

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

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

Present: 80

Apologies for Absence:

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

1 Minutes

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

2 Chairman's Announcements

- 2.1 There were no announcements.

3 Declarations of Interest

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

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

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

4 Questions to Leader of the Council

4.1 Question from Mr C Jordan

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.2 **Question from Dr M Strong**

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

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

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

4.3 **Question from Mr R Bearman**

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

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

Norfolk should have a say on any proposals.

4.4 **Question from Mr B Bremner**

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

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

4.5 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

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

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

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

5 **Notice of Motions**

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

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

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

national level.

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

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

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

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

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

5.2.1 Ms E Corlett proposed the following amendment:

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

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

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

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

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

6 Recommendations from Service Committees

6.1 Policy & Resources – 21 March 2016.

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

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

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

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

6.1.3 Council **RESOLVED** to agree

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

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

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

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

6.3 **Communities – 16 March 2016**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

7.1.1 **Question from Mrs J Leggett**

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

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

7.1.2 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

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

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

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

7.1.3 Question from Mr B Watkins

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

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

7.1.4 Question from Mrs A Thomas

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

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

7.1.5 Question from Mr B Borrett

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

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

7.1.6 Question from Mr R Smith

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

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

7.1.7 Council RESOLVED to note the report.

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

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

7.2.1 **Question from Ms C Rumsby**

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

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

7.2.2 **Question from Mr B Watkins**

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

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

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

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

7.2.3 **Question from Mr B Borrett**

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

The Chair gave her assurance.

7.2.4 **Question from Mr R Smith**

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

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

7.2.5 **Question from Ms A Kemp**

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

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

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

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

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

7.3.1 **Question from Mr R Smith**

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

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

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

7.3.2 Question from Mrs J Leggett

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

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

7.3.3 Council RESOLVED to note the report.

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

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

7.4.1 Council RESOLVED to note the report.

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

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

7.5.1 Question from Mr B Hannah

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

7.5.2 Question from Mr M Wilby

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

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

7.5.3 Question from Mr S Askew

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

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

7.5.4 Question from Dr A Boswell

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

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

7.5.5 Question from Mrs J Chamberlin

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

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

7.5.6 Question from Mr J Childs

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

7.5.7 Question from Mr B Spratt

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

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

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

7.5.8 **Question from Mr R Smith**

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

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

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

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

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

Other Committees

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There were none.

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

There were none.

10 **Any Other Business**

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

The meeting concluded at 1.45pm.

Chairman



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