

Norfolk County Council**Minutes of the Meeting Held on Monday 11 December 2017****Present:**

Mr T Adams	Ms A Kemp
Mr A Adams	Mr K Kiddie
Mr S Aquarone	Mr M Kiddle-Morris
Mr D Bills	Mr B Long
Mr B Borrett	Mr I Mackie
Ms C Bowes	Dr E Maxfield
Mr R Brame	Mr G Middleton
Mrs J Brociek-Coulton	Mr S Morphew
Mrs S Butikofer	Mr G Nobbs
Mr M Castle	Ms J Oliver
Mr S Clancy	Mr R Oliver
Ms K Clipsham	Mr G Peck
Mr D Collis	Mr G Plant
Mr E Colman	Mr R Price
Ms E Corlett	Mr A Proctor
Mr S Dark	Mr W Richmond
Mrs M Dewsbury	Mr D Roper
Mr N Dixon	Mr D Rowntree
Mr D Douglas	Ms C Rumsby
Mr P Duigan	Mr M Sands
Mr F Eagle	Mr E Seward
Mr T East	Mr C Smith
Mr S Eyre	Mr T Smith
Mr J Fisher	Mr M Smith-Clare
Mr T FitzPatrick	Mr B Spratt
Mr C Foulger	Ms S Squire
Mr T Garrod	Mr B Stone
Mr A Grant	Mrs M Stone
Mrs S Gurney	Mr M Storey
Mr R Hanton	Dr M Strong
Mr D Harrison	Mr H Thirtle
M Chenery of Horsbrugh	Mrs A Thomas
Mr H Humphrey	Mr V Thomson
Mr B Iles	Mr J Timewell
Mr A Jamieson	Mrs K Vincent
Mr T Jermy	Mrs C Walker
Mrs B Jones	Mr J Ward
Dr C Jones	Mr B Watkins
Mr C Jordan	Mr A White

Present: 78

Apologies for Absence:

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs P Carpenter and Mr M Wilby.

1 Minutes

- 1.1 The minutes of the Council meeting held on Monday 16 October 2017 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2 Chairman's Announcements

- 2.1 The Chairman outlined some of the many visits he had carried out since the last meeting, in particular highlighting the hosting of the Dutch Ambassador on his two-day visit to Norwich with the Lord Mayor; attending the Lord Lieutenant's presentation of the British Empire Medals; attending the Rembrandt exhibition launch at Norwich Castle and numerous Trafalgar Day and Remembrance Day duties. The Chairman also referred to the visit he had organised for Councillors at RAF Marham as well as attending a yuletide event at RAF Mildenhall.

The Chairman went on to remind Council of his theme for the year – volunteering for youth groups with the emphasis on scouts, guides and cadets and that he had set his Chairman's Challenge to demonstrate something youth groups were doing to help alleviate loneliness in their communities. He also threw down a challenge to staff at county hall as well as Councillors to take up a new volunteer role within a youth group and said there would be a reception in the spring at County Hall where badges and certificates would be presented to those that had risen to the challenge.

- 2.2 The Chairman reminded Council that the annual Christmas Carol Service would be taking place on Friday 15 December at 12 noon in the marble map area and invited Members to attend where they could enjoy a glass of mulled wine and a mince pie for a minimum donation of £1 for charity.
- 2.3 The Chairman also mentioned the Citizenship ceremonies which took place on the first Wednesday of each month from 5 to 7pm. Two Councillors were invited to each ceremony and if any Member wanted to attend they should contact Trish Rodgers-Daymond in the first instance.

3 Declarations of Interest

- 3.1 Mr D Roper declared an interest in agenda item 5 (Motion 3) as his brother was a serving Police Community Support Officer (PCSO).
- 3.2 Mr H Humphrey declared an interest in agenda item 5 (Motion 2) as he was a Governor at Emneth Nursery and Children's Centre.
- 3.3 Mr T FitzPatrick declared an interest in Agenda item 5 (Motion 7) as he sat on the Executive of the Local Government Association.

4 Questions to Leader of the Council

4.1 Question from Mr G Nobbs

4.1.1 Mr Nobbs referred to the recent meeting the Leader had held with other District Leaders in Norfolk to discuss Unitary status or a single unitary in Norfolk. He asked the Leader if he had found any District Leader in Norfolk who supported his policy.

4.1.2 The Leader replied that he did not have a policy but was enquiring whether there could be a better way for governance in Norfolk and that all Leaders were involved in it.

Mr Nobbs considered the Leader had not answered the question and again asked the Leader if any District Leader supported his policy for a unitary Norfolk.

The Leader replied that all Norfolk Leaders were involved in the discussions.

4.2 Question from Mr D Roper

4.2.1 Mr Roper said he trusted the Leader would agree with him, that it was vitally important that Norfolk County Council was able to support its residents in terms of access to education and their place of work. He asked if the Leader further agreed with him that it would be disgraceful if any member of the community was no longer able to get to work or their place of education as a result of cuts to bus services as a direct result of cuts to bus subsidies by this Council.

4.2.2 The Leader replied that as the topic was subject to the consultation he would reserve comment.

4.3 Question from Mr M Castle

4.3.1 Mr Castle referred to the fact that a return to a Cabinet System of Governance by May 2019 was anticipated and asked the Leader to confirm that a vote to this effect would take place at the Annual meeting. He asked if the Leader would also confirm if his Administration would stick to the important protocol regarding the Chair of Scrutiny Committees being drawn from the opposition side of the Council.

4.3.2 The Leader replied that as there was a committee currently considering the subject he would not predetermine any recommendations.

4.4 Question from Mr B Stone

4.4.1 Mr Stone asked the Leader if he could confirm whether there was any truth in the claim that Council was not promoting the budget consultation and was instead hiding it away.

4.4.2 The Leader replied that there was no truth in the claim and the Administration was being quite open. He added that to date, 1328 responses had been received, therefore people were getting engaged with the consultation, it was open and was as straight as a gun barrel.

4.5 Question from Mr M Sands

4.5.1 Mr Sands said that Adult Social Care had been completely omitted in the autumn statement and County Council's Adult Social Care Committee had taken

the action of passing a cross-party motion on funding and the Chairman, Cllr Borrett, had a motion concerning Adult Social Care on the agenda. He added that the broadcast and print media in recent weeks had all covered the state of care in the home and of care homes and now we were informed through the EDP of the likely collapse of Four Season's Care Homes in Norfolk and Suffolk. Mr Sands asked if the Leader of the Council, with his counterpart in Suffolk, would be taking action to ensure continued and unbroken care of the residents of Four Seasons Care Homes should the administrators be called in. He also asked if the Leader would join him in deploring the actions of the hedge funds that seemed more intent on asset stripping or running down services rather than providing services and if the Leader would be writing to the Minister concerned.

4.5.2 The Leader replied that he was not aware of details of Four Seasons Care Homes but in a global sense he thought that Norfolk County Council's role and responsibility was to do the best it could for the elderly.

4.6 **Question from Mr B Watkins**

4.6.1 Mr Watkins referred to the recently published state of the nation report into social mobility which had revealed that six local authorities in Norfolk were in the bottom 20% of 325 local authorities across the country. He added that this was a pretty damning indictment of a lack of effective action and coordination across the county and surely could not be allowed to continue, looking particularly at the prospects for young people in some areas getting a poor start in life from which they struggled to recover later on. Mr Watkins quoted Dan Mobbs, the CEO from the Mancroft Advice Project which supported young people, who had said we should be ashamed of ourselves. Mr Watkins asked if the Leader agreed with Mr Mobbs and also what plans the Conservative Administration had to raise the profile of social mobility across Norfolk.

4.6.2 The Leader responded that one of his visions for Norfolk was to increase social mobility but that also, there used to be grammar schools but that they had been discontinued, the decision of which a lot of people still disagreed with. He added that personally he was not in favour or against it, but that either way social mobility was going to become a big issue.

4.7 **Question from Ms J Oliver**

4.7.1 Mrs Oliver asked the Leader, following the decision by the Labour Group to oppose the NDR western link, if he could confirm whether the project still had his full support.

4.7.2 The Leader replied that the project still had his full support. He added that he thought it was a real benefit to the city as well as Norfolk generally and that it was sad Labour did not support it, or it had been reported at EDT Committee that they did not support it.

4.8 **Question from Dr M Strong**

4.8.1 Dr Strong referred to proposed budget cuts and said she had been pleased to see that Lord Porter, the Leader of the Conservatives at the Local Government Association (LGA) and Leader of the LGA, had harangued the government by stating that local government was the most efficient part of the public sector, vigorously delivering balanced budgets and carving out efficiencies when carrying out essential local services, but we were reaching the impossible and facing uncertainty of future funding and the rise in demand for services for

children, adults and homeless people.

Dr Strong asked the Leader for details about the last time this county had approached the government with a similar plea and when was the last time Norfolk had harangued all our MPs for their support and if so, what the response had been.

4.8.2 The Leader replied that he had spoken to George Freeman recently on this subject and also spoken to Sajid Javid at the CCN conference a couple of weeks ago. He added that the topic was constantly at the forefront as everyone knew that Norfolk was under-funded and that a fairer funding campaign was going ahead and that London Boroughs were relatively a lot better off than shire counties. He added that something needed to happen with fairer funding and that hopefully the government would listen.

4.8.3 Dr Strong asked if we had approached all our MPs, to which the Leader replied that he had spoken to some, but not all, of them.

4.9 **Question from Ms E Corlett**

4.9.1 Ms Corlett asked the Leader, ahead of item 8 on the agenda, if he could tell Council what the current job seekers allowance was per week, which unemployed citizens in Norfolk had to live on.

4.9.2 The Leader responded that he understood it was £8.50 or £8.64 per hour.

4.10 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

4.10.1 Ms Kemp said that essential infrastructure was needed in west Norfolk. A river crossing had been agreed for Great Yarmouth, the NDR in Norwich was nearing completion but urgent improvements were needed in King's Lynn. She added that there had been another fatality near the pullover roundabout recently and urgent improvements in the infrastructure plan were needed. She asked what the Leader was doing in lobbying for this as the lack of funding was harming productivity and that businesses were moving away because of the poor road network.

4.10.2 The Leader replied that Martin Wilby, the Chairman of Environment, Development and Transport Committee was constantly lobbying.

4.11 **Question from Mr S Morphew**

4.11.1 Mr Morphew said, in light of the possible announcement of the Local Government Settlement later this week, if the Leader could let Council have some detail, because there was no detail available as yet, what lobbying he had done of Ministers in the lead-up to the Local Government settlement on behalf of the people of Norfolk.

4.11.2 The Leader replied that he had spoken to those mentioned previously and that he had lobbied, would continue to lobby and that the Managing Director was also lobbying. He added that everything possible was being done to get extra money into the Council.

4.12 **Question from Mr T Jermy**

4.12.1 Mr Jermy referred to the Leader's comments about the openness of the consultation currently taking place and asked if the Leader could confirm how

many press releases had been issued by the County Council promoting the consultation to date and how many more would be issued before the consultation closed in a few weeks' time.

- 4.12.2 The Leader replied that he didn't have the details to hand and would provide a written reply.

5 Notice of Motions

- 5.1 The following motion was proposed by Mrs C Walker and seconded by Mr T Jermy:

"Council believes the economic development contribution of the County Council is crucial in supporting business and growth in Norfolk. Council further believes the Business and Property Committee is currently too inward looking and not including on its agenda issues that are important to Norfolk like Britvic, Colman, CITB, Downham Market Science hub, Multiyork and Remploy.

Council resolves to request the Managing Director to present a report to the January Policy and Resources Committee with recommendations to strengthen the Economic Development function for incorporation into the 2017/18 budget if Policy and Resources Committee agrees.

Council further resolves that if any of the recommendations require consideration by CAG that they be brought directly to Council to avoid delay."

- 5.1.2 Following debate, and upon being put to a vote, with 25 votes in favour and 1 abstention, the motion was **LOST**.

- 5.2 The following motion was proposed by Ms E Corlett and seconded by Mr M Smith-Clare:

"Council notes:

- a. The public response to proposals to reduce council funding for Children's Centres from £10m to £5m as exemplified by the petition that has exceeded 5000 signatures opposing the proposals.
- b. The briefing was provided for Council members in 2016 (attached at annex A of the report) setting out the overwhelming benefits to families of Children's Centres and the longer term cost effectiveness of investing in Children's Services.

Council therefore resolves to:

1. Abandon the proposals to reduce funding to Children's Centres;
2. Withdraw those proposals from public consultation;
3. Utilise any recoverable underspends from Children's Centres for this financial year to mitigate the budget for 2018/19 and ask officers to bring proposals to fund any residual gap from other budgets;
4. Prepare budgets for 2018/19 to 2020/21 based on the presumption of protecting Children's Centres;
5. Request the Director of Children's Services to update the briefing to

members on the benefits of Children's centres;

6. Recommend that all members visit their local Children's Centre(s) by the time committees meet in January 2018, in order to be better informed during discussions on the future of Children's Centres"

5.2.1 The Chairman received the Petition against reducing council funding for Children's Centres from Ms E Corlett.

5.2.2 Following debate, and upon being put to a recorded vote (attached at Appendix A), with 27 votes in favour, 48 votes against and 2 abstentions, the motion was **LOST**.

5.3 The following motion was proposed by Dr C Jones and seconded by Mr D Rowntree:

"Council regrets the proposal by Norfolk's Chief Constable to abolish PCSOs and reduce public access to police stations. Council believes this is contrary to the Police and Crime Plan produced by the Police and Crime Commissioner to increase visible policing. Council notes the increase in warranted officers being proposed and that they will not materially increase visibility because of the nature of the work required of them.

Council believes the reduction in visible policing, even with the increase in warranted officers, is detrimental to the peace of mind of Norfolk residents. Whether it results in increased low level crime, it will undoubtedly result in increased fear of crime. Local intelligence and early warning of problems that can be mitigated by early intervention will also be lost.

As those most affected are likely to be the more vulnerable, Council believes abolishing PCSOs and reducing visible policing will put further strain on Council services either from victims, those needing support or because of the missed opportunities for early intervention mean a problem has already escalated. Whilst Council appreciates the financial challenge faced by Norfolk Constabulary caused by cuts in police funding, we also believe shifting the burden onto Councils is no solution.

Council resolves:

1. To welcome the increase in warranted officers and oppose the abolition of PCSOs, and to request the Chief Constable and Police and Crime Commissioner to review their proposals
2. To lobby the Home Secretary and Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to recognise the links between visible policing and its impact on demand for council services and provide more funding for visible policing through PCSOs
3. To undertake an impact assessment to establish the likely knock on effect on demand for County Council services and the projected impact on safeguarding of the reduction of police presence in Norfolk's schools."

5.3.1 Following debate, and upon being put to a vote, with 25 votes in favour and 2 abstentions, the motion was **LOST**.

5.4 The following motion was **WITHDRAWN** by Mrs S Butikofer.

“Over the last three years (2013-2015) in Norfolk 290 people have taken their own lives, on average there are 77 suicides every year in the county. This gives Norfolk an age-standardised suicide rate of 12.4 per 100,000, significantly higher than the national average of 10.1.

Nationally, suicide is the biggest killer of men under the age of 45.

Suicide is preventable yet in England 13 people kill themselves every day; one person every 90 minutes in the UK.

The government’s Mental Health Five Year Forward View (2016) has set the ambition to reduce the number of deaths from suicide by 10% from 2016-2021.

This Council rejects the target of a 10% reduction as inadequate.

The Council agrees that the Norfolk Suicide Prevention Strategy 2016-21 should be rewritten so that its target can be reset away from this government target and should follow the lead taken by the Cheshire and Merseyside Suicide Prevention Network of a ‘NO MORE’ suicide prevention strategy in saying clearly that aiming for zero suicides is the only acceptable outcome for the people in Norfolk.”

5.5 The following motion, proposed by Mr S Aquarone and seconded by Dr M Strong was amended by Mr Aquarone. Council accepted the amendment:

“This Council considers that sexual harassment is completely unacceptable and believes that it has no place in today’s workplace. Any councillor or member of staff who feels that they have been subjected to unwanted sexual advances should **feel confident to be able** raise their concerns without fear of intimidation or retaliation.

In light of this, the Managing Director is asked to report to the next meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee on the number of sexual harassment **allegations** claims that have been made in the last two years, any action or learning points and if any changes are required to the Council’s procedures in light of the report’s findings.”

5.5.1 The following amendment was proposed by Ms S Squire:

“This Council considers that sexual harassment, **bullying, harassment and intimidation** is completely unacceptable and believes that it has no place in today’s workplace. Any councillor or member of staff who feels that they have been subjected to unwanted sexual advances, **bullying, harassment and intimidation** should feel confident to raise their concerns without fear of intimidation or retaliation.

In light of this, the Managing Director is asked to report to the next meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee on the number of sexual harassment, **bullying, harassment and intimidation** allegations that have been made in the last two years, any action or learning points and if any changes are required to the Council’s procedures in light of the report’s findings.”

5.5.2 As proposer of the original motion, Mr Aquarone accepted the amendment, which became the substantive motion.

5.5.3 The following amendment was proposed by Mr R Oliver, which was accepted by Mr Aquarone as proposer of the original motion and became the substantive motion:

“This Council considers that sexual harassment, bullying, harassment and intimidation is completely unacceptable and believes that it has no place in today’s workplace **or society**. Any councillor or member of staff who feels that they have been subjected to unwanted sexual advances, bullying, harassment and intimidation, should feel confident to raise their concerns without fear of intimidation or retaliation.

In light of this, the Managing Director is asked to report to the next meeting of the Policy and Resources Committee on the number of sexual harassment, bullying, harassment and intimidation allegations that have been made in the last two years, any action or learning points and if any changes are required to the Council’s procedures in light of the report’s findings.”

5.5.4 Following debate, and upon being put to a vote, the motion was unanimously **CARRIED**.

5.6 The following motion was proposed by Dr E Maxfield and seconded by Mr D Roper:

“A 2016 report by The Children’s Society found that when care leavers move into independent accommodation they begin to manage their own budget fully for the first time. The report showed that care leavers can find this extremely challenging and with no family to support them and insufficient financial education, are falling into debt and financial difficulty.

Research from The Centre for Social Justice found that over half (57%) of young people leaving care have difficulty managing their money and avoiding debt when leaving care.

Norfolk County Council has statutory corporate parenting responsibilities towards young people who have left care up until the age of 25.

The Children and Social Work Act 2017 places corporate parenting responsibilities on district councils for the first time, requiring them to have regard to children in care and care leavers when carrying out their functions.

This council believes that:

1. To ensure that the transition from care to adult life is as smooth as possible, and to mitigate the chances of care leavers falling into debt as they begin to manage their own finances, they should be exempt from paying council tax until they are 25.
2. Care leavers are a particularly vulnerable group for council tax debt. This council resolves to use the County Council’s convening powers and expertise in corporate parenting to work with all council tax collecting authorities to exempt all care leavers in the county from council tax up to the age of 25, sharing any arising costs proportionately.”

5.6.1 Following debate, and upon being put to a recorded vote (attached at Appendix B), with 27 votes in favour, 47 votes against and 1 abstention, the motion was **LOST**.

5.7 The following motion was proposed by Mr B Borrett and seconded by Mr G Plant:
“Social care services across the country is facing a funding gap of over £2.5bn by 2020.

We believe that older and disabled people and their carers deserve lives which are good, dignified, healthy and as independent as possible, in their own communities.

The government needs to urgently recognise why social care matters and treat it as a national priority.

Therefore, this council resolves to call upon the government to:

1. Carry out an urgent and fundamental review of social care and health before next year's autumn Budget.
2. Properly fund social care with genuinely new government money and to explore other mechanisms to support social care.”

5.7.1 The following amendment was proposed by Mr B Watkins and seconded by Mr D Roper:

“Social care services across the country is facing a funding gap of over £2.5bn by 2020.

~~We believe that older and disabled people and their carers deserve lives which are good, dignified, healthy and as independent as possible, in their own communities.~~

The government needs to urgently recognise why social care matters and treat it as a national priority.

Therefore, this council resolves to call upon the government to:

1. Carry out an urgent and fundamental review of social care and health before next year's autumn Budget.
2. Properly fund social care with genuinely new government money and to explore other mechanisms to support social care.
3. ***The Council urgently assesses the effects of its cuts to Adult Social Care funding and reports to a future meeting of the Adult Social Care Committee, not later than the 5 March 2018 meeting, on the outcomes that the reduction in funding is having on the recipients of care.***

5.7.2 As proposer of the original motion, Mr Borrett did not accept the amendment, which was then debated by Council. Upon being put to a vote, with 28 votes in

favour and 2 abstentions, the amended motion was **LOST**.

5.7.3 The following amendment was proposed by Ms E Corlett and seconded by Mr M Sands:

“Social care services across the country is facing a funding gap of over £2.5bn by 2020.

We believe that older and disabled people and their carers deserve lives which are good, dignified, healthy and as independent as possible, in their own communities.

Council notes the funding gap of children's services by £2 billion by 2019/20 as outlined in the cross-party Local Government Association (LGA) report 'Bright Futures' published in October, further backed up by an open letter to ministers last month from the LGA, Barnardo's, The Children's Society, Action for Children and the National Children's Bureau.

As corporate parents we believe that Norfolk children and young people deserve lives which are safe, healthy and happy, and should be supported equally to achieve their potential.

The government needs to urgently recognise why social care matters and treat it as a national priority.

Therefore, this council resolves to call upon the government to:

1. Carry out an urgent and fundamental review of social care and health before next year's autumn Budget.
2. Properly fund social care with genuinely new government money and to explore other mechanisms to support social care.
3. ***Lobby the government to properly fund the needs of Norfolk in the forthcoming Local Government funding settlement announcement***
4. ***Lobby the government to properly fund children's services and plug the £2 billion funding gap***

Council further resolves

- ***To a cross party delegation to speak to ministers to show unity of purpose to government on behalf of Norfolk residents***
- ***To use any underspend in the adult services budget this year to mitigate the impact of funding cuts on services to vulnerable people in Norfolk”.***

5.7.4 As proposer of the original motion, Mr Borrett did not accept the amendment, which was then debated by Council. Upon being put to a vote, with 27 votes in favour, the amended motion was **LOST**.

5.7.5 Mr B Borrett proposed the following amendment to the motion which was agreed by Council and became the substantive motion:

Social care services across the country is facing a funding gap of over £2.5bn by 2020.

We believe that **all recipients of adult social care** ~~elder and disabled people~~ and their carers deserve lives which are good, dignified, healthy and as independent as possible, in their own communities.

The government needs to urgently recognise why social care matters and treat it as a national priority.

Therefore, this council resolves to call upon the government to:

1. Carry out an urgent and fundamental review of social care and health before next year's autumn Budget.
2. Properly fund social care with genuinely new government money and to explore other mechanisms to support social care.

5.7.6 The substantive motion was then debated and upon being put to a vote was unanimously **CARRIED**:

Social care services across the country is facing a funding gap of over £2.5bn by 2020.

We believe that all recipients of adult social care and their carers deserve lives which are good, dignified, healthy and as independent as possible, in their own communities.

The government needs to urgently recognise why social care matters and treat it as a national priority.

Therefore, this council resolves to call upon the government to:

1. Carry out an urgent and fundamental review of social care and health before next year's autumn Budget.
2. Properly fund social care with genuinely new government money and to explore other mechanisms to support social care.

Council adjourned at 12.50 p.m. and reconvened at 1.30 p.m.

5.8 The following motion was proposed by Mr K Kiddie and seconded by Mr S Clancy:

"This council recognises the vital importance of job creation and economic growth as drivers of prosperity, improved quality of life, and as the number one means of lifting people out of poverty.

We celebrate the fact that over 30,000 more Norfolk people are in work now than in 2010, and applaud the role played by the Conservative government in helping creating the conditions that have brought this about.

The launch of the government's Industrial Strategy now takes this to a new level, ensuring investment is targeted in the areas likely to generate the greatest

outcomes.

This council resolves to:

- Make the strongest possible case to the government that Norfolk is open for business
- Prepare a plan for submission to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, outlining how Norfolk can play its part in raising productivity, driving innovation and creating jobs, and putting us at the front of the queue for new investment.
- Express to the government our support and readiness to play a full role in addressing the four Grand Challenges, particularly the challenge of an ageing population.”

5.8.1 The following amendment was proposed by Mr T Jermy and seconded by Mr S Morphew:

“This council recognises the vital importance of job creation and economic growth as drivers of prosperity, improved quality of life, and as the number one means of lifting people out of poverty.

~~We celebrate the fact that over 30,000 more Norfolk people are in work now than in 2010, and applaud the role played by the Conservative government in helping creating the conditions that have brought this about.~~

We celebrate the fact that over 30,000 more Norfolk people are in work now than in 2010, **but recognise the challenges faced by the nature of a low wage economy with two District Council areas in Norfolk ranking within the top 10 in the UK in terms of low wages.**

The launch of the government’s Industrial Strategy now takes this to a new level, ensuring investment is targeted in the areas likely to generate the greatest outcomes.

This council resolves to:

- Make the strongest possible case to the government that Norfolk is open for Business
- Prepare a plan for submission to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, outlining how Norfolk can play its part in raising productivity, driving innovation and creating jobs, and putting us at the front of the queue for new investment. **As part of this we will highlight to the Government that the Eastern Region remains the second least funded region in England for spending per head on transport infrastructure and demand more equitable support.**
- Express to the government our support and readiness to play a full role in addressing the four Grand Challenges, particularly the challenge of an ageing population.”

5.8.2 As proposer of the original motion, Mr Kiddie did not accept the amendment, which was debated and put to a vote. With 27 votes in favour the amended motion was **LOST**.

5.8.3 The following amendment was proposed by Ms A Kemp:

“This council recognises the vital importance of job creation and economic growth as drivers of prosperity, improved quality of life, and as the number one means of lifting people out of poverty.

We celebrate the fact that over 30,000 more Norfolk people are in work now than in 2010, and applaud the role played by the Conservative government in helping creating the conditions that have brought this about.

The launch of the government’s Industrial Strategy now takes this to a new level, ensuring investment is targeted in the areas likely to generate the greatest outcomes.

This council resolves to:

- Make the strongest possible case to the government that Norfolk is open for business
- Prepare a plan for submission to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, outlining how Norfolk can play its part in raising productivity, driving innovation and creating jobs, and putting us at the front of the queue for new investment.
- Express to the government our support and readiness to play a full role in addressing the four Grand Challenges, particularly the challenge of an ageing population, ***including road, infrastructure and public transport.***”

5.8.4 As proposer of the original motion, Mr Kiddie did not accept the amendment and, with no seconder, the amendment **FELL**.

5.8.5 The substantive motion was then debated. Upon being put to a vote, with 54 votes in favour, 16 votes against and 2 abstentions, the motion was **CARRIED**.

“This council recognises the vital importance of job creation and economic growth as drivers of prosperity, improved quality of life, and as the number one means of lifting people out of poverty.

We celebrate the fact that over 30,000 more Norfolk people are in work now than in 2010, and applaud the role played by the Conservative government in helping creating the conditions that have brought this about.

The launch of the government’s Industrial Strategy now takes this to a new level, ensuring investment is targeted in the areas likely to generate the greatest outcomes.

This council resolves to:

- Make the strongest possible case to the government that Norfolk is open for business
- Prepare a plan for submission to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, outlining how Norfolk can play its part in raising productivity, driving innovation and creating jobs, and putting us at the front of the queue for new investment.
- Express to the government our support and readiness to play a full role in addressing the four Grand Challenges, particularly the challenge of an ageing population.”

6 Recommendations from Service Committees

6.1 Policy & Resources – Recommendations from the meetings held on 30 October and 27 November 2017

6.1.1 Mr C Jordan, Chairman of Policy & Resources Committee, moved the recommendations in the report.

6.1.2 Consents for the Appointment of Company Directors – Norse Environmental Waste Services Ltd.

Council **RESOLVED** to:

- **Appoint** Tracy Jessop as the nominated Director of Norse Environmental Waste Services Ltd.

6.1.3 Norwich Northern Distributor Road – Capital Update.

Council **RESOLVED** to:

- Increase the NDR Budget by £19.25m to £205m as explained at Appendix 1 of the report.

6.1.4 Mid-Year Treasury Management Monitoring Report 2017-18.

Council **RESOLVED** to:

- **Agree** the Mid-Year Treasury Management Monitoring Report 2017-18.

6.1.5 Recommendations from the Constitution Advisory Group meeting held on 8 November 2017.

Council **RESOLVED** to:

- **Agree** the Recommendations from the Constitution Advisory Group meeting held on 8 November 2017.

6.1.6 Norse Consents Report

Council **RESOLVED** to:

- Agree the appointment of Directors to Companies in the Norse Group as set out below:

- 1 A change to the Directors of Enfield Norse Ltd whereby Justin Galliford is replaced as a Director by Robert Trewick, who is the Operations Director of Commercial Services at Norse Commercial Services Ltd; and Ruth Metcalf, who has recently left the business, is replaced by Nick Maddox, Group Director, Building & FM at Norse Commercial Services Ltd.
- 2 A change to the Directors of NEWS Ltd whereby Ruth Metcalf is replaced by Mark Emms, Group Director, Environmental and

- 3 Transport at Norse Commercial Services Ltd.
The appointment of Mike Britch, Managing Director of the Norse Group Ltd, and David Shaw, Operations Director of NPS Norwich Ltd as Directors of the new joint venture company, Build Insight Ventures Ltd.

6.2 **Recommendations from the Environment, Development & Transport Committee meeting held on 10 November 2017.**

6.2.1 Mr S Clancy, Vice-Chairman of Environment, Development & Transport Committee, moved the recommendations in the report.

6.2.2 **Highway Capital Programme & Transport Asset Management Plan (TAMP).**

Council **RESOLVED** to:

- **Note** the content of the Inspector's report into the examination of the Single Issue Silica Sand Review.
- **Adopt** the Single Issue Silica Sand Review, incorporating the main modifications and additional modifications.
- **Adopt** the associated changes to the Revised Policies Map.
- **Note** that, on adoption, the Single Issue Silica Sand Review would form part of the adopted Norfolk Minerals Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document.

7 **Reports from Service Committees (Questions to Chairman)**

7.1 **Report of the Adult Social Care Committee meetings held on 9 October and 6 November 2017.**

Mr B Borrett, Chairman of Adult Social Care Committee moved the report.

7.1.1 **Question from Dr M Strong**

Dr Strong asked if the Chairman would write to every single Norfolk MP for support, asking for them to write to Government and also ask them if there was any other action they could take to speed up the process of getting additional funding for adult social care.

The Chairman replied that he would be very happy to do so.

7.1.2 **Question from Mr B Watkins**

Mr Watkins said that it had been agreed earlier this year that part of the extra £35m Council had received from Government for adult social care would be used for the recruitment of up to 50 new social workers. Mr Watkins asked if the Chairman could explain what the rationale was for removing the 2018/19 proposed saving relating to the reduction in the number of personnel we use who work for employment agencies, what the extra cost to Council was and if it indicated that the recruitment process for new social workers had run into difficulties.

The Chairman replied that the recruitment process had not run into difficulties and that he would let Mr Watkins have a written response to the technical issues

regarding costs, etc.

7.1.3 **Question from Mr D Rowntree**

Mr Rowntree said that the Chairman may, or may not, know that he was delighted to have been appointed the Labour Group Champion for People with Learning Disabilities. He added that one in 50 adults had such a disability which could cause problems with learning new skills or information and living independently. Mr Rowntree said he intended to meet as many people across the county with learning disabilities as he could, but those he had already met had been asked what the one thing Council could do that would most transform their lives. The overwhelming response had been that people were desperate for help in finding a job. He continued that Councillors may already know there was some support available, for example, the Match scheme who tried to place adults in suitable jobs in the community and the Owl Scheme, led by Children's Services, who helped young people prepare for work. He continued that, in Norfolk, the outcomes in this area were very poor with the latest figures showing that, out of 1 million learning disabled adults who were willing to work and be able to carry out suitable work, only 7,500 had paid jobs. Sadly many organisations were still nervous about employing disabled people, especially those with learning disabilities and were often unaware of the reasonable adjustments they could make, the financial help available, but most importantly the abilities if you looked past the disabilities. Mr Rowntree added that he was pleased to say that the tide seemed to be turning and some large organisations, including the NHS had committed to taking positive steps to increase the intake of staff with learning disabilities. He said, with that in mind, he had two questions – 1) how many people did the Council currently employ who identified as having a learning disability, and 2) would Council join the growing list of employers and commit to taking positive steps to increase the number of staff it employed who had a learning disability.

The Chairman replied that it was a target of the Adult Social Care Committee to increase the number of people with learning disabilities in employment. He added that he had said earlier that people in employment had far better outcomes and that Adult Social Care followed that principle. He continued that currently, a Learning Difficulties Strategy for the Council was being developed and was currently out for consultation. The Chairman said he did not know the answer to the question about how many people were employed by the County Council and would provide a written reply, but confirmed that the County Council employed as many people as possible and this was something that Adult Social Care Committee had already championed in the past and would continue to do so.

7.1.4 **Question from Ms S Squire**

Ms Squire stated, with the forthcoming budget looming large, the biggest fear she heard from talking to residents was that the budget will mean service cuts to people receiving social care. She asked if the Chairman could please confirm if service cuts were planned and if so, whether they had been discussed, or if there were plans to discuss them, with any co-production groups to minimise the impact on residents.

The Chairman replied that the budget was currently out for consultation, so Members would be aware of the proposals.

7.1.5 **Question from Mr M Sands**

Mr Sands said that 20 out of the 50 additional social workers and six managers had been employed, but asked if this was 20 in addition to the filling of the 31 vacancies, meaning 51 had been employed in total. In other words was this 20 additional social workers over and above the 31 vacancies, meaning 51 had been employed, or was it just 20 filled vacancies out of 81?

The Chairman replied that these new appointees were part of the 50 additional capacity positions. He added that it was right that there was a turnover of social workers so there were always vacancies and we routinely recruit to replace those. He said he was pleased to say that the new recruitment campaign was now attracting people from outside Norfolk as well as internally through promotion and that he would provide Mr Sands with a breakdown.

7.1.6 **Question from Mr E Seward**

Mr Seward stated that the Chairman would be aware that, at the Policy & Resources Committee meeting, when reductions in building resilient lives budget and the provision of funding for emergency alarm systems in sheltered housing had been discussed, and the Chairman had said that this kind of funding had been the responsibility of District Councils since 2012. He continued that he had written to North Norfolk District Council and asked them how they were exercising this responsibility to which they had replied that they were not responsible for funding this service. He asked the Chairman who was right, North Norfolk District Council or him.

The Chairman replied that he stood by what he had said and that if Mr Seward had a concern with an answer he had received from another authority he needed to take it up with them.

7.1.7 Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

7.2 **Report of the Business & Property Committee meeting held on 18 October 2017.**

Mr K Kiddie, Chairman of Business & Property Committee moved the report.

7.2.1 **Question from Mr J Timewell**

Mr Timewell proposed a word change to page 177, 7.2 section 6 of the agenda.

- (vi) **AUTHORISE** the Head of Property to **implement the rental disposal** of 2 sites by way of lease on Scottow Enterprise Park for use as battery storage facilities on terms to be agreed. In the event of the disposal values exceeding delegated limits the Head of Property in consultation with the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services and Chair of Business and Property Committee was authorised to accept the proposal and report the fact at a subsequent Business and Property committee meeting.

The Chairman agreed the amendment.

7.2.2 **Question from Mr M Castle**

Mr Castle said, when a number of inadequate Children's Services office facilities in Great Yarmouth were relocated to the Havenbridge House three years ago, the expectation was that there would be a speedy disposal of the redundant sites. Mr

Castle asked the Chairman of Business and Property Committee if he could please tell Council if plans had yet been prepared with regard to the development of the County's Tar Works Road site, which was in Mr Castle's Division, and which would lend itself to a riverside development of town houses with garages/utility rooms below in this attractive riverside location.

The Chairman replied that it was a redundant site, but having had discussions with officers, it was a highly complex site with regard to utilities. Discussions were taking place and once a clearer view of the site and its potential was known he would let Mr Castle know.

7.2.3 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

Ms Kemp referred to the discussions taking place with EPUK Ltd for the piece of land at the Willows site and asked why EPUK Ltd were applying to the Secretary of State to nearly double the size of the power station from 1000 megawatts to 1700 megawatts which would raise the height of the stack to more than 200ft high to accommodate the emissions to a safe level. She added that the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk had agreed to limit the extent of the output at the site in 2003. Ms Kemp asked if the Chairman was aware of the application and what view he took about EPUK Ltd stating they did not need to have a human health assessment, which she thought was disgraceful.

The Chairman replied that as far as he was aware EPUK Ltd wished to develop the site for power production. To do so, because the various rules and regulations had changed he understood they needed to include carbon capture requirements and therefore would require a bigger site.

Ms Kemp continued that her question was about capacity from 1000mw to 1700mw whereas when King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council had voted for not allowing the site to produce more than 1000mw due to safety reasons as it was next to an urban area, the stack would already need to be 200ft high and if 1700mw was produced, the stack would need to be even higher and potentially not suitable for that area. She asked the Chairman what his view was, as EPUK Ltd had written in their scoping report that they thought they didn't need a human health assessment.

The Chairman said he did not know the answer, but he understood to make the site viable in line with carbon capture requirements it needed to be bigger and they needed to produce more power. However, he would provide a written response.

7.2.4 Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

7.3 **Report of the Children's Services Committee meetings held on 17 October and 14 November 2017**

Mr S Dark, A/Chairman of Children's Services Committee moved the report.

7.3.1 **Question from Ms S Squire**

Ms Squire referred to what appeared to be an ongoing crisis with the application and issuing of EHCPs (Education Health Care Plans) in our County, and that she was alarmed to hear of incidences where ECHP's were being issued without the proper amendments recommended by health care professionals, on the basis that they were then finished quickly and parents could appeal afterwards if they wished.

She said considering the effects of a properly written EHCP on the education of a child and the stressful effects on the parents, not to mention the costs involved for both the parents and the Council when an appeal was undertaken, she would like to ask the Chairman if he was aware of the number of EHCP's that were being appealed, what the costs involved with an appeal were for both the council and the parents and whether he would agree that if something was worth doing, it was worth doing properly in the first place to avoid un-necessary stress and costs involved.

The A/Chairman responded that he totally agreed that if we were doing something we should get it right. He added he would provide a written response with the exact numbers of appeals, together with costs.

7.3.2 **Question from Ms E Corlett**

Ms Corlett asked the A/Chair to update Council about how much the Department for Education had cut the Norfolk Maintained Nursery School Grant by and what the impact would be in real terms of this cut on our maintained Nursery Schools at Emneth, King's Lynn and Earlham.

The A/Chairman replied that he did not have the details on those but would provide a written response to all Members.

7.3.3 **Question from Ms K Clipsham**

Ms Clipsham said that she was sure the A/Chair was aware that one of the priorities identified by the Department for Education for the Norwich Opportunity Area Board was to improve outcomes for the most disadvantaged young children. Earlham Nursery School in her division was in the middle of the most deprived area in Norwich. Given the wealth of research proving that Maintained Nursery Schools had a significantly positive impact on social mobility, would the A/Chairman commit to raising this issue with the unelected Opportunity Area Board and demand that they commit some of their funding to keep Earlham Nursery open to improve the life chances of some of the most deprived families in our community?

The A/Chairman responded that he felt proud to be part of Children's Services Committee that was investing £162m over the next four years in our schools, as he fully took on board, together with all Members, that education and improving life chances was very important. He added that 89% of the schools in Norfolk were now rated good, or outstanding by Ofsted. The A/Chairman continued that he was not fully aware of the circumstances at Earlham, but would be happy to visit if Ms Clipsham would arrange it to familiarise himself with the challenges faced. He continued that he was not in a position to demand action by other organisations, but it was hoped the investment would improve outcomes.

7.3.4 **Question from Mr M Smith-Clare**

Mr Smith-Clare asked the A/Chairman, with the roll-out of universal credit and the closure of children's centres across the county, what assurances could be given to continue the essential support and protection of already deprived and vulnerable young members of our communities.

The A/Chairman responded that he understood the concerns, but referring to the closure of children's centres was premature at this stage as we were waiting for a report back to Children's Services Committee from the Children's Services Leadership Team as to what the new service could look like, after which it could be

discussed further.

7.3.5 Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

7.4 **Report of the Communities Committee meetings held on 11 October and 15 November 2017.**

Mrs M Dewsbury, Chairman of Communities Committee, moved the report.

7.4.1 **Question from Mr M Castle**

Mr Castle said, in advance of the planned completion of the Great Yarmouth third river crossing in 2022, that it remained absolutely essential that no change was made to the current situation whereby there were fire stations in both Great Yarmouth and Gorleston. Mr Castle asked if the Chairman of Communities Committee could confirm that it was her intention that both fire stations be retained in the interests of public safety.

The Chairman replied that she had not had any discussion about either Great Yarmouth or Gorleston fire stations.

7.4.2 **Question from Mr B Watkins**

Mr Watkins referred to the number of alcohol specific deaths for people aged 50 and over which had risen nationally. The outcomes were worse in Norfolk than across England for the overall successful completion of alcohol and drug treatment and hospital admissions for alcohol related conditions. Despite this the public health grant to Local Authorities had been substantially reduced with an in-year cut of £100m in 2015-16, with real-term cuts averaging 3.8% per year until 2020/21. Mr Watkins asked if the Chairman of Communities Committee agreed with Izzi Seccombe, the current Chair of LGA Community Wellbeing Board, who had said that alcohol related deaths were preventable and that Councillors would be able to do more if the cuts in the public health grant were reversed.

The Chairman replied that she didn't know enough about it to comment on what Izzi Seccombe had said. The Chairman added that the Drug and Alcohol contract had recently been put out to commission a better service. The Chairman continued that Norfolk County Council did the best it could with the money available.

7.4.3 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

Ms Kemp referred to the work carried out by Healthwatch, in consulting about the STP Plan although £189,000 was now to be removed from their budget. Ms Kemp asked the Chairman what she was going to do to ameliorate the cuts to ensure that proper consultations took place.

The Chairman replied Norfolk County Council received an amount of money to pass on to Healthwatch, which it added to, giving them more money than we received.

7.4.4 The Chairman referred to the motion on suicide which had been withdrawn from the agenda. The Chairman wished to mention how much good work public health were doing in conjunction with the Theatre Royal, Farmers Union and other organisations. A leaflet had been circulated to all Councillors, giving contact numbers and giving information on reducing the suicide rate in Norfolk. She urged Councillors to pass that information on to their parish councils and communities.

7.4.5 **Question from Dr M Strong**

Dr Strong asked the Chairman when Communities Committee would be discussing rural libraries and library buses.

The Chairman replied that she would ensure Dr Strong knew when the subject came up for discussion.

7.4.6 Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

7.5 **Report of the Digital Innovation & Efficiency Committee meetings held on 12 October and 8 November 2017.**

Mr T Garrod, Chairman of the Digital Innovation & Efficiency Committee moved the report.

7.5.1 **Question from Mr V Thomson**

Mr Thomson asked if the Chairman supported the potential move of Channel 4 into Norwich.

The Chairman responded that he absolutely supported it as it summed up exactly what the Committee had been set up to do to develop a digital offer to give us a competitive edge when companies were considering relocating around the country.

7.5.2 **Question from Mr D Rowntree**

Mr Rowntree said he welcomed the Committee's proposal to survey mobile phone coverage across the county, but that he had concerns about the proposed focus on the survey on rural areas. He added that in some areas of his Division (University) in Norwich there was no mobile phone signal at all, let alone 3G or 4G and rural areas now seemed to be forging ahead but we were now in a situation where areas one mile from the coast had a better coverage than areas one mile from the city centre. Mr Rowntree asked the Chairman if he would commit to using the study to get areas like University ward the mobile phone service they were entitled to.

The Chairman replied that the study would be commissioned on all A & B roads and results should be received in time for the January meeting when representatives from some mobile phone companies would be attending. The Chairman said he would then take the Committee's guidance on whether an enhanced offer was needed in certain areas, but he felt a clearer picture of mobile phone coverage across the county was needed first.

7.5.3 **Question from Ms S Squire**

Ms Squire said while it was pleasing to see Norfolk on schedule to providing high speed broadband to most homes and businesses, it seemed that some residents, particularly the elderly and those on a limited income, were almost being forced to pay for fibre, when all they really wanted to be able to do was to check their emails and look at Facebook occasionally, however their data speeds were so slow, they were forced to pay the increased cost. Ms Squire asked if the Chairman would agree that, instead of trying to get super high speed for the majority of residents, it might be beneficial to actually get a usable speed for all residents instead.

The Chairman responded that he thought we needed both and he would not like to prioritise areas.

7.5.4 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

Ms Kemp said when Mr Garrod next met with representatives from BT and BT Openreach, could he make sure that he spoke up for the people of West Winch and make sure that the timescale that had slipped for improving the end of the West Winch Gravel Hill lane and Poplar Road connection did not slip back any further.

The Chairman responded that he did not know the specifics of the West Winch contract but Norfolk County Council was on target with the BT Openreach contract.

7.5.5 **Question from Dr M Strong**

Dr Strong asked if a company had yet been appointed to carry out the survey and if the survey had been started yet?

The Chairman responded that he would provide a written response.

7.5.6 Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

7.6 **Report of the Environment, Development and Transport Committee meetings held on 20 October and 10 November 2017.**

Mr S Clancy, Vice- Chairman of EDT Committee moved the report.

7.6.1 **Question from Mr T East**

Mr East stated, as a long standing supporter of a complete NDR, he noted that there had been a number of changes to the NDR contract as agreed at the Policy & Resources Committee meeting on 27 November 2017. Mr East asked if a copy of the contract was available so that everyone could be clear who was responsible for what under the contract.

The Vice-Chairman replied that a working group had been looking at the contract in its current form, and deferred the question to Mr C Foulger who chaired the working group for a response.

Mr Foulger responded that there was a new contract, and that both parties of the contract will have a consolidated copy of the contract which brought together all the changes into one document and which was clear and comprehensive.

7.6.2 **Question from Mr S Aquarone**

Mr Aquarone asked, as a railway fan and with the recent government announcements that certain railway lines which were closed in the 1960s could now be reconsidered for reopening, if a case could be made in the Norfolk Shared Vision Document for the restoration of passenger, business and commercial services to places like Dereham, Fakenham, and Melton Constable to help promotion and development of a Norfolk orbital railway.

The Vice-Chairman replied that the Government was committed to relooking at railways, especially some branch lines. He added that it could be looked at and that it would be sensible to submit a submission document of potential routes around Norfolk which could lead to viability. He added that realistically he didn't envisage anything happening unless viability could be proven.

7.6.3 **Question from Mr T Jermy**

Mr Jermy referred to the growing concern across Norfolk about the impact of

removing £0.5m from the public transport budget. He also referred to a BBC Look East programme where they had interviewed a bus driver from Sanders Coaches who was still driving in his 70's, where he had challenged Norfolk County Council's Councillors to get out of County Hall and meet with him and others to talk about the effects of this decision. Mr Jermy said he had accepted the challenge and hoped to meet with representatives soon. He asked the Vice-Chairman if he would agree to visit with him so he could hear the concerns which could then feed into the consultation.

The Vice-Chairman replied that there was a lot of work being done, and consultation was taking place with all the bus operators and all routes were being appraised. He said he recognised the concerns in rural communities on subsidised routes and that Norfolk County Council spent approximately £2.7m on bus subsidies in Norfolk so it was important that we got the service right. The Vice-Chairman said he would encourage all Members to ensure they consulted with their residents and parish councils to build up a strong case for consideration, although the reality remained that changes needed to be made but he was aware of the public concerns, particularly in rural parishes.

7.6.4 **Question from Mr M Castle**

Mr Castle said that, although the County Council had made the dualling of the A47 Acle Straight a priority scheme for the RIS2 Highways Programme, uncertainty remained about the outcome of the move in the Spring of 2016 of around 800 Lesser Whirlpool Ramshorn Snails, which must be successfully completed before work could proceed on dualling the road. The snails only had a 12 month life expectancy and the study had been ongoing since 2015. Mr Castle asked if the Chairman of EDT would be prepared to make early representations to Highways England to secure a progress report on work so far, and a firm timescale for ruling the move of the snails a success.

The Vice-Chairman agreed and said he approved getting on with the dualling of the full A47 including the Acle Straight without delay. He added that he fully approved of wildlife, but the Ramshorn Snails should have been rehoused quickly as the amount of time taken was a total waste of public money. He added that he would speak with the Chairman to try to progress the issue quickly.

7.6.4 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

Ms Kemp said that she had conducted her own consultation at West Winch which had identified that the current bus service did not accommodate the needs of the residents. She asked what could be done about it.

The Vice-Chairman strongly suggested Ms Kemp submit the evidence she had gathered to Community & Environmental Services department which would be carefully considered.

7.6.5 Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

7.7 **Report of the Policy and Resources Committee meetings held on 30 October and 27 November 2017.**

Mr Jordan, Chairman of Policy and Resources Committee, moved the report.

7.7.1. **Question from Mr G Nobbs**

Mr Nobbs referred to the NDR contract and the fact he had been reported as saying you always had to be prepared for surprises. He added that on 13 October 2017 Mr Jordan had said to the EDP that "I personally think it (the contract) would be around £200m to £205m, that is what I think, that is what I have always thought, that is the figure I set out and I still think that". Mr Nobbs asked the Leader, who had been Leader for 18 months now, when he had set it out, which Officers had he shared that information with and what provision he had made to make up the shortfall.

The Chairman replied that he had not made that prediction to any officers. He had spoken to the Chairman of EDT, in a private conversation when the contract was first signed, and said that there was no hope of delivering the contract for that money. He added that it was a bet he had made between Mr Wilby and himself and he had written the price down and put it in a drawer and would open it when the work was completed, which was his business.

7.7.2 Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

Other Committees

7.8 **Report of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 26 October.**

M Chenery of Horsbrugh, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

7.9 **Report of the Joint Museums Committee meeting held on 27 October 2017.**

Mr J Ward, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

7.10 **Report of the Records Committee meeting held on 3 November 2017.**

Mr P Duigan, Vice-Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

8 **Review of Norfolk County Council Members' Allowances Scheme.**

8.1 Council received the report by the Independent Remuneration Panel which was moved by Mr C Jordan, who proposed the following amendments to the recommendations in the report. The proposed amendments were seconded by Mrs A Thomas.

Basic Allowance – Proposed Amendments

1 To amend recommendation 1, so that it reads:

“That the Basic Allowance be increased to £10,500 from the current financial year (2017/18) – to be backdated to 15th May 2017 – and subject to the same percentage increase, if any, that is awarded to local authority employees in subsequent years.

2 To amend recommendation 2, so that it reads:

“That a fundamental review of all members allowances be undertaken by the Panel in 2020, with any resulting changes to be implemented for the start of the new council in May 2021.

Special Responsibility Allowances (SRAs) – Proposed Amendments

1 To delete recommendation 1.

2 The remaining recommendation to be amended to read as follows:

- Leader of the Council’s SRA to increase to £31,700 from the current financial year (2017/18) – to be backdated to 15th May 2017 - and for the remainder of the scheme of SRAs to be adjusted accordingly.
- Chairmen of Children’s Services Committee and Adult Social Care Committee to receive 57.5% of the Leaders SRA.
- Group Spokespersons from the second largest Group not holding the Chair on Service Committees and Policy and Resources Committee to receive 5% of the Leaders Allowance.

8.2 Following debate and upon being put to a recorded vote (Appendix C), with 39 votes in favour, 26 votes against and 2 abstentions, Council **RESOLVED** to **AGREE** the recommendations, including the amended recommendations set out in paragraph 8.1 above.

9 Proportional Allocation of Seats on Committees

9.1 Council received the report by the Head of Democratic Services detailing the overall allocations of committee places to political groups following recent changes to the political balance of the Council.

9.2 Mr C Jordan proposed that the Conservative Group give up places on the following Committees to the Independent Group:

- 1 Conservative place from Communities Committee
- 1 Conservative place from Children’s Services Committee

and

- 1 Labour place on Environment, Development & Transport Committee to Independent Group.

Upon being put to a vote, with 34 votes in favour, 14 votes against and 8 abstentions the proposal was **CARRIED**.

9.3 Council **RESOLVED** to:

- Determine the political composition of the committees as set out in the report.
- Agree that the Group Leaders notify the Head of Democratic Services by 15 December 2017 of their proposed changes to appointments to reflect the new political composition of committees and the appointments then formally

be made by the Head of Democratic Services under the delegated powers set out in the Constitution.

10 Appointments to Committees, Sub-Committees and Joint Committees (Standard Item).

None

11 To answer questions under Rule 8.3 of the Council Procedure Rules

11.1 Question from Ms A Kemp to Leader of the Council:

This Council cannot possibly justify its budget proposal to cut £0.5 million from Norfolk's buses, while it is prepared to spend an extra £19 million for the over-budget Norwich Distributor Road; so shouldn't this Council allocate at least the same funding in next year's budget, if not more, to buses to:

1. increase independence for Norfolk's ageing population, needing access to essential shopping, banking and health services in key rural centres, instead of diminishing their choice;
2. reduce future, more costly demands on Adult Social Care by keeping people active for longer and in better mental health;
3. provide access to work for young people and disabled people; and
4. encourage more people to use public transport to reduce congestion, which is affecting Norfolk's competitiveness and attractiveness to business?

The Leader replied that they are all out for consultation.

11.2 Question from Ms S Squire to the A/Chairman of Children's Services Committee:

Given that there is still an appalling backlog of Education Health and Care Plans (EHCP's) waiting to be issued by this council, which is seriously damaging the education and life chances of Children in Norfolk with Special Educational Needs (SEN), what plans does the Chairman and committee have for clearing the backlog and ensuring that all EHCP's are in future, processed and issued in a timely fashion and are fully SEN Code of Practice compliant and also done properly?

The A/Chairman responded that he shared the concerns about EHCPs which was being addressed in conjunction with the NHS. The A/Chairman suggested that he meet with Ms Squire to discuss the topic in more detail.

11.3 Question from Mr D Roper to the Chairs of all Service Committees:

- Adult Social Care
- Children's Services
- EDT
- Business and Property
- Communities
- Digital Innovation & Efficiency

- Policy & Resources

Referring to budget proposals for your specific Committee for 2018/9 and the medium term financial strategy:

- 1) What is the estimated reduction in staffing establishment by department as a result of proposals for your Committee?
- 2) How many jobs do you anticipate will be lost from providers from whom Norfolk County Council commissions services as a result of proposals from your Committee?

The Chairman of Adult Social Care replied that the staffing establishment has increased.

The A/Chairman of Children's Services Committee replied that he would provide a written response.

The Vice-Chairman of Environment, Development & Transport Committee replied that the net reduction in EDT was 13 Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) posts.

The Chairman of Business & Property Committee responded that no reduction had been made.

The Chairman of Communities Committee replied that the net reduction was 36.8 FTE, which included 13 vacant posts which were no longer needed.

The Chairman of Digital Innovation & Efficiency Committee replied that there had been no direct reduction in the staffing establishment as a result of the proposals and no jobs were directly at risk as a result of the Committee proposals.

The Chairman of Policy & Resources Committee replied that there were none as far as he was aware.

11.4 Question from Mr D Roper to the Leader of the Council:

The Leader of the Council has made public statements calling for local government reorganisation in Norfolk with a personal preference for a County Unitary Authority

Could the Leader outline what steps (if any) he has taken to progress this stated aim

Could the Leader outline what steps he intends to make (if any) in the coming months to progress this stated aim.

The Leader replied that discussions were being held but there are no steps being taken.

11.5 Question from Mrs B Jones to the Leader of the Council:

Does the leader agree it is time we tried to make the business of Council as accessible as we reasonably can by:

1. Introducing signing for council, main committees and other meetings where there is a demand
2. Webcasting full council meetings
3. Extending provision of council documents and consultation materials in languages other than English and ensuring translation services are available for councillors as part of the support given to them by the council and agree to ask CAG to draw up proposals for consideration by Policy and Resources so agreed changes can be introduced from the Council Annual Meeting in 2018?

The Leader replied that the Constitution Advisory Group had a number of things to consider, of which this was one item. He said he would also suggest that a judgement is made on the number of motions put to Council each meeting due to the amount of time taken up in debating them.

11.6 Question from Mr M Sands to the Leader of the Council:

An article published online by CHPI (Centre for Health and Public Interest) states:

The reorganisation of health services in England by teams of planners in 44 “footprints” could hardly be more important, yet the process has no legal basis. This means a corresponding lack of public accountability, increasing the risk of serious mistakes, conflicts of interest and misuse of public funds.

Under this process there is a table of costs that includes consultants and staff time. On this table Norfolk is fourth in expenditure with a total outlay to date of £1,010,000. Given the cuts to budget across County, can the Leader explain why Norfolk has spent in excess of £1million on outside consultants on a process that has no legal basis, and can we have a breakdown of where and on what this money has been spent?

The Leader replied that as far as he was aware there was very little expenditure involved.

11.7 Question from Mr M Sands to the Chairman of Adult Social Care Committee:

I see that 20 new social workers have been appointed along with 6 managers. Are these new appointees part of the 50 'new' positions created or are they part of the 31 existing vacancies before the project to employ 50 was begun. In other words is this 31 plus 20 out of the 81 positions, or 20 out of 81 positions? Where appointments were made internally have the vacant positions created been filled?

The Chairman replied that this question had already been asked and answered.

11.8 Question from Mr M Sands to the Leader of the Council:

Human trafficking and modern slavery is a sad factor across Britain and I know that Norfolk is no exception to this. Police, Immigration and other agencies are involved in the fight to tackle these terrible situations, but does Norfolk County Council have a role in this, and if so in what capacity?

The Leader replied that human trafficking and modern slavery was a sad fact across Britain and Norfolk was no exception. Police, Immigration and other agencies were involved in trying to tackle the problem and Norfolk County

Council had an important role to play in tackling human trafficking and modern slavery. Everyone who was subject to, or at risk of, these crimes required a multi-agency response, including working in partnership with the non-statutory sector. Norfolk County Council was classed as the first responder, which was an agency that was responsible for identifying and interviewing potential victims of modern slavery. Only trained specialists within the first responder organisations could decide whether someone may be a victim of trafficking or modern slavery and make a referral to the National Referral Mechanism. In Norfolk multi-agency expertise on trafficking and modern slavery was embedded within the MASH team. Norfolk's adults and children's safeguarding boards were responsible for coordinating a strategy across agencies in Norfolk on human trafficking and modern slavery to assist staff in identifying, referring, assessing and supporting potential victims. So far, there had been two convictions in Norfolk for modern slavery offences. Modern slavery referrals to NCC were increasing - in 2016 there had been 22 referrals, although this number was surpassed in October 2017. However this number is still low compared to large cities like London and Birmingham which received 40 plus referrals per day.

11.8 Question from Mr T Jermy to the Chairman of Environment, Development & Transport Committee:

Can the Chairman of ETD provide Councillors with a list of all the bus services in Norfolk that have seen their subsidy removed or reduced by Norfolk County Council in the past 10 years and can the Chairman confirm the rationale used to determine which services were affected and to what extent?

The Vice-Chairman replied that a list of bus services subsidised and which could be subsidised would be provided.

The meeting concluded at 3.50 p.m.

Chairman



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Customer Services 0344 800 8020 or 18001 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

**Norfolk County Council
11 December 2017**

RECORDED VOTE – Motion 2 – Children’s Centres – Proposed by Emma Corlett, seconded by Mike Smith-Clare.

For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain	
			ADAMS Timothy	X			KEMP Alexandra
	X		ADAMS Tony		X		KIDDIE Keith
X			AQUARONE Steffan		X		KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark
			ASKEW Stephen		X		LONG Brian
			BARNARD Jess		X		MACKIE Ian
	X		BILLS David	X			MAXFIELD Edward
	X		BORRETT Bill		X		MIDDLETON Graham
	X		BOWES Claire				MOONEY Joe
	X		BROME Roy	X			MORPHEW Steve
X			BRODIEK-COULTON Julie	X			NOBBS George
X			BUTIKOFER Sarah		X		OLIVER Judy
			CARPENTER Penny		X		OLIVER Rhodri
X			CASTLE Mick		X		PECK Greg
	X		CLANCY Stuart		X		PLANT Graham
X			CLIPSHAM Kim		X		PRICE Richard
X			COLLIS David		X		PROCTOR Andrew
	X		COLMAN Ed		X		RICHMOND William
X			CORLETT Emma	X			ROPER Dan
	X		DARK Stuart	X			ROWNTREE David
	X		DEWSBURY Margaret	X			RUMSBY Chrissie
	X		DIXON Nigel	X			SANDS Mike
X			DOUGLAS Danny	X			SEWARD Eric
	X		DUIGAN Phillip		X		SMITH Carl
	X		EAGLE Fabian		X		SMITH Thomas
X			EAST Tim	X			SMITH-CLARE Mike
	X		EYRE Simon		X		SPRATT Bev
	X		FISHER John			X	SQUIRE Sandra
	X		FITZPATRICK Tom		X		STONE Barry
	X		FOULGER Colin		X		STONE Margaret
	X		GARROD Tom		X		STOREY Martin
	X		GRANT Andy	X			STRONG Marie
	X		GURNEY Shelagh		X		THIRTLE Haydn
	X		HANTON Ron		X		THOMAS Alison
X			HARRISON David		X		THOMSON Victor
	X		HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of	X			TIMEWELL John
		X	HUMPHREY Harry		X		VINCENT Karen
	X		ILES Brian	X			WALKER Colleen
	X		JAMIESON Andrew		X		WARD John
X			JERMY Terry	X			WATKINS Brian
X			JONES Brenda		X		WHITE Tony
X			JONES Chris				WILBY Martin
	X		JORDAN Cliff				YOUNG Sheila

With 27 votes in favour, 48 votes against and 2 abstentions the Motion was **LOST**.

Norfolk County Council
11 December 2017

RECORDED VOTE – Motion 6 – Proposed by Ed Maxfield, seconded by Dan Roper.

For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain	
			ADAMS Timothy	X			KEMP Alexandra
	X		ADAMS Tony		X		KIDDIE Keith
X			AQUARONE Steffan		X		KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark
			ASKEW Stephen		X		LONG Brian
			BARNARD Jess		X		MACKIE Ian
	X		BILLS David	X			MAXFIELD Edward
	X		BORRETT Bill		X		MIDDLETON Graham
	X		BOWES Claire				MOONEY Joe
	X		BROME Roy	X			MORPHEW Steve
X			BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	X			NOBBS George
X			BUTIKOFER Sarah		X		OLIVER Judy
			CARPENTER Penny		X		OLIVER Rhodri
X			CASTLE Mick		X		PECK Greg
	X		CLANCY Stuart		X		PLANT Graham
X			CLIPSHAM Kim		X		PRICE Richard
X			COLLIS David		X		PROCTOR Andrew
	X		COLMAN Ed		X		RICHMOND William
X			CORLETT Emma	X			ROPER Dan
	X		DARK Stuart	X			ROWNTREE David
	X		DEWSBURY Margaret	X			RUMSBY Chrissie
	X		DIXON Nigel	X			SANDS Mike
X			DOUGLAS Danny	X			SEWARD Eric
	X		DUIGAN Phillip		X		SMITH Carl
	X		EAGLE Fabian		X		SMITH Thomas
X			EAST Tim	X			SMITH-CLARE Mike
	X		EYRE Simon		X		SPRATT Bev
	X		FISHER John			X	SQUIRE Sandra
	X		FITZPATRICK Tom		X		STONE Barry
	X		FOULGER Colin		X		STONE Margaret
	X		GARROD Tom		X		STOREY Martin
	X		GRANT Andy	X			STRONG Marie
	X		GURNEY Shelagh		X		THIRTLE Haydn
	X		HANTON Ron		X		THOMAS Alison
X			HARRISON David		X		THOMSON Victor
			HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of	X			TIMEWELL John
	X		HUMPHREY Harry		X		VINCENT Karen
	X		ILES Brian	X			WALKER Colleen
	X		JAMIESON Andrew		X		WARD John
X			JERMY Terry	X			WATKINS Brian
X			JONES Brenda		X		WHITE Tony
X			JONES Chris				WILBY Martin
			JORDAN Cliff				YOUNG Sheila

With 27 votes in favour, 47 votes against and 1 abstention the Motion was **LOST**.

Norfolk County Council
11 December 2017

RECORDED VOTE – Agenda Item 8 – Review of Norfolk County Council Members’ Allowances Scheme.

For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain	
	X		ADAMS Timothy				KEMP Alexandra
X			ADAMS Tony	X			KIDDIE Keith
	X		AQUARONE Steffan	X			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark
			ASKEW Stephen				LONG Brian
			BARNARD Jess				MACKIE Ian
X			BILLS David				MAXFIELD Edward
X			BORRETT Bill	X			MIDDLETON Graham
X			BOWES Claire				MOONEY Joe
X			BRAME Roy		X		MORPHEW Steve
	X		BROCIK-COULTON Julie		X		NOBBS George
	X		BUTIKOFER Sarah	X			OLIVER Judy
			CARPENTER Penny				OLIVER Rhodri
X			CASTLE Mick				PECK Greg
	X		CLANCY Stuart			X	PLANT Graham
	X		CLIPSHAM Kim	X			PRICE Richard
	X		COLLIS David		X		PROCTOR Andrew
X			COLMAN Ed	X			RICHMOND William
	X		CORLETT Emma		X		ROPER Dan
X			DARK Stuart		X		ROWNTREE David
X			DEWSBURY Margaret		X		RUMSBY Chrissie
	X		DIXON Nigel		X		SANDS Mike
			DOUGLAS Danny		X		SEWARD Eric
X			DUIGAN Phillip	X			SMITH Carl
X			EAGLE Fabian				SMITH Thomas
	X		EAST Tim		X		SMITH-CLARE Mike
X			EYRE Simon				SPRATT Bev
		X	FISHER John	X			SQUIRE Sandra
X			FITZPATRICK Tom	X			STONE Barry
X			FOULGER Colin	X			STONE Margaret
X			GARROD Tom	X			STOREY Martin
X			GRANT Andy		X		STRONG Marie
X			GURNEY Shelagh	X			THIRTLE Haydn
X			HANTON Ron	X			THOMAS Alison
			HARRISON David	X			THOMSON Victor
X			HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of		X		TIMEWELL John
X			HUMPHREY Harry				VINCENT Karen
X			ILES Brian		X		WALKER Colleen
X			JAMIESON Andrew	X			WARD John
	X		JERMY Terry		X		WATKINS Brian
	X		JONES Brenda	X			WHITE Tony
	X		JONES Chris				WILBY Martin
X			JORDAN Cliff				YOUNG Sheila

With 39 votes in favour, 26 votes against and 2 abstentions Council **RESOLVED** to agree the amended Recommendations.

Questions requiring written responses from the Council Meeting – 11 December 2017

	Question and response:
<p>Question to the Leader from Mr T Jermy</p>	<p>Mr Jermy referred to the Leader's comments about the openness of the consultation currently taking place and asked if the Leader could confirm how many press releases had been issued by the County Council promoting the consultation to date and how many more would be issued before the consultation closed in a few weeks' time.</p> <p>Reply by the Leader: We have used a variety of means to promote our consultations including 27 social media postings, we have been interviewed by the media (BBC Radio Norfolk on 23rd November and 14th December). There have been articles in the press and we have talked about the consultations at a range of meetings. The Norfolk Association of Local Councils included information in its newsletter about our consultation in November and we have put information on the home page of our website.</p>
<p>Question to the Chairman of Adult Social Care Committee from Mr B Watkins</p>	<p>Mr Watkins said that it had been agreed earlier this year that part of the extra £35m Council had received from Government for adult social care would be used for the recruitment of up to 50 new social workers. Mr Watkins asked if the Chairman could explain what the rationale was for removing the 2018/19 proposed saving relating to the reduction in the number of personnel we use who work for employment agencies, what the extra cost to Council was and if it indicated that the recruitment process for new social workers had run into difficulties.</p> <p>Response by the Chairman of Adult Social Care Committee The Chairman replied that the recruitment process had not run into difficulties and that he would let Mr Watkins have a written response to the technical issues regarding costs, etc.</p> <p>A recruitment campaign for 50 practitioners and 15 team managers is underway. In December and January we expect the following posts to be filled, 17 full time equivalent social workers, 11 full time equivalent team managers and 5 full time equivalent occupational therapists. The new recruitment campaign has proved successful and is also supported through the ongoing work with the Norfolk Institute of Practice Excellence to train and recruit new and returning social workers.</p> <p>With a few exceptions, Adult Social Care has not historically employed personnel through employment agencies.</p>
<p>Question to the Chairman of Adult Social Care Committee from Mr D Rowntree</p>	<p>Mr Rowntree said that the Chairman may, or may not, know that he was delighted to have been appointed the Labour Group Champion for People with Learning Disabilities. He added that one in 50 adults had such a disability which could cause problems with learning new skills or information and living independently. Mr Rowntree said he intended to meet as many people across the county with learning disabilities as he could, but those he had already met had been asked what the one thing Council could do that would most transform their lives. The overwhelming response had been that people were desperate for help in finding a job. He continued that Councillors may already know there was some support available, for example, the Match scheme who tried to place adults in suitable jobs in the community and the Owl Scheme, led by Children's Services, who helped young people prepare for</p>

	<p>Question and response:</p> <p>work. He continued that, in Norfolk, the outcomes in this area were very poor with the latest figures showing that, out of 1 million learning disabled adults who were willing to work and be able to carry out suitable work, only 7,500 had paid jobs. Sadly many organisations were still nervous about employing disabled people, especially those with learning disabilities and were often unaware of the reasonable adjustments they could make, the financial help available, but most importantly the abilities if you looked past the disabilities. Mr Rowntree added that he was pleased to say that the tide seemed to be turning and some large organisations, including the NHS had committed to taking positive steps to increase the intake of staff with learning disabilities. He said, with that in mind, he had two questions – 1) how many people did the Council currently employ who identified as having a learning disability, and 2) would Council join the growing list of employers and commit to taking positive steps to increase the number of staff it employed who had a learning disability.</p> <p>Response by the Chairman of Adult Social Care Committee:</p> <p>NCC only record whether someone considers they have a disability under the Equality Act and not what type of disability they have, so we are unable to identify the data for a learning disability specifically. Last year we had 183 employees who had declared they had a disability - 3.17% of the workforce. However this is likely to be under reporting the actual numbers employed.</p> <p>Our approach as an exemplar employer includes engagement with Access to Work and Remploy to get a variety of support for individuals with all types of disabilities – physical and mental impairments. We use E-Voice and Indigo in relation to dyslexia support for individuals together with the Dragon software and other practical adjustments. We engage with external charities/support organisations to increase understanding of conditions and how that may affect individuals at work and what adjustments we might need to make to enable them to fulfil a full and active role in NCC.</p>
<p>Question to the Chairman of Adult Social Care Committee from Mr M Sands</p>	<p>Mr Sands said that 20 out of the 50 additional social workers and six managers had been employed, but asked if this was 20 in addition to the filling of the 31 vacancies, meaning 51 had been employed in total. In other words was this 20 additional social workers over and above the 31 vacancies, meaning 51 had been employed, or was it just 20 filled vacancies out of 81?</p> <p>Response by the Chairman of Adult Social Care Committee:</p> <p>The breakdown for the extra capacity posts and their locations is as follows:</p> <p>Social Workers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 in North 9 in South 6 in Central 4 in East 8 in West <p>Occupational Therapists:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 in North 2 in South

	<p>Question and response:</p> <p>2 in Central 1 in East 2 in West</p> <p>Learning Disability Social Workers: 8 Countywide</p> <p>Our current vacancies for TMs, PCs & SWs (not including the extra capacity posts, which are covered by the dashboard) is 21.5 FTE.</p>
<p>Question to the Chairman of Business & Property Committee from Ms A Kemp.</p>	<p>Ms Kemp said that her question was about capacity from 1000mw to 1700mw whereas when King's Lynn & West Norfolk Borough Council had voted for not allowing the site to produce more than 1000mw due to safety reasons as it was next to an urban area, the stack would already need to be 200ft high and if 1700mw was produced, the stack would need to be even higher and potentially not suitable for that area. She asked the Chairman what his view was, as EPUK Ltd had written in their scoping report that they thought they didn't need a human health assessment.</p> <p>Reply: EP UK are at the very start of the formal process of obtaining the revised consent for the power station and as Ms Kemp notes have just produced a scoping report.</p> <p>This is the first stage of their application which will undergo a series of independent assessments by statutory bodies, who are well placed to assess and comment on the suitability of any development on the site. Of particular concern will be the safety of the site.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council will respond in its statutory roles as: Highway Authority; Lead Local Flood Authority; Public Health; and Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. The County Council will also continue to monitor the application and the views of the statutory agencies throughout this process. Until further work has been undertaken, it would be inappropriate for the Chairman of the B&P committee to comment and would further note that the responsibility for the determination of the amended proposal rests with Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy. As a statutory consultee in the planning process the County Council's response will be made through the procedures agreed by the Environment, Development and Transport Committee.</p>
<p>Question to the A/Chairman of Children's Services Committee from Ms S Squire.</p>	<p>Ms Squire referred to what appeared to be an ongoing crisis with the application and issuing of EHCPs (Education Health Care Plans) in our County, and that she was alarmed to hear of incidences where ECHP's were being issued without the proper amendments recommended by health care professionals, on the basis that they are then finished quickly and parents could appeal afterwards if they wished. She said considering the effects of a properly written EHCP on the education of a child and the stressful effects on the parents, not to mention the costs involved for both the parents and the Council when an appeal was undertaken, she would like to ask the Chairman if he was aware of the number of EHCP's that were being appealed, what the</p>

Question and response:

costs involved with an appeal were for both the council and the parents and whether he would agree that if something was worth doing, it was worth doing properly in the first place to avoid un-necessary stress and costs involved.

Reply by the A/Chairman of Children's Services Committee:

The Children & Families Act 2014 provides a right to families to appeal LA decisions regarding Education Health & Care Plans, for reasons relating to:

- The LA deciding not to carry out an EHCP assessment
- The LA deciding not to issue an EHCP after the assessment
- The content of a final EHCP, i.e. the 'provision'
- The named education provider within a final EHCP, i.e. the 'placement'
- The LA deciding not to make amendments to an existing EHCP at each subsequent annual review of the plan
- The LA determining changes to an existing EHCP, at each subsequent annual review of the plan, that the parents do not agree with, i.e. the 'provision' or the 'placement'

A parent has 2 months to lodge an appeal to the 1st Tier Tribunal for SEN after the LA deciding any of the above elements. At the point of appeal current provision and placement must be maintained until the outcome of the Tribunal hearing. The LA has a duty to inform parents that in addition to their right to appeal to the Tribunal they can also continue to meet with Officers of the LA to try to resolve the issues and also to do this via dispute resolution / mediation.

Therefore, in addition to the employment of Education Health & Care Plan Co-ordinators to carry out the assessment and to meet with parents and professionals, the LA must also commission a dispute / mediation service and have arrangements in place for representation at Tribunal.

- Our annual contract for dispute mediation is for a total cost of £70k (£49k NCC and £11k CCG)
- Our current forecast spend for SEN Tribunal representation, via NpLAW, is £110k

In line with the ongoing review of additional resources for Education Health & Care Plan work we are considering ceasing the role of NpLaw within Tribunal work and moving to a 'Complex Cases Officer' role which could make savings of approximately £40k per year.

The latest published national figures for mediation / appeals to tribunal report that:

- The number of mediation cases held in Norfolk was 53, and the proportion that went on to appeal was 13.2%. There were 4.0 registered appeals to the SEND tribunal per 10,000 of its school population. This compares to the average for All English single tier and county councils of 3.8 per 10,000. [source : DfE, Local Area SEND Report 2017]

This means that of the 53 cases that underwent mediation only 7 cases then progressed to Tribunal, with the balance of 46

	<p>Question and response:</p> <p>having been resolved 'locally'; this demonstrates better than national average performance and underlines Norfolk's commitment to a person centred model of EHCP service. However, it is possible for parents to go direct to Tribunal and not take up the offer of mediation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current number of appeals to Tribunal for 2017 = 74 cases <p>The team who carry out EHCP assessments do so fully compliant with both the detail of the relevant legislation / code of practice and also the spirit of these; these teams in Norfolk strive to work in a 'person centred' way and are involved in over 900 new assessments per year and in excess of 4500 reviews each year. There will be occasions, therefore, when there is parental dissatisfaction within individual assessments and this is the reason that the option of mediation and tribunal exist. However, given the large number of families that the service deals with each year (over 5000) the number of appeals should be seen in that context.</p>																								
<p>Question to the A/Chairman of Children's Services Committee from Ms E Corlett.</p>	<p>Ms Corlett asked the A/Chair to update Council about how much the Department for Education had cut the Norfolk Maintained Nursery School Grant by and what the impact would be in real terms of this cut on our maintained Nursery Schools at Emneth, King's Lynn and Earlham.</p> <p>Reply by the A/Chairman of Children's Services Committee:</p> <p>There has been an in year reduction to fixed sum received from the DfE for the three Norfolk Nursery schools of £98796.99 . However the hourly rate paid to providers in Norfolk has increased, so instead of £3.30 base rate, they now receive £3.65 per hour. The DfE have taken this increase in to account when deciding on the fixed sum.</p> <p><u>Original figures</u></p> <table border="0" data-bbox="421 938 1294 1072"> <tr> <td>Emneth Nursery School</td> <td>45600</td> <td>132,136.37</td> </tr> <tr> <td>King's Lynn Nursery School</td> <td>39900</td> <td>115,619.33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Earlham Nursery School</td> <td><u>59280</u></td> <td><u>171,777.29</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>144780</td> <td>419,532.99</td> </tr> </table> <p><u>Revised figures</u></p> <table border="0" data-bbox="421 1152 1294 1279"> <tr> <td>Emneth Nursery School</td> <td>45600</td> <td>101019.21</td> </tr> <tr> <td>King's Lynn Nursery School</td> <td>39900</td> <td>88391.81</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Earlham Nursery School</td> <td><u>59280</u></td> <td><u>131324.98</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>144780</td> <td>320736.00</td> </tr> </table>	Emneth Nursery School	45600	132,136.37	King's Lynn Nursery School	39900	115,619.33	Earlham Nursery School	<u>59280</u>	<u>171,777.29</u>		144780	419,532.99	Emneth Nursery School	45600	101019.21	King's Lynn Nursery School	39900	88391.81	Earlham Nursery School	<u>59280</u>	<u>131324.98</u>		144780	320736.00
Emneth Nursery School	45600	132,136.37																							
King's Lynn Nursery School	39900	115,619.33																							
Earlham Nursery School	<u>59280</u>	<u>171,777.29</u>																							
	144780	419,532.99																							
Emneth Nursery School	45600	101019.21																							
King's Lynn Nursery School	39900	88391.81																							
Earlham Nursery School	<u>59280</u>	<u>131324.98</u>																							
	144780	320736.00																							
<p>Question to the Chairman of Digital Innovation & Efficiency Committee from Dr M Strong.</p>	<p>Dr Strong asked if a company had yet been appointed to carry out the survey and if the survey had been started yet?</p> <p>Reply:</p> <p>The procurement was issued before Christmas following extensive analysis of which areas need to be analysed over</p>																								

	<p>Question and response:</p> <p>and above the A&B road network and subsequent definition of those areas in the tender specification. The closing date for the tender is 11th January at which time we will appoint the supplier and advise DIEC members. This delayed start does mean that we will not have any initial feedback at the January committee meeting, but should have the full analysis for the March meeting.</p> <p>The ITQ went out before Christmas and is due back on 11th January. No clarifications have been received.</p>
<p>Question from Mr D Roper to Chairs of All Services Committees – Children’s Services Committee.</p>	<p>Referring to budget proposals for your specific Committee for 2018/9 and the medium term financial strategy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) What is the estimated reduction in staffing establishment by department as a result of proposals for your Committee? 2) How many jobs do you anticipate will be lost from providers from whom Norfolk County Council commissions services as a result of proposals from your Committee? <p>Reply by the A/Chairman of Children’s Services Committee:</p> <p>The Strategic & Financial; Planning paper which went to CS Committee on 17 October 2017 indicated that CS had been set a target for budget savings in 2018/19 of £5.913m.</p> <p>Much of this will be achieved as the full year effect of changes implemented during the current financial year.</p> <p>The rest will be made up as follows:</p> <p>£0.142m - from reduced spend on legal fees from more effectively prioritised use of legal advice</p> <p>£0.090m - from increased fee income from Early Years training activities</p> <p>£0.200m - from the increased recruitment and retention of Social Workers and consequent savings on agency worker spend</p> <p>£1.000m - from Year 1 of the department’s Demand Management and Prevention Strategy transformation programme to achieve better outcomes for the children and young people involved in our services and to reduce both the numbers that we look after and the spend associated with formal care arrangements.</p> <p>£2.000m - from remodelling Children’s Centre services to provide a more targeted response to families through working more closely with our other services and partners, for example by sharing buildings, and by focusing their work on the families that need them most.</p> <p>The first four of these proposals are not expected to involve reductions in staffing establishment in 2018/19 or beyond in MTP terms.</p>

	<p>Question and response:</p> <p>In relation to the last of the above proposals, we are in discussions with providers about the impact of a 7.5% reduction in their contract budgets for 2018/19 and it is anticipated this would have a limited impact in relation to the wider Children’s Centre workforce. This is alongside looking at working more closely with our other services and partners, for example by sharing buildings, and by further focusing their work on the families that need them most. Ultimately, it will be for the providers to determine how they will respond to any reductions in their contract income for these services and discussions with them are at too early a stage for them or us to be clear on any staffing implications.</p>
<p>Question from Mr T Jermy to the Chairman of EDT Committee.</p>	<p>Can the Chairman of ETD provide Councillors with a list of all the bus services in Norfolk that have seen their subsidy removed or reduced by Norfolk County Council in the past 10 years and can the Chairman confirm the rationale used to determine which services were affected and to what extent?</p> <p>Reply by the Vice-Chairman:</p> <p>Some bus services had subsidy reduced or removed in the period 2010/11, as a result of budget reductions in that period of financial planning. These are a matter of public record. Due to negotiation and partnership working, only 2 routes were ceased from a total of more than 70.</p> <p>In terms of rationale, we look at the services on a route by route basis. We assess the geographical need, and other factors based on rural deprivation. We also take into consideration the following:</p> <p>Who is using the services?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of users on a particular route • Levels of income of those who use the route • Levels of car ownership within the area of the route • The age range of people within the area of the route • The proportion of residents on the route who may be experiencing difficult social conditions <p>The impact of changes to routes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of alternative transport, i.e. rail, other bus or community based transport services , • Does the route offer journeys to work or education? • Is the route used by many older or disabled people? • Can we reduce the frequency, rather than the whole service? <p>Other considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the bus operator be able to run the service without the council’s financial support? • Is renegotiation around cost of services possible? • Is replacement of services with a "Demand Responsive" or "Feeder" arrangement possible e.g. involving Community Transport providers?

	Question and response:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Value for Money, comparing cost of service with passenger usage• Could we raise fares?• Could we reduce the service on Sundays and evening's services, when usage is much lower?