

Norfolk County Council

Annual General Meeting

Date: **Monday 9 May 2016**

Time: **10.00 a.m**

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

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

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

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

Prayers

To Call the Roll

AGENDA

1. **To elect a Chairman for the ensuing year**

2 **Minutes**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council
meeting held on 11 April 2016

(Page 4)

3. **To elect a Vice-Chairman for the ensuing year**

4. **Vote of thanks to the outgoing Chairman**

5 **To receive any announcements from the Chairman**

6. Members to declare any interests

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

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

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

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

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

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

7 Election of Leader of the Council

8. Election of Deputy Leader of the Council

9. Appointments to Committees, Sub-Committees and Joint Committees for 2016/17

Report by Head of Democratic Services

(Page 18)

10. Appointment of the Chairs and Vice-Chairs of Service Committees

11. Questions to Leader of the Council

12. Questions to Service Committee Chairs

13. Reports from Committees

- Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee -14 April 2016 (Page 28)
- Health and Wellbeing Board - 26 April 2016 (Page 32)
- Audit Committee – 21 April 2016 (Page 33)
- Planning (Regulatory) Committee – 1 April 2016 (Page 36)
- Records Committee Meeting - 22 April 2016 (Page 40)
- Joint Museums Committee – 22 April 2016 (Page 41)

14. **Notice of Motion**

Notice of a motion has been given in accordance with the Council Procedure Rules as follows:-

- (i) Proposed by Ms E. Corlett (Page 45)

15. **To answer Questions under Rule 8.3 of the Council Procedure Rules (if any received)**

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

Date Agenda Published: 28 April 2016

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

Greg Insull on 01603 223100 or email greg.insull@norfolk.gov.uk



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

Tel: 01603 223100
Minicom 01603 223833

Email: greg.insull@norfolk.gov.uk and we will do our best to help

Norfolk County Council**Minutes of the Meeting Held on 11 April 2016****Present:**

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

Present: 80

Apologies for Absence:

Apologies for absence were received from Mr S Clancy, Mr P Hacon, Ms E Morgan and Mr M Storey.

1 Minutes

- 1.1 The minutes of the Council meeting held on 22 February 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

2 Chairman's Announcements

- 2.1 There were no announcements.

3 Declarations of Interest

- 3.1 Mr D Roper declared an interest in item 6 (Recommendations from Service Committees – Children's Services Committee Meeting held on 15 March 2016, Norfolk Youth Justice Plan) as he was a Member of the County Rehabilitation Board.

Mrs C Walker declared an interest in item 7 – Reports from Committees (Norse Governance Review) as she was a Director of Norse.

Ms E Corlett declared an interest in item 7(i) Questions to Chair of Adult Social Care Committee as she was an employee of Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust.

4 Questions to Leader of the Council

4.1 Question from Mr C Jordan

Mr Jordan said that, as Leader of the Council, Mr Nobbs had often said he acted in the interests of the people of Norfolk, or Norfolk and the people of Norfolk in the devolution negotiations. Mr Jordan asked if the Leader could clear up any confusion as to what was going to happen, when it was going to happen and what we should be debating and when we should be debating it. Mr Jordan said the situation was confusing, if not for Councillors, certainly for Parish Councils.

The Leader said he could let everyone know what the timetable was as he felt it was important that everyone knew what was happening. He added that Council would be debating the report from the Policy & Resources Committee meeting and endorsing the work that had taken place so far with regard to negotiations and authorising the Leader of the Council and key officers to continue negotiating in good faith to get the best deal possible for Norfolk.

The Leader continued that Government legislation allowed for a mayor to be elected to a combined authority as of 17 May 2017, therefore the timetable worked back from there. Councils needed to decide whether or not to proceed no later than 4 July 2016 in order for a public consultation to take place. A special Council meeting would need

to be convened on 27 June for Council to debate and agree whether or not it wished to proceed.

The Leader continued that it would be at that stage when every council in Norfolk, Suffolk and Cambridgeshire that had decided to continue with the process, would consider a draft scheme setting out the main constitutional provisions, which would have been negotiated with the involvement of all the Leaders. That scheme would then be submitted for public consultation. After that, government would draft an order and those Councils which were still in the process would hold a further meeting to make their final decision, in October, as to whether or not they wished to proceed.

The Leader considered that he believed the government would insist on there being an elected mayor, although this was not his personal choice.

4.2 Question from Dr M Strong

Dr Strong said that when the concept of devolution had initially been presented it had been clearly stated that the role of mayor was optional and this had been repeated until it had become compulsory. Dr Strong added that in her area, it was the distaste of the concept of a mayor which had dominated recent conversations. She also said that whilst there were a number of very exciting opportunities, there were a lot of possibilities which needed to be firmed up if the county committed to the concept of devolution. Dr Strong asked the Leader, as he represented the Council in meetings with devolution officialdom, how trusting he was that not only this council but the county of Norfolk would not feel disappointed in the final package?

The Leader replied he didn't know whether the county of Norfolk would feel disappointed and that it was not yet a fait accompli. He added that all councillors taking part would have come up with what they considered was the best possible form of governance and also what they thought was the best possible deal they could get. This would then form the basis for the public consultation. The Leader added that the results of the consultation would be considered, as had been the case in the consultation on the budget, and added that it would be a matter for individual judgement if Members considered they could recommend the deal and sign it off. The Leader added that the deal could fall if there were too many key players who decided not to take part.

The Leader also added that there were pros and cons to the scheme and although at the beginning of the process we had been told that an elected mayor was an option, it had been at the meeting with Greg Clarke and Lord Heseltine that it was made clear that having an elected mayor was a take it or leave it part of the devolution deal.

4.3 Question from Mr R Bearman

Mr Bearman asked if the Leader agreed with Mr S Morphew's statement to Policy & Resources Committee which said that the current devolution plans were flawed and we should decline to have anything to do with them.

The Leader responded that he agreed the plans were flawed and far from perfect and that he wished to stress the devolution plans were not his scheme, but a Conservative Government proposal which he was presenting to Council as honestly as he could. He reiterated that there were flaws but he didn't consider Norfolk County Council should have nothing to do with them as he felt the public should be consulted. He continued that there were substantial sums of money involved in any deal and the people of

Norfolk should have a say on any proposals.

4.4 Question from Mr B Bremner

Mr Bremner referred to the exemplary gateway scheme Norfolk used to have with Norwich City Council and asked why Norfolk had not yet taken any Syrian Refugees. He asked what the holdup was and if we could commit to taking people from the next tranche of Syrian refugees in June 2016.

The Leader replied that some work had been carried out with Norwich City Council and it had been agreed that a number of Syrian Refugees could be taken although we would need to ensure that the costs of properly resettling and ensuring they could become independent could be recouped. The Leader added that the Home Office had confirmed they could not and would not meet the cost that Norwich City Council and Norfolk County Council had requested. Therefore, without the funding it would make it extremely difficult to settle the refugees and give them the best possible chance of finding a better life. He continued by saying that was why Norwich City Council and Norfolk County Council continued to make a joint case for additional funding. The Leader confirmed that Norfolk County Council and Norwich City Council were committed to taking refugees but funding needed to be found. He added that a further briefing for Group Leaders would be held this week and reiterated that the delay had been caused by trying to negotiate sufficient funding.

4.5 Question from Ms A Kemp

Ms Kemp asked the Leader about devolution and asked if having an elected mayor as part of a devolution deal gave too much power to one person, who may not come from Norfolk and who would possibly only be able to act in the interests of a particular area. She asked if it wasn't the case that, with an elected mayor, we would end up with a "concrete jungle" because an elected mayor would have a mandate to push through an ambitious housing target. She asked if the Leader would back a referendum to let the people of Norfolk decide if they wanted to have an elected mayor.

The Leader replied that whoever the elected person was could not come from all areas of Norfolk, Suffolk or Cambridgeshire at the same time. He added that with regard to the "concrete jungle", he thought there was a need for affordable housing, particularly in rural Norfolk, Cambridgeshire and Suffolk and that provision of housing would not be any different if there was an elected Mayor.

He continued by saying that it could be argued the concentration of power was not about taking power from councils, it was about taking powers from Government.

5 Notice of Motions

5.1 The following motion was proposed by Mr R Bearman and seconded by Mr A Dearnley:

"We ask this council to support lowering the voting age to 16. Researchers at Edinburgh University have found high levels of political engagement among this age group. In the Scottish independence referendum, which widened the franchise to 16 and 17 year-olds, turnout among this age group hit 75%.

In the most recent Norfolk MYP elections turnout from young people was the highest ever with 51% of 11-18 year-olds voting. 16 and 17 year-olds are eligible to pay taxes, yet have no say in how it is to be spent through the democratic process at either local or

national level.

This Council therefore RESOLVES to write to the government, the leader of the opposition and our local MPs stating that Norfolk County Council supports lowering the voting age to 16 for local and national elections, and to suggest Norfolk as a possible pilot area for 16 and 17 year-olds to participate in local government elections."

- 5.1.1 Following debate, and upon being put to a vote, with 25 votes in favour, 55 votes against and 0 abstentions, the motion was **LOST**.

- 5.2 Mr J Dobson asked Council to accept an amendment to the proposed motion under Paragraph 11.7 of the Council Procedure Rules, sub paragraph (a). Council **agreed** the amended motion set out below. The amended motion was seconded by M Chenery of Horsbrugh.

"This Council notes that its first- stated, published priority in the recently completed re-imagining exercise published on our new web-site is "excellence in education – working for a well-educated Norfolk where people are prepared for real jobs with good wages and prospects". Although not formally spelt out, it is taken for granted that resources for this priority will be evenly applied across the full range of Norfolk schools. It is therefore disappointing to learn that resources for recently negotiated Broadband contracts for individual schools are in some cases not being evenly applied – rather, some schools in rural areas have been disadvantaged because of their lack of super-fast Broadband, with the result that teaching using computers and other digital aids will be either more expensive, markedly less effective, or both. Also, there is inequity in the contract terms between High Schools and Primary Schools. The Council therefore is critical of the advice given to members of the Policy and Resources Committee at its November 2015 meeting which was: "Schools are likely, in general, to see reduced costs, even though the service to schools is currently subsidised by the council and this will cease under the new contract. But some hard-to-reach schools will see an increase in costs – in the form of a one-off, set- up charge and potentially a somewhat higher ongoing charge – because they will be paying the actual cost of their service and not a cost averaged across all schools." ~~This Council regrets that the Policy and Resources Committee authorised the letting of a contract on this latter, unfair basis.~~

In order to bring equity across Norfolk schools in the resources available for Broadband contracts, this Council now asks the Policy and Resources Committee, together with Children's Services, to set up a joint working group to identify and recommend for implementation mitigating measures to restore equity in Broadband financing resources between schools in rural and urban locations, as well as between Primary and High schools."

- 5.2.1 Ms E Corlett proposed the following amendment:

"This Council notes that its first-stated, published priority in the recently completed re-imagining exercise published on our new web-site is "excellence in education – working for a well-educated Norfolk where people are prepared for real jobs with good wages and prospects". Although not formally spelt out, it is taken for granted that resources for this priority will be evenly applied across the full range of Norfolk schools. It is therefore disappointing to learn that resources for recently negotiated Broadband contracts for individual schools are in some cases not being evenly applied

– rather, some schools in rural areas have been disadvantaged because of their lack of super-fast Broadband, with the result that teaching using computers and other digital aids will be either more expensive, markedly less effective, or both. Also, there is inequity in the contract terms between High Schools and Primary Schools. The Council therefore is critical of the advice given to members of the Policy and Resources Committee at its November 2015 meeting which was: “Schools are likely, in general, to see reduced costs, even though the service to schools is currently subsidised by the council and this will cease under the new contract. But some hard-to-reach schools will see an increase in costs – in the form of a one-off, set-up charge and potentially a somewhat higher ongoing charge – because they will be paying the actual cost of their service and not a cost averaged across all schools.”

In order to bring equity across Norfolk schools in the resources available for Broadband contracts, this Council now asks the Policy and Resources Committee, together with Children’s Services, ~~to set up a joint working group~~ **to re-convene the existing working group** to identify and recommend for implementation mitigating measures to restore equity in Broadband financing resources between schools in rural and urban locations, as well as between Primary and High schools.”

5.2.2 Upon being put to the vote, with 31 votes in favour, 43 votes against and 3 abstentions, the amendment was **LOST**.

5.2.3 The substantive motion was then debated and upon being put to the vote, with 54 votes in favour, 5 votes against and 19 abstentions, the motion was **CARRIED**.

6 Recommendations from Service Committees

6.1 Policy & Resources – 21 March 2016.

Mr G Nobbs, Chair of Policy & Resources Committee moved the report and the following recommendations:

- 6.1.1
1. Recommend to County Council that Council considers the draft Devolution agreement for East Anglia and endorses the next steps as set out in section 3 of the report.
 2. That the Leader, with key officers, be authorised to continue to represent Norfolk’s best interests in the next stages of the process of designing a scheme of governance and business plan.

Upon being put to the vote, with 70 votes in favour, 7 votes against and 2 abstentions, Council **RESOLVED** to agree the recommendations.

6.1.2 Council **RESOLVED** to agree the changes to the Financial Regulations contained within the report.

6.1.3 Council **RESOLVED** to agree

1. The suggested Public Question Rules as set out in Appendix A of the report.
2. The suggested Committee Procedure Rules for dealing with motions as set out in Appendix B of the report.

6.2 **Children's Services – 15 March 2016**

Mr J Joyce, Chairman of Children's Services Committee, moved the recommendation in the report, that County Council approve the Norfolk Youth Justice Plan 2016-17.

Council **RESOLVED** to approve the Norfolk Youth Justice Plan 2016-17.

6.3 **Communities – 16 March 2016**

Mr P Smyth, Chair of Communities Committee, moved the recommendation in the report, that Council adopt the Trading Standards Service Plan.

Council **RESOLVED** to adopt the Trading Standards Service Plan.

6.4 **Environment, Development and Transport – 29 January and 11 March 2016**

Mr T Coke, Chair of Environment, Development and Transport Committee moved the reports and the recommendations contained therein.

Council **RESOLVED** to agree the recommendations as set out the report. The Green group asked that it be noted they voted against the recommendation - Silica Sand Review of the Minerals Site Specific Allocations Plan: Pre-Submission and Submission Stages.

7 **Reports from Service Committees (Questions to Chairs)**

7.1 **Report of the Policy and Resources Committee meetings held on 8 February and 21 March 2016.**

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

7.1.1 **Question from Mrs J Leggett**

Mrs Leggett asked whether the Chair thought it was a good idea to make a new website live with what appeared to be insufficient systems testing.

The Chair of Policy & Resources Committee replied that he did not believe there had been insufficient systems testing.

7.1.2 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

Ms Kemp asked how much money had been agreed for the establishment of a project budget to provide the necessary capacity for Norfolk to fully participate and shape the detailed work to secure the devolution agreement.

The Chair of Policy & Resources deferred the question to the Managing Director who said that no specific amount of money had been agreed at the present time and that discussions were taking place with colleagues in neighbouring counties to clarify what capacity was necessary between now and the end of June. Other than the £10k provided by each of the members of the combined authority when discussions first started, no cash had been put in apart from the £1200 put in last June to explore the very early discussions with other Norfolk authorities.

The Leader said it was his understanding that all expenses were claimed in the same way as any other occasion when Leaders and Officers needed to visit places in pursuance of their duties and that he did not know how much had been claimed as each individual person would have claimed via their own authority.

7.1.3 Question from Mr B Watkins

Mr Watkins referred to the minutes from the Policy & Resources meeting held on 21 March which projected an £817k overspend on the 2015/16 budget. He asked if the Leader, or Deputy Leader, could give the updated position.

The Chair deferred the question to the Vice-Chair, who responded that he was pleased to report the period 11 figures showed a balanced budget. He added that he hoped the figures in period 12 would show a very slight underspend.

7.1.4 Question from Mrs A Thomas

Mrs Thomas asked, as he thought the website testing had been sufficient, if the Chair could explain why the website failed and also explain why, when Members had tried to download their papers for meetings, they had been sent a message that the IT Administrator had blocked access to the papers and that papers would need to be downloaded in a different way, which was most inconvenient for those Members who used their ipads.

The Chair replied that the website had not failed and that it had been Good for Enterprise that had failed.

7.1.5 Question from Mr B Borrett

Mr Borrett asked, following on from his earlier statement, what specific report stated that the Government had said we had to have an elected mayor.

The Chair referred to the recorded note of the meeting in Cambridgeshire with Greg Clarke, Secretary of State and Lord Heseltine which would provide the information requested.

7.1.6 Question from Mr R Smith

Mr Smith asked for the Leader's comments on the performance of the Beach coach station car park scheme at Great Yarmouth. He said that the report to EDT had stated that the scheme had made a loss of £2.4m in the building of 19 houses on the site and that he could not see any explanation in the report about how the money had been lost, which amounted to a loss of approximately £19k on every house built. He continued that Councillor Walker would know about this as she was a Director of the Great Yarmouth Development Company which appeared to have insufficient funds to repay the loan from the Norfolk Infrastructure Fund. Mr Smith asked the Leader if he would comment on how the company had managed to lose such a large sum of money on a relatively small housing scheme.

The Chair deferred the question to the Chair of Environment Development & Transport Committee who said that the loss was about £100k not £2.4m and that he would provide a written response to Mr Smith.

7.1.7 Council RESOLVED to note the report.

7.2 **Report of the Adult Social Care Committee meetings held on 25 January and 7 March 2016**

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

7.2.1 **Question from Ms C Rumsby**

Ms Rumsby asked the Chair what progress had been made to address employment figures for people with mental health issues and learning difficulties.

The Chair replied that the percentage of people with mental health issues and learning difficulties who were in paid employment was very disappointing, being around 3% although this figure was not too much out of kilter with other county councils that had a social services responsibility. The Chair added that this was a priority for the department, as well as the Mental Health Trust and the Department for Work and Pensions. She considered that the most sensible way forward would be for everyone to work together rather than in three separate strands, possibly targeting the same people, and holding conversations with large employers in the county, including the county council, to ensure everyone played their part.

7.2.2 **Question from Mr B Watkins**

Mr Watkins said that with the recent launch of the promoting independence strategy, the Adult Social Care department would be working with local community groups and voluntary organisations to reduce dependence on traditional care services and to help people remain as independent as possible. Two pilot schemes were in the process of being launched, however, building sufficient infrastructure and support mechanisms across the communities of Norfolk would be essential if this new approach was to succeed. Clearly this would be quite a difficult task. Mr Watkins asked the Chair to outline how the department intended to address this crucial issue.

The Chair replied that the department wished to build on what was happening already and added that the first community link meeting had been held in Harleston, at an existing facility which people were already attending for other reasons. The second of the link meetings was to be held on 11 April in Aylsham with a third meeting being held in King's Lynn week commencing 18 April. The Chair said work was being undertaken to build on the use of premises in district council areas as it was considered very important to use existing premises which were already being used by voluntary groups and which would help people realise what was already available in their local community. The Chair added that it was important to remember that offers could be different in different areas and just because something was on offer in Great Yarmouth did not mean it needed to be the same as an offer in King's Lynn as it was important to gear facilities to individual circumstances. The Chair continued by stating she had outlined three of the locations and that over the next two to three months there would be at least one community link facility offered in each of the seven district council areas.

The Chair went on to say that the real change that needed to take place was in the department's new way of providing social work and the new ways of working.

The Chair reiterated it was not a question of starting from scratch, it was a question of building on what was already available including additional joint working, not only with district councils and existing voluntary organisations, but hopefully with the health service and various other organisations.

7.2.3 **Question from Mr B Borrett**

Mr Borrett quoted from the report of the meeting held on 7 March (item 7 – Risk Management, paragraph 7.2. (f)) and stated that Risk RM14237 ‘Deprivation of Liberty Safeguarding’ was changed from an amber risk to a red risk. Mr Borrett added that the Committee had felt that the amber risk as it had been scored on the risk register was not sufficient and did not reflect the details of the risk that the Committee had been presented with. Mr Borrett asked the Chair for her assurance that the matrix which had produced the amber result did not include any other failures and that the results would be revisited to ensure they were correct.

The Chair gave her assurance.

7.2.4 **Question from Mr R Smith**

Mr Smith stated that Dave Hill, who had been appointed by the Secretary of State, had challenged the pace of improvement across all services. He added that Children’s Services did not have a monopoly on social work and asked the Chair what review or processes had taken place with regard to improving social work within Adult Social Care.

The Chair responded that ongoing discussions had been held with the UEA on the social work training course they offered as it was felt that there had been an accent on children’s social work, possibly to the detriment of adult social work training. The Chair referred to her response to Mr B Watkins’ question about a new model of social work and new way of working where there had been a switch from looking at what people could not do, to what they could do and building on individual strengths. She also referred to the extensive programme of training being undertaken for all adult social care social workers to make sure that the new message was getting through.

7.2.5 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

Ms Kemp asked, with regard to the home care service, what steps had been taken to ensure the service ran efficiently and that people were not receiving 10 minute visits when they had paid for 30 minute visits as she understood this remained a problem in King’s Lynn and west Norfolk.

The Chair replied that no action could be taken if the department was not notified of any problems. The Chair urged everyone to let the department know if there were any issues.

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

7.3 **Report of the Children’s Services Committee meetings held on 26 January and 15 March 2016.**

Mr J Joyce, Chair of Children’s Services Committee moved the report.

7.3.1 **Question from Mr R Smith**

Mr Smith referred to a report in the EDP about the findings of Dave Hill, the Commissioner appointed by the Secretary of State to improve Children’s social care. He added that the report issued, which had not yet been seen by Councillors, challenged the County Council to accelerate the pace of improvement across all services. Mr Smith asked the Chair precisely what that meant and was it within the

department's capacity to meet the pace outlined in the report.

The Chair said that a meeting had been held on Friday 8 April, however he could not comment as it was up to the Department for Education to comment on the report. Mr Joyce added that discussions were being held about the recommendations as these were all about the pace of improvement. The Chair referred to the introduction of a new leaving care service in September 2015 and said it was his opinion that the department was now capable, under the new structure, of increasing the pace and meeting the challenges.

7.3.2 Question from Mrs J Leggett

Mrs Leggett said that when Sheila Lock joined the council she had introduced several changes. Mrs Leggett asked the Chair if Dave Hill's report actually suggested further changes were required to do something different as opposed to doing everything we should be doing, quicker.

The Chair replied that he could not comment on Dave Hill's report as it had not yet been published. He added that the changes introduced by Sheila Lock were totally necessary and that he would be very surprised if there was anything in Dave Hill's report which referred to those changes being wrong. The Chair continued that the County Council needed to get its act together and do things quicker because any day lost to a child could not be put back and cases needed to be dealt with as quickly and fairly as possible, without rushing into a decision. The important thing was to ensure a child was safe and we needed to act sensibly and ensure that all action taken was in the best interest of the child.

7.3.3 Council RESOLVED to note the report.

7.4 Report of the Communities Committee meetings held on 27 January and 16 March 2016

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

7.4.1 Council RESOLVED to note the report.

7.5 Report of the Environment, Development and Transport Committee meetings held on 29 January and 11 March 2016.

Mr T Coke, Chair of EDT Committee moved the report.

7.5.1 Question from Mr B Hannah

Mr Hannah referred to the Norfolk Parking Partnership report and thanked the Committee and Officers for the support offered when considering parking meters in his local area. He added that the support they had given local people and the notice that had been taken of local views was appreciated.

7.5.2 Question from Mr M Wilby

Mr Wilby asked if the Chair of EDT could explain how the pilot scheme of pay as you throw at some of Norfolk's recycling centres was going to work as it appeared that who paid what was down to the employee on the gate which could put employees in a very awkward position.

The Chair replied that 11 April was the first day of the pilot scheme and that he fully endorsed the principle of people using the facility being the ones that paid for it, as it was not a statutory service. He added that pay as you throw had been in place for approximately 7 years and this new pilot scheme would make it a much fairer system. He said that vehicles in the past had paid according to the size of the vehicle, and that under the new proposal a charge would be made based on the content and amount of waste, which would make the system much fairer. The Chair confirmed that it was up to the trained staff to ascertain what users would be paying and that feedback would be gathered in due course.

7.5.3 Question from Mr S Askew

Mr Askew asked if the Chair would join him in paying tribute to the skill and professionalism of the emergency services personnel who had attended the rail incident in his division on 10 April at Roudham. He added that he had heard nothing but praise for the way they had handled a very difficult situation.

The Chair of EDT said he thoroughly endorsed the sentiments as indeed did the Leader and said it had been a very impressive effort by everyone concerned.

7.5.4 Question from Dr A Boswell

Dr Boswell referred to the Air Quality Management item and said that the Committee had resolved to bring a report back to a future Committee meeting, although no date had been agreed. Dr Boswell continued by saying since the meeting, the Government had been taken to the Supreme Court again on its strategy for tackling air management being inadequate which could mean that fines would be passed to local Councils. Dr Boswell asked the Chair whether he would commit to bringing the report back to the July meeting of EDT which should give a reasonable amount of time to get a report together.

The Chair endorsed Dr Boswell's comments and said that, if it was possible, a report would be presented to the Committee in July 2016.

7.5.5 Question from Mrs J Chamberlin

Mrs Chamberlin said that she understood the Highways budget for traffic regulation orders had been abolished and that, although she understood the possible rationale, the Parish and Town Councils had not been informed or advised how they should proceed. Mrs Chamberlin asked that a briefing note be sent to Councillors and Parish and Town Councils to clarify the situation.

The Chair replied that he would arrange for a briefing note to be sent to all Members.

7.5.6 Question from Mr J Childs

Mr Childs thanked the Chair of EDT and the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services for rescheduling the road works on Great Yarmouth seafront which had been due to take place over the Easter holiday and would have led to disrupted holiday trade for the arcades, theatre, Hippodrome circus and other businesses. Mr Childs said that due to the rescheduling of the work, the holiday season had started well with no disruption to traffic and visitors were able to park.

7.5.7 Question from Mr B Spratt

Mr Spratt referred to the information given on the new Norfolk County Council website which stated that reported pot holes would be filled within 3 days, or 6 days if

notified over a weekend period. Mr Spratt asked the Chairman if Norfolk County Council would be able to keep to that standard.

The Chair replied that the general view was that the standard could be adhered to.

7.5.8 Question from Mr R Smith

Mr Smith asked the Chair of EDT, with the controversy surrounding British Steel and its closure of the Port Talbot works, if he knew, or if he could find out, the origin of the steel work being used to construct the NDR. He added that there had been some talk that local authorities should be encouraged to purchase British steel.

The Chair replied that he did not know the answer but that he would find out.

7.5.9 Council RESOLVED to note the report.

7.6 Report of the Economic Development Sub-Committee meetings held on 21 January and 24 March 2016

7.6.1 Council RESOLVED to note the report.

Other Committees

7.7 Report of the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings held on 3 December 2015 and 25 February 2016.

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

7.8 Report of the Audit Committee meeting held on 28 January 2016

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

7.9 Report of the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meetings held on 8 January and 19 February 2016

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

7.10 Report of the Standards Committee meeting held on 23 March 2016.

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

7.11 Report of the Health and Wellbeing Board meeting held on 3 February 2016

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

7.12 Report of the Joint Museums Committee meeting held on 7 January 2016

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

7.13 Report of the Records Committee meeting held on 7 January 2016.

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

7.14 Report of the Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee meetings held on 21 January and 17 March 2016.

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

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

There were none.

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

There were none.

10 Any Other Business

As this was the last whole County Council meeting chaired by the current Chairman, the Leader placed on record his thanks to Mr R Parkinson-Hare.

The meeting concluded at 1.45pm.

Chairman



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

Appointments to Committees, Sub-Committees and Joint Committees for 2016/17

Report by Head of Democratic Services

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 At its Annual General Meeting, Council is required to appoint the membership of its committees, sub-committees and joint committees for the ensuing Council year.
- 1.2 The political balance arrangements on committees were reviewed and approved by Full Council in December 2015 following two by-elections that had resulted in change to the political composition of the Council. There have been no further changes to the political composition since then.
- 1.3 The current membership is set out in this report and Council is asked to decide whether to confirm the membership as it is or to make any changes.
- 1.4 Council's attention is drawn to the following issues that also need to be addressed:-
 - (i) In appointing its two members to serve on the Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee, Council is required to appoint one of the two members to be the Joint Committee's Chair for the ensuing year;
 - (ii) There are 2 Labour vacancies on the Panel of Substitutes for Regulatory Committees and a Labour vacancy on the General Purposes Committee

2.0 Recommendation

- 2.1 That Council appoints its committees, sub-committees and joint committees for 2016/17, including to the vacant positions set out in 1.4 (ii) above;
- 2.2 That Council determines which of its two members on the Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee will be the Joint Committee's Chair.

SECTION 1

SERVICE COMMITTEES AND POLICY AND RESOURCES

Policy and Resources Committee - 17

Conservative (9)

Cliff Jordan
Andrew Proctor
Hilary Cox
Ian Mackie
Roger Smith
Ian Monson
Judy Leggett
Alison Thomas
Martin Wilby

Labour (3)

Mick Castle
Steve Morphew
George Nobbs

Liberal Democrat (2)

Marie Strong
Daniel Roper

UKIP & Ind (2)

Fred Agnew
Michael Baker

Green(1)

Adrian Dearnley

Adult Social Care Committee - 17

Conservative (8)

Beverley Spratt
Margaret Stone
William Richmond
Shelagh Gurney
Tom Garrod
Andrew Proctor
Alison Thomas
Bill Borrett

Labour (3)

Julie Brociek-Coulton
Mike Sands
Sue Whitaker

Liberal Democrat (2)

Brian Watkins
Eric Seward

UKIP & Ind (3)

Denis Crawford
Alan Grey
Jim Perkins

Green(1)

Elizabeth Morgan

Children's Services Committee- 17 plus 2 Church representatives (voting)

Conservative (8)

Judith Virgo
Jenny Chamberlin
Roger Smith
Tony Adams
Brian Long
Mark Kiddle-Morris
Barry Stone
Tony White

Labour (3)

David Collis
Emma Corlett
Bert Bremner

Liberal Democrat (2)

James Joyce
Brian Hannah

UKIP & Ind (3)

Denis Crawford
Paul Gilmour
Jim Perkins

Green(1)

Richard Bearman

Communities Committee - 17

Conservative (8)

Harry Humphrey
Hilary Cox
Margaret Dewsbury
John Ward
Nigel Shaw
Nigel Dixon
Wyndham Northam
Jason Law

Labour (3)

Julie Brociek-Coulton
Mike Sands
Chrissie Rumsby

Liberal Democrat (2)

Allison Bradnock
David Harrison

UKIP & Ind (3)

Colin Aldred
Jonathon Childs
Paul Smyth

Green(1)

Richard Bearman

Environment, Development & Transport Committee - 17

Conservative (9)

Colin Foulger
Stuart Clancy
Tony White
Brian Iles
Judy Leggett
Martin Wilby
Margaret Dewsbury
Graham Plant
Claire Bowes

Labour (3)

Bert Bremner
Terry Jermy
Colleen Walker

Liberal Democrat (2)

Tim East
John Timewell

UKIP & Ind (2)

Toby Coke
Jonathan Childs

Green(1)

Andrew Boswell

SUB-COMMITTEES

Economic Development Sub-Committee – 9

Conservative (5)

Martin Wilby
Stuart Clancy
Claire Bowes
Tony White
Colin Foulger

Labour (2)

Collen Walker
Terry Jermy

Liberal Democrat (1)

John Timewell

UKIP & Ind (1)

Jonathan Childs

OTHER COMMITTEES

Planning (Regulatory) Committee - 17

Conservative (8)

John Ward
Tony White
Jason Law
Stephen Askew
Wyndham Northam
Brian Long
Martin Storey
Colin Foulger

Labour (3)

Bert Bremner
David Collis
Mike Sands

Liberal Democrat (2)

Eric Seward
David Harrison

UKIP & Ind (3)

Fred Agnew
Michael Baker
Alan Grey

Green (1)

Elizabeth Morgan

Panel of Substitutes for Regulatory Committees - 17

Conservative (8)

Brian Iles
Jenny Chamberlin
Adrian Gunson
Ian Monson
Alec Byrne
William Richmond
Margaret Stone
Nigel Dixon

Labour (3)

Terry Jermy
2 Vacancies

Liberal Democrat (2)

Tim East
John Timewell

UKIP & Ind (3)

Colin Aldred
David Ramsbotham
Richard Bird

Green (1)

Adrian Dearnley

Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee 8

Conservative (4)

Michael Carttiss
Margaret Stone
Jennifer Chamberlin
Michael Chenery

Judith Virgo (named substitute)
Nigel Dixon (named substitute)

UKIP & Ind (1)

Colin Aldred
Paul Gilmour (named substitute)

Labour (1)

Bert Bremner
Margaret Wilkinson (named substitute)

Liberal Democrat (1)

David Harrison
Brian Hannah (named substitute)

Green (1)

Richard Bearman
Adrian Dearnley (named substitute)

Audit Committee 7

Conservative (4)

Ian Mackie
Roger Smith
Harry Humphrey
Shelagh Gurney

UKIP & Ind (1)

David Ramsbotham

Labour (1)

Bert Bremner

Liberal Democrat (1)

James Joyce

Standards Committee - 7

Conservative (4)

Alec Byrne
Ian Monson
Mark Kiddle-Morris
William Richmond

UKIP & Ind (1)

Fred Agnew

Labour (1)

Patrick Hacon

Liberal Democrat (1)

John Timewell

Emergency Committee - 5 (Must include the Leader of the Council)

Conservative (2)

Stephen Askew
Wyndham Northam

UKIP & Ind (1)

Jonathan Childs

Labour (1)

George Nobbs

Liberal Democrat (1)

Marie Strong

General Purposes (Regulatory) Committee – 5

Conservative (2)

Alec Byrne
Ian Monson

Liberal Democrat (1)

Brian Watkins

UKIP & Ind (1)

Jonathan Childs

Labour (1)

Vacancy

Pensions Committee 5

Conservative (3)

Judith Virgo
Martin Storey
Jason Law

Liberal Democrat (1)

Allison Bradnock

UKIP & Ind (1)

David Ramsbotham

Personnel Committee - 5 (Must include the Leader of the Council)

Conservative (3)

Cliff Jordan
Andrew Proctor
Alison Thomas

Labour (1)

George Nobbs

UKIP & Ind (1)

Toby Coke

SECTION 2

Employment Appeals Panel – 11

When the Panel meets, it has a membership of 3 appointed by the Head of Human Resources and drawn from the wider Panel of 11

Conservative (5)

Cliff Jordan
Andrew Proctor
Bill Borrett
Tony White
Judy Leggett

Labour (2)

Emma Corlett
Steve Morphew

Liberal Democrat (1)

Marie Strong

UKIP & Ind (2)

David Ramsbotham
Vacancy

Green (1)

Richard Bearman

Health and Wellbeing Board (3)

- * Chairman of the Children's Services Committee –James Joyce
- * Chairman of the Adult Social Care Committee – Susan Whitaker
- Brian Watkins

*Statutory member of the Board

SECTION 3

JOINT COMMITTEES

Norfolk Joint Museums & Archaeology Committee – 9

Conservative (4)

Harry Humphrey
John Ward
Mark Kiddle-Morris
Martin Storey
Jason Law (named substitute)

Labour (2)

Julie Brociek-Coulton
Margaret Wilkinson
Terry Jermy (named substitute)

Liberal Democrat (1)

James Joyce
Tim East (named substitute)

UKIP & Ind (1)

Paul Gilmour
Alan Grey (named substitute)

Green (1)

Elizabeth Morgan
Adrian Dearnley (named Substitute)

Norfolk Records Committee – 3

Conservative (1)

Michael Chenery
Brian Iles (named Substitute)

Labour (1)

Margaret Wilkinson (1)
Mike Sands (named Substitute)

UKIP & Ind (1)

Paul Smyth
Fred Agnew (named substitute)

Eastern Inshore Fisheries Conservation Authority – 3

Conservative (1)

Hilary Cox

Labour (1)

Margaret Wilkinson

UKIP & Ind (1)

Michael Baker

Norfolk Police & Crime Panel – 3

Conservative (1)

Alec Byrne
Michael Chenery (named substitute)

Liberal Democrat (1)

Brian Hannah
James Joyce (named substitute)

Labour (1)

Terry Jermy
Mick Castle (named substitute)

Note: The overall political composition of the Norfolk Police and Crime Panel is required to reflect the political balance across the whole County (County

and District councils). That balance must be reviewed after the results of the District Council elections being held on 5 May have been analysed. If this affects the County Council's political representation on the Panel, the political groups will be advised in advance of the Council meeting.

SECTION 4

Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee – 2

Conservative – Tony Adams
Labour – Steve Morphew

Council is also required to appoint one of its two above representatives as the Chairman of the Joint Committee

Non-Voting Advisors (3)

Conservative (1)	-	Nigel Shaw
Labour (1)	-	Mike Sands
UKIP & Ind (1)	-	Fred Agnew

Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation Joint Committee- 2

Conservative –	Ian Monson
Labour –	Mick Castle

Norfolk Parking Partnership Joint Committee (1 Member of the Council)

Mick Castle
Tony White (named substitute)

Planning and Traffic Regulation Outside London Joint Committee (1 Member of the Council)

Mick Castle
Tony White (named substitute)

National Bus Lane Adjudication Committee (1)

Bert Bremner
Mick Castle (named substitute)

Report of the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 14 April 2016

1. IC24's NHS 111 and GP Out of Hours service in Central and West Norfolk

1.1 The Committee received a suggested approach from the Democratic Support and Scrutiny Team Manager to a report from IC 24 and commissioners, Norwich Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG), on progress with an action plan to address various issues regarding IC24's NHS 111 and GP Out of Hours service in central and west Norfolk.

1.2 Representatives from IC24 and Norwich CCG were in attendance to discuss the issues.

1.3 In the course of discussion the following key points were made:

- NHS 111 calls in the central and west Norfolk and the Wisbech area of Cambridgeshire were answered and delivered from IC24 offices in Norwich and Ipswich (with dispatch delivered solely from Norwich).
- The out-of-hours element of the IC 24 integrated service was commissioned as a GP led service. Out of approximately 500 GPs working in the Norfolk and Wisbech area, 98 GPs had signed up for out of hours shifts, supported by a multi-disciplinary skills mix of medical practitioners. The national and local shortage of GPs who were happy to deal with out of hours work meant that primary care was having to make increasing demands on allied professionals (nurse practitioners and others where it was safe to do so).
- The funding for running the integrated NHS 111 and OOH service in Norfolk was approximately £7.50 a year for every Norfolk taxpayer.
- A member of the Committee described a case of where a west Norfolk patient with a Peterborough postcode who lived within 5 to 10 minutes travel time of the QEH was advised by a Care Centre Advisor to travel to Peterborough or Norwich (based on Care Co-ordination Centres making use of pre-set postcodes). The witnesses said that they were aware of this case and that it raised a number of cross boarder issues which were being fully investigated.
- The witnesses were asked to explain the action that was taken to address the issues identified in the Norwich CCG's unannounced visit to the NHS 111 and GP OOH service in November 2015. They were also asked to explain what measures had been put in place to give staff the confidence to speak to management instead of raising issues of concern with the press.
- In reply, the witnesses said that Norwich CCG and IC24 had worked together to fully investigate all of the issues raised by the unannounced visit and to make service improvements where they were considered to be necessary.
- The witnesses said they had found no evidence to substantiate the claim that details of patients not dealt with by the end of the day were removed from computer screens by a non-clinical member of staff. They added that the IT system used for handling the calls had a failsafe mechanism to prevent this from happening.
- Updated IT systems, changes in the ways calls were classified, the

introduction of staff newsletters and making more senior management available for staff to express concerns were among the improvements outlined in an action plan that the CCG and IC24 had agreed for taking the integrated NHS 111 and GP OOH service forward.

- Recruitment of more highly-skilled clinicians and staff with local knowledge, and the appointment of an operational manager to integrate 111 and out-of-hours services were among the other steps that were being taken.
- IC24 had joined a Stakeholder Project Board Group that included representatives of Norfolk's acute hospitals, the Ambulance Service and Norfolk Healthwatch who were helping IC24 to put in place an independent patient experience audit.
- IC24 had become a partner of the West Norfolk Alliance and a member of the System Resilience Group. These groups provided a means for IC24 to work in close partnership with existing community and hospital services so that patients were given accurate advice about local services and not sent to hospital unnecessarily.
- The witnesses said that to prevent unnecessary hospital visits, and to improve urgent home care visiting for palliative and end of life patients, IC24 had introduced two urgent care cars (one operating in the west and the other in the central area). Patients had made a number of favourable comments about the use of these cars.
- In response to a question about sustainability of the NHS 111 and GP OOH contract the witnesses assured the committee the service would continue to be provided.
- The witnesses said that the Norfolk MPs had received information from IC24 about the GP indemnity crisis. This was a national issue that had a significant impact on out- of-hours services. The indemnity costs for GPs undertaking out of hours work (in Norfolk) had risen by approximately 50% in the last five to ten years. It was not uncommon for out-of-hours indemnity to cost a GP over £7,000 to £8,000 a year. On average, GPs were paid £60 to £70 an hour for working for the out-of-hours service.
- Elsewhere in the country where IC24 provided an out-hours-service it had trialled a range of initiatives to reduce the impact of indemnity costs on GPs. Some of these initiatives (such as a "multi-shift support system") were now being considered for introduction in Norfolk.

1.4 The Committee **agreed** to accept an invitation for Members of the Committee to visit the central and west Norfolk NHS 111 service.

1.5 It was also **agreed** to receive an update on the central & west Norfolk NHS 111 and GP Out of Hours service in one year's time (at the meeting planned for 6 April 2017).

2 Service in A&E following attempted suicide or self-harm episodes

2.1 The Committee received a suggested approach from the Democratic Support and Scrutiny Team Manager to an update report from the acute hospitals in Norfolk and the Norfolk and Suffolk NHS Foundation Trust (NSFT) on the treatment in A&E of patients who had attempted suicide or self-harm.

2.2 Representatives from the acute hospitals and the NSFT were in attendance to discuss the issues.

2.3 In the course of discussion the following key points were made:

- The witnesses said that the level of NSFT mental health support that was available at the NNUH had risen significantly over the last 12 months and was now of a higher standard than that which was available elsewhere in Norfolk.
- The witnesses said that the disparity of mental health provision at Norfolk's three A&E departments reflected how healthcare was commissioned across Norfolk.
- There were regular mental health joint clinical staff meetings with NSFT and the Emergency Department at the NNUH.
- The measures that had been taken at the NNUH had reduced frequent attenders to A&E with recognised mental health issues such as episodes of self-harm. The NNUH had 24/7 mental health nurse cover, and was getting pilot funding for a full-time, on-site consultant psychiatrist and additional nurses in 2016-17.
- A round-the-clock service had been introduced at the NNUH last year, but there was still no on-site cover at night at the James Paget University Hospital (JPH) in Gorleston or at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital (QEH) in King's Lynn. The witnesses said that going forward these issues would be addressed.
- The QEH currently had a commissioned service from 8am to 8pm and used the crisis team out of hours. The number of staff working on mental health issues in King's Lynn and West Norfolk had had to change to reflect the level of funding that was available.
- Those working for the NSFT were being encouraged to involve the patient's family, friends and other support networks in hospital discharge arrangements where it was legally permitted to do so.
- The referral arrangements for patients with mental health issues were now put in place before they left hospital.
- It was estimated that approximately 70% of those who were likely to take their own lives did not come in contact with mental health services. More was being done to make those who came across mentally disturbed people (e.g. the Samaritans, transport police and car park attendants) aware of the issues and what could be done to help these people. Outreach services were also provided to schools.

2.4 The Committee noted the three acute hospitals' and the NSFT's answers to the questions that were raised in the meeting and in their written responses.

3 **NHS Workforce Planning in Norfolk – response from NHS England Midlands & East (East)**

3.1 The Committee was asked to note a letter dated 1 April 2016 from NHS England Midlands and East (East) on the subject of Undergraduate Medical and Dental Training and to consider further correspondence with the Department of Health regarding progress towards 'fair share' funding for the education and training of health care professionals in Norfolk.

3.2 The Committee **agreed** that the Chairman and Mrs Stone should write to:

1. Ben Gummer MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Care Quality – to follow up on the question of speeding up the transition towards 'fair share'

funding via the secondary care placement tariff.

2. The Chairman of the Department of Health and Health Education England Working Group on the primary care tariff – to emphasise the importance of incentivising GP education and training in Norfolk.

4 **Forward work programme**

- 4.1 The Committee **agreed** the forward work programme with the addition of 'Community Pharmacy' for the 8 September 2016 meeting. The Committee also agreed to nominate Mrs Margaret Stone to the Children's Services Committee task & finish group on 'Children's Emotional Health and Wellbeing'.

Michael Carttiss
Chairman

Report of the Health and Wellbeing Board Meeting held on 26 April 2016

1. Norfolk and Waveney Sustainability and Transformation Plan

- 1.1 The Board received a report which outlined the new national policy initiative of STP's (Sustainability and Transformation Plans). The NHS shared planning guidance 'Delivering the Forward View' asks "every health and care system to come together to create their own ambitious local blueprint for accelerating implementation of the Five Year Forward View" through a new Sustainability and Transformation Plan which will cover the period from October 2016 to March 2021.
- 1.2 The Board **RESOLVED** to;
- Provide views to the STP Executive Group about the development of the Norfolk and Waveney STP, including the H&WB's involvement and role, and noting that the final submission is due later in June

2. Integration and the Better Care Fund plans 2015/16 and 2016/17

- 2.1 The Board received a report which updated them on the progress of with Norfolk's 2015/16 BCF plan along with most recent BCF quarterly submission to NHS England. The Board were also updated on the development of the Norfolk 16/17 programme, which builds on the learning from 2015/16 programme, and noted the work underway to resolve agreement about funding allocations. An update was also provided on successful bids for support from NHS England and details of how these would be used to build an impactful programme in 16/17.
- 2.2 The Board **RESOLVED** to;
- Note the BCF 2015/16 progress submission to NHS England for the period 1 October to 31 December 2015
 - Note that agreement on the 2016/17 BCF programme financial plan has yet to be reached and the work that is underway to achieve this agreement
 - Agree that the H&WB's BCF sub-group should be asked to agree the final version of the BCF 2016-17 plan, with all Board members having the opportunity to provide comments to inform that decision.

Brian Watkins,
Chairman, Health and Wellbeing Board

Report of the Audit Committee Meeting held on 21 April 2016

1 Items of Urgent Business

The Committee expressed their sincere condolences to the representatives of Ernst & Young on the sad passing of Rob Murray.

Mr I Mackie left the room and Mr R Smith, Vice-Chair, took the Chair.

2 County Farms

2.1 The Committee considered the report by the Executive Director of Finance introducing the County Farms Governance Arrangements Audit Report and Lines of Enquiry Report.

2.2 The Committee proposed that

- a) The recommendations in the report be agreed;
- b) The report should be presented to a specially convened meeting of the County Farms Advisory Board, which should be formally minuted, to give Members of the Board an opportunity to formally respond.
- c) The report and the response from the CFAB meeting should then be presented to the Economic Development Sub-Committee, requesting that the Chair establish a Task and Finish Group to consider the report and the CFAB response and make any formal recommendations regarding governance arrangements to the Policy and Resources Committee. It was noted that any proposed governance changes would need to be presented to the Constitution Advisory Group before being formally presented to full Council for consideration and adoption.
- d) An update report to be presented to the Audit Committee at its June meeting.

With 5 votes in favour, 1 vote against and 0 abstentions, the proposal was **AGREED**.

2.3 The Committee **RESOLVED**:

- 1) To recommend that Policy and Resources Committee:
 - Clarify and strengthen decision making for County Farms by asking the Council to consider, in accordance with the Council's provisions for changes to the Constitution, to
 - Place County Farms functions of decision making with the Policy and Resources Committee
 - Define the County Farms Advisory Board's role of scrutiny of the County Farms operational decisions, reporting back to Policy and Resources

Committee, as part of an annual review and make required recommendations for Member's approval

- Require the Managing Director to review (in consultation with the Executive Director of Finance) how the Council's County Farms landlord functions are exercised, including the selection of tenants, the allocations of County farm assets and Estate Strategies and then make recommendations to Policy and Resources for Member's approval
 - Require County Farm leases to be approved in accordance with the Constitution, for the avoidance of doubt, this will mean that Members no longer have a direct role in the selection of County farm tenants. Members will continue to set policy direction for the County Farms estate (including the lettings policy) via decisions at the relevant committee
- 2) To consider:
- The opinion that, there are 'key issues that need to be addressed' for both reports; and
 - The findings, recommendations and agreed action plans in the reports
- 3) To note that:
- Responses will be made to the complainants; and
 - A County Farms systems audit has been included in the 2016-17 Internal Audit Plan, which will include following up the agreed actions.
- 4) The County Farms report should be presented to a specially convened meeting of the County Farms Advisory Board, which should be formally minuted, to give Members of the Board an opportunity to formally respond.
- 5) The report and the response from the CFAB meeting should then be presented to the Economic Development Sub-Committee, requesting that the Chair establish a Task and Finish Group to consider the report and the CFAB response and make any formal recommendations regarding governance arrangements to the Policy and Resources Committee. It was noted that any proposed governance changes would need to be presented to the Constitution Advisory Group before being formally presented to full Council for consideration and adoption.
- 6) An update report to be presented to the Audit Committee at its June meeting.

Mr I Mackie in the Chair.

3 Norfolk Audit Services Quarterly Report for the Quarter ended 31 December 2015.

- 3.1 The Committee considered and **noted** the report by the Executive Director of Finance setting out the work of the Internal Audit team and was asked to comment on the overall opinion on the effectiveness of risk management and internal control being 'acceptable' and therefore considered 'sound', and that satisfactory progress with the traded schools audits and the preparations for any Audit Authority for the France Channel England Interreg Programme.

4 Risk Management report.

- 4.1 The Committee considered the report by the Executive Director of Finance setting out the Corporate Risk Register at April 2016, along with an update on the Risk Management strategy 2016-19 and other related matters, following the latest review which was conducted in March 2016.
- 4.2 The Committee **noted** the progress with Risk Management since the last Audit committee meeting and the changes to the Corporate risk register as set out in Appendices A and B of the report and the progress with the mitigating risks.

5 External Auditor's Audit Plan 2015-16

- 5.1 The Committee considered and noted the report by the Executive Director of Finance introducing the External Auditor's Audit Plan for the year ending 31 March 2016.
- 5.2 The Committee welcomed Mr M Hodgson and Mr D Riglar from Ernst & Young LLP (EY) who attended the meeting to answer questions from the Committee.

6 NORSE Governance Review

- 6.1 The Committee considered and **noted** the report by the Executive Director of Finance, introducing the Norse Governance Review report which was reported to the Policy & Resources Committee on 21 March 2016. By way of a verbal report, Members were asked to consider the progress that had been made with implementing the Norse Governance Review.

7 Audit Committee Work Programme

- 7.1 The Committee considered and **noted** the report by the Executive Director of Finance setting out the programme of work for the Committee and agreed the following items to be included on the agenda for the June meeting:
- Northern Distributor Route – Project Risk Update
 - Anti-Fraud & Corruption Update – including an update on the mandatory training.
 - County Farms Update.
 - Update on ICT Security risk as part of the Risk Management Report.

Ian Mackie
Chairman, Audit Committee

Report of the Planning (Regulatory) Committee Meeting held on 1 April 2016

- 1 C/3/2015/3016: Besthorpe: Retrospective application for the recovery of aggregates and soils from imported inert materials linked to the adjacent Newell Civil Engineering business.**
 - 1.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking retrospective planning permission to regularise the development of a 1.2 hectare inert waste recycling facility adjacent to an existing civil engineering business at Heron Farm, Besthorpe.
 - 1.2 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services was authorised to issue a **REFUSAL NOTICE** on the grounds that the Committee considered that the application was contrary to the Development Plan and material considerations did not outweigh the requirement to determine the proposal in accordance with the plan.
- 2 C/1/2015/1020: Holt: Variation of conditions 1 and 2 of Planning Permission C/1/2013/1014 to extend duration of mineral extraction and restoration until 31 December 2030 and remove screen bund from north west boundary.**
 - 2.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking planning permission to extend the time period for extraction of remaining reserves of sand and gravel at the quarry and for completion of restoration until 31 December 2030, together with temporary removal of part of an existing screen bund along the north-west boundary of the quarry.
 - 2.2 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services was authorised to:
 - i) Grant planning permission subject to a legal agreement in respect of vehicle routing and highway wear and tear payment and, the conditions outlined in section 12 of the report.
 - ii) Discharge conditions (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) where those detailed in the report required the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commenced, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted.
 - iii) Delegate powers to officers (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

3 C/1/2015/1025: Hempton: Change of use to a mixed use development to allow the acceptance of trade waste in addition to household waste; and to allow the ancillary small scale sale of non-recycled products (compost bins, green waste sacks, Christmas trees and logs).

3.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking planning permission to enable the existing Hempton Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) to accept trade waste in addition to household waste and to facilitate the small-scale sale of non-recycled products such as compost bins, green waste sacks, Christmas trees and logs in order to promote the recycling service and generate a small income to offset the cost of running the service.

3.2 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services was authorised to:

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

4 C/6/2016/6001: Caister: Change of use to a mixed use development to allow the acceptance of trade waste in addition to household waste; and to allow the ancillary small scale sale of non-recycled products (compost bins, green waste sacks, Christmas trees and logs).

4.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking planning permission to enable the existing Caister Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) to accept trade waste in addition to household waste and to facilitate the small-scale sale of non-recycled products such as compost bins, green waste sacks, Christmas trees and logs in order to promote the recycling service and generate a small income to offset the cost of running the service.

4.2 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services was authorised to:

- i) Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in section 12 of the report.
- ii) Discharge conditions (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) where those detailed in the report required the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commenced, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted.

- iii) Delegate powers to officers (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.
- 5 C/2/2015/2044: King's Lynn: Change of use to a mixed use development to allow the acceptance of trade waste in addition to household waste; and to allow the ancillary small scale sale of non-recycled products (compost bins, green waste sacks, Christmas trees and logs).**
 - 5.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking planning permission to enable the existing King's Lynn Household Waste Recycling Centre (HWRC) to accept trade waste in addition to household waste and to facilitate the small-scale sale of non-recycled products such as compost bins, green waste sacks, Christmas trees and logs in order to promote the recycling service and generate a small income to offset the cost of running the service. The proposals also included a modest extension (5.7m x 5m) to the existing re-use centre.
 - 5.2 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services was authorised to:
 - i) Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in section 12 of the report.
 - ii) Discharge conditions (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) where those detailed in the report required the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commenced, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted.
 - iii) Delegate powers to officers (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.
- 6 Y/5/2015/5031: Reepham: Formation of additional parking spaces, to allow the parking of up to 20 cars or light vehicles to the rear drill yard for other users other than NFRS Staff.**
 - 6.1 The Committee received the report by the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services seeking planning permission to utilise part of the rear hardstanding that currently provided for a fire service drill area, as a daytime parking area available to local businesses under the management of NFRS and operated using a parking permit scheme, not open to the general public.
 - 6.2 The Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services was authorised to:
 - i) Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in section 12 of the report.
 - ii) Discharge conditions (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) where those detailed in the report required the submission and

implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commenced, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted.

- iii) Delegate powers to officers (after discussion with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee) to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

Brian Long

Chairman, Planning (Regulatory) Committee

Report of the Norfolk Records Committee Meeting held on 22 April 2016

1. Finance and Risk Report

- 1.1 The Committee received the report from the Executive Director of Communities and Environmental services which covered the forecast position and risk management for the Norfolk Records Committee as at 29th February 2016.
- 1.2 The Committee, having considered the report, **RESOLVED** to;
 - Note the performance with the revenue budget and reserves and provisions for 2015/16.
 - Note the management of risk for 2015/16.
 - Note the proposed budget savings for 2016/17 and beyond.

2. Performance Report

- 2.1 The Committee received the report from the Executive Director of Communities and Environmental Services which provided information on the activities of the Norfolk Record Office and its performance against its service plan during the period between 1 October 2015 and 31 March 2016.
- 2.2 The Committee, having considered the report, **RESOLVED** to;
 - Note the performance against the 2015/16 service plan.

3. Service Plan 2016-17

- 3.1 The Committee received the report from the Executive Director of Communities and Environmental Services which provided information on the Norfolk Record Office Service Plan for 2016.
- 3.2 The Committee, having considered the report **RESOLVED** to;
 - Agree the adoption of the service plan for 2016-17.

Dr C. J. Kemp, Chairman

**Report of the Meeting of the
Norfolk Joint Museums Committee
held on 22 April 2016**

1 Norfolk Joint Museums Service – Integrated Finance and Risk Monitoring Report for 2015/16

1.1 Members received a report that (based on budget out-turns as at end of February 2016) covered progress with the NMS revenue budget for 2015/16, reserves and provisions and the capital programme, and savings applied to the revenue budget for 2016/17. The report also provided the Committee with an update on progress with the management of risk within the NMS.

1.2 In the course of discussion of the report, the following key points were noted:

- Progress with NMS Revenue budgets and Reserves and Provisions indicated that the Service would achieve a break-even position at the year end.
- Good progress had been made with risk management for the NMS with several key risks now being recorded as ‘fully met’ rather than outstanding.
- The risk register would be updated to show that the threat from flooding across the County remained only as a residual threat, particularly in Great Yarmouth.
- To meet the savings targets for 2016/17 and beyond the NMS was dependent on continuing strong performance in terms of income generation.

1.3 The Joint Committee **resolved** to note:

1. Progress with the revenue budget, capital programme and reserves and provisions forecast out-turn positions for 2015/16.
2. Progress with the management of risk within the NMS.
3. The proposed savings for 2016/17 and beyond.

2 Reports from Area Museums Committees

2.1 Members received reports from the Great Yarmouth, King’s Lynn and West Norfolk and Norwich Area Museums Committees.

2.2 Topics in the Area Committee reports that were discussed by Members of the Joint Committee included:

- the Google Art Project that provided a new high profile means of showcasing objects to the public;
- the opening of the Lynn Museum on Sunday afternoons;
- the continued success of the Junior Friends of the Lynn Museum scheme;
- the highly successful HLF-funded *Stories of Lynn* project;

- the NMS response to changes in the National Curriculum and the addition of a local history item to history GCSE;
- the arrangements for museums to be used as venues for weddings, conferences and banqueting functions;
- a suggestion from Members of the Joint Committee that tourism officers should report to Area Museums Committees on local tourism activities (which was the position taken by the King's Lynn and West Norfolk Area Museums Committee).

3 Norfolk Museums Service – Performance & Strategic Update Report

- 3.1** The Joint Committee received a report that provided progress with performance against the NMS agreed service plan for 2015/16 and plans for the delivery of the 2016/17 budget, progress regarding the Voices from the Workhouse project at Gressenhall Farm and Workhouse, Norwich Castle Keep and other capital developments, details as to museum education and learning programmes, marketing and PR, partnership programmes, commercial developments, NMS fundraising, the Deep History Coast project and Arts Council England consultation on its new funding programme for 2018-22.
- 3.2** The Joint Committee also received three presentations. The first of these presentations was about the NMS response to changes in the National Curriculum and other key learning developments. The second presentation was about the Service's work with Looked After Children and those in foster care. The third presentation was about an extension to the "Museums and Schools" literacy programme *Stories from the Sea*, funded by the Department for Education (DfE) and Arts Council England, to North Norfolk (in addition to the continuing programme in Great Yarmouth).
- 3.3** During discussion of the report, the following key points were noted:
- Visits by members of the public across all 10 NMS sites had closely matched the previous year's all-time record of 400,000 visits. This significant result for 2015/16 was achieved despite the impact of development work at Gressenhall Farm and Workhouse and of poor weather conditions on some of the museum's special event days.
 - School visitor figures had remained high due largely to the hard work of the Museums' learning teams. Their proactive approach in the face of changes to the National Curriculum, and in overcoming the many barriers faced by schools in terms of making a museum visit had reduced the shortfall in school visitor figures that were reported at previous Joint Committee meetings.
 - The highly successful schools' and family events programme had involved the Service working closely with the Norfolk Libraries and Information Service.
 - The record breaking visitor numbers were attributed to a large extent to the continuing success of the NMS visitor programme. The highlights of that programme included:
 - **A Viking's Guide to Deadly Dragons:** exhibition at Norwich Castle, which ran until 30 May 2016
 - **Halfway to Paradise – The Birth of British Rock:** exhibition at Time and Tide Museum, Great Yarmouth, which ran until 2 October 2016
 - **Art of the Mart: exhibition at Lynn Museum,** King's Lynn, which ran until 2 July 2016
 - **Memorial Cottages:** exhibition at Museum of Norwich at the Bridewell, which had run until Spring 2016
 - **17th Century Tokens:** exhibition at Museum of Norwich at the Bridewell, which ran until the Autumn

- **‘To watch the corn grow, and the blossoms set’:** the art of Claughton Pellow: exhibition in the Colman Project Space, Norwich Castle which ran until the Autumn
 - **Flint Rocks: exhibition at Ancient House, Thetford** which ran until 29 October 2016.
- The NMS had arranged for an informal opening to the public of the Voices from the Workhouse capital development project at Gressenhall for Spring 2016. The VIP opening (with representatives of the Heritage Lottery Fund and other funders) was due to be held on Friday, 8th July 2016 and all Members of the Joint Committee are invited to attend.
 - The NMS had continued to work closely with the Norwich University of the Arts (NUA) to bring the British Art Show to Norwich in the summer of 2016. The British Art Show was the largest contemporary art exhibition in Britain. It was held every 5 years and this would be first time in its history that it had been held in the East of England and the first time it had taken place without a London anchor venue (the Hayward Gallery). The exhibition was expected to have a very significant impact in terms of benefits to the wider Norfolk economy.
 - The NMS continued to actively promote the corporate venue hire offer of its museum sites as wedding venues. Going forward, the NMS was working with third parties to build links between museum wedding venues and the provision of outside reception facilities, particularly in relation to Norwich Castle, Strangers’ Hall and Gressenhall Farm & Workhouse museum sites.
 - The Joint Committee placed on record its congratulations to Rachael Duffield, Learning Officer from the Voices project, Gressenhall, a runner up (in third place) in the Visit England/Mirror Newspaper Group National Tourism Superstar Awards 2016. This good result for Rachael and the wider team helped focus national attention on how important the tourism sector was for the Norfolk economy and how museums were central to that important sector.
 - The Joint Committee was informed that the application to the Heritage Lottery Fund for the Norwich Castle Keep project had been assessed by the East of England Committee and the final decision of the Board of Trustees was expected to be made public shortly.
 - Consultation was underway with the Arts Council to shape its next funding programme. This was likely to be a four year settlement that brought Museums into line with the rest of the arts portfolio in terms of having one major funding programme (with the potential of three levels of investment giving different stages of responsibilities).

3.4 The Joint Committee **resolved to note:**

1. The performance of the NMS against the Service Plan for 2015/16.
2. Progress regarding development of the Keep at Norwich Castle.
3. Progress regarding the Voices from the Workhouse project at Gressenhall Farm and Workhouse.
4. Performance for the financial year 2015/16 and plans for the delivery of the 2016/17 budget.
5. The Arts Council England consultation on the new funding programme for 2018-22.

4 Next meeting of the Joint Committee

The Joint Committee agreed that its next meeting on Friday 1 July 2016 should be held at King's Lynn.

John Ward

Chairman

Notice of Motion

Notice of the following motion has been given in accordance with the Council Procedure Rules:-

Proposed by Ms E. Corlett

This council notes:

The publication of the Government's White Paper, Educational Excellence Everywhere, which

- dictates that any schools that have chosen not to adopt the academy model must do so by 2022
- is projected to cost the people of Norfolk around £4500 per school transferred
- will remove from parents the right to be represented on the governing body of their child's school
- proposes to leave the council with duties which it will no longer have the power or the money to enact
- The majority of the schools that will be affected by forced academisation are primary schools, over 87% of which are already rated good or excellent by Ofsted nationally (86% in Norfolk), despite only 17 per cent being academies

Council further notes the wide-ranging objections raised over recent weeks;

- Sir David Carter, the new national schools commissioner, voiced fears that education funding would be used to pay lawyers to manage academy conversion "... the extra money that we are given to help us achieve this will just wash through in to law firms and I want to get as much as this in to the classroom as we can". He noted that although the cost of conversion had "fallen dramatically", the average cost of £32,000 was still too high.
- Conservative chair of the Local Government Association Lord Porter spoke of his opposition to significant powers being given to Regional Schools Commissioners as they are an "unelected body which parents and residents can't hold to account"

Cllr Roger Gough, Cabinet Member for Education and Health Reform at Kent County Council, has expressed his objection to the White Paper on the grounds that

- “Whitehall now clearly believes that it knows those schools’ best interests better than they do themselves..... nor are the wishes or choices of parents seen to count for anything, a paternalistic and technocratic approach reflected in the equally unjustified proposal to end the requirement for parent governors”
- There is a weak evidence base for the proposals “A little over a year ago, the Education Select Committee – cross-party under a Conservative chairman – concluded.... “current evidence does not allow us to draw conclusions about whether academies in themselves are a positive force for change... Academisation is not always successful nor is it the only proven alternative for a struggling school”

Louise Goldsmith, leader of West Sussex County Council, has called on the government to rethink these plans as “I have reservations that the ‘one size fits all’ academies approach that ministers are proposing does not seem to promote any benefits to pupils and parents in West Sussex”

Council shares these concerns and believes that no one system has a monopoly on delivering the best results, and that is why a centrally imposed forced academisation programme is not the answer.

Council does not believe that a ‘one size fits all’ approach is in the best interests of pupils or parents, and is concerned that the proposals as they stand limit parental choice.

Council believes that well achieving schools should not be forced in to a reorganisation that the school governing body does not believe is in the best interests of its pupils

Council has very specific concerns about how vulnerable children will fare under the proposals, particularly in terms of inclusion, a statutory responsibility that will rightfully remain with the council but with very few powers to help us to fulfil that duty.

Council notes that the following local authorities have rejected the government proposals, and called upon the Secretary of State to rethink their proposals; Kent, West Sussex, Birmingham

Council therefore resolves to:

Instruct the Managing Director to write to the Secretary of State for Education to set out the concerns that Council has about the potential impact of the proposed changes as laid out in this motion, and set out to her our following constructive suggested amendments to the White Paper proposals:

- Well achieving schools should not have to convert to an academy if the governing body does not believe that it is in the best interests of pupils
- A requirement for elected parent governors should be retained

- A requirement for local community representation on governing bodies should be explicit
- The people of Norfolk should be compensated for any reorganisation through reimbursement of costs to the council.
- Provide local authorities with adequate resources and powers to fulfil our duties to vulnerable children, to planning of places and to fulfil our role of 'championing' parents and children.