

Cabinet

Minutes of the Meeting held on Monday 5 August 2019 at 10am in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Norwich

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 Greg Peck	Cabinet Member for Commercial Services & Asset Management.
Cllr Martin Wilby	Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.

Local Members Present:

Cllr Alexandra Kemp
Cllr Brenda Jones

Other Members Present:

Cllr Steve Morphew
Cllr David Bills

Executive Directors Present:

Tom McCabe	Executive Director of Community & Environmental Services and Head of Paid Service.
Helen Edwards	Chief Legal Officer & Monitoring Officer
Simon George	Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services
Gary Heathcote	Director of Commissioning (for Executive Director of Adult Social Care.)
Fiona McDiarmid	Executive Director of Strategy & Governance
Sara Tough	Executive Director of Children's Services

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Graham Plant (Vice-Chairman and Cabinet Member for Growing the Economy) and Cllr Andrew Jamieson (Cabinet Member for Finance).

2 Minutes

The minutes from the Cabinet meeting held on Monday 15 July 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3 Declaration of Interests

There were no declarations of interest made.

4 Items of Urgent Business

There were no items of urgent business.

5 Public Question Time

5.1 The list of public questions and their responses are attached at Appendix A to these minutes.

5.2 The Chairman invited Mr Christopher Keene to ask a supplementary question. Mr Keene asked if Cabinet was aware that Peter Wadhams, Professor of Ocean Physics at Cambridge University had said that the Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change had ignored feedback about the release of methane in the arctic, which had some hundreds, or thousands, of billion tonnes compared with just five billion tonnes present in the entire atmosphere now, with a 20-30% chance of a massive methane release in the next five years, so we need an even faster reduction in emissions than they demand.

In reply, the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport said that the introduction of more electric vehicles together with reductions in emission levels of all other vehicles would lead to improvements being made.

6 Local Member Questions/Issues

6.1 The list of Local Member questions and their responses are attached at Appendix B to these minutes.

6.2 As a supplementary question Cllr Alexandra Kemp said she did not accept the answer given and that there was a failure of scrutiny and accountability in the Council. She added that the proposal to send out a local plan for minerals and waste with incineration and fracking included was wrong, when 65,000 people in west Norfolk had voted against incineration and also that fracking should be taken out.

The Chairman said that this was a statement rather than a question.

6.3 As a supplementary question, Cllr Brenda Jones asked when the Council had last explored the relative costs for direct provision compared to intervening in the private market and also if the Cabinet Member had spoken to Norse about its capacity for a massive expansion as an alternative.

The Chairman deferred the question to the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care who replied that Norse was not managed by the County Council, it was an arms-length organisation run by its own management. He added that when residential services and care homes had been run by the County Council they had been more expensive and achieved less satisfactory outcomes. He added that NorseCare had been able to remove more than £1m of costs from the delivery of services and had also increased the quality of services. The

Cabinet Member added that he was content that the Norse model was successful whilst also achieving good value for money.

The Chairman welcomed Norfolk's Police & Crime Commissioner, Lorne Green, to the meeting and invited him to join Cabinet for the discussion of agenda item 7 (Norfolk Fire & Rescue Authority Statement of Assurance 2018-19).

7 Norfolk Fire and Rescue Authority Statement of Assurance 2018-19.

- 7.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Community & Environmental Services setting out how the statement of assurance provided an accessible way in which communities, Government, local authorities and other partners may make a valid assessment of their local fire and rescue authority's performance.
- 7.2 In introducing the report, the Chief Fire Officer, Stuart Ruff, advised that Norfolk County Council was required to produce the Statement of Assurance annually within the guidance of the National Framework. The intent was to ensure that the service was accountable to the communities it served, with the document being clear for people to understand, the main focus being on the way the operation was run, as well as financial and governance arrangements.
- 7.3 The Cabinet Member for Communities & Partnerships stated that the report was required to show that the service was delivering on its Integrated Risk Management Plan for the year, as well as meeting the requirements of the National Framework for Fire & Rescue Authorities 2018. She added that during 2018-19 the fire service had been governed by the Communities Committee and the Statement provided assurance that financial governance and operational management requirements were being met for the reporting year of 2018-19.
- 7.5 Lorne Green, Norfolk Police & Crime Commissioner (PCC) said he was pleased the report acknowledged the collaboration agreement between the Norfolk Constabulary and the Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service. He added that it held the potential to ensure communities represented were kept safe and showed a cost-effective use of tax payers' resources which he was happy with. The PCC was also pleased to report that a joint public meeting had recently been held in Fakenham which had allowed members of the community to ask questions and that he hoped there would be more opportunities for similar meetings in other locations in the future.
- 7.6 The Cabinet Member for Communities and Partnerships moved the recommendations as set out in the report.

7.7 Decision

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

1. **Note** the assurances that financial, governance and operational management of Norfolk Fire and Rescue Service meet statutory requirements.
2. **Approve** the Norfolk Fire and Rescue Authority Statement of Assurance 2018/19 (Appendix A of the report)

7.8 **Alternative Options**

Refer to Cabinet report.

7.9 **Reasons for Decision**

It is a legal requirement to publish an annual Statement of Assurance. The format and content was for the Fire Authority to agree.

8 **Transformation of Mental Health Services for Children and Young People.**

8.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Children's Services updating Cabinet on progress with the transformation of Children and Young People's Mental Health Services (CYPMHS) and seeking decisions on a small number of issues that would enable the programme to move to the next phase.

8.2 In introducing the report the Executive Director of Children's Services advised that the report set out the important first step towards integration between Children's Services and National Health Services Partners. She added that the proposal had been supported as a way forward through the Sustainable Transformation Partnership with providers; Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) governing bodies; and the Joint Strategic Commissioning Group.

8.3 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services proposed the following amendment to one of the recommendations in the report:

- Delegate to the Executive Director of Children's Services authority to enter into a revised Section 75 agreement with the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) that will enable and support the Alliance model, in consultation with the ~~Leader~~ Cabinet Member for Children's Services and the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services.

8.4 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services highlighted the following points in the report:

- the future service model moved away from the current system by linking Norfolk County Council services with those provided by the NHS.
- Cabinet was being asked to change the Section 75 Agreement to provide a better service to meet the needs of the national recommendations.
- Clinical evidence had shown that the appropriate age range was between 0-25.
- The single Board for CYPMH, bringing together senior commissioners and providers across Norfolk and Waveney would be chaired by the Executive Director of Children's Services.
- Expanding the current Section 75 Agreement to include all relevant expenditure, would result in a larger agreement totalling approximately £34m.

8.5 **Decision**

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

- **Agree** to the development of an Alliance approach to commissioning and provision;
- **Agree** to the establishment of revised system governance arrangements.
- **Delegate** to the Executive Director of Children's Services authority to enter into a revised Section 75 agreement with the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) that will enable and support the Alliance model, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children's Services and the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services.
- **Note** the progress with the transformation of mental health services for children and young people;
- **Note** the emerging service model ("THRIVE");
- **Note** the importance of effective engagement and communications to the programme and the potential requirement for consultation on the service model;
- **Note** the proposed next steps for the programme.

8.6 **Alternative Options**

Refer to Cabinet report.

8.7 **Reasons for Decision**

The reasons for the decision are set out in section 2 of the Cabinet report.

9 **Norfolk Youth Justice Plan Refresh 2019-21**

9.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Children's Services setting out how the existing Norfolk Youth Justice Plan had been refreshed to outline the actions, risks and opportunities identified to ensure that the desired outcomes for young people and the victims of their crime would be achieved by Norfolk Youth Offending Team and the Norfolk Youth Justice Board Partnership in 2019-21. The Plan also set out the key priorities for the 2019-21 period which would be delivered in partnership with the required statutory agencies on the Norfolk Youth Justice Board (Health, Police and Probation) and others such as the County Community Safety Partnership, Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner and the Norfolk and Suffolk Criminal Justice Board.

9.2 The Executive Director of Children's Services introduced the report, setting out that Council considered and approved the Plan annually which was a statutory requirement under Section 40 of the Crime and Disorder Act. The Executive Director added that the work undertaken this year included more robust action to provide a plan which also took into account the new national priorities.

9.3 The Cabinet Member for Children's Services highlighted the following points when presenting the report:

- Cabinet was being asked to recommend the Norfolk Youth Justice Plan refresh 2019-2021 to Council for approval.
- The new plan had been produced in line with national guidance.

- The new plan included a new system titled “child first, offender second” with a lot of work being carried out, headed up by the Executive Director of Children’s Services, to prevent children entering the criminal system.
- A ‘Setting the Strategic Direction’ workshop had been held in March 2019 which had identified how to engage with children and young people and new ways of working based on preventing young people from entering the criminal system.
- The number of first-time entrants into the criminal system was at an all-time low, although unfortunately the percentage of reoffending rates was slightly higher due to a smaller cohort in the criminal justice system.

The Cabinet Member moved the recommendations in the report.

9.4 The Cabinet Member for Innovation Transformation and Performance applauded the plan, particularly the prevention aspects; the highlighting of the damage caused to the victims of crime and the restorative impact. He added that he was proud that Norfolk was a safe community and that the Plan would help to ensure this remained the case.

9.5 The Chairman also welcomed the use of the word ‘prevention’ as well as the restorative approach and highlighted the “plan on a page” as well as the confirmed financial position for 2019-20.

9.6 **Decision**

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to

- **recommend** the Norfolk Youth Justice Plan refresh 2019-2021 to Council for approval.

9.7 **Alternative Options**

Refer to Cabinet Report.

9.8 **Reason for Decision**

As the lead public sector partner within the statutory multi-agency partnership Norfolk County Council is required by section 40 of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998 to formulate and implement an annual Youth Justice Plan after consultation with the Norfolk Youth Justice Board partnership.

In March 2019 the Norfolk Youth Justice Board held a ‘Setting the Strategic Direction’ workshop. The Chair of the Board and the YOT Management Team delivered a series of presentations on future challenges for 2019-20 and our progress and achievements against the 2018-19 annual plan. The Board subsequently agreed the 2019-20 plan priorities at the March 2019 Board meeting and those priorities are contained in this refreshed plan which will be considered at the Norfolk Youth Justice Board meeting on 25 June 2019.

10 Autism Strategy

10.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services providing an update on the All-Age Autism Partnership Board (NAPB) and the workstreams in place to support the implementation of a co-produced local All-Age Autism Strategy 'My Autism, Our Lives, Our Norfolk'.

10.2 In introducing the report the Director of Commissioning, Adult Social Care, advised that Cabinet was being asked to agree the co-produced Strategy and promote and champion the Strategy through their work within the County Council.

10.3 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention welcomed the Strategy which had already been unanimously supported by NHS Partners from the Clinical Commissioning Groups at the Health and Wellbeing Board. The work covered a whole system approach and had been co-produced by the Autism community and a number of professional bodies, providing a strategic vision, giving people with autism equal opportunities in life within the County. The Cabinet Member commended the Strategy to Cabinet.

10.4 In moving the recommendations, the Cabinet Member said he hoped all Councillors and staff would complete the autism e-learning training.

10.5 Decision

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

- **Agree** the Strategy, 'My Autism, Our Lives, Our Norfolk'.
- **Promote** and champion the strategy within the County Council.
- **Agree** that Cabinet Members complete the Autism e-learning training to lead by example.

10.6 Alternative Options

Refer to Cabinet Report.

10.7 Reason for Decision

The work of the NAPB supports the implementation of the Autism Act (2009) National Autism Statutory Guidance (2016) and Strategy 'Think Autism'. It defines the activity underway to support the statutory bodies' responsibilities in undertaking their duties under the Autism Act 2009, Statutory Guidance 'Think Autism' 2014, Care Act 2014 and the Equality Act 2010.

11 Adult Social Care Annual Quality Report 2018-19

11.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services providing a detailed evaluation of quality in the market both in terms of Care Quality Commission (CQC) ratings and the Council's quality assurance team risk ratings and our proposals for continuous improvement going forward.

11.2 The Director of Commissioning, Adult Social Care introduced the report, setting out the proposals to provide continuous improvement in the future.

11.3 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention advised Cabinet of the welcome announcements made in the news on 5 August 2019 for £153m of new funding for the NHS in Norfolk and Suffolk.

- £70m for new diagnostic centres across the county which would be administered by the Norfolk & Norwich University Hospital. The previous shortage of capital funding for new equipment had led to longer waiting times.
- £40m for the Norfolk & Suffolk Foundation Trust for mental health services in Norfolk which was a substantial investment and would be used to provide new beds.
- £25m for South Norfolk CCG, as the lead authority to develop and improve primary care across the county, which was a key part of Norfolk County Council's prevention strategy.

The Cabinet Member added that work was just starting on the five-year plan for Norfolk & Waveney and this additional funding was very timely and would be spent where it was needed most.

11.4 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention introduced the annual report, highlighting the duty of Norfolk County Council to shape the market. He added that Norfolk County Council, at its budget meeting in February 2019, had invested an additional £11m to support the stability of the care market and help care providers cover the costs of the living wage, meaning workers were appropriately paid for the work they carried out. He added that he fully supported the work and moved the recommendations in the report.

11.5 The Chairman thanked the Cabinet Member for highlighting the additional funding announced by the Government and welcomed the investment made. He added that a clear trend was now being seen in new build homes exclusively aimed at the self-funding market and highlighted the lead role of the County Council.

11.6 **Decision**

Cabinet considered the findings presented in the Annual Quality Report and **RESOLVED** to:

- **Approve** the proposals for improving quality in 2019-20 in Section 5 of the report.

11.7 **Alternative Options**

Refer to Cabinet report.

11.8 **Reason for Decision**

The Care Act places significant duties on Local Authorities to promote and shape their market for adult care and support, so that it meets the needs of all

people in their area who need care and support, whether arranged or funded by the state, by the individual themselves, or delivered direct by the Council.

The ambition is for Local Authorities to influence and drive the pace of change for their whole market leading to a sustainable and diverse range of care and support providers, continuously improving quality and choice and delivering better, innovative and cost- effective outcomes that promote the wellbeing of people who need care and support. This is in line with the Council's Promoting Independence strategy.

Poor quality services are not effective in supporting people to achieve their wellbeing outcomes and deliver poor value for money. It is essential, therefore, that we ensure we know that all the services we pay for are high quality and effective. This requires regular ongoing proactive monitoring of provider performance across the board and effective interventions to restore high quality services if things are beginning to go wrong. The quality framework supports this.

12 Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review – Preferred Options Consultation.

12.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Community & Environmental Services providing information about the proposed 'Preferred Options' consultation stage and including the proposed planning policies for minerals and waste management development and the proposed mineral extraction sites. The next stage in the process would be to consult with stakeholders, including parish councils and the public, on the preferred options consultation.

12.2 The Executive Director of Community & Environmental Services, in introducing the report, advised that the Plan had recently been considered by the Infrastructure & Development Committee as set out in Section 10 of the report. He added that the County Council was part-way through a heavily prescribed process which should lead to formal adoption of a robust, compliant local Plan in September 2021.

12.3 The Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste stated the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Plan review covered the years 2026-2036 and followed on from the initial consultation carried out in the summer of 2018. The report presented to Cabinet included the preferred options consultation and it was essential that a robust and compliant local plan was in place. The Cabinet Member moved the recommendations in the report.

12.4 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport said the Environment, Development & Transport Committee had previously considered the Plan with a focus across the whole county and that he was satisfied the right way forward was to move to consultation.

12.5 The Chairman advised Cabinet that the consultation was likely to start at the end of August, running through September into October 2019.

12.6 **Decision**

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to

- 1 a) **Agree** that the revised Minerals and Waste Development Scheme shall have effect from 1 September 2019;
 - b) **Agree** to the publication of the Preferred Options Consultation Document (and associated background documents).
 - c) **Agree** to carry out the Preferred Options consultation using the methods detailed in the report (ie for a six-week formal consultation period).
- 2 **Delegate** responsibility to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste (in consultation with the Executive Director of Community & Environmental Services) to make minor corrections and non-material changes to the consultation document that are identified prior to publication, if required.

12.7 **Alternative Options**

Refer to Cabinet Report.

12.8 **Reason for Decision**

Refer to paragraphs 4.1 to 4.5 of the report.

13 **Finance Monitoring Report (P3 – June 2019).**

13.1 Cabinet received the report by the Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services providing a summary of the forecast financial position for the 2019-20 Revenue and Capital Budgets, General Balances and the Council's Reserves at 31 March 2020, together with related financial information.

13.2 The Executive Director of Finance & Commercial Services introduced the report which set out the current financial position as at period 3 and made 2 recommendations for additions to the Capital Programme.

13.3 With regard to the first bullet point in the recommendations, the Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation and Performance welcomed the additional £7.766m towards the Local Full Fibre Network (LFFN) which followed a lot of hard work by officers, particularly the Head of IMT, in a competitive bidding process to DCMS against other interested authorities. One reason Norfolk County Council had been successful was following on from the success of the Better Broadband for Norfolk programme to deliver digital infrastructure where the working relationship with Open Reach had been noticed. He added that the money would be used to provide ultra-fast data to county council buildings. He also added that the process for improving mobile phone coverage by allowing mobile phone operators to make use of county council buildings if they wished, would benefit the county council, schools and other council services.

13.4 The Chairman highlighted the following aspects of the P3 Finance Monitoring report:

- The projected overspend had not changed from period 2. Cabinet Members were aware of the overspend which was about demand

management both in Children's Services and Adult Social Care – the Adult Social Care element being due to the strain on the purchase of care budget. This was being offset against the current general underspend.

- The Chairman had written to the new Prime Minister, Boris Johnson, although no reply had been received to date, asking for more certainty around funding and asking for more information on the announced proposals.
- The size of the capital programme, which for 2019-20 was approximately £367m and included projects such as the Great Yarmouth 3rd river crossing, strategic projects such as Better Broadband and capital loans and subsidiaries.

13.5 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention echoed the points made by the Cabinet Member for Innovation, Transformation & Performance about digital broadband which was key to Norfolk and the way services were delivered. He added that access to superfast broadband was important and that he was pleased to see the Council investing large sums of money, consistently over the last 10 years, to improve the broadband offer in the county. The Cabinet Member also echoed the Chairman's points about the capital programme in general, particularly the Great Yarmouth 3rd River Crossing being a key part of that plan. He added that connectivity in Norfolk was important to the overall economic benefits for Norfolk as well as the health of the economy and he was pleased it was being supported to benefit the people of Norfolk.

13.6 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport said that one of Norfolk County Council's priorities was putting infrastructure in place, and he was therefore pleased to see the investment taking place. He added that the Great Yarmouth 3rd River Crossing project was progressing well and building was likely to commence in 2021-22.

13.7 The Chairman fully endorsed the points made about connectivity and investing for the future.

13.8 **Decision**

Cabinet **RESOLVED** to:

1. **Recommend** to County Council an addition of £7.766m to the CES capital programme in accordance with a proposed Norfolk Local Full Fibre Network (LFFN) capital grant agreement with DCMS, approved at 15 July 2019 Cabinet, as set out in appendix 2, paragraph 2.1 of the report.
2. **Recommend** to County Council an addition of £2m to the Children's Services Capital programme to replace revenue contributions. This will be used to support the 2019-20 Children's Services revenue budget as set out in Appendix 2, paragraph 2.2 of the report.
3. **note** the period 3 forecast general fund revenue overspend of £6.108m noting also that Executive Directors will take measures throughout the year to reduce or eliminate potential over-spends;

4. **note** the period 3 forecast shortfall in savings of £4.706m noting also that Executive Directors will take measures throughout the year to mitigate savings shortfalls through alternative savings or underspends;
5. **note** the forecast General Balances at 31 March 2020 of £19.623m, before taking into account any over/under spends;
6. **note** the expenditure and funding of the revised current and future 2019-22 capital programmes.

13.9 **Alternative Options**

Refer to Cabinet Report.

13.10 **Reasons for Decision**

Two appendices attached to the 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
- Changes to the approved budget
- Reserves
- Savings
- Treasury management and
- Payments and debt performance

Appendix 2 summarises the capital outturn position, and includes:

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

14 **Delegated Decisions Reports**

14.1 Cabinet **noted** the following Delegated Decisions:

Cabinet Member for Commercial Services & Asset Management:

- Bryggen Road, King's Lynn.
- Site 1
- Site 2

Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure and Transport:

- Improvements to Thickthorn Junction
- Hardings Way, King's Lynn.

14.2 The Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport highlighted that the Thickthorn junction was a key area of infrastructure being carried out by Highways England. Highways England were being held to account by the County Council to ensure they delivered on their promises, not only for the Thickthorn junction, but also other A47 improvements.

14.3 The Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention said it was heartening to see the progress being made on the Thickthorn junction, adding that the next stage would be the North Tuddenham to Easton A47 dualling, which his constituents wished to see delivered as soon as possible.

The meeting ended at 10.45am.

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.

**Agenda Public Question Time
item 5**

Question received from Dr Iain Robinson:

I am the owner of woodland likely to be destroyed by Route C. A mature oak in my woodland can support over two hundred species of insect, which in turn support bird and mammal life. Veteran trees also provide roosting sites for bats and nesting sites for birds. Can the Councillors explain to me how they will manage to create a net biodiversity gain when habitat that has taken over two hundred years to mature will be destroyed?

Response from the Chairman:

Biodiversity net gain is development that leaves biodiversity in a better state than before. It is the end result of a process applied to development so that overall, there is a positive outcome for biodiversity. We will use the nationally recognised Defra Biodiversity Metric as a tool to assess the changes in biodiversity value through development.

The habitats created to compensate for the loss of habitats to be impacted by the preferred route will include new woodland and wetland with measures designed to benefit the barbastelle bat and other protected species.

Supplementary Question from Dr Iain Robinson

A woodland is made of more than just trees. The woodland soil ecology and understory (wildflowers, grasses, shrubs etc) might take centuries to mature and develop fungus and species diversity. How do the councillors intend to mitigate for such an irreplaceable loss?

Response from the Chairman:

The Defra biodiversity metric takes account of current and future habitat value (distinctiveness and condition) and applies risk factors to any compensation to deal with time to maturity (target condition).

Question from Christopher Keene

The United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report of October 2018 states that we need a 45% reduction in carbon emissions by 2030 compared to 2010 to keep warming below 1.5C above pre-industrial levels, which will demand a radical change to our way of life. How can this occur when the Norwich Western link will increase emissions, as research has proven that new roads generate more traffic, with traffic increasing by an average of 47% above the regional equivalent in areas receiving major new roads according to a March 2017 study by Transport for Quality of Life?

Response from the Chairman:

The modelling data suggests that NWL will result in a reduction in vehicle miles travelled in the opening year (of just over 4%) with a corresponding reduction in CO2 emissions. Increased traffic levels nationally and locally means that by 2040 there is a modelled increase of 1.2% in greenhouse gases attributable to NWL, but this figure does not reflect the governments stated ambition that all new cars and vans to be effectively zero emission by 2040 and does not reflect any potential improvements in vehicles efficiency, or to emissions standards. On this basis it is considered a worst-case scenario. Part of the package of mitigation measures for NWL includes improved facilities for cycling and walking, which is one of the recommendations of the Government's Response to the Committee on Climate Change document.

Question from Jenn Parkhouse, Chair, Wensum Valley Alliance.

Last October the IPCC reported that carbon emissions would need to be reduced to net zero by 2050 to have a reasonable chance of limiting global warming to 1.5 degrees. If the NWL goes ahead and opens in 2025 this would increase carbon emissions by 20%+ (ref OSR Table 5.29 specific to Route C. Why is this committee discussing the merits of Route C instead of questioning the very viability of any new road? This would be in keeping with Council's own declared intention when adopting motion in April this year to consider all future key decisions with regard to their environmental impact, and in alignment with IPCC guidance.

Response by the Chairman:

NWL is not modelled to increase carbon emissions by 20%. Table 5.29 illustrates that in the opening year of 2025, NWL is modelled to reduce both vehicle kilometres travelled and carbon gases by just over 4%.

The environmental impacts of the scheme will be formally assessed through an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). The EIA will be used to fully assess the impacts of the scheme on the environment and to identify any mitigation measures that are required to make the scheme environmentally acceptable.

Question from Mr Stephen Daw.

Welcome Pit, Burgh Castle

Why is MIN203 not a Preferred Site?

Following the meeting of the Infrastructure and Development Committee on 17 July, Officers were instructed to review the conclusion that MIN203 is not Allocated. The report to Cabinet doesn't say if a review has been carried out or what the findings were. However, it is clear that you are being asked to approve the Preferred Options Document without any alterations. The Highways Authority has previously written to say they have no objection to extending Welcome Pit and this is the only mineral site close enough to supply Great Yarmouth. Please correct this contradiction and recommend this as a Preferred Site.

Response by the Chairman:

The comments of the Select committee are listed in paragraph 10.1 of the cabinet report.

One of the comments relates to the decision not to allocate MIN203 (Burgh Castle) which was prompted by a public question to the select committee. The reason that the site is not proposed for allocation, is that we have considered all the sites put forward for minerals extraction and only selected the best that are needed to meet Norfolk's needs. In the context of mineral extraction this means sites with the lowest impact upon amenity and least environmentally damaging. MIN203 (Burgh Castle) has highway limitations being served by a narrow road bounded on both sides by residential properties. Hence it is not supported for allocation on highways grounds. Since the Select committee we have revisited the matter and can confirm that the highways position regarding allocation remains unchanged.

The reference to the removal of the highway's objection relates to pre-application discussions held between the developer and the Highways Authority in which the Highways authority have accepted that through the suspension of several operations on

site that the minerals could be extracted without making the current highways situation worse. However, this does not address the highways limitations of the site and there is a critical difference between not being bad enough to object to a planning application and being good enough to support allocation in a plan. Hence the recommendation remains not to allocate MIN203

Question from Mr Jon Herbert

The report presented today quite rightly focusses on quality of care delivery and continually refers to the 'measurement' so that we can deliver *the outcomes that people want for their lives*. A few years ago NCC asked the BIG QUESTION and a key outcome was that NCC would continue to deliver care for critical and substantial needs. Other needs would be unfunded. If this is still the case how do you reconcile the needs which are not critical or substantial that ARE outcomes that people want for their lives? eg the extended home care call that is purely social because the individual is isolated and lonely.

Supplementary question:

If NCC really want quality based on person centred and outcome based care why do they continue to commission services based on task and time?

Response by the Chairman:

In line with the Care Act, the Council supports people to meet their unmet eligible care needs. The Care Act introduced a national threshold for eligibility for adult social care which the Council follows. This replaces the concept of substantial and critical needs. The Council also meets its duties under the Care Act by ensuring that the outcomes that matter to an individual are key components of their social care assessment

Ensuring care is person centred care is important to meeting an individual's needs. This is why social work in Norfolk is strength based and focused on outcomes, so that every person's care and support plan sets out both the needs and the outcomes to be achieved from their care package. Everyone receives a personal budget to enable this. Some people choose to receive this as a direct payment and arrange care themselves and others ask the council to commission services on their behalf.

Our contracts vary, with some specified arrangements to meet complex needs and others, such as home care based on the number of hours delivered. However, regardless of payment mechanism, all providers are commissioned to deliver against the individual's agreed outcomes, which are set out in their care and support plan.

Appendix B

Agenda Local Member Issues/Questions item 6

Question from Cllr Danny Douglas

What does the announcement of the government's 2050 net zero target do the business case of the Western Link Road?

Response from the Chairman:

The process of submitting a business case to the Department for Transport to secure funding for new road schemes remains unaltered by the Governments net zero emissions announcement.

Supplementary Question from Cllr Danny Douglas

Does the increase in the budget for the Major Schemes Department to prepare the Western Link Road in 2019 - 20 threaten the local bus budget which assists with sustainable transport connectivity in Norfolk?

Response from the Chairman

The additional funding within the 2019/20 financial year for the NWL project is bringing forward capital budget spend that is committed to the project in future years. It will not therefore have an impact on other budget provisions."

Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp

Incineration and Fracking

Following £34 million lost from Council's budget, with the cancellation of the infamous South Lynn incinerator contract for Planning Failure in 2014, Council agreed a No-Incineration-in-Norfolk Policy, ("Appendix M").

West Norfolk is alarmed by the criteria-based Draft Waste Plan, which fails to state our No-Incineration Policy, instead permissively lists forms of incineration (page 56), endangers West Winch Growth Area by permitting prospecting for fracking (page 90), erroneously ignoring prospecting always causes earthquakes.

Can Cabinet amend the Plan to state "in West Norfolk, where 65,000 people voted against incineration in the Borough Poll, applications for incinerators will not be permitted"; and exclude fracking and prospecting for fracking?

Response from the Chairman.

The County's policy regarding No incineration, relates to our role as the waste disposal authority and remains unaffected by the policies proposed within the draft plan. To exercise effective planning control on future minerals and waste development proposals we need to maintain an up to date plan. The Minerals & Waste Local Plan Review proposed will ensure that this remains the case. However, adoption can only take place after the plan has been approved by an independent inspector appointed by the Secretary of State. In order to pass examination, the plan policies must be consistent with National Polices. Currently National policies support both Hydraulic fracturing and thermal

treatment of waste. Our policies therefore set out criteria against which such proposals must be assessed to ensure that the health and amenity of Norfolk's residents are robustly protected. Conversely policies that contradict national policies are likely to result in delays to adopting a replacement plan due to the inspector either rejecting the plan outright or asking for modifications to bring the plan in line with national policy. The longer the delay the more it diminishes the Authorities ability to refuse development proposals and so exposes Norfolk residents to poor development options.

Question from Cllr Brian Watkins

It has taken over a year for the new autism strategy to finally be agreed. The whole process has been beset by difficulties, including accusations that the Council had often failed to fully understand the needs and aspirations of people living with the condition.

Is the Cabinet member now confident that the strategy has the full confidence of the autism community in Norfolk and what guarantee can he give that the poor performance of services for autistic people highlighted in the strategy will see significant improvements in the next 12 months?

Response by the Chairman.

As you are aware in early 2018, Norfolk appointed a national expert in autism to pull together a Norfolk Autism Partnership board to address the statutory requirements of the Autism Act. In addition, in June 2018 an autism commissioner was appointed to drive forward the work of the board.

The Norfolk Autism Partnership Board has been running for just over a year. This Partnership is coordinated by a Partnership Board meets quarterly and is made up of autistic people of all ages family carers, representatives from public sector and third sector organisations. There are 25 members, of whom 9 are autistic people and family/carers. With an expression of interest to join the partnership people are welcome to observe the board. Everyone involved with the partnership board is committed to working in coproduction to respond to the challenges highlight in the strategy to improve the life opportunities of all autistic people living in Norfolk.

The Partnership Board is supported by a wider Norfolk Autism Partnership Group which is open to everyone. There are 87 members of this group and people are welcome to join at any time. This new partnership has been built up since the first meeting in 2018 and effort will continue to strengthen and widen the Partnership, in particular participation in the Norfolk Autism Partnership Group.

There are currently five sub groups of the Norfolk Partnership Board, these are:

- Engagement working group to increase participation, promote co-production and improve communication about the work of the Board.
- Diagnosis working group with work already underway to support current providers to develop and improve the services that they are contracted to deliver, and this will result in changes during the coming months. At the same time NHS and NCC colleagues will be co-producing the design of the future approach and pathway. The Norfolk Autism Partnership Board and it's sub groups will have a key role in coordinating this co-production. For example the Norfolk Autism Partnership Group will use its August meeting to focus on what people want from pre- and post- diagnostic support. This session will be open to everyone.

- Education working group with an implementation plan in place for the NAPB to contribute to the implementation of the SEND Strategy through coproduction.
- Data working group with improvements made to the way the council records autism and the creation of an autism dashboard that will help inform improvements to services and commissioning intentions. In December 2018 all members of the board were involved in the completion and submission of the National Autism Self-Assessment.
- Workforce Development working group has coproduced a basic autism awareness e-learning programme that is currently being rolled out to children's and adults social care and wider council staff. The intention is to make basic autism e-learning available to anyone in Norfolk. In addition, this group also coproduced specialist face to face autism training to embed the learning from the e-learning programme and provide a focus in practice. Both training course will be quality tested with the face to face training course accredited.

I hope that this new structure and approach make a huge contribution to the wellbeing of autistic people across the county.

Question from Cllr Brenda Jones

At Scrutiny Cllr Jamieson said it would be a good idea for the Council to borrow money to invest in the provision of care homes.

Given the concerns about the viability of the care market would it be a good idea to take up this suggestion? If NorseCare were supported to take over failing care homes and to run new care homes then the Council could be assured that there would be sufficient provision of good quality care available

Funding NorseCare to provide this makes sense financially, in terms of standards of care, and would provide security and certainty in the care market.

Response by the Chairman.

The Quality Improvement Strategy sets out a range of proposals that will support both quality and capacity in the Norfolk care market. Together with the annual market position statement these set out the Council's intentions for shaping the market to meet people's need.

I hope that NorseCare, like other providers, will consider any business opportunities to step in where there is shortage of provision or gaps in the market.

Investment is a key part of shaping the market and NCC has created a £29m capital fund to deliver a ten year programme – Living Well Homes for Norfolk – to build more extra care housing with care across Norfolk.

Provision of enough good quality care requires engagement with all parts of the care market and the Council is committed to looking at market shaping opportunities with ALL providers.