

Norfolk County Council**Minutes of the Meeting Held at 10am on Monday 10 December 2018****Present:**

Mr A Adams	Ms A Kemp
Mr T Adams	Mr K Kiddie
Mr S Aquarone	Mr B Long
Mr S Askew	Mr I Mackie
Mr D Bills	Dr E Maxfield
Mr B Borrett	Mr G Middleton
Ms C Bowes	Mr J Mooney
Mr R Brame	Mr S Morpew
Mrs J Brociek-Coulton	Mr G Nobbs
Mrs P Carpenter	Mr R Oliver
Mr M Castle	Mr G Plant
Mr S Clancy	Mr R Price
Ms K Clipsham	Mr A Proctor
Mr D Collis	Mr W Richmond
Mr E Connolly	Mr D Roper
Ms E Corlett	Mr D Rowntree
Mr S Dark	Ms C Rumsby
Mrs M Dewsbury	Mr M Sands
Mr N Dixon	Mr E Seward
Mr D Douglas	Mr C Smith
Mr P Duigan	Mr T Smith
Mr F Eagle	Mr M Smith-Clare
Mr T East	Mr B Spratt
Mr J Fisher	Ms S Squire
Mr T FitzPatrick	Mr B Stone
Mr C Foulger	Mrs M Stone (Chairman)
Mr T Garrod	Dr M Strong
Mr A Grant	Mr H Thirtle
Mrs S Gurney	Mrs A Thomas
Mr R Hanton	Mr V Thomson
M Chenery of Horsbrugh	Mr J Timewell
Mr H Humphrey (Vice-Chairman)	Mrs K Vincent
Mr A Jamieson	Mr J Ward
Mr T Jermy	Mr B Watkins
Mrs B Jones	Mr A White
Dr C Jones	Mr M Wilby
	Mrs S Young

Present: 73

Apologies for Absence:

Apologies for absence were received from Mrs S Butikofer; Mr D Harrison; Mr B Iles; Mr M Kiddle-Morris; Mrs J Oliver; Mr M Storey and Mrs C Walker.

1 Minutes

- 1.1 The minutes of the meeting held on Monday 15 October 2018 were confirmed as a correct record by Council and signed by the Chairman, subject to the inclusion of an apology from Ms K Clipsham and paragraph 9.5.6 being amended to read as follows:

Ms Kemp referred to the business and intellectual **property** service in the Millennium Library in Norwich

2 Chairman's Announcements

- 2.1 The Chairman formally announced the sad passing of Wyndham Northam who had represented Mundesley ward from 2001-2009 and then again from 2013-2017. Mr Northam had been Chairman of the County Council in 1997/98.

The Chairman also announced the sad passing of Patricia Hollis who had been a Labour County Councillor from 1981 to 1985 and had gone on to have a distinguished career in national politics.

Council paid tribute to both former Councillors and stood in a minute's silence as a mark of respect.

- 2.2 The Chairman highlighted a few of the recent engagements she had attended since the last meeting including a presentation of the British Empire Medal to Herbert Slaughter for his service to the Royal Artillery Association and the Community; the City College Norwich Graduation Ceremony at Norwich Cathedral; a visit to a Buddhist retreat in Surlingham and a number of Remembrance Services. The Vice-Chairman had attended the official opening of the redeveloped King's Lynn Police Station where he had met HRH the Prince of Wales.
- 2.3 The Chairman advised that the annual Christmas Carol Service would be taking place on Friday 14 December 2018 at 12.30pm in the Marble Map area and invited all Councillors to attend.
- 2.4 The Chairman invited Councillors to attend citizenship ceremonies which were held on the first Wednesday of each month between 5pm and 7pm and urged any interested Councillors to contact her Executive Assistant, Suzanne Morson to express their interest.
- 2.5 As Dr Wendy Thomson would be leaving the County Council to take up a new role as Vice-Chancellor of the University of London, the Chairman thanked her for her service to the County and reminded Members of Dr Thomson's invitation to join her on Friday 14 December at 3.30pm in the Marble Map Area

3 Declarations of Interest

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

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

4.1 There were no items of urgent business.

5 Questions to Leader of the Council

5.1 Question from Ms E Corlett

5.1.1 Ms Corlett asked, as the Government had torn up funding rules to bail out Northamptonshire County Council, what rules the Leader had asked the Government to tear up so that Norfolk could stop paying more council tax for fewer services.

5.1.2 The Leader replied that it was an interesting point “tearing up rules” and that he would suggest a better way of looking at it was what Councils needed to do to ensure services were delivered within the financial envelope available. The Leader added that he had attended a meeting recently with three other Leaders and the Chief Secretary of the Treasury who had been keen to hear suggestions about how funding arrangements could be improved for the County Council, although she wasn’t saying more money would be given. He added that the days of “here is our hand, fill it with gold” are gone.

5.2 Question from Mr T East

5.2.1 Mr East asked if the Council was proposing to close 46 or 53 of the children’s centres and also how many of the 5300 consultation responses opposed the closure of children’s centres.

5.2.2 The Leader replied that he would prefer to address that question once the whole set of proposals for the new early childhood and family service was published in January. He added that it was the wrong approach to try to particularise any element at the present time as we needed to ensure that the published proposals were the right ones.

5.3 Question from Mr M Castle

5.3.1 Mr Castle asked if the Leader could tell Council whether his Administration had got plans yet for the promised revamp of the Members Room and Committee Rooms in the vicinity of the Council Chamber, given that these now appeared somewhat dated and ill equipped.

5.3.2 The Leader replied there were plans to do a number of alterations to the north wing, although he was unsure of the exact details at the moment.

5.4 Question from Mr R Brame

5.4.1 Mr Brame asked if the Leader would like to comment on Norfolk County Council recently being judged fourth best in the country for customer satisfaction for highways.

5.4.2 The Leader replied that people complained a lot about highways so to come 4th out of 28 similar councils was a really good result. The poll had been based on

an independent survey carried out by Ipsos Mori and 3300 residents, chosen at random, had responded to the survey. He added that perhaps the opening of the Broadland Northway had a positive effect on the feedback.

5.5 Question from Ms A Kemp

5.5.1 Ms Kemp asked if the Leader would join her in sending condolences to the family of Mr Richard Hutches of South Lynn who had sadly passed away in the Queen Elizabeth Hospital (QEH). Mr Hutches had waited 5 weeks for a suitable discharge package which never happened and the complaint raised had shown that the QEH and the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) had been unable to hold a private contractor to account to enable him to leave hospital. She added that this should not have happened and highlighted how much work the Sustainable Transformation Plan (STP) and the Health and Wellbeing Board Plan needed to do to reach patient centred care. The family was concerned that this situation should not happen to anyone else.

5.5.2 The Leader replied that he would certainly join her in sending condolences to his family but as far as the rest of the detail he had no further comment to offer.

5.6 Question from Ms C Rumsby

5.6.1 Ms Rumsby asked if the Leader would confirm that the County Council's cost in responding to the Police & Crime Commissioner's (PCC) bid to take over the Fire Service was around £49,000 which was made up of 980 hours of staff time and if he would also agree that the money spent on this unwelcome and pointless exercise would have been better directed straight from the police service to provide much needed council services for Norfolk residents. She also asked if the Leader would further agree that the return of the issue would be unwelcome, unnecessary and a reckless distraction from the pressing priorities in Norfolk.

5.6.2 The Leader confirmed that the figures were about right and were a rough estimate of the money which had been spent. He added that he felt the money had been well spent in terms of the process carried out and that perhaps in future more could be achieved by working better together.

5.7 Question from Mr B Watkins

5.7.1 Mr Watkins said, in the past couple of weeks, another damning report from the Care Quality Commission (CQC) had been received about the performance of the Norfolk & Suffolk Foundation Trust. He added that, not only was this a failure of regulation, but Commissioners had failed to take the necessary action to address glaring deficiencies within the Trust. He asked the Leader, what steps he was taking to reassure people that action would finally be taken and if he supported the calls for Norfolk mental health services to be split from Suffolk.

5.7.2 The Leader replied that there was a long way to go before talking about splitting and he quoted from a recent press statement which had been published shortly after the announcement – "We are deeply disappointed to learn that, while the Norfolk and Suffolk Foundation Trust remains a caring trust, its leadership and capacity for improvement has worsened. It must be accountable for its performance and there is now a real sense of urgency to change the Trust's culture to ensure high quality, sustainable care". The Leader added that no-one wanted to be associated with failure and that it was incumbent on everyone to ensure that any service regarded as failing was investigated to make sure an improvement plan was in place and delivered.

5.8 Question from Mrs S Young

5.8.1 Mrs Young asked if the Leader would join her in congratulating the County Councils People from Abroad Team which had won the Creative and Innovative Social Work Practice category for their work supporting refugees, in the National Social Worker of the Year Awards.

5.8.2 The Leader replied that it was always good to have two good news announcements of success and for anyone that didn't know the team, it was based in the Millennium Library and had been set up a couple of years ago to respond to the needs of migrants and Syrian Refugees arriving in Norfolk. The team provided a non-threatening environment where the families worked with could attend other volunteer-based services and exchange groups. He added that the judges had stated that they were impressed with the "imaginative and inclusive approach" of the team.

5.9 Question from Mr G Nobbs

5.9.1 Mr Nobbs referred to agenda item 8 (Senior Management Review) where Council would be asked to consider the abolition of the post of Managing Director and asked if the Leader could tell Council how long he and the Deputy Leader may have been considering the option.

5.9.2 The Leader replied that challenges brought opportunities and this particular challenge had brought us an opportunity.

5.10 Question from Mr J Timewell

5.10.1 Mr Timewell asked if the Leader would give a commitment that this Council would have an opportunity in 2019 to discuss different future models of devolution for Norfolk.

5.10.2 The Leader responded that a similar question had been asked at the last Council meeting and that he had said then that he had always been a supporter of devolution since it had been first muted. He added that if there were opportunities to reconsider devolution and ensure that it could be delivered this time, he would certainly support it.

5.11 Question from Mr D Bills

5.11.1 Mr Bills stated that tourism was such a vital part of Norfolk's economy and essential to both coastal and market towns. He asked if the Leader would like to comment on how valuable he considered tourism was to Norfolk.

5.11.2 The Leader replied that he would like to break his answer down into three elements –

- 1) the number of people that came here - over 46m visitors;
- 2) in terms of the spend - which was over £3bn; and
- 3) in terms of the jobs it supports - approximately 18,900.

He added that the figures quoted were statistics from 2017 and hopefully 2018 would be an even better year.

5.12 Question from Mr D Roper

5.12.1 Mr Roper stated that the Chairman of Environment, Development and Transport (EDT) Committee had previously commented on the popularity of waste charges,

particularly in relation to DIY waste. He added that on his recent trip to his local recycling centre, in the 500 metres leading up to the recycling centre, there had been three different piles of fly-tipped DIY waste. He asked if the Leader could tell Council what Norfolk County Council was doing to talk to those land owners to persuade them about the popularity of these charges.

5.12.2 The Leader replied that to be fair no charge was a good charge, but having said that what had worked out with the DIY waste and construction charge had actually levied far better income for the Council than expected. He continued that the other side of this, which he thought was where the story went wrong, was that the blame for fly-tipping had been put on those who fly-tipped construction waste, which was not true and that the majority of fly tipping was actually materials that could be taken to the tips. The Leader added that through the Waste Partnership, a huge amount of effort was being carried out to stop fly-tipping and make sure people respected the environment.

5.13 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

5.13.1 Ms Kemp said that it was important to support rural businesses in West Norfolk and that in Setchey there was a tourist outlet that needed a brown sign. She asked the Leader if it was time to review the brown signs policy so that rural businesses could be effectively supported.

5.13.2 The Leader replied that he would support all rural businesses, not just those in West Norfolk. The brown signs policy had been reviewed to his knowledge but if it hadn't then he was sure whoever needed to review it would review it.

6 **Recommendations from Service Committees**

6.1 **Recommendation of the Environment, Development and Transport Committee Meeting held on 12 October 2018.**

6.1.1 Mr M Wilby, Chairman of Environment, Development and Transport Committee moved the recommendations in the report.

6.1.2 **Statement of Community Involvement**

Council **RESOLVED** to:

- **Formally** adopt the 2018 Norfolk Statement of Community Involvement as set out in Appendix A of the report.

6.2 **Policy & Resources – Recommendations from the meetings held on 29 October and 26 November 2018.**

6.2.1 Mr A Proctor, Chairman of Policy & Resources Committee, moved the recommendations in the report.

6.2.2 **Director of Public Health Annual Report 2018 : A Health Profile for Norfolk.**

Council **RESOLVED** to:

- **Endorse** the main population health findings and trends identified in the Director of Public Health's Annual Report 2018.

6.2.3 **Mid-Year Treasury Management Monitoring Report 2018-19.**

Council **RESOLVED** to:

1. Approve the mid-Year Treasury Management Monitoring Report 2018-19 as detailed in Appendix C.

6.2.4 **Limited Company Consents**

Council **RESOLVED** to:

- **Agree** to the appointment of directors to companies as detailed in Appendix D.

6.2.5 **Transition from a Committee to an Executive Leader and Cabinet system of governance.**

Following debate and upon being put to a recorded vote (attached at Appendix A), with 48 votes in favour, 24 votes against and 0 abstentions, Council **RESOLVED** to:

1. **Change** from the current Committee system of governance to an Executive Leader and Cabinet system of governance from the Annual General Meeting of full Council in May 2019.
2. **Agree** that further work to produce the remaining draft Appendices is delegated to the Policy & Resources Committee working through the Cabinet System Member Working Group.
3. **Note** that the final draft of the new Constitution will be returned to the Policy & Resources Committee meeting on 25 March 2019 to enable the Committee to recommend the final draft of the new Constitution to full Council on 15 April 2019.

Council **agreed** to consider agenda item 8 - Senior Management Review as its next item of business.

7 Senior Management Review

7.1 Council received the report by the Leader of the Council seeking approval to adopt a new senior management structure and delete the post of Managing Director

7.2 The Leader introduced the report which followed the recommendations from Policy & Resources Committee at its meeting on 26 November 2018, that Council resolves to change to an Executive Leadership and Cabinet system of governance with effect from May 2019. If approved, the change would implement the Administration's ambition for a member-led Authority to drive forward the strategy and policy direction of the Council providing for close working relationships with the Head of Paid Service and Chief Officers.

7.3 Upon the recommendations being put to a vote, with 48 votes in favour, 23 votes against and 0 abstentions, Council **RESOLVED** that:

1. The post of Managing Director which currently included the discharge of responsibilities on local authorities to designate one of their officers as a Head

of Paid Service, be deleted.

2. The Executive Director, Community and Environmental Services be designated as Interim Head of Paid Service in addition to his existing Chief Officer role until the appointment of a permanent designation by Full Council in due course.
3. The current role of Strategy Director to be re-designated as a Chief Officer and retitled Executive Director, Strategy and Governance
4. Note the decisions of the Personnel Committee in relation to grading and payments
5. Confirm that the Monitoring Officer will make the necessary consequential changes to the Constitution pursuant to paragraph 2.1 of Article 13 to the Constitution.

8 Reports from Service Committees (Questions to Chairmen)

8.1 Report of the Policy and Resources Committee meetings held on 29 October & 26 November 2018.

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

8.1.1 Question from Mr S Morpew

Mr Morpew asked, in the light of the delay in the announcement of local government finance, if the Chairman of Policy & Resources Committee could tell him what he thought the implications were and whether this was likely to be a good sign for us. He also asked, in light of the decision that had just been made, if the Chairman could tell him how much extra he intended to ask to be budgeted for next year in anticipation of the Independent Remuneration Panel's findings.

The Chairman replied that as far as the delay could be looked at from two perspectives – if it was an easy decision they could have just issued a written ministerial statement, but perhaps the optimistic side would be that there might be something more meaningful after the other meaningful Government vote, expected to take place on Tuesday 11 December, had taken place. He added that, as far as the extra money for remuneration and Members Allowances was concerned, the Independent Remuneration Panel had not yet met and he thought we should wait and see what they came up with before anything was put in motion.

8.1.2 Question from Mr M Castle

Mr Castle asked if the Chairman could reassure Council that there were no plans for wholesale changes to current appointments to Outside Bodies when these become the responsibility of Cabinet, rather than the relevant Service Committees as at present.

The Leader replied that all the Outside Bodies were going to be reviewed in detail to ensure the right people were nominated and that we were actually on the right bodies. He added that there would be a wholesale review of all the appointments to outside bodies in due course to make sure they achieved maximum benefit to those attending.

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

8.2 **Report of the Adult Social Care Committee meetings held on 8 October & 5 November 2018.**

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

8.2.1 **Question from Mrs B Jones**

Mrs Jones said she was concerned about the use of winter monies to deal with failures in the care market and that while she appreciated we needed to ensure what was provided and that it was within the letter of the rules of the use of winter monies – surely it was not the intention to use the money for this purpose. The failure of the care market was not just a winter problem, and she felt we were patching up an increasingly leaky boat.

The Chairman replied that it was quite challenging in the care market and that it was not something new to Members as it was a national issue. He added that the pressure on beds across Norfolk got tougher in the winter months although a great winter strategy had been put in place this year as for the first time it had been agreed, through the Health and Wellbeing Board, through Adult Social Care and through the health system as well so we have a more joined up plan for winter. He added that he thought this was a perfectly acceptable use of this money and that was why it was in the rules to be used, therefore he didn't accept that this was not what the money had been provided for.

8.2.2 **Question from Mr B Watkins**

Mr Watkins stated that last year the number of adults receiving social care in Norfolk fell by 455. He asked the Chairman if this meant that it was inevitable, in order for the department to achieve its cuts target for 2018-19, that there would need to be a further reduction in service users and if the Chairman thought this was one of the principal reasons why the public dissatisfaction with our service had fallen to the second lowest in our group.

The Chairman replied that our strategy was one of prevention and if we could prevent people going into residential care and keep them living independently in their homes, he considered this showed a success of the strategy which Cllr Watkins had supported many times.

8.2.3 **Question from Ms S Squire**

Ms Squire referred to the recent TV drama, "Care" starring Sheridan Smith, which highlighted the issues for some sick, elderly people in accessing NHS continuing care. She added that the issue had also been discussed at the recent Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and asked if the Chairman agreed that there was cause for concern and if he would press the Government to provide a fairer funding regime.

The Chairman responded that he was always keen to obtain more money for Norfolk and we had a duty to run an efficient and focused system, but he also felt that, because the character of a Norfolk person was to get on and manage, Norfolk didn't always get its fair share of money from Government. The Chairman said he would continue banging that particular drum but the NHS was under considerable financial strain. The Chairman added that one of the reasons why the new Health and Wellbeing Board Strategy of One System was so important

and why, with his other hat as Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board, he was pleased that all NHS organisations in Norfolk had signed up to that Strategy which had occurred for the first time since the formation of the Board in 2012.

8.2.4 **Question from Dr C Jones**

Dr Jones asked, given the announcement that the Care Quality Commission (CQC) was closing a care home in his Division with less than one weeks notice, if Social Services were aware of the developing problems and what contingency plans had been put in place to rehome residents at such short notice.

The Chairman stated that this was not a decision of the Council, it was a decision by the CQC since the quality of the service was not deemed to be safe enough for the people in the home. The home had been failing for a while which meant the Council was aware of the issues and unfortunately it had been deemed to be failing too much to be able to be brought round. The Chairman added that everything possible would be done to make sure that the residents of that home had a care package that was interrupted as little as possible.

8.2.5 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

Ms Kemp said her question related to the provision of cancer care services in King's Lynn and advised that the Board of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in King's Lynn had been attempting to close the cancer ward for the second time, and move it to Norwich and also to move surgical services, which hadn't been done although was in the pipeline. Ms Kemp said she had been the only County Councillor to vote against the STP Plan because of its focus on Norwich as the hub and King's Lynn as the periphery and this was causing a great deal of stress to her constituents. Ms Kemp asked if the Chairman, in both his role as Chairman of Adult Social Care Committee and the Health and Wellbeing Board, could make sure that this change didn't go ahead.

The Chairman asked Ms Kemp to raise this question under the Health and Wellbeing Board report item.

8.2.6 **Question from Mr M Sands**

Mr Sands referred to Four Seasons nationally and as Norfolk had a number of Four Seasons homes, he asked if the Chairman could assure Council that the number of places across the county offered in care homes was secure. He also asked if there was a role within Repton Homes, which was currently inactive, in securing and acquiring further places for people who may need places in care homes in the future.

The Chairman said that as Members would be aware when Allied got into financial difficulties Norfolk County Council acted very quickly in protecting the services that service users were receiving and transferred the service from Allied to Independence Matters. The Chairman added that several national providers of care were labouring under large amounts of debt and were finding it difficult to operate. He also added that the Council had a role around market shaping and he was keen to see private providers of adult social care thrive and run profitable businesses because they could then provide a better service and more continuity of care, with less disruption, to service users.

8.2.7 **Question from Ms E Corlett**

Ms Corlett said her question related to mental health bed availability and that one

of the issues that the CQC had flagged up recently was a lack of mental health beds. She continued that it was the responsibility of social workers employed by the County Council to carry out Mental Health Act Assessments and that there were still 22 patients out of area relating back to 2014 despite the CQC saying this would be resolved. Ms Corlett asked, as it was totally unacceptable for a Norfolk County Council employee to undertake a mental health assessment without knowing if there was a bed available and it was the responsibility of the CCG to make sure there were sufficient beds, if the Chairman could tell Council what action had been taken and what pressure he was exerting to ensure mental health beds were available so Norfolk County Council employees were not placed in this impossible position.

The Chairman replied that he could answer the part of the question about the role of the assessments and the need to provide those as quickly and efficiently as we could, and that staff were on call to make sure that those assessments are completed. The Chairman asked Ms Corlett to raise the part of the question around the health service more generally under Health and Wellbeing Board.

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

8.3 **Report of the Business & Property Committee meetings held on 9 October & 6 November 2018**

Mr B Stone, Chairman of Business & Property Committee moved the report.

8.3.1 **Question from Mr Tim Adams**

Mr Adams asked if the recent experience of the property disposals at Elm Road, Thetford and Gimmingham Road Trimmingham had, in the Chairman's opinion, shown a need to re-evaluate the level of prioritisation given to Community Groups and smaller councils who may be willing to help reduce the burden on Norfolk County Council in maintaining existing property assets.

The Chairman replied that the two issues were still ongoing. The timeline on both properties had been extended and there were proposals in the pipeline which could substantially change the proposals put forward so far. The Chairman said he listened to the arguments put forward by Community Groups and residents of those areas and no hard and fast decisions made and decisions could be reappraised regularly. He added that the Committee, at its January meeting, would be updated about any changes.

8.3.2 **Question from Mrs A Thomas**

Mrs Thomas asked, given the earlier mention about a possible refurbishment of the north wing of County Hall, if the Chairman of Business and Property Committee could ask for an urgent review of the heating system in the Council Chamber.

The Chairman replied that all options for the whole of the north wing was being considered, including the basement and lower ground floor, for refurbishment, mothballing etc. He added that it was expected that a proposal would be presented, possibly in January, for the civic area and public areas. The Chairman also added that if Members went downstairs they would find there was no heating, no air conditioning, useless ducting with no fresh air but he hoped proposals would be forthcoming in the near future.

8.3.3 Question from Mr D Roper

Mr Roper said that he understood that the Business and Property Committee would be considering an item about the new recycling centre north of the Broadland Northway at its January meeting. He asked if the Chairman could give some assurance that, when the report was presented to Committee, it would consider the traffic impact, particularly on the roundabout at the Cromer Road onto the Broadland Northway as this was a subject which was already causing considerable concern for his residents at Horsham St Faith.

The Chairman replied that all aspects would be considered.

8.3.4 Question from Mr M Castle

Mr Castle said that in February the County Council had approved the Norfolk Futures Strategy for 2018-2021, including a pledge to build new homes to help young people get onto the housing ladder. He asked if the Chairman could tell him how many such homes he anticipated would have been built on Council landholdings by the Council's wholly owned Repton Property Developments Company in the period to 2021.

The Chairman replied that he couldn't give that figure at the moment because Repton Homes, as a company, was still relatively new and in the process of being established with a development partner. He added that until that existed and until we started building establishments, we couldn't establish what the percentage would be of affordable, rentable homes on the sites that we would be building on. The Chairman added that that aspect would be considered as part of the evaluation process.

8.3.5 Question from Mr F Eagle

Mr Eagle asked the Chairman to provide an update on Repton Homes.

The Chairman replied that he had some very good news which he should be able to announce after the Repton Board meeting due to take place on Thursday 14 December. He added that a rigorous process of procurement to find a development partner had been carried out, resulting in several national companies putting in bids to be considered. The bids had been appraised very carefully by a Committee established purely for that purpose, with the three preferred bidders invited to make a presentation. From those presentations a preferred development partner had been selected and the Repton Board would be asked to confirm the appointment, after which a press release would be issued. Once the development partner had been appointed, it was hoped the first site in Acle could commence development in the near year.

8.3.6 Question from Ms A Kemp

Ms Kemp said that her question was about infrastructure, particularly the Nar Ouse Enterprise Zone (NOEZ) which was a very important development for the County Council. She said she had been unable to ascertain whether the gas main in the land opposite the innovation centre had been moved to allow the five sites to become available for commercial development, despite asking the question for several months. Ms Kemp asked if the Chairman could find out the current position and let her know.

The Chairman replied that he would ask the officer concerned to provide a written

answer to the question.

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

8.4 **Report of the Children's Services Committee meetings held on 16 October & 13 November 2018.**

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

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

Mr M Smith-Clare asked if the speed signs, which had been funded by the people of North Yarmouth Community Group, would remain on Keyes Avenue, near the former Alderman Swindell School, particularly as the site was guaranteed for future education provision.

The Chairman confirmed that the site would be used for future education provision but, as he was not aware of what would be happening with the speed signs a written response would be provided.

8.4.2 **Question from Dr E Maxfield**

Dr Maxfield asked if the Chairman would instate an additional meeting of the Children's Services Committee in January so that responses to the Children's Centre consultation could be given proper scrutiny, particularly given the likely level of public interest.

The Chairman replied that there were a number of items on the forward plan for the January meeting and that he would be writing to members of the Committee, setting out the priority of how the meeting could be structured, after which a decision could be made as to whether the Children's Services Committee meeting in January needed to be a long meeting or whether an additional meeting would be called.

8.4.3 **Question from Mr J Fisher**

Mr Fisher asked the Chairman to provide further details of the proposed investment in schools.

The Chairman replied that capital spend in schools had been highlighted in the report which included some large investment and he gave the following clarity of the figures below:

- £120m new investment into special educational needs and disability provision across the Council. For that we would be getting two new complex needs schools; one new autism spectrum disorder school; the transformation of Alderman Swindell School into a dedicated SEMH school which was much needed in the Great Yarmouth area; and 20 new specialist resources spaces across the county, which was a significant investment in children with SEND. (Special Educational Needs).
- In terms of main capital spend on schools, it needed to be borne in mind that 90% of schools in Norfolk were now graded good or outstanding by Ofsted, which was a fantastic achievement for the children. This didn't mean we were resting on our laurels; we need to work on the other 10%, but what that did mean was from preschool right the way through primary, secondary school and sixth form our children were getting a good standard of education.

- £132m over the next few years was being invested to enhance mainstream schools, building on the ones we have got and where necessary building brand new schools which was also a significant investment.

8.4.4 **Question from Mrs A Thomas**

Mrs Thomas said, as a long standing member of the Adoption Panel, she was very pleased to see the Fostering and Adoption Annual Reports which came to Children's Services Committee recently. She asked if the Chairman could highlight some of the points that had put Norfolk County Council in that position.

The Chairman replied that the report was a very good read and the adoption service had been graded as "outstanding", being in the top 10% of councils in the country for our adoption service – a fantastic achievement, not only for staff but our wonderful adopters and foster carers. He added that Norfolk children were now waiting less time to be brought into care and placed with a family which was a good outcome for those children. He continued that Norfolk County Council's foster to adopt programme had achieved significant success, with 18 during the last financial year and that customised support programmes for children and families around adopt were also being offered.

The Chairman continued that Norfolk County Council was now in the top ten percent in the country and Bromley Children's Services had made contact to ascertain how they could use our processes to improve their own services.

The Chairman also referred to the fostering service which, although a standalone service, related to adoption and was a key strand of the £12m investment in the Transformation Programme.

8.4.5 **Question from Mrs J Brociek-Coulton**

Mrs Brociek-Coulton asked if the Chairman fully supported the need for respite care to be provided to families, particularly for children with special educational health needs and if so, what could be done to ensure that this care was both accessible and sustainable.

The Chairman replied that he had received a similar question from Mr M Smith-Clare under agenda item 11 and he would answer the question at that time. The headline was that he absolutely supported it but would provide a detailed answer under that item.

8.4.6 **Question from Ms S Squire**

Ms Squire stated, considering this authority's poor performance in the number of Educational Health and Care Plans (EHCP) completed within the legally allowed timescale, together with the sheer number of tribunals, their costs and the low number that were upheld in favour of Norfolk County Council, as well as the number of excluded children with special educational needs, if the Chairman would like to state whether he felt that, while it was great to be providing more special school places, we were letting down some of the most vulnerable children and their families. She also asked if the services provided were acceptable and if the Chairman could inform Council of the number of children in Norfolk that had been off-rolled from one school and not appeared on the roll of another so were currently missing from education.

The Chairman replied that there were a number of aspects to the question and that this was one of the areas that we could improve and needed to improve. He agreed to provide a written response about the number of children off-rolled but agreed there was work to do in this area.

8.4.7 **Question from Mr H Thirtle**

Mr Thirtle asked the Chairman to provide an update about social worker recruitment in Norfolk.

The Chairman replied that this was another pleasing aspect of the reports presented to the last Children's Services Committee meeting. He continued that recruitment was increasing at a faster rate in Norfolk than at other authorities across the UK and in the last financial year, we had recruited at a rate of 10% as opposed to the national average of 3%. At the same time retention turnover for 2017-18 fell to lower than the national average; therefore we were recruiting more and losing less social workers. This meant that if we continued on the current trajectory we would be fully staffed by the summer of 2019 and that agency staff would only be used for short-term issues such as maternity cover or sickness absence. This was a really good result for Norfolk which also meant that children and families had less change of social workers which led to a more consistent service, something that Children's Services Committee members were passionate about. The Chairman continued that social work timescales were also improving through management intervention and having a stable workforce and that, from a financial point of view a permanent worker cost approximately £23k less per year than an agency worker which was a really good news story.

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

8.5 **Report of the Communities Committee meetings held on 10 October & 7 November 2018.**

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

8.5.1 **Question from Ms C Rumsby**

Ms Rumsby referred to the consultation on children's centres and asked if the Chairman had any inkling as yet from Children's Services as to the type of activities they wanted to carry out in libraries and if so, did she know what they were and had they been robustly risk assessed. She also asked if the topic would feature on the agenda at the next Communities Committee meeting.

The Chairman responded that at the moment she did not know what was planned, but it would be covered by the Communities Committee.

8.5.2 **Question from Mr Tim Adams**

Mr Adams said the Chairman would be familiar with the budget gap likely to impact on the Cromer museum unless action was taken, as a result of the summer weather, we were significantly down on revenue with approximately £8k less in the budget, resulting the loss of one months opening next year. He added that he feared, unless the gap was filled, that we would never recover. Mr Adams asked the Chairman, what in her opinion, could be done to resolve the situation and if she would agree that the best potential source of income could be the second home council tax money which the County Council benefitted from North Norfolk District Council removing the council tax discount from second homes.

The Chairman replied that she would work with Mr Adams to look at revenue but didn't yet know where the money would come from.

8.5.3 Question from Ms S Squire

Ms Squire asked, now that the Police & Crime Commissioner was not pursuing a take over of the Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service, if the Chairman agreed that this Council should establish a new Norfolk Fire & Rescue Panel, with District Council representation along the lines of the existing Police & Crime Panel, to provide a public facing forum for the service from May 2019 when this Authority moved to a Cabinet system of governance.

The Chairman replied that this would form part of the plans for the future Cabinet System of Governance and there was insufficient time to plan anything before May 2019.

8.5.4 Question from Dr C Jones

Dr Jones said in relation to Norfolk County Council's contract for Drug and Alcohol Services with Change Grove Live, what multi-agency work was being commissioned in relation to drug related offending, county lines and Operation Gravity.

The Chairman replied that a written response would be provided.

8.5.5 Question from Mr M Sands

Mr Sands referred to the support and recognition of the excellent work around the county supporting the Armed Forces Covenant and drew Councillors attention to veterans' drop in centre operating in his division over the last two years, which had now become affiliated with the Association of Ex-Servicemen Drop-In Centres. Mr Sands invited the Armed Forces Champion and the Chairman of Communities Committee to visit with him one Thursday morning, adding that the centre was also open to Members and ex-Members of Blue light services.

The Chairman thanked Mr Sands for the invitation and said that both herself and Mr K Kiddie, the Armed Forces Champion would love to visit.

8.5.6 Question from Mr E Seward

Mr Seward stated that North Walsham Library was one of the busiest libraries in the county, with dedicated and innovative staff who, apart from providing a basic library service, did their best to arrange a range of other services for the town community. Mr Seward said that the library was too small and asked the Chairman if any work had been done, or any provision made in the capital programme, to enlarge that library, or look for an alternative site.

The Chairman replied that to her knowledge there hadn't been any work done in that area and that we did what we could with what we had.

8.5.7 Question from Ms E Corlett

Ms Corlett referred to the reluctance to review the drug and alcohol service too early because the new service had only started in April 2018 and she asked if the Chairman would ensure local Members who were having direct experience and persistent problems with needles being discarded, intravenous drug use in stairwells with blood spattered up the walls in their division were invited to provide evidence when the service was reviewed.

The Chairman replied that she would be happy to work with Local Members, although it was the responsibility of the District Councils to clear up needles, etc.

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

8.6 **Report of the Digital Innovation & Efficiency Committee meeting held on 14 November 2018.**

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

8.6.1 **Question from Dr M Strong**

Dr Strong said going back to January 2018, Council had made a commitment towards improving mobile phone, voice and data coverage and moving towards 100% coverage. She asked if the Chairman could provide an update on where we were with our commitment to 100% coverage for mobile phones.

The Chairman replied that a report would be considered by a future Committee meeting but following a survey across the whole of the county which gave us the ability to hold the providers to account, we now had some hard evidence. The Chairman said that meetings had been held with various providers and Norfolk had been commended for the work carried out, recognising that there was more work to do. All mobile phone companies had been notified that where there were problems with coverage, access to masts, etc. Norfolk County Council could allow them to use some of its properties to erect masts to help plug some of the gap areas.

8.6.2 **Question from Ms S Squire**

Ms Squire asked the Chairman to explain the benefits to Norfolk of being 5G and what would differ from 4G and if he felt that any attempt to make Norfolk a 5G county would be a touch ironic considering there were still vast swathes of the county which could not receive any mobile signal at all. She asked if we should be concentrating on that rather than giving 5G to a few people living in towns.

The Chairman replied that he felt it was essential to have coverage across the whole county and 5G was an aspiration for the country never mind the county and that personally he would be satisfied with 4G coverage. He added that, as already stated we were speaking with the mobile phone providers and we would continue to push them particularly where services were deficient in particular areas

8.6.3 **Question from Mr D Rowntree**

Mr Rowntree said at the start of the year he had raised the issue of video streaming of council meetings. The options have not yet been discussed at Committee and the topic did not appear on the Committee's forward plan. Mr Rowntree asked if the Chairman could reassure Councillors that the topic would be discussed at Committee and that the Council still intended to video stream these meetings.

The Chairman replied that he was happy for the topic to be added to the Committee's Forward Plan for discussion at the next meeting.

8.6.5 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

Ms Kemp said, at a recent conference she had been impressed with the LOWRAN network which was low cost and low energy, allowing battery devices to be plugged into it, particularly assistive technology devices such as temperature sensors and movement sensors to keep people safe. Ms Kemp said she understood there was a LOWRAN network in Great Yarmouth and one in Norwich and asked when there may be one in King's Lynn.

The Chairman replied that there was a gateway above the Millennium Library in Norwich and one in Great Yarmouth which was being used in conjunction with the pilot but the aspiration was to roll it out across the country to enable connection of the low cost devices which was something the county council had pledged to do. The conference had shown what could be done using innovation using existing technology to link together to provide services.

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

8.7 **Report of the Environment, Development and Transport Committee meetings held on 12 October & 9 November 2018.**

Mr M Wilby, Chairman of EDT Committee moved the report.

8.7.1 **Question from Mr D Douglas**

Mr Douglas said that the economic development in terms of the Norwich Western Link road were welcomed and asked the Chairman if he could assure Council that the building and creation of the Norwich Western Link would result in no extra journey times and no extra congestion for bus services on the key routes in Norwich.

The Chairman replied that there was now less congestion and it was essential that the bus routes worked to timetables and worked as efficiently as possible.

8.7.2 **Question from Mr S Aquarone**

Mr Aquarone said that some of his constituents had raised the issue of never ending road closures by utility companies and asked if the Chairman could let Council know how often it had used overstay fees on utility companies and how much money had been raised. He also asked, in light of those figures, how much money he thought the Council would collect from the lane rental charges when they were introduced.

The Chairman replied he would find out about the utilities overstay fees and lane fees and provide a written response.

8.7.3 **Question from Mr M Castle**

Mr Castle said that whilst he was delighted with the work that had taken place over the past two years on infrastructure improvements in his division around the railway station, the poor reliability of rail services remained a real cause for concern. With almost 6 million visitors each year to Great Yarmouth and over 4 million bed nights taken, it was even more important that this issue was tackled to achieve better rail access for one of the country's most popular seaside resorts. Mr Castle asked the Chairman, if he agreed that the County Council should endeavour to get Great Yarmouth designated as the preferred terminus for new services to Stansted

Airport for the next rail franchise specification.

The Chairman replied that he had attended the opening of the new railway station two or three weeks ago and it really improved the area, although it hadn't necessarily improved the trains. He added that the rollout of all the new stock which was happening in May was welcomed and that he had been assured by the train companies that this would improve reliability and accessibility into Great Yarmouth. He also hoped 2019 was a much better year for Great Yarmouth and people were able to get there on the trains and on time.

8.7.4 Question from Mr M Smith-Clare

Mr Smith-Clare asked if the Chairman of EDT would agree that Great Yarmouth residents deserved far better train services than they were currently receiving and if the Chairman would agree to invite James Burles, Managing Director of Greater Anglia, to an EDT Committee meeting to answer the concerns of Members.

The Chairman replied that Great Yarmouth certainly did deserve a much better service, but that he had been assured that the service would be greatly improved from May 2019, as soon as the new rolling stock was in place.

8.7.5 Question from Mr J Mooney

Mr Mooney asked the Chairman to provide an update on the Western Link project.

The Chairman deferred the question to the Vice-Chairman who responded that the project was currently on time. The current round of consultations would finish on 18 January 2019 and had been well received in all the venues where it had been rolled out. The Vice-Chairman urged all Members to respond to the consultation and reiterated the importance of following the process and ensuring the project was delivered on time and within budget.

8.7.6 Question from Mr D Roper

Mr Roper asked if the Chairman would agree that, when significant changes were being made to a road, such as lane changes or priority changes, it was important to drivers that there was adequate signage and warnings ahead of the change. He added that if the Chairman did agree, could he comment on the recent changes to roads that feed onto roundabouts on the Broadland Northway where changes to lanes and feeder lanes were made overnight with no warnings or signs for drivers leading to much confusion in the days that followed.

The Chairman agreed good signage was important, so drivers knew exactly where to go and he would look into the issue on the Broadland Northway.

8.7.7 Question from Mr A Jamieson

Mr Jamieson asked if the Chairman could provide an update on the recycling centres in Norfolk.

The Chairman responded that Norfolk had some of the best recycling centres in the country and were really popular with the visitors to those sites. Investment was planned for two new recycling centres, one to replace the one at Mile Cross and a new centre at King's Lynn. It was also hoped to replace the centre in Wymondham and the one at Ketteringham so we were investing big time in our recycling centres. The Chairman added that there were also some really popular re-use shops at 9 recycling centres, with the one at Thetford being one of the best performing ones in

Norfolk which in 2017-18 diverted 115 tonnes of recycling material producing an income of approximately £45k. A percentage of the income from the re-use shops would go to the Air Ambulance Service, one of the local charities that we support. Our recycling centres were performing really well and at the last EDT Committee meeting he said he had written to congratulate the service on what they were doing and had received a good response back which he would reporting back to the Committee at its next meeting.

8.7.8 **Question from Mr T Jermy**

Mr Jermy said at a recent Breckland Council scrutiny meeting looking into fly tipping, a representative from the Country Landowners Association was invited to come and talk to them. The Country Landowners Association represented thousands of landowners and farmers all over the country including in Norfolk and Mr Jermy said he was disappointed to learn that they felt their Members hadn't been engaged in major policy changes, such as the introduction of DIY waste charges. The figures about fly tipped material on their land tended to get lost because they were not recorded anywhere and there was a significant issue in the Breckland area with fly tipped material, not just the cost of driving over the fields but the actual cost to the animals often from eating the fly tipped material. Mr Jermy asked if the Chairman would agree that in future, if there was a major policy change such as the introduction of DIY waste charges, that key partners such as the CLA were involved in the discussions.

The Chairman replied that fly-tipping was not pleasant, it was illegal and work was being done through the Norfolk Waste Partnership who worked with all Authorities across Norfolk as well as the CLA and NFU and other bodies.

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

9 Other Committees

9.1 **Report of the Personnel Committee meeting held on 4 December 2018.**

9.1.1 Mr A Proctor, Chairman, moved the report, highlighting a correction to paragraph 1.1 as follows:

New legislation took effect in 2018, requiring all employers with 250+ **employees** to publish their Gender Pay Gap by the

9.1.2 Following a comment about the result of the vote on the resolution not being included in the report, the Chairman clarified that this would be included within the minutes.

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

9.2 **Report of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 18 October 2018.**

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

9.3 **Report of the Health & Wellbeing Board meeting held on 31 October 2018.**

9.3.1 Mr B Borrett, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

9.3.2 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

Ms Kemp said, regarding the prospective move of the cancer ward and surgical services from the QEH to Norwich which would cause considerable hardship for people but also under the sustainable community and transformation plan Norwich was seen as the hub which meant Great Yarmouth and King's Lynn were seen as the periphery which wasn't right as there were a lot of older and aging people in west Norfolk, the transport wasn't good and the sheer cost of getting to hospital in Norwich could be prohibitive. Ms Kemp asked the Chairman of the Health and Wellbeing Board if he would write to the STP and also to the QEH in the strongest terms possible and ask them not to close the cancer ward and its associated surgical services.

The Chairman replied that he was aware that the three acute hospitals in Norfolk were trying to work together and the key area around that was the best possible patient outcomes. He added that if you had three small teams operating independently you got a difference in the level of outcomes from those teams and they were more vulnerable to issues such as sickness or a lack of staffing. He added that the Chief Executive of the QEH was now going to work with the NNUH to ascertain how the acute hospitals could work together more closely which could only be a good thing for patients.

9.3.3 **Question from Ms E Corlett**

Ms Corlett asked what was being done to hold the CCGs to account to make sure there were sufficient beds available for mental health patients.

The Chairman replied that there were issues around the Norfolk & Suffolk Mental Health Trust and the provision of beds at the Julian Hospital and other sites. He added that he thought that there was an acceptance that the issue of mental health services in Norfolk was a key issue and one that was balancing on a knife edge. He added that he thought that the Health and Wellbeing Board would be taking a great deal of interest in this going forward and would specifically look at how these services could be delivered in the future which may mean they were not the same as they had been in the past.

9.4 **Report of the Museums Committee meeting held on 2 November 2018.**

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

9.5 **Report of the Records Committee meeting held on 2 November 2018.**

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

9.6 **Report of the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meeting held on 26 October 2018.**

Mr C Foulger, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

Council adjourned at 12.50pm and reconvened at 1.30pm.

10 Notice of Motions

- 10.1 The following motion was proposed by Mr A Jamieson and seconded by Mr G Plant:

“This Council welcomes the additional funding announced by the Chancellor in the 2018 autumn budget. However, despite this NCC still faces significant challenges over the next three years to balance its budget. We recognise that NCC is one of the highest recipients of Revenue Support Grant (RSG) in the Country, due to the relatively lower levels of council tax which can be raised locally. With the expected loss of some £39m in 2021 this presents a ‘cliff edge’ which, despite planning for, will be difficult to manage.

We fully appreciate that Local Government must contribute towards reducing the national debt, however this must be balanced with our ability to forward plan to deliver our services in a sustainable way.

Therefore, this council resolves to write to The Chancellor, The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, and all Norfolk MPs to ask that they consider phasing the reduction to zero RSG over three more years to 2024 to allow for sustainable forward planning and financial deliverability.”

- 10.1.1 Mr M Sands proposed the following amendment, seconded by Mr T Jermy:

“This Council welcomes the additional funding announced by the Chancellor in the 2018 autumn budget. However, despite this NCC still faces significant challenges over the next three years to balance its budget. We recognise that NCC is one of the highest recipients of Revenue Support Grant (RSG) in the Country, due to the relatively lower levels of council tax which can be raised locally. With the expected loss of some £39m in 2021 this presents a ‘cliff edge’ which, despite planning for, will be difficult to manage.

We fully appreciate that Local Government must contribute towards reducing the national debt, however this must be balanced with our ability to forward plan to deliver our services in a sustainable way.

Therefore, this council resolves to write to The Chancellor, The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, and all Norfolk MPs to ask that they consider phasing the reduction to zero RSG over three more years to 2024 ~~abandon plans to reduce the Rate Support Grant to zero to allow for sustainable forward planning and financial deliverability.”~~

- 10.1.2 As proposer of the original motion Mr Jamieson did not accept the amendment which was debated by Council.

- 10.1.3 Following debate and upon the amendment being put to the vote, with 19 votes in favour, the amendment was **LOST**.

- 10.1.4 Mr S Aquarone, seconded by Mr E Seward, proposed the following amendment:

“This Council welcomes the additional funding announced by the Chancellor in the 2018 autumn budget. However, despite this NCC still faces significant challenges over the next three years to balance its budget. We recognise that NCC is one of the highest recipients of Revenue Support Grant (RSG) in the Country, due to the

relatively lower levels of council tax which can be raised locally. With the expected loss of some £39m in 2021 this presents a 'cliff edge' which, despite planning for, will be difficult to manage.

~~We fully appreciate that Local Government must contribute towards reducing the national debt, however this must be balanced with our ability to forward plan to deliver our services in a sustainable way.~~

~~Therefore, this council resolves to write to The Chancellor, The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, and all Norfolk MPs to ask that they consider phasing the reduction to zero RSG over three more years to 2024 to allow for sustainable forward planning and financial deliverability.~~

This Council resolves that the rate support grant should be retained and that it should distribute resources fairly from richer to poorer areas and that the business rates should be abolished in favour of a tax on land value”

10.1.5 As proposer of the original motion Mr Jamieson did not accept the amendment which was debated by Council.

10.1.6 Upon the amendment being put to a vote, with 18 votes in favour, the amended motion was **LOST**.

10.1.7 Council then debated the substantive motion and upon the motion being put to a vote, Council **resolved** that:

“This Council welcomes the additional funding announced by the Chancellor in the 2018 autumn budget. However, despite this NCC still faces significant challenges over the next three years to balance its budget. We recognise that NCC is one of the highest recipients of Revenue Support Grant (RSG) in the Country, due to the relatively lower levels of council tax which can be raised locally. With the expected loss of some £39m in 2021 this presents a 'cliff edge' which, despite planning for, will be difficult to manage.

We fully appreciate that Local Government must contribute towards reducing the national debt, however this must be balanced with our ability to forward plan to deliver our services in a sustainable way.

Therefore, this council resolves to write to The Chancellor, The Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, and all Norfolk MPs to ask that they consider phasing the reduction to zero RSG over three more years to 2024 to allow for sustainable forward planning and financial deliverability.”

10.2 The following motion was proposed by Mr S Mophew and seconded by Mr M Smith-Clare. Mr Mophew asked Council to also agree to defer the work to the Cabinet Governance Working Group for inclusion in the new Constitution.

“Council believes that other than where the Monitoring Officer is investigating an alleged breach of the code of conduct or in the event of an investigation by law enforcement authorities, all information about and contained in councillor emails should remain confidential.

Council therefore resolves

1. To request the Head of Democratic Services to draft a provision to be included in the Council constitution to ensure no officer can give authority for any third party to inspect or access such information without the specific written consent of each councillor involved.
2. Where that is not achievable because of Data Access requests, Freedom of Information requests or the need for technical staff to have access to maintain the email system, that such circumstances should be defined as part of the new provision in the Constitution.
3. To consider this new provision at Council in April 2019 and meanwhile to adopt these principles in the event of any further requests for access to councillor email information meanwhile.”

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

10.3 The following motion was proposed by Mr S Aquarone and seconded by Mr T East:

“Government advice on public consultations is that consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.

Statements by judges in legal cases on public consultations have said:

In R (Derbyshire County Council) v Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield Combined Authority [2016] “at least the major proposals in the scheme should be identified and be made the subject of the consultation, with adequate ... material provided to explain it so as to permit of sensible response.”

In R v London Borough of Haringey (2014) the courts say that there is an obligation to let consultees know, “what the proposal is and exactly why it is under positive consideration” and telling them enough (which may be a good deal) to enable them to make an intelligent response.”

Recent public consultations by the council have left much to be desired in terms of the level of information provided causing public confusion and anger. The people of Norfolk are right to expect better openness and transparency from the County Council.

There has also been an inconsistent approach taken in recent consultations where one was stopped and restarted due to incorrect information being provided and one wasn't when the same circumstances happened.

The Council resolves to instruct officers to undertake a review of the council's public consultation processes to ensure that the council is following good practise which should include a requirement that where the council changes the information it provides during a consultation process that the consultation is stopped and then restarted so that the full and correct information can be provided.”

10.3.1 Following debate, and upon the motion being put to a vote, with 18 votes in favour the motion was **LOST**.

10.4 The following motion was proposed by Mr T East and seconded by Mr B Watkins:

“Norfolk is so much more than a car county. Census figures show that 18.8% of households in Norfolk (70k) do not own a car and there were 27.3 million passenger journeys on Norfolk buses in 2016/17.

Nearly 90% of those who took part in the 2018 Transport for Norwich survey rated investment in public transport as ‘important’ or ‘very important’, Measures to tackle congestion was rated as ‘important’ or ‘very important’ by 87%. Not surprising when it is estimated that Norwich drivers waste an average 26hrs a year in peak hour congestion.

The Government’s recent announcement that Norwich should be getting some of Transforming Cities Fund which aims to fund “coherent programmes of interlinking interventions which will transform connectivity in key commuter routes in major city regions” Is very welcome.

However, this opportunity must not be squandered. The proposals must be of sufficient quality and the money is only available until 2021- 22.

The Council’s application to the Transforming Cities Fund says Norwich’s Park and Ride network is critical to reducing car commuting, but its contribution to tackling congestion is constrained by Park and Ride not connecting with other bus services or picking up in key suburban locations.

The Council’s application states that Park and Ride based express services will stop at mobility hubs at 10-minute frequencies as shown on the map below. This is critical to making the network an integrated one and to reducing air pollution across the city.

Castle Meadow, a major bus interchange, had NO2 levels of 56 mg/m3 in 2016, exceeding EU targets. This is harmful to health and is completely unacceptable.

This council resolves that by the end of 2021-22 public transport hubs that connect major parts of Norwich and its surrounding area in a similar way to that set out in map 9 of the council’s application to the Transforming Cities Fund will have been implemented and be fully functioning.”

10.4.1 Following debate and upon being put to the vote, with 18 votes in favour, the motion was **LOST**.

10.5 The following motion was proposed by Ms E Corlett and seconded by Mrs J Brociek-Coulton:

“Council notes:

- the vital contribution that Norfolk foster carers and adoptive parents make to keep Norfolk’s children safe, cared for and nurtured.
- the time commitment needed to undertake the relevant training courses prior to taking on these vital roles
- the policy that Norfolk County Council has in place to support its own staff, including time off to attend essential training and development for foster carers and adoptive parents

Council further notes the wider societal responsibility of every Norfolk citizen to our children and young people.

Council therefore **resolves** to

- use our influence as individual councillors and community leaders to encourage people to come forward to become foster carers and adopters with Norfolk County Council
- use our collective influence to encourage Norfolk employers to introduce policies that allow foster carers and adoptive parents paid leave to attend induction courses and training
- work collaboratively with the LEP, Federation of Small Business, Chamber of Commerce and Trade Unions to raise the profile of the needs of foster carers and adoptive parents, promote working practices and policies that support people in this caring role, for the benefit of Norfolk's children."

10.5.1 Mr B Watkins proposed the following amendment, which was seconded by Mr S Aquarone:

"Council notes:

- the vital contribution that Norfolk foster carers and adoptive parents make to keep Norfolk's children safe, cared for and nurtured.
- the time commitment needed to undertake the relevant training courses prior to taking on these vital roles
- the policy that Norfolk County Council has in place to support its own staff, including time off to attend essential training and development for foster carers and adoptive parents

Council further notes the wider societal responsibility of every Norfolk citizen to our children and young people.

Council therefore resolves to

- use our influence as individual councillors and community leaders to encourage people to come forward to become foster carers and adopters with Norfolk County Council
- use our collective influence to encourage Norfolk employers to introduce policies that allow foster carers and adoptive parents paid leave to attend induction courses and training
- work collaboratively with the LEP, Federation of Small Business, Chamber of Commerce and Trade Unions to raise the profile of the needs of foster carers and adoptive parents, promote working practices and policies that support people in this caring role, for the benefit of Norfolk's children."
- **urge local health and care authorities and employers to maximise early help for carers by making policies and rights to financial support clear**

and accessible.

- 10.5.2 As proposer of the original motion Ms E Corlett accepted the amendment which became the substantive motion.
- 10.5.3 Following debate and upon being put to the vote, with 18 votes in favour, the motion was **LOST**.

The Chairman left the meeting and the Vice-Chairman, Mr H Humphrey, took the Chair.

11 Appointments to Committees, Sub-Committees and Joint Committees (Standard item).

Council **noted** the following change to Communities Committee Membership:

- Tim Adams to replace Sarah Butikofer.

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

12.1 Question from Mrs B Jones to the Leader:

Each year Norfolk County Council appoints a number of Member Champions who do valuable work in driving forward the Council's priorities and supporting many vulnerable groups across Norfolk. Will the Leader ask each Member Champion to provide a written report of their activities for members to consider at Full Council in April.

Reply by the Leader:

Member Champions were appointed annually by service committees therefore it was for them to decide if/how reports were submitted. My own view was that a report to the final cycle of service committee meetings each year by Member Champion could be useful.

12.2 Question from Mr S Morpew to the Chairman of Children's Services Committee:

In the current children's centre contract, what percentage of contacts between children's centre staff and parents take place at a designated children's centre and what percentage take place away from a designated centre. What is the value in the existing contract of this outreach?

Reply by the Chairman of Children's Services Committee:

In the period from October 2016 – October 2018 75% of participants attended an activity at a designated children's centre building and 25% of participants attended an activity at an outreach venue. Based on a recent audit, it is apparent that the current balance of onsite/offsite delivery varied across centres and most deliver some of their services offsite. Two centres: North City and Drayton & Taverham have indicated their delivery is all onsite at the centre. We don't apportion a value in the contract to outreach work; it was down to each centre to develop its own service plan against the specification.

12.3 Questions from Ms E Corlett to the Chairman of Children's Services Committee:

How many planned respite sessions have been cancelled by NCC / the service at Morley House in the last two years? What was the total number of children

affected?

How many planned respite sessions have been cancelled by NCC / the service at Marshfields in the last two years? What was the total number of children affected?

In all cases, how was the impact on the child and family assessed? In how many cases was an alternative contingency plan put in place?

Reply by the Chairman of Children's Services Committee:

In January 2018, 6 nights were cancelled by Morley House for one child so that appropriate and necessary additional mental health support was sourced to enable the short breaks provision to take place safely. The child's need for respite was as a consequence of the delay in Morley House moving to offer 52-week residential care.

In May 2018, the local authority asked Morley House to cancel 2 nights respite for a child as a result of the child's changing needs as they moved into a shared care arrangement (between an NCC foster carer and the family).

In September 2018, as a result of the critical health needs of a parent, 2 nights at Morley House were cancelled so that emergency carers could be trained up and familiarised with the needs of the child in order that they were able to provide emergency domiciliary care at home.

Other cancellations have occurred due to parents' wishes or by Morley House as they have not had sufficient staffing, but respite sessions have been rebooked at other times.

This information has not routinely been collated but is being built into future data and performance reporting.

In November 2018 a child was placed for 15 days on an emergency basis and due to very complex needs, 51 nights of respite had to be cancelled affecting 18 children. These sessions will be rebooked with families.

As with Morley House other cancellations have occurred due to parents' wishes or by Marshfields as they have not had sufficient staffing, but respite sessions have been rebooked at other times. This information has not routinely been collated but is being built into future data and performance reporting.

12.4 Question from Mr M Smith-Clare to the Chairman of Children's Services Committee:

Does the council fully support the need for respite care to be provided to families, particularly those caring for children with special educational health needs? If so what can be done to ensure that this care is both accessible and sustainable?

Reply by the Chairman of Children's Services Committee:

As a council we fully support the need for respite care for children with special educational health needs. This includes providing short breaks provision both within the community and where necessary, on a residential basis. It may also include putting additional resources and support into the family home, an aspect of support that we are seeking to further develop.

As part of our ongoing commissioning processes, we are currently engaging with providers around the county to discuss how we work together to ensure that there is sufficient provision of high quality respite care that can respond to and meet the needs of our children

12.5 Question from Mr M Smith-Clare to the Chairman of Children’s Services Committee:

What criteria are being used to evaluate consultation responses related to the future of Children’s Centres?

Reply by the Chairman of Children’s Services Committee:

There were twelve questions that asked residents for their opinions about various aspects of the proposals. Some of these questions gave respondents the opportunity to give a quantitative (numbers) response to demonstrate how far they agree or disagree with our proposal. This provides us with numerical data and these responses will be presented in a graphic format.

Some questions gave respondents the opportunity to give a qualitative (words) response allowing the respondents the chance to describe why they agree or disagree with a particular approach. The way we are analysing these qualitative responses involves each comment being coded into a theme. The final report will include the number of times each coded theme has been mentioned for each question which allows us to identify which comments are the most important to the respondents. This approach has successfully been used in to evaluate responses for previous consultations.

A detailed report outlining the data, coded comments and key themes, impact of the proposals on individuals, groups or communities (known as an Equality Impact Assessment), petitions and how our consultation was promoted will be presented at our Children’s Services Committee meeting on 22nd January 2019 when the findings will be considered by our councillors.

12.6 Question from Mr T Jermy to the Chairman of Environment, Development and Transport Committee:

In the report regarding the Norwich Western Link that went before the November ETD Committee meeting, there was no details about the cost of proceeding to the next stage which specifically included the non-statutory consultation. The report outlined that “the options appraisal and consultation are within scope and budget for the work to be undertaken this financial year”. Could you confirm the total cost of the work, including the cost of officer time?

The report also states that the “Norwich Western Link project team will be developing an Equality Impact Assessment following Norfolk County Council procedures”. Given the clear environmental risks and concerns expressed by the public, can you confirm when the EIA will be produced and published?

Reply by the Chairman of Environment, Development and Transport Committee:

The work in financial year 2018/19 comprises a comprehensive study of the case for the scheme including stakeholder engagement, environmental studies, traffic surveys and modelling, an options appraisal process and report, two phases of public consultation, and the initial preparation of a Strategic Outline Business Case. The cost of this work is as stated in the October 2017 EDT Committee Report at

£1m. This has been met through a £500k allocation from Business Rate Pool funding and £500k match funding from the capital programme.

The work in financial year 2019/20 will build upon the current work and deliver the Outline Business Case, undertake the next stage of environmental and ecological work, preliminary scheme design and preparation for project procurement. The cost of this work is £1.95m and has been met through a 50% allocation from Business Rate Pool funding and 50% match funding from the capital programme.

An Equality Impact Assessment will be completed for the preferred solution process. This will need to be prepared for Spring 2019 to support the decision making documents to be presented to Elected Members. A range of environmental and ecological studies have already been completed, more are ongoing and these will support the scheme design and potential mitigation. Meetings have been held with the Environment Agency and Natural England in order to agree the scope of work and likely mitigation required. The Environmental Impact Assessment will be submitted as part of the planning application process which is currently scheduled for 2021

12.7 Question from Mr S Morpew to the Chairman of Environment, Development and Transport Committee:

Why is the final bill for the NDR taking so long to finalise? When and where will it be reported?

Reply by the Chairman of Environment, Development & Transport Committee:

The delivery of the Broadland Northway saw the new road fully opened in April this year and other minor works completed by the main contractor by July. This is a large contract and there is a significant exercise to complete to review the project costs and check these against what the contract allows for and assess in detail any areas that are disputed between the parties. This can be a very lengthy process if those disputed items cannot be resolved or agreed and this could potentially result in a legal dispute. This final account exercise is ongoing and I hope that it can conclude in the first six months of 2019. Cllr Morpew will appreciate that this is a commercial discussion and that I do not want to weaken our position by applying any artificial end date to discussions, but I can assure him that details will be reported to Members as soon as the process has concluded.

12.8 Question from Mrs C Walker to the Chairman of Environment, Development & Transport Committee:

What representations has the EDT chairman made on behalf of train passengers facing yet more fare increases and a lack of any commitment to tackle the crucial infrastructure improvements required at Trowse and elsewhere between Norwich and London?

Reply by the Chairman of Environment, Development & Transport Committee:

As chairman of EDT I represent the county council on a number of groups and bodies including Transport East, the emerging Sub-national Transport Body, New Anglia Local Transport Board and the Great Eastern Main Line Task Force. Each of these allows me to put across the case for Norfolk; to secure investment that would benefit the county's residents and businesses.

In particular, the Great Eastern Main Line Task Force is working to secure commitment to investment in the Norwich to London line, and this includes making the case for Trowse bridge alongside other investments (at Haughley Junction near Stowmarket and additional track in Essex) needed to deliver improvements to rail services such as Norwich in 90. This Task Force is chaired by Priti Patel MP, supported by all MPs along the line, and works closely with government officials at the Department for Transport, Network Rail and Greater Anglia, the train operator.

Turning to fares, government announced in August that regulated fares (around 45% of fares including season tickets and some tickets on long distance journeys and around major cities) would rise by an average of 3.1% on 2 January 2019. These increases are determined by government and reflect the policy that money raised from farepayers, rather than taxpayers, should cover as much as possible of the cost of running the railway day-to-day.

There is ongoing work within government and the rail industry on fares policy. A final report is expected shortly and is likely to make proposals for fares reform.

12.9 Question from Mr D Douglas to the Chairman of Environment, Development and Transport Committee:

There are regular reports of problems for communities with inadequate bus services and changes that make matters worse. What active interventions are planned to improve services especially outside the urban areas of Norfolk?

Reply by the Chairman of Environment, Development & Transport Committee:

The majority of local bus services in Norfolk are run commercially by the bus operators and therefore we have no influence over the routes, timetables, frequencies or fares. The County Council's role is to identify if there are areas with real problems in accessing key services and to see if this can be resolved by providing a local bus service. We currently spend £3.3m each year on those bus services, nearly all in rural areas, and nearly £0.5m on supporting community transport.

We do have a very good working relationship with all the local bus operators and work with them on the planning of their routes, but at the end of the day, whatever they decide to do is a commercial decision taken by them over which we have no power. If you have any specific examples then the Passenger Transport team would be happy to look into them for you.

The meeting concluded at 3.15pm.

Chairman



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

Norfolk County Council 10 December 2018

RECORDED VOTE – Minutes item No: 6.2.5 (Recommendations from Policy & Resources committee).

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

With 48 votes in favour, 24 votes against and 0 abstentions, Council **AGREED** the recommendations in the report.

Questions requiring written responses from the Council Meeting – Monday 10 December 2018

<p>Question from Ms A Kemp to Chairman of Business & Property Committee</p>	<p>Question and response:</p> <p>Ms Kemp said that her question was about infrastructure, particularly the Nar Ouse Enterprise Zone (NOEZ) which was a very important development for the County Council. She said she had been unable to ascertain whether the gas main in the land opposite the innovation centre had been moved to allow the five sites to become available for commercial development, despite asking the question for several months. Ms Kemp asked if the Chairman could find out the current position and let her know.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>The high pressure gas main diversion was completed in October 2018.</p>
<p>Question to the Chairman of Children’s Services Committee from Mr M Smith-Clare.</p>	<p>Mr M Smith-Clare asked if the speed signs, which had been funded by the people of north Yarmouth Community Group, would remain on Keyes Avenue, near the former Alderman Swindell School, particularly as the site was guaranteed for future education provision.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Installation of speed restriction signs has been included within the draft planning conditions for the new North Denes school building at the request of Highways Development Team. The works have been instructed so a contractor will be identified so it can be completed in the next few months. It is intended that this will reuse those signs currently relating to the former Alderman Swindell school site and any highways requirements for the reuse of the site can be addressed in the subsequent planning application.</p>
<p>Question to the Chairman of Children’s Services Committee from Ms S Squire</p>	<p>Ms Squire stated, considering this authority’s poor performance in the number of Educational Health and Care Plans (EHCP) completed within the legally allowed timescale, together with the sheer number of tribunals, their costs and the low number that were upheld in favour of Norfolk County Council, as well as the number of excluded children with special educational needs, if the Chairman would like to state whether he felt that, while it was great to be providing more special school places, we were letting down some of the most vulnerable children and their families. She also asked if the services provided were acceptable and if the Chairman could inform Council of the number of children in Norfolk that had been off-rolled from one school and not appeared on the roll of another so were currently missing from education.</p> <p>Response from the Chairman:</p> <p>The Chairman replied that we recognise that as numbers of children being referred for an EHCP has risen, and with the exceptionally high number of already statemented children that had to be transferred to an EHCP, we have struggled to meet the DFE’s 20-week timescale for completion of plans. We apologise to some families where we have taken longer to complete the plan and this has caused concern. Our SEND transformation programme will focus on increasing staffing capacity, as well adopting the recommendations of the Strategy Development Unit Report which scrutinised practice and is reported to committee. Furthermore we have engaged external capacity to drive up performance. Over 7,000 children have an EHCP or are within the process and the majority are well served by their schools and their EHCP. However we continue to strive to ensure the best</p>

	<p>Question and response:</p> <p>practice and provision for all children.</p> <p>The number of children who have come off a school roll is known to us, where they leave a school, move school, move out of the county or their parents choose to Home School. 'Off-rolling' is a term used colloquially to describe a child / parents being encouraged to leave a school, or home school, and this may happen without informing the Local Authority. We make every effort to know about all children. We have reported the numbers of children being home schooled in a previous committee and will update committee on an annual cycle as agreed. We have also reported exclusions figures previously, and this month report a drop in numbers compared to this time last year. We can provide these figures again to Cllr Squire as well as the movement in and out of schools that we are currently tracking.</p>
<p>Question to the Chairman of Communities Committee from Dr C Jones</p>	<p>Dr Jones said in relation to Norfolk County Council's contract for Drug and Alcohol Services with Change Grove Live, what multi-agency work was being commissioned in relation to drug related offending, county lines and Operation Gravity.</p> <p>Response from the Chairman:</p> <p>Change Grow Live (CGL) have been commissioned to support the reduction in drug and alcohol related crime and anti-social behaviour in Norfolk through the delivery of effective drug and alcohol interventions across the whole criminal justice pathway, including transfer from custody to the community. The provider will deliver relevant and accessible services across all areas of Norfolk.</p> <p>They work in an integrated way with the whole of criminal justice system both in community settings and within the relevant criminal justice settings such as Police Investigation Centres (PICs), courts and local prisons.</p> <p>Through developing information and data sharing guidelines to enhance partnership working, they will be able to share relevant information and intelligence pertinent to vulnerable clients who maybe at further risk of exploitation due to county lines type activities such as cuckooing or through gang like pursuits.</p> <p>CGL are expected to balance the provision of treatment & interventions to drug and alcohol users on assessed need whilst considering the additional needs of those that pose a high risk to themselves, risk to others or risk to the wider community and they will follow as appropriate the Norfolk safeguarding protocols or other relevant guidelines.</p> <p>Other information:</p> <p>Public health also commission The Matthew Project to deliver drug & alcohol specialist interventions and support to young people. This will involve young people who are caught up in gang related activities linked to county lines.</p> <p>Public health also make a contribution to the drug/alcohol work currently delivered by the Norfolk Youth Offending Team, who deliver a range of services to young people who are being or at risk of being criminally exploited, including county lines.</p>
<p>Question to the Chairman of EDT Committee from Mr</p>	<p>Mr Aquarone said that some of his constituents had raised the issue of never ending road closures by utility companies and asked if the Chairman could let Council know how often it had used overstay fees on utility companies and how much money had been raised. He also asked, in light of those figures, how much money he thought the Council would collect from the lane rental</p>

	Question and response:
S Aquarone.	<p>charges when they were introduced.</p> <p>Response from the Chairman: Q1: How often the council has used overstay fees on utility companies? A1: For the last complete financial year of 2017/18, there were 294 separate Section 74 overrun charges raised on utility companies</p> <p>Q2: How much money was raised? A2: Again, for 2017/18, Norfolk County Council collected £188,615 in Section 74 overrun charges.</p> <p>Q3: How much money would the council collect from the lane rental charges when they are introduced? A3: Norfolk County Council does not have any plans to introduce a Lane Rental scheme in Norfolk at the current time, so does not have these figures. Presently this type of scheme only exists in London & Kent and only for certain sections of the road network. Now that the Department for Transport have recently opened this option to other highway authorities, some have begun to actively consider introducing a similar scheme. Hertfordshire County Council report that it will take around 2 years to identify, develop & introduce such a scheme. Through existing regional streetworks meetings, Officers will closely monitor how the Hertfordshire scheme develops and keep the advantages and disadvantages under review..</p>