

## Norfolk County Council

### Minutes of the Meeting Held at 10am on Monday 25 November 2019

**Present:**

Cllr Tony <b>Adams</b>	Cllr Brian <b>Long</b>
Cllr Timothy <b>Adams</b>	Cllr Ian <b>Mackie</b>
Cllr Steffan <b>Aquarone</b>	Cllr Ed <b>Maxfield</b>
Cllr Stephen <b>Askew</b>	Cllr Graham <b>Middleton</b>
Cllr Jess <b>Barnard</b>	Cllr Joe <b>Mooney</b>
Cllr Bill <b>Borrett</b>	Cllr Steve <b>Morphew</b>
Cllr Claire <b>Bowes</b>	Cllr George <b>Nobbs</b>
Cllr Roy <b>Brame</b>	Cllr Judy <b>Oliver</b>
Cllr Julie <b>Brociek-Coulton</b>	Cllr Rhodri <b>Oliver</b>
Cllr Sarah <b>Butikofer</b>	Cllr Greg <b>Peck</b>
Cllr Penny <b>Carpenter</b>	Cllr Graham <b>Plant</b>
Cllr Mick <b>Castle</b>	Cllr Andrew <b>Proctor</b>
Cllr Kim <b>Clipsham</b>	Cllr William <b>Richmond</b>
Cllr David <b>Collis</b>	Cllr Dan <b>Roper</b>
Cllr Ed <b>Connolly</b>	Cllr Chrissie <b>Rumsby</b>
Cllr Emma <b>Corlett</b>	Cllr Mike <b>Sands</b>
Cllr Stuart <b>Dark</b>	Cllr Eric <b>Seward</b>
Cllr Margaret <b>Dewsbury</b>	Cllr Carl <b>Smith</b>
Cllr Nigel <b>Dixon</b>	Cllr Thomas <b>Smith</b>
Cllr Danny <b>Douglas</b>	Cllr Mike <b>Smith-Clare</b>
Cllr Phillip <b>Duigan</b>	Cllr Bev <b>Spratt</b>
Cllr Fabian <b>Eagle</b>	Cllr Sandra <b>Squire</b>
Cllr Tim <b>East</b>	Cllr Barry <b>Stone</b>
Cllr John <b>Fisher</b>	Cllr Margaret <b>Stone</b>
Cllr Tom <b>FitzPatrick</b>	Cllr Marie <b>Strong</b>
Cllr Colin <b>Foulger</b>	Cllr Haydn <b>Thirtle</b>
Cllr Andy <b>Grant</b>	Cllr Alison <b>Thomas</b>
Cllr Shelagh <b>Gurney</b>	Cllr Vic <b>Thomson</b>
Cllr Ron <b>Hanton</b>	Cllr Karen <b>Vincent</b>
Cllr David <b>Harrison</b>	Cllr Colleen <b>Walker</b>
Cllr Chenery of <b>Horsbrugh</b>	Cllr John <b>Ward</b>
Cllr Harry <b>Humphrey</b> (Chairman)	Cllr Brian <b>Watkins</b>
Cllr Brian <b>Iles</b>	Cllr Tony <b>White</b>
Cllr Andrew <b>Jamieson</b>	Cllr Fran <b>Whymark</b>
Cllr Terry <b>Jermy</b>	Cllr Martin <b>Wilby</b>
Cllr Alexandra <b>Kemp</b>	Cllr Sheila <b>Young</b>
Cllr Keith <b>Kiddie</b>	
Cllr Mark <b>Kiddle-Morris</b>	

**Present: 74**

## **Apologies for Absence:**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr David Bills; Cllr Stuart Clancy; Cllr Ed Colman; Cllr Brenda Jones; Cllr Chris Jones; Cllr Richard Price; Cllr Martin Storey and Cllr John Timewell.

## **1 Minutes**

- 1.1 The minutes of the Council meeting held on Monday 23 September 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

## **2 Chairman's Announcements**

- 2.1 The Chairman reported the sad passing of former County Councillor Derrick Murphy who was the Conservative Councillor for Freebridge Lynn from June 2009 to May 2013. Council stood in a minute's silence in his memory after which Members paid tribute to Mr Murphy.
- 2.2 The Chairman highlighted some of the many events he had attended, including the presentations of the British Empire Medal at the Great Hospital; a special Evensong at Norwich Cathedral to welcome the new Lord-Lieutenant; the Justices Service at Norwich Cathedral followed by the Novi-Sad Association annual lunch. The Chairman had also attended the Remembrance Day Parade in King's Lynn; the opening of The Nook in Framingham Earl on 15 November by HRH The Duchess of Cambridge and the Carers' Rights Day at the Forum. The Chairman was also pleased to announce he had attended an event at RAF Mildenhall for all new Chairmen and Mayors where he had participated in an annual corn hole tournament and been crowned the 2019 corn hole champion of Norfolk, Cambridgeshire and Suffolk.

## **3 Declarations of Interest**

- 3.1 Cllr Chenery of Horsburgh declared an Other Interest as a Trustee of NORAH (Norfolk Archives & Heritage Development Foundation).

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

- 4.1 There were no items of urgent business.

## **5 Questions to Leader of the Council**

### **5.1 Question from Cllr Steve Morphew**

Cllr Morphew stated that the General election meant there would be no announcement of the Local Government Funding arrangements on the date anticipated. He asked if the Leader could tell Council what impact that would have on budget preparations for this Council; did he ever get a response from the outgoing Government about extending the tapering of the wind-down of the local government funding arrangements and under the circumstances, would he be going to take extra steps to encourage the public to respond to the budget consultation.

The Leader replied that the spending review had given the Council some guidance about the funding to be received, the specific amounts of which were still to be confirmed. He confirmed that a plan had been developed based on the money announced in the spending review and added that one-off funding had been agreed for Adult's and Children's social care as well as some money for Special Educational Needs (SEND) schools which would help in the formulation of the overall budget. He continued that those aspects were only one-year funding at this stage and it was hoped that, once the General Election had taken place with hopefully a majority Government established from whichever party, fairer funding for local government and the priorities for local government could be established. He reassured Council that Norfolk County Council would continue to lobby and make its case for fairer funding once the new Government was announced.

**5.2 Question from Cllr Dan Roper**

Cllr Roper said he was sure the Leader would agree with the need for public consultations to be carried out properly and drew attention to the consultation about the proposed new recycling centre off the Broadland Northway. He continued that the exhibitions had taken place on week days outside the parish most affected, which had given people about one hour to view the plans. He also stated that the paperwork given out at those exhibitions had contained a map showing the recycling centre in the wrong location. Cllr Roper asked if the Leader would agree that a short extension to the consultation should be allowed, with preferably a further evening exhibition in the parish of St Faiths, which was something he had already agreed with the Portfolio Holder at Broadland District Council.

The Leader replied that in the context of ensuring a fair outcome from the consultation he would speak to the Cabinet Member and relevant officers after the meeting, to consider the proposal.

**5.3 Question from Cllr Mick Castle**

Cllr Castle asked the Leader, on the day Council was due to adopt its new Environmental Policy, if he would pledge Norfolk County Council's continued support for the dualling of the A47 trunk road, which was so important to the county's future economic development, to road safety and the quality of life of Norfolk residents.

The Leader replied that Cllr Castle was aware of the work that had been carried out with the A47 Alliance to ensure the A47 was dualled and also ensure that the Government fulfilled its promise in 2014 to inject £300m into the dualling of the road. The Council had an unswerving commitment as part of the A47 Alliance to ensure the work took place and also to ensure the necessary infrastructure was in place to allow the county to grow and thrive in the future.

**5.3 Question from Cllr Ed Connolly**

Cllr Connolly asked if the Leader would talk Council through the findings of the recent Peer Review and the recommendations they had made.

The Leader replied that the Council had requested the Corporate Peer Review which in his view had taken place at a very opportune time, as Norfolk County Council had established a new business plan 'Together for Norfolk' which had been adopted in May 2019 and also moved to the new governance arrangements

which had given the Peer Review a focus for their review. He added that the team had carried out their review as critical friends and had used their combined experiences to make some excellent recommendations as to how Norfolk County Council could continue to improve how services were delivered for residents and communities.

The Leader continued that the key points they had made were about how the Council was changing at pace by being more outward looking; creating a feeling of stability and confidence with partners; and was successfully addressing the financial challenges to date.

The recommendations made by the Peer Review would be reported to Cabinet on Monday 2 December and would form the basis of an action plan. The Leader also added that the County Council had already committed to a governance review when it adopted the new governance arrangements and the LGA team would be asked to carry out that review on our behalf and which was likely to take place in January 2020.

**5.4 Question from Cllr Emma Corlett**

Cllr Corlett asked if the Leader shared the disappointment at the woeful lack of an Adult Social Care Policy or funding in the Conservative manifesto launched recently and if he agreed with the independent analysis on Radio 4 on 25 November that it offered no new money above the one-off funding announced in September, which would not even keep up with demographic pressures, let alone reverse the cut to the Minimum Income Guarantee.

The Leader responded that the issue of a manifesto was what anyone could or could not promise at the time. He added that in his opinion it was a matter of regret that all the Parties concerned had not got to grips with the key issues faced by everyone, not just adult social care funding, but all forms of social care funding. He continued that he hoped, after the General Election and whoever the new government was, that they addressed the situation and ensured that all forms of social care were adequately funded.

**5.5 Question from Cllr Marie Strong**

Cllr Strong stated that, in her division, there had been some concern regarding the communication, or lack of, from the LGA Boundary Commission. She asked if the Leader could tell Council if the LGA Boundary Commission had confirmed in a letter or email, that Norfolk County Council's submission could be delayed until after the January 2020 Council meeting.

The Leader replied that there were two things about the Boundary Commission – firstly, the Boundary Commission had agreed with Norfolk County Council's submission to retain 84 Councillors and secondly the submission would be delayed until after the Council meeting on 20 January 2020 allowing sufficient time for its submission.

**5.6 Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp**

Cllr Kemp referred to the 65,000 people in west Norfolk who had voted "no" for incineration in the Borough poll. She asked if the Leader's Administration would place this statement in the draft Mineral and Waste Plan as the current criteria left things too open in that any piece of waste land or any piece of land that had a business purpose could be open to an application. She added that nothing had

yet been built on the Willows site and there was no certainty that there would **not** # be a power station there. She also asked why the budget for recycling had been cut by £200,000.

***# It was agreed that this minute be amended and was corrected at the Council meeting on 20 January 2020. Please view the minutes of that meeting in order to note the correction made.***

The Leader replied that the concerns raised by Cllr Kemp were somewhat scaremongering around what could happen because, in terms of what the Policy was, it was sufficient to cover all the issues which needed to be covered both now and in the future.

**5.7 Question from Cllr Jess Barnard**

Cllr Barnard stated that the largest transport infrastructure project for the county which did not include roads, was the Broadland Business Park rail station proposal, which had been proposed since the last century with no progress being achieved. Cllr Barnard asked the Leader what he would be doing to ensure and secure a way forward on the project and to ensure the work the Council was doing to safeguard green public transport was progressing as this would be essential if the Council was to meet its 2030 net zero targets.

The Leader replied that it had been the intention to drop the Broadland Business Park rail station from the Norfolk Infrastructure Plan, but it had now been reinserted on the recommendation of the Infrastructure & Development Select Committee as a future project. He added that this was a project that needed to be completed and which had been delayed substantially by Network Rail, but it was a project that was now in the Norfolk Infrastructure Plan and would be progressed.

**5.8 Question from Cllr Brian Watkins**

Cllr Watkins stated that EU funding had been a lifeline for local economies and Norfolk had particularly benefited from several EU funded Interreg projects in the past. However, without replacement funding, local communities could miss out on millions of pounds of additional private investment. Cllr Watkins asked the Leader what impact he thought this was likely to have on our Norfolk economy and how he hoped this might be taken forward by the next Government, whatever political colour it was.

The Leader replied that the most important aspect was the work already being done with the money received, acknowledging the benefit to the Norfolk economy from the additional money. He added that, in terms of the future, he knew the Local Government Association, particularly Cllr Kevin Bentley, the Leader of Essex County Council, had been pushing to ensure that whatever happened in the future would be dealt with at a national level as well as at a local level. The Leader continued that the anticipated outcome of the funding for the future was unknown at the moment apart from the “shared prosperity fund” although the details remained unknown at the moment. He added that he was hoping the shared prosperity fund could be used both nationally and locally.

**5.9 Question from Cllr Danny Douglas**

Cllr Douglas asked if the Leader would support a change in the direction of the A47 Alliance to include the development of sustainable travel modes as part of the

Alliance to include improvements to rail services between Peterborough and Great Yarmouth and also guarantee the future of the Xcel bus services to King's Lynn.

The Leader replied that it was not an unreasonable suggestion to widen the remit of the A47 Alliance and he was sure those people sitting on the A47 Alliance would take notice of the comments and take it forward.

**5.10 Question from Cllr Tim Adams**

Cllr Adams stated that the public often didn't ask for social care assessments to be reviewed as they were worried the Council was more interested in saving money and would find ways to reduce the money they received. He also stated that social care and day care providers said they would not speak out when things went wrong in fear of their ability to win contracts in that they may be undermined or reduced. Cllr Adams asked the Leader what the Council would be doing differently next year to change this perception of how the Council was being run.

The Leader replied that the Council was rightly responding to demand-led services and was responding in a way to try to get the best outcomes for all the individuals and communities it served. He added that as far as that went, he could see no reason to change that approach and if services could be made better in the future for everybody that was surely a better way forward.

**5.11 Question from Cllr Tim East**

Cllr East stated that the new governance arrangements had now been in place for six months and asked if the Leader could tell Council what the tangible benefits had been from the Select Committees, given that at Scrutiny Committee on 19 November, Cllr Brame had acknowledged that it was impossible to properly scrutinise a department as complex as children's services without extra meetings. He added that it was further evidence that the County Council should have remained with the Committee system of governance.

The Leader replied "no", there was a role for the Scrutiny Committee in scrutinising performance and activities. He added that, in terms of the Select Committee roles, they were responsible for policy development in those areas of activity the Select Committees had been set up for and he saw no reason to change that, primarily because of the split between the two. He reiterated that the Select Committees were the overview aspect of governance and the Scrutiny Committee provided scrutiny and he could see no reason why it should be changed adding that, in his opinion, work was starting to flow through the Select Committees in terms of their forward work programmes.

**6 Cabinet Recommendations**

6.1 Cllr Andrew Proctor, Chairman of Cabinet, moved the recommendations in the report from the meetings held on 7 October and 4 November 2019.

6.2 Council **AGREED** the recommendations as outlined in the report.

**6.3 Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp**

Cllr Kemp referred to the Annual Review of Residential Children's Homes where the report cited a worrying fact that 311 episodes of children missing from care had occurred, which related to only 41 children – an average of 8 episodes of

going missing per child. She asked, bearing in mind that any child going missing from a care home was very vulnerable to criminalisation or exploitation, what was being done to address the issue.

The Chairman of Cabinet replied that the issue had been addressed at the Cabinet meeting where it had been raised as a matter of concern. Children's Services department had confirmed it had the situation firmly under control.

The Cabinet Member for Children's Services confirmed that some of the incidents were very minor, nonetheless the department was required to record them as an incident even if, for example, a child returned to the home five minutes later than the expected time. The Cabinet Member reassured Council that all Norfolk's children's homes, apart from one, had been rated "good" by Ofsted at the last inspections and also that children were very closely monitored and were not given opportunities to be manipulated by outside forces if the department could prevent it.

## **7. Cabinet Reports (Questions to Cabinet Members)**

Cllr Andrew Proctor, Chairman of Cabinet, introduced the report.

### **7.1 Question from Cllr Alison Thomas to Cllr Greg Peck, Cabinet Member for Commercial Services & Asset Management.**

Cllr Thomas noted with pleasure that Carrow Bridge House had recently been auctioned and asked if the Cabinet Member could update Council on the progress of the sale as well as progress going forward.

The Cabinet Member responded that Carrow Bridge House had been sold for £254,000 with 50% of the net amount going to Highways England as they owned the land at the front of the property. He added that this was the 49th highways "scrap" sold since October 2016 and brought the total generated from sales to over £1m, which was over £1m from property which many people had considered unsaleable. He also added that the stream of sales would continue into 2020/21 with an estimated £100,000 in receipts to be made, which included the disposal of some NDR related parcels of land.

### **7.2 Question from Cllr Emma Corlett to Cllr Bill Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention.**

Cllr Corlett asked if the Cabinet Member could tell Council the number of health visitor led clinics across Norfolk, per district area, that had taken place in the past six weeks, compared to the same period last year. Cllr Corlett recognised the Cabinet Member may need to provide the detail in a written answer, however, asked if he could tell Council now whether it had increased, decreased, or stayed the same.

The Cabinet Member responded that, due to the technical nature of the question he would provide a written response.

### **7.3 Question from Cllr Dan Roper to Cllr John Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services.**

Cllr Roper stated that the Portfolio Holder would be aware from correspondence that in the village of Frettenham, a number of families no longer had access to school transport to their chosen school in spite of a bus running through the

village. He continued that this included a family where the pick-up point was at the end of their driveway; a family where one child had a place on the school bus and the other one didn't; and another family which was disqualified by a mere 10 metres in terms of the location of their home. He asked if the Cabinet Member would agree with him that extra capacity was needed on the school transport network and if could he commit to working towards getting additional budget funding so the problems did not occur next year.

The Cabinet Member replied that the County Council needed to stick to its policy, adding that all the issues were normally experienced at the start of the school term which had happened again with children changing schools. He added that he couldn't guarantee extra funding would be available for this service but what he could guarantee was that the department would very carefully consider how to make the best use of the service with the maximum number of children transported to school on the bus network. The Cabinet Member reiterated the need to stick to the policy due to the Council's financial constraints.

**7.4 Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp to Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.**

Cllr Kemp asked if the Cabinet Member would agree that there was an evidence-based policy at the Council in that when Traffic Orders came to Committee for decision making, there was no access to the original terms of the CIF 2 funding meaning that £5.3 of government funding could be repayable because of the impact of Traffic Orders.

The Cabinet Member replied that he was satisfied the Committee had made the right decision and everything was being done correctly.

**7.5 Question from Cllr Roy Brame to Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.**

Cllr Brame said, at the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 19 November, the Cabinet Member had stated that the national report from the Annual Highways and Transport Survey had been published. He asked if it was possible to have a report on how this affected Norfolk.

The Cabinet Member replied that he had mentioned it at the Scrutiny Committee meeting on 19 November, adding that the National Highways and Transport Survey (NHTS) took place annually during the summer and the survey was referenced in the Department for Transport incentive fund self-assessment process. He said the survey allowed the County Council to compare itself with its peers, monitor performance and help make efficiencies.

The Cabinet Member continued that Norfolk County Council had achieved an overall score of 56 and a ranking of 1<sup>st</sup> out of 28 County Councils, who had participated in this year's survey and that this result was an improvement on its ranking of 4<sup>th</sup> last year and 7<sup>th</sup> in the year before. He continued that the average score of most of the County Council's peers was 52. The survey results also took into account the areas considered most important by the residents in Norfolk and for this the County Council also ranked 1<sup>st</sup> out of 28, as opposed to 4<sup>th</sup> last year. When comparing itself to all authorities in the east of the region, the Council again ranked 1<sup>st</sup> out of 11 in the overall score and out of the 28 councils and large unitary authorities in the peer group, Norfolk also ranked first



in the following key business indicators:

- Traffic levels and congestion. (The opening of the Broadland Northway also coincided with the survey result.)
- Condition of highways.
- Highway maintenance.

The Cabinet Member added that Norfolk had achieved a score that was at, or above the national average across 24 out of the 26 key business indicators with our best results in comparison to the NHTS average being:

- condition of highways – 9% above the national average;
- traffic levels and congestion – 8% above the average;
- ease of access – 5% above the average.

Cllr Wilby continued that the increase to the condition of the highway was arguably due to the increase in repairs made possible by additional government funding. After the “beast from the east” in March 2018, central Government had awarded Norfolk County Council £3.4m to help fix the roads. A further £12.7m in government funding was also received as part of the autumn budget in October 2018 to address the problem. In response to the increased volume of potholes the Council supplemented its 27 patching gangs with four velocity patching machines to get the potholes filled as quickly as possible. The additional funding had allowed the Council to carry out more resurfacing work which may otherwise have been scheduled to a later date and in combination with a dedicated staff who, the Cabinet Member publicly thanked, worked hard to make the most of the money available, and had improved the road conditions in the county as evidenced in the survey and which was a good reflection on the improvements made.

#### 7.6 **Question from Cllr Terry Jermy to Cllr Greg Peck, Cabinet Member for Commercial Services & Asset Management.**

Cllr Jermy stated that the car park at County Hall was getting busier all the time with more people working from County Hall and also that he was aware of ongoing plans to increase the amount of car parking spaces. Cllr Jermy asked if the Cabinet Member could give assurance that when considering car parking, efforts would be made to increase the frequency of buses visiting County Hall, as the number of buses had decreased over the last few years. He added that this was a great opportunity to encourage more people to access the building by public transport if the number of bus services was increased.

The Cabinet Member replied that buses didn't fall under his remit but in terms of car parking, one of the long-term aspirations was to be an efficient and modern estate at County Hall. He continued by saying that by building on the moving of staff and the subsequent closure of Vantage House and Thorpe Road in Norwich, the next step was to move approximately 540 people from Carrow House to County Hall within the next nine months. To accommodate approximately 360 staff that did not have parking at County Hall, the Council was looking to increase the amount of spaces on the site and a formal planning application was likely to be submitted to Norwich City Council before Christmas with the feedback from Norwich City Council being taken into account. The Cabinet Member also said other options, including encouraging staff to use sustainable transport as well as walking and cycling were being explored.

**7.7 Question from Cllr Tim East to Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.**

Cllr East said, following the fatalities in a road traffic accident at Costessey on Friday 22 November, there was a dire need to improve road and pedestrian safety in the area. He added that he understood improvements were dependant on money received from planning development contributions, eg Section 106 and CIL, which could take up to five years to be received. Cllr East asked, if the Cabinet Member could step in to urgently improve pedestrian and road safety in this locality, bearing in mind the Council's appalling record on road safety.

The Cabinet Member replied that he was aware of the accident which happened on Friday 22 November and had seen the press coverage and the correspondence and comments from Cllr East. He added that he could not comment about the accident and the Council would need to wait for the police and coroners reports before any decision could be made on what could be done to improve safety at that site.

**7.8 Question from Cllr Sandra Squire to Cllr Bill Borrett, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention.**

Cllr Squire asked if the Cabinet Member would agree that young people with learning difficulties should not be waiting many months for a personal assistant for supported employment experiences where a care plan had been in place for some time stating that support would be provided and a job placement had been found. Cllr Squire also asked if the Cabinet Member could tell Council how many people with learning difficulties were in work in Norfolk and how that compared with the rest of the country.

The Cabinet Member replied that traditionally in the past Norfolk County Council had not been up to the level of its peers in that it had far fewer people with learning difficulties in employment than similar councils and that was one of the reasons why, earlier on this year, as part of the budget, this Council had agreed to allocate £1m to support the work of the department in getting people with learning difficulties into employment.

Regarding the first part of the question, the Cabinet Member agreed that people should not be waiting for support and that if there were opportunities, anyone wanting to work should be encouraged to do so.

**7.9 Question from Cllr Graham Plant to Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.**

Cllr Plant stated that in 2014 Norfolk County Council was awarded £300m to dual five elements of the A47, none of which had yet taken place, with Highways England holding onto the money although we had been told that some planning work had taken place. Cllr Plant asked the Cabinet Member to tell Council what steps would be taken when the new Minister was appointed to ensure the £300m was spent in Norfolk, because from the business case put forward Norfolk could benefit by an extra £500m in turnover every year if the schemes had gone ahead.

The Cabinet Member replied that the A47 was a really important route for Norfolk and the whole of the east of England, as it connected the energy coasts of Lowestoft and Yarmouth right through to Peterborough. He added that it was

frustrating that the A47 had not received the upgrades it should have had by now. The Cabinet Member also said that pressure continued to be put on Highways England, who had informed the County Council they were on schedule to deliver the improvements on the dates they had publicised. The Cabinet Member stressed that work would continue across all parties in Norfolk, including working with all MPs and that as soon as the new Minister for Transport had been appointed, Norfolk would lobby them to ensure these richly deserved improvements were delivered.

**7.10 Question from Cllr Mike Sands to Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.**

Cllr Sands referred to Transport for London (TfL) which had introduced a large fleet of fully electric buses set up in consultation with, and infrastructure by, UK Power Networks (UKPN). He added that Norfolk had a very good network of Park and Ride around Norwich and asked what work had been done to move forward in introducing a fully electric fleet for Park and Ride.

The Cabinet Member replied Norfolk County Council worked closely with all bus companies across the county and that bus companies were currently subsidised by approximately £300m. He added that, as Council was aware the Transforming Cities Fund application had been submitted, as well as the future mobility zones funding application and suggested the County Council was moving closer to getting where it wanted to be with improvements in bus services and that by working closely with all the bus companies he was sure this could happen fairly soon.

**7.11 Question from Cllr Sarah Butikofer to Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.**

Cllr Butikofer stated that fly-tipping in North Norfolk had hit its highest level in seven years and asked if the Portfolio Holder would agree that we should be doing all we could to encourage and assist residents and visitors to recycle their waste responsibly as it would appear the charges were having a detrimental impact on this aspiration.

The Cabinet Member replied that he personally did not like fly-tipping; it was illegal, and he was sure the Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste was on top of fly-tipping across the county. He added that he believed the number of fly-tipping incidents had decreased across the county in the last twelve months.

Cllr Butikofer reiterated that fly-tipping had increased in North-Norfolk and was at its highest level for seven years.

**7.12 Question from Cllr Sandra Squire to Cllr Andy Grant, Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste.**

Cllr Squire asked if the Cabinet Member could give Council an update on the balloon and lantern charter in terms of how many organisations had signed up; if he would join her in encouraging all Councillors at Norfolk County Council to sign up to the charter and also, if a date had been confirmed for the launch of the single use plastic charter.

The Cabinet Member replied that he didn't have the details to hand but would provide a written response. He added that he would and endorse encourage all Councillors to sign up to the Charter.

**7.13 Question from Cllr Ian Mackie to Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.**

Cllr Mackie said his question was about winter preparations across the county's 2000 miles of highways, and particularly whether the County Council would be filling Parish and Town Council grit bins as they had done in previous years.

The Cabinet Member confirmed that grit bins would be filled this year and added that preparations for keeping Norfolk moving this winter were well in hand with approximately 16,000 tonnes of salt stored in salt stores across the county, which would be replenished as and when needed during the winter through our long term contract with our supplier – Compass Minerals. The Cabinet Member added that more than one third of Norfolk's roads were on the council's 49 regular gritting routes, including all A and B class roads and some C class roads, each full run covering more than 2,400 miles of roads and taking approximately 3 hours to complete.

The Cabinet Member reminded Council that the A11 and the A47 were gritted by Highways England and that members of the public could check which roads were on the County Council's gritting routes for the 2019/20 season on the map available at [www.norfolk.gov.uk/gritting](http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/gritting). The map also included the locations of approximately 1900 grit bins around the county which were filled by the County Council for the public to use on pavements, cyclepaths and roads and he thanked the volunteers that used the grit bins.

The Cabinet Member also referred to the fleet of gritting trucks and the dedicated crews who went out in all weathers to grit the roads and clear snow as and when needed and urged everyone to take care when using roads which were cold and wet and remember to always drive to arrive and drive to the conditions of the road at all times.

**7.14 Question from Cllr Mike Smith-Clare to Cllr John Fisher, Cabinet Member for Children's Services.**

Cllr Smith-Clare asked if Cllr Fisher could confirm, compared with this time last year, if Norfolk's permanent exclusions, across all age groups had increased, decreased, or remained the same.

The Cabinet Member replied that, due to the technical nature of the question, he would provide a written response.

**7.15 Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp to Cllr Andrew Proctor, Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategy & Governance**

Cllr Kemp referred to the Infrastructure First policy of the Council, particularly the A10 in West Winch in west Norfolk which stated # was busier than the A47 and was the worst performing section of the A10 with approximately 19000 cars using it per day. She continued that Highways England had a holding objection to the planned development of 4000 houses due to potential gridlock on the Hardwick roundabout, the bypass and also the dualling of the A47 from East Winch to Tilney. Cllr Kemp asked the Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategy & Governance if his Administration ruled out this plan for 300 more houses to be accessed by the A10 before the bypass was constructed.

**# It was agreed that this minute be amended and was corrected at the Council meeting on 20 January 2020. Please view the minutes of that**

**meeting in order to note the correction made.**

The Leader and Cabinet Member replied that Cllr Kemp was talking about the Local Plan and how all these developments came forward and how the assessment of traffic requirements and infrastructure requirements followed. He added that Councillor Kemp also knew that the West Winch housing access road had been agreed as a priority for our region and that the major road network funding was not dependant on 350 houses being built before the bypass was constructed and also that the A10 at Setchey was listed as an emerging project.

**7.16 Question from Cllr Brian Iles to Cllr Greg Peck, Cabinet Member for Commercial Services & Asset Management**

Cllr Iles said, at the recent County Farms tenants meeting, he had heard that a remarkable young man from the west of the County had become our youngest farm tenant at the age of 18. He asked if the Cabinet Member would tell Council what County Farms had done to support new entrants into farming.

The Cabinet Member replied that he was very proud of the County Farms tenants and the high levels of industry and professionalism they brought to their farms. The ethos of County Farms remained a way for people to get into and progress into agriculture. He continued by informing Council that four farms had been let this year, all to new entrants into farming and that the approach to interviewing, which included opposition Members on the Panel, provided a thorough method of evaluating business plans to ensure that tenants met the ethos of County Farms.

The Cabinet Member said he particularly wanted to mention the new tenants at Mautby, who would be establishing a new care farm supporting the most vulnerable people in society, and also the young man referred to by Cllr Iles, who was interviewed in between taking his 'A' levels and although not from a farming background, had started a sheep business at the age of 16. Norfolk County Council had leased him 48 acres in the west of the county to develop his business.

The Cabinet Member also reiterated the cross-party support for County Farms in Norfolk, with a number of Councillors visiting farms over the past year who had all been impressed by the work undertaken by tenants to care for the land.

He also added that continued investment in the estate would take place to bring up the standard of the buildings, infrastructure and by the acquisition of strategic parcels of land for the future.

**7.17 Question from Cllr Tim Adams to Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.**

Cllr Adams stated that if the County Council continued doing the bare minimum on flooding in the Norfolk Strategic Infrastructure Plan, the outer harbour would end up being in the cloisters at Norwich Cathedral. He continued that flood defences and coastal erosion projects would be vital in protecting both existing and future homes and businesses and that the recent Conservative pledge on coastal flooding and erosion was a drop in the ocean as far as Norfolk's coastline was concerned. Cllr Adams asked the Cabinet Member what future projects were being planned to protect the coastline.

The Cabinet Member replied that work was being undertaken with all agencies and the Environment Agency to ensure our coastal areas were in the best possible shape they could be.

**7.18 Question from Cllr Mick Castle to Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.**

Cllr Castle said he was pleased to see the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport questioning the absence of the Great Yarmouth 3<sup>rd</sup> river crossing and the A47 dualling in the original draft of the new Norfolk & Suffolk Local Industrial Strategy when it came to Cabinet last month for endorsement. Cllr Castle asked if the Cabinet Member would assure Council that these had been included in the final text, as if not this could seriously undermine Norfolk County Council's bid to get A47 dualling included in the RIS2 programme.

The Cabinet Member replied that he would.

**7.19 Question from Cllr Chenery of Horsburgh to Cllr Martin Wilby, Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.**

Cllr Chenery referred to the amount of road-kill seen on Norfolk's roads and asked if more signs could be established to alert motorists that deer and other wildlife had been seen in the vicinity.

In reply, the Cabinet Member said that Norfolk was a rural county and it was lovely to see all the wildlife. He added that the signs were in place for the motorists to read and reiterated that every time a warning sign was seen, motorists should take care and drive to the appropriate conditions of the road. He added that he would look into the possibility of providing more signs where deer were seen.

**7.20 Question from Cllr Tim East to Cllr Harry Humphrey, Chairman**

Cllr East asked a procedural question about taking questions in group order and moving to the next group if a questioner didn't ask a question as it had been similar to a question already asked and answered. He felt the next opportunity to ask a question should be given to the same Group.

The Chairman agreed to take the point on board and consider the suggestion.

**8. Committee Reports**

**8.1 Scrutiny Committee meetings held on 22 October and 19 November 2019**

Cllr Steve Morphew, Chair, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

**8.2 Corporate Select Committee meeting held on 14 November 2019**

Cllr Karen Vincent, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

**8.3 Infrastructure and Development Select Committee meeting held on 13 November**

Cllr B Stone, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

- 8.3.1 Cllr Bev Spratt referred to the Select Committee's decision to receive a paper on pot hole repairs at its January meeting and said he looked forward to seeing the report.

8.4 **People and Communities Select Committee meeting held on 15 November 2019**

Cllr Shelagh Gurney, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

8.5 **Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 10 October 2019**

Cllr Penny Carpenter, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

8.6 **Health & Wellbeing Board meeting held on 30 October 2019.**

Cllr Bill Borrett, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

8.6.1 **Question from Cllr Brian Watkins**

Cllr Watkins referred Members to the Norfolk & Waveney Sustainability & Transformation Partnership and asked if the Chairman was confident the Plan properly reflected the needs of local people across Norfolk rather than being driven by the priorities of the NHS and if he did, could he give some examples of where this had happened.

The Chairman responded that Cllr Watkins, as previous Chairman of the HWB, would know some of the frustrations experienced with partners in the past and that he was very pleased that the NHS five-year plan was mentioned. He added that the Plan gave a greater reliance of internal NHS procedures and structures than he would have liked, but good progress was being made and the last minute agreement from the NHS to put prevention front and centre was down to the democratic mandate of the non-NHS Members on the Health and Wellbeing Board. The Chairman thanked the NHS for agreeing that prevention was important and for including it in their Plan.

8.6.2 **Question from Cllr Emma Corlett**

Cllr Corlett urged caution about being pleased with the reduction in out of area placements and asked the Chairman to report back to Council after the next Health and Wellbeing Board meeting, more details on the length of stays for those mental health patients treated out of area. Cllr Corlett also asked about readmission rates and the risk of people being discharged too soon together with information about readmission rates within four weeks, within six months and also whether those admissions were under the Mental Health Act or informally. Cllr Corlett also asked about the financial impact on families as, despite the good work of the NHOSC, no financial support was available for families to visit their loved ones who were dispersed across the country in out of

area placements.

The Chairman responded that he was glad the work the NSFT was doing in this area had been acknowledged as important which was why the report had been presented to the Health and Wellbeing Board. He added that it was no secret that the Norfolk & Suffolk Foundation Trust had been through a very rocky patch for a very long time but it now appeared that, as a result of the report, real progress was being made. The Chairman urged Cllr Corlett and all Councillors to attend Health and Wellbeing Board meetings in the future where they could experience its work.

#### 8.6.3 **Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp**

Cllr Kemp referred to the Norfolk & Waveney Sustainability Plan and the Health and Care STP update, particularly the shortage of care home places in Norfolk. She added that 12 care homes had closed in 2018-19 with a net loss of 157 places, and expressed the need for an additional care home in King's Lynn. Cllr Kemp asked if the Chairman could look into providing a new care home in King's Lynn.

The Chairman responded that County Council Adult Social Care didn't run care homes, it commissioned places for people. He added that the County Council had done a lot of work over the last few years to try to make the care market more stable as it held overall responsibility for the care market itself. The County Council had invested £11.3m in the last budget, over and above previous spend to increase the basic amount paid to carers to well above inflation and the positive element of this had meant funders had been able to spend more money on fees which meant care homes had been able to pay the new living wage which was something the County Council particularly wanted to see happen. The Chairman added he wanted to see the market more stable to keep good staff working in care where they could use their skills to benefit the residents of Norfolk.

#### 8.7 **Standards Committee meeting held on 9 October 2019**

Cllr Mark Kiddle-Morris, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

##### 8.7.1 **Question from Cllr George Nobbs:**

Cllr Nobbs asked if the Chairman would agree that the public probably didn't realise how limited the powers of the Standards Committee were, no matter how appalling the breach of standards was. He asked if the Chairman would consider, after the election, writing to the Government, to ask for the powers of the Standards Committee to be strengthened.

The Chairman agreed and referred to the consideration of a report at the last Standards Committee Meeting on Standards in Public Life which had made 26 recommendations to Government to reinstate the teeth of the Standards regime which were removed by the Localism Act 2011. The Chairman advised that another 16 recommendations had been implemented during the meeting which would be considered by the Committee on Standards in Public Life in 2020 to ensure these were adopted, the detail of which was contained in the report.

#### 8.8 **Audit Committee meeting held on 24 October 2019**



Cllr Ian Mackie, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

8.9 **Planning Regulatory Committee held on 11 October 2019.**

Cllr Colin Foulger, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

8.10 **Norfolk Joint Museums Committee meeting held on 6 November 2019**

Cllr John Ward, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

8.11 **Norfolk Records Committee meeting held on 6 November 2019.**

Cllr Chenery of Horsburgh, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

8.11.1 **Question from Cllr Alexandra Kemp**

Cllr Kemp referred to the collection of renaissance documents held in the town library which would be on public display on Saturday 30 November. She added that the building itself was built with money from Andrew Carnegie's endowment in 1904 and was a very important piece of Victorian Gothic architecture. Cllr Kemp asked for a categoric denial that there was any plot afoot to sell the building off, stop it being a library and maybe demolish it or build on the site.

The Chairman said he did not know the answer.

8.12 **Norwich Highways Agency Joint Committee meeting held on 5 September 2019.**

Cllr Tony Adams, Chairman, moved the report. Council **RESOLVED** to note the report.

**9. Environmental Policy for Norfolk County Council**

9.1 Council received the report by the Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste setting out the proposed new Environmental Policy. The Policy was a key step in demonstrating the County Council's leadership role in addressing climate change.

9.2 Following debate and being put to a vote, on a show of hands, Council unanimously **RESOLVED** to:

1. **agree** that the County Council's Environmental Policy should form part of the Policy Framework set out in Article 4 of the Council's Constitution (noting that responsibility for approving the Policy Framework and the strategies and policies that sit within it lies with Full Council).
2. **approve** the following recommendations from the Infrastructure and Development Select Committee:-

2.1 **Approve** the new Environmental Policy for Norfolk County Council, as set

out in Appendix A.

2.2 **Approve** implementation of the following actions associated with the delivery of the new Policy:

- (a) To establish a Member Oversight Group chaired by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Waste to develop and oversee the obligations contained in the Environmental Policy (including actions (b) to (e) below). The Terms of Reference for this group, including reporting processes, to be agreed.
- (b) To task officers to audit the NCC carbon footprint, using appropriate Greenhouse Gas Reporting protocols). In addition, identify processes to engage with partners and neighbours to address the collective footprint of the area.
- (c) To task officers to develop a number of early action demonstrator projects that showcase environmental excellence - such as developing 'rewilding' and carbon sequestration projects (including strategic tree-planting), subject to available funding.
- (d) To task officers to take steps to actively bid for external resources through the emerging funding streams supporting the wider environmental agenda.
- (e) Identify revenue funding to enable dedicated resource to be put in place to progress actions associated with the Policy and to support the Member oversight group to ensure synergy across the whole of the Council.

3. **Agree** to make provision of £1m in the Council's capital programme that can be used to match fund appropriate capital projects to support delivery of the Policy.

4. **Support** the allocation of £350k revenue funding to the Community and Environmental Services Department to enable relevant resources to be put in place to support delivery of the Policy. This provision will be proposed as part of the budget setting process for 2020/21 that will be considered by Full Cabinet in February 2020. In the meantime, Officers will continue to provide support from within existing resources.

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

10.1 No appointments were made.

**11. Notice of Motions**

11.1 The following motion was proposed by Cllr Mike Smith Clare and seconded by Cllr Emma Corlett:

Council regrets that, despite the motion passed in April, the outgoing government failed to act on the pension injustice inflicted on women born in the 1950s.

Council requests the Leader of the Council to write to the leaders of the main

parties with candidates seeking election to seats in Norfolk and the new Secretary of State in the next government urging them to commit to redress the unfairness resulting from the increase to the State Pension Age.

Council also supports the reduction of the qualifying age for free bus travel and requests the leader to include a request for funding to enable this in his letter to the next Secretary of State.

11.1.1 Cllr Boy Brame, seconded by Cllr Tony Adams proposed a closure motion cease debate on the motion.

11.1.2 Upon being put to a vote on a show of hands, Council **AGREED** to cease debate and move to the vote.

11.1.3 Upon being put to a recorded vote (Appendix A), with 23 votes in favour, 46 votes against and 0 abstentions, the motion was **LOST**.

11.2 The following motion was proposed by Cllr Jess Barnard and seconded by Cllr Terry Jermy:

11.2.1 Council believes bus and community transport services are crucial to the social and economic prosperity of Norfolk. Council requests the cabinet to prepare a report for discussion by council on measures necessary to increase the number of communities served by regular and reliable public transport and how to make fares affordable.

Council supports the extension of free bus travel to 16-19 year olds and the reduction in the qualifying age for bus travel for older people as a way of encouraging greater passenger numbers to make routes viable, reducing car usage and contributing to tackling the climate crisis.

11.2.2 Cllr Brian Watkins, seconded by Cllr Steffan Aquarone moved the following amendment to the motion.

Council believes bus and community transport services are crucial to the social and economic prosperity of Norfolk. Council requests the cabinet to prepare a report for discussion by council on measures necessary to increase the number of communities served by regular and reliable public transport and how to make fares affordable.

**This report should include how the council could introduce a modern innovative integrated system to radically change and improve public transport in rural areas such as through a hub and spoke model.**

Council supports the extension of free bus travel to 16-19 year olds and the reduction in the qualifying age for bus travel for older people as a way of encouraging greater passenger numbers to make routes viable, reducing car usage and contributing to tackling the climate crisis.

11.2.3 As proposer of the original motion, Cllr Barnard accepted the amendment which became the substantive motion.

11.2.4 Cllr Tony Adams, seconded by Cllr Ian Mackie proposed a closure motion, which,

on a show of hands, was **CARRIED**.

11.2.5 Upon being put to a vote, on a show of hands the motion was **LOST**.

11.3 The following motion was proposed by Cllr Tim Adams and seconded by Cllr David Harrison:

11.3.1 This Council notes that:

Norfolk's ring-fenced public health grant from government has fallen over the last 3 years

2017/18 - £40,093,000

2018-19 - £39,062,000

2019-20 - £38,031,000

The Spending Round 2019 indicated that the Public Health grant would increase by inflation in 2020-21 with subsequent announcements suggesting an additional real term increase of 1%

The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy assumes that £2.0m savings from the Public Health budget would be found over 2020-21 and 2021-22.

The Council is required under the Health and Social Care Act 2012 to take steps for improving the health of Norfolk's residents.

The Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) June 2019 report Ending the Blame Game says – The case for a new approach to public health and prevention states that "Over half of the disease burden in England is deemed preventable, with one in five deaths attributed to causes that could have been avoided."

Around four in ten cancers are preventable, largely through avoidable risk factors, such as stopping smoking, keeping a healthy weight and cutting back on alcohol.

Academic research (Masters R, Anwar E, Collins B et al 2017) has shown that for every £1 invested in public health, £14 will subsequently be returned to the wider health and social care economy.

"Parity of esteem" is the principle by which mental health must be given equal priority to physical health. It was enshrined in law by the Health and Social Care Act 2012.

The Centre for Mental health states that mental health problems account for 28% of the burden of disease but only 13% of NHS spending.

The Council believes that:

Public health funds vital services and functions that prevent ill health and contribute to the future sustainability of the NHS.

Public health services and campaigns can make a significant improvement to people's lives such as the In Good Company campaign that sought to reduce

loneliness and isolation.

This Council agrees to:

- (A) Lobby the new government to ask that the public health grant will continue to be funded from central government beyond 2020-21,
- (B) Lobby the new government to request that the parity of esteem principle is followed in Public Health and NHS funding, and
- (C) Confirm that the Council will seek to push for Public Health and NHS activities across Norfolk to meet the parity of esteem principle including a specific commitment to do so in the Council's Public Health strategy.

11.3.2 The following amendment was proposed by Cllr Bill Borrett and seconded by Cllr Shelagh Gurney:

This Council notes that:

Norfolk's ring-fenced public health grant from government has fallen over the last 3 years

2017/18 - £40,093,000  
2018-19 - £39,062,000  
2019-20 - £38,031,000

The Spending Round 2019 indicated that the Public Health grant would increase by inflation in 2020-21 with subsequent announcements suggesting an additional real term increase of 1%

The Council's Medium-Term Financial Strategy assumes that £2.0m savings from the Public Health budget would be found over 2020-21 and 2021-22.

The Council is required under the Health and Social Care Act 2012 to take steps for improving the health of Norfolk's residents.

The Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) June 2019 report Ending the Blame Game says – The case for a new approach to public health and prevention states that "Over half of the disease burden in England is deemed preventable, with one in five deaths attributed to causes that could have been avoided."

Around four in ten cancers are preventable, largely through avoidable risk factors, such as stopping smoking, keeping a healthy weight and cutting back on alcohol.

Academic research (Masters R, Anwar E, Collins B et al 2017) has shown that for every £1 invested in public health, £14 will subsequently be returned to the wider health and social care economy.

"Parity of esteem" is the principle by which mental health must be given equal priority to physical health. It was enshrined in law by the Health and Social Care Act 2012.

The Centre for Mental health states that mental health problems account for 28% of

the burden of disease but only 13% of NHS spending.

The Council believes that:

Public health funds vital services and functions that prevent ill health and contribute to the future sustainability of the NHS.

Public health services and campaigns can make a significant improvement to people's lives such as the In Good Company campaign that sought to reduce loneliness and isolation.

This Council agrees to:

- (A) Lobby the new government to ask that the public health grant will continue to be funded from central government beyond 2020-21, **and that should the Public Health budget be passed into any future for Business Rates Retention arrangements this should only be done with safeguards in place.**
- (B) Lobby the new government to request that the parity of esteem principle is followed in Public Health and NHS funding, and
- (C) Confirm that the Council will seek to push for Public Health and NHS activities across Norfolk to **continue to strive for** ~~meet the~~ parity of esteem principle including a specific commitment to do so in the Council's Public Health strategy.

11.3.3 As proposer of the original motion, Cllr Tim Adams accepted the amendment which became the substantive motion.

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

11.4 The following motion was proposed by Cllr Sandra Squire and seconded by Cllr Mick Castle:

11.4.1 Council resolves to build on its new Environmental Policy, which acknowledges that trees are a vital resource in helping to combat climate change and for carbon sequestration. Therefore this council agrees to plant the equivalent of one tree for every Norfolk resident, spread over a period of 4 years, creating a series of community woodlands around the county, which will not only reduce our carbon levels, but will benefit wildlife and provide valuable green space to improve the lives of Norfolk residents in years to come.

11.4.2 Cllr Andy Grant proposed the following amendment which was seconded by Cllr Barry Stone:

~~Council resolves to build on its new Environmental Policy, which acknowledges that trees are a vital resource in helping to combat climate change and for carbon sequestration. Therefore this council agrees to plant the equivalent of one tree for every Norfolk resident, spread over a period of 4 years, creating a series of community woodlands around the county, which will not only reduce our carbon levels, but will benefit wildlife and provide valuable green space to improve the lives of Norfolk residents in years to come.~~

Replace all wording with

**Council resolves to build on its new Environmental Policy which acknowledges that trees are a vital source in help combating climate change alongside rewilding for Carbon sequestration. Therefore this council agrees to work with communities, landowners and partners to plant 1 million trees over 5 years around Norfolk which will not only reduce carbon levels but will also benefit wildlife and provide valuable green space to improve the lives of Norfolk residents for years to come.**

11.4.3 As the proposer of the original motion, Cllr Sandra Squire accepted the amendment which became the substantive motion and was debated by Council.

11.4.4 Cllr Jess Barnard proposed a further amendment which was seconded by Cllr Emma Corlett:

1. **Therefore this council agrees to protect existing woodland.**
2. Council resolves to build on its new environmental policy which acknowledges that trees are a vital source in help combating climate change alongside rewilding for Carbon sequestration. Therefore this council agrees to work with communities, landowners and partners to plant 1 million trees over 5 years **which must amount to a net increase** around Norfolk which will not only reduce carbon levels but will also benefit wildlife and provide valuable green space to improve the lives of Norfolk residents for years to come.

11.4.5 With the consent of Council, Cllr Barnard varied her amendment, to remove the sentence "Therefore this Council agrees to protect existing woodland".

11.4.6 As the proposer of the original motion, Cllr Sandra Squire accepted the varied amendment which then became the substantive motion.

11.4.7 Upon the substantive motion being put to a vote, on a show of hands, the motion was **CARRIED** as follows

Council resolves to build on its new Environmental Policy which acknowledges that trees are a vital source in help combating climate change alongside rewilding for Carbon sequestration. Therefore this council agrees to work with communities, landowners and partners to plant 1 million trees over 5 years which must amount to a net increase around Norfolk which will not only reduce carbon levels but will also benefit wildlife and provide valuable green space to improve the lives of Norfolk residents for years to come.

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

### **12.1 Question from Cllr Steve Morphew**

The Care Market is in a very perilous position as evidenced by the failure of providers, notably Allied Health. There is currently a 10% vacancy rate for care staff across Norfolk and a 40% turnover rate. Please tell me how these figures compare with NorseCare?

**Response:**

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategy & Governance responded that Norsecare's current vacancy rate was 7.1%, and the overall company turnover rate was 15.75%, beating the national trend, while ensuring the Norsecare ran good care homes. NorseCare had recently been nominated for and won awards, the most recent being Munhaven which had been recognised as the best dementia care home in the country. The Leader added that retaining staff was testament to the training staff received at Norsecare and its focus on high quality care. He also added that Investment by Norsecare continued in new care facilities in Norfolk, responding to the requirements of the county.

**12.2 Question from Cllr Julie Brociek-Coulton to the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.**

In the past there has been late changes to traffic schemes because of concerns from disabled people that could have been avoided had those needs been identified at the design stage. Will the cabinet member commit to genuine involvement so schemes designed under the Transforming Cities fund are co-produced with representatives of disabled people?

**Response:**

Through our scheme design process, we already consult and engage with stakeholders, including groups representing disabled users, and take their feedback into account in developing proposals. Through the design process, we also identify and seek to design out or mitigate hazards.

The Cabinet member confirmed he was happy to consider whether there were opportunities to strengthen the engagement for the Transforming Cities Programme.

**12.3 Question from Cllr Dan Roper to the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport.**

Over the past twelve months graffiti has appeared on all of the bridges and some road signs along the Broadland Northway. Some of this was clearly part of an orchestrated campaign with it receiving local media coverage and causing some initial amusement. However, graffiti is illegal, it has irritated many residents and among others who initially found it amusing the joke has now worn thin. Are there any plans for the graffiti to be removed?"

**Response:**

Our current policy on graffiti was to remove any offensive graffiti as soon as possible but we do not make special visits to remove non-offensive graffiti, particularly in cases where the cost of doing so was disproportionately high associated with necessary traffic management. As the graffiti on the NDR was not considered to be offensive, we aim to carry out this work in conjunction with other planned highway maintenance works.

**12.4 Question from Cllr Brian Watkins to the Cabinet Member for Highways, Infrastructure & Transport and the Cabinet Member for Environment & Waste.**

In what ways has the council sought to reduce air pollution caused by car parking near schools across the county?



**Response:**

A wide range of activities were carried out to encourage residents and visitors to use alternative means of transport, including parents taking children to school.

There is also significant work taking place to help address road safety concerns, including cycle training, direct engagement with students on road safety through programmes delivered by our Road Safety and Fire and Rescue services including the #Impact programme, Crucial Crew and cycling proficiency.

Our Local Transport Plan acknowledges that travel choices are based on journey needs and available options. This plan encourages viable alternatives to single occupancy car travel, and active travel options (walking and cycling in particular) for short journeys, particularly frequent ones such as to schools.

**12.5 Question from Cllr Brian Watkins**

Suffolk County Council has put £150 million in pension funds from its £2.9 billion passive equity investments fund - investments which are held long term to reduce fees associated with frequent buying and selling into a dedicated pot investing in climate-aware companies. How can Norfolk County Council follow Suffolk County Council's lead?

**Response:**

Norfolk County Council is the statutory administering authority of the Norfolk Pension Fund. It delivers the Local Government Pension Scheme in the county on behalf of more than 400 participating employers, securing the retirement incomes of 95,000 individual members.

The investment assets are in excess of £4bn and is invested globally across a diverse range of asset shares, corporate debt, property, infrastructure and timberland in order to pay pension benefits as they fall due.

The Norfolk Fund is typical of many public and private funds in using a mix of passive and active investment approaches to construct an investment strategy suitable for its operational, funding and fiduciary needs.

The management of the Fund, including the strategic asset allocation of the Fund, is delegated to the Pensions Committee. Councillor Watkins is a member of the Pensions Committee, together with four other County Councillors, two representatives of other employers and a staff representative. Investment decisions must be approved by the Committee, having taken formal professional advice and following appropriate supplier procurement. The committee must always ensure its fiduciary duty is central in its decision-making processes.

The Fund is committed to being a good long-term steward of the institutional capital upon which its members depend for their future retirement incomes. The Committee takes its Employee Savings Plan (ESP) responsibilities very seriously. As a Pension Fund we invest long-term and there is plenty of evidence to suggest that companies that also take ESP responsibilities seriously are better performing investors in the long term.

I also understand the Committee recently undertook two days training on this very

important matter. Cllr Watkins was no doubt pleased to benefit from the training.

We believe that the proactive engagement with companies is the most efficient means of understanding and influencing the social, environmental and business policies of those companies and it has policies and reporting to support this. However, it would be completely inappropriate for individuals to over-ride a professionally delivered actuarially based decision-making process centered on the Committee as a whole. Various fund management companies have recently launched climate aware products in response to investor demand but most currently lack any meaningful track record. The Fund is aware of the UBS product as used by Suffolk and although cheaper than active management, it is a more expensive product than the conventional passive alternative. As the product is a substitute for conventional passive investment, the difference in exposure to companies with positive, or indeed negative, climate change credentials will be relatively small, eg exposure to oil or gas companies will still be fairly similar to a passive manager investing money without applying a climate aware tilt. As at 30 September 2019, it was just 0.4% underweight oil and gas producers and was overweight industrial metals and mining, construction and basic materials, industrial transportation and chemical companies by similar degrees.

For clarification, the valuation provided for the Suffolk Fund (£2.9 billion) is the total value at the last accounting date and of this approximately 5% has been invested in the climate aware product. The overall investment strategy would have been constructed to be suitable for the investment needs of the Suffolk Fund in meeting its financial obligations to members and sponsoring employers.

The meeting concluded at 1.40pm.

### **Chairman**



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

**Norfolk County Council**  
**25 November 2019**  
**Recorded Vote**

**Agenda item 11 – Motion 1 Proposed by Cllr Mike Smith-Clare and  
Seconded by Cllr Emma Corlett.**

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

**With 23 Votes in favour, 46 votes against and 0 abstentions the motion was LOST.**