

Norfolk County Council

Minutes of the Meeting Held at 10am on Monday 23 September 2019

Present:

Mr T Adams	Mr M Kiddle-Morris
Mr S Aquarone	Mr B Long
Mr D Bills	Mr I Mackie
Mr B Borrett	Dr E Maxfield
Mr R Brame	Mr G Middleton
Mrs J Brociek-Coulton	Mr J Mooney
Mrs S Butikofer	Mr S Morphew
Mrs P Carpenter	Mr G Peck
Mr M Castle	Mr G Plant
Mr S Clancy	Mr A Proctor
Mr D Collis	Mr W Richmond
Mr E Connolly	Mr D Roper
Ms E Corlett	Mr D Rowntree
Mrs M Dewsbury	Ms C Rumsby
Mr N Dixon	Mr M Sands
Mr P Duigan	Mr E Seward
Mr T East	Mr C Smith
Mr J Fisher	Mr B Spratt
Mr T FitzPatrick	Ms S Squire
Mr C Foulger	Mr B Stone
Mr A Grant	Mr M Storey
Mrs S Gurney	Dr M Strong
Mr R Hanton	Mr H Thirtle
Mr D Harrison	Mrs A Thomas
M Chenery of Horsbrugh	Mr V Thomson
Mr B Iles	Mrs K Vincent
Mr A Jamieson	Mrs C Walker
Mr T Jermy	Mr J Ward
Mrs B Jones	Mr B Watkins
Dr C Jones	Mr A White
Ms A Kemp	Mr F Whymark
Mr K Kiddie (In the Chair)	Mr M Wilby

Present: 64

Apologies for Absence:

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Humphrey, Cllr Tony Adams, Cllr Bowes, Cllr Eagle, Cllr Clipsham, Cllr Smith-Clare, Cllr Thomas Smith, Cllr Young, Cllr R Oliver, Cllr J Oliver, Cllr Price, Cllr Nobbs.

1 Minutes

1.1 The minutes of the Council meeting held on Monday 7 May 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments;

- On page 23, point 12.1.2; To replace
*'Following debate and upon being put to the vote, with 15 votes for and 7 abstentions, the motion was **LOST**.'*

With:

*'Following debate and being put to the vote, the motion was **LOST**.'*

- Page 24, 12.2.2; To replace **LOST** to **CARRIED**.
- Page 25 – the Chairman announced that appendix B and C referred to in the minutes on page 25 had been omitted from the minutes in the agenda pack but they were tabled and would be attached to the published minutes.
- Page 13, point 7.6; To replace *'Walked'* with *'Walker'*
- Page 10, 5.13.1; Cllr Roper's question to the Leader: To replace:
'Cllr Roper asked for assurance from the leader that the and traffic monitoring survey which related to safety of the roundabouts on the Broadland Northway would be presented and put in the public domain. He had previously received assurance from the Chairman of the EDT Committee that this would happen and it was so far yet to materialise.'

With;

'Cllr Roper asked for assurance from the leader that the safety audits and traffic monitoring survey which related to safety of the roundabouts on the Broadland Northway would be presented and put in the public domain. He had previously received assurance from the Chairman of the EDT Committee at the July 2018 Council meeting that this would happen and it was so far yet to materialise.'

- Page 8, point 5.6, Cllr Squire announced that she had not received the number of LGO complaints. The Chairman reassured that she would receive the details.
- Page 16 point 7.9; Cllr Roper's question to Cabinet Member. To replace:
'if the proposals were of concern'

With

'As the proposals were of concern'

1.2 Cllr Corlett asked if there was any mechanism open to members to raise concern about a point of accuracy concerning a statement made in the audio recording rather than in the minutes. The concern was specifically around a comment about 70% of the overall budget being spent on 4.5% of the population. It was about something said in the recording that was felt to be inaccurate and whether there was a mechanism for correcting it.

Cllr Mackie made a point of order to the effect that Council should be following its standing orders regarding the record of the meeting.

The Chairman said that the minutes were not a verbatim record of the meeting. He recognised the problem of something being said which was not strictly correct, even if not done deliberately. He said that this ought to be raised during the actual debate. He acknowledged Cllr Mackie's point of order and felt that the council needed to look at how the 2 systems worked, the audio and written records, as

part of a discussion at a separate time.

- 1.3 The Leader clarified points of the budget and funding position that had been referred to in the previous Council meeting, and this is attached at appendix A of these minutes.

2 Chairman's Announcements

- 2.1 The Vice-Chairman reported the sad passing of Audrey Brown County Councillor for Lakenham 1999-2001. Council stood in a moments silence in her memory.
- 2.2 The Vice-Chairman reported that Cllr Humphrey had attended the East Coast Truckers 34th Children's Convoy which left from County Hall on Sunday 25 August where they waved to all the truckers and children as they left to enjoy their day out.
- 2.3 He had welcomed the new Lord-Lieutenant, The Lady Dannatt to the September Citizenship Ceremony, where he had presented the individual Certificates of Citizenship.
- 2.4 The Chairman had attended Battle of Britain events at City Hall, and at County Hall, where there was a Spitfire Flypast and the Air Cadet band and the commemoration service at the Cathedral on Sunday 15th September 2019.
- 2.5 At the Forum, the Chairman presented medals to children aged 5 – 11 on their success in achieving the Summer Reading Challenge of reading at least six books which had been a very happy event.
- 2.6 The Chairman visited the Howard Junior school in Kings Lynn, to look at their digital approach to learning and facilities, it had been a very impressive visit.

3 Declarations of Interest

- 3.1 Cllr B Long declared an interest, as being registered disabled, was in receipt of a Personal Independence Payment (PIP).
- 3.2 Cllr Whymark declared an interest in item 10 – motion 4, as he represented the Council on the Broads Authority.
- 3.3 Cllr Thomson declared an interest in item 10 – motion 4, as he was an appointee on the Broads Authority.
- 3.4 Cllr Kemp declared an interest as she helped the community of South Lynn campaign against the Hardings Way traffic changes.
- 3.5 Cllr East declared an interest as he received disability living allowance.
- 3.6 Cllr Brociek-Coulton declared an interest as she represented Norwich City Council on the Broads Authority.

4 To receive any items of business which the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency.

- 4.1 There were no items of urgent business.

5 Questions to Leader of the Council

5.1 Question from Cllr B Jones

- 5.1.1 Cllr B Jones said that at Cabinet, the Leader was asked if he and the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services would spend time with families affected by changes to the Minimum Income Guarantee to experience for themselves what life was like before making further budget decisions. Could he tell Council how much time Cabinet Members had spent with families to understand their experience first hand.
- 5.1.2 The Leader replied that a number of Members had attended the meeting on the 17th September 2019 and an outcome from that had been to agree to campaign with the Disabled Norfolk Group to get better and more robust funding from Government to fund Adult Social Care. The Leader added that the outcome would be honoured.

5.2 Question from Cllr Maxfield

- 5.2.1 Cllr Maxfield explained that at the last Council meeting, one of the Member Champions for disabilities, Cllr Smith, had said that if extra money became available the Council would of course look at the cuts to support for disabled people. Since the Chancellor of the Exchequer had been bountiful in his recent Autumn statement and the Disability Network group for Norfolk had asked him to do this, did he plan to do so.
- 5.2.2 The Leader replied that they welcomed the additional money in terms of Children's and Adults Social Care, towards SEND provision and other aspects to do with homelessness for example, but regrettably this was only one year money. It plugged to a certain extent a gap and helped to look forward but it didn't provide the financial certainty needed to change anything of decisions that had already been made. It was hoped for the future that the Chancellor would recognise what needed to be done and would actually come up with a proper method of funding for Adult Social Care, a proper method of funding local government through the next spending review. He said there was a need to keep the pressure up and that he would be in the vanguard of this.

5.3 Question from Cllr Squire

- 5.2.1 Cllr Squire asked the Leader whether following an email sent on 28th August 2019 suggesting compulsory disability awareness training for all councillors and a reply which stated that the Leader would be taking up the suggestion with Officers, was this idea going to be progressed as clearly it was sorely needed.
- 5.2.2 The Leader replied that this was being progressed and there were several training initiatives going on at the moment. The Leader had spoken to the Health and Safety Manager about future training for Members and it would be carried out.

5.3 Question from Cllr Carpenter

- 5.3.1 Cllr Carpenter said that despite the misleading political statements made by the opposition parties implying that this Council was intending on closing all but 15 former Children's Centre sites She asked if the Leader would join her in congratulating the great work officers in Children's Services had undertaken to agree leases on 49 delivery sites, which included the 15 bases, for the new Early Childhood and Family Service.

- 5.3.2 The Leader replied that he would add that it was great hard work done by everybody concerned to get this on track. The new service was still on track to start from 1st October 2019. He added that there had been a huge amount of work and the partnership around this to make this work for the future. There had also been the information which had gone out to all the Local Members concerned when all the changes have been made so it was a time when the Officers should be congratulated for the extremely good work they had done so far.

5.4 **Question from Cllr Rowntree**

- 5.4.1 Cllr Rowntree asked the Leader that following Cabinet, where he was asked if himself and the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Services would spend time with families affected by changes to the Minimum Income Guarantee to experience for themselves what life was like before making further budget decisions, could he tell Council how much time Cabinet Members had spent with families to understand their experience first hand.
- 5.4.2 The Leader replied that he had answered the question as best he could and added that this work would be continued in the future

5.5 **Question from Cllr Roper**

- 5.5.1 In July 2018, Cllr Wilby gave an assurance to Council that safety audits and traffic monitoring work on the Norfolk Distributor Road / Broadland Northway would be put into the public domain. Cllr Roper had asked about this in July 2019, but there had been no information released as yet, not least as the Local Member. He asked how much longer he was going to have to wait.
- 5.5.2 The Leader replied that he had said he was going to speak to the relevant Cabinet Member and had done so. He would speak again and any information that could be released to the public, Cllr Roper and any other Councillors would be done so.

5.6 **Question from Cllr Kemp**

- 5.6.1 Cllr Kemp explained that the people of South Lynn had invited the Leader to their protest rally on Hardings Way the previous Saturday, against NCC running a road and traffic through the safe buggy pavement and the only safe route to school and into town. There was still no highways impact assessment on this and the effect on disabled people had been severely underestimated. She asked when the Leader was going to start listening to the voices and the needs of disabled people in the County.
- 5.6.2 The Leader replied that Hardings Way had gone through a long and lengthy process to come to the conclusion of what happens there and hopefully Cllr Kemp would accept what had already been said about it as well.

5.7 **Question from Cllr Walker**

- 5.7.1 Cllr Walker asked if the Leader of the Council had ever received a response to his letter to Secretary of State and Department for Work and Pensions regarding the pension age changes for women. She added that with Elizabeth Truss now having responsibility for women and equalities in the Cabinet, did the Leader intend to write to her too and would we receive an answer to that letter.

- 5.7.2 The Leader replied that he hadn't had a response and had written to new ministers with the new Government having been formed but hadn't yet written to Elizabeth Truss but would follow that up. The Leader was hopeful there would be a reply received.
- 5.8 **Question from Cllr Aquarone**
- 5.8.1 Cllr Aquarone asked the Leader if he would describe the Council as 'open for business'.
- 5.8.2 The Leader replied that he would and part of that was the rationale for how the council had worked with partners, other district, borough and city councils in Norfolk, the LEP and the way that the council had tried to take what it had said it was trying to do to Government to demonstrate that they were not just talking about things but were actually getting things done.
- 5.9 **Question from Cllr Castle**
- 5.9.1 Cllr Castle asked the Leader that on the assumption that there would be a new Queen's Speech this October with an English Devolution Bill "at the heart of it", would the Leader pledge his unequivocal support for a refreshed Norfolk and Suffolk devolution deal, to give people more say over the delivery of key road, rail and broadband infrastructure, skills development and housing in the region.
- 5.9.2 The Leader replied that he supported the stance of the LGA in seeking to see this in the Queen's Speech.. With regards to the Norfolk and Suffolk devolution deal, the Leader wasn't sure that this would be on the table again. Having said that, the Leader added that Cllr Castle knew his views about what should have happened in the past and what needed to be done in the future, and that was to ensure that we got the economy moving in Norfolk and Suffolk and work with the Local Enterprise Partnership to do so. The Leader wanted to put that request forward and wanted to support the bill that had been requested by the Local Government Association.
- 5.10 **Question from Cllr T Adams**
- 5.10.1 Cllr Adams requested some clarification around the Leader's statement made earlier at the meeting in relation to 70% of the budget because according to the Norfolk County Council's website and the expenditure analysis 2019-2020, the combined social care budget for adults and children's amounts to 46%. In fact, the combined social care bill amounted to less on the percentage of people the budget served. He asked if the Leader was suggesting that the website information was incorrect.
- 5.10.2 The Leader replied that he could only repeat what he had said earlier and that was the latest information he had received from the Executive Director of Adult Social Services and the details would be circulated to everyone to examine accordingly. He had no reason to doubt the figures that he had been provided with.
- 5.11 **Question from Cllr Corlett**
- 5.11.1 Cllr Corlett asked the Leader if it was policy or coincidence that critical stories in

the media usually include a comment from a Council spokesperson rather than the responsible Cabinet Member.

- 5.11.2 The Leader replied that whoever made the statement at that time when the press release went out depended on the circumstances and who was available at the time to comment.

5.12 **Question from Cllr East**

- 5.12.1 Cllr East asked the Leader if he thought that children were right to leave the classroom to protest against the climate change emergency.
- 5.12.2 The Leader replied that it was a difficult call. If it was his grandchildren telling him that they were going to do it and there was good logic around it bearing in mind what they should be doing which is in class in lessons, then fair enough. As a general point, he would suggest that it wasn't the best thing to do given that education and educating children must be a high priority for everybody.

5.13 **Question from Cllr Morphew**

- 5.13.1 Cllr Morphew asked the Leader that given the importance of complaints as a way of assessing performance and driving improvement, could he explain why the annual complaints report had not yet been published and would he agree to commissioning a video to be posted online to help the public understand the process of making complaints against the Council.
- 5.13.2 The Leader replied that complaints would always be an emotive situation for everybody. They gave the opportunity for people to express what they want to express, some were upheld, some were not. With regards to the complaints details, they would be coming to a future meeting of the Corporate Select Committee to identify what could be learnt from past events and what could happen in the future. He added that the better way forward was to learn from it to the benefit of everybody.

6 **Cabinet Recommendations**

- 6.1 Mr A Proctor, Chairman of Cabinet, moved the recommendations in the report from the meeting held on 5 August 2019 and 2 September 2019.
- 6.2 Council **AGREED** the recommendations as outlined in the report.

7. **Cabinet Reports (Questions to Cabinet Members)**

7.1 **Question from Cllr B Jones to Cllr Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention**

- 7.1.1 Cllr Jones asked what it had cost to create the new direct payment support service because the service appears to be unfit for purpose and a lot of mistakes had been made.

7.1.2 The Cabinet Member replied that given the technical nature of the question he would respond with a written reply.

7.2 Question from Cllr T Adams to Cllr Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention

7.2.1 Cllr Adams asked if Cllr Borrett agreed with him that the Member Champions, for example the member champion for physical disability and sensory impairment should be taking the time to talk to and learn from those impacted by the recent changes to the social care charging policy as part of the watching brief description of their role.

7.2.2 The Cabinet Member replied that he was glad that there were members who were Member Champions and it was an important part for Councillors to be involved in all elements of policy. They were entirely independent of the Cabinet and that was their strength. He welcomed all the work that they undertook and supported it wholeheartedly.

7.3 Question from Cllr Squire to Cllr Grant, Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste

7.3.1 Cllr Squire said that in the Spring, Highways England sprayed miles of roadside verges along the main roads in Norfolk. At the time they had stated they were planning on doing it again in the Autumn. She asked if the Cabinet Member had any update on whether they had been persuaded otherwise and whether they would be sprayed again this year or had plans to do so going forward.

7.3.2 The Cabinet Member replied that he had chased them but had not received a response. Cllr Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highway, Infrastructure and Transport added that he had not had any response either but there was an A47 Alliance meeting being held soon so could raise it with them there.

7.4 Question from Cllr A Thomas to Cllr Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport

7.4.1 Cllr Thomas asked the Cabinet Member to join with her in acknowledging the huge amount of work and progress that was being made at the Hempnall roundabout. Cllr Thomas added that she had received numerous contacts from local residents who were not only pleased to see the road progressing but also the fact of how tidily the work was being done with the landscaping being done at the same time as the road construction which meant it was looking very tidy. She asked the Cabinet Member if he was hopeful that the roundabout would be completed within the timeframe expected and the entire roundabout open later in the Autumn.

7.4.2 The Cabinet Member replied that as he used the A140 daily, he had seen the good progress being made and had also received many good responses about it from all over the County. The work was on schedule and should be finished by November. There was still a large piece of work to finish on the Hempnall side. He would like to thank the staff on site, which was always being clean and tidy and helpful to anyone who had visited and it was a good example of everyone working together.

7.5 Question from Cllr Rumsby to Cllr Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services

7.5.1 Cllr Rumsby asked that as the Council's unregulated accommodation was used for those in need of support or care, could the Cabinet Member define for the Council the difference between support and care and who determined what was support and what was care.

7.5.2 The Cabinet Member replied that unregulated accommodation was a way of progressing youngsters to experience life as a 'normal' teenager would experience living in a family accommodation. He added that he would have to take advice to see who distinguished between support and care.

7.6 Question from Cllr East to Cllr Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services

7.6.1 Cllr East asked the Cabinet Member if he agreed with the Leader's response that children have a right to leave the classroom to protest against climate change emergency.

7.6.2 The Cabinet Member replied that he was keen on the environment and welcomed some of the action that had been progressed to raise awareness of the current climate issues across the world. His personal opinion of children taking time off to demonstrate was that he would not encourage his own children to take time off if he were a parent of school age children. It would have been better to have been carried out on a weekend.

7.7 Question from Cllr East to Cllr Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport

7.7.1 Cllr East asked the Cabinet Member that as per page 47 of the agenda with regards to the presentation from the King's Lynn - Hunstanton Railway Campaign, this also needed to be exposed to scrutiny in terms of examination of the proposal through the Norfolk Rail Group which was an existing committee. He asked if the Cabinet Member could assure him that it would be on the agenda of the next Norfolk Rail Group meeting and he hoped that Cllr Long would be supportive of that, as Chairman of the Norfolk Rail Group.

7.7.2 The Cabinet Member replied that he would look into it.

7.8 Question from Cllr Castle to Cllr Grant, Cabinet Member for the Environment

7.8.1 Cllr Castle said that although he was very proud of Yarmouth's key role with renewable energy, with calls by Climate Change activists for an immediate end to oil and gas extraction. He asked if the Cabinet Member agreed with him that only a phased programme over several years is practical given the need for Britain's nuclear energy capability to be significantly expanded to take its place and in order to retain a continuing income stream from oil and gas to actually finance the decommissioning of the hundreds of rigs and other structures in our seas.

7.8.2 The Cabinet Member replied in order to de-carbon the economy it could not be done overnight as it would require huge subsidy to clear the wells. It would have to be done over a period of time until new funding was available to clear the old wells and cap them off.

7.9 **Question from Cllr Connolly to Cllr Jamieson, Cabinet Member for Finance**

7.9.1 Cllr Connolly asked the Cabinet Member that following the Chancellor's spending review, what did this mean for Norfolk and how far did it go to solve the budget problem.

7.9.2 The Cabinet Member replied that as the Leader had already explained the one-year spending review was extremely useful for Norfolk. The key points were the £1billion grant for social care, 2% adult social care precept increase in 2020/21, and therefore the Government were assuming that Council Tax would rise by a total of 4%. In real terms of an assumed 1.8% increase, there would be a real term increase in funding which included the revenue support grant, the public health and business rates baseline. There was £700million for the high needs block and a continuation of other one-off short term funding allocations such as fire pensions. Although this all represented an increase, it was only a one year-round. The timing of any detailed announcements for this round would not be until approximately 5 December 2019.

The extra money for the high needs block would mean that the deficit would be reduced from around £15 million to around £10 million. In May 2019 it was suggested that the deficit over two years of 2020/21 and 2021/22 could be around £71 million. It was believed that the additional savings made in the forthcoming year together with the additional funding provided by the one-year spending review would help towards a balanced budget in 2020/21. However, there were still considerable and mounting pressures particularly on children's and adult's budgets. The make up of the overspend so far this year was detailed on table 1 of page 106 of September's Cabinet papers. Although the extra money was welcomed, there was still an overspend which was having to be dealt with this year and it was reasonable to say that even with the additional money there would still be a deficit over the next two years and no capacity to reverse the savings made in service departments budgets this year without having to look for savings elsewhere. He added that finance officers were working on the model currently and he was confident that a balanced budget would be achieved for 2020/21 but would need to review the detailed Government settlement which may not be due until December.

7.10 **Question from Cllr C Jones to Cllr Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention**

7.10.1 Cllr C Jones said that in this financial year an extra £2.5 million was due to be raised by the Council from charges to disabled people following the removal of the disregard. Whilst this was good news for Council budgets, Cllr Jones asked if Cllr Borrett agreed that this would add to the hardship experienced by this vulnerable group.

7.10.2 The Cabinet Member replied that the amount overall that was being spent on this group was increasing and therefore the Council and its Members had taken a series of decisions over a number of years to protect the spending on this cohort

of people, which was rightly so. Since 2016 and 2017, where £355 million was spent on adult social care it has risen to £427million in 2019/20 which had been achieved by adult social care being prioritised over other elements within the Council and therefore the proportion of spending on adult social care has increased as a percentage of the total spending of the Council. One of the reasons the demand was increasing was that people were living longer which was good news and went some way to show the success of the care that people were receiving which perhaps they hadn't received in the past. Cllr Borrett added that he was always keen to lobby for extra money and had done so on a number of occasions and the extra money mentioned by the Chancellor in the budget review was recognition of the campaigning that had been done. He added that although extra money could always be used, actions had shown that the vulnerable and those who needed the extra support were cared about and decisions had been taken accordingly.

7.11 Question from Cllr Watkins to Cllr Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention

7.11.1 Cllr Watkins asked the Cabinet Member how much the expenditure on public parks had been reduced across Norfolk over the last three years and how could the County Council in its public health role help to bridge that gap.

7.11.2 The Cabinet Member replied that public parks were not the responsibility of the County Council and were the responsibility of the District Councils. He added that public health was a very important part of the Council's responsibility as it was ultimately about prevention and given the crux of the Adult's Strategy and Childrens Strategy was to invest in prevention, to keep people out of crisis, keep them healthy, fit and well and in their own homes. He was pleased to hear in the Government's announcement that there was to be no cut in the public health budget in the coming year. He supported all the good work that the Director of Public Health, Dr Louise Smith and her team did in this area.

7.12 Question from Cllr Kemp to Cllr Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport

7.12.1 Cllr Kemp asked the Cabinet Member that with regards to the buses into Kings Lynn from villages such as Clenchwarton and West Winch, many users were quite elderly and found it difficult to get into the town. Improvements were needed to the 54, 55, 505, 37, 38, and 39 bus services and a new bus was needed to take people from West Winch to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. She asked if the Cabinet Member would actively campaign to improve the buses as he was involved in the Lynn Transport Plan and this would reduce congestion too.

7.12.2 The Cabinet Member replied that the Council worked closely with all the bus companies across Norfolk and were working alongside the Kings Lynn Borough Council to produce the transport plan.

7.13 Question from Cllr Clancy to Cllr Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport

7.13.1 Cllr Clancy said that it was a disappointment that the Labour Group had taken an anti-road stance in Norfolk and in fact a lot of the positive work to drive the

Western Link had been undertaken by the previous labour administration. He asked if the Labour group had indicated to the Cabinet Member that they would no longer be supporting the dualling of the A11 and the Acle Straight as this would be a grave danger to the economy.

- 7.13.2 The Cabinet Member replied that the Norwich Western Link was one of the three main highway priorities for the Council which was voted on unanimously. It was a great shame that the Labour group had taken the stance and did raise the question about their support for the A11 and the Acle Straight.

The Chairman agreed to a request by Councillor Morpew that he correct some of the information given in the previous question and answer.

Cllr Morpew said his group had not taken an anti-road stance, but a stance against the Norwich western link as it thought it would be too damaging, too expensive and there were other alternatives. They had listened to the Norwich South MP as well as to the children on the streets on Friday and to the scientific evidence. The group had concluded that the people at the end of the route deserved relief but that no-one needed the Norwich western link.

7.14 Question from Cllr Brociek-Coulton to Cllr Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services

- 7.14.1 Cllr Brociek-Coulton said that the BBC recently reported that an investigation into six councils use of unregulated accommodation found serious and significant safeguarding failings. She asked that given that Essex County Council was our improvement partner at the time the use of unregulated accommodation was reviewed, would the Cabinet Member agree to review Norfolk's approach.

- 7.14.2 The Cabinet Member replied that as a result of the task and finish panel, NCC's whole process of unregulated accommodation was on track with a new quality assurance system in place, with new checks. What had been reported on the BBC did not apply to Norfolk.

7.15 Question from Cllr Aquarone to Cllr FitzPatrick, Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance

- 7.15.1 Cllr Aquarone said that the previous week he had attended an extremely productive conference in the chamber on installing full fibre internet connectivity in Norfolk. The CEO of Norfolk Chamber of Commerce gave a presentation, as did a representative from the Department of Culture, Media and Sport. They were surely two of several of this Council's partners the Leader had referred to earlier in meeting about whether the council was open for business. He asked the Cabinet Member why didn't he or any senior officers attend and was he against his own party's policy in central government on rolling out full fibre.

- 7.15.2 The Cabinet Member replied that he did not attend due to a previously scheduled engagement and the conference had been organised without consulting the County Council. The Cabinet Member had written to the organiser stating why it wouldn't be supported. The Head of IMT was also out of the

Country on business for the Council. He added that the Council would want to do good for all the communities in Norfolk. They had not been convinced that the approach being taken was of maximum benefit to as many communities across Norfolk as possible. He added that the Council was definitely open for business but for the widest possible range of business and in order to spread the benefit.

7.16 Question from Cllr Squire to Cllr Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services

7.16.1 Cllr Squire asked how many children with special educational needs were currently out of school awaiting a suitable school place, or on a school roll but not attending, and how long on average they had been out of school.

7.16.2 The Cabinet Member replied that he would provide a written answer.

7.17 Question from Cllr Ward to Cllr Dewsbury, Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships

7.17.1 Cllr Ward said that he recently had the privilege of presenting awards and medals at the summer reading challenge at his local library. He asked if the Cabinet Member would join with him in congratulating the library staff on the way those events are run and give assurance that they would continue in the future.

7.17.2 The Cabinet Member assured the Council that they wouldn't stop. There had been over 10,000 children take part this year with the largest number ever reading all six books so it had been a highly successful summer.

7.18 Question from Cllr Seward to Cllr Dewsbury, Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships

7.18.1 Cllr Seward asked the Cabinet Member if she could confirm that it would be a year before the new 4x4 vehicles purchased for the Fire Service are outfitted..

7.18.2 The Cabinet Member replied that there were already a couple of 4x4 vehicles in use in the area of Fakenham / Sandringham. The rest would be out within the next year. They would be sited alongside the current vehicles so staff could assess which vehicles they needed for which response.

7.19 Question from Cllr Rowntree to Cllr Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention

7.19.1 Cllr Rowntree asked the Cabinet Member how much money the Council had made to date by increasing contributions to the minimum income guarantee.

7.19.2 The Cabinet Member replied that as the increase only started in July there was not a total to date, however one could be sought from Officers and a written response provided.

7.20 Question from Cllr Maxfield to Cllr Peck, Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management

7.20.1 Cllr Maxfield asked the Cabinet Member when the building work on County Hall forecourt would be finished and what would be the total cost.

7.20.2 The Cabinet Member replied that it was still targeted to finish in December, and the cost was unknown as it was still under negotiation.

7.21 Question from Cllr Kemp to Cllr Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services

7.21.1 Cllr Kemp explained that at a recent conference she had attended with Family Voice, she heard that people were waiting over a year for a response to their child's Health and Care Plan (EHCP) despite the law saying they should be completed within 20 weeks. A recent report to Cabinet in June had stated that only 4.5% of plans were completed within the timescale. Cllr Kemp asked what the current percentage of EHCP's completed on time was and what was being done to improve matters.

7.21.2 The Cabinet Member reported that the figures had improved and a new system had been introduced. The delay had been noted and it was an issue that had devolved from a change of recording system across the Country. Every Council was impacted. Improved results were now being seen from the changes but the issues and impact on the families were recognised hence the changes being made.

7.22 Question from Cllr Walker to Cllr Peck, Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management

7.22.1 Cllr Walker asked the Cabinet Member that as County Farms were one of the largest agricultural landowners in Norfolk, the National Farmer's Union (NFU) had published a report on how it intended to achieve zero emissions by 2040, which was a decade ahead of any Government targets. She asked if the Cabinet Member would introduce terms into leases for County Farms that would require tenants to reduce their emissions faster than or in line with the NFU proposals.

7.22.2 The Cabinet Member replied that there was a Government initiative coming out to introduce an environmental management scheme and all tenants would be able to enter that scheme if they so wished. All the land on County Farms was very productive and if they were taken out of production it would affect the tenant's income so it had to be balanced. He added that tenants were encouraged to farm in an environmentally way and the new scheme should help achieve that.

8. Committee Reports

8.1 Scrutiny Committee held on 22 and 30 July 2019

8.1.1 Cllr S Morphew, Chair of Scrutiny Committee, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

8.2 Corporate Select Committee held on 16 July 2019

8.2.1 Cllr K Vincent, Chairman, moved the report.

- 8.2.2 Cllr Jermy asked if assets were disposed of as efficiently as possible.
- 8.2.3 Cllr Peck, Cabinet Member for Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management replied that excess furniture and fittings were disposed of efficiently as far as possible. Fittings recently seen in a skip outside County Hall were broken, but as much had been recycled and offered to charities as possible.
- 8.2.4 Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.
- 8.3 **Infrastructure and Development Select Committee held on 17 July and 11 September 2019**
- 8.3.1 Cllr B Stone, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.
- 8.4 **People and Communities Select Committee held on 19 July and 13 September 2019**
- 8.4.1 Cllr S Gurney, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.
- 8.5 **Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 25 July and 5 September 2019**
- 8.5.1 Cllr M Chenery of Horsbrugh, Member of the Committee, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.
- 8.6 **Audit Committee held on 29 July 2019**
- 8.6.1 Cllr I Mackie, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.
- 8.7 **Planning Regulatory Committee held on 26 July and 6 September 2019.**
- 8.7.1 Cllr C Foulger, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

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

- 9.1 Council **AGREED** the appointment of Cllr P Carpenter to the Health Overview and Scrutiny Panel to replace Cllr M Stone. Cllr A Thomas was appointed as substitute.

10. Notice of Motions

- 10.1 The following motion was proposed by Cllr Aquarone and seconded by Cllr Watkins.

This Council notes that:

- The Government's Operation Yellow Hammer documents state that a No

deal Brexit could result in a reduction in choice and availability of food, and potential price increases for utilities, food and fuel.

- It also states that there could be a rise in public disorder and community tensions resulting from a shortage of food and drugs.
 - These views are confirmed in Norfolk County Council's EU "No deal" Exit Strategy which also raises other issues such as disruption to care provision and food supply chain problems to Norfolk schools and care homes.
- The Council believes that Norfolk's people should be protected as far as possible from the effects of a No Deal Brexit.

Therefore, this Council agrees to:

- Report to all members and the public through its normal media channels weekly on what measures the County Council has in place for coping with the effects of a no deal Brexit. These reports should include how much money the County Council is spending on these preparations.
- Report to all members and the public through its normal media channels weekly on the work that is being done to protect Norfolk's public should a no deal Brexit happen.

10.1.1 Following debate and upon being put to the vote, with 21 votes for, 40 votes against and 1 abstention, the motion was **LOST**.

10.2. The following motion was proposed by Cllr Morpew and seconded by Cllr B Jones.

Council regrets the publication and circulation to families affected by the minimum income guarantee reduction of the Money Advice leaflet that among other things advises eating a big breakfast in order to reduce spending on lunch, inviting friends round to reduce the cost of going out and shopping at online discount food shops. Council believes that the hardship being imposed on disabled young people and their carers should not be made worse by disrespectful, patronising and condescending suggestions to mitigate hardship created by the choice to cut MIG made by Council.

Council resolves to request the appropriate cabinet member to immediately stop the circulation of this leaflet and instead work with the disabled people and carers to ensure they get the advice they need rather than the advice other people think they need.

10.2.1 Following debate and upon being put to the vote, with 23 votes for, 38 votes against and 4 abstentions, the motion was **LOST**.

10.3 The following motion was proposed by Cllr T Adams and seconded by Cllr Harrison.

This Council notes that:

- The Charity Scope have created a Disability Price Tag that calculates the average additional monthly income that a disabled person would need in order to achieve the same standard of living as a non-disabled person. They have calculated that on average, disabled people face extra costs of £583 a

month related to their impairment or condition, even after receiving welfare payments designed to help meet these costs.

- For one in five disabled people, extra costs amount to over £1,000 per month.
- It is £528 per month for one disabled child in a family and £823 for 2 or more disabled children in a family.
- The Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman undertook 61 detailed investigations into Norfolk County Council for the period 1 April 2018 to 31 March 2019. It upheld 67% of those complaints. That is a higher than average figure of upheld decisions compared to similar authorities.
- Some of the cases upheld against the council were to do with its charging policies such as the 29 April 2019 decision 18 012 762 where the Council gave incorrect advice to Mrs X about her mother's residential care and refused to meet the full cost of the care and required Mrs X to pay a top up or the 2 April 2019 decision 18 012 892 where the Council reduced Mr X's personal budget without properly considering his individual needs and wishes.
- Whilst accepting that the statutory guidance provides an indicative list of disability-related expenditure examples and it is not possible for the list to be comprehensive, as it will vary from person to person, residents have expressed concern over gaps in the Council's Disability Related Expenditure policy such as what happens to a physically disabled couple that become parents.
- The Government has met the Local Government Association's call for £1 billion of funding nationally for Adult Social Care in the next financial year.

The Council believes that:

- The incorrect assessment of needs and implementation of charging policies causes unnecessary distress and anxiety to people the council should be supporting.
- Vice President Hubert Humphrey was right when he said, "The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy and the handicapped."

Therefore, this Council agrees to

- Review its Adult Social Care charging policies to ensure that gaps in advice can be closed so that there is clarity of information being given to the public.
- Undertake an urgent assessment of the effect of the Council's Adult Social Care charging policies over the last three years to understand what effect those policies have had on vulnerable and disabled people across Norfolk.
- Request the Executive Director of Adult Social Services to submit that assessment to the full council meeting on 20 January 2020.

10.3.1 Cllr Morphew proposed the following amendment, seconded by Cllr B Jones.

Therefore, this Council agrees to

- ~~• Review its Adult Social Care charging policies to ensure that gaps in advice can be closed so that there is clarity of information being given to the public.~~
- ~~• Undertake an urgent assessment of the effect of the Council's Adult Social Care charging policies over the last three years to understand what effect those policies have had on vulnerable and disabled people across Norfolk.~~
- ~~• Request the Executive Director of Adult Social Services to submit that assessment to the full council meeting on 20 January 2020.~~

1. Review the advice and the way it is given to Adult Care service users and carers, adopting the principle that the advice should be what the service users and carers say they need, not what the council thinks they need
2. Note the Scrutiny Committee scheduled investigation into the 'Cumulative impact of cutting services for families with disabilities' and urge cabinet to present a budget to ensure fairness and justice for those with additional needs.

10.3.2 As proposer of the original motion, Cllr Maxfield did not accept the amendment.

10.3.3 Following debate and upon being put to the vote, the amendment was **LOST**.

10.3.4 Following debate and upon being put to the vote, with 23 votes for, 37 against and 2 abstentions, the substantive motion was **LOST**.

10.4 The following motion was proposed by Cllr Strong and seconded by Cllr Maxfield.

This Council notes that:

- The European Union (EU) asked nations to grade rivers between poor, moderate, good and high. Governments should aim for rivers to be "good" - meaning relatively unaffected by human activity.
- The EU's Water Framework Directive set a target for all rivers to be "good" by 2027.
- The UK government in its 25-year environment plan aims for 75% of rivers to be in good health "as soon as is practicable".
- The Environment Agency states that currently 8% of rivers in the Anglian river basin meet a good ecological status.
- By 2027, the Environment Agency estimates that 43% of Anglian rivers will be "good."
- The Environment Agency permits water companies to spill untreated sewage into rivers during extreme rainfall. The World Wildlife Fund claim that water companies are discharging even when there is light rain due, the charity says, due to "insufficient capacity in the system."
- Norfolk Broads Authority states that clear water now only occurs in about five of the 63 broads.
- Norfolk Broads Authority says that by 2027, it wants to see Norfolk's rivers and broads meeting the requirements of European legislation and local aspiration.
- The Government's Water Environment Grant scheme that provided funding to improve the water environment in rural England ended in May 2018.

The Council believes that:

- The East Anglian region should be renowned for its beautiful wetlands and rivers.
- Unpolluted rivers are essential for human health and for wildlife. More needs to be done to make our rivers clean enough for swimming and pollution free for fish, birds, insects and mammals.

Therefore, this Council agrees to:

- Call on the Government to fast-track flagship legislation to better protect and restore our waterways and invest in effective monitoring and enforcement to ensure that all our rivers are once again clean and healthy.

10.4.1 Following debate and upon being put to the vote the motion was **CARRIED**.

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

11.1 There were none received.

The meeting concluded at 1.15pm.

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.

Briefing Note – County Council question regarding spend on social care

Following the meeting held last week with people who access social care, their families and stakeholders, there was a question raised on the proportion of the council's spending on social care and the percentage of the Norfolk population that this supports.

Broadly, the Council has a gross spend of £633.111 on Adult Social Care and Childrens Services (excluding Schools) and £974.640 including schools. This equates to 60% and 70% respectively.

However, net spend (adjusted for finance general) equates to 70% on childrens (non schools) and adult social care.

So, 70% is broadly representative of the cost to council tax payers in relation to the proportion spent on front line services.

In relation to the percentage of the population this supports, both Adults and Childrens Services includes both direct formal services and universal services, so the number of people helped by services will invariably be larger.

The following statements provide some wider context regarding the direction of this spend.

- Most of the spend is on formal services. Adults supports (at anyone time) c16,000 in long term services. This equates to 2.2% of the adult population in Norfolk.
- Broadly, commissioned care services for children supports c1600 young people in Norfolk, but over 4700 children are helped through social work teams. This equates to 2.5% of the population (0-19) of children in Norfolk.
- So, in total those directly supported 17,600 represents 2% of the overall population.
- However, support is also provided to people through reablement and Swifts (a further 20,000 each year) - **in total these long term and early help services will reach just over 4.5% of the population each year.**
- For many of the services, - those for older people, people with mental health needs and early help, the mix of people being supported will be constantly changing. It therefore means that more people will feel the effects of this spend over time. It also will have a wider benefit for the individual's family and carers – so the indirect benefits support a higher percentage of the population.

The above is a key factor when considering fairer funding and future sustainability of social care. Determinants of care needs in the county are driven by multi components. Population is only one variable – age profile, market factors, workforce and rurality are all factors. It will therefore be important, as we all continue to lobby and to work with government departments to shape future policy that we work together to develop and share our research on use of services in Norfolk.

24th September 2019

Questions requiring written responses from the Council Meeting – Monday 23 September 2019

	Question and response:
<p>Question from Cllr Chris Jones to Cllr Bill Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention</p>	<p>Cllr Jones asked what it has cost to create the new direct payment support service because the service appears to be unfit for purpose and a lot of mistakes had been made.</p> <p><i>Answer: The new direct payment support service has cost £1.138m in one off costs, including procurement and set up costs of a new payroll system to improve services for direct payment holders as employers and their employees. There has been no additional cost from the transfer of services.</i></p> <p><i>The service provides support for adults and children who choose to take their personal budget as a direct payment. The service provides individuals with support to manage their direct payment, employer support, advice and training, help with accessing personal assistant carers; payroll services and training for personal assistants.</i></p> <p><i>Despite significant challenges with the transition of the payroll service from the previous provider, the Council's team worked hard to make the transition as smooth as possible for service users. Despite this, a mix of new processes for service users and personal assistants, early system challenges and some human error meant that the transition was not perfect. The team also had to ensure that all employers were meeting their legal responsibilities to their employees with regard to national minimum wage. However, every action was taken to manage this and in the first month all employees were paid either on or within a few days of their given pay date. Urgent payments were made to personal assistants where necessary. Looking ahead, the service is focusing on developing and improving the service offer for individuals in response to feedback and we are confident in the service the team is delivering to our service users.</i></p> <p><i>Now that the service is being delivered in house, NCC is committed to working with advice and advocacy agencies in ensuring people have independent advice where they wish, and to promote personalisation.</i></p>
<p>Question from Cllr Squire to Cllr Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services</p>	<p>Cllr Squire asked how many children with special educational needs were currently out of school awaiting a suitable school place, or on a school roll but not attending, and how long on average they had been out of school.</p> <p><i>Answer: The Head of the High Needs SEND Service has met with Cllr Squire to discuss this complex issue. Further questions raised by Cllr Squire are being explored and answers will be provided directly to her.</i></p>

	Question and response:								
Question from Cllr Rowntree to Cllr Bill Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention	<p>Cllr Rowntree asked how much money had the Council made so far by increasing contributions by increasing the minimum income guarantee?</p> <p><i>Answer: As agreed by County Council the policy was not implemented at the beginning of the year, so full year changes to income are not yet expected. The changes to the non-residential charging policy were agreed on a phased basis. The net income within the two year period is set out below:</i></p> <table><tr><td></td><td><i>2019-20 £m</i></td><td><i>2020-21 £m</i></td><td><i>Total £m</i></td></tr><tr><td><i>Changes to the non-residential charging policy for MIG and PIP</i></td><td><i>1.000</i></td><td><i>3.000</i></td><td><i>4.000</i></td></tr></table> <p><i>The profile of savings reflects the two phases.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><i>1. from July 2019 to change the Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG) for working age adults from £189pw to £165pw and take into account £9pw of enhanced Personal Independence Payment (PIP)</i><i>2. from April 2020 to change the level of the MIG for working age adults to the statutory level recommended by central Government of £151.45 pw and take full account of PIP.</i> <p><i>Invoices under the revised charging policy have been prepared in line with the agreed policy. For people with commissioned services, where charges are made after services have been received, the first invoices under the revised policy were raised at the end of September 2019.</i></p>		<i>2019-20 £m</i>	<i>2020-21 £m</i>	<i>Total £m</i>	<i>Changes to the non-residential charging policy for MIG and PIP</i>	<i>1.000</i>	<i>3.000</i>	<i>4.000</i>
	<i>2019-20 £m</i>	<i>2020-21 £m</i>	<i>Total £m</i>						
<i>Changes to the non-residential charging policy for MIG and PIP</i>	<i>1.000</i>	<i>3.000</i>	<i>4.000</i>						