007 to September 2008.
- 2.2 During the presentation and the ensuing discussion the following key points were made:
- Some of the most important archaeological finds of the last 12 months were the 28 palaeolithic (one hundred thousand year old) hand axes found in gravel dredged up from the seabed in international waters off Great Yarmouth. The NMAS and English Heritage are working with their Dutch counterparts to evaluate these finds and explore whether some of this material can be placed on display in Norfolk. English Heritage has produced archaeological advice on which areas of the North Sea should be excluded from dredging operations and this advice is available to companies involved in this line of work.
  - The Norfolk Heritage Explorer Project was commended in the British Archaeological Awards 2008, in the best Information and Communication Technology Project category. The Joint Committee placed on record their thanks to everyone who had been involved in this success.

- 2.3 The Heritage Protection Bill, when enacted, will allow for the introduction of Heritage Partnership Agreements (HPAs). These will be legal agreements made between landowners, the local Planning Authority and English Heritage. They are intended for large archaeological sites and will outline the scope for work of a straightforward and/or repetitive nature (eg hedge cutting) to be undertaken in accordance with an agreed procedure. One of the two HPA pilots in the region will be for the Roman Fort at Caister-on-Sea.

### **3 The Roman Town at Venta Icenorum at Caistor St Edmund**

- 3.1 The Joint Committee received a PowerPoint presentation from Dr William Bowden, Lecturer in Roman Archaeology at the University of Nottingham about work by the Caistor Roman Town Project Team to date. The geographical survey was carried out during 2007/08 and the Project Team surveyed 30 hectares of the site and its hinterland. The survey revealed evidence of possible prehistoric and Anglo-Saxon occupation at Caistor St Edmund, suggesting that it had the largest archaeological sequence of any of the Greenfield Roman Towns of Britain. It was widely thought that the Roman Town had been accessible to maritime traffic. The geographical survey had not revealed evidence that showed the River Tass to be any wider at Caistor St Edmund in Roman times than it was today.
- 3.2 An audio tour has been produced for the site which can be downloaded on a mobile phone for £1.50 and taken as a text message. After the introduction of the next generation of mobile phones, as people walk around the site they will be able to pinpoint their position. The Project Team is seeking funding for a small-scale archaeological excavation.

### **4 NMAS and Looked After Children**

- 4.1 The Joint Committee received a PowerPoint presentation, including a short film, about the service for Looked After Children provided by the NMAS. The Joint Committee also received on the table a booklet about the Norwich Castle Museum's summer schools programme for Looked After Children managed by the NMAS and made possible through funding from Renaissance.
- 4.2 During the presentation and the ensuing discussion the following key points were made:
- The NMAS Learning Team support Looked After Children by running summer schools and offering free family tickets to all registered foster families in the county and providing foster carer days.
  - Many foster carers are unfamiliar with museums and welcome opportunities to learn more about how museums can support them and the children in their care.
  - The NMAS Learning Team has developed considerable expertise in working with vulnerable children by working in collaboration with the Norwich Youth Offending Team. This work had been extended in 2008 to include new collaboration with the Norwich Youth Inclusion and Support Panel.

- The NMAS Learning Team work closely with Community Music East and other arts organisations in order to integrate performance arts into museum activities.

## **5 NMAS Services for Older People**

- 5.1 The NMAS are collaborating with Adult Social Services in its review of day opportunities for older people and young people with physical and sensory impairments – the “Making Your Day” Project. This project provides the NMAS with an opportunity to develop its services to better meet the County Council’s strategic objectives for these target groups.
- 5.2 It is too early to say what effect the changes in concessionary bus travel will have on Museum attendance figures. The lack of public transport from Dereham to Gressenhall on Sundays is an issue that needs to be addressed by other organisations than the NMAS.

## **6 King’s Lynn Heritage and Cultural Asset Buildings Review**

- 6.1 The Joint Committee noted a briefing for Members on the recommendations of a review of King’s Lynn heritage and cultural assets and the potential implications for the delivery of the NMAS in King’s Lynn.

## **7 Collections Review: Norwich Museums**

- 7.1 The Joint Committee received a report that explained the background to the collections review and rationalisation process for Norwich Museums and recommended de-accessioning of two large social history objects, which did not fit the collecting policy, and a group of ethnographic material, which had been a long-term loan overseas for many years. The collection of ethnographic material will be given as a permanent commonwealth gift to the people of New Zealand from the people of Norfolk, England for display at Canterbury Museum, New Zealand. It was suggested that Canterbury Museum might like to erect a plaque to that effect.

**John Gretton**  
**Chairman**

## **Report of the Norfolk Records Committee Meeting held on 21 November 2008**

### **1. Appointment of Co-Opted Member and Observer**

Professor Carole Rawcliffe was appointed as Co-Opted Member and Dr Victor Morgan was invited to take up the Observer's position on the Norfolk Records Committee for 2008-09.

### **2. Norfolk Records Office Financial Report**

The report detailed the latest service planning and the projected out-turn for the 2008/09 Revenue Budget, Capital programme, and forecasts of Provisions and Reserves at 31 March 2009.

### **3. Service and Budget Planning, 2009-12**

The report identified key planning considerations for the service covered by the Norfolk Records Committee, including the contextual issues, performance position and the key improvement areas towards delivering the corporate objectives. It also set out the overall funding prospects and the assessment of spending pressures and potential savings needed to deliver the overall service plan within the forecast position for financial planning purposes.

The Committee agreed to recommend to Cabinet that The Archive Centre had a special need in regard to utility budget pressures and hoped that this could be recognised in the next budget round.

### **4. Revision of Some Charges for Service**

The report set out the County Archivist's revision of some service charges to offset the escalating external costs of raw materials and energy. The Committee agreed the new charges set out in the report.

### **5. Risk Register**

The report asked the Norfolk Records Committee to note the latest version of the Norfolk Record Office's risk register and invited comments from the committee. The Committee noted the risk register.

### **6. Periodic Report**

The report described the activities of the Norfolk Record Office between 1 April and 31 October 2008. So far this year, there were 255 accessions, including one which could be sub-divided into several parts. In addition, there were only five parishes which had yet to deposit their registers.

Work was ongoing to pursue records that were held by private businesses and Members were encouraged to use their contacts to help in this effort.

The Committee agreed that the County Archivist should contact the local branch of the Law Society and the courts to learn more about acquiring old records from solicitors.

## **7. King's Lynn Heritage and Cultural Asset Building Review**

The report provided a briefing on the recommendations of the above review and the potential implications for the delivery of the King's Lynn Borough Archives service in King's Lynn. It was suggested that, if the records ever became at risk, there was the option for housing them temporarily in The Archive Centre until a permanent solution was found in King's Lynn.

**Christopher Lloyd Owen, Chairman**



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Kristen Jones 01603 223053 or Textphone 0844 8008011 and we will do our best to help.

**Matters Considered by Review Panels**

**Adult Social Services Review Panel  
17 November 2008**

1. Cabinet Member Feedback on Previous Review Panel Comments
2. Progress Report on the Transfer of Employment of County Council Staff Seconded to the Norfolk and Waveney Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust
3. Scrutiny Items Identified by Members
4. 2008-09 Review and Capital Budget Monitoring Report
5. Service and Budget Planning for 2009 to 2012
6. Adult Social Services Performance Report
7. Update Report on the Progress of the Development of a Social Firm to Offer Employment Opportunities to People with Learning Difficulties
8. Making Your Day: Locality Commissioning Plans for Day Opportunities for Older People and People with a Physical Disability or Sensory Impairments in Norfolk
9. Transformation Programme
10. Audit Commission "Don't Stop Me Now – Preparing for an Ageing Population"

**Children's Services Review Panel  
19 November 2008**

1. Cabinet Member Feedback on Previous Review Panel Comments
2. 'Summer Challenge' Presentation by Keith Grainger
3. JAR Report Update
4. Scrutiny Programme
5. Annual Corporate Parenting Update
6. Children's Services Approach to Family Support and Looked After Children
7. Children's Services Financial Monitoring Report 2008/09 as at 30 September 2008
8. Service and Budget Planning 2009-12
9. Building Schools for the Future
10. Update on the Re-use of Buildings and Sites at Former Norwich Schools
11. The 14-19 Agenda: Changes to Arrangements For 16-19 Education and Training

12. South Lynn Millennium Community: Review of Children's Services' Developments
13. Expression of Interest for a New Academy to Replace Earlham High School in Norwich
14. The Hewett School: Proposal to Acquire Trust Status

<p><b>Corporate Affairs Review Panel</b> <b>12 November 2008</b></p>
--

1. Cabinet Member Feedback on Previous Review Panel Comments
2. Proposed new Scrutiny Topic – Review of Council's Constitution
3. Forward Work Programme: Scrutiny
4. Risk Management within Norfolk County Council and the Departments of Chief Executives and Corporate Finance
5. Efficiency Savings Programme
6. Planning, Performance and Resources Monitoring Report
7. 2008-09 Finance Monitoring Report
8. 2009/10 ICT Plan
9. Asset Performance Report 2008
10. Corporate Health & Mid-Year Report for 2007/2008
11. Service Budget Planning 2009-12

<p><b>Economic Development &amp; Cultural Services</b> <b>Review Panel – 18 November 2008</b></p>
---

1. Cabinet Member Feedback on Previous Review Panel Comments
2. Update of Economic Development's Service Plan Actions, Risk and Performance 2008/09
3. Cultural Services Performance & Revenue Budget & Capital Programme 2008/09 including Risk Register
4. Service and Budget Planning 2009-12 (Cultural Services)
5. Economic Development Budget Monitoring Report 2008/09
6. Service and Budget Planning 2009-12 (Economic Development)
7. Regional Spatial Strategy Review: EERA Request for Strategic Planning Authority Advice
8. Nar Ouse Regeneration Scheme – Economic Development Support
9. Scrutiny Work Programme
10. Norfolk Rural Community Council
11. Making Libraries a Safe and Welcoming Place

**Fire & Community Protection Review Panel  
11 November 2008**

1. Cabinet Member Feedback on Previous Review Panel Comments
2. Domestic Abuse – A Coordinated Response (Presentation)
3. Forward Work Programme: Scrutiny
4. Revenue Budget, Capital Programme and Performance Monitoring 2008/09
5. Risk Management in the Community Safety Portfolio
6. Trading Standards Performance Review: April – September 2008-09
7. Service and Budget Planning 2009-12
8. Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service Plan 2009/12

**Planning, Transportation, the Environment &  
Waste Review Panel - 5 November 2008**

1. Cabinet Member Feedback on Previous Review Panel Comments
2. Forward Work Programme: Scrutiny
3. Transfer of Closed Landfill Sites Formerly Operated by NEWS to the County Council – Update
4. Partnership Working
5. Budget Monitoring 2000/09
6. Update of Planning and Transportation's Service Plan Actions, Risks and Performance 2008/09
7. Service and Budget Planning 2009/12
8. Regional Spatial Strategy Review: EERA Request for Strategic Planning Authority Advice
9. Anglian Water Draft Business Plan 2010/15
10. Asset Performance Report