

# Norfolk County Council

Date: **Monday 19 October 2015**

Time: **10.00 a.m**

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

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

This meeting may be recorded for subsequent publication via the Council's internet site – at the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being recorded. You should be aware that the Council is a Data Controller under the Data Protection Act. Data collected during this recording will be retained in accordance with the Council's Records Management Policy.

Under the Council's protocol on the use of media equipment at meetings held in public, this meeting may be filmed, recorded or photographed. Anyone who wishes to do so must inform the Chairman and ensure that it is done in a manner clearly visible to anyone present. The wishes of any individual not to be recorded or filmed must be appropriately respected.

## Prayers

## To Call the Roll

## AGENDA

### 1. Minutes

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council meetings held on 27 July and 2 September 2015

Page **4**

### 2 To receive any announcements from the Chairman

### 3. Members to declare any interests

If you have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in a matter to be considered at the meeting and that interest is on your Register of Interests you must not speak or vote on the matter. It is recommended that you declare that interest but it is not a legal requirement.

If you have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in a matter to be considered at the meeting and that interest is not on your Register of Interests you must declare that interest at the meeting and not speak or vote on the matter.

In either case you may remain in the room where the meeting is taking place. If you consider that it would be inappropriate in the circumstances to remain in the room, you may leave the room while the matter is dealt with.

If you do not have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest you may nevertheless have an Other Interest in a matter to be discussed if it affects:

- your well being or financial position
- that of your family or close friends
- that of a club or society in which you have a management role
- that of another public body of which you are a member to a greater extent than others in your ward.

If that is the case then you must declare such an interest but can speak and vote on the matter.

#### **4. Questions to Leader of the Council**

#### **5. Recommendations from Service Committees**

- Children's Services – 15 September 2015 Page **25**

#### **6. Reports from Committees**

##### **(i) Service Committees (Questions to Chairs)**

- Policy & Resources – 1 & 28 September 2015 Page **27**
- Adult Social Care – 7 September 2015 Page **33**
- Children's Services – 15 September 2015 Page **36**
- Communities – 9 September 2015 Page **38**
- Environment, Development and Transport – 18 September 2015 Page **41**
- Economic Development Sub-Committee – 21 September 2015 Page **46**

##### **(ii) Other Committees**

- Audit Committee Page **49**
  - 24 September 2015
- Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Page **53**
  - 3 September 2015

- Planning (Regulatory) Committee Page **55**
  - 24 July 2015
- Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee Page **57**
  - 23 July & 17 September 2015
- 7. **Minimum Revenue Provision Policy 2015-16 (revision) and 2016-17** Page **68**

Report by Executive Director of Finance
- 8. **Appointments to Committees, Sub-Committees and Joint Committees (Standard Item)**
  - (i) To note appointments made under delegated powers;
  - (ii) To consider any proposals from Group Leaders for changes to committee places
- 9. **To answer Questions under Rule 8.3 of the Council Procedure Rules (only if any received)**

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

Date Agenda Published: 9 October 2015

**For further details and general enquiries about this Agenda please contact the Assistant Head of Democratic Services:**

Greg Insull on 01603 223100 or email [greg.insull@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:greg.insull@norfolk.gov.uk)

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



Tel: 01603 223100  
Minicom 01603 223833

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

## **Norfolk County Council**

### **Minutes of the Meeting Held on 27 July 2015**

**Present:**

Mr A Adams	Mr J Joyce
Mr S Agnew	Ms A Kemp
Mr C Aldred	Mr M Kiddle-Morris
Mr S Askew	Mrs J Leggett
Mr M Baker	Mr B Long
Mr R Bearman	Mr I Mackie
Mr R Bird	Mr I Monson
Mr B Borrett	Ms E Morgan
Dr A Boswell	Mr S Morphew
Mr B Bremner	Mr G Nobbs
Ms J Brociek-Coulton	Mr W Northam
Mr A Byrne	Mr R Parkinson-Hare
Mr M Carttiss	Mr J Perkins
Mr M Castle	Mr G Plant
Mrs J Chamberlin	Mr A Proctor
Mr J Childs	Mr D Ramsbotham
Mr T Coke	Mr W Richmond
Mr D Collis	Mr D Roper
Ms E Corlett	Ms C Rumsby
Mrs H Cox	Mr M Sands
Mr D Crawford	Mr E Seward
Mr A Dearnley	Mr N Shaw
Mrs M Dewsbury	Mr R Smith
Mr N Dixon	Mr P Smyth
Mr T East	Mrs M Somerville
Mr T FitzPatrick	Mr B Spratt
Mr C Foulger	Dr M Strong
Mr T Garrod	Mrs A Thomas
Mr A Grey	Mr D Thomas
Mrs S Gurney	Mr J Timewell
Mr P Hacon	Miss J Virgo
Mr B Hannah	Mrs C Walker
Mr D Harrison	Mr J Ward
Mr M Chenery of Horsbrugh	Mr B Watkins
Mr H Humphrey	Ms S Whitaker
Mr B Iles	Mr M Wilby
Mr T Jermy	Mrs M Wilkinson
Mr C Jordan	

**Present: 75**

## **Apologies for Absence:**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr S Clancy, Mr J Dobson, Mr P Gilmour, Mr S Hebborn, Mr J Law, Mr J Mooney, Mr M Storey and Mr A White.

## **1 Minutes**

- 1.1 The minutes of the Council meeting held on 18 May 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendments:

Paragraph 16.1.4 – Lydia Reed Court to be amended to read Lydia Eva Court.

Paragraph 16.1.5 last sentence – Remove the word minimum. Sentence to read “The Chair added that she had asked whether providers could be asked to tender two prices – one with the ~~minimum~~ living wage included and one without, in the hope that improved terms and conditions could be offered to staff.

## **2 Chairman’s Announcements**

- 2.1 The Chairman welcomed The Reverend Ian Fosten to his first Council meeting.
- 2.2 After the Chairman had announced the sad passing of Councillor Derek Blake, Conservative Member for Loddon and Mr Michael Langwade, former County Councillor for Gaywood South from 2009-2013, Members paid tribute to both men and stood in silence in their memory.
- 2.3 The Chairman welcomed Graham Plant, the new Conservative member for Gorleston St Andrews and Chrissie Rumsby, the new Labour Member for Mile Cross and said he hoped they would enjoy their time at Norfolk County Council.
- 2.4 The Chairman announced that Chief Fire Officer Nigel Williams, Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service had recently been awarded the Queens Fire Service Medal in the Queen’s Birthday Honours 2015. The Queen’s Fire Service Medal was awarded to members of the Fire and Rescue Service for distinguished service or gallantry.
- 2.5 The Chairman also announced that this would be the last meeting attended by Nigel Williams as he was due to retire in September 2015. Members wished him a long and happy retirement.

## **Presentation by Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust’s Youth Council**

- 2.6 Council received a presentation by members of the Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust’s Youth Council on their role and work across the county. They would be presenting their work at the International Association of Youth Mental Health Conference in Montreal in October and briefed members about their plans for the trip, which included visiting youth projects in the area.

## **3 Declarations of Interest**

- 3.1 The Head of Law and Monitoring Officer advised that all Councillors who were also members of District or Borough Councils had an “other” interest rather than a pecuniary interest and therefore could participate in the debate and would not need to

leave the room when agenda item 5 (Notice of Motion) was discussed. Members received the advice from the Head of Law and Monitoring Officer, and decided to declare whether they were Members of District or Borough Councils and therefore had an other interest in agenda item 5. The details of the declarations can be found at Appendix A.

#### **4 Questions to Leader of the Council**

##### **4.1 Question from Mr C Jordan**

Mr Jordan said that given the Labour Group had run the country for 13 years, and the Alliance had run the County Council for over two years, why had the County Council had to wait for a Conservative Government to introduce the living wage?

The Leader replied that this was not his area of responsibility and took the opportunity to welcome Mr Plant and Ms Rumsby to the Council and to echo the words said previously about the two colleagues who had sadly died.

##### **4.2 Question from Mr J Childs**

Mr Childs asked if the Leader thought that Conservative colleagues should forego the remaining months of their spokespersons allowances for the civic year, given that they had refused to attend spokespersons meetings and undertake the duties of their role, noting that participating in these duties was a specific requirement of the roles laid out in the Constitution. He asked if the Leader would also agree that they should do the honourable thing and repay the money that they had been paid to date after neglecting these duties and could the Leader please check the legality of these actions and whether it was a dereliction of duty whilst in the public office? He also asked if those Members who wouldn't repay the money to the Council, would like to donate it to one of the charities that the Council supported?

The Leader thanked Mr Childs for his question. He said that a great deal of time had been spent debating the Committee system and also on reviewing it, with an outside person carrying out the review and who had made recommendations on a cross-party basis. He added that there were a lot of meetings about the role of Councillors and he had attended either 11 or 17 meetings about this with the recommendations being very clear. The system had been designed in such a way that there were group spokespersons and that they should attend relevant meetings. The Leader said he was not so much concerned about whether they were entitled to their allowances, but he was concerned about the fact that one group had withdrawn their attendance at spokespersons meetings. He added that this wasted time at Committee meetings, as spokespersons and agenda setting meetings were used to discuss and agree agenda items. The Leader said he was not concerned about special responsibility allowances, which was a matter of conscience, although he was concerned about the way arbitrary decisions were taken, forbidding members from turning up at spokespersons meetings which was a requirement of the Constitution, and that there were group spokespersons who were not happy with the situation.

##### **4.3 Question from Dr M Strong**

Dr Strong said that on 8 June, the Leader had written to the Secretary of State for Communities regarding the Right to Buy in relation to housing associations and that this continued to be of concern to people involved with these associations. She asked if the Leader had received the courtesy of a reply.

The Leader said that he had not yet received a reply. He added that he had written to

the Secretary of State at the request of the Policy & Resources Committee on some very specific cases and that it had not been the intention to gainsay the Government's right to introduce legislation having just won an election. The letter had been to point out that there were certain housing societies and associations in Norfolk which were totally different to the general associations where they had bought houses in villages for the express purpose of keeping the housing stock and stopping the houses being purchased by second home owners, meaning that villages would be empty most of the year, as many of them were already. He added that he was specifically talking about the Blakeney Housing Society, founded in 1946. Many people had left houses to this society so that they could be kept and let to local people. It had nothing to do with the general principle about whether or not housing associations should sell their housing stock. He added that he had also written to Brandon Lewis MP, the Housing Minister who had a coastal constituency in Norfolk, but he had not received a reply to either letter.

As a supplementary question, Dr Strong asked the Leader if he could pursue the answer, to which the Leader replied he would.

**4.4 Question from Mr R Bearman**

Mr Bearman asked what the Leader's views were on the proposed 40% cut for Local Government spending recently announced, given the Council was trying to reduce spending by 25% over the next three years.

The Leader replied that there were some Members who had questioned whether we were taking things too far by looking for a 25% reduction in spend rather than a 15% reduction to give ourselves additional headroom. He said it was known that the council needed to make a 15% reduction in spend over the next few years and there were certain areas where reductions were unlikely to be achieved. The Chancellor had recently announced that outside the four ring-fenced departments of education, health, the armed forces and overseas aid, a 40% reduction in spend was expected.

**4.5 Question from Mr B Bremner**

Mr Bremner asked how the Ofsted inspection of Children's Services was proceeding.

The Leader said Ofsted were now more than half way through their inspection of Looked after Children and asked Mr Joyce, Chairman of Children's Services Committee to provide a more detailed update.

Mr Joyce advised that the inspection of looked after children had commenced at the beginning of July and he would be attending a debriefing on Thursday 30 July. Children's Services was in a much better position than it had been two years ago and he hoped the inspection would show that Children's Services had made excellent progress since the last inspection had found the Looked after Children service to be totally inadequate. The Inspectors had asked some very searching questions, particularly in areas where performance differed across the county. Where this had been the case Children's Services had been able to provide an explanation for the differences in performance.

**4.6 Question from Mr B Borrett**

Mr Borrett said that given the importance of Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) in allocating funds to the County Council, specifically for infrastructure projects, he asked the Leader how many Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) meetings he had actually attended in the last 12 months and how many of these meetings he should have

attended and had asked a colleague to substitute for him.

The Leader said that he would provide a written response to the question.

**4.7 Question from Mr B Hannah**

Mr Hannah asked what was happening to the chaplaincy role. He had been advised by the Managing Director that all Members would be involved in any decision regarding the important, but mostly unseen role. He asked if a decision had already been made.

The Leader deferred the question to the Chairman who confirmed that no decision about the chaplaincy role had yet been made.

**4.8 Question from Mr A Dearnley**

Mr Dearnley asked if the Leader and senior officers had yet discussed the implications of the Local Authorities Devolution Bill for Norfolk with Leaders and senior officers from all the other District and Borough Councils.

The Leader replied that devolution had been discussed at a Norfolk Leaders Meeting and added that the Managing Director was having talks with the Chief Executives of the District and Borough Councils to discuss the options. He added that there were also some bi-lateral talks taking place and the Managing Director had also been holding talks with other county councils and Government bodies about the devolvement of power.

**5 Notice of Motions**

- 5.1 The Leader of the UKIP Group, Mr R Coke, seconded by Mr P Smyth proposed the following motion, including the additional wording which was accepted by the Chairman.

“That this Council reviews the governance options set out under the Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill, at both county and district levels, with a view to identifying significant savings, **improving efficiency, democracy and accountability**”.

- 5.2 Mr C Jordan, seconded by Mr A Proctor proposed the following amendment:

“That this council, in conjunction with other councils, voluntary and public sector bodies in Norfolk, reviews the governance options under the Cities and Local Government Devolution Bill, with a view to identifying significant savings.

Such options will exclude proposals for a unitary form of governance.”

- 5.3 Following debate and upon being put to a recorded vote (Appendix B), with 35 votes in favour, 39 votes against and 1 abstention, the amended motion was **LOST**.
- 5.4 Following debate and upon being put to a recorded vote (Appendix C), with 40 votes in favour, 35 votes against and 0 abstentions, the substantive motion was **CARRIED**.

**6 Residential and Non-Residential Charge Policy Associated with War Veterans.**

- 6.1 Council received the report by the Executive Director of Finance providing it with a review of the charging policy for Residential and Non-Residential care that was associated with War Veterans. The report highlighted the representations made by the



Royal British Legion as part of the national campaign and identified funding options as directed by the Policy and Resources Committee.

**6.2 RESOLVED to:**

1. Authorise officers to make the necessary policy changes to be able to fully disregard pre-1 April 2015 War Disablement Pensions when determining how much an individual must pay towards their residential and non-residential care costs, (save for the additional attendance allowance paid to some War Veterans to cover some of the costs of their care).
2. Note that the policy change was estimated to affect 104 individuals (as at March 2015) and cost approximately £400k annually to implement.
3. Approve that any 2015/16 cost relating to this policy change be funded from the additional £1.7m transferred to the Adults Reserve at the end of the 2014/15 financial year (as approved by Policy & Resources Committee).
4. Note that the change will be effective from 6 April 2015 (the start of the current tax year) and that further work will be required to review the arrears and apply them to each individual affected.
5. Note that the full year budget pressure from this policy change will be addressed as part of the budget setting process for 2016/17.

**7 Statutory Officers – Changes to Standing Orders**

7.1 Council received the report from the Head of Law and Monitoring Officer informing members of a mandatory change in standing orders relating to the statutory officers and report on their implementation within the Council's Constitution.

**7.2 RESOLVED to:**

1. Note the report and to instruct the Head of Law and Monitoring Officer to implement the necessary changes to the Council's Constitution so as to comply with the Regulations.
2. Instruct the Acting Head of HR to establish a procedure for the appointment of, and the process to be followed by, the Panel in accordance with the Regulations.

**8 Recommendations from Service Committees**

**8.1 Policy and Resources Committee – 1 June 2015**

Mr G Nobbs, Chairman of Policy & Resources Committee moved the recommendation that County Council approve the Annual Treasury Management Report 2014/15.

8.1.1 The Council **RESOLVED** to endorse the Annual Treasury Management Report 2014-15.

## 8.2 **Children's Services Committee – 7 July 2015**

8.2.1 Mr J Joyce, Chairman of Children's Services Committee, moved the recommendation that County Council approve the Norfolk Youth Justice Plan 2015-16.

8.2.2 Council **RESOLVED** to approve the Norfolk Youth Justice Plan 2015-16.

## 8.3 **Environment, Development & Transport Committee – 10 July 2015**

8.3.1 Mr R Coke, Chairman of Environment, Development and Transport Committee moved the recommendation that Council adopt the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment, Habitats Regulation Assessment and Equality Impact Assessment be adopted.

8.3.2 Council **RESOLVED** to adopt the draft Local Flood Risk Management Strategy and the Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment, Habitats Regulation Assessment and Equality Impact Assessment.

## 9 **Reports from Service Committees (Questions to Chairs)**

### 9.1 **Report of the Policy and Resources Committee meetings held on 1 June and 20 July 2015.**

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

#### 9.1.1 **Question from Mrs J Leggett**

Mrs Leggett said that the Public Services Network was the government's high-performance network that allowed public authorities to work together and, in the case of our district and borough council colleagues, administer benefit payments on behalf of the DWP. Breckland District Council had only received its accreditation two and a half hours before the deadline because of issues around information security. Mrs Leggett asked the Chairman if he could please explain where we were with our own accreditation and what work this might be hampering.

The Chairman responded that the DNA (Digital Norfolk Ambition) Working Party had dealt with this issue and asked Cllr Roper to respond to the question. Mr Roper said he would provide a written response and copy the reply to all Members.

#### 9.1.2 **Question from Dr A Boswell**

Mr Boswell referred to the outage of Good for Enterprise which had appeared to be a Vodafone server problem, and the disrespect shown to Councillors and other users with the 8 day delay before Vodafone had admitted there was a problem. He asked if the Council had undertaken an analysis of the impacts of the outage to the Council and also if the Chairman would join with the other councils and bodies who were affected by the outage to lobby Vodafone for a much stronger service level agreement.

The Chairman of Policy & Resources Committee said that he would lobby for a stronger service level agreement and added that the Managing Director had already written to Vodafone about the outage and would ask her to let Members have a copy of the letter.

9.1.3 **Question from Mr B Borrett**

Mr Borrett said he had been disappointed to see there was no mention in the reports of Council's inadequate response to Members losing access to their emails and that there had been no plan in place to contact Members by other means, to inform them of the problem and to get them the agenda and minutes of meetings, bearing in mind they knew the system was down and had been for ten days. He added that whilst there was a finger to be pointed at Vodafone the Council's response had not been adequate. He asked if the Chairman would support him in agreeing that the response from the Council was not adequate and that a proper plan, which had been requested at Policy & Resources, that should a similar failure take place in the future, Members would have the support from the County Council so they were not left high and dry as they had been before.

The Chairman replied that the reports that were presented to County Council were not the minutes of the meeting and he was sure the points made would be recorded in the full minutes of the Policy & Resources meeting. With regard to the other issue raised he asked the Chairman of Communities Committee, Mr Smyth to reply. Mr Smyth confirmed he had already contacted the Chief Fire Officer and the resilience team about the problem.

9.1.4 **Question from Mr M Wilby**

Mr Wilby referred to the proposals to charge staff for parking at County Hall. He asked if the Chairman could say if he was in support of that policy and if he was not, could he put an end to such a proposal?

The Chairman responded that the issue about staff car parking was not primarily about the need to raise revenue, although that was important. He added that due to the successful refurbishment of county hall, more staff needed to be accommodated at county hall from satellite offices, which would save money. A consequence of moving more staff into County Hall was there would not be enough room on the car park to accommodate all staff. The Chairman said that he had not closed his mind to the final way of dealing with this but that something would have to be done as not all staff could be accommodated on the car park. He said this was as far as he was able to go at the moment as the situation was still being reviewed.

9.1.5 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

Ms Kemp asked if penalties were incorporated in the service level agreement with IT if those service providers failed to provide the required service and if not, why had they not been included?

The Chairman replied that the issue of whether the County Council could seek compensation was being taken up by the Managing Director with Vodafone. The Head of Law and Monitoring Officer would be able to provide details of the service level agreement with Vodafone.

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

9.2 **Report of the Adult Social Care Committee meetings held on 11 May, 8 and 29 June 2015.**

Ms S Whitaker, Chair of Adult Social Care Committee moved the report.

9.2.1 **Question from Mr B Bremner**

Mr Bremner asked how the more integrated working with the NHS was progressing.

The Chair replied that there were a number of initiatives already in place, for example:

- Joint management with Norfolk Community Health and Care who provided community services.
- The mental health social workers had now been brought back to work for the county council, although we were still working closely with the Mental Health Trust.
- This was the first year of the Better Care Fund which was five separate agreements with the five Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG's).

The Chair added that there was further work to be carried out as it was recognised that there were savings that needed to be made with less money and more demand for services. There was scope for more joint working and opportunities were being identified and worked through to provide a service for all the residents of Norfolk more efficiently with less money.

#### 9.2.2 **Question from Mr B Watkins**

Mr Watkins asked the Chair to comment on the recently announced government changes to the implementation timetable for the Care Act and the implications that this would have on the Council going forward.

The Chair replied that Part 2 of the Care Act was due to be implemented from 1 April 2016 which was the part which would have brought about the cap on the amount that people would have to pay for care over their lifetime. The implementation had now been put back from 1 April 2016 to 1 April 2020, with the general view being 2020 equalled sometime never. She added that we had originally been told that £570m would be forthcoming to social services authorities and that we would get approximately 1% of that. What was not clear was whether that money would still go to the relevant local authorities.

#### 9.2.3 **Question from Mr A Dearnley**

Mr Dearnley said that with promoting independence, the strategy for delivering adult social care services in Norfolk appeared to rely heavily on communities and the voluntary sector in caring for Norfolk's vulnerable citizens. He asked the Chair if, in her opinion, communities and the third sector had sufficient resilience to respond to the strategy and if not, what the Council could do to ensure that both capacity and resilience was in place.

The Chair replied that her answer would be yes, but there needed to be more partnership working, not only the County Council and other councils, but also involving communities and voluntary sectors. She added that at a recent meeting of the Older People's Strategic Partnership Board, the Chief Executive of Voluntary Norfolk had said there needed to be more cooperation so providers did not compete with each other. The Chair suggested that an audit should be carried out on what services were available, what could be provided, by whom, how and in a way that was beneficial to everyone.

#### 9.2.4 **Question from Mr B Borrett**

Mr Borrett referred to paragraph 6.2 of the report from Adult Social Care Committee to Council that the Committee had resolved to note with concern that the draft revenue outturn position showed an overspend of over £3m. The Committee had decided that

just noting the position was insufficient as they were extremely concerned, when coupled with the risk register, that the budget savings targets over the next three years could lead to a significant overspend in a number of areas, leading to significant financial pressures across the council and would not achieve the expected improvement in services. The risk was currently rated red which meant officers did not think the target would meet the deadline of 1 April 2017. He asked the Chair of Adult Social Services Committee to share with Council what she proposed to do about the situation.

The Chair replied that the red rating was there to remind Members that radical action needed to be taken to change the way services were provided. She had said previously that there were too many customers requiring services and there were insufficient funds. She continued by saying that social care was not one of the areas exempt from departmental cuts at government level so there was a need to radically rethink how adult social care services were provided. She added that it was likely that Children's Services would have identified very similar issues with regard to the provision of social care.

9.2.5 Council **RESOLVED** to note the reports.

9.3 **Report of the Children's Services Committee meetings held on 12 May and 7 July 2015**

Mr J Joyce, Chairman of Children's Services Committee moved the report.

9.3.1 **Question from Mrs J Leggett**

Mrs Leggett said that at previous Children's Services Committee meetings, there had been discussions about holding a Joint Safeguarding Forum between Children's and Adult Services. There had been a meeting on 22 May led by David Ashcroft, Chair of Norfolk Safeguarding Children's Board (NSCB) but nothing since. She asked what was happening with regard to the Joint Safeguarding Forum.

The Chairman responded that the next meeting of the Joint Safeguarding Forum would be held on Wednesday 2 September at 2pm at County Hall which would be convened by Adult Social Services.

9.3.2 **Question from Mr B Watkins**

Mr Watkins said one of the priorities for the Health and Wellbeing Board was promoting the social and emotional wellbeing of children under the age of five. This priority emphasised the crucial importance of addressing overarching mental health issues and Members had received an excellent presentation by the Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust's Youth Council. He asked if the Chairman could suggest ways in which the Health and Wellbeing Board could work more effectively with Children's services to achieve this important objective.

The Chairman replied that one way of achieving this objective was for both Chairs to get together to discuss the issues and to identify ways in which the Health and Wellbeing Board could achieve its objective. He invited any Member to speak to him at any time and said that early intervention was vital and key to how Children's Services was moving forward.

9.3.3 **Question from Mr M Sands**

Mr Sands asked the Chairman of Children's Services Committee to comment on the

recent press report by the Regional Schools Commissioner about the Hewett School?

The Chairman responded that the question referred to an interview with Tim Coulson in the EDP and said that the Government had the right to propose academisation at schools that were deemed not to be performing satisfactorily. He said that the decision the County Council was currently waiting for was about the land and how it could be transferred across in the event of the school becoming an academy. He added that he hoped the decision by the Department for Education would be received soon and would let all Members know the outcome.

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

9.4 **Report of the Communities Committee meetings held on 13 May and 1 July 2015**

Mr P Smyth, Chairman of Communities Committee, moved the report.

9.4.1 **Question from Mr R Smith**

Mr Smith stated that at the Council meeting on 18 May it was agreed that Chairs and Vice-Chairs of Service Committees would agree and publish their respective areas of responsibility on an annual basis. Mr Smith asked whether the Chair and Vice-Chair of Communities Committee had published this information. He also mentioned that Chairs and Vice-Chairs of the other Service Committees may also like to take note.

The Chair replied that areas of responsibility had been discussed and agreed and once the information had been agreed by the Committee at its meeting on 9 September, the information would be published.

9.4.2 **Question from Mr H Humphrey**

Mr Humphrey referred to the report of the Adult Education Steering Group where it was noted that the Further Education Commission was going to visit to consider what action had been taken since the Ofsted report. The lack of facilities for 16-18 year olds did need to be looked at and it had been mentioned that we should work in partnership with the further education colleges which was something that had been considered previously. He asked if the Chairman thought this was something that the Adult Education Working Group should tackle quite promptly.

The Chair asked the Vice-Chair to respond. The Vice-Chair said the courses that had been affected was a result of the Council's inadequate status which had meant the withdrawal of some funding. The Acting Head of Service had been working with City College Norwich to see if they could take over the specific courses, although the Vice-Chair did not know the final outcome. There had also been some difficulties with staff transferring, although he was hopeful this would be resolved by September and the courses could run. He hoped the outcome from the Inspection on 9 June where the monitoring visit from Ofsted had given us the highest grade of progress we could receive, would continue and when the inspectors returned in September we could move forward with the service so that these essential courses for 16-18 year olds courses could once again be offered.

9.4.3 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

Ms Kemp said that she had been informed that the car park at the back of the new fire station in south Lynn was inaccessible and could not be used and that firemen, including those that worked there, were required to clock on and park at the north

Lynn fire station and were then being ferried to the south Lynn fire station. She asked if the Chair could enlighten her as to whether this was true and if it was, why was this happening because it was a waste of personnel time.

The Chairman said neither himself nor the Chief Fire Officer were aware of the situation at South Lynn and said that an investigation would be carried out and a response provided to Ms Kemp.

**9.4.4 Question by Mr M Carttiss**

Mr Carttiss asked for more information and clarification about the report providing an update on key service issues and activities.

The Chair responded that officers, on a fortnightly basis, provided a bullet point summary of items they considered Members of the Committee should be made aware of and this was referred to as a situation report. These reports were then collated and included on the agenda of Communities Committee meetings so Members had an opportunity to ask questions about the activities included. As Communities Committee had about 13 service delivery areas, the fortnightly report kept members aware of the work each of the areas were doing and offered an opportunity for members to ask questions. The reports did run into a significant number of pages and were also available to members on the website.

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

**9.5 Report of the Environment, Development and Transport Committee meetings held on 15 May and 10 July 2015.**

Mr R Coke, Chairman of EDT Committee moved the report.

**9.5.1 Question from Mr M Wilby**

Mr Wilby said that George Freeman MP had written to the Chairman of EDT on 23 June about the provision of school transport for children at Carbrooke Primary School and that Mr Freeman had not yet received a response. He added that it had been reported in the Watton and Swaffham Times that Norfolk Constabulary had said the route Norfolk County Council was asking the children to walk to the school was considered unsafe. He asked when the chairman was going to do something about the problem.

The Chairman responded that the letter from George Freeman about the school run was with officers at present and a reply would be sent in due course.

Mr J Joyce, Chairman of Children's Services Committee added that it was his intention to walk the school route to see for himself the problems and issues, although he wanted to do this during late November/December when the mornings and evenings were darker. He also advised that transport for eligible pupils attending Carbrooke Primary School would be in place until January 2016.

**9.5.2 Question from Mr B Spratt**

Mr Spratt said that with all the roadworks going on in the city centre at the present time, was Norwich closing to businesses, visitors and tourists? He added that we needed to encourage more visitors to the cathedral and castle and that we must support visitors and people who wanted to visit Norwich

The Chairman said that he did have a certain amount of sympathy with trying to negotiate roadworks and deferred the question to Mr Morphew, the Chairman of the Norwich Joint Highways Agency Committee.

Mr Morphew said that much of the work currently taking place was as a result of funding having only just been received. The plans currently being implemented were the Norwich Area Transport Strategy (NATS) plan and the Transport for Norwich Implementation Plan which had been drawn up and approved in 2010. He added that the Strategy and Plans had been widely consulted upon and there had been tens of thousands of responses to the consultation which had received public approval. There had been no evidence that the disruption caused by the roadworks had impacted on businesses and regular dialogue was held with businesses to ensure this remained the case. Mr Morphew added that once the improvements had been completed, cars would have much easier access to car parks, and although cars would not be able to drive around the city centre, access into and out of car parks would be improved.

**9.5.3 Question from Mr B Long**

Mr Long referred to the hazardous waste amnesty held in 2014 which had been a shambles with people in West Norfolk turned away and asked to return, only to be turned away again. He asked the Chair what was going to be different when amnesties happened again in September.

The Chairman said that a report would be presented to the EDT Committee in September 2015 about waste recycling centres, which would include an update on the hazardous waste amnesty. He added that amnesties would be repeated this year and arrangements had been discussed at the recent Waste Advisory Group meeting and that the situation was under control.

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

**9.6 Report of the Economic Development Sub-Committee meetings held on 20 May and 13 July 2015**

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

**Other Committees**

**9.7 Report of the Audit Committee meeting held on 18 June 2015**

Mr I Mackie, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

**9.8 Reports of the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings held on 28 May and 16 July 2015.**

Mr M Carttiss moved the reports. Council **RESOLVED** to note the reports.

**9.9 Report of the Health and Wellbeing Board meeting held on 15 July 2015.**

Mr B Watkins moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

**9.10 Report of the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meeting held on 19 June 2015**



Mr B Long moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

9.11 **Report of the Standards Committee meeting held on 26 June 2015.**

Mr I Monson moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

9.12 **Report of the Records Committee meeting held on 19 June 2015**

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

9.13 **Report of the Joint Museums Committee meeting held on 19 June 2015**

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

9.14 **Report of the Norfolk Highway Agency Committee meeting held on 4 June 2015.**

Mr S Morpew moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

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

10.1 There were none.

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

There were none.

The meeting concluded at 1.20pm.

**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 0344 800 8011 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

**Norfolk County Council**  
**Date – 27 July 2015**

**Item 3 – Declarations of Other Interest in Agenda Item 5 (Notice of Motion)**

**Y – Member of County Council and District /Borough Council**

**N – Not a Member of another authority**

Present		Present	
Y	<b>ADAMS</b> Tony	N	<b>KEMP</b> Alexandra
N	<b>AGNEW</b> Stephen	N	<b>KIDDLE-MORRIS</b> Mark
N	<b>ALDRED</b> Colin	Absent	<b>LAW</b> Jason
N	<b>ASKEW</b> Stephen	Y	<b>LEGGETT</b> Judy
N	<b>BAKER</b> Michael	Y	<b>LONG</b> Brian
N	<b>BEARMAN</b> Richard	Y	<b>MACKIE</b> Ian
Y	<b>BIRD</b> Richard	N	<b>MONSON</b> Ian
Y	<b>BORRETT</b> Bill	Absent	<b>MOONEY</b> Joe
Y	<b>BOSWELL</b> Andrew	N	<b>MORGAN</b> Elizabeth
Y	<b>BREMNER</b> Bert	N	<b>MORPHEW</b> Steve
Y	<b>BRODIEK-COULTON</b> Julie	N	<b>NOBBS</b> George
N	<b>BYRNE</b> Alec	Y	<b>NORTHAM</b> Wyndham
N	<b>CARTTISS</b> Michael	N	<b>PARKINSON-HARE</b> Rex
N	<b>CASTLE</b> Mick	N	<b>PERKINS</b> Jim
N	<b>CHAMBERLIN</b> Jenny	Y	<b>PLANT</b> Graham
N	<b>CHILDS</b> Jonathon	Y	<b>PROCTOR</b> Andrew
Absent	<b>CLANCY</b> Stuart	N	<b>RAMSBOTHAM</b> David
N	<b>COKE</b> Toby	Y	<b>RICHMOND</b> William
N	<b>COLLIS</b> David	Y	<b>ROPER</b> Daniel
	<b>CORLETT</b> Emma	N	<b>RUMSBY</b> Chrissie
Y	<b>COX</b> Hilary	Y	<b>SANDS</b> Mike
Y	<b>CRAWFORD</b> Denis	Y	<b>SEWARD</b> Eric
N	<b>DEARNLEY</b> Adrian		<b>SHAW</b> Nigel
Y	<b>DEWSBURY</b> Margaret	Abstain	<b>SMITH</b> Roger
Y	<b>DIXON</b> Nigel	N	<b>SMYTH</b> Paul
Absent	<b>DOBSON</b> John	N	<b>SOMERVILLE</b> Margaret
N	<b>EAST</b> Tim	N	<b>SPRATT</b> Bev
Y	<b>FITZPATRICK</b> Tom	Absent	<b>STOREY</b> Martin
Y	<b>FOULGER</b> Colin	N	<b>STRONG</b> Marie
N	<b>GARROD</b> Tom	Y	<b>THOMAS</b> Alison
Absent	<b>GILMOUR</b> Paul	N	<b>THOMAS</b> David
N	<b>GREY</b> Alan	N	<b>TIMEWELL</b> John
Y	<b>GURNEY</b> Shelagh	N	<b>VIRGO</b> Judith
N	<b>HACON</b> Pat	N	<b>WALKER</b> Colleen
Y	<b>HANNAH</b> Brian	Y	<b>WARD</b> John
Y	<b>HARRISON</b> David	N	<b>WATKINS</b> Brian
Absent	<b>HEBBORN</b> Stan	N	<b>WHITAKER</b> Sue
Y	<b>HORSBRUGH</b> Michael Chenery of	Absent	<b>WHITE</b> Tony
Y	<b>HUMPHREY</b> Harry	Y	<b>WILBY</b> Martin
N	<b>ILES</b> Brian	Y	<b>WILKINSON</b> Margaret
Y	<b>JERMY</b> Terry		
N	<b>JORDAN</b> Cliff		
N	<b>JOYCE</b> James		

## Norfolk County Council - 27 July 2015

**VOTING – ITEM NUMBER: 5** – Amended Motion proposed by Mr C Jordan, seconded by Mr A Proctor.

FOR	AGAINST.	ABST.		FOR	AGAINST	ABST	
X			<b>ADAMS</b> Tony	X			<b>KEMP</b> Alexandra
	X		<b>AGNEW</b> Stephen	X			<b>KIDDLE-MORRIS</b> Mark
	X		<b>ALDRED</b> Colin	ABSENT			<b>LAW</b> Jason
X			<b>ASKEW</b> Stephen	X			<b>LEGGETT</b> Judy
	X		<b>BAKER</b> Michael	X			<b>LONG</b> Brian
	X		<b>BEARMAN</b> Richard	X			<b>MACKIE</b> Ian
	X		<b>BIRD</b> Richard	X			<b>MONSON</b> Ian
X			<b>BORRETT</b> Bill	ABSENT			<b>MOONEY</b> Joe
	X		<b>BOSWELL</b> Andrew		X		<b>MORGAN</b> Elizabeth
	X		<b>BREMNER</b> Bert		X		<b>MORPHEW</b> Steve
	X		<b>BROCIEK-COULTON</b> Julie		X		<b>NOBBS</b> George
X			<b>BYRNE</b> Alec	X			<b>NORTHAM</b> Wyndham
X			<b>CARTTISS</b> Michael		X		<b>PARKINSON-HARE</b> Rex
	X		<b>CASTLE</b> Mick		X		<b>PERKINS</b> Jim
		X	<b>CHAMBERLIN</b> Jenny	X			<b>PLANT</b> Graham
	X		<b>CHILDS</b> Jonathon	X			<b>PROCTOR</b> Andrew
ABSENT			<b>CLANCY</b> Stuart		X		<b>RAMSBOTHAM</b> David
	X		<b>COKE</b> Toby	X			<b>RICHMOND</b> William
	X		<b>COLLIS</b> David		X		<b>ROPER</b> Daniel
	X		<b>CORLETT</b> Emma		X		<b>RUMSBY</b> Chrissie
X			<b>COX</b> Hilary		X		<b>SANDS</b> Mike
	X		<b>CRAWFORD</b> Denis		X		<b>SEWARD</b> Eric
	X		<b>DEARNLEY</b> Adrian	X			<b>SHAW</b> Nigel
X			<b>DEWSBURY</b> Margaret	X			<b>SMITH</b> Roger
X			<b>DIXON</b> Nigel		X		<b>SMYTH</b> Paul
ABSENT			<b>DOBSON</b> John	X			<b>SOMERVILLE</b> Margaret
X			<b>EAST</b> Tim	X			<b>SPRATT</b> Bev
X			<b>FITZPATRICK</b> Tom	ABSENT			<b>STOREY</b> Martin
X			<b>FOULGER</b> Colin		X		<b>STRONG</b> Marie
X			<b>GARROD</b> Tom	X			<b>THOMAS</b> Alison
ABSENT			<b>GILMOUR</b> Paul		X		<b>THOMAS</b> David
	X		<b>GREY</b> Alan		X		<b>TIMEWELL</b> John
X			<b>GURNEY</b> Shelagh	X			<b>VIRGO</b> Judith
	X		<b>HACON</b> Pat		X		<b>WALKER</b> Colleen
	X		<b>HANNAH</b> Brian	X			<b>WARD</b> John
	X		<b>HARRISON</b> David		X		<b>WATKINS</b> Brian
ABSENT			<b>HEBBORN</b> Stan		X		<b>WHITAKER</b> Sue
X			<b>HORSBRUGH</b> Michael Chenery of	ABSENT			<b>WHITE</b> Tony
X			<b>HUMPHREY</b> Harry	X			<b>WILBY</b> Martin
X			<b>ILES</b> Brian		X		<b>WILKINSON</b> Margaret
	X		<b>JERMY</b> Terry				
X			<b>JORDAN</b> Cliff				
	X		<b>JOYCE</b> James				

**With 35 votes in favour, 39 votes against and 1 abstention the amended motion was LOST.**

## Norfolk County Council - 27 July 2015

**VOTING – ITEM NUMBER: 5** – Substantive Motion proposed by Mr T Coke, seconded by Mr P Smyth.

FOR	AGAINST.	ABST.		FOR	AGAINST	ABST	
	X		<b>ADAMS</b> Tony		X		<b>KEMP</b> Alexandra
X			<b>AGNEW</b> Stephen		X		<b>KIDDLE-MORRIS</b> Mark
X			<b>ALDRED</b> Colin	ABSENT			<b>LAW</b> Jason
	X		<b>ASKEW</b> Stephen		X		<b>LEGGETT</b> Judy
X			<b>BAKER</b> Michael		X		<b>LONG</b> Brian
X			<b>BEARMAN</b> Richard		X		<b>MACKIE</b> Ian
X			<b>BIRD</b> Richard		X		<b>MONSON</b> Ian
	X		<b>BORRETT</b> Bill	ABSENT			<b>MOONEY</b> Joe
X			<b>BOSWELL</b> Andrew	X			<b>MORGAN</b> Elizabeth
X			<b>BREMNER</b> Bert	X			<b>MORPHEW</b> Steve
X			<b>BROCIEK-COULTON</b> Julie	X			<b>NOBBS</b> George
	X		<b>BYRNE</b> Alec		X		<b>NORTHAM</b> Wyndham
	X		<b>CARTTISS</b> Michael	X			<b>PARKINSON-HARE</b> Rex
X			<b>CASTLE</b> Mick	X			<b>PERKINS</b> Jim
	X		<b>CHAMBERLIN</b> Jenny		X		<b>PLANT</b> Graham
X			<b>CHILDS</b> Jonathon		X		<b>PROCTOR</b> Andrew
ABSENT			<b>CLANCY</b> Stuart	X			<b>RAMSBOTHAM</b> David
X			<b>COKE</b> Toby		X		<b>RICHMOND</b> William
X			<b>COLLIS</b> David	X			<b>ROPER</b> Daniel
X			<b>CORLETT</b> Emma	X			<b>RUMSBY</b> Chrissie
	X		<b>COX</b> Hilary	X			<b>SANDS</b> Mike
X			<b>CRAWFORD</b> Denis	X			<b>SEWARD</b> Eric
X			<b>DEARNLEY</b> Adrian		X		<b>SHAW</b> Nigel
	X		<b>DEWSBURY</b> Margaret		X		<b>SMITH</b> Roger
	X		<b>DIXON</b> Nigel	X			<b>SMYTH</b> Paul
ABSENT			<b>DOBSON</b> John		X		<b>SOMERVILLE</b> Margaret
X			<b>EAST</b> Tim		X		<b>SPRATT</b> Bev
	X		<b>FITZPATRICK</b> Tom	ABSENT			<b>STOREY</b> Martin
	X		<b>FOULGER</b> Colin	X			<b>STRONG</b> Marie
	X		<b>GARROD</b> Tom		X		<b>THOMAS</b> Alison
ABSENT			<b>GILMOUR</b> Paul	X			<b>THOMAS</b> David
X			<b>GREY</b> Alan	X			<b>TIMEWELL</b> John
	X		<b>GURNEY</b> Shelagh		X		<b>VIRGO</b> Judith
X			<b>HACON</b> Pat	X			<b>WALKER</b> Colleen
X			<b>HANNAH</b> Brian		X		<b>WARD</b> John
X			<b>HARRISON</b> David	X			<b>WATKINS</b> Brian
ABSENT			<b>HEBBORN</b> Stan	X			<b>WHITAKER</b> Sue
	X		<b>HORSBRUGH</b> Michael Chenery of	ABSENT			<b>WHITE</b> Tony
	X		<b>HUMPHREY</b> Harry		X		<b>WILBY</b> Martin
	X		<b>ILES</b> Brian	X			<b>WILKINSON</b> Margaret
X			<b>JERMY</b> Terry				
	X		<b>JORDAN</b> Cliff				
X			<b>JOYCE</b> James				

**With 40 votes in favour, 35 votes against and 0 abstentions the motion was CARRIED.**

**Norfolk County Council****Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting Held on 2 September 2015****Present:**

Mr A <b>ADAMS</b>	Ms A <b>KEMP</b>
Mr S <b>AGNEW</b>	Mr M <b>KIDDLE-MORRIS</b>
Mr C <b>ALDRED</b>	Mr J <b>LAW</b>
Mr S <b>ASKEW</b>	Mrs J <b>LEGGETT</b>
Mr M <b>BAKER</b>	Mr I <b>MACKIE</b>
Mr R <b>BEARMAN</b>	Mr I <b>MONSON</b>
Mr R <b>BIRD</b>	Ms E <b>MORGAN</b>
Mr B <b>BORRETT</b>	Mr S <b>MORPHEW</b>
Dr A <b>BOSWELL</b>	Mr G <b>NOBBS</b>
Mr B <b>BREMNER</b>	Mr R <b>PARKINSON-HARE</b>
Mrs J <b>BROCIEK-COULTON</b>	Mr J <b>PERKINS</b>
Mr A <b>BYRNE</b>	Mr G <b>PLANT</b>
Mr M <b>CASTLE</b>	Mr A <b>PROCTOR</b>
Mrs J <b>CHAMBERLIN</b>	Mr D <b>RAMSBOTHAM</b>
Mr J <b>CHILDS</b>	Mr W <b>RICHMOND</b>
Mr S <b>CLANCY</b>	Mr D <b>ROPER</b>
Mr T <b>COKE</b>	Mr M <b>SANDS</b>
Mr D <b>COLLIS</b>	Mr E <b>SEWARD</b>
Mr D <b>CRAWFORD</b>	Mr N <b>SHAW</b>
Mr A <b>DEARNLEY</b>	Mr R <b>SMITH</b>
Mrs M <b>DEWSBURY</b>	Mr P <b>SMYTH</b>
Mr N <b>DIXON</b>	Mr B <b>SPRATT</b>
Mr J <b>DOBSON</b>	Mr M <b>STOREY</b>
Mr T <b>FITZPATRICK</b>	Dr M <b>STRONG</b>
Mr C <b>FOULGER</b>	Mrs A <b>THOMAS</b>
Mr T <b>GARROD</b>	Mr J <b>TIMEWELL</b>
Mr P <b>GILMOUR</b>	Miss J <b>VIRGO</b>
Mr A <b>GREY</b>	Mr C <b>WALKER</b>
Mrs S <b>GURNEY</b>	Mr J <b>WARD</b>
Mr P <b>HACON</b>	Ms S <b>WHITAKER</b>
Mr B <b>HANNAH</b>	Mr A <b>WHITE</b>
Mr D <b>HARRISON</b>	Mr M <b>WILBY</b>
Mr M Chenery of <b>HORSBRUGH</b>	Mrs M <b>WILKINSON</b>
Mr H <b>HUMPHREY</b>	
Mr B <b>ILES</b>	
Mr J <b>JORDAN</b>	
Mr J <b>JOYCE</b>	

**Present: 70**

## **Apologies for Absence:**

Apologies for absence were received from Mr M Carttiss, Ms E Corlett, Mrs H Cox, Mr T East, Mr S Hebborn, Mr T Jermy, Mr B Long, Mr J Mooney, Mr W Northam, Ms C Rumsby, Mrs M Somerville, Mr D Thomas and Mr B Watkins.

### **1 Chairman's Announcements**

- 1.1 There were no Chairman's Announcements.

### **2 Declarations of Interest**

- 2.1 No Declarations of Interest were made.

### **3 Norwich Northern Distributor Road Budget**

- 3.1 Council received the report of the Executive Director of Communities and Environmental Services and the Executive Director of Finance updating Members on the final target cost for the scheme and asking Members to approve a mechanism to fund a budget shortfall of £29.9m.
- 3.2 Members were asked to:
1. Accept the funding proposals from Department for Transport (DfT) and the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and confirm a Norfolk County Council contribution of up to £9.9m to meet the budget shortfall;
  2. Approve the funding mechanism set out in paragraph 2.8 of the report to deliver the additional funds of up to £9.9m to support the NDR and approve an adjustment to the 2015-18 capital programme to reflect the additional budget requirement and funding as set out in the report.
  3. Subject to the approval by DfT of the NDR 'full approval' submission, the Council confirms the award of the Stage 2 construction works to Balfour Beatty, to set the project in motion for an anticipated October 2015 start.
- 3.3 In light of the concerns raised by Dr A Boswell about the application of construction inflation costs, the Executive Director of Communities and Environmental Services, Mr T McCabe, clarified the costings for the NDR scheme.

The Executive Director drew Council's attention to Appendix C of the report, and the target costs offered by Balfour Beatty shown as £178.45m. He added that, as this was a considerable increase on the £148.5m previously proposed, he had asked the Highways Team to develop benchmark figures that could be compared against the Balfour Beatty target to test the reasonableness of the figures proposed by Balfour Beatty.

The first piece of work the Executive Director had commissioned was from Franklin and Andrews, a cost consultant specialist, asking them to assess construction inflation costs between 2010 and 2015. Franklin and Andrews had concluded that the NDR inflation closely matched that experienced on other highways schemes. The Executive Director added that he was happy to concede Dr Boswell's point that the figure of 22%

extracted from the Franklin and Andrews report and quoted on page 17 of the agenda papers, should in fact read 15.68%, although this did not detract from the analysis that the proposed cost was reasonable and reflected construction inflation elsewhere.

The second piece of benchmarking work compared the cost of the A11 dualling with the NDR target cost. The A11 scheme completed by Balfour Beatty, at a cost of £13.7m per mile compared to the NDR costs of £12.5m per mile, which suggested that the NDR target cost was reasonable.

Neither of these benchmarks changed the target cost developed by Balfour Beatty, they simply provided a benchmark against which the reasonableness of the Balfour Beatty proposal could be tested.

The Executive Director added that the alternative to accepting the proposal would be to re-tender the contract which would inevitably lead to a delay of a minimum of six months, which in itself would cost money. He added that, with what was known about construction inflation, there remained a high risk that the actual tender costs would be higher than that proposed from Balfour Beatty. Therefore, the strong advice given by the Executive Director of Communities and Environmental Services was that Council should not re-tender the contract.

3.4 Mr G Nobbs, seconded by Mr T Coke, moved the recommendations contained within the report and set out in paragraph 3.2 above.

3.5 Following debate and upon being put to a recorded vote (appendix A), Council  
**RESOLVED:**

1. To accept the funding proposals from Department for Transport (DfT) and the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and confirm a Norfolk County Council contribution of up to £9.9m to meet the budget shortfall;
2. To approve the funding mechanism set out in paragraph 2.8 of the report to deliver the additional funds of up to £9.9m to support the NDR and approve an adjustment to the 2015-18 capital programme to reflect the additional budget requirement and funding as set out in the report.
3. Subject to the approval by DfT of the NDR 'full approval' submission, the Council confirmed the award of the Stage 2 construction works to Balfour Beatty, to set the project in motion for an anticipated October 2015 start.

The meeting ended at 10.50am.

### Chairman

# Norfolk County Council

## Wednesday 2 September 2015 - Recorded Vote

### ITEM No 3 – Norwich Northern Distributor Road Budget.

FOR	AGAINST.	ABST.		FOR	AGAINST	ABST	
X			<b>ADAMS</b> Tony	X			<b>KEMP</b> Alexandra
X			<b>AGNEW</b> Stephen	X			<b>KIDDLE-MORRIS</b> Mark
X			<b>ALDRED</b> Colin	X			<b>LAW</b> Jason
X			<b>ASKEW</b> Stephen	X			<b>LEGGETT</b> Judy
	X		<b>BAKER</b> Michael	Absent			<b>LONG</b> Brian
	X		<b>BEARMAN</b> Richard	X			<b>MACKIE</b> Ian
X			<b>BIRD</b> Richard	X			<b>MONSON</b> Ian
X			<b>BORRETT</b> Bill	Absent			<b>MOONEY</b> Joe
	X		<b>BOSWELL</b> Andrew		X		<b>MORGAN</b> Elizabeth
X			<b>BREMNER</b> Bert	X			<b>MORPHEW</b> Steve
X			<b>BROCIK-COULTON</b> Julie	X			<b>NOBBS</b> George
X			<b>BYRNE</b> Alec	Absent			<b>NORTHAM</b> Wyndham
Absent			<b>CARTTISS</b> Michael			X	<b>PARKINSON-HARE</b> Rex
X			<b>CASTLE</b> Mick			X	<b>PERKINS</b> Jim
X			<b>CHAMBERLIN</b> Jenny	X			<b>PLANT</b> Graham
X			<b>CHILDS</b> Jonathon	X			<b>PROCTOR</b> Andrew
X			<b>CLANCY</b> Stuart		X		<b>RAMSBOTHAM</b> David
X			<b>COKE</b> Toby	X			<b>RICHMOND</b> William
X			<b>COLLIS</b> David	X			<b>ROPER</b> Daniel
Absent			<b>CORLETT</b> Emma	Absent			<b>RUMSBY</b> Chrissie
Absent			<b>COX</b> Hilary	X			<b>SANDS</b> Mike
X			<b>CRAWFORD</b> Denis	X			<b>SEWARD</b> Eric
	X		<b>DEARNLEY</b> Adrian	X			<b>SHAW</b> Nigel
X			<b>DEWSBURY</b> Margaret	X			<b>SMITH</b> Roger
X			<b>DIXON</b> Nigel			X	<b>SMYTH</b> Paul
X			<b>DOBSON</b> John	Absent			<b>SOMERVILLE</b> Margaret
Absent			<b>EAST</b> Tim	X			<b>SPRATT</b> Bev
X			<b>FITZPATRICK</b> Tom	X			<b>STOREY</b> Martin
X			<b>FOULGER</b> Colin	X			<b>STRONG</b> Marie
X			<b>GARROD</b> Tom	X			<b>THOMAS</b> Alison
	X		<b>GILMOUR</b> Paul	Absent			<b>THOMAS</b> David
	X		<b>GREY</b> Alan	X			<b>TIMEWELL</b> John
X			<b>GURNEY</b> Shelagh	X			<b>VIRGO</b> Judith
X			<b>HACON</b> Pat	X			<b>WALKER</b> Colleen
X			<b>HANNAH</b> Brian	X			<b>WARD</b> John
X			<b>HARRISON</b> David	Absent			<b>WATKINS</b> Brian
Absent			<b>HEBBORN</b> Stan	X			<b>WHITAKER</b> Sue
X			<b>HORSBRUGH</b> Michael Chenery of	X			<b>WHITE</b> Tony
X			<b>HUMPHREY</b> Harry	X			<b>WILBY</b> Martin
X			<b>ILES</b> Brian	X			<b>WILKINSON</b> Margaret
Absent			<b>JERMY</b> Terry				
X			<b>JORDAN</b> Cliff				
X			<b>JOYCE</b> James				

With 59 votes in favour, 8 votes against and 3 abstentions, Council **RESOLVED** to agree the recommendations in the report.



## Recommendations from the Children's Services Committee Meeting held on 15 September 2015

### **1 Norfolk County Council Adoption Agency Annual Review.**

- 1.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Children's Services detailing the performance of the adoption service including performance in recruiting adopters; performance in finding adoptive families for children; performance providing post-adoption support; complaints and service-user engagement.
- 1.2 The Committee was asked to recommend approval of the statement of purpose to full Council and provide scrutiny and challenge to the adoption service.
- 1.3 The Committee **RESOLVED** to recommend approval of the statement of purpose to full Council.

#### **Note by Head of Democratic Services**

A copy of the report considered by the Committee (at item 8 of the 15 September agenda) can be viewed on the committee papers area on the County Council's website. A full copy will also be placed in the Members' Room.

### **2 Statement of Purpose of Norfolk's Fostering Service Annual Review**

- 2.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Children's Services providing a performance review of the Norfolk Fostering Service.
- 2.2 The Committee was asked to recommend the approval of the statement of purpose to full Council and provide scrutiny and challenge to the fostering service.
- 2.3 The Committee **RESOLVED** to recommend the approval of the statement of purpose to full Council.

#### **Note by Head of Democratic Services**

A copy of the report considered by the Committee (at item 9 of the 15 September agenda) can be viewed on the committee papers area on the County Council's website. A full copy will also be placed in the Members' Room.

### **3 Annual Review of Norfolk Residential Service**

- 3.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Children's Services reporting on the performance and outcomes achieved by the Norfolk Residential Service.

- 3.2 The Committee was asked to:
- Scrutinise the information in the report.
  - Challenge the service on the performance and outcomes achieved.
  - Recommend the approval of the Statement of Purpose and Functions for all the Local Authority children's homes to full Council to comply with the Care Standards Act 2000.
- 3.3 The Committee **RESOLVED** to recommend the approval of the Statements of Purpose and Functions for all the Local Authority children's homes to full Council to comply with the Care Standards Act 2000.

**Note by Head of Democratic Services**

A copy of the report considered by the Committee (at item 10 of the 15 September agenda) can be viewed on the committee papers area on the County Council's website. A full copy will also be placed in the Members' Room.

[http://www.nicc.norfolk.gov.uk/lic\\_residentialhomes.asp](http://www.nicc.norfolk.gov.uk/lic_residentialhomes.asp)

**James Joyce**  
**Chairman, Children's Services Committee**

## **Report of the Policy and Resources Committee meetings held on 1 September 2015 and 28 September 2015**

### **A Items from the meeting of 1 September 2015**

#### **1 Financial Monitoring 2015/16 June 2015**

- 1.1 The Committee received a report that provided details of the forecast position for the 2015-16 Revenue and Capital Budgets, General Balances, and the forecast Council's Reserves at 31 March 2016 (period 3), together with related financial information.
- 1.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to note:
- a. the period 3 forecast Revenue overspend of £12.325m (period 2 overspend £12.386m) on a net budget of £318.428m, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report;
  - b. the forecast General Balances at 31 March 2016 of £19.200m, before taking into account any over/under spends;
  - c. the revised expenditure and funding of the 2015-18 capital programme as set out in Appendix 2 to the report;
  - d. the forecast financial information in respect of Resources and Finance budgets which are the responsibility of this Committee, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report.

#### **2 Delivering Financial Savings 2015/16**

- 2.1 The Committee received a report that provided an overview of the progress in delivering the savings agreed by the County Council at its meeting of 16 February 2015.
- 2.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to note:
- a. the forecast total shortfall of £11.572m in 2015-16, for which alternative savings need to be identified;
  - b. the increase in the budgeted value of 2015-16 savings projects rated as RED to £19.088m, of which £7.745m are now forecast to be delivered;
  - c. the forecast savings shortfall on AMBER rated projects of £0.424m;
  - d. the forecast over-delivery of GREEN rated projects totalling £0.195m.

#### **3 Strategic and Financial Planning 2016-19 – In year Savings**

3.1 The Committee received a report that provided an update on the strategic and financial planning process for 2016-17 to 2018-19, and positioned the County Council to produce its budget for 2016-17 in accordance with the law and proper standards.

3.2 The Committee **RESOLVED:**

- a. To note the progress towards setting the 2016-17 to 2018-19 Strategic and Financial Plan, and the timetable for Committee decisions over the coming months.
- b. Note the potential impact of Government's national policy decisions on Norfolk County Council, and the significant areas of uncertainty remaining.
- c. Recommend that Service Committees in September consider their spending proposals:
  1. in light of budgets based on 75% of their addressable spend, to allow for choices and options to be considered initially at October Policy and Resources Committee; and
  2. in light of the reductions required to achieve a balanced budget for 2016-17 to 2018-19 (84% of addressable spend over three years). This equates to a £42.028m reduction in expenditure across the Council in 2016-17, delivering the first year of the £110.593m budget gap as identified in the 1st June Reimagining Norfolk Policy and Resources report.
- d. Recommend that Service Committees consider the potential for early savings to revenue budgets for in-year delivery in 2015-16.

#### 4 **Staff Car Parking**

4.1 The Committee received a report that set out a range of policy options to allow the Council to make more effective use of its scarce car parking capacity and allow the Council to achieve a budgeted saving approved at Full Council in February 2015.

4.2 The Committee **RESOLVED:**

- a. To note the report.
- b. To set up a task and finish group consisting of 2 Conservatives and 1 member from each of the other political parties (with names provided by the Group Leaders) plus 1 union representative to consider policy options for staff car parking on Council premises.
- c. That, having considered the options (including the implications for local residents), the Working Group reports back to the Policy and Resources Committee in November 2015 with the intention that a final decision on the matter is taken at full Council.

#### 5 **Re-Imagining Norfolk - An Update**

5.1 The Committee received a report updating Members on the Council's progress on implementing the proposals agreed in Re-Imagining Norfolk,

the strategic framework for the County Council to re-focus its role and pursue its priorities within a radically reduced level of resources over the next 3 years. It highlighted three initiatives: (1) raising revenue by more effectively securing external funding awarded on a competitive basis; (2) exploring the potential benefit to Norfolk of the Devolution offer made by the Chancellor in the Spending Review, the report from the New Local Government Network, commissioned by the 8 Norfolk Leaders, that set out the possible options for devolution with the preferred deal involving Norfolk and Suffolk (3) a more integrated public service for Norfolk that was the subject of a forthcoming summit with the Police and all Local Authorities, a similar event planned for health and social care system leadership in early October.

5.2 The Managing Director was congratulated on the success of the newly established Corporate Bidding Team in ensuring that Norfolk competed successfully when there were opportunities to secure grants through bids to external funding sources.

5.3 The Committee **RESOLVED** to note the progress set out in the report.

## **6 Norse Group Annual Report 2014-15**

6.1 The Committee received a report that outlined the positive results of the Norse Group Ltd for the financial year 2014-15. The Committee congratulated the Managing Director of Norse Group Ltd on the continued success of the business in providing a comprehensive range of services to both the public and private sector clients in Norfolk and throughout the UK during the financial year 2014/15.

6.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to note the on-going growth in the business and the benefits the Company continues to bring to the Norfolk economy.

## **B Items from the meeting of 28 September 2015**

### **7 2015-16 Finance Monitoring Report July 2015**

7.1 The Committee received a report that provided details of the forecast position for the 2015-16 Revenue and Capital Budgets, General Balances, and the forecast Council's Reserves at 31 March 2016 (period 4), together with related financial information.

7.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to note:

- a. the period 4 forecast Revenue overspend of £10.807m (period 3 overspend £12.325m) on a net budget of £318.428m, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report;
- b. the forecast General Balances at 31 March 2016 of £19.200m, before taking into account any over/under spends;
- c. the revised expenditure and funding of the 2015-18 capital programme as set out in Appendix 2 to the report;

- d. the forecast financial information in respect of Resources and Finance budgets which are the responsibility of this Committee, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report.

## 8 **Delivering Financial Savings 2015/16**

8.1 The Committee received a report that provided an overview of the progress in delivering the savings agreed by the County Council at its meeting of 16 February 2015.

8.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to note:

- a. the forecast total shortfall of £11.341m in 2015-16, for which alternative savings need to be identified;
- b. the increase in the budgeted value of 2015-16 savings projects rated as RED to £18.811m, of which £7.343m are now forecast to be delivered;
- c. the forecast savings shortfall on AMBER rated projects of £0.424m; and
- d. the forecast over-delivery of GREEN and BLUE rated projects totalling £0.551m.

## 9 **Developing Re-Imagining Norfolk – Resources Directorate and Finance and Property Directorate**

9.1 The Committee received a report on proposals for developing Re-Imagining Norfolk in relation to the services for which it was directly responsible. The appendices to the report set out an officer view of what services could look like at 75% addressable spend and with a total of 21 budget saving proposals that would deliver permanent revenue savings of £16.916m over the next three years in respect of Policy and Resources budgets, equivalent to 25% of addressable spend.

9.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:

- a. note the strategies for developing savings set out in section 6 of the report
- b. note the illustrative service models set out in Appendix 1 to the report
- c. note the savings proposals set out in Appendix 2 to the report
- d. Ask officers to bring back to this Committee's October meeting (for consideration alongside the proposals from other Committees) fully developed savings proposals that will contribute to the delivery of a budget based upon 75% of the Committee's addressable spend, to allow for choices and options to be considered and to support the delivery of a balanced budget for 2016-17.

## 10 **Strategic and Financial Planning 2016-17 to 2018-19**

10.1 The Committee received an update report on progress towards the setting of the 2016-17 to 2018-19 Strategic and Financial Plan, and the timetable for Committee decisions in the lead up to the Council setting the Budget and Council Tax in February 2016. This report summarised the early savings proposals which had been presented to Service Committees.

10.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:

- a. Note the progress towards setting the 2016-17 to 2018-19 Strategic and Financial Plan.
- b. Note the budget options that were presented to Service Committees during September.
- c. Receive verbal updates from the service committee chairs on their budget options discussions during the September Committee round.
- d. Recommend that Service Committees bring forward further proposals to deliver budgets based on 75% of their addressable spend, including a complete set of budget proposals for 2016-17, to allow for choices and options to be considered initially at October Policy and Resources Committee.

## 11 **Development of the Council's three-year strategy**

11.1 The Committee received a report outlining the approach to developing the County Council Plan. The County Council Plan is the vehicle for articulating the Council's medium term service and financial strategy as part of the Council's over-arching policy framework. In the Council's constitution, the Policy and Resources Committee is responsible for co-ordinating the development of the Plan and submitting it for approval by Full Council.

11.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:

- a. Agree the framework for the County Council Plan and associated Committee Plans
- b. Note and agree the timetable set out in section 3.5 of the report.

## 12 **Devolution Opportunities for Norfolk and Suffolk Councils- Update on Progress**

12.1 The Committee received a report that updated Members about work being undertaken across 16 Authorities and the New Anglia Local Enterprise partnership on gaining the devolution of powers and resources to Norfolk and Suffolk. The report detailed some of the benefits and opportunities that Devolution offers in areas such as skills, transport, infrastructure, housing, policing, health and social care, and outlined the next key milestones in the process. It clarified the economic development focus of a Combined Authority which includes a strategic transport function.

12.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:

- a. Note progress to date
- b. Agree the principle of a Norfolk and Suffolk Combined Authority
- c. Agree that the Leader and Managing Director continue to play a full part in discussions, representing the best interests of Norfolk residents.
- d. Ask that the Chair and other Group Leaders agree on an appropriate date for bringing the devolution opportunities for Norfolk and Suffolk Councils to a meeting of Full Council at the earliest possible opportunity.

13 **Syrian refugee crisis – Norfolk response**

- 13.1 The Committee received a report that summarised the Government's policy on the Syrian humanitarian refugee crisis, and the latest guidance available from the Home Office about the Syrian Vulnerable Person's Relocation Scheme. An update was provided at the meeting on a task force meeting that the Leader had hosted with community leaders to consider the matter further. The Committee noted the actions being taken by the Council to explore a countywide response to the Syrian refugee crisis and the range of actions being taken to respond to concerns expressed across Norfolk by residents.

**George Nobbs**  
**Chairman, Policy and Resources Committee**



## **Report of the Adult Social Care Committee Meeting held on 7 September 2015**

### **1 Healthwatch Report on Mental Health Services in Norfolk**

- 1.1 The report by Healthwatch Norfolk was received by the Committee and provided Members with an overview of the findings from an independent study into mental health services in Norfolk.
- 1.2 The Committee **NOTED** the report and requested a further update report in March 2016.

### **2. Update from Members of the Committee regarding any internal and external bodies that they sit on.**

- 2.1 Members of the Committee reported on meetings they had attended.

### **3. Executive Director's Update**

- 3.1 The Executive Director of Adult Social Services reported that the main focus since the last Committee meeting had been managing the current budget pressures, and work is being carried out to manage the current situation.
- 3.2 Promoting Independence was still high on the agenda of the work, with decisions being taken to increase the capacity of the reablement service which in turn would make considerable savings for the department. A budget challenge workshop had been held with the Deputy Leader of the Council.
- 3.3 The Committee heard that the department had received another visit from Professor John Bolton who was acting as a critical friend. In response to a question by the Committee, the Executive Director confirmed that a number of local authorities who had worked with him and had made appreciable savings. Professor Bolton had suggested a number of other contacts for Norfolk to use.
- 3.4 The Executive Director confirmed that all section 75 agreements as part of the Better Care Fund had been signed since the last Committee meeting.
- 3.5 The Committee were informed that the Government had recently deferred the implementation of part two of the Care Act.

### **4. Chair's Update**

- 4.1 The Chair reported on meetings she had attended.

### **5. Risk Management**

- 5.1 The report by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services was received by the Committee. The report included the departmental risk summary together with changes to revised risk scores for 2015/16 and any significant changes since the

last report.

- 5.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to;
- Note the changes to departmental risks and significant changes.
  - Comment on the changes to departmental risks significant changes.
  - Consider if any further action was required.

## **6. Adult Social Care Finance Monitoring Report Period 4 (July) 2015-16**

- 6.1 The report by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services was received by the Committee which provided the Committee with financial monitoring information, based on information to the end of July 2015. It provided an analysis of variations from the revised budget and recovery actions taken in year to reduce the overspend.
- 6.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to note;
- The forecast outturn position at period 4 for 2015-16 Revenue Budget of an overspend of £5.608m.
  - The planned recovery actions being taken in year to reduce the overspend.
  - The planned use of reserves.
  - The forecast outturn position at period 4 for 2015-16 Capital Programme.
  - The overspend action plan at 2.6 and requested a regular detailed update.

## **7. Strategic and Financial Planning 2016-19 – Re-Imagining Norfolk**

- 7.1 The report by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services was received which considered the impact of re-modelling their services based on 75% of their current addressable spend.
- 7.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to;
- Note the savings proposals set out in section four for further development.
  - Note the investment proposals set out in section six for consideration by Policy and Resources Committee.
  - Ask officers to bring back further savings proposals in October which will contribute to the development of budgets based on 75% of the Committee's addressable spend, to allow for choices and options to be considered, and to support the delivery of a balanced budget for 2016-17. This would be for subsequent consideration at Policy and Resources Committee in October.

## **8. Cost of Care – The Cost of Care in Adult Social Services – interim report**

- 8.1 The report by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services was received, which set out the process for a cost of care exercise.
- 8.2 The Committee **RESOLVED**;
- To consider the proposed process to enable it to retake its decision of 9 March regarding the prices the Council would usually expect to pay for residential and nursing care in Norfolk for the 2015/16 financial year.

**9. Towards meeting the new market development responsibilities for Adult Social Care**

9.1 The report by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services was received. The report summarised the overall approach to the new market development duties and also proposed the development of a concordat for future engagement with the market and support for sector led programmes.

**9.2 The Committee RESOLVED;**

- To endorse the development of a market development framework within the Promoting Independence strategy that enables the Council to develop and set out its programmes in future Market Position Statements.
- To endorse the development and implementation of new arrangements for effective provider engagement and sector led market development programmes.

**Sue Whitaker**  
**Chair, Adult Social Care Committee**

## **Report of the Children's Services Committee Meeting held on 15 September 2015**

### **1 Local Member Issues/Member Questions**

- 1.1 Mr R Smith asked if the Committee could now be informed as to the respective areas of responsibility between the Chair & Vice-Chair of the Committee as required by the NCC Constitutional change agreed by full Council 18th May 2015

The Chairman replied that he was pleased to set out below the relative responsibilities agreed between himself as Chair and the Vice-Chair (Emma Corlett) of Children's Services Committee:

- Statutory lead - James Joyce
- Performance and Challenge lead – this will be shared
- Social Work lead – Emma Corlett
- Early Help and Prevention lead – James Joyce
- Education lead – James Joyce

Both the Chair and Vice Chair have various innovation projects around Mental Health and Emotional Wellbeing and Emma Corlett would have responsibility for these.

### **2 Integrated Performance and Finance Monitoring Report 2015-16**

- 2.1 The Committee received and **noted** the report by the Executive Director of Children's Services setting out the financial monitoring data for the period ended 31 March 2016 and setting out the variations between the approved budget for 2015/16 and the actual spending during the year to date. The report also offered comment on the Children's Services Revenue Budget, Capital Budget, School Balances and Children's Services Reserves and provisions.
- 2.2 The Committee was asked to approve the proposed approach to making changes to the Social Work Dashboard content and note and comment on the report.

### **3 Strategic and Financial Planning 2016-17 and 2018-19**

- 3.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Children's Services providing it with an update on the strategic and financial planning process for 2016-17 to 2018-19 which positioned the County Council to produce its budget for 2016-17 in accordance with the law and proper standards.

3.2 **RESOLVED to:**

- Note the illustrative service model set out in section 1 of the report.
- Note the approach to savings proposals set out in section 4 of the report.
- Ask officers to bring back further savings proposals in October 2015 which will contribute to the development of budgets based on 75% of the Committee's addressable spend, to allow for choices and options to be considered and to support the delivery of a balanced budget for 2016-17, for subsequent consideration at Policy and Resources Committee in October 2015.

**4 Young Carers Task and Finish Group**

4.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Children's Services proposing the composition and terms of reference for the Young Carer's Task and Finish Group.

4.2 **RESOLVED** to agree the Terms of Reference for the Young Carers Task and Finish Group.

**5 Employment and Skills Team Apprentices Presentation**

5.1 The Committee received a presentation from two apprentices about the work being carried out to raise awareness of Apprenticeships in Norfolk to upskill and develop Norfolk's future workforce.

**6 Developing Norfolk's Future Workforce**

6.1 The Committee received the report by the Interim Director of Children's Services and the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services informing members of the progress with Developing Norfolk's Future Workforce including new developments and the planned next steps.

6.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:

- Endorse the approach outlined in the report.
- Promote Developing Norfolk's Future Workforce to the communities with whom members work – schools, employers, parents and carers.

**James Joyce**  
**Chairman, Children's Services Committee**

## Report of the Communities Committee Meeting held on 9 September 2015

### 1. Update on Key Service Issues and Activities

- 1.1 The Committee received the report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services which provided Members with fortnightly updates about key service issues and activities. The update enabled Members to discuss the latest position and identify any areas where the Committee would like to receive further information or updates.
- 1.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to;
- Review the latest service update at Appendices A to E and identify any areas where the Committee would like to see further information or update.

### 2. Norfolk Adult Education Service: Update on progress post Ofsted Inspection

- 2.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services which updated them on the work of the Steering Group for Norfolk Adult Education Service.
- 2.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to;
- Note the progress made in the Norfolk Adult Education Service since the last report in May 2015 and following the Ofsted 'inadequate' judgement received in January 2015.
  - Approve the new vision which will better align the service to address identified needs across Norfolk and more effectively target resources and learning opportunities.
  - Agree to the change of name of the Norfolk Adult Education Service to Norfolk Community Learning Services, which more clearly describes what the service will do in future.

### 3. Public Health Lifestyle Service

- 3.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Resources which explained an Integrated Healthy Lifestyle Service (IHLS) for adults. This would improve health and wellbeing in Norfolk and help reduce the need for future health and social care services.
- 3.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to;
- Support option C: The procurement of an Integrated Healthy Lifestyle Service. Procurement will be led by Public Health in collaboration with Adult Social Services and Children's Services.

**4. Re-Imagining Norfolk – service and financial planning 2016-19 for Communities Services**

4.1 The Committee received the report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services and the Executive Director of Resources. The report set out the implications of Re-Imagining Norfolk for the services of the Communities Committee.

4.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to;

- Note the service models set out at Appendix 2
- Note and comment on the savings proposals set out in Appendix 3
- Ask Officers to bring back further detailed savings proposals in October which will contribute to the development of budgets based on 75% of the Committee's addressable spend, to allow for choices and options to be considered, and to support the delivery of a balanced budget for 2016-17, for subsequent consideration at Policy and Resources Committee in October.

**5. Final report of the Member Steering Group on Libraries**

5.1 The Committee received the annexed report (10) by the Executive Director of Environmental and Community Services, which outlined the recommendations of the Member Review Group on the future direction of library and information service delivery.

5.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to;

- Agree that there should be a consultation with communities about their use of libraries and their longer term aspirations for libraries.
- Agree that libraries should have a strengthened role in supporting NCC's early help and community development agendas. Libraries should be used as hubs in communities for supporting literacy, information, learning and for facilitating access to communities for NCC and other agencies and councils.
- Agree that funding should be agreed to introduce self-service access to libraries to enable an increase in the availability of the service while reducing staff costs, and enabling buildings to be used by other service and organisations.
- Agree that the proposed reasonable distance for travel to a library as outlined in 1.1.3 of the report.
- Agree that the service should continue to encourage community engagement and involvement in libraries, including for example increased volunteering opportunities and installing donation boxes in appropriate libraries.

**6. Fire and Rescue Strategic Review – Report from the Member Working Group**

- 6.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services which provided a further update on the working group's considerations and deliberations.
- 6.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to;
- Acknowledge the detailed analysis and options considered by the Fire and Rescue Working Group.
  - Agree that these options be considered in detail at a proposed workshop for Committee members held in advance of the October meeting, to provide Members with the opportunity to inform the recommendations to be presented in October.

**7. Communities Committee Finance Monitoring Report at Period 04 2015-16**

- 7.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services, which provided the Committee with information on the latest monitoring position for the Committee for 2015-16. It provided information on emerging issues and the position on the expected use of reserves for Communities purpose.
- 7.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to note;
- The forecast revenue outturn position for 2015-16 as at Period 4.
  - The forecast capital outturn position for the 2015-16 capital programme.
  - The current forecast for use of reserves.

**Paul Smyth**  
**Chair, Communities Committee**



## Report of the Environment, Development and Transport Committee Meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> September 2015.

### 1. Items of Urgent Business

- 1.1 The Chairman brought to the Committee's attention the response that had been received from Brandon Lewis MP regarding the Committee's latest letter about growth, development and health care provision.  
The Committee **Agreed** that this final response was a lot more encouraging and that the Chairman should write to Brandon Lewis to express the Committee's thanks and make a suggestion that an amendment to the National Planning Policy Framework may be worth looking into for the future.
- 1.2 The Chairman advised the Committee that a request had been received from the Environment Agency asking that the County Council nominate deputy members to the RFCC (Regional Flood and Coastal Committee) meetings. This would ensure that they have the best balance of representation of members at each of meeting and to help ease any additional work in finding substitutes for meetings. This was considered urgent as the Environment Agency wanted to have these arrangements in place before their October RFCC meeting.
- The Committee **Agreed** that:
- Mrs C Walker would deputise for Mr M Castle.
  - Mr B Iles would deputise for Mr R Bird.
  - Mr A White would deputise for Mr B Long.
- 1.3 The Chairman advised the Committee that an additional member for the A47 Working Group was needed before the next meeting.  
The Committee **Agreed** 16 votes **For** and 1 **Against** that Mrs C Walker should be the new member on the working group.

### 2. Local Member Issues / Member Questions

- 2.1 Cllr Bev Spratt asked the Chairman what was being done to manage the chaotic traffic in and around Norwich.
- 2.2 The Chairman's response can be found at Appendix B of the meeting minutes.

### 3. Finance Monitoring Report

- 3.1 The Committee received and noted the report from the Executive Director Community and Environmental Services which provided the Committee with information on the latest monitoring position for the relevant services from the Community and Environmental Services department, for 2015-16.

### 4. Rangers Update

- 4.1 The Committee received and noted a verbal update from Mr B Spratt regarding the

Ranger Scheme.

## **5. Moving Towards Zero Waste – Delivering the County Council's Policies**

5.1 The Committee received the report from the Executive Director of Communities and Environmental Services which outlined the County Council's waste policies and ambitions.

5.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:-

- 1) Agree the 'Moving Towards Zero Waste' delivery plan
- 2) Agree to the development of business cases to support the 'Moving Towards Zero Waste' delivery plan, which will involve growth bids, on an invest to save basis, to deliver waste reduction, reuse/repair and recycling initiatives to support the delivery of the County Council's waste policies.
- 3) Approve the use of consultants to undertake due diligence on a range of emerging and existing generic waste treatment processes and technologies and complete an assessment of their relative potential performance and impact and approve expenditure of up to £20,000 to complete this work in 2015/16.

## **6. Recycling Centre Service Review**

6.1 The Committee received the report from the Executive Director of Communities and Environmental Services which provided a full review of the existing operation and standards in Norfolk's recycling centre network and provided a range of options to both reduce costs and improve recycling performance.

6.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to:-

- 1) Note that better contract management and service efficiencies at Recycling Centres have helped to reduce budgetary pressures to £280,000 instead of the predicted £447,000.
- 2) Approve implementing service improvements detailed in the report to deliver estimated savings of £57,000 which includes introducing a new trade waste scheme for small businesses at selected Recycling Centres, with the charge to be reviewed each year in line with the cost of dealing with such waste (potential income around £10,000).

Following a vote the Committee **RESOLVED** to:-

- 3) To approve the following service changes as a package capable of delivering in combination savings estimated at £280,000:
  - Making three sites at Ashill, Heacham and Morningthorpe part time, i.e. closed Monday to Wednesday inclusive (saving £50,975).
  - Reducing summer opening hours by one hour (closing at 5pm) with the exception of Mile Cross (saving £80,000).
  - Increasing the charge we currently make for tyres to £4 per tyre in 2015/16, to be reviewed annually and maintained in line with the cost of dealing with tyres (cost neutral service).
  - Close Docking Recycling Centre, Norfolk's smallest site, in 2016 (saving £70,000)

and subject to consultation).

4) To maintain the existing DIY waste policy and agree a new distance service standard for Recycling Centres as follows:

- a) Approve continuing the current approach to the amount of DIY type waste materials we accept for free and the charges we make for larger amounts.
- b) Agree a new distance service standard with the aim that over 90% of residents are within a 20 minute drive of a recycling centre where economically practicable.

5) To consider and advise on the potential for rationalising the network in the future and standardising recycling facilities by increasing the number of large modern sites with full recycling and re-use facilities, as replacements for the older small sites which provide limited facilities:

- a) The redevelopment or relocation of Sheringham Recycling Centre and the relocation of Mayton Wood Recycling Centre, to provide larger facilities, subject to a further business plan.
- b) To provide a single, larger Recycling Centre to replace the existing Wymondham, Ketteringham and Snetterton sites (subject to a further business plan).
- c) To close the Bergh Apton Recycling Centre, subject to the location of a replacement for the existing Mile Cross Recycling Centre in Norwich.
- d) To consider reducing the network to around thirteen sites.
- e) To enable members to have further input into the issues surrounding recycling centres, a working group should be formed with membership to be agreed at the next meeting.'

Following a vote the Committee **RESOLVED** to NOT-

- Close all sites on bank holidays.
- Consider a longer term goal of rationalising the network to seven sites.

## **7. EDT Strategic Review – Recommendations from the Member Working Group**

7.1 The Committee received the report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services which outlined the findings from the Member Working Group which had carried out a strategic review of EDT Services.

7.2 The Committee **RESOLVED**:-

1. To note the areas for potential budget saving recommended by the Working Group, summarised in section 3.2, and that these have been included in the Reimagining Norfolk report included elsewhere on the agenda for this meeting today so that the Committee can consider all budget proposals together;
2. To agree the Working Group's recommendations for officers to bring more detailed reports to Committee for items identified for further development, as summarised in section 3.3;
3. To agree the Working Group's recommendations relating to stopping cost increases, as summarised in section 3.4.
4. To request that officers renegotiate the contract with LaFarge Tarmac for rural grass cutting to be reduced to intermittent cuts on junctions and bends on rural roads and reactive maintenance where necessary.

Full cuts on straight stretches of road to be every other year or possibly, once every three years, to be carried out in late July or after the nesting/flowering season.

Officers to bring back a report with options for members to consider and cost saving details to the November EDT meeting.'

## **8. Re-imagining Norfolk – service and financial planning 2016-19 for EDT Services**

- 8.1 The Committee received the report from the Executive Director of Communities and Environmental Services which set out the outcomes from the Executive Director investigating what the service could look like in three years' time, with 75% of addressable spend.
- 8.2 The Committee **Agreed** to note the service models set out in Appendix 2 and the savings proposals set out in Appendix 3 of the report.
- 8.3 With **7** votes **For** and **7** votes **Against**, the Chairman cast his residing vote **For** and the Committee **Agreed** to ask officers to bring back further detailed savings proposals in October which will contribute to the development of budgets based on 75% of the Committee's addressable spend, to allow for choices and options to be considered, and to support the delivery of a balanced budget for 2016-17, for subsequent consideration at Policy & Resources Committee in October.

## **9. Update from the previous Economic Development Sub Committee**

- 9.1 The Committee received and noted the update from the Executive Director of Communities and Environmental Services which summarised the issues and actions from the Economic Development Sub-Committee meeting held on the 13<sup>th</sup> July 2015.

## **10. Annual Local Levy Setting for the Regional Flood and Coastal Committees**

- 10.1 The Committee received the report from the Executive Director of Communities and Environmental Services which provided the Committee with possible options for NCC's preferred position in regards to the annual local levy for the Regional Flood and Coastal Committees (RFCCs).
- 10.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** that the appointed members could vote up to maximum of 5% increase in the Local Levy based on what was felt appropriate at the next Regional Flood and Coastal Committee meetings.

## **11. Decisions taken under delegated authority – update**

- 11.1 The Committee received and noted the report from the Executive Director of Communities and Environmental Services which provided an update on decisions taken under delegated powers by the Director in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman up to 3 September 2015.

## **12. Forward Plan for Environment, Development and Transport Committee**

- 12.1 The Committee received and noted the report from the Executive Director of

Communities and Environmental Services which set out the Forward Plan for the Environment, Development and Transport Committee.

Toby Coke  
Chairman, EDT Committee

## Report of the Economic Development Sub-Committee Meeting held on 21 September 2015

### 1 Update from Member Working Groups

1.1 The Sub-Committee received verbal updates from members for the following outside bodies:-

#### 1.2 North West Norfolk Economic Development Working Group

- The chairman of the Working Group, Mr R Bird, provided an overview of the aims and terms of reference for the group.
- Members raised concerns over the wide scope of the group and whether the goals would be achievable.
- The chairman advised that the wide scope of the aims was required as the need for joined up working with different agencies was key to affecting real change.
- It was mentioned that although the terms of reference incorporated a wide range of issues the focus of the group was on a small geographical area.
- The Working Group could be seen as providing an operational identification tool where the methods could be transferred to other areas of Norfolk if successful.
- The Sub-Committee **Agreed** that the following members should make up the Working Group:  
Mr R Bird (Chairman)  
Mr M Chenery  
Mr J Dobson  
Mr T Jermy  
Mr J Law
- The Sub-Committee **Agreed** that there would be an open invitation to all local members of the relevant areas the work of the group covered.

#### 1.3 County Farms

- The Sub-Committee were advised that the rent reviews for the County Farms should be done by the end of October.
- Easton and Otley College had been working closely with the staff farms and also with the apprentice for agriculture.
- The County Farms Group had been engaged with the A47 working group as funding for the A47 project would be partially found from the County Farms estate.
- At the next meeting of County Farms the branding of the estate would be considered.

### 2. Developing Norfolk's Future Workforce

2.1 The Sub-Committee received the report from the Executive Director of Community

and Environmental Services which informed members of the progress with Developing Norfolk's Future Workforce including new developments and the planned next steps.

- 2.2 The Sub-Committee **Agreed** to endorse the approach outlined in the paper and promote Developing Norfolk's Future Workforce to the communities with whom Members work – schools, employers, parents and carers.

### 3. **Scottow Enterprise Park update**

- 3.1 The Sub-Committee received the report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services which updated the Sub-Committee on the progress that had been achieved and sought support, in line with resolution of the infrastructure constraints, to move away from a 'building by building' basis to a more consolidated regeneration programme for the varied collection of the buildings that are not currently let.

- 3.2 Mr J Timewell proposed, seconded by Mr T Jermy that the member representation on the Scottow Enterprise Park Member Working Group be:  
Mr M Baker, Mr M Castle, Mr J Childs, Mr N Dixon, Mr T Garrod, Mr D Harrison and Mr J Timewell.

Mr M Wilby proposed as an amendment, seconded by Mr S Clancy, that the membership on the Scottow Enterprise Park Member Working Group should be as follows:

Mr S Clancy, Mr A White, Mr B Spratt, Mr N Dixon, Mr T Fitzpatrick, Mr T Garrod and Mr J Timewell.

The amendment to the motion was **LOST** with **4** votes in favour and **5** votes against.

The original motion was then agreed with **5** votes in favour and **4** votes against.

- 3.3 The Sub-Committee **RESOLVED:-**
- To support the submission of the 'suite' of Change of Use Planning Applications with accompanying Overarching Statement
  - To note the new branding and website used to assist the commercial marketing of Scottow Enterprise Park
  - To confirm support for the principle of minimising prudential borrowing
  - To note the proposed review of management arrangements building on the lessons learned from Hethel and elsewhere.
  - That the new membership of the Scottow Enterprise Park Member Working Group would be:
    - Mr M Baker
    - Mr M Castle
    - Mr J Childs
    - Mr N Dixon
    - Mr T Garrod
    - Mr D Harrison
    - Mr J Timewell.

#### **4. Finance Monitoring report**

- 4.1 The Sub-Committee received and noted the report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services which provided the Sub-Committee with the financial position for the service to the end of June, including planned use of reserves. It also gave an overview of progress against plan in relation to the service's 2015/16 service plan.

#### **5. Forward Plan**

- 5.1 The Sub-Committee received and noted the report from the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services which set out the Forward Plan for the Economic Development Sub-Committee.

**Colleen Walker**  
**Chair, Economic Development Sub-Committee**



## **Report of the Audit Committee Meeting held on 24 September 2015**

### **1 Items of Urgent Business**

- 1.1 In response to a question received from the Green Group about commissioning an independent investigation and audit of how the recent cost increases on the NDR construction contract were progressed through full Council meeting on 2 September, the Chairman asked that the Committee's concerns about the accounting method be fed back to the Executive Director of Communities and Environmental Services. The Committee also requested that a contingency plan for capital increases as well as risk management of NDR costs should be considered in greater detail.
- 1.2 In response to an issue raised by the Chairman that he had not received a substantial reply to the email he sent to the Chief Internal Auditor about the process for ensuring members of staff who left the employment of Norfolk County Council could no longer access emails and other county council information, the Executive Director of Finance agreed to follow this up.

### **2 Norfolk Pension Fund Governance Arrangements.**

- 2.1 The Committee received and **noted** the report by the Executive Director of Finance and Head of Pensions outlining the ongoing governance arrangements of the Norfolk Pension Fund and requesting the Committee to consider the report, detailing Norfolk Pension Fund's governance arrangements, being fully compliant with legislative requirements, regulatory guidance and recognised best practice.

### **3 Norfolk County Council and Norfolk Pension Fund Audit Results Reports – Audit Committee Summary for the year ended 31 March 2015.**

- 3.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Finance introducing the External Auditor's (Ernst and Young) Norfolk County Council and Norfolk Pension Fund Audit Results Reports – Audit Committee Summary for the year ended 31 March 2015.
- 3.2 The report was introduced by Mr R Murray, from External Auditors EY who drew the committee's attention to the Value for Money (VfM) arrangements which were currently being finalised and advised that he was confident an unqualified opinion would be given once the VfM audit had been completed.
- 3.3 The Committee considered and **agreed** the Ernst and Young Norfolk County Council and Norfolk Pension Fund Audit Results Reports – Audit Committee Summary for the year ended 31 March 2015.

#### **4 Annual Statement of Accounts and Annual Governance Statement 2014-15**

4.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Finance introducing the Statement of Accounts and Annual Governance Statement of Norfolk County Council for 2014-15 which had been subject to external audit by Ernst and Young. It was anticipated that Norfolk County Council would receive an unqualified audit opinion.

4.2 The Committee was pleased to note that the Public Services Network (PSN) Accreditation had been achieved on 8 September 2015 and the Annual Governance Statement 2014-15 would be amended to reflect the accreditation before it was signed off.

#### **4.3 RESOLVED to**

- Note that, following annual review, the system of internal control and internal audit are considered adequate and effective for the purposes of the relevant regulations;
- Approve the Annual Governance Statement (Appendix 2) and commend the final statement for signature by the Leader and the Managing Director;
- Approve the Council's 2014-15 Statement of Accounts (Appendix 3);
- Note the Summary of the Statement of Accounts (Appendix 4) to be published alongside the full accounts.

#### **5 Letters of Representation 2014-15**

5.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Finance providing details of the letters of representation in connection with the audit of the financial statements of Norfolk County Council for 2014-15.

#### **5.2 RESOLVED to**

Endorse the letters of representation in respect of the Pension Fund and of Norfolk County Council. The Chairman of the Audit Committee and Executive Director of Finance signed the letter on behalf of Norfolk County Council.

#### **6 Norfolk Audit Services Quarterly Report for the Quarter ended 30 June 2015.**

6.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Finance. The Committee was asked to consider and comment on the overall opinion on the effective of risk management and internal control being 'acceptable' and therefore considered 'sound'; the progress with the anti-fraud e-learning roll-out; the changes to the approved 2015-16 Norfolk Audit Services audit plan as set out in Appendix B of the report; satisfactory progress with the traded schools audits and the preparations for an Audit Authority for the France Channel England Interreg Programme.

- 6.2 The Committee again raised concern about the amount of time it was taking for effecting its request to make it a mandatory requirement that all staff undertake the Fraud Awareness e-learning course and asked for a further update at its next meeting.

6.3 **RESOLVED to note**

- the overall opinion on the effectiveness of risk management and internal control being 'acceptable' and therefore considered 'sound'.
- The progress with the Anti-Fraud eLearning roll-out.
- The changes to the approved 2015-16 Norfolk Audit Services audit plan, as set out in Appendix B of the report.
- The satisfactory progress with the traded schools audits and the preparations for an Audit Authority for the France Channel England Interreg Programme.

**7 Internal Audit Plan 2015-16 for Quarters 3 and 4.**

- 7.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Finance setting out the Internal Audit Plan 2015-16 and **RESOLVED** to note:

- the revised Internal Audit Strategy (Appendix A) for the remainder of the year (646 days).
- The Internal Audit Plan to support the opinion for quarters 3 and 4 (Appendix B) at 383 days (including 80 days in reserve for Traded Schools Audits and up to 100 days of contractor time).
- The overall the target for final report and draft reports for audits are 34 and 12 respectively, to be reported on in the Annual Internal Audit Report.
- The three year Internal Audit Strategy agreed in January remained largely unchanged, except for the deletion of an Internal Audit Manager post.
- The actual days available to deliver the audit opinion work within the strategy (Appendix A) remain sufficient to support the opinion.
- The opinion work plan (Appendix B) will be managed flexibly to support the traded schools approach, while the service was developed and bookings stabilised.
- Some audits timed for Quarters 1 and 2 are carried into the remainder of the year as work in progress.
- The medium term internal audit strategy will be refreshed in January 2016.

**8 Governance, Control and Risk Management of Treasury Management**

- 8.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Finance, concluding that the County Council's Treasury Management operations are fully compliant with the statutory and regulatory framework and recognised best practice.

- 8.2 The Committee **RESOLVED** to note the report which provided assurance to the Committee as to the adequacy and effectiveness of the governance, control and risk management arrangements for Treasury Management.

## **9 Risk Management Report**

- 9.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Finance providing it with an update of the Corporate Risk Register at September 2015 and other related matters following the latest review conducted during the early part of 2015-16.
- 9.2 The Committee requested some further information about the levels of Norfolk County Council insurance cover.
- 9.3 With regard to risk RM005 (The potential risk of failure to fully implement Digital Norfolk Ambition (DNA), the Committee requested that the Project Manager for DNA be requested to attend the next meeting to provide an update on the project. The Committee noted that a Member Working group had been convened by the Policy & Resources Committee to consider all aspects of DNA. The Executive Director of Finance agreed to circulate information about the project plan and the risks to Members of the committee.
- 9.4 With regard to the Northern Distribution Route (NDR) the Committee requested that the Chairman of the Environment, Development and Transport Committee be asked to consider placing the risks surrounding the building of the NDR on the agenda for its next meeting.
- 9.5 The Committee **agreed** that it required all Service Committees to review departmental risk registers on a quarterly basis.
- 9.6 **RESOLVED** to note:
- that risk management was now managed by the Chief Internal Auditor.
  - that a Risk Management Strategy 2015-18 was being prepared and a Strategic Risk Manager was being sought.
  - the changes to the Corporate Risk Register (Appendix A of the report).
  - the 13 corporate risks identified and the progress with the mitigating risks.

## **10 Work Programme**

- 10.1 The Committee received and **noted** the report by the Executive Director of Finance setting out the programme of work for the Committee.

**Ian Mackie**  
**Chairman, Audit Committee**

**Report of the Meeting of the  
Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee  
Held on 3 September 2015**

**1 The new day case theatre complex at the James Paget Hospital**

- 1.1** The Committee was informed about an invitation that the Chairman had taken up from the James Paget University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust to visit the new day case theatre complex at the James Paget Hospital. The trust was justifiably proud of this new state-of-the-art facility which had increased the total number of theatres at the hospital from 7 to 8, providing increased capacity for day case procedures and emergency operations. This new £8 million complex included three day care theatres, a new day case ward and associated areas. The facilities were very modern and the new theatres provided an ultra-sterile operating environment created by a hi-tech air flow system. Energy costs would be reduced with power supplied from the site's own solar panels. The new complex would bring numerous benefits to both patients and staff at the James Paget Hospital for years to come. Not least they would help to reduce demand on beds and patients' length of stay in hospital.

**2 Diabetes Care within Primary Care Services in Norfolk**

- 2.1** The Committee received a suggested approach from the Democratic Support and Scrutiny Team Manager to reports on the delivery of diabetes care within Primary Care Services in Norfolk from NHS England Midlands and East (East), West Norfolk Clinical Commissioning Group and a presentation (which can be found on the Committee papers website) from the Central Norfolk Integrated Diabetes Management Group. The Committee welcomed witnesses from these organisations who attended the meeting to answer Members questions.
- 2.2** In the course of discussion the following key points were made:
- There were an estimated 3.2 million people in England with diabetes of whom 2.8 million had been diagnosed. A further 5 million people in England were at risk of Type 2 diabetes, and by 2030 more than 4 million people in England would have the disease.
  - 90% of people with diabetes had Type 2, and the majority of these cases could be prevented or delayed.
  - Many more people had blood sugar levels above the normal range but not high enough to be diagnosed as having diabetes, a condition which was known as pre-diabetes.
  - North Norfolk CCG and West Norfolk CCG had some of the highest levels of people with diabetes in the UK. To a large extent this was due to the older age profile of the population in these areas of Norfolk.
  - The health and financial burdens of this disease were high and would continue to grow unless more was done to prevent it.
  - The witnesses stressed the importance of health checks which assisted in the detection of any early signs of diabetes so that they could be caught and treated successfully. They said that GPs were able to provide support with lifestyle choice such as how to enjoy healthy foods, how to adjust the diet and how to keep active.
  - The witnesses also said that not enough was being done in society generally to tackle high levels of diabetes which had reached epidemic proportions.

- Members suggested that a high visibility advertising campaign, better food labelling and more appropriate display of food items in supermarkets would go some way to raise public awareness of the issue. More work needed to be done at a government level to tackle the issue.
- A successful high visibility media campaign, similar to that which had led to reduced salt levels in food, and the wide range of measures that were continuing to be taken in society to reduce smoking, was needed if high levels of diabetes were to decrease.
- There was a danger that children born to women with gestational diabetes were more likely to go on to develop type 2 diabetes themselves.
- As obesity rates in children continued to soar, type 2 diabetes, a disease that was seen primarily in adults over age 45, was becoming more common in young people.
- The diagnosis of diabetes in a child or young person also affected the child's parents, teachers, friends and other carers. It was, therefore, vital that children and young people, and their families, received support that met their needs from diagnosis to transfer to adult services, including support in school settings such as Sure Start Centres.
- Following Public Health England, NHS England and Diabetes UK call for expressions of interest from local partnerships in becoming first wave sites for the NHS Diabetes Prevention programme several nationally recognised pilot diabetes prevention sites had been identified. Unfortunately none of these sites, which would be tasked with implementing and evaluating evidence based approaches to Type 2 diabetes prevention, were situated in Norfolk. However, a similar regional initiative that involved the Norfolk CCGs and their partners working together to deliver behavioural change interventions to prevent Type 2 diabetes in this area, had been given the go ahead. This initiative was welcomed by the Committee.
- The Committee also welcomed the information supplied in the report on increasing prevalence of diabetes and Quality Outcomes Framework (QOF) 2013-14 data showing better delivery of care for people with diabetes in primary care than appeared in the National Diabetes Audit 2012-13.

2.3 It was noted that any additional questions from Members about Norfolk Diabetes QOF 2013-14 could be addressed to Maureen Orr, the Democratic Support and Scrutiny Team Manager, who would take them up with one of the witnesses.

### **3. Forward work programme**

3.1 The Committee's forward programme was approved subject to Policing and Mental Health Services being moved from 15 October 2015 to 25 February 2016 and Children's and Young People's Mental Health terms of reference being approved and this item scheduled for 3 December 2015. The 14 January 2016 meeting of the Committee was cancelled. Members who had items which they wished to have considered for inclusion in the forward work programme were asked to contact the Democratic Support and Scrutiny Team Manager in the first instance. The Committee also agreed to appoint Mrs Marlene Fairhead as the substitute link member with the Great Yarmouth and Waveney CCG and Mrs Margaret Somerville substitute link member with the South Norfolk CCG.

**Mr Michael Carttiss**  
**CHAIRMAN**

## **Report of the Planning Regulatory Committee Meeting held on 24 July 2015**

- 1 C/7/2014/7030: Southern extension to Mangreen Quarry and ancillary works with progressive restoration to agriculture and nature conservation by the importation of inert restoration materials; Retention of existing consented facilities, establishment of a crossing point over Mangreen lane and Proposed variation to the approved restoration scheme. Development by Lafarge Tarmac.**
  - 1.1 The Committee received a report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking planning permission for an extension to the mineral operations at Mangreen Quarry on an area of agricultural land to the south of the existing quarry site and Mangreen Lane, for a period of 8 years. A programme of extraction and progressive restoration to a mix of agriculture, woodland and a balancing pond is being proposed. The scheme also includes retention of the existing aggregate processing plant complex, bagging plant, ready-mix plant and access/haul road.
  - 1.2 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services was authorised to:
    - i) Grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement in respect of long term wildlife management, vehicle routing and removal of a right turn lane in the highway and the conditions outlined in section 12 of Appendix A of the report.
    - ii) Discharge conditions (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) where those detailed in the report required the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commenced, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted.
    - iii) Delegate powers to officers (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.
- 2 Broadland District: C/5/2015/5010: Strumpshaw Closed Landfill Site, Mill Hill, Strumpshaw: Installation and operation of a small scale electricity generation plant. Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services, Norfolk County Council.**
  - 2.1 The Committee received a report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking planning permission for the installation and operation of a small scale electricity generation plant fuelled by landfill gas.
  - 2.2 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services was authorised to:

- i) Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in section 12 of the report.
- ii) Discharge conditions (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) where those detailed in the report required the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commenced, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted.
- iii) Delegate powers to officers (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

**Brian Long**  
**Chairman, Planning (Regulatory) Committee**



**Norwich Highways Agency Committee  
Report of the meetings held on 23 July 2015  
and 17 September 2015**

**A: Meeting held on 23 July 2015**

**1 Public Questions/Petitions**

- 1.1 The Committee received a petition presented on behalf of the residents of Salisbury Road, NR1 1TU about Parking Permit
- 1.2 The Committee received a question from a member of the public about the Push the Pedalways scheme at the Avenues and Colman Road.
- 1.3 The Committee received a question from a member of the public about the proposed bus lane at Bowthorpe Three Score.

**2 Hotblack Road**

- 2.1 The report produced by residents of Hotblack Road about traffic issues in the local area was presented by the Senior Transportation Planner (Norwich City Council) and received by the Committee.
- 2.2 **RESOLVED** to:
  - (1) Receive the report produced by Hotblack Road residents;
  - (2) Note the actions already taken on some issues in the report and confirm the residential area will be considered for inclusion in a 20mph speed limit when funds became available.

**3 Push the Pedalway programme update**

- 3.1 The Committee received the report from the Transportation and Network Manager updating the committee on the progress of the Push the Pedalways phase one programme of cycling infrastructure improvements.
- 3.2 **RESOLVED** to
  - (1) Note the content of the report.

- (2) Ask the Head of City Development Services to complete the statutory procedures associated with the revisions to project 4, The Avenues, and project 13, Tombland and Palace Street, as set out in the report.

#### **4 Push the Pedalways – Project 19 – 20mph areas in the city centre and Heartsease.**

- 4.1 The Committee received the report from the Senior Transportation Planner (Norwich City Council), asking the Committee to consider the responses to the City Centre and Heartsease 20mph areas statutory consultation and approve the proposals for implementation, with amendments.

#### **4.2 RESOLVED to**

- (1) Note the response to the consultation.
- (2) Ask the Head of City Development Services to complete the necessary statutory processes associated with the installation of:
  - a. The new 20mph Speed Restriction order for the historic city centre as shown on plan No PL/TR/4142/225/3.2 and associated amended traffic calming as below:
    - i. Ber Street – Plan no CCAG-CON-202A
    - ii. Duke Street – Plan No CCAG-CON-502
    - iii. Rouen Road/King Street – Plan Nos CCAG/CON-402 and 402a
    - iv. Westwick Street – Plan No CCAG-CON-302
  - b. The 20mph Speed Restriction Order for the area north of Barrack Street as shown on Plan No PL/TR/4142/225/3.2
  - c. The 20mph Speed Restriction Order for the Heartsease area without additional traffic calming. The area is shown on Plan No PL/TR/4142/225/3.1.
- (3) Ask officers to circulate details of the outcome of measures to improve air quality, including “engine switch off” to members.

#### **5 Bowthorpe Three Score**

- 5.1 The Committee was asked to note that the road infrastructure and new bus gate to the Bowthorpe Three Score development was currently under construction, and due for completion before March 2016; and, agree to advertise the Traffic Regulation Orders required to implement the bus gate and speed restrictions on the new spine roads.

#### **5.2 RESOLVED to:**

- (1) note that the new road infrastructure and the associated bus gate to service the new Bowthorpe Three Score development is currently under construction and due to be completed by March 2016;
- (2) ask the Head of City Development Services to advertise the necessary traffic regulation orders to implement the new bus gate, a 20mph Zone and waiting restrictions on the new estate roads within the development site (as shown on the plans in Appendices 1-4), making allowance for the proposed parking bays in front of the new approved development (shown in Appendix 5);
- (3) delegate the consideration of any objections to the Head of City Development Services in consultation with the Chair and Vice-chair.

## **6 Norwich Car Club 2015 expansion – results of consultation**

6.1 The Committee received the report from the Principal Planner (transportation) setting out the results of the statutory consultation on the planned introduction of 25 new car club parking bays across the city.

### **6.2 RESOLVED to:**

- (1) note consultation representations regarding proposed car club bays;
- (2) ask the Head of City Development Services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures associated with implementing the following car club bays;
  - (a) Bank Plain;
  - (b) Brunswick Road;
  - (c) Edinburgh Road;
  - (d) Fishergate;
  - (e) Shipstone Road;
  - (f) St. Clement's Hill;
  - (g) St. Giles Street;
  - (h) Waldeck Road;
  - (i) Bunnett Square;
  - (j) Clarendon Road;
  - (k) King Street South;
  - (l) Newmarket Street.
- (3) authorise the Head of City Development Services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures to implement the following as and when required up until 5 June 2017:
  - (a) St. Leonard's Road;
  - (b) Riverside Road;
  - (c) Northfields;
  - (d) Wilberforce Road;
  - (e) Rawley Road.

**7 Hall Road District centre area – results of consultation on traffic management changes.**

7.1 The Principal Planner introduced the report setting out the consultation and seeking approval to implement a Traffic Regulation Order, Shared use footway/cycle order and road crossing notice associated with the new Hall Road district centre development.

**7.2 RESOLVED to:**

- (1) note the representation received and the officer response:
- (2) ask the Head of City Development Services carry out the necessary statutory procedures associated with implementing the traffic management measures as described in this report.

**8 Major road works**

The Committee received the report from the Transportation and Network Manager, advising and updating members of current and planned future roadworks in Norwich.

**RESOLVED to:**

- (1) note the report;
- (2) ask the Head of City Development Services to ensure that it is made clear that the current works in Westlegate are not part of the Golden Ball Street scheme that is out to consultation but works by National Grid Gas to replace a 100 year old gas main.

**B: Meeting held on 17 September 2015**

**9. Annual Report of the Norwich City Highways Agency 2014-15**

9.1 The Committee received the Norwich Highways Agency annual report for 2014-15. During the discussion the Committee expressed concerns about the increase in the numbers of people recorded as being killed or seriously injured as a result of a traffic accident.

**9.2 RESOLVED to:**

- (1) Approve the Norwich Highways Agency annual report for 2014-15
- (2) Ask the Head of City Development Services and the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services (Norwich County Council) to report on the issues and trends behind the statistics on road accident

casualties.

## **10. Transport for Norwich – Golden Ball and Westlegate**

10.1 The Committee received a question from Mr Peter Mitchell (Jarrolds & Sons Ltd), Chair of the Norwich Business Improvement District concerning the risk that the proposed changes would create congestion on the Inner Ring Road with detrimental consequences for the city centre's shoppers and businesses in 2016.

### **10.2 RESOLVED:**

(1) to approve the changes required to implement the scheme, including:

- (a) Conversion of Golden Ball Street to two-way for general traffic.
- (b) Pedestrianisation of Westlegate with access for deliveries and cyclists only.
- (c) Removal of general traffic from Red Lion Street to create a bus, cycle and taxi only route with access for deliveries only.
- (d) Reconfiguration of John Lewis car park access on Ber Street to enable right turn in and out in addition to existing movements.
- (e) Conversion of Farmers Avenue to two-way for general traffic between the Castle Mall car park entrance and its junction with Golden Ball Street.
- (f) Reconfiguration of Rouen Road/Cattle Market Street junction to remove traffic signals and improve cycle/pedestrian facilities.
- (g) Removal of traffic on Farmers Avenue between its junctions with Castle Meadow and Orford Street, with access for cyclists and pedestrians retained.
- (h) Removal of vehicular through traffic from All Saints Green, from its junction with Surrey Street northwards, and removal of all traffic from All Saints Street, except for use by buses and taxis when St Stephens Street, Red Lion Street or Castle Meadow are closed.
- (i) Removal of traffic signals at St Stephens Plain - Westlegate/St Stephens Street/Red Lion Street/Rampant Horse Street junction.
- (j) Removal of existing turning bans at St Stephens Plain, with provision of right turn for buses and taxis from Rampant Horse Street into St Stephens Street, and left turn from St Stephens Street into Rampant Horse Street.
- (k) Closure of Thorn Lane at its junction with Ber Street, with the provision of a turning area at the closed end.

- (l) Removal of the signal controlled pedestrian crossing at Castle Meadow/Farmers Avenue junction, with provision of an uncontrolled table crossing in its place.
  - (m) Provision of raised table with combined pedestrian and cycle zebra crossing on Ber Street at junction with Golden Ball Street/Timberhill.
  - (n) The removal of the banned left turns for cyclists from St Stephens Street into Rampant Horse Street, and from Westlegate into St Stephens Street.
  - (o) Provision of a signal controlled crossing on Rampant Horse Street immediately west of its junction with Brigg Street.
  - (p) Restrict right turns from Orford Hill into Red Lion Street except for cyclists and taxis.
  - (q) Note that all the roads subject to road closures will be designed such that they are available for use in the event of an emergency.
- (2) to ask the Transportation and Network Manager at Norwich City Council to carry out the necessary statutory processes to confirm the following Traffic Regulation Orders:

(a) the Traffic Management Order

- (i) Introduce a pedestrian zone on Westlegate and All Saints Street, whilst retaining access for loading and cyclists.
- (ii) Introduce a pedestrian zone on Farmers Avenue between Castle Meadow and Orford Street, retaining access for cyclists.
- (iii) Rescind the existing turning bans, to enable buses, taxis and cyclists to turn in all directions at St Stephens Plain.
- (iv) Make Red Lion Street two-way for buses, taxis, cycles and access only; this will be consistent with the approach taken on St Stephens Street.
- (v) Rescind the current one-way orders on Golden Ball Street and Farmers Avenue, and the one-way order on Westlegate and All Saints Street to allow two-way cycling.
- (vi) Introduce a point closure, with cycling and emergency access, on Thorn Lane at its junction with Ber Street.
- (vii) Introduce a mandatory on-carriageway cycle lane on the east side of Cattle Market Street and Golden Ball Street.

(b) the Controlled Parking Zone Order

- (i) Introduce a 'loading only' restriction in all of the proposed pedestrian areas.
- (ii) Introduce no waiting and no loading restrictions along both sides of Golden Ball Street and Ber Street up until the junction with Thorn Lane, excepting those locations

reserved for on-street parking. Similar restrictions will be introduced on All Saints Green around the proposed turning head.

- (iii) Introduce revised parking arrangements on Ber Street to include additional disabled parking provision.

(c) in relation to pedestrian crossings:

- (i) Replace the existing signal controlled crossing on Surrey Street, at its junction with St Stephens Street, with an uncontrolled crossing point.
- (ii) Replace the existing signal controlled crossing on Rampant Horse Street, near St Stephens Plain, with a raised uncontrolled crossing point.
- (iii) Replace the existing signal controlled crossing on Red Lion Street, near St Stephens Plain, with a raised uncontrolled crossing point.
- (iv) Remove the existing signal controlled crossing on Westlegate near St Stephens Plain.
- (v) replace the existing signal controlled crossing on Castle Meadow, at its junction with Farmers Avenue, with an uncontrolled crossing point.
- (vi) remove the existing signal controlled crossing on Farmers Avenue, at its junction with Castle Meadow.
- (vii) replace the existing signal controlled crossings at the All Saints Street junction with Golden Ball Street and Ber Street with a raised crossing point with a combined (pedestrian and cycle) zebra crossing.
- (viii) replace the existing signal controlled crossing on Farmers Avenue, at its junction with Golden Ball Street, with an uncontrolled crossing point.
- (ix) replace the existing signal controlled crossing on Golden Ball Street, at its junction with Farmers Avenue, with an uncontrolled crossing point on Cattle Market Street, just north of its junction with Rouen Road.
- (x) replace the existing signal controlled crossing on Rouen Road, at its junction with Cattle Market Street, with an uncontrolled crossing point.
- (xi) provide a signal controlled crossing on Rampant Horse Street immediately west of its junction with Brigg Street.
- (xii) provide a zebra crossing on Rouen Road situated on the speed table.

(3) to ask the Transportation and Network manager, Norwich City Council, to commence the necessary statutory processes to:

- (a) make Timberhill two-way for general traffic from Lion and Castle Yard to its junction with Golden Ball Street.
  - (b) re-advertise the locations of the parking bays on Ber Street to confirm the position of the revised proposals.
  - (c) extend the existing coach bay on Castle Meadow.
  - (d) implement the additional formal crossings recommended in the report.
  - (e) delegate the consideration of any objections received to the Head of city development services, in association with the Chair and Vice chair.
- (4) to ask the NATS and NDR Manager, Norfolk County Council, and Transportation and Network Manager, Norwich City Council, to:
- (a) carry out further analysis and design work for the necessary improvements at Finkelgate / Queens Road junction and Ber Street / Bracondale junction to mitigate the impacts of the additional traffic resulting from the works described above;
  - (b) with the agreement of the Chair and Vice chair of this committee, carry out any necessary statutory consultation on the proposed scheme;
  - (c) report the results of that consultation to a future meeting of this committee.

## 11. **Norwich City Football Club – proposed toucan and bus gate**

11.1 The Committee received the report and noted the comments raised by the Principal Transportation Planner who explained that the bus gate was required because of the level of traffic on this section of Koblenz Avenue and its proximity to the ring road.

### 11.2 **RESOLVED to:**

- (1) note that the various planning permissions granted have provided funding for improved crossing facilities and public transport access to the expanding development at Norwich City Football Club;
- (2) ask the Head of City Development Services to advertise the necessary traffic regulation orders and notices to provide an egress for buses only from Geoffrey Watling Way/ Carrow Road on to Koblenz Avenue and access over a short section of shared 'cycle/footway' for cyclists to the Toucan Crossing as shown on Plan No. PH2113-HP-003 attached in Appendix 1
- (3) ask the Head of City Development Services to advertise the necessary traffic regulation orders to amend the on-street waiting restrictions by



removing the existing parking bays and replacing them with double yellow lines Carrow Road as shown on Plan No. PH2113-HP-004;

- (4) note that any objections received will be considered by a future meeting of the committee.

12. **Prince of Wales (side road) access restrictions**

12.1 The Committee received the report and **RESOLVED to:**

- (1) authorise the Head of City Development Services to carry out the necessary statutory procedures for a permanent traffic regulation order that will have the following provisions:

- (a) to prohibit motor vehicle access:

Friday 11.00pm – 12.00 midnight  
Saturday 12.00am – 06.00am and 11.00pm – 12.00 midnight  
Sunday 12.00 - 06.00am

and from 11.00pm on any day that is the night before any bank holiday, public holiday or major public event to 06:00am of the following day

From the junction of Prince of Wales Road with:

- (i) Cathedral Street;
- (ii) St Faiths Lane;
- (iii) Recorder Road.

- (b) with the following exemptions:

- (i) Emergency vehicles;
- (ii) invalid carriages (mobility scooters) (Class, 1, 2 and 3 vehicles);
- (iii) pedal cycles;
- (iv) motor vehicle displaying a valid disabled persons parking badge (blue badge);
- (v) motor vehicle with a valid residents or visitor parking permit and such use meets the terms and conditions of such a permit;
- (vi) motor vehicles visiting a resident whose properties entitles visitor parking permit entitlement;
- (vii) motor vehicle for the access/egress of a private parking spaces;
- (viii) in the service of local authority or water authority in the pursuance of statutory powers or duties;

- (ix) in connection with the maintenance, improvement or reconstruction of that length of road or the laying, erection, alteration or repair in or adjacent to that length of road of any sewer, water, gas or electricity apparatus of any telecommunications apparatus as defined in the Telecommunications Act 1984.
  - (x) any other vehicle that requires access as deemed by a police officer in uniform;
  - (xi) Any vehicle leaving the affected streets may do so without restriction at any time.
- (c) to amend pay and display times on bays on Cathedral Street, Recorder Road and St Faiths Lane as follows:
- (i) Cathedral Street (west side/two bays near its junction with Prince of Wales Road)
 

*Mon-Sat 8am-10pm: Short Stay Parking Places for 120 Minutes, (pay and display parking) Return Prohibited Within 180 Minutes*  
*Permit Holders Parking Places At All Other Times Mon-Sat, No Restriction At Any Time Sunday and Christmas Day*
  - (ii) Recorder Road (bay on the south side, adjacent to the James Stuart Gardens),  
 (bay on the west side adjacent to Foundry Court)
  - (iii) St Faiths Lane (two bays on the north side opp. junction with Recorder Road)  
 Mon-Sat 8am-6pm Short stay parking places for 120 Minutes (pay and display parking), Return prohibited within 180 Minutes  
  
 Permit holders parking places at all other times Mon-Sat and Any Time Sunday and Christmas Day
- (d) to continue with the informal arrangement to allow private hire vehicles or taxis to wait in Castle Meadow and Bank Plain only when the access restrictions are in operation.
- (2) note that any written objections made to the advertisement for consultation of a permanent traffic regulation order will be reported to future meeting of The Norwich Highways Agency committee. If no written objections are received the TRO may be implemented as a delegated officer matter.
- (3) approve as an informal measure private hire vehicles or taxis to wait at Castle Meadow and Bank Plain during restricted hours associated with the operation of the access restrictions.

- (4) seek authorisation from the Department for Transport for the design and content of the proposed permanent highway signage.

**13. Proposed variations to car park fees and charges**

- 13.1 The Committee received the report and **RESOLVED to** support the proposed revised fees and charges as set out in appendices C and D of the report, to take effect from 16 November 2015.

**14. Air Quality Management Plan**

- 14.1 The Committee received the report which was presented by the Head of Citywide Development Services (Norwich City Council). Comments from members of the committee would be reported to the city council's cabinet on 7 October 2015.

**15. Major road works – regular monitoring**

- 15.1 The Committee considered and noted the report of the Head of City Development services.

**Steve Morpew**  
**Chairman, Norwich Highways Agency Committee**

# Norfolk County Council

Item No 7

<b>Report title:</b>	<b>Minimum Revenue Provision Policy 2015-16 (revision) and 2016-17</b>
<b>Date of meeting:</b>	<b>19 October 2015</b>
<b>Responsible Chief Officer:</b>	<b>Executive Director of Finance</b>
<b>Strategic impact</b> MRP is a charge to the revenue account in relation to capital expenditure financed from borrowing or credit arrangements, and can be thought of as a provision for “debt repayment”.  Regulations 27 and 28 of the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003 (as amended) require that a local authority “shall determine for the current financial year an amount of minimum revenue provision which it considers to be prudent”.	

## Executive summary

A minimum revenue provision (MRP) policy is set each year by the County Council. The revised policy, if approved, will release revenue to support the revenue budget, without compromising the Council’s responsibility to set aside amounts sufficient to re-pay its debt.

### Members are asked to:

- **approve the revised 2015-16 Minimum Revenue Provision statement set out in Appendix 2, to be applied in 2015-16 and 2016-17.**

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 MRP is a charge to the revenue account in relation to capital expenditure financed from borrowing or credit arrangements, and can be thought of as a provision for “debt repayment”.
- 1.2 The MRP policy should be set by the authority’s full Council, and changes should also be approved at full Council.

## 2. Evidence

- 2.1 This report proposes a revision to the Council’s MRP policy. The reasons for and implication of the policy are set out in Appendix 1, and the revised policy is attached as Appendix 2.
- 2.2 The key change relates to pre 1 April 2008 capital expenditure, and later expenditure funded through the supported borrowing regime which existed until that date. The

current policy calculates MRP on this element by applying a set percentage (4%) on a reducing balance basis. The revised policy adapts the Regulatory Method of accounting for MRP by setting aside a fixed amount each year, calculated as 2% of the balance at 31 March 2015. This annual amount of “pre-2008” MRP will be £10.158m.

- 2.3 In addition, a relatively minor change aligns the capital receipt received when debt is repaid by third parties with the associated Council debt repayment, thus removing the need to account for MRP in these circumstances. A further change allows for a wider application of the annuity method for post 2008 expenditure, where appropriate and as allowed for under statutory guidance.
- 2.4 With all authorities facing significant financial challenges, a number of councils across the country are reviewing their MRP policy, and the proposed approach has already been adopted by other authorities.

### **3. Financial Implications**

When the latest MRP rules were revised in 2008, the Council operated in a very different financial climate.

The proposed “straight line” method will result in full provision, whilst remaining prudent and affordable. Under the proposed method, all “pre-2008” debt will be fully provided for over a period of 50 years.

The latest estimate of MRP in 2015-16 under the current method is £25.1m, of which £20.3m relates to pre 2008 capital expenditure. The revised policy will allow MRP to reduce by £10.157m in 2015-16 and £9.326m in 2016-17.

### **4. Issues, risks and innovation**

#### **Risk implications**

- 4.1 Financial risk is considered as part of the overall budget setting process and financial monitoring throughout the year as reported to members.
- 4.2 The policy has been shared with the Council’s auditors and advisors, and their views have been taken into consideration.

### **5. Background**

- 5.1 The County Council approved the current MRP policy at its meeting on 16 February 2015.

## Officer Contact

If you have any questions about the matters contained in this paper please get in touch with:

Name	Telephone Number	Email address
Simon George	01603 222400	<a href="mailto:simon.george@norfolk.gov.uk">simon.george@norfolk.gov.uk</a>
Howard Jones	01603 222832	<a href="mailto:howard.jones@norfolk.gov.uk">howard.jones@norfolk.gov.uk</a>



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

## **Appendix 1: Rationale and Implications of new MRP policy**

### **1. Purpose**

- 1.1. This paper reviews the Council's General Fund minimum revenue provision ("MRP") policy and sets out proposed changes.

### **2. Statutory basis of MRP**

- 2.1. Regulations 27 and 28 of the Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003 (as amended) require that a local authority "shall determine for the current financial year an amount of minimum revenue provision which it considers to be prudent".
- 2.2. MRP is a charge to the revenue account in relation to capital expenditure financed from borrowing or credit arrangements, and can be thought of as a provision for "debt repayment".
- 2.3. The Secretary of State has issued statutory Guidance on determining the "prudent" level of MRP. Authorities are required to have regard to this guidance. The current revision of the Guidance is the third edition applicable from 1 April 2012. The Guidance is in turn supported by an "informal commentary" from the Department of Communities and Local Government.
- 2.4. The Guidance clarifies that the MRP policy should be set by the authority's full Council (or closest equivalent), and changes should also be approved at full Council.
- 2.5. In 2007 the Government concluded that previous prescriptive arrangements should be replaced by a system of self-regulation. The Informal Commentary to the Capital Finance and Accounting (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2007 said "the present scheme of MRP looks out of place in the broader context of the Prudential system, which is based on simple legislation backed up by standard accounting codes and guidance, and allows authorities significant local discretion based on their own judgement as to what is prudent".

### **3. The Council's objectives in reviewing its MRP Policy**

- 3.1. The Council's MRP policy has evolved since 2007, at the start of the new MRP system, but remains essentially unchanged.
- 3.2. The statutory guidance issued gave examples of how MRP could be calculated easily and conservatively, and most authorities adopted them without adaptation which resulted in very prudent MRP policies.
- 3.3. With all authorities facing significant financial challenges, a number of councils across the country are reviewing their MRP policy and are amending those calculations which now seem over-prudent.
- 3.4. A number of relatively minor adjustments have been made over the years as new types of project have arisen, for example in relation to loans to companies. However, these changes have not addressed the question of what is prudent, after having regard to the statutory guidance.
- 3.5. Substantial General Fund budget reductions are required over the next three financial years, in addition to the substantial reductions already made. The Council should seek to ensure a stable and deliverable financial transition over the next few years, in the interest of prudent management of the Council's finances generally as well as MRP.

#### 4. Principles of MRP: the meaning of “prudent provision”

- 4.1. Regulations do not define the meaning of the term “prudent provision” in regulation 28.
- 4.2. The statutory MRP Guidance to which the Council must have regard states that “the broad aim of prudent provision is to ensure that debt is repaid over a period that is either reasonably commensurate with that over which the capital expenditure provides benefits, or, in the case of borrowing supported by Government Revenue Support Grant, reasonably commensurate with the period implicit in the determination of that grant”.
- 4.3. The Guidance does not stipulate a minimum amount of provision to be made in any particular year, providing that the broad aims or prudent provision are met. It does suggest four options, two of which apply to pre-2008 supported borrowing, and two which relate to schemes funded from borrowing under the “prudential borrowing” regime.
- 4.4. Of the four options suggested, two have not been used by Norfolk County Council

<b>Applicable to pre 1 April 2008 expenditure and later expenditure funded through supported borrowing</b>	<b>Used in existing MRP policy?</b>
Option 1 – regulatory method: applying the statutory formula set out in the 2003 Regulations (as amended) before it was revoked by the 2008 Regulations	No
Option 2 – CFR method: multiplying the Capital Financing Requirement at the end of the preceding financial year by 4%.	Yes
<b>Applicable to Post April 2008 expenditure funded through “prudential borrowing”</b>	
Option 3 – asset life method: amortising expenditure over an estimated useful life for the relevant assets created.	Yes
Option 4 – depreciation method: making charges to revenue based on proper practices for depreciation as they apply to the relevant assets.	No

- 4.5. In having regard to the Statutory Guidance, and if agreed, the Council will adapt Option 2 as described in Section 5 below, and continue to apply Options 3, as described in section 6 below.

- 4.6. Actual MRP provision in the past five years has been as follows:

<b>MRP</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>	<b>2013-14</b>	<b>2014-15</b>
	<b>£m</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>£m</b>	<b>£m</b>
On pre-2008 Supported Borrowing	23.470	23.970	23.012	22.078	21.180
On Unsupported Prudential Borrowing	1.409	1.576	2.182	2.330	2.414
On Finance Leases and other adjustments	4.079	3.878	4.150	2.778	2.911
<b>Total</b>	<b>28.958</b>	<b>29.424</b>	<b>29.344</b>	<b>27.186</b>	<b>26.505</b>

- 4.7. The latest estimate of MRP due in 2015-16 is £25.1m. In accordance with the objectives set out in section 3 above, proposed changes to the Council’s MRP policy are described below. A revised MRP policy Statement accompanies this paper.



## 5. Proposed changes to MRP policy - pre 1 April 2008 expenditure, and later expenditure funded through supported borrowing

- 5.1. The CFR method multiplies the Capital Financing Requirement at the end of each preceding financial year by 4%, which reduces the CFR balance accordingly. This “reducing balance” method has the characteristic that the debt is never entirely repaid, but in any one year may be in excess of the amount actually needed to be set aside to re-pay debt.
- 5.2. The amount set aside for MRP on pre-2008 supported borrowing under the CFR method using a 4% reducing balance, is as follows:

Financial year	Capital Financing Requirement on pre-2008 supported borrowing (start of year)	Estimates of 4% MRP on b/f CFR	Other movements in CFR
	£m	£m	
2008-09	547.207	-21.888	41.858
2009-10	567.177	-22.687	42.257
2010-11	586.747	-23.470	35.983
2011-12	599.260	-23.970	0.002
2012-13	575.292	-23.012	-0.329
2013-14	551.951	-22.078	-0.381
2014-15	529.492	-21.180	-0.429
2015-16	507.883	-20.315	-0.480
2016-17	487.088	-19.484	0.001
2017-18	467.605	-18.704	

Note: prior to 2014-15, MRP on unsupported or prudential borrowing on pre 2008 expenditure was calculated separately. The figures in the tables above have been attributed in accordance with the method used since 2014-15, which absorbed all pre-2008 borrowing into the supported borrowing figure.

- 5.3. In recent years the amount set aside as MRP on pre-2008 expenditure is in the order of £20m, reducing by approximately 4% each year. Increases in the CFR and MRP in the years immediately after 2008 are accounted for by post 2008 expenditure which was funded through pre-2008 supported borrowing. This expenditure is shown in the “other movements” column, along with annual adjustments for finance leases.
- 5.4. As noted above, the Statutory Guidance for borrowing supported by Government Revenue Support Grant says that prudent provision should be made to ensure that debt is repaid over a period reasonably commensurate with the period implicit in the determination of that grant. However, since the Business Rates changes in 2013-14 there is no component of grant determining an implicit level of support for debt re-payment so prudent but affordable alternatives need to be explored.
- 5.5. The reducing balance method currently applied to pre-2008 expenditure means that full provision for debt re-payment will never be made. Over £65m will remain unprovided after 50 years, which may be considered a reasonable assumption for the average useful life of assets funded by this expenditure such as land, highways and school buildings.
- 5.6. A straight line method will mean that MRP in respect of 2008 debt is fully provided over a pre-defined period. It is therefore proposed that it would be prudent and affordable to adapt the Regulatory Method of accounting for MRP by setting aside a fixed amount each year, calculated as 2% of the balance at 31 March 2015. This annual amount will be £10.158m.

5.7. The effect on MRP in 2015-16 and 2016-17 is estimated as follows.

Financial year	Current policy	Revised policy	Effect on revenue budget
	£m	£m	£m
<b>2015-16</b>	20.315	10.158	10.157
<b>2016-17</b>	19.484	10.158	9.326

5.8. In the initial years, the “pre-2008” element of MRP using a 2% straight line calculation is lower than using a 4% reducing balance. The amounts become comparable in the 18th year, and the contribution remains constant thereafter to ensure that debt is fully provided after 50 years, rather than the alternative which leaves £65m not provided at that point. The proposed fixed rate therefore ensures that the pre-2008 debt is fully provided considerably earlier than it would be under the existing method.

5.9. The latest estimate of total MRP due in 2015-16 under the current policy is £25.1m. The Council’s section 151 officer will apply the revised policy to calculate the prudent amount to set aside in 2015-16, and as part of the budget setting process for 2016-17. As can be seen from the table above, this will lead to in-year expenditure reductions of £10.157m in 2015-16 and £9.326m in 2016-17.

## **6. Proposed changes to MRP policy - Post April 2008 expenditure funded through “prudential borrowing”**

6.1. For Post April 2008 expenditure funded through “prudential borrowing, it is proposed to continue to use Option 3, the asset life method: amortising expenditure over an estimated useful life for the relevant assets created.

6.2. Under this method, MRP is chargeable in the first financial year after the relevant asset becomes operational, although where not material smaller assets (under approximately £1m) may be combined for the purpose of calculations and MRP calculated on expenditure in the previous year.

6.3. Option 3 allows for an equal instalment method, or the annuity method, where appropriate. The annuity method is likely to be appropriate where an asset produces a steady or increasing flow of benefits over its useful life. Existing practice has been to use the equal instalment method for assets apart from those funded through loans to third parties, but significant new and existing asset will be assessed for the most appropriate treatment. The current policy specifically applies the annuity method to loans to third parties, but this is no longer relevant due to the proposed change in 7 below.

## **7. Proposed changes to MRP policy – loans to third parties**

7.1. It is proposed to amend the MRP policy in relation to capital loans to require repayment provision to be made from the capital receipts arising from the repayment of the loan by the third party, subject to a revenue charge if the loan is impaired or uncertain.

7.2. This will have only a marginal effect on MRP, approximately £0.064m in 2015-16, but it has the effect of matching the annual re-payments of capital by third parties with the notional re-payment of debt which accords with the underlying purpose of MRP.

7.3. No additional revenue provision is necessary because under The Local Authorities (Capital Finance and Accounting) (England) Regulations 2003, capital receipts may be used to repay the principal of any amount borrowed.

## **8. Treasury Management**

- 8.1. The Council's average cash balances in the year to August 2015 were £218m, with a minimum in that period of £174m.
- 8.2. There is no direct impact on Treasury Management from the above proposals. There is a potential indirect impact in that reducing MRP will allow increased cash expenditure from the annual revenue budget.
- 8.3. The Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities 2011 Edition has been reviewed, and the proposal will have no direct effect on Prudential indicators. The code covers affordability and prudence, and this proposal is consistent with the guidance. The Code states that an Authority should set upper and lower limits with respect to the maturity structure of its borrowing. While this proposal does not affect the limits, the effect on the MRP under the proposed policy would need to be taken into account if the current debt was to be radically re-structured in accordance with the current maximum limits.
- 8.4. The Code of Practice and Cross Sectoral Guidance Notes (2011 Edition) and Treasury Management in the Public Services Guidance Notes for Local Authorities 2011 Edition do not address MRP specifically, but they do address managing treasury management risks, in particular effective cash and cash flow forecasting and monitoring systems to identify potential cash flow variations and shortfalls. The proposed policy clearly allows for sufficient funds to be built up to ensure debt can be re-paid in the short, medium and long term.
- 8.5. The Cross Sectoral Guidance also addresses decision making and says that the organisation should consider the on-going revenue liabilities created, and the implications for the organisation's future plans and budgets. Again, this proposal is fully consistent with this advice.

## **9. Conclusions**

- 9.1. The proposals above are considered to be consistent with the statutory duty on the Council to make prudent provision, having regard to the Government Guidance and advice received.

**Appendix 2: Proposed MRP statement 2015-16 (revision) and 2016-17**

- A1 Regulations issued by the Department of Communities and Local Government in 2008 require the Council to approve a Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) statement in advance of each year.
- A2 Members are asked to approve the MRP statement annually to confirm that the means by which the Council plans to provide for repayment of debt are satisfactory. Any revisions to the original statement must also be issued. Proposals to vary the terms of the original statement during the year should also be approved.
- A3 MRP is the provision made in the Council's revenue budget for the repayment of borrowing used to fund capital expenditure - the Council has a statutory duty to determine an amount of MRP which it considers to be prudent, having regard to guidance issued by the Secretary of State.
- A4 For 2015-16, the Council has adopted the following revision to its policy in relation to calculating the Minimum Revenue Provision, and this policy will also apply in 2016-17:
- For capital expenditure incurred before 1 April 2008, and all capital expenditure since that date which is supported by Formula Grant (supported borrowing), the MRP policy will be provide a fixed annual sum of £10.158m, calculated as 2% of the 31 March 2015 pre-2008 Capital Financing Requirement balance.
  - For expenditure since 1 April 2008, the MRP policy for schemes funded through borrowing will be to base the minimum provision on the estimated life of the assets in accordance with the new regulations.
- A5 Where loans are made to third parties for capital purposes, the capital receipt received each year in the annual loan repayments will be set aside in order to re-pay the principal borrowed over the life of the loan. MRP will only be accounted for if an accounting provision has been made for non-repayment of the loan or there is a high degree of uncertainty regarding the repayment. This arrangement will also be applied where a third party has committed to underwrite the debt costs of a specific project through amounts reserved for capital purposes.
- A6 The Council will continue to make provision at least equal to the amount required to ensure that each debt maturity is met.