

**Cabinet**  
**Minutes of the Virtual Teams Meeting held on**  
**Monday 2 November 2020 at 10am**

**Present:**

Cllr Andrew Proctor	Chairman. Leader & Cabinet Member for Strategy & Governance.
Cllr Bill Borrett	Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention.
Cllr Margaret Dewsbury	Cabinet Member for Communities & Partnerships.
Cllr John Fisher	Cabinet Member for Children's Services.
Cllr Tom FitzPatrick	Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation & Performance.
Cllr Andy Grant	Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste.
Cllr Andrew Jamieson	Cabinet Member for Finance
Cllr Greg Peck	Cabinet Member for Commercial Services & Asset Management.
Cllr Graham Plant	Vice-Chairman and Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy.
Cllr Martin Wilby	Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.

**Executive Directors Present:**

James Bullion	Executive Director of Adult Social Services
Helen Edwards	Director of Governance and Monitoring Officer
Simon George	Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services
Tom McCabe	Executive Director of Community & Environmental Services and Head of Paid Service.
Fiona McDiarmid	Executive Director of Strategy & Governance
Sara Tough	Executive Director of Children's Services

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the Cabinet meeting and advised viewers that pursuant to The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020, the meeting was being held under new Regulations which had been brought in to deal with the restrictions under Covid 19. Decisions made in the meeting would have the same standing and validity as if they had been made in a meeting in County Hall.

Cabinet Members and Executive Directors formally introduced themselves.

**1 Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

## **2 Minutes**

The minutes from the Cabinet meeting held on Monday 5 October 2020 were agreed as an accurate record.

## **3 Declaration of Interests**

Cllr Andrew Proctor declared a non-prejudicial interest in agenda item 14 (Limited Company Consents) as he was a Norfolk County Council appointed Director of Repton Property Developments Ltd.

Cllr Greg Peck declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 14 (Limited Company Consents) as he was a Norfolk County Council appointed Director of Repton Property Developments Ltd.

## **4 Matters referred to Cabinet by the Scrutiny Committee, Select Committees or by full Council.**

There were no matters referred to Cabinet.

## **5 Items of Urgent Business**

The Chairman read out a statement (attached at Appendix A) advising Cabinet about the support Norfolk County Council could offer to vulnerable families through the Norfolk Assistance Scheme as a result of the hardship caused by the coronavirus pandemic.

## **6 Public Question Time**

6.1 The list of public questions and responses is attached to these minutes at Appendix B.

### **6.2 Supplementary Question from Lesley Grahame:**

As a supplementary question, Ms Grahame asked if the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport could expand on the values and the audit tools used by the County Council and consulted experts about tree felling and how the biodiversity corridor and net gain aspired to would be created, not only on Tombland but also across the county.

The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport responded that the County Council had consulted arboricultural experts on the plans for the scheme in Tombland and informed Cabinet that the two felled trees would be replaced by 5 trees giving a net gain of 3 trees overall. He added that advice was sought from experts when any tree felling across the county was being considered.

## **7 Local Member Questions/Issues**

7.1 The list of Local Member questions and the responses is attached at Appendix C.

### **7.1 Supplementary question from Cllr Brian Watkins**

Mr Watkins stated that he felt the response to his question was inadequate during this time of such great hardship and anxiety for many families. As a supplementary question, he asked how other councils, such as the Liberal Democrat run

Portsmouth Council and many others across the country, could directly manage to help prevent children from going hungry while Norfolk only offered a general fund to cover all sorts of different eventualities.

The Chairman responded that his response was not inadequate, it contained facts. He added that, under agenda item 5 (Urgent Business), he had stated that the fund established, which was a significant amount of money at over £2.75m, was designed to help families, children and anyone who was in need and suffering hardship across Norfolk, and that this was the best way to help people.

**7.2 Supplementary question from Cllr Dan Roper**

Cllr Roper said that the answer to his substantive question about allocation of laptops to schools appeared to say that the Cabinet Member for Children's Services didn't know the answer. As a supplementary question, Cllr Roper asked if the matter was something the Cabinet Member should know, or was it something the Cabinet Member didn't take seriously.

In reply, the Cabinet Member for Children's Services assured Cllr Roper that he took every issue seriously within Children's services and also with this particular topic.

7.3 Cllr Smith-Clare submitted a written supplementary question which has been responded to (Appendix E).

7.4 Cllr Colleen Walker submitted a written supplementary question which has been responded to (Appendix E).

7.5 Cllr Alexandra Kemp submitted a written supplementary question which has been responded to. (Appendix E).

**8 Norfolk Safeguarding Children's Partnership Annual Report 2019-20**

8.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Children's Services which summarised the work of the Norfolk Safeguarding Children's Partnership (NSCP) between 1 July 2019 and 30 June 2020.

8.2 Cabinet welcomed Chris Robson, Chair of the Norfolk Safeguarding Children's Partnership to the meeting.

8.3 During the introduction of the report by the Chair of the Norfolk Safeguarding Children's Partnership, the following points were noted:

- Mr Robson had been appointed as Chair of the Norfolk Safeguarding Children's Partnership in April 2020.
- The report was an honest report including positive aspects of the work carried out by the Partnership, but it also acknowledged that there was some work still to be done.
- The professional and community volunteers working within children's safeguarding were outstanding, with the leadership in Norfolk considered to be one of the best across the country. The Executive Director of Children's Services was exceptional and this level of commitment was also mirrored across the county from health and police colleagues.

- The report covered the introduction of new arrangements for independent scrutiny which were working well and showed a real commitment from the three independent people scrutinising the partnership performance which would improve the outcomes for children and families in Norfolk.
- The Partnership had worked responsibly and positively throughout the covid-19 pandemic and the Chair often used Norfolk as an example of good practice, one example being community engagement through the promotion of the “ears and eyes” campaign which had taken place during the lockdown period.
- Exploitation of children remained a challenge within Norfolk, as it did nationally, and two priorities had been set to address this issue.
- Norfolk was described as a data rich county, although work was needed to improve how the data was managed, presented and used. Cabinet was reassured that the Safeguarding Partners were committed to achieving better use of the data it collected.
- The Chair of the Safeguarding Partnership was pleased that educational establishments were remaining open throughout the next lockdown phase, as they were very important in helping to safeguard children.
- The Partnership was rising to all the unique challenges faced by the pandemic and showed a real commitment to safeguarding children.

8.4 The Chairman thanked the Chair of the Safeguarding Partnership for the introduction and recognised that there could always be a need for more work due to the challenges faced.

8.5 In moving the recommendations, the Cabinet Member for Children’s Services placed on record his thanks to Mr Robson for the positive report and for his acknowledgement of the excellent Safeguarding Team and the Children’s Services team. He highlighted the work carried out during the first lockdown period which started in March 2020 and the initiative of the “ears and eyes” campaign which had been exceptional.

8.6 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

- a) **Endorse** the content of the report.
- b) **Proactively** share the report with Partner organisations with whom they have contact and actively encourage their involvement with NSCP’s work.
- c) **Ask** all elected Members to proactively promote the report using their social media accounts.

8.7 **Evidence & Reasons for Decision.**

The publication of an annual report is a statutory requirement upon the statutory partners responsible for safeguarding children under Working Together 2018.

8.8 **Alternative Options**

None.

## 9 **Norfolk Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2019-20**

9.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services which summarised the work of the Norfolk Safeguarding Adults Board (NSAB) during 2019-20.

- 9.2 Cabinet welcomed Joan Maughan, Independent Chair of Norfolk Safeguarding Adults Board to the meeting.
- 9.3 During the introduction of the report by the Independent Chair of the Norfolk Safeguarding Adults Board, the following points were noted:
- 9.4
- The report covered the period 2019-20 and the lead into the covid-19 pandemic at the start of the 2020 financial year.
  - The Chair endorsed the comments made by the Chair of the Norfolk Children's Safeguarding Partnership which, in her opinion, had grown stronger in response to the pandemic and the challenges faced.
  - Adult Safeguarding had a very effective partnership arrangement and the Chair thanked Partners for the support received from Adult Social Care and from Funding Partners which had increased the capacity to deal with adult safeguarding referrals.
  - The Eyes and Ears campaign had played a large part in the role of safeguarding adults, particularly with issues around consent and data protection, etc. although the impact of covid-19 had meant some of those eyes and ears were not as engaged as they had been previously.
  - A dropping away of referrals for safeguarding was experienced between March and June 2020, although the situation had now changed and had brought new challenges which needed to be faced, such as an increase in domestic abuse and violence; criminal exploitation; domestic abuse, particularly in older people; relationship breakdown – all of which had proved to be a major challenge and would continue to be a challenge as a result of the impacts of covid-19.
  - Over 40 communication assets, in many different formats, were now accessible through the Norfolk Safeguarding Partnership website and had allowed messages to be distributed with the help of Partners to the shielding group, which amounted to over 40k people across Norfolk.
  - Training was also accessed by volunteers who were new to the work which proved to be a very successful initiative.
  - The Community Safety Partnership and the Domestic Abuse and Sexual Violence group, together with the Norfolk Safeguarding Adults Board had formed a strong partnership to work together more comprehensively to deal with issues of domestic violence.
  - Cases of self-harm and self-neglect was an area that caused some concern with an increase in the number of referrals received.
  - There was strong evidence of good practice in engaging with people who did not want to engage with authorities, such as those who lived chaotic lifestyles, homelessness and addiction.
- 9.5 The Chairman thanked the Independent Chair of the Safeguarding Board for the introduction and highlighted that partnership working across Norfolk had been key to the work that had been done over the past months as well as in the work they would do in the future.
- 9.6 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention thanked the Independent Chair for the work she had achieved in her role so far; welcomed the report to Cabinet and also thanked Joan Maughan for presenting the report to the Health and Wellbeing Board. The Cabinet Member highlighted the promotion

of the whistleblowing campaign and the work done in combating scams, both of which had been excellent campaigns.

In moving and endorsing the recommendations, the Cabinet Member advised that Cabinet was being asked to agree the content of the report which was ready for publication; share the report as actively as possible with other partner organisations; and consider spreading the good work that the Board did through media accounts.

9.7 The Chairman endorsed the comments and thanks to Joan Maughan and her team for the excellent work they carried out, although it was recognised there was further work to be done. He added that Partnerships were key to the work that needed to be carried out both now and in the future to protect the residents of Norfolk.

9.8 The Executive Director of Adult Social Services, added his thanks to the Independent Chair and the Board for their work in holding the department to account.

9.9 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

- a) **Agree** the content of the report, which was ready for publication.
- b) **Proactively** share this report with partner organisations with whom they have contact and actively encourage their involvement with NSAB's work.
- c) **Ask** all elected Members to proactively promote this report using their social media accounts. Model Tweets for this purpose were attached at Appendix B to the report.

9.10 **Evidence & Reasons for Decision.**

The publication of an annual report is a statutory requirement upon safeguarding adults boards (14.136 Care act Guidance 2016).

9.11 **Alternative Options**

The publication of the NSAB Annual Report is a statutory requirement (14.136 Care Act Guidance 2016). The report has been approved for publication by the NSAB and its Business Group.

**10 NCC Response to Covid-19 – Initial Lessons Learned – Progress Update.**

10.1 Cabinet received the report by the Head of Paid Service which provided an update on progress against the initial lessons learned action plan agreed by Cabinet in August 2020.

10.2 The Head of Paid Service highlighted that the situation had changed considerably since the report had been published and also added that the partnership working with the statutory agencies, the voluntary sector and communities would continue during the next phase of lockdown.

10.3 In introducing the report, the Chairman read out the statement attached at Appendix D, as the situation had changed significantly since the publication of the report.

- 10.4 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services emphasised that schools and educational establishments would remain open during the lockdown period from 5 November to 2 December 2020, as he believed children needed to be in school. He added that the department would take a flexible approach with schools to support and work with them so they could remain open.
- 10.5 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention thanked the Chairman for the introduction which provided some useful and helpful information. He highlighted the work carried out by Adult Social Care to support the care provider market across care homes and generally which had provided a massive challenge and he congratulated the team for the work they had carried out.
- He continued that another key strand of the Adult Social Care work was helping to reduce the pressures on the NHS, which would become even more important if the expected peak was higher than that seen in May 2020, so everything that could be done to reduce the pressure on hospitals was vital. The commitment and hard work shown by members of Council staff who had been supporting this work, and who hadn't had much of a break was appreciated by everyone concerned.
- The Cabinet Member endorsed the report which acted as a check to ensure the right governance structures were in place and the framework was fit for purpose and feedback showed that the work the Council was doing was achieving results. The Cabinet Member also highlighted the collaboration with the NHS which was pleasing and hoped this would continue in the future.
- 10.6 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport endorsed the report which highlighted the work Norfolk County Council had undertaken. He highlighted in particular the introduction of the highways winter maintenance plan to ensure Norfolk roads were kept safe and maintenance works could continue. Cabinet was informed that 7 new gritting vehicles had been received and were ready to commence work when needed; the salt domes were full of salt and grit and a plan was established to replenish stocks when required; the staff, particularly the drivers and the staff who loaded the vehicles at the depots worked in the worst weather conditions and he paid tribute to them all for keeping Norfolk roads safe with the winter gritting regime.
- The Cabinet Member also thanked the bus operators who had allowed Norfolk's residents, particularly key workers, to travel around the rural county during the pandemic.
- 10.7 The Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy highlighted the work done by the County council to help businesses operate and also the receipt of the grant from the government which had been helpful and he looked forward to seeing how the £1.1bn would help businesses in the next phase of lockdown. He added that any work that could be done to help businesses survive would be welcomed, as businesses may find it more difficult to attract customers during the winter months than they had in the summer.
- 10.8 The Chairman advised that regarding the £1.1bn from Government, Norfolk's share could be approximately £17m, although the details of the allocation was awaited.

- 10.9 The Cabinet Member for Finance endorsed the comments made, adding that protecting vulnerable people was a key priority and he was therefore pleased to note the additional capacity in the care home community, although a long-term funding solution for Adult Social Care was needed. He advised that negotiations with the Government would continue to ensure a funding solution was received. He also welcomed the support generally to Norfolk's businesses and the new step-down facility at Cawston Lodge.
- 10.10 The Cabinet Member for Communities & Partnerships wished to place on record her thanks to all the staff from different organisations, not just the frontline staff such as the fire service and trading standards who had been monitoring businesses and warning about scams and the customer services team for taking calls relating to test and trace. She also highlighted the work of the museums, library and adult education services who had provided online activities and entertainment which had contributed to the wellbeing of residents which she hoped would continue during the next lockdown period.
- 10.11 The Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation & Performance agreed that the report highlighted the huge range of work carried out by Norfolk County Council staff on behalf of the residents of Norfolk. He drew attention to the work done in using technology to support staff working from home, but also emphasised that the service was continuing with other initiatives such as training events and the HR and Finance Transformation Programmes.
- 10.12 The Chairman highlighted that Norfolk County Council was in a far better place than it had been in February/March 2020.
- 10.13 Cabinet reviewed the report and **RESOLVED** to:
1. **Endorse** progress against the initial lessons learned action plan set out in Appendix A of the report.
- 10.14 **Evidence and reasons for Decision**
- It is usual practice to capture learning at the end of an incident both to ensure the process does not distract those focussed on responding to the incident and so that learning can be considered and captured with knowledge of the full facts. Given the length of the Covid-19 emergency, it will likely be some time before we can undertake a full and formal de-brief process. Therefore, capturing and progressing initial learning points now is crucial to enable us to provide the best possible response to Norfolk communities.
- 10.15 **Alternative Options**
- Cabinet may wish to amend or make additions to the Improvement Plan

The Cabinet Member for the Environment left the meeting at 11am.

## **11 Finance Monitoring Report 2020-21 P6: September 2020**

- 11.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services which gave a summary of the forecast financial position for the 2020-21



Revenue and Capital Budgets, General Balances, and the Council's Reserves at 31 March 2021, together with related financial information.

11.2 The Cabinet Member for Finance introduced the report, during which the following points were noted:

- The forecast level of overspend at the end of September 2020 was just under £4m, down from £5.314m in August 2020.
- Grant funding totalling £81.29m to cover covid-related costs had been received.
- Forecast covid-related financial pressures had increased to £92.135m.
- Notice was received on 22 October of an additional £5.607m which was Norfolk County Council's share of the £1bn additional support to Local Authorities announced by the Prime Minister on 12 October, together with approximately £850k to support the tiered approach adopted by the Government to contain the transmission of the virus.
- Details of the Council's allocation for the Emergency Assistance Grant to support families and individuals in financial hardship was set out in tables 4a-4c of the report, which together with the details of other allocations received made up total funding of £81.291m for covid-related expenditure.
- The first claim had been submitted for compensation for lost income, which totalled £2.657m and the outcome of negotiations with MHCLG were awaited.
- Regarding the Revenue Budget, Adult Social Care saw a £3m reduction in its departmental overspend which was mainly caused by the partial removal of the increase in estimated purchase of care, together with a reduction in back office costs.
- The Adult Social Care departmental overspend stood at £4.9m, however the report highlighted three key areas of risk – purchase of care costs which were being closely monitored not only from a value for money perspective, but also due to the changes in the way the government was funding costs of caring for elderly people discharged precipitously from hospitals into the care of the County Council by the NHS in March 2020. The situation was being closely monitored.
- Children's Services forecast remained at break-even, although any second surge could destabilise the situation.
- One increasing area of concern in Children's Services was the overspend in the High Needs Block of £10.6m which meant the cumulative overspend on the Dedicated Schools Grant was forecast to be over £30m at 31 March 2021. Work continued with the Department for Education to find a solution and a further update was expected to be presented to Cabinet in January 2021, although in the meantime the Government had legislated that local authorities were not responsible for funding the deficit on the DSG, although the increase in demand for placements remained a cause for concern.
- The overspend in Community & Environmental Services department had been reduced by £478k, mainly due to the allocation of its share of the first tranche of the government lost income support grant.
- The forecast underspend in Finance General had been reduced due to the allocation of the £2.657m lost income claim and also unbudgeted covid-related purchase of PPE, increased staff and other related costs.

The Cabinet Member drew Cabinet's attention to the recommendations it was being asked to agree:

#### Recommendation 1

Cabinet was being asked to approve the dissolution of NCC HH Limited. Horatio House had been set up at very short notice following the sudden collapse of Great Yarmouth Community Trust and had been established to continue to provide alternative education provision until the end of the academic year. Year 10 students had found alternative provision and the year 11 students had completed their GCSE's. Having delivered its purpose Horatio House would be dissolved.

#### Recommendation 2

If Cabinet approved the borrowing it would facilitate the purchase of 163 acres of land at Outwell, at a cost of £1.4m, which would be added to the County Farms Estate. It would also allow the overall county farms holding to be maintained at well over the minimum level of 16,000 acres. A number of under-utilised holdings and barns had recently been reviewed and significant receipts had been secured to date this year. Capital investment in the estate had significantly exceeded capital receipts and therefore the borrowing requirement would be repaid from sales, although an element of the profit generated would be held back for future purchases.

#### Recommendation 3

The new schemes set out in the draft capital strategy would be scored before they were added to the programme. The scoring provided an objective method for determining the values of markedly different projects on a council-wide basis, maximising the use of limited government grants, developer contributions and other third-party funding. The marking scheme had proved sufficiently flexible in the past in comparing large and small projects; externally and internally funded schemes; quick purchases and long-term ambitions. The framework, if agreed, would lead to a revised capital programme which County Council would be asked to approve in February 2021.

- 11.3 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport welcomed the purchase of the 163 acres at Outwell which would not only provide a return on the investment but would also help young farmers in that area of the county to access the farming industry which was significant now when growing food for our own county was very important.
- 11.4 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention highlighted the work done by Adult Social Services in reducing the variance over budget by the end of the financial year. They faced an incredibly challenging set of circumstances and to see the variance reduce to 1.9% over budget at this stage of the year was an excellent result, whilst delivering services to, and protecting, the vulnerable residents of Norfolk in a methodical way whilst managing the risks of not delivering a balanced budget, which was a legal requirement.
- The Cabinet Member also highlighted that the Public Health Team, despite the demands and pressures on the service, was on target to meet their budget, whilst recruiting and growing the team and again, he congratulated all those involved.
- 11.5 The Cabinet Member for Commercial Services & Asset Management supported the purchase of the land at Outwell, as the £1.4m investment could actually

generate £2.25m in income from rent from the 121 agricultural tenants and would also allow younger people to enter the farming industry in the county.

In addition to the revenue income, the purchase would also enable the County Council to use some land for development by Repton. So far this year, approximately £2.9m had been secured in capital receipts, with an additional £2.9m due from the sale of old barns and land expected by the end of the year.

- 11.6 The Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy referred to the £2.65m of income received from the government through the lost income grant, although it needed to be noted that this was after 5% had been taken off and 75% of the total paid, leaving a shortfall of approximately £800k. If the full amount of lost income had been received, a balanced budget would have been achieved.

- 11.7 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services endorsed the recommendation of dissolving NCC HH Ltd which had served its purpose.

Regarding the Children's Services budget, the Cabinet Member advised that the department was on track to achieve a balanced budget, although progress against the transformation programme hadn't been as quick as expected due to the lock down.

- 11.8 The Chairman highlighted the capital strategy and prioritisation scoring method, as there was a substantial increase in demand on the capital programme and the projects needed to be evaluated to ensure they would deliver value for money, social value, economic value and also conformed with the business plan. It was accepted borrowing was currently cheap, but there also needed to be a strong value for money case behind projects to ensure they delivered value for money to the County Council.

- 11.9 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention endorsed the recommendations and highlighted that cross-party support had been received in the past to guarantee the county farms estate should not be allowed to fall below 16k acres. The policy of maximising the return of assets of Norfolk County Council to support services and protect vulnerable people meant it was necessary to purchase land to replace land that had been sold or developed, with a small proportion of the revenue raised used to purchase replacement land to ensure the estate retained a minimum of 16k acres.

- 11.10 In summing up, the Cabinet Member for Finance endorsed the thanks to core team members in the spending departments, particularly Adult Social Services for the work done in negotiating with central government and impress upon them the need to deliver a long-term funding solution for Adult Social Care. He also thanked the Executive Director of Children's Services for continuing with their transformation programme to build on the successes they had achieved.

- 11.11 The Chairman formally moved the recommendations.

- 11.12 Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

1. **Approve** the proposal to dissolve NCC HH Limited as set out in Appendix 1 paragraph 3.4.

2. **Recommend to County Council** additional prudential borrowing of £1.4m to be available for the purchase of farmland at Outwell and associated costs, subject to approval, as set out in paragraph 4.1 of Capital Appendix 2.
3. **Approve** the draft capital strategy and prioritisation method as the basis for developing the 2021-22 capital programme, as set out in Capital Annex 2;
4. **Note** the period 6 general fund forecast revenue overspend of **£3.956m** noting also that Executive Directors will take measures to reduce or eliminate potential over-spends;
5. **Note** the COVID-19 grant funding received of **£81.291m**, the proposed use of that funding, and the related expenditure pressures resulting in net Covid-19 pressure of **£10.844m**.
6. **Note** the period 6 forecast shortfall in savings of **£17.382m**, noting also that Executive Directors will take measures to mitigate savings shortfalls through alternative savings or underspends;
7. **Note** the forecast General Balances at 31 March 2021 of £19.706m, before taking into account any over/under spends;
8. Note the expenditure and funding of the revised current and future 2020-23 capital programmes.

#### 11.13 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision:**

Two appendices are attached to this report giving details of the forecast revenue and capital financial outturn positions:

**Appendix 1** summarises the revenue outturn position, including:

- Forecast over and under spends
- Covid-19 pressures and associated grant income.
- Changes to the approved budget
- Reserves
- Savings
- Treasury management
- Payment performance and debt recovery

**Appendix 2** summarises the capital outturn position, and includes:

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

#### 11.14 **Alternative Options**

In order to deliver a balanced budget, no viable alternative options have been identified to the recommendations in this report. In terms of financing the proposed capital expenditure, no grant or revenue funding has been identified to fund the expenditure.

#### 12 **Progress on the Council's Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Objectives 2020-2023**

- 12.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Community & Environmental Services summarising the progress over the last six months to deliver against the Council's Equality, Diversity & Inclusion Objectives for 2020-2023 and the additional actions agreed by full Council on 20 July 2020. It also included a brief update of the impact of Covid-19 on equality, diversity and inclusion.
- 12.2 The Executive Director of Community & Environmental Services reminded Cabinet that it had set out its ambitious agenda in December 2019, which had been supplemented by a motion agreed by Council in July 2020 and the report updated Cabinet on the progress made to date and the future actions.
- 12.3 In introducing the report and moving the recommendations, the Cabinet Member for Communities & Partnerships highlighted that Cabinet had agreed to conduct a review of how the County Council worked and communicated as an organisation in order to identify any unconscious or structural bias. In July 2020, Council had supported a motion to tackle discrimination and prejudice and would receive an update report by the end of 2020. The report included the progress made to date under the various objectives from the motion agreed by Council, together with an update on the impact of Covid-19 on people with protected characteristics and on equality, diversity and inclusion.

The Cabinet Member wished to place on record her thanks to all the officers involved in the work. Work to deliver the objectives would continue over the next three years.

- 12.4 The Chairman highlighted that this was a long-term plan to show the work being carried out against the various aspects of equality, diversity and inclusion until 2023.
- 12.5 Cabinet considered the report and **RESOLVED** to:
1. **Note** the progress against the Council's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Objectives 2020-2023 and the actions set out in the Motion agreed by Full Council on 20 July 2020.
  2. **Note** the latest version of the COVID-19 equality impact assessment (last reviewed by Cabinet on 11 May 2020), which summarises the impact of COVID-19 on people with protected characteristics (see Appendix C).
  3. **Agree** that the COVID-19 equality impact assessment should continue to inform decision-making across the Council wherever appropriate, to ensure that the Council's resilience and recovery effort is accessible and inclusive.

12.6 **Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

Refer to the report.

12.7 **Alternative Options**

The equality, diversity and inclusion objectives for 2020-23 and the associated key activity areas were agreed by Cabinet in December 2019. Cabinet could decide to change, add or delete an objective or key activity area. This would need to be

balanced against the need for the Council to comply with the requirements of the Equality Act 2010.

For the actions relating to the motion agreed by Full Council in July 2020, it would be for Full Council to consider any change, addition or deletion in relation to these specific agreed actions.

### **13 Adult Social Care Market Position Statement & Quality Account 2021-2024**

13.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services setting out the Adult Social Care Market Position Statement and Quality Account 2021-2024.

13.2 The Executive Director of Adult Social Services wished to place on record his thanks for the way the care market in Norfolk had responded to covid-19, particularly when being asked to remain working as another peak built, and for continuing to show the bravery and the professionalism they had shown whilst keeping the best interests of people using the service at the heart of their work.

13.3 The Chairman endorsed the comments made and also thanked everyone for the work they had done and continued to carry out.

13.4 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention endorsed the comments made, highlighting the debt owed to everyone who had worked hard and at great personal risk to keep vulnerable people protected within the care market in Norfolk throughout the pandemic and going forward. He also praised the excellent relationship with Norfolk Care Association (NorCA) which was the overseeing body for various different businesses in the care market.

In introducing the report and moving the recommendations, the Cabinet Member advised that the report was an annual report which also incorporated the quality report and highlighted the increased focus on the £29m capital strategy; the increasing number of services which were judged as outstanding; the unlocking of a £6m programme in conjunction with Suffolk to provide funding for training; and the acknowledgment that NCC had sourced emergency PPE which had been made available to front-line staff early on in the pandemic. An Editorial Board would be established to review the performance and provide a quarterly update.

13.5 The Chairman highlighted the vision to support people to be independent, resilient and well through the Promoting Independence Strategy by market shaping and the changes that had been made across the system to support everyone in the care market into the future.

13.6 The Cabinet Member for Finance reiterated the financial challenges faced and again highlighted that a long-term funding solution was needed from the Government.

13.7 Cabinet considered the report and **RESOLVED** to:

1. **Approve** the Adult Social Care Market Position Statement Update 2021-2024 (Appendix 1 of the report) for publication.

### **13.8 Evidence and Reasons for Decision**

Refer to Appendix 1 of the report 'Adult Social Care Market Position Statement and Quality Account – 2021-2024'

The Care Act (2014) introduced new duties for local authorities to facilitate and shape a diverse, sustainable and quality market known as market shaping. The Market Position Statement is a document that analyses the care market from these perspectives and presents the steps that the Council is taking to meet its responsibilities under the Care Act. The document is a key piece of analysis to support the Council and its partners who undertake market shaping in the care market.

### 13.9 **Alternative Options**

No alternative options have been identified.

## 14 **Limited Company Consents**

14.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services asking it to approve the formation of a new subsidiary company of Repton Property Developments Limited, St Edmunds Park Estate Management Ltd.

14.2 In introducing the report and moving the recommendations, the Cabinet Member for Commercial Services and Asset Management said that Cabinet was being asked to approve the formation of a new subsidiary company of Repton Developments Ltd, to be named "St Edmunds Park Estate Management Ltd".

Cabinet noted that it was a requirement to set up an estate management company which was part of the development of St Edmunds Park at Acle which would be responsible for managing the development. The company would be owned and controlled initially by Repton Property Developments, although once all the plots were sold the company would be transferred to the residents of St Edmunds Park to own and run, the commitment to which was set out in the purchase documents. Repton Property Developments would not have any involvement with the Company once the company had been transferred to the residents.

The Repton Board had approved the creation of the company and the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services had reviewed and approved the proposal. Once created, two Directors would need to be appointed to run the company and the proposed Norfolk County Council appointees were Harvey Bullen and Al Collier.

14.3 Cabinet considered the report and **RESOLVED** to:

1. **Approve** the formation of a new subsidiary company of Repton Property Developments Limited, St Edmund's Park Estate Management Ltd.
2. Once created, **approve** the appointment of NCC directors to the new company as detailed in Appendix A of the report.

**15 Reports of the Cabinet Member and Officer Delegated Decisions made since the last Cabinet meeting:**

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

**Decisions by the Leader & Cabinet Member for Communities & Partnerships.**

- [Scope of Whole Council Review of Unconscious & Structural Bias.](#)

**Decision by the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport**

- [Covid Bus Services Support Grant \(CBSSG\) Restart Grant](#)

The meeting ended at 11.45am.

**Chairman**



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



### **Statement to Cabinet from Cllr Andrew Proctor re support for vulnerable families**

With the changes made to the national and as a result local situation from Thursday what I have to say about Norfolk's support for vulnerable families is even more relevant.

Concerns have been raised locally and nationally about the best way to support our residents and communities as the coronavirus pandemic continues.

The Government has put in substantial support to children and families through the benefits system and local government's support has been in addition to that.

The council's Norfolk Assistance Scheme, which has been in place since 2013, provides emergency cash or food and essential household items such as white goods and beds. Recognising the pressure people of all ages would be under, we set aside £500,000 from government Covid-19 funds to add to the existing £1.150m annual Norfolk Assistance Scheme budget to provide advice and support to people. That was in April.

In the period from April to September we spent £625,000 from this fund helping people with food, fuel, exceptional household items and other welfare support. The remainder of the £1.15m core budget and the additional £500,000 is forecast to be spent by the end of March in order to address the increasing demand for those families and individuals in financial crisis.

We also increased staffing to provide more people with advice and support, including advice on benefits claims. Covid-19 has meant many people have had to tackle the complexities of the benefits system for the first time, and of the £500,000, £120,000 is being used to pay for this.

In addition, we made a £100,000 grant from Covid-19 funds to the Norfolk Community Foundation to support their work and help take their fund to over £1m.

That's a total of £1.75m overall. But that's not all

In August we had the £1.016m Emergency Assistance Grant from the government for food and essential supplies. It isn't ringfenced, and this gave the Council the opportunity to use this valuable resource to support our residents and communities in the best way we could.

That money was never intended to be used for free school meals. The Government ran a free school meal voucher scheme, the Covid Summer Food Fund, over the summer holidays, and made clear that the emergency

assistance grant should not duplicate that provision. If the Government reintroduced a holiday food scheme and provided sufficient funding, we would, of course, support its delivery.

There have been and continue to be many calls on this limited fund. Primarily we have used it to support people with Covid-related rent arrears and to help the most vulnerable people buy food and cover household bills. We have also provided laptops to support children and vulnerable adults in financial crisis.

So far, we have made payments or provided equipment to 676 people, at a cost of £170,000. This includes £157,000 spent on food, fuel and essential household items, £6,000 for digital equipment for education, and £7,000 to cover rent arrears.

We have set aside a further £144,000 for laptops and other digital support, to expand the group of children from disadvantaged families who can access education online and maintain social contact as well as assisting people in financial crisis into work.

Inevitably, a combination of seasonal unemployment, the ending of the furlough scheme, although that's now been delayed for a month, likely further Covid-19 outbreaks resulting in people needing to self-isolate and the new restrictions will increase family hardship over the winter months. To address that we have committed £502,000 to cover food, energy household equipment and rent arrears for the period through to March.

We have made a further grant of £200,000 to the Norfolk Community Foundation to support vulnerable families this winter. I'm delighted that by doing this we can help the foundation to maximise the help it can make available by matching contributions from businesses and charitable donors.

We have spent or allocated the whole £1.016m, and the further £1.75m of other funds referred to earlier. We believe this is the right way to support families and communities in Norfolk. Given the changes since Saturday we need to know how the Emergency Assistance Grant and other funds can be extended by central government so that we in local government can use them to help people in hardship.

I will be publishing this statement, with a note of how to make applications to the Norfolk Assistance Scheme.

### *Note*

Applications for help can be made to the Norfolk Assistance Scheme on the county council website - <https://www.norfolk.gov.uk/care-support-and-health/support-for-living-independently/money-and-benefits/norfolk-assistance-scheme> - or for those who don't have internet access by calling 01603 223392 option 5.

Awards that can be made include:

- A three-day award for applicants who have made an application for Universal Credit
- A seven-day award for people who are furloughed, are self-employed or have been made redundant and are awaiting verification of their Universal Credit application
- Awards to applicants with no recourse to public funds

**Cabinet**  
**2 November 2020**  
**Public & Local Member Questions**

Agenda item 6	Public Question Time
6.1	<p><b>Question from Lesley Grahame</b>  Nearly 4 000 people have signed a petition to keep two lime trees on Tombland, wanting to defend the trees that give amenity, shade, habitat and flood protection to their area, and improves its air quality. Many have expressed wider concerns for the incremental loss of trees &amp; green spaces for development</p> <p>I'm told that Conservation Area Appraisal was used which does not consider natural heritage. Given the twin crises of climate and species extinction, will the Cabinet member introduce:  A default presumption of preserving mature established trees  An Assessment process that gives substantial weight to the ecosystem and amenity services that trees provide, before considering their removal, such as CAVAT or TEMPO.</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Martin Wilby</b>  In relation to the specific scheme at Tombland, of the 22 existing trees we need to remove two of these to enable the scheme to be delivered, however we will be replacing these with five new trees.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that two trees will be removed, and this is a not a decision that has been taken lightly. We carried out a public consultation on the proposals and as a result of feedback we carried out further survey work and made some changes to the scheme design. We also sought and took account of the advice of appropriate experts.</p> <p>We recognise that the tree planting in Tombland is of significant value, which is why we have used the project as an opportunity to diversify and increase planting, ensuring that tree cover in Tombland is secured for future generations while also responding to the reconfigured uses in space.</p> <p>The replacement trees will be of a minimum heavy standard size classification – these trees are much larger than saplings and will have an immediate presence in the streetscene. They will also increase the resilience of the overall Tombland tree planting in our changing climate, with increasing pressures from pests and diseases, and will increase biodiversity. Pollution tolerance and mitigation was another consideration in the selection of tree species.</p> <p>We will be improving rooting conditions for the retained existing trees by installing a permeable surface below them and addressing the treatment around the base of the stems to allow unimpeded future growth.</p> <p>More generally, all highway projects where trees may be impacted are discussed with appropriate experts, to ensure that we can reflect current best practice and guidance, and their advice is taken into account by our highway design teams. The County Council also has a well established Tree Safety Management Policy in place, and as part of the Council's Environmental Policy we have recognised the importance of planting more trees to improve biodiversity and as potential mitigate measure for climate change.</p>

	<p>Therefore, I do not think that there is a need to amend the existing approach or policy.</p>
6.2	<p><b>Question 1 from Christine Marshall</b> To the local community, Holt Hall is a much loved part of its history, a local asset, for over 70 years a source of income for local businesses, livelihoods for local residents, a venue for active volunteering as well as for its primary School, Youth Project, residents on Open Days and events and a Norfolk wide facility of which it is inordinately proud.</p> <p>What community consultation has NCC undertaken with Holt Town Council, community groups and residents in the locality about the impact on them of the sale of Holt Hall?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr John Fisher</b> We have engaged with those who use the outdoor learning provision at Holt Hall to consider the impact of ceasing day and residential visits. Engagement has taken place with stakeholders - principally schools, Holt Hall staff and volunteers as well as partners such as Friends of Holt Hall and a local holiday company offering services on the site. No decision has been taken regarding the future of the building.</p>
6.2.1	<p><b>Question 2 from Christine Marshall</b> What steps has the council taken to explore the potential of identifying and establishing partnership working with local interested parties to save on site educational provision?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr John Fisher</b> We are consulting on ceasing the current day and residential provision. We have not sought partnerships, as the approach being evaluated is to leave this market to other providers. We are not consulting on closing Holt Hall, and the future of the building is not yet decided.</p>
6.3	<p><b>Question 1 from Brian Donovan</b> NCC says it is keen to promote volunteering and its value in the community. The council must be aware of the huge contribution volunteers have made as part of the Holt Hall “family”. Some volunteers who have died have memorial trees funded and planted in the Victorian wall garden. Volunteers add value with the planting of the walled garden, assist the Head Gardener with management of the woodlands, raising funds through a pop up cafe and Run Norwich, adding to the beauty and ethos for children’s outdoor learning and mental well-being.</p> <p>What will the council do in a lasting way to respect the value of these voluntary contributions and protect the memorials to those whose commitment was so strong?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Greg Peck</b> A decision has yet to be made about the future of Holt Hall. Once a decision is taken about the service delivery of outdoor learning on November the 17th the council will consider future plans for the building and its land and any associated matters to be</p>

	<p>considered, including the voluntary contributions and memorials. If there are specific concerns about memorials, I would ask that Mr Donovan contact the Corporate Property Team <a href="mailto:corp.propertyteam@norfolk.gov.uk">corp.propertyteam@norfolk.gov.uk</a></p>
6.3.1	<p><b>Question 2 from Brian Donovan</b> NCC sold the lower lake off. It is not maintained as it should be now. The main lake contains rare fish, the woods contain semi ancient and protected trees, and delicate habitat that needs continuous care. They have several layers of protection (eg SSSI). How seriously do NCC take their responsibility to protect these environments?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Greg Peck</b> A number of protections exists for environmental assets – notably around protected trees and SSSI landscapes – enforced by a number of bodies, including the Local Planning Authority. Environmental issues will be flagged up, should the site be disposed, with purchasers (who will ultimately be liable) and who will need to consider the maintenance of these sites. The environmental legislation that exists already is the most appropriate to protect these natural assets.</p>
6.4	<p><b>Question from Kate Jewell</b> Before it is decided to cease the provision of current outdoor learning services at Holt Hall and potentially dispose of the vacated land and buildings, the value to society of the site should be protected.  What are the council's views on a proposal to protect, through planning constraints and sale conditions this valuable natural environment and county wildlife asset, its ancient woodland and scientifically significant lake, the skills and inspiration of the team, and overall, the present mission (which council says it supports) providing young people's opportunity to learn, love and value the natural world and their part in its future?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Greg Peck</b> No formal decision has been made on the future of Holt Hall. Should it be declared as surplus to NCC's requirements, we will work with our agents to identify what the best method to bring this site to the market would be. This will also consider what the likely interest would be in the site and this could be as a going concern, for a restricted use, or on an all enquiries basis. Ultimately the decision on any use (different to the current use) would need to be made by the Local Planning Authority.</p>
6.5	<p><b>Question from Iona Chamberlain</b> Cllr Fisher stated 'closing Holt Hall is not the end of Outdoor Learning in Norfolk' and agreed that it is an important part of any curriculum. The impact of Covid 19 has affected all providers and The Telegraph expect half of UK centres to close, because residential, which are a major source of income, are currently restricted by the DfE.  What research has been carried out, which gives the council confidence that there will be sufficient providers operating in 2021 and what will the Council do to support schools if there is a lack of provision?</p>

	<p>Cllr Fisher specifically mentioned Brancaster Activity Centre will no longer be running residentials</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr John Fisher</b> Outdoor learning and residential provision is offered within the market by a range of local and international providers. Norfolk is fortunate to have a number of such centres located within the county and we have sought to understand the planned offer and some of the current challenges in at least 10 other centres which offer significant programmes including a core offer of residential activity packages. All centres are currently affected by the impact of the pandemic and the continuing need to maintain social distancing etc which restricts their ability to offer residential programmes</p> <p>In the financial year 2019 – 2020 43 Norfolk schools out of over 450, and 1 Norfolk university, used the residential facilities at Holt Hall. This was approximately 7% of all residential outdoor learning visits undertaken by Norfolk schools. In addition, 32 Norfolk schools completed day visits, and 9 schools used the campsite. This highlights that most Norfolk's schools already make use of other centres and locations to deliver outdoor learning to Norfolk children and young people.</p>
6.6	<p><b>Question 1 from Nic Hopkins</b> Children's Services is considering the future of Holt Hall as a Centre for Outdoor Learning. I worry that ceasing to provide these services is the wrong choice. Closing the environmental study facilities and grounds risks losing valuable professional skills, experience and reputation for Norfolk and a centre of excellence according to customer feedback assessments.</p> <p>If there is a funding gap of £85,000 per year, why not take further time to explore the options of additional services, commercial partnerships, sponsorships and revenues to provide cost-effective future outdoor learning, personal development and mental health for Norfolk and the region's children for years to come?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Andrew Jamieson</b> We have not sought partnerships, as the approach being evaluated is to leave this market to other providers. The funding gap is considerably larger than £85,000 per annum, which was the average figure before Covid-19, as there is currently no income. In addition, there is a significant requirement for maintenance and a long-term future would require substantial capital investment.</p>
6.6.1	<p><b>Question 2 from Nic Hopkins</b> Has the Children's Services Team in the review process had suggestions about possible partners and additional services, and how have these been evaluated?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr John Fisher</b> We are consulting on ceasing the current day and residential provision. We have not sought partnerships, as the approach being evaluated is to leave this market to other providers and taken on the role of strategic enabler. We are not consulting on closing Holt Hall, and the future of the building is not yet decided</p>
6.7	<p><b>Question from Susan Vaughan</b> Holt Hall is a unique, secure, valuable asset with potential to generate additional</p>

	<p>income through extended activity, and the ability to substantially add premium value to areas of social, health and preventative services that NCC and its partners deliver to vulnerable young people individuals, families and groups.</p> <p>What discussions internally and with potential partners have been undertaken to establish how such a venue could meet multiple statutory functions by supporting the cost effective delivery of other services, in addition to its current environmental education role which leads on NCC's Environmental Policy of more engagement with the public about biodiversity and making Norfolk carbon neutral by 2030?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Greg Peck</b></p> <p>Holt Hall is an expensive to maintain building for the local authority and is unlikely to offer a cost-effective solution to provide multi-agency statutory functions. Our objective is to make our estate carbon neutral by 2030 and we are engaged in several measures to achieve this.</p> <p>A number of protections exists for environmental assets – notably around protected trees and SSSI landscapes – enforced by a number of bodies, including the Local Planning Authority. Environmental issues will be flagged up, should the site be disposed, with purchasers (who will ultimately be liable) and who will need to consider the maintenance of these sites.</p> <p>The environmental legislation that exists already, is the most appropriate to protect these natural assets.</p>
6.8	<p><b>Question from Thomas Green</b></p> <p>As a Norfolk teacher, headteacher, inspector and Education Department associate, I witnessed first-hand the transformational impact and education benefit to children visiting Holt Hall. Exposure to nature and the outdoors is a key factor in maintaining and improving mental health and well-being. The review landscape has now changed. The UK Children's Commissioner has drawn attention regarding children's well-being adversely affected by the Covid crisis. Councils will be judged by how they remediate this situation.</p> <p>What is the assessed impact of any proposed closure on children and young people and where is the evidence to support it?</p> <p><b>Response Cllr John Fisher</b></p> <p>We agree on the importance and impact of great outdoor education and want to ensure that we take a leadership role to support and challenge all schools on this part of their curriculum. We are currently consulting on ceasing our direct delivery of residential and day visit provision at Holt Hall. It is a difficult decision but would enable us to focus our limited resources. It would also assist other providers, some of whom are struggling, as the Council would no longer be a direct provider, but an enabler in the market.</p> <p>We have a duty to ensure that public money is appropriately spent. In the last financial year 7% of Norfolk School residentials took place at Holt Hall. This represents a small share of the current market.</p>
6.9	<p><b>Question 1 from Susan Dowling</b></p> <p>Could the cabinet member for Assets please provide an update relating to the former</p>



	<p>Cosy Carpets building, Minstergate ,in Thetford. I believe from media reports the building was compulsory purchased by Norfolk County Council; rumours locally suggest that this building has been returned to it's previous owner. Could you please confirm whether this is the case ?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Greg Peck</b> We have reached a settlement with the previous owners, as part of which we have transferred the freehold of the former Cosy Carpets site to them, a settlement we feel is fair for all sides. There were strong arguments on both sides and we also need to bear in mind the cost of going to Upper Tribunal, with us, as the Acquiring Authority expected to pay all parties' costs.</p>
6.9.1	<p><b>Question 2 from Susan Dowling</b> Could you please confirm the total expenditure incurred by Norfolk County Council in relation to the Cosy Carpets building over the past 10 years; including the estimated cost of the asset, if it has been returned to previous owner.</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Greg Peck</b> This case dates back to the original Compulsory Purchase Order for the site back in 2013. The valuation and compensation payable for sites purchased under CPO can be extremely complex, as the court will look at the potential value for a site at the time of acquisition (in this case 2014).</p> <p>There are a number of other factors that we needed to take account of including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The planning status of the various plots, as well as a Certificate of Appropriate Alternative Development for 12 apartments and 2 dwellings on Plot 1 and a restaurant / flat on Plot 3.</li> <li>2) The difficulty in establishing values in this area, given the relatively low volume of comparable sites.</li> </ol> <p>The time and level of the correspondence between the various agents – do show that this is not a simple matter, however the current value of the site is therefore not a material consideration. In terms of the total cost, this was subject to an FOI (Freedom of Information Request ENQ-404037-M0P3K8) we will update with latest costs and provide directly to the enquirer.</p>
6.10	<p><b>Question from Adrian Vaughan</b> At a time when NCC has a projected budget deficit, why is the cabinet refusing to allow access to its extensive estate at Holt Hall Outdoor Learning Centre, or permit its staff to deliver services at any remote site or even in school grounds? Permitting this would meet current thwarted customer demand and earn much needed income through the sale of Covid secure expertly taught school day visits, family activities and private bookings at Holt Hall.</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr John Fisher</b> The current guidance from the DfE clearly states that they advise against overnight educational visits. Day visits are permitted but require full consideration of the range of measures in place for schools, including consistent grouping and COVID-19 secure measures at the destination and during transport. Full and thorough risk assessments both in relation to COVID-19 and the normal guidance regarding</p>

	<p>educational visits are required, as is appropriate insurance. Within this context, the service provided would therefore at a minimum require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional staffing both by the school and by the service provider</li> <li>• Smaller pupil groups to facilitate social distancing</li> <li>• Transport arrangements within consistent groups</li> <li>• Social distancing arrangements of keeping people two metres apart, particularly if staff support more than one group</li> <li>• Hygiene measures to ensure any equipment that is handled is disinfected before being used by a second or subsequent person</li> <li>• Additional cleaning, including between sessions, where multiple groups attend a centre</li> <li>• Arrangements for separate (specialist) transport, including if a pupil or member of staff develops symptoms during the trip</li> </ul> <p>School leaders are understandably cautious regarding such arrangements. They have spent and are spending considerable time on the operational arrangements in their schools and communication with parents and the wider community. Therefore, the likely uptake of services is deemed low. Within this context the provision of services is not deemed viable and by some education leaders it is also not deemed desirable due to the increased risks whilst cases are rising.</p>
6.11	<p><b>Question 1 from Philip Bacon</b> Holt Hall is a much loved part of Norfolk history, a local asset for more than 70 years, a source of income for local businesses and local resident livelihoods, a venue for active volunteering as well as for its Primary School, Youth Project, residents, Open Days and events as well as being a Norfolk wide facility of which it is inordinately proud.</p> <p>What community consultation has taken place with Holt Town Council, other town and parish councils, local community groups and residents about the impact of the sale of Holt Hall?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr John Fisher</b> We have engaged with those who use the outdoor learning provision at Holt Hall to consider the impact of ceasing day and residential visits. Engagement has taken place with stakeholders - principally schools, Holt Hall staff and volunteers as well as partners such as Friends of Holt Hall and a local holiday company offering services on the site. No decision has been taken regarding the future of the building.</p>
6.11.1	<p><b>Question 2 from Philip Bacon</b> What steps have the council taken to explore establishing potential new partnerships with local interested parties to save on-site educational provision?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr John Fisher</b> We are consulting on ceasing the current day and residential provision. We have not sought partnerships, as the approach being evaluated is to leave this market to other providers. We are not consulting on closing Holt Hall, and the future of the building is not yet decided.</p>
6.12	<p><b>Question from Stephanie Gilbert</b> Holt Hall is a unique, secure, valuable asset which has the potential to generate</p>

additional income through extended activity, and the ability to substantially add premium value to areas of social, health and preventative services that NCC and its partners deliver to vulnerable young people, individuals, families and groups.

What discussions internally and with potential partners have been carried out to establish how such a venue can meet multiple statutory functions by supporting the cost effective delivery of other services in addition to its current environmental education role which leads NCC's Environmental Policy of more engagement with the public about biodiversity and making Norfolk carbon neutral by 2030?

**Response: Cllr Greg Peck**

Holt Hall is an expensive to maintain building for the local authority and is unlikely to offer a cost-effective solution to provide multi-agency statutory functions. Our objective is to make our estate carbon neutral by 2030 and we are engaged in a number of measures to achieve this.

A number of protections exists for environmental assets – notably around protected trees and SSSI landscapes – enforced by a number of bodies, including the Local Planning Authority. Environmental issues will be flagged up, should the site be disposed, with purchasers (who will ultimately be liable) and who will need to consider the maintenance of these sites.

The environmental legislation that exists already, is the most appropriate to protect these natural assets.

## Appendix C

Agenda item 7	Local Member Issues/Questions
7.1	<p><b>Question from Cllr Brian Watkins</b> Are you disappointed that Norfolk Conservative MPs voted with the Government to not fund the poorest families with food for their children over the half term and future holidays, as the demand for support from households facing financial hardship as a result of COVID-19 has outstripped the government funding available. Will you join Councils such as the Liberal Democrat run Portsmouth City Council, in not wanting any child to go hungry, and provide families of children with food tokens to cover the Christmas period?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Andrew Proctor</b> I recognise that government has made significant support available to vulnerable people through the benefits system, in addition to the Emergency Assistance Grant and other general purpose and specific Covid-19 grants to local authorities. We know this has been a tough year for many people in Norfolk and we've been working with partners to support the most vulnerable, especially as winter kicks in and the furlough scheme ends. Norfolk County Council will continue to support people in the best way possible with the funds available to us. I announced on Thursday a £200,000 fund in partnership with Norfolk Community Foundation to support families and vulnerable people facing hardship over the coming months and into the Christmas period.</p>
7.2	<p><b>Question from Cllr Steff Aquarone</b> What would need to be done to make Norfolk – not just Norfolk County Council - carbon neutral by 2030?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Andy Grant</b> Achieving the target of carbon neutrality is a stretching goal, either for Norfolk County Council or for the county of Norfolk as a whole. Whilst Norfolk County Council has set a target of 2030, the current Government target for the country as a whole, including Norfolk, is to achieve this goal by 2050.</p> <p>Norfolk County Council has set itself this ambitious target as an authority and has taken significant strides towards this goal, including through its commitment to plant a million trees, and by changing many aspects of the way the organisation operates, including through its ambitious Smarter Working programme and in the approach taken to managing its estate.</p> <p>In terms of the wider county, Norfolk County Council recognises that it has a responsibility to work in partnership with many different organisations and bodies including our District partners, the private sector, key environmental organisations, and higher education, particularly working with the University of East Anglia who have considerable expertise in this field.</p> <p>As elsewhere in the country, achieving carbon neutrality will involve a concerted effort across many sectors including construction, agriculture, transportation, and energy production. Alongside adopting a range of positive new measures across these different sectors, the Committee on Climate Change suggests that there will also be a residual amount of impact that will have to be addressed through some form of offsetting activity. This is likely to involve an increasing reliance on renewable</p>

	<p>electricity as the main component within the wider energy mix, both within our homes and underpinning how we travel.</p> <p>Over the coming period, NCC will continue to provide a leadership role where appropriate, helping to coordinate key activity, developing sustainable partnerships, and communicating and delivering our plans in close partnership with the communities we serve.</p>
7.3	<p><b>Question from Cllr Dan Roper</b></p> <p>School Headteachers in England have just received an email from the Department of Education informing them that their allocations of laptops for disadvantaged pupils have been slashed by around 80%. This was just two days after the government used its Covid-19 emergency powers to impose a new legal duty on schools to provide a remote education to any pupil unable to attend lessons because of the pandemic. Can you confirm what the position is in Norfolk and how many/what percentage of school children will now receive a laptop?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr John Fisher</b></p> <p>Children are supported with a laptop in a number of ways, including the government schemes. For example, schools have for some time made laptops available to children and young people. We do not have an overall percentage of how many children benefit from this across Norfolk, as allocations are made directly to academies</p>
7.4	<p><b>Question from Cllr Tim East</b></p> <p>Did you accept the European Environment Agency data in February of a six-metre rise in sea levels which would see areas such as Great Yarmouth, Lowestoft, Hemsby and Wroxham under water? If you did not, what level of sea rise and damage to Norfolk are you working to?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Andy Grant</b></p> <p>We take account of the evidence gathered by the Government via the lead UK agencies, including the Met Office and the Environment Agency. This is set out in the 'Exploratory sea levels projections for the UK to 2300'. The projections in this do not suggest that the levels will be in the range proposed by The European Environment Agency along any stretch of the UK coastline.</p> <p>A more detailed analysis of potential sea level rise impacts on Norfolk is currently being undertaken through the "Broadlands Futures Initiative": a partnership including the Environment Agency, Broads Authority and Norfolk County Council. This work has not yet drawn any final conclusions but in regard to this question offers the following advice:</p> <p>It depends on the timescale considered, the assumed future emission scenario, and the level of statistical confidence assumed within the scenario results.</p> <p>For the purposes of Broadlands Futures Initiative (BFI) we've presented a number of different emissions scenarios to reflect uncertainty about the future, but to also emphasise that change is inevitable. These scenarios range between RCP 2.6, where emissions are restricted to limit warming to 2 degree C above pre-industrial levels, and RCP 8.5 which is 'business as usual' with continued high emissions. Within each of these scenarios we show the 50th percentile values in our BFI</p>

documents. Based on this approach we are presenting the possibility that by 2120 mean sea level could be between 54cm and 102cm higher.

However, for the purpose of undertaking flood risk assessments for development current national guidance requires a conservative approach is adopted. Therefore scenario RCP 8.5 is still used, but the 70th and 95th percentiles being used. In this approach the assumed sea level by 2125 is up to 160cm higher.

So in both case well below the 6m figure mentioned

7.5

**Question from Cllr John Timewell**

How has the business birth rate in Norfolk over the period between 2014 and 2018 compared to the UK average?

**Response: Cllr Graham Plant**

On average, there was one start-up in Norfolk per 149 people of working-age in the period 2014 to 2018. For the UK, there was one start-up per 109 people of working-age in the same period. Therefore, more start-ups per capita were evidenced in the UK in that period than in Norfolk. This was the case for every year in that period, as shown in the table below.

**Table: Start-up rates in Norfolk and the UK 2014-2018**

	Norfolk: Business starts per year	Norfolk: working age population	Norfolk: people per business start	UK: Business starts per year	UK: working age population	UK: people per business start
2014	3,330	525,000	158	350,305	41,036,700	117
2015	3,380	527,000	156	382,755	41,241,000	108
2016	3,910	528,500	135	413,900	41,443,900	100
2017	3,945	530,400	134	381,885	41,545,600	109
2018	3,300	531,400	161	380,580	41,645,800	109

Source: Office of National Statistics (Business Demography; Population estimates)

We should note, however, that the UK average start-up rate will include London, where start-up rates are very high. We should also note that Norfolk's 'business death' rate is also relatively low: those businesses that do start often have a higher survival rate in Norfolk than elsewhere. For instance, the five-year survival rate in Norfolk in 2018 was 45.1%, whereas in London it was 39.3% and, in the UK, only 42.4%.

There are some instances in Norfolk where the picture bucks the national trend. At Hethel Innovation Ltd for example, which the County Council set up with the specific purpose of delivering economic outcomes for Norfolk communities, support has been provided direct to many start up businesses. They have seen around 95% of these still operating 2 years after set-up, in comparison to the national picture where the Small Business Association reports that 30% of start-ups fail in their first year alone

7.6	<p><b>Question from Cllr David Harrison</b> What are the opportunities to increase the financial benefits that Norse brings to Norfolk County Council over the course of the current Medium Term Financial Plan?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Andrew Jamieson</b> The County Council has set out its shareholder expectations for Norse over the current Medium Term Financial Strategy. This includes an expectation of an increased dividend being received from £2.2m for 2020/21 incrementally increasing to £3m for 2023/24. The shareholder expectations have been discussed by the Norse Board and will be reflected in the company's current and future business plans. In addition a budget proposal for 2021/22 is to renegotiate the Norsecare contract which, if agreed by the County Council and Norse, would reduce the contract value by £3m and provide a further financial benefit for the County Council."</p>
7.7	<p><b>Question from Cllr Tim Adams</b> Norfolk County Council has been ranked 103rd out of 151 local authority areas by the UK Safer Internet Centre for performance in providing appropriate online safety resources to help children online. What are the main reasons for this low ranking and what is being done to get Norfolk ranked higher?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr John Fisher</b> The ranking is derived from the responses given by schools using a specific online evaluation tool (360Degreesafe) combined with the proportion of schools in an area engaging with it. Schools are not required to engage with this tool, it is a voluntary offer often promoted alongside the Online Safety Mark.</p> <p>The evaluation of school effectiveness on this issue is part of the Ofsted Inspection framework, within both the Quality of Education and the Personal Development, Behaviour and Safety judgements. It is also considered as part of safeguarding checks.</p> <p>A very small proportion of Norfolk schools have engaged with the tool, which explains the ranking. We will consider any future opportunities to alert schools to this tool. Up until lockdown, Educator Solutions offered CEOP (Child Exploitation and Online Protection command) accredited courses for schools and also offered Online Safety training for governors.</p>
7.8	<p><b>Question 1 from Cllr Sarah Butikofer</b> I believe recent decisions by the Children's Services department in my County Division of Holt, have failed to take account of the impact of those decisions will have on the local community and indeed the children of the County of Norfolk. Groups and panels have made recommendations behind closed doors, leading to confusion, for portfolio holders and improbable financial promises, in relation to the future of Holt Hall, and Holt Primary School. Would Cabinet not agree decisions about the future of key educational assets should be made in a completely transparent and open process the public can have confidence in?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr John Fisher</b> The Local authority has the duty to forecast places and secure new places through commission new schools or expanding existing ones. There is a robust process for this, which includes taking all major financial recommendations to the Capital Priorities Group. The membership of this group includes cross party representation as well as school leaders. The group meets regularly and takes account of strategic</p>



	<p>planning for ensuring there are enough places for children across the county. They receive information and updates about the forecast needs and sufficiency planning. They scrutinise proposed projects and recommend funding allocations. Officers work closely with district colleagues and also ensure local members are aware of the process of any application to expand and build a new school. The Town Council is very supportive of the new school, as reported in the EDP: "The current school, as you are aware, is constrained as it sits on two sites and is split by the busy A148. The proposed new school is therefore a huge community benefit which would be welcomed by many families in the town."</p> <p>Holt Hall is a building in North Norfolk that is currently used by Norfolk Children's Services to deliver residential and day visits, largely from Norfolk schools. Last year 43 Norfolk schools out of over 450 completed residentials there, 32 schools held a day visit and 9 stayed at the campsite. 70% of the total income for the provision of this service comes from the residentials. This represents just over 3,000 children using Holt Hall in the last financial year out of approximately 130,000. The service is requiring a significant subsidy from the council to continue to operate and so we are consulting on the cessation of this service. This is a decision for Norfolk's Children's Services to make, as with any other service decision. We have spoken to the users of Holt Hall, and to staff to understand this decision. The staff consultation stage ends on 7th November. The final decision to cease this element of our Outdoor Learning service, that is the residential and day visit element, will be taken by the Executive Director for Children's Services following the closure of the staff consultation. This decision will then be taken to Corporate Board on the 17th November. The future of Holt Hall has not been decided. Norfolk County Council will consider that once any decision has been taken about a change in service approach and should it be no longer needed by Children's Services.</p>
7.8.1	<p><b>Question 2 from Cllr Sarah Butikofer</b> Due to the recent confusion can you confirm for the public record, what is the process now for a decision on Holt Hall, will you commit to giving North Norfolk District Council a say in the future of this facility.</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr John Fisher</b> The answer is contained in response to question 1 from Cllr Butikofer above.</p>
7.9	<p><b>Question from Cllr Mike Smith-Clare</b> At the cabinet meeting in September Cllr Fisher said 'It is not the role of Children's Services to ensure all children are fed. Our budget....I would love to have the budget.' While Children's Services may not have the budget why did he not refer to £500,000 unspent from the Emergency Assistance Grant for Food and Essential Services the council was supposed to spend within twelve weeks of receipt in July and why was that money not used to feed hungry children in Norfolk during the recent half term holiday?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Andrew Proctor</b> The Cabinet member for Children's Services rightly outlined what the role of Children's Services was and reassured members that if a child or family is in need Children's Services steps in to assist. When September Cabinet took place there was still funding available as we didn't receive the Defra grant until August. Although reference was made in the DEFRA correspondence to spending the bulk of this within 12 weeks Defra also referred to this being the 2020/21 budget allocation and</p>



	<p>acknowledged that funds would no doubt be spent beyond October. There was not at that time, nor since, any suggestion that further such specific grants would follow. On that basis a prudent approach was developed to ensure that support could be provided to those facing financial hardship not just from August through to the end of October, but through the winter period which is likely to be the most difficult time for people facing financial hardship due to Covid. The long-standing Norfolk Assistance Scheme has continued to be in place through half term to provide emergency cash or access to food due to the coronavirus situation. While the Cabinet Member did not talk about the Norfolk Assistance Scheme directly Norfolk County Council has used it to help those families who need it to access support.</p>
7.10	<p><b>Question from Cllr Colleen Walker</b></p> <p>In response to my question on 7 September 2020 while the consultation on the future of Holt Hall was ongoing Cllr Fisher said 'There is no intention for Holt Hall and Whitlingham to be closed for good and I'm not quite sure where Cllr Walker has got that interpretation from'. Having therefore ruled it out as an option during the consultation can we assume he misspoke when last week he said Holt Hall would be closing or did he tell me and Norfolk a lie?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr John Fisher</b></p> <p>We are consulting on the cessation of a service at Holt Hall. We are not consulting on closing a building. There has been no decision about the future use of Holt Hall. In the early stages of the process to engage with some stakeholders as well as staff and friends there may have been some confusion. I [Cllr Fisher] apologised for that immediately and I set the record straight at the end of the meeting and through a subsequent press release. Contrary to what the councillor infers I did not tell anyone a lie however she wants to interpret what I said</p>
7.11	<p><b>Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp</b> <u>Strategic Infrastructure in West Norfolk</u></p> <p>The Govt recently refused Norfolk County Council's application for funding for the £50 million West Winch Relief Road. How is the County going to secure the funding so that the Relief Road is in fully in place before the development of up to 4,000 homes?</p> <p><b>Response: Cllr Martin Wilby</b></p> <p>You will be pleased to hear that Government has not refused an application for funding and active work to continues to try to bring this important scheme to fruition.</p> <p>The Department for Transport (DfT) has not turned down our Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) for the West Winch Housing Access Road (WWHAR).</p> <p>To clarify, the importance of the scheme has been recognised by Transport East and prioritised for investment in July 2019. A draft Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) was submitted to the Department for Transport (DfT) for the Major Road Network (MRN) fund and the DfT requested that we provide additional information. We have responded to that request and since that time completed work on a full economic appraisal and prepared a revised SOBC. The SOBC indicates that the scheme demonstrates high value for money - due to the nature of the alignment of the route, this is predicated on housing delivery benefits rather than traditional transport benefits.</p> <p>We are currently finalising the updated Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) for</p>

	<p>the scheme and intend to submit this to the DfT by the end of the year.</p> <p>The importance of the scheme to Norfolk continues to be recognised in our Norfolk Strategic Infrastructure Development Plan, and we are continuing to work hard to try to secure the funding needed.</p> <p>In the meantime, the numbers of any new housing coming forward before the Access Road is in place will need to be agreed as conditions of planning permissions. This will be based on evidence supplied by the individual applicants and reviewed and considered by both the Borough and County Council development management teams before any recommendations are made to the relevant planning committee.</p>
--	--

**Agenda item 10 - NCC Response to Covid-19 – Initial Lessons Learned – Progress Update**

**Statement by the Chair:**

This report looks back at what the Council, its staff and partners have done and have achieved together over recent months. Work which is still going on and which will need to continue given the changed circumstances for the country and county over the last 48 hours.

In some respects it's wrong to single out individuals who have stood out as everyone has done their bit. But Dr Louise Smith our DPH and her team have been outstanding with Dr Smith probably now the most well known face and voice in Norfolk.

As Members of the Council we owe them all our thanks for everything that has been done, and continues to be done, in support of Norfolk's residents, businesses and communities. Communities we know that have responded so well to support themselves and others and who I am sure will step up to do it all over again between now and 2<sup>nd</sup> December.

The Council's work will also be stepped up again in response to the lockdown to come into effect on Thursday.

The messages we have put out are not to be complacent and complacency has definitely not been the case in Norfolk. Throughout the county we have taken strong local action.

We have seen a big increase in Covid cases nationally. Locally figures have risen too although so far not to the same extent. People are rightly worried and concerned.

What we clearly want to achieve by 2 December is to keep Norfolk's Covid infection rates low so that if the current tiers remain then we can return to a less restrictive position of what is now Tier 1.

The report shows what has been done; it says very firmly keep following the advice and guidelines to keep us all safe and well – hands, face and space; it points out the work done to revitalise the economy; it summarises the work done by service area; and most importantly it shows that we haven't stood still but are planning and being prepared for further Covid peaks – such as those we are now facing.

The Covid pandemic isn't over by a long way. It's important we don't get bogged down with resource intensive enquiries now but follow this path of learning and capturing and progressing that learning as we stand up our response again, working better together for our communities. Appendix A from page 91 sets out the 13 key learning points; what has been done; who is leading the action and response; the timescale and what progress has been made towards it. I'm sure fellow Cabinet members will also wish to comment on this and other aspects of the report. But let me say I am confident that we have been doing the right things; we have the systems, plans and procedures in place; our people are working hard for the whole of Norfolk; and we are learning from what has been done. We are as ready as we can be for the next set of challenges coming our way.

We know that from Thursday the whole country will be facing significant restrictions on how we can go about our lives and how businesses are yet again having to change. And we know that those restrictions have been put in place after detailed consideration of lives versus livelihoods and the potential adverse impact on the NHS.

I'm not going to rehearse all the specific restrictions or places that have to close as they are on our website, news outlets and government information. These are some of the key issues relevant to Norfolk at this stage from 5 November to 2 December:

- Schools, nurseries, colleges and universities will remain open
- Venues providing childcare and support groups will remain open
- Workplaces should stay open where people cannot work from home – for example agriculture, food processing, construction or manufacturing sectors
- Tradespeople can continue to work safely in people's homes
- HWRCs will remain open but the reuse shops will close
- Leisure centres will be closed but outdoor playgrounds will remain open
- Care home visiting restrictions remain in place
- The County Council will be supporting vulnerable people through its normal services, through the provision of food and the Norfolk Assistance Scheme for those in need or experiencing hardship
- People who are extremely clinically vulnerable won't be required to "shield" but are advised to minimise social contact including not going to shops. DHSC & MHCLG will be writing to individuals by the end of the week
- The charities the Norfolk Community Foundation works with will also be there to help vulnerable people
- In addition, district councils have their own individual support mechanisms
- Local authorities have been allocated a total of £1.1bn across the country for discretionary schemes to support businesses
- Remembrance services can continue but not inside places of worship
- Community contact tracing will be increased with a more local focus on test and trace
- The Norfolk Resilience Forum and its structures has been stood up across the county

The overriding message I can give to everyone in Norfolk is to continue to follow the guidelines – frequent hand washing, use face coverings at places that require them and keep your social distance – 2m away. But most importantly the new restrictions are in place for a very good reason - to attempt to contain the spread of the Coronavirus. Please follow them to protect yourself, protect others and protect Norfolk.

I wouldn't want to see anyone in Norfolk flouting the law and tying up police or other resources. The County Council and its partners will continue to help everyone in Norfolk in the best way we possibly can. If you are experiencing hardship in any way, shape or form please contact us **on 0344 800 8020**

## Questions requiring written responses from the Cabinet Meeting held on Monday 2 November 2020

	<b>Question and response:</b>
<p>Agenda item 7 Local Member Questions</p> <p>Supplementary Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp.</p>	<p>Norfolk County Council is committed to Infrastructure First. But West Norfolk Council wants to put in the Application for 1300 new homes before the West Winch Relief Road is in place, when the highway network cannot sustain the additional pressure.</p> <p>Lynn's economy as a Sub-Regional Centre, preferred Norfolk port for the export of manufacturing and recyclables, and tourism gateway, cannot thrive as it should, without a proper standard Major Route Network leading to it from the South.</p> <p>As the Highways Authority, can Norfolk County Council enhance its business case for the Relief Road, recognising that there can be no development before the bypass?</p> <p><b>Response from the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure &amp; Transport:</b> The planning application for new homes in the northern portion of the West Winch Growth Area has been submitted by the developer. The Borough Council as the local planning authority will determine the planning application in the normal way. This will include reviewing the Transport Assessment submitted by the applicant in consultation with both NCC as the statutory Highway Authority and Highways England (HE) who are responsible for the A47 trunk road.</p> <p>The amount of any new housing that could come forward before the new road is in place will need to be agreed as conditions of the planning permission. This will be based on evidence supplied by the applicant and reviewed and considered by both the Borough and County Council development management teams before any recommendations are made to the relevant planning committee. It will be for the King's Lynn and West Norfolk planning committee to determine the application and decide upon any recommended conditions.</p> <p>Borough and County officers are continuing to work hard to try to secure the funding needed for the scheme and the business case will make the strongest possible arguments for the new road. However, we cannot simply state that none of the houses can come forward before the road is open. The due process puts the onus on the developer to provide the evidence and for the local planning authority to decide accordingly.</p>
<p>Written supplementary question from Cllr Colleen Walker</p>	<p>In cabinet you said 'There is no intention for Holt Hall and Whitlingham to be closed for good'. Are you now suggesting that Norfolk should have been able to distinguish between closing services and closing Holt Hall from that when you made no such distinction in any media appearances you made?</p> <p><b>Response from the Cabinet Member for Children's Services:</b> In my response to questions for cabinet yesterday I answered this point. I had given additional clarity at the end of the cabinet meeting in September, followed by a written statement.</p>

<p>Written supplementary question from Cllr Mike Smith-Clare</p>	<p><b>Question and response:</b></p> <p>The Leaders answer does not explain why money known to be available was not used to feed hungry Norfolk children over half term. Nor does it explain why the cabinet member said there were no resources when there obviously were. Why weren't hungry children in Norfolk helped by the county council during half term when they had money to do so?</p> <p><b>Response from the Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategy &amp; Governance:</b></p> <p>The long standing Norfolk Assistance Scheme continued to be in place through half term to provide emergency cash or access to food due to the coronavirus situation, as well as other essentials such as paying Covid-induced rent arrears to prevent homelessness.</p>
--	--