

Norfolk County Council

Date: **Tuesday 21 February 2023**

Time: **10 am**

Venue: **Council Chamber, County Hall, Martineau Lane,
Norwich NR1 2DH**

Supplementary Agenda

- 2 Corrected Recorded Voting Sheets of Meeting Held on 17 January 2023** **Page A3**
- 5 Norfolk County Council Revenue and Capital Budget 2023-24 to 2026-27**
- Proposed Budget Amendments from the Labour Group. **Page A11**
(Amendment 1)
 - Proposed Budget Amendment from the Green Group. **Page A17**
(Amendment 2)
 - Proposed Budget Amendments from individual Members:
 - Councillor Alexandra Kemp (Amendment 3) **Page A21**
 - Annexe 3 Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-24 - Report from the Scrutiny Committee to the Leader of the Council **Page A24**

Tom McCabe
Head of Paid Service
County Hall
Martineau Lane
Norwich
NR1 2DH



Date Agenda Published: 17 February 2023

**For further details and general enquiries about this Agenda
please contact committees@norfolk.gov.uk**



If you need this agenda in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Democratic Services. Email: committees@norfolk.gov.uk and we will do our best to help

Norfolk County Council
Date: 17 January 2023 APPENDIX A

**RECORDED VOTE (A Deal for Norfolk) Labour Amendment – ITEM
NUMBER: 4, paragraph 2**

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	x			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark		x	
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl		x		LONG Brian		x	
AQUARONE Steffan	x			MACKIE Ian		x	
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	Absent			MAXFIELD Ed		x	
BENSLY James		x		MORIARTY Jim	x		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve	x		
BIRMINGHAM Alison	x			NEALE Paul	x		
BLUNDELL Sharon	x			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill	Absent			OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire	Absent			OSBORN Jamie	x		
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	x			PECK Greg		x	
CARPENTER Graham		x		PENFOLD Saul	x		
CARPENTER Penny		x		PLANT Graham		x	
CLANCY Stuart	Absent			PRICE Ben	x		
COLMAN Ed		x		PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert	x			PROCTOR Andrew		x	
CONNOLLY Ed		x		RICHMOND Will		x	
CORLETT Emma	x			Reilly Matthew	x		
DALBY Michael		x		RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart		x		ROPER Dan	x		
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher		x		SANDS Mike	x		
DEWSBURY Margaret		x		SAVAGE Robert		x	
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry		x		SHIRES Lucy	x		
DUIGAN Phillip	Absent			SMITH Carl		x	
EAGLE Fabian		x		SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel		x		STONE Barry		x	
FISHER John		x		STOREY Martin		x	
FITZPATRICK Tom		x		THOMAS Alison	Absent		
GRANT Andy		x		THOMSON Vic		x	
GURNEY Shelagh		x		VARDY Eric		x	
HEMPSALL Lana		x		VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of		x		WALKER Colleen	Absent		
JAMES Jane	Absent			WARD John		x	
JAMIESON Andrew		x		WATKINS Brian	x		
JERMY Terry	x			WEBB Maxine	x		
JONES Brenda	x			WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra	x			WHYMARK Fran		x	
KIDDIE Keith		x		WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	22
Against	37
Abstentions	1

Norfolk County Council
Date: 17 January 2023 APPENDIX B

**RECORDED VOTE (A Deal for Norfolk) Labour Amendment – ITEM
NUMBER: 4, paragraph 4**

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	x			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark		x	
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl		x		LONG Brian		x	
AQUARONE Steffan	x			MACKIE Ian		x	
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	Absent			MAXFIELD Ed		x	
BENSLY James		x		MORIARTY Jim	x		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve	x		
BIRMINGHAM Alison	x			NEALE Paul	x		
BLUNDELL Sharon	x			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill	Absent			OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire	Absent			OSBORN Jamie	x		
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	x			PECK Greg		x	
CARPENTER Graham		x		PENFOLD Saul	x		
CARPENTER Penny		x		PLANT Graham		x	
CLANCY Stuart	Absent			PRICE Ben	x		
COLMAN Ed		x		PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert	x			PROCTOR Andrew		x	
CONNOLLY Ed		x		RICHMOND Will		x	
CORLETT Emma	x			Reilly Matthew	x		
DALBY Michael		x		RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart		x		ROPER Dan	x		
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher		x		SANDS Mike	x		
DEWSBURY Margaret		x		SAVAGE Robert		x	
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry		x		SHIRES Lucy	x		
DUIGAN Phillip	Absent			SMITH Carl		x	
EAGLE Fabian		x		SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel		x		STONE Barry		x	
FISHER John		x		STOREY Martin		x	
FITZPATRICK Tom		x		THOMAS Alison	Absent		
GRANT Andy		x		THOMSON Vic		x	
GURNEY Shelagh		x		VARDY Eric		x	
HEMPSALL Lana		x		VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of		x		WALKER Colleen	Absent		
JAMES Jane	Absent			WARD John		x	
JAMIESON Andrew		x		WATKINS Brian	x		
JERMY Terry	x			WEBB Maxine	x		
JONES Brenda	x			WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra	x			WHYMARK Fran		x	
KIDDIE Keith		x		WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	22
Against	37
Abstentions	1

Norfolk County Council
Date: 17 January 2023 APPENDIX C

**RECORDED VOTE (A Deal for Norfolk) Green Amendment – ITEM
NUMBER: 4**

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy	x			KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark		x	
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl		x		LONG Brian		x	
AQUARONE Steffan	x			MACKIE Ian		x	
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	Absent			MAXFIELD Ed	Absent		
BENSLY James		x		MORIARTY Jim	x		
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve	x		
BIRMINGHAM Alison	x			NEALE Paul	x		
BLUNDELL Sharon	x			OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill	Absent			OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire	Absent			OSBORN Jamie	x		
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie	x			PECK Greg		x	
CARPENTER Graham		x		PENFOLD Saul	x		
CARPENTER Penny		x		PLANT Graham		x	
CLANCY Stuart	Absent			PRICE Ben	x		
COLMAN Ed		x		PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert	x			PROCTOR Andrew		x	
CONNOLLY Ed		x		RICHMOND Will		x	
CORLETT Emma	Absent			Reilly Matthew	x		
DALBY Michael		x		RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart		x		ROPER Dan	x		
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher		x		SANDS Mike	x		
DEWSBURY Margaret		x		SAVAGE Robert		x	
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry		x		SHIRES Lucy	x		
DUIGAN Phillip	Absent			SMITH Carl		x	
EAGLE Fabian		x		SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel		x		STONE Barry		x	
FISHER John		x		STOREY Martin		x	
FITZPATRICK Tom		x		THOMAS Alison	Absent		
GRANT Andy		x		THOMSON Vic		x	
GURNEY Shelagh		x		VARDY Eric		x	
HEMPSALL Lana	Absent			VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of		x		WALKER Colleen	x		
JAMES Jane	Absent			WARD John		x	
JAMIESON Andrew		x		WATKINS Brian	x		
JERMY Terry	x			WEBB Maxine	x		
JONES Brenda	x			WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra	x			WHYMARK Fran		x	
KIDDIE Keith		x		WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	22
Against	35
Abstentions	1

Norfolk County Council
Date: 17 January 2023 APPENDIX D

**RECORDED VOTE (A Deal for Norfolk) Substantive motion – ITEM
NUMBER: 4**

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
ADAMS Timothy		x		KIDDLE-MORRIS Mark	x		
ADAMS Tony	Absent			KIRK Julian	Absent		
ANNISON Carl	x			LONG Brian	x		
AQUARONE Steffan		x		MACKIE Ian	x		
ASKEW Stephen	Absent			MASON BILLIG Kay	Absent		
BAMBRIDGE Lesley	Absent			MAXFIELD Ed	x		
BENSLY James	x			MORIARTY Jim		x	
BILLS David	Absent			MORPHEW Steve		x	
BIRMINGHAM Alison		x		NEALE Paul		x	
BLUNDELL Sharon		x		OLIVER Judy	Absent		
BORRETT Bill	Absent			OLIVER Rhodri	Absent		
BOWES Claire	Absent			OSBORN Jamie		x	
BROCIEK-COULTON Julie		x		PECK Greg	x		
CARPENTER Graham	x			PENFOLD Saul		x	
CARPENTER Penny	x			PLANT Graham	x		
CLANCY Stuart	Absent			PRICE Ben		x	
COLMAN Ed	x			PRICE Richard	Absent		
COLWELL Robert		x		PROCTOR Andrew	x		
CONNOLLY Ed	x			RICHMOND Will	x		
CORLETT Emma	Absent			Reilly Matthew		x	
DALBY Michael	x			RILEY Steve	Absent		
DARK Stuart	x			ROPER Dan		x	
DAUBNEY Nick	Absent			Rumsby Chrissie	Absent		
DAWSON Christopher	x			SANDS Mike		x	
DEWSBURY Margaret	x			SAVAGE Robert	x		
DIXON Nigel	Absent			SAYERS David	Absent		
DUFFIN Barry	x			SHIRES Lucy		x	
DUIGAN Phillip	Absent			SMITH Carl	x		
EAGLE Fabian	x			SMITH-CLARE Mike	Absent		
ELMER Daniel	x			STONE Barry	x		
FISHER John	x			STOREY Martin	x		
FITZPATRICK Tom	x			THOMAS Alison	Absent		
GRANT Andy	x			THOMSON Vic	x		
GURNEY Shelagh	x			VARDY Eric	x		
HEMPSALL Lana	x			VINCENT Karen			x
HORSBRUGH Michael Chenery of	x			WALKER Colleen		x	
JAMES Jane	Absent			WARD John	x		
JAMIESON Andrew	x			WATKINS Brian		x	
JERMY Terry		x		WEBB Maxine		x	
JONES Brenda		x		WHITE Tony	Absent		
KEMP Alexandra		x		WHYMARK Fran	x		
KIDDIE Keith	x			WILBY Martin	Absent		

For	37
Against	22
Abstentions	1

Labour Group amendments to the Cabinet's proposed 2023-24 Budget

For Consideration at Full Council (21 February 2023)

Purpose of report

1. To present to Full Council proposed amendments from the Labour Group to the budget recommended by Cabinet on 30 January 2023, with officers' technical comments on the impact to the budget.

Background

2. The Labour group amendment seeks to address some of the disconnect between the assertions and realities of the budget proposals.
 - a) Leaving aside our opposition to the NWL, it is the latest example of a big infrastructure project that carries an inherent risk in the event of failing to go ahead. Currently that risk probably equates to £30m+ that would revert to the revenue budget in the event the project did not proceed for whatever reason, and is recognised on the Corporate Risk Register as a result. However, whilst there is a methodology for deciding where the money to meet the cost would come from there is no money earmarked or identified even in general terms.

In future we expect the council to undertake more infrastructure schemes that will inevitably carry risk. We have experience from the incinerator scheme and the costs of scrapping that to learn from. This amendment proposes not just that we should prepare a plan in the event of a failure of the NWL to proceed but that we should adopt a practice that where the risk associated with any scheme failure exceeds £20m there should be an explicit plan to deal with the financial impact of failure.

The S151 officer has advised that the approach would be

1. Review corporate centre revenue budgets to identify resources.
2. Review of ear-marked reserves to assess if their intended use is still required and if not reprioritise.
3. Instruct departments to work towards delivering in-year revenue savings were practicable.
4. Lastly, the council has a General Fund Reserve that it sets aside for major financial shocks any balance would need to be found here.
5. If necessary replenish General Fund/Ear Marked reserves as part of the MTFS.

Clearly the need to find large sums may have a direct impact on services if the scheme fails. As well as finding the revenue, the service departments required to deliver savings and use earmarked funds

should have advance warning of how much they might be called upon to find, at least in general terms. That would allow service departments to plan for contingencies commensurate with the likely impact.

The S151 officer and Cabinet member have said they are sure the budget could withstand £30m (although that is an approximate figure based on £22.5m in April 2022. We have no update and there is no ceiling). Leaving aside the genuine affordability of a £30m unplanned revenue hit and the question of whether the £140m of earmarked reserves could not be spent on protecting frontline services, at the very least those earmarked reserves that could be used to mitigate risk should be identified as the impact of services can be planned for all major scheme in future.

This proposal is about prudent risk management of major schemes. It has no immediate costs associated with it, and while it initially mitigates against the NWL not proceeding it is intended to apply to all future major schemes where the risk exceeds £20m or such other figure determined by council in future.

- b) The Labour Group has been critical of the strategic review. It has been asserted that the need to deal with duplication and layers has built up because there has been no review for ten years. In an organisation like a county council that should never be the case. Almost £1.9m has been spent on consultants. From what little we know fewer than 100 redundancies are likely to result. Over ten years a workforce requiring fewer than 100 changes should have been identified and managed through workforce planning and management action. Instead staff have been subjected to a year of uncertainty. Other benefits from the strategic review appear to be exactly what we would expect from good management, not outside consultants, and should be ongoing.

It is noteworthy that there are more than 500 posts on our establishment that have not been filled over the past six months. We have no information about which have been genuinely difficult to fill and are essential and which have been simply left vacant and could be disestablished.

It is also noteworthy that the Employment Committee has been asked to rubber stamp a new senior management structure before and outside any consultation on the strategic review and out of the sight of most councillors. The report to the employment committee includes no costing other than the saving from the loss of the Director of Governance and the Executive Director of Finance and Commercial Services and the recognition that some posts will be regraded to reflect changed duties.

What was initially badged as a one year project has grown to three and an additional £1.5m has been included for each of the next two years. It is unclear whether the money will be used to extend the consultants contract or build in house capacity.

Our conclusion is that this is not really a strategic review. Our solution is two parts of the amendment

1. To extend the funding of £1.5m a year for the project to embed it as a permanent part of the culture of the organisation and use it to strengthen the internal team so there is an ongoing review process within the county council
2. To genuinely look at how we could do things different by exploring the feasibility of a new combined care directorate to take overall responsibility for developing a functional care market and commissioning or providing care. In the Scrutiny Committee this week Cllr Jamieson said¹:

“when private equity firms are getting wholly involved in societal projects, you know you are probably being overcharged.”

A genuine strategic review to look at better ways of delivering our services could be genuinely transformative.

- c) The proposed increase in members highways budget reflects an inflationary pressure but as we know inflation in that sector is running far in excess of 10% so is likely to be a real term cut. We are therefore proposing a further £1k increase specifically targeted at habitat and pollinators so that this element does not lose out to increases in the cost of highways work
- d) The budget papers identify three savings which potentially require consultation, which could not be included in the wider consultation due to the late addition to the proposals. The Labour Group propose these are withdrawn so that full and fair consultation can take place with residents and stakeholders.

The consultation feedback on the harmonisation of opening hours at the recycling centres is not conclusive enough to support this saving being made and Labour propose the hours remain the same. There is clear feedback that this has a detrimental impact on residents of working age using the services which has not been given sufficient regard.

The extra government grant above the provisional and final settlement is sufficient to cover these proposed cuts so they should be funded and maintained.

- e) Cabinet is scheduled to receive a report on a Climate Change Strategy in April 2023 (which presumably will have been considered by Infrastructure and Development Select Committee in March despite it not being on their forward work programme). The Labour amendment

¹ <https://www.youtube.com/live/tvE81rk5scM?feature=share&t=7193>

proposes that the carbon impact of this budget should be reported as part of the report to cabinet on the Climate Change Strategy in April and carbon impact should be a standard feature of every budget.

3. The proposals are set out below:

- To commission the Section 151 Officer to undertake a review during 2023-24 and report to Cabinet on the specific measures that would be required to fund any risk of the failure of the Norwich Western Link to proceed (£22.5m in April 2022). This review in particular to identify sources of funds and mitigation options for the potential collateral impact on other council services in the event that such a fund were to be needed.

To adopt a model based on this review to apply to all major schemes in future so that where the risk to the council exceeds £20m or such other figure agreed by council when confirming the capital allocation for the scheme, sources of funding to meet or mitigate the risks will be identified in outline and updated with any changes in the risk as the scheme develops.

- To make permanent provision for increased capacity in the Transformation function (approximately £1.5m pressure from 2025-26).
- To establish a revenue budget to fund a feasibility study into the opportunity to establish a combined care directorate with consequential changes to the senior management structure.
- To increase members highways and environmental budgets by a further £1,000 a year earmarked for small scale projects associated with habitat and pollinators.
- To remove the following three savings proposals from the budget as they require consultation:
 - S2324CES141 Recycling Centres: Mayton Wood relocation to Norwich North RC site
 - S2324CES144 Streetlighting - further dim all lights with an existing CMS (central management system)
 - S2324CS035 Post 16 transport: remove option to pay a daily fare
- To remove saving proposal S2324CES119 Recycling Centres: harmonise summer opening hours at recycling centres.
- To request Cabinet to include in the report on Climate Change Strategy programmed for their April 2023 meeting the carbon impact of this budget and in future years include the carbon impact of budget proposals to council as part of the budget approval process.

REVENUE

Ref	Proposal	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
1	Combined care directorate feasibility study (backfill)	0.100	-0.100	0.000	0.000	0.000
2	Permanent uplift in Transformation resource	0.000	0.000	1.500	0.000	1.500
3	Remove savings requiring consultation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S2324CES14 • S2324CES144 • S2324CS035 	0.185	0.114	0.000	0.000	0.299
4	Remove saving proposal S2324CES119	0.070	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.070
	Total	0.355	0.014	1.500	0.000	1.869

Revenue proposals funded from the following areas:

Ref	Funding	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
1	Additional funding via Rural Services Delivery Grant / Services Grant at 2023-24 Final Settlement (reinstate use of reserves)	0.355	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.355
2	Address pressure in future year (2024-25 and 2025-26) budget process	0.000	0.014	1.500	0.000	1.514
	Total	0.355	0.014	1.500	0.000	1.869

CAPITAL AMENDMENTS / ADDITIONS

Ref	Capital Project / Proposal	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
1	Increase Local Members Fund – highways and environmental schemes	0.084	0.084	0.084	0.084	0.336
	Total	0.084	0.084	0.084	0.084	0.336

Revenue Implications of Capital Expenditure to be funded by:

- The £0.084m per year addition to the Capital Programme would be funded by borrowing. This will result in an additional interest cost (and MRP charge in the year following completion of the asset).

Section 151 Officer technical comments

5. The revenue budget pressure for 2023-24 can be addressed from the sources identified. The additional pressure for 2024-25 is minimal and could be addressed as part of 2024-25 budget setting. There would be a small 2024-25 pressure from reinstating use of reserves in 2023-24. A pressure of £1.500m would need to be addressed within the 2025-26 budget process, increasing the 2025-26 Budget gap.
6. Additional borrowing costs would be minimal (circa £0.004m) and could be absorbed within the overall Capital Programme for 2023-24. Borrowing costs and MRP would then need to be provided for as part of the 2024-25 Budget process.
7. Assuming additional borrowing in 2023-24, these amendments would increase the 2024-25 Budget gap by £0.375m to £46.591m and the overall MTFS gap to £128.043m.

Monitoring Officer technical comments

8. None.

Head of Paid Service technical comments

9. None.

Conclusion

10. Council is able to consider these proposed amendments.

Green Group amendments to the Cabinet's proposed 2023-24 Budget

For Consideration at Full Council (21 February 2023)

Purpose of report

1. To present to Full Council proposed amendments from the Green Group to the budget recommended by Cabinet on 30 January 2023, with officers' technical comments on the impact to the budget.

Background

2. **Retrofit strategy:** The best way to permanently address the cost of living crisis is to ensure people have very low bills, due to well-insulated homes and provision of efficient renewable energy, ensuring that energy demand is low and energy is cheap. Retrofitting homes is also a prime way of bringing down carbon emissions, as energy in home use currently accounts for approx. 23% of Norfolk's carbon emissions (excluding aviation, shipping and production and consumption).
3. There is a need for coordination of the retrofit market in Norfolk, with coordination between vocational skills providers, FE and higher education institutions, the renewable energy and construction industries, and county and district councils, to make sure that there is a trained workforce able to deliver insulation projects and install renewable energy. Some of this is already underway but to meet the scale of the challenge, additional resource is needed, especially to unlock further private sector investment. A retrofit taskforce could also coordinate sources of funding and public engagement campaigns. Effective coordination could bring down energy prices, cut carbon emissions, and support the creation of 6,000 jobs.
4. The proposal would establish officer resource for the establishment and operation of the retrofit taskforce.
5. **Renewable energy investment officer:** Community renewable energy has been identified as one of the key priorities for the Norfolk Climate Change Partnership, yet Norfolk lags behind other areas where it comes to provision of community-led renewable energy. Investment in renewable energy can generate income for the council as well as providing environmental benefits and supporting local jobs. The renewable energy investment officer would scope out potential investments and see them through to completion. This role could also include working with community energy groups.
6. **Norfolk Climate Commission:** The Norfolk Strategic Flooding Alliance headed by Lord Dannatt has demonstrated the benefits of inter-agency working to address countywide issues. A similar approach is needed for climate change. The Norfolk Climate Change Partnership provides a space for officers at county and district councils to collaborate on climate

change plans, but there is a need for additional resource and strategic leadership to deliver a countywide carbon-reduction plan engaging with institutions, businesses and partners beyond the councils. A Climate Commission with adequate resourcing would be a strong step towards this. The Commission could contract out proposals, support bids for projects that can deliver systemic change, and be a driving force for net zero plans across the county.

7. **Sure Start centres:** Over the last more than a decade, Sure Start centres which provide invaluable support for children and families, helping to address inequality from the beginning of their life have been cut. This has had a serious impact on inequality and deprivation in Norwich and Norfolk. Green Party councillors are supporting residents to campaign for the re-opening of Sure Start Centres and so propose funding to establish the best route to re-opening them.
8. **Extension of On-Demand Bus Service (pilot):** An on-demand bus service has been opened near Swaffham. Better access to public transport connecting rural areas and towns and villages is essential to improving people's access to services and enabling economic activity. This amendment would seek to make provision to extend the concept of the on-demand bus service to other areas of the county.
9. **EHCP support capacity:** The recent Scrutiny meeting on EHCPs identified a need for support for parents working through the EHCP process. This should help to reassure parents during the EHCP assessment process and make sure that they and their children are supported. £40,000.
10. The proposals are set out below:

Green Group Budget Amendment Proposals 2023-24

Amendment 2

REVENUE

Ref	Proposal	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
1.	Retrofit taskforce	0.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.500
2.	Renewable energy commission	0.150	0.150	-0.300	0.000	0.000
3.	Norfolk Climate Commission	0.500	0.300	0.000	0.000	0.800
4.	On-demand bus service	0.500	0.000	0.200	0.000	0.700
5.	EHCP capacity	0.040	0.000	-0.040	0.000	0.000
6.	Sure Start Centres	0.300	-0.300	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Total	1.990	0.150	-0.140	0.000	2.000

Revenue proposals funded from the following areas:

Ref	Funding	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
1.	Additional funding via Rural Services Delivery Grant / Services Grant at 2023-24 Final Settlement (reinstate use of reserves)	0.740	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.740
2.	Carry forward 2022-23 funding received from accumulated surplus held in the business rates levy account, announced in Final Settlement 2023-24	1.250	-1.250	0.000	0.000	0.000
3.	Address pressure in future year (2024-25 and 2025-26) budget process	0.000	1.400	-0.140	0.000	1.260
	Total	1.990	0.150	-0.140	0.000	2.000

CAPITAL AMENDMENTS / ADDITIONS

11. **Purchase of ANPR cameras to enable school streets programme:** Air pollution kills over 100 people a year in Norwich alone. Children are especially vulnerable to air pollution, with pollution causing developmental damage and asthma. The proposal is to reduce pollution outside schools through rolling out a school streets programme with ANPR cameras.
12. **Rewilding:** Rewilding, or restoration of dynamic ecosystems, is essential to reversing extinctions of species and brings huge benefits to nature. Norfolk already has some pioneering rewilding sites including Wild Ken Hill, however East Anglia is also one of the most nature-depleted areas in the UK, which is itself one of the most nature-depleted countries in the world. So there is an urgent need to scale up rewilding projects across the county. This amendment would provide capital funding for necessary landscape interventions to support rewilding.
13. **Replacement of trees:** Tree cover in Norwich has declined by from 18.6% to 17.4% since 2016. Many street trees have been lost or cut down and not replaced, undermining the county council's ambition of planting 1 million trees. This amendment would provide capital funding necessary for replacing these lost trees.
14. **£2.5m for establishment of a retrofitting pilot revolving fund:** Working with district councils, this fund would be available for districts to bid for to insulate homes and install renewable energy while producing models that are scalable. The savings from the retrofitting, collected through a comfort charge (as is done with Energiesprong and some other retrofitting best practice models) would return to the fund to enable future projects.

Ref	Capital Project / Proposal	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
1.	ANPR cameras	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000
2.	Rewilding	0.750	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.750
3.	Replacement of trees	0.750	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.750
4.	Retrofitting revolving fund	2.500	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.500
	Total	5.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.000

Revenue Implications of Capital Expenditure to be funded by:

15. All funding for capital projects would come from the Norwich Western Link reserve.

Section 151 Officer technical comments

16. The revenue budget pressure for 2023-24 can be addressed from the sources identified. A pressure of £1.400m would need to be addressed within the 2024-25 budget process, increasing the 2024-25 Budget gap.
17. Utilising the £5m capital funding set aside for the Norwich Western Link would mean alternative capital funding would ultimately be required to deliver the Norwich Western Link. If funded through additional borrowing, the annual interest costs for this would be circa £0.250m, and the Minimum Revenue Provision cost circa £0.125m. However, in view of the spend profile of the project, this could be managed within the overall financing of the Capital Programme and therefore could be addressed within the 2024-25 budget process.
18. Assuming additional borrowing in 2025-26, these amendments would increase the 2024-25 Budget gap by £1.400m plus a pressure of £0.740m in 2024-25 from reinstating use of reserves in 2023-24, making the 2024-25 gap £48.356m and the overall MTFS gap £128.898m.

Monitoring Officer technical comments

19. None.

Head of Paid Service technical comments

20. In relation to the proposal to establish a £2.5m retrofitting pilot revolving fund, it is important to note that, as described in the proposal, this would represent a County Council fund that would be available for District Councils and other external bodies to bid into. No other comments.

Conclusion

21. Council is able to consider these proposed amendments.

Individual Member amendments to the Cabinet's proposed 2023-24 Budget – Cllr Alexandra Kemp

For Consideration at Full Council (21 February 2023)

Purpose of report

1. To present to Full Council proposed amendments from the Non-Aligned Member to the budget recommended by Cabinet on 30 January 2023, with officers' technical comments on the impact to the budget.

Background

2. Urgently needed Active and Sustainable Transport Measure for King's Lynn – Safety Improvements to Ferry Landing Stages (owned by Norfolk County Council) and urgent repair to West Lynn Riverbank Footpath (LCWIP route) from the football field to the Freebridge, to improve connectivity between the two parts of King's Lynn, West Lynn and King's Lynn to:
 - increase Accessibility, Public Transport and Active Travel opportunities for residents,
 - improve footfall in King's Lynn Town Centre to support and sustain local shops,
 - reduce road miles, petrol consumption, congestion and traffic coming into Lynn through the South Gates area,
 - reduce reliance on the private car, and
 - mitigate Climate Change.
3. The proposals are set out below:

Cllr Alexandra Kemp Budget Amendment Proposals 2023-24 Amendment 3

CAPITAL AMENDMENTS / ADDITIONS

Ref	Capital Project / Proposal	2023-24 £m	2024-25 £m	2025-26 £m	2026-27 £m	Total £m
1	Sustainable Transport, Active Travel, Clean Connectivity Accessibility and Inclusivity in King's Lynn and West Norfolk £2 million for urgent safety and inclusivity improvement to West Lynn Ferry Landing Stage and Bank of River Ouse Footpath Repair.	2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.000
	Total	2.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.000

Revenue Implications of Capital Expenditure to be funded by:

4. The £2.000m addition to the Capital Programme would be funded by borrowing. This will result in an additional interest cost (and MRP charge in the year following completion of the asset).

Section 151 Officer technical comments

5. £2.000m additional borrowing within the Capital Programme would increase the cost of interest payable by approximately £0.150m assuming a 5% interest rate.
6. Additional debt-funded capital expenditure increases annual MRP in the year following completion of the asset. Assuming an asset life of 40 years the MRP charge would be approximately £0.050m.
7. Additional borrowing costs of £0.100m could be absorbed within the overall Capital Programme for 2023-24 and borrowing costs and MRP would then need to be provided for as part of the 2024-25 Budget process. These would increase the 2024-25 Budget gap by £0.150m to £46.366m and the overall MTFS gap to £126.673m.

Monitoring Officer technical comments

8. None.

Head of Paid Service technical comments

9. The Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk (KLWN) and Norfolk County Council (NCC) have agreed to jointly fund a feasibility study into a possible improvement to the West Lynn Ferry. This is an essential first step to fully understand the issues and determine what is required before any improvements can be specified, funding sought, and a scheme implemented.
10. Key aspects of the feasibility work will include:
 - Site visit during all states of the tide and inspections of the current infrastructure
 - Identification of Health and Safety responsibilities
 - Discussions with the ferry operator and stakeholders
 - Linkages to KLWN car parking strategy
 - Review of previous proposals from 2009, consideration of alternative solutions, and determination of a preferred option
 - Determination of cost of preferred option and how it might be funded
 - Investigation of other measures to increase patronage.
11. The precise timescales for the feasibility work are not yet known but it is estimated that it will take between three to six months from commencement to complete the study.

Conclusion

12. Council is able to consider these proposed amendments.

Annexe 3 Annual Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-24 - Report from the Scrutiny Committee to the Leader of the Council

1 Background

- 1.1 At the meeting held on the 15 February 2023, members of the Scrutiny Committee received the final draft of the Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-34. This document is revised annually, and sits among the suite of documents that make up the annual NCC budget. It is also a distinct item that sits as part of the council Policy Framework.
- 1.2 The Scrutiny Committee has a clear role in providing challenge to any refresh or amendment to items that make up the policy framework. This is set out in section 11b of the NCC constitution, alongside guidelines around communication with members and the process leading to Full Council approval. The item must be considered by the Scrutiny Committee in good time, and the Committee are asked to provide a report to the Leader of the Council outlining a summary of discussions and any recommendations put forward by the Scrutiny Committee. This report will include details of any minority views expressed as part of the debate at the Scrutiny Committee. Having considered any report by the Scrutiny Committee, the Leader or Executive will agree proposals for submission to the Council and report to Council on how any recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee have been taken into account.
- 1.3 The committee discussed the Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-34, but made no formal comments or recommendations.

2 Actions and recommendations

- 2.1. No formal recommendations were moved or agreed by the committee regarding the content of the Investment and Treasury Strategy 2023-24 for consideration by the Cabinet Member or the Leader of the Council.