



**People and Communities Select Committee
Minutes of the Meeting Held on 19 November 2021 at 10am
in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Norwich**

Present:

Cllr Fabian Eagle (Chair)
Cllr Fran Whymark (Vice Chair)

Cllr Tim Adams	Cllr Paul Neale
Cllr Brenda Jones	Cllr Mike Smith-Clare
Cllr Mark Kiddle-Morris	Cllr Eric Vardy

Substitute Members Present:

Cllr Lesley Bambridge for Cllr Michael Dalby
Cllr Phillip Duigan for Cllr Julian Kirk
Cllr Carl Smith for Cllr Claire Bowes
Cllr Tony White for Cllr Alison Thomas

Also Present

Michael Bateman	Assistant Director, SEND Strategic Improvement and Early Effectiveness
Debbie Bartlett	Director of Strategy & Transformation, Adult Social Services
James Bullion	Executive Director of Adult Social Services
Alison Gurney	Programme Director, Local Outbreak Control, Public Health
Cllr Shelagh Gurney	Deputy Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health & Prevention
Alex Stewart	Healthwatch Norfolk
Sara Tough	Executive Director of Children's Services
Sharon Brooks	Carers Voice (via video link)
Teresa Hewitt	Disability Norfolk Network Group (via video link)
Anne Landamore	Disability Norfolk Network Group
Judith, Nick and Charlie Taylor	Disability Norfolk Network Group

1. Apologies for Absence

1.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Claire Bowes (Cllr Carl Smith substituting), Cllr Ed Connolly, Cllr Michael Dalby (Cllr Lesley Bambridge substituting), Cllr Julian Kirk (Cllr Phillip Duigan substituting) and Cllr Alison Thomas (Cllr Tony White substituting).

2. Minutes of last meeting

2.1 The minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2021 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chair.

3. Declarations of Interest

3.1 Cllr Lesley Bambridge declared a non-pecuniary interest as a trustee of West Norfolk

Carers.

4. Items received as urgent business

4.1 No urgent business was discussed.

5. Public Questions

5.1 No public questions were received.

6. Member Questions and Issues

One Member question was received, and the response was published on the Council website and circulated at the meeting. The question and the response is attached to these minutes at appendix A.

7. Adult Social Services Charging Policy for Non-Residential Care - update on engagement

7.1.1 The Committee received the report detailing work carried out since a Judicial Review in December 2020, which identified that changes to Norfolk County Council's charging policy had unintentionally discriminated against a group of people the judge identified as severely disabled. This work included amending the Charging Policy for non-residential care to address the findings of the High Court and engaging with the disabled community. Some of the key issues highlighted from this engagement were presented in the report, which updated the Committee on engagement work to date and setting out work planned for the coming months.

7.1.2 The Executive Director of Adult Social Services introduced the report to the Committee:

- The report set out the background to work including amendments to the interim policy and reimbursements to people affected by the policy change.
- Work undertaken with the reference group had helped officers and the Executive Director of Adult Social Services thanked the Disability Norfolk Network Group (DNNG) and the reference group for their work and engagement with the Council.
- It was recommended that the interim policy shouldn't change until the Government implemented national reform over the charging policy. Officers would come to committee with a briefing on the white paper once it had been published.

7.1.3 The Director of Strategy & Transformation, Adult Social Services, added that a lot had been learned from having real discussions with people. Through this work, areas to make changes had been identified.

7.2.1 Teresa Hewitt spoke to the Committee:

- Teresa Hewitt was a full-time carer to her sister Susan. She joined the DNNG in 2019 when changes to her sister's contributions gave her concerns that Susan would have less money than she should. Teresa therefore started campaigning.
- Teresa was now part of the workshops with the public office and attended officer meetings once a month with Norfolk County Council officers. At times these

meetings were stressful for herself and carers.

- Teresa understood that the Council had less money coming in but queried why Councillors voted for changes to the policy when they didn't understand why they were charging people.
- Teresa felt the Government needed to recognise that not enough money was being given to Adult Social Services, admit what they did wrong and start doing things right before other people died or were in conditions which limited their survival.

7.2.2 Judith Taylor spoke to the Committee:

- Judith thanked officers for working with members of the DNNG and she felt this had helped start to build a relationship with Norfolk County Council. She noted that there was no trust between the disabled community and the Council mainly caused by a lack of engagement.
- The disabled community were also keen to build relationships with Councillors, especially Conservative Councillors due to the Council being Conservative run. This would help Councillors understand what it was like to have a disability in Norfolk, understand what changes to the charging policy meant, and what life was like for carers and families of people with a disability. Judith hoped that a meeting would be held for Councillors to learn more, involving people with disabilities, carers and families.
- Judith spoke about the fact that those who could work did not have their earnings taken into consideration when Minimum Income Guarantee (MIG) contributions were calculated, whereas those who were unable to work had their benefits taken into account when calculating MIG contributions. Judith felt this was a form of discrimination.
- Judith felt that the MIG contributions involved age discrimination as different aged people were charged different amounts.
- Judith was unhappy that, despite the DNNG having been invited to lobby with Councillors and Ministers back in 2019, this had only occurred once. Judith felt that working together was important to get more money from Government, through Councillors and Government hearing how peoples' lives were affected directly "from the horse's mouth".

7.2.3 Anne Landamore spoke to the Committee

- Anne had two adult children with learning disabilities. Her daughter, aged 41, was profoundly, multiply disabled with complex medical needs and funded by continuing healthcare by the NHS. She didn't have to pay towards her care. Anne's son of 31 lived independently in supported living with carers 24/7, shared with another person; he was one of the highest payers of charges relating to MIG calculations because people who lived independently received an extra benefit called the "severe disability premium" from Government. The entire amount of this grant was taken from his MIG calculation towards his care. This meant there was no benefit to him filling out the 43-page assessment to receive the severe disability premium. However, if he did not apply for this benefit he would be charged towards his other benefits.
- Anne pointed out that people who had learning disabilities and who were employed and receiving a wage did not have their earnings counted towards their MIG calculation. Those people who were unable to carry out paid employment and therefore received employment support allowance, had this benefit taken into account in their MIG calculation.
- Anne queried why when the Government had announced that people with less than £23,500 in the bank didn't have to pay towards their care, all young people

were being assessed by the MIG and many disabled people were paying towards their care, making some people think disabled people were well off.

7.2.4 Sharon Brooks spoke to the Committee:

- Councillors ensured they were mindful of the decisions they made but it was not easy to be aware of the full impact of these decisions, which was why the experience of service users was so important.
- Sharon represented unpaid carers through the organisation Carers' Voice. Carers of those with learning disabilities were concerned that the people they were caring for were vulnerable and unable to advocate for themselves.
- Contacting the Council was daunting, and people were not always aware of the decisions made and why; documents were not always easy to understand or available in easy read versions.
- The reference group was an opportunity to look at some of these issues and build trust.
- The group asked that work would be co-produced so that everyone could be fully aware of the impact of decisions by being equal partners.

7.2.5 Alex Stewart from Healthwatch Norfolk spoke to the Committee:

- Through his work in this area, Alex noted that the overwhelming issue being raised was communication. He noted for example that if there was a change of social worker, a person's story often had to be told again from the beginning.
- It would be important to establish what was meant by co-production so that everyone was clear on this.
- Meetings had been successful in setting out what would be achieved and Healthwatch were keen to continue to be involved.

7.2.6 The Executive Director of Adult Social Services replied to the comments made by representatives at the meeting.

- The judicial review raised a point about employment discrimination noting that if a person was severely disabled, they would receive a benefit called enhanced PIP (Personal Independence Payment) which had to be taken into account by the Council. However, if a person was employed, their earnings would be disregarded. The Judge stated this was discrimination. Following this judgement, the Council had amended the interim guidance to disregard enhanced PIP however this change did not disregard employment benefit. This was a point which would be raised in lobbying when the Government's White Paper was released.
- Regarding the comments on age discrimination, The Executive Director of Adult Social Services clarified that different amounts paid by people of different ages was built into the MIG rules, which were suggested by Government.
- The Chair **asked** for bullet points covering key information on this topic to be sent to the Committee to help with lobbying and discussing with MPs.

7.3 The following points were discussed and noted:

- Committee Members thanked those who had attended the meeting in person and by video link to speak to the Committee.
- Officers were asked what would be done to help Councillors understand the difficulties experienced by people with disabilities and their families and carers. The Executive Director of Adult Social Services suggested that Councillors spoke to people and visited community groups; Officers would help facilitate this if needed.

- A Committee Member noted that the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention was not present at the meeting and asked the Taylor family what their opinion was of this. Judith Taylor replied that the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention did not engage with the disabled community, and noted that Cllr Gurney, Deputy Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention had been asked to take over the aspect of his role related to disabilities.
- Cllr Gurney, Deputy Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, Public Health and Prevention, spoke to the members of the DNNG and Carer's Voice present at the meeting and the Committee. She assured them that she took this issue very seriously. When appointed as Deputy Cabinet Member, due to the Cabinet Member's large workload including integrated healthcare and public health, she was given her own areas of work to take forward which included working with people with disabilities. So far, she had attended a meeting with the DNNG on zoom and intended to meet with them in person. She spoke of her experience of looking after people with disabilities as a carer for her father and working in a home for elderly people with mental health difficulties.
- A Committee Member queried how much had been repaid to people following changes to the interim guidance. The Executive Director of Adult Social Services **agreed** to circulate a response to Committee Members.
- Members of the DNNG and Carers Voice were asked what they felt the Council was doing right. They responded that officers were listening and engaging; further work was needed to ensure Councillors were listening and understanding by speaking with people with disabilities, their carers and families. The Director of Strategy & Transformation, Adult Social Services, suggested that a joint learning session could be facilitated between Councillors and service users and carers. This would be an opportunity to co-design a learning event for councillors to learn about "walking in disabled people's shoes".
- Teresa Hewitt noted that if Councillors engaged with service users, visiting people in their homes and in care homes on a regular basis they would have the opportunity to see how the money they were investing was being used.
- It was noted that there were still barriers in place, and it was important to look at how these could be overcome. The Executive Director of Adult Social Services agreed that more structured work was needed around engagement. He noted that children's services had a more formal process in place around engagement in corporate parenting and he would have discussions with the department.
- A Committee Member raised concerns with a statement on page 32 of the report which stated, "The judge said that we didn't mean to be unfair and we couldn't have known that our policy was going to be unfair". Cllr Shelagh Gurney said that she had worked with the Making It Real group to make an easy read document covering the judicial review and that the phrase was a statement of fact from the judicial review.
- Anne Landamore felt that severe disability premium being taken into account in MIG calculations while salary was not was unfair. The Executive Director of Adult Social Services noted that in his judgement, the Judge was urging the Council to engage with people so that when the MIG was set its implications could be fully understood.
- It was requested that cross party Councillors were involved in engagement work with service users.
- Cllr Tony White, the Disability Member Champion, said that it had been good to hear the comments of people who had attended the meeting and he intended to plan some visits.

- 7.4 The Committee **AGREED** to:
- a) **Note** the completion of reimbursement
 - b) **Note** the update on the work currently in progress
 - c) **Agree** to receive a further report on the engagement at a subsequent meeting, including clarity on national reforms and the implications for charging and next steps

8. Covid-19 Update

8.1 The Committee received a presentation from the Programme Director, Local Outbreak Control, Public Health; see appendix B:

- There was a incident rate in Norfolk of 316 confirmed positive cases; the England average was 385 confirmed positive cases. Norfolk was the lowest county in the region for case rates.
- There had been a significant increase in cases in school age children, but Norfolk had followed the England average and trend, with Norfolk case rates decreasing.
- There had been a decrease in the positivity rate in the number of people being tested for Covid-19.
- Hospitalisations and deaths remained relatively low in Norfolk compared to the high case rates, following the national trend
- A local outbreak management plan was in place as in all areas in the country; the local outbreak management plan was a multi-agency plan which brought in in summer 2020 and updated regularly. Norfolk continued with its overarching aim for people to protect themselves, others and Norfolk as shown on slide 4
- An engagement board was in place to deliver the outbreak management plan consisting of the Leader of Norfolk County Council, seven District Council representatives and senior officers.
- The Health Protection Board was chaired by the Director of Public Health and involved senior officers
- Local coordination groups were in place based on district council footprints where district council, police and other colleagues came together to respond to local outbreaks and needs
- Norfolk had consistently been in the top 10 of outcomes for contact tracing.
- Norfolk County Council continued to support businesses in Norfolk in a multi-agency approach to reduce transmission of Covid-19.
- The Council would continue to support the booster programme and second jab for young people.
- The national situation was being monitored to see if the Government's "Plan B" would need to be enacted; locally this would result in actions such as status entry into venues, mandated face coverings and working from home.
- In schools work was being carried out around increased vaccination uptake, increased ventilation, asymptomatic testing, social distancing and virtual meetings where needed.

8.2 The following points were discussed and noted:

- The issue of vaccine hesitancy was raised and the impact of this in Norfolk particularly on the uptake of the booster vaccine. The Programme Director, Local Outbreak Control, replied that data would start to become available on the uptake of the booster vaccine soon but it was known that there were some parts of the population who were vaccine hesitant. Officers were working with these people to address their concerns.

- A Committee Member asked if the Council could do more to enforce social distancing, mask wearing and other Covid-19 prevention methods. The Programme Director, Local Outbreak Control, agreed to take this question to the engagement board, but added that there were communications campaigns being carried out and due to be launched in the festive season which were Norfolk focussed reminding people of Covid-safe behaviours.
- The Programme Director, Local Outbreak Control, confirmed that Norfolk University of Arts and University of East Anglia sat on the local coordination groups, and regular meetings were held with these institutions when there were Covid-19 outbreaks; work continued with them to encourage vaccine uptake.
- Noting reported cases of people receiving positive lateral flow tests but negative PCR tests, reports of testing issues were queried. Gurney confirmed that there were no reported issues with testing in Norfolk, but also noted that PCR testing was more accurate than lateral flow testing.

8.3 The Committee **NOTED** the presentation.

9. Carers Charter progress report

9.1.1 The Committee received the report setting out the important work completed across 2021 towards the Council's commitments in the Carers Charter.

9.1.2 The Director of Strategy & Transformation, Adult Social Services, reported that this group involved carers, Councillors and other representatives, chaired by an independent chair, Bill Armstrong. Since the charter started, there was greater understanding of what it meant to be a carer and increased services for carers in Adult Social Care. The report set out what had been achieved through the year and areas to look at in the future.

9.1.3 Cllr Shelagh Gurney wished to highlight Bill Armstrong's commitment to the group and in his role as Chair.

9.2 The following points were discussed and noted:

- It was pointed out that the Carers' Charter didn't mention respite care. The Director of Strategy & Transformation confirmed that some people had had respite cancelled at short notice and officers were in the process of reinstating respite services and restoring people's confidence in booking respite.
- Cllr Adams proposed that the Committee took part in the national campaign to increase the weekly allowance for carers and lobby the Government. There was no seconder and so the proposal was not voted on.
- It was noted as positive that contact with schools regarding young carers had improved over the years. The Executive Director of Adult Social Services confirmed that Norfolk held a list of young carers.
- The Chair reported that he had been in contact with a farm park in North Norfolk who had offered to put on an event for young carers in the area.
- The Director of Strategy & Transformation confirmed that the parent carer statistics in the report were national statistics; it was challenging to collect this data locally, but it was an aim to do so.
- A Committee member noted from the report that 76% of families didn't visit the GP about their child's disability or condition and asked what more could be done to help those most at need. The Director of Strategy & Transformation pointed out that officers use the term carer but many people didn't use that

term to refer to themselves, so the language used needed to be changed to help reach out to more people.

- The Vice-Chair agreed that it was important to identify people who did not recognise they were carers and provide them with support.
- The Chair pointed out that 12% of the population of Norfolk were carers

9.3 The Committee:

- a) **ENDORSED** the 2021 Carers Charter progress report;
- b) **REVIEWED** the working group's focus areas for 2022.

10. Strategic and financial planning 2022-23

10.1.1 The Committee received the report which responded to feedback from Select Committees in July 2021 and provided an opportunity for the Select Committee to give its views on the detailed budget proposals for the services within its remit and which are being taken forward to public consultation (subject to Cabinet decisions 8 November 2021).

10.1.2 Cllr Jamieson, the Cabinet Member for Finance, introduced the report to Committee:

- Council had published its initial budget savings proposal 2022-23 to begin the consultation process later in November 2021.
- Key points were that current planning reflected the proposed savings programme of £24.5m with the aim to look for a further savings of £5m in the current financial year 2021-22. Subject to consultation, the council was planning on an increase in council tax of 3%.
- The spending review had provided a multi-year settlement which, assuming it was mirrored by a multi-year settlement in local government spending review, would help the council set a sustainable medium term financial strategy
- There were no proposed changes in the way that services would be delivered that required consultation.
- £24.5m new savings proposed so far was intertwined with Adult Social Services' vision was to support people to be independent, resilient and well, combined with prevention and early intervention, development of alternative care and more in-house care helping Children's Services control their costs. Both of these key, demand led departments had been impacted by the pandemic and cost pressures would include adult and children's social care pressures driven by demand and additional cost pressures of purchasing care provision.
- Norfolk County Council welcomed the Government announcement of £4.8bn funding for local authorities. However, £4.8bn had become £1.6bn per year with no uplift in the public health grant and no resolution of the high needs block deficit.
- The final figure to be received from government could vary depending on how the formula was used to determine what proportion of the £1.6bn would come to Norfolk and this would not be known until mid-December 2021.
- Executive Directors would be asked to identify up to a further £5m savings in the short term should Government funding prove insufficient.
- A multiyear settlement would allow management to look at transformational savings by a review of how services were delivered and how people were used. External analysis was in place to look at service delivery in 2022.
- Government confirmed in its social care announcement that it expects demographic and unit cost pressures to be met through council tax, social care precept and long-term efficiencies which required funding each year. Each year

demographics represented an £18-20m cost increase for Norfolk.

- Consultation would go out for a 2.99% increase in council tax consisting of a 1% adult social care precept increase and 1.99% council tax increase in line with core spending power guidelines assumed in the spending review.

10.1.3 Cllr Tony White left the meeting at 15:55

10.2 The following points were discussed and noted:

- The Cabinet Member for Finance clarified that Adult Social Care was the largest department, which was why it had the largest savings. There was an ongoing transformation programme in place within the department to identify more effective and economically viable ways to deliver services. The Executive Director of Adult Social Services added that every scheme of 60-70 flats saved £200,000 on the purchase of care budget. A 10-year programme for 3000 homes was in place however planning their location and size could cause problems if objections were received during the planning process.
- The Cabinet Member was asked if he thought the current and successive Governments had been taking the Adult Social Care crisis seriously. The Cabinet Member for Finance replied that Adult Social Care and Social Care reform had been anticipated for many years. The recent announcement from Government had partially solved the problem and he awaited further updates. The department were looking at how things could be done in a better way, which were more economically effective and better for service users.
- A Committee member asked why the decision had been taken not to raise the social care precept by the additional 1% which was available. The Cabinet Member for Finance replied that Cabinet had decided not to move forward with raising adult social care precept by the additional 1% deferred from 2020-21 in the light of rising costs incurred by residents such as national insurance, inflation and energy prices.
- The Cabinet Member for Finance confirmed that there were ongoing conversations with NorseCare and all suppliers of care to ensure the Council was receiving good value for money. The NorseCare contract was a “block” contract; through discussion with NorseCare there was an opportunity to agree for some beds to be sold privately to individuals, reducing the cost to the Council and reducing staff costs.
- The Executive Director of Children’s Services clarified that North Yorkshire was a £5m investment from Government which the Council had put match funding into; this work started in mid-2021 and efficiencies from this work were built into the savings proposals for the next few years.
- the Executive Director of Adult Social Services confirmed that there was a modest saving of £100,000 for recruitment and retention in adult social care.
- The Executive Director of Adult Social Services reported that there was a programme of £5.5m over 3 years to improve the adult social care “front door” by integrating with the NHS to provide support to people earlier and looking at digital end to end contact with service users.

10.3 The Committee **CONSIDERED** and **COMMENTED** on the budget proposals for the services within its remit which are being taken forward to public consultation, to inform Cabinet’s recommendations to County Council on the 2022-23 Budget in February 2022.

11. **Special Educational Needs (SEND): Performance Framework**

11.1.1 The Committee received the regular report to the People and Communities Select Committee providing a range of performance data regarding services and provision for Special Educational Needs & Disability (SEND). Information was being reported to Committee over a 2-year period (which began in November 2020) following recommendations by the Local Government & Social Care Ombudsman (LGSCO) in 2020 following their published investigation report.

11.1.2 The Assistant Director, SEND Strategic Improvement and Early Effectiveness introduced the report to the Committee:

- the standard reporting showed an overall positive trend however the datasets showed a slight time lag of children being logged following the summer holiday.
- Education Health and Care Plans (EHCP) showed sustained performance; it was unlikely that the target of 60% would be met however reaching 53% from 8% when originally inspected was good progress.
- Page 125 of the report showed the new content requested by councillors
- A correction on was highlighted on page 130 of the report: cumulative overspend related to 2019-20 year.

11.2 The following points were discussed and noted:

- Officers were asked why complaints about EHCP had increased. The Assistant Director of SEND Strategic Improvement and Early Effectiveness confirmed that most complaints were around timescales of completion and the type of placement given. The EHCP team were involved in around 8000 cases per year, therefore the number of complaints received were low in comparison.
- The Executive Director of Children's Services reported that an increase in demand was being seen, with more children being referred for specialist provision, as reflected nationally. Engagement was carried out with families however sometimes they had a different opinion on what provision should be provided for their children than the Council. A national solution was needed to address the challenge faced in this area.
- The reasoning behind progressing to tribunal was queried given the low success rate and cost involved for the Council. The Assistant Director of SEND Strategic Improvement and Early Effectiveness **agreed** to find out the exact cost to the Council of tribunals per year and send this to Cllr Brenda Jones.
- The Council was investing capital in building new special schools so that children could benefit from reduced travel time and were trying to manage admissions into these provisions carefully so that those who needed the places most would get the most benefit from this capital investment.
- The Executive Director of Children's Services noted that tribunals could order for a child to be given a place in a school where there was not space; this could leave children waiting for a space.
- Discrepancy in data in table 2.24 of the report was queried; the Assistant Director of SEND Strategic Improvement and Early Effectiveness; the orange line was related to a national trial where 18 months ago, tribunals trialled cases where there was a dispute around health or children's social care. This couldn't be upheld as the 2014 Act of Parliament didn't allow this, but it did allow for an extra layer of mitigation.
- Officers confirmed that there had been extra investment in EHCP coordinators however there was a need for more educational psychologists to provide earlier interventions to support children in their families, schools and to provide support to schools to help children earlier. This would prevent a trajectory towards specialist provision being the only solution.
- The funding given to schools had reduced over the past decade meaning they

had less money available to support families around parenting and whole school interventions. A national review was ongoing which was due in spring 2022.

- Regarding changes to home to school transport outlined in the report, officers confirmed that child and young person need and parental preference would be taken into account. Engagement work had been carried out with schools to look at opportunities for group travel schemes to be introduced where appropriate.

11.3 The Committee:

1. **NOTED** the ongoing content of the SEND performance framework and agree ongoing reporting at all subsequent meetings through to Summer 2022, complying with the outcome of the LGSCO report.
2. **AGREED** that the range of performance measures will directly assist with decision making regarding any policy changes needed over time as part of the range of SEND improvement programmes.

12. Forward Work Programme

- 12.1 The Committee considered and **AGREED** the forward work programme with the addition of work on adult social care engagement as discussed in item 7.

The Meeting Closed at 16:57

**Cllr Fabian Eagle, Chair,
People and Communities Select Committee**



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

**People and Communities Select Committee
19 November 2021**

Item 6; Member Questions

Question from Cllr Maxine Webb:

P126 2.23 says “At the January Committee meeting, data on “the number of appeals lodged, the outcomes of these and comparison to previous years” for future reports. The Assistant Director, SEND Strategic Improvement and Early Effectiveness, agreed to include this in future reports.”

Thank you for starting to include this data, however, while the November report now gives the number of appeals lodged, the reasons and comparison to previous years, it does not include the outcomes. Could this missing data please be sent to members and included in future reports?

Response from the Chairman

The Assistant Director for SEND Strategic Improvement apologises for the omission of ‘outcomes’ data within the Tribunal information section of the November committee report. This will be rectified in future reports. However, to ensure there is no delay in this information being available for the Committee and also for Cllr Webb a separate briefing note is being sent to Members and Cllr Webb to provide this initial information. This will be in the public domain via subsequent reports.