

COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Wednesday, 23 February 2022 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 6.00 pm

Members Present:

Mr T Adams	Ms P Bevan Jones
Mr D Birch	Mr H Blathwayt
Mr A Brown	Mr C Cushing
Mr N Dixon	Mr P Fisher
Mrs A Fitch-Tillett	Mr T FitzPatrick
Mr V FitzPatrick	Mrs W Fredericks
Ms V Gay	Mrs P Grove-Jones
Mr G Hayman	Mr P Heinrich
Dr V Holliday	Mr N Housden
Mr R Kershaw	Mr N Lloyd
Mr G Mancini-Boyle	Mr N Pearce
Mr S Penfold	Mrs G Perry-Warnes
Mr J Punchard	Mr J Rest
Mr E Seward	Miss L Shires
Mrs E Spagnola	Mrs J Stenton
Mr M Taylor	Mr J Toye
Mr A Varley	

Also in attendance:

The Chief Executive, The Section 151 Officer / Director for Resources, The Assistant Director for Resources / Monitoring Officer, the Director for Communities, the Chief Technical Accountant, the Democratic Services Manager, the Democratic Services & Governance Officer (Scrutiny)

141 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllrs P Butikofer, S Butikofer, C Heinink, C Stockton, E Vardy and E Withington.

142 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS FROM MEMBERS

None received.

143 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None received.

144 CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Chairman said that as there had been a meeting of Full Council just two weeks ago, he did not have any announcements to make.

145 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader began by saying that it was two years since the first lockdown due to the pandemic. He said that he wanted to reflect on the achievements of the staff and their achievements during this very challenging time. Their flexibility to adapt was

demonstrated across the organisation, with many teams working harder than ever before . This was borne out by the positive feedback received from businesses and residents. Despite this extra demand on resources and capacity, staff continued to work hard towards the Corporate Plan priorities. He thanked everyone for their achievements.

He went onto say that he had been Leader for two weeks now and in that short time he had been very impressed by the enthusiasm of both members and staff for the Council and the wider district. He had met with representatives from several town councils and local businesses since becoming Leader and he intended to carry on with this approach of engagement and discussion.

He then spoke about the recent storm damage to the Council's property assets, particularly in coastal areas and thanked the Property Services team for responding so quickly.

In conclusion he said that one of his key tasks since becoming Leader was to represent the Council in countywide discussions on 'levelling up'. He was hopeful that councillors across Norfolk could find a starting consensus from which to move forwards. He said that an even bigger and more immediate challenge for residents and consequently the Council. was the rise in the cost of living. He added that he had held discussion with staff and demand on services would be monitored and any additional resources required for the voluntary sector would be assessed and provided when necessary.

146 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

None received.

147 APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES, SUB-COMMITTEES, WORKING PARTIES & PANELS

The Chairman invited the Group Leaders to inform Council of any changes to committee appointments.

Cllr T Adams, said that Cllr L Shires would be replacing Cllr P Grove-Jones on the Constitution Working Party.

He then said that Cllr V Gay wished to stand down as Chairman of the Constitution Working Party and he wished to nominate Cllr A Varley for the position of Chairman. This was seconded by Cllr V Gay, who said that it was a very important committee and she was sure that Cllr Varley would do a good job.

It was proposed by Cllr T Adams, seconded by Cllr V Gay and

RESOLVED

That Cllr A Varley be elected as Chairman of the Constitution Working Party.

Nine members voted against.

148 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET 31 JANUARY 2022

The Chairman informed Members that the recommendations would be taken in turn rather than en bloc.

a) Agenda Item 8: Net Zero Strategy & Action Plan

Cllr N Lloyd, Portfolio Holder for Environment introduced this item. He said the strategy underpinned the Council's commitment to addressing climate change. He said this was one of the most pressing problems facing humankind. It had a huge impact on everyone across the globe. He added that councils had important work to do in reducing their own carbon footprint but they also had a role to play in leading by example and taking residents on the journey with them. Cllr Lloyd went on to say that talking climate change was now a corporate activity which reflected the need for a 'whole council' approach. Cooperation was required across all service areas and departments. He spoke about the Environmental Charter which set out the Council's aspirations clearly. The Net Zero Strategy now set out the pathway to decarbonise NNDC's activities by 2030 whilst also outlining the challenges that existed for North Norfolk as a whole in tackling climate change. He said that it was an evidence based document. Overview & Scrutiny Committee had provided feedback during the development of the strategy and their recommendations had been adopted. A programme of engagement with staff and members had taken place and he thanked everyone for their involvement.

Cllr N Housden commented that it was a commendable document but it was only a strategy and he was concerned that it omitted to reference 'greenwashing'. He said that he was aware of Bahamian companies buying farms in the UK and planting spruce and fir which was obliterating indigenous wildlife. In addition, DEFRA was intending to allow parts of the country to flood to facilitate the import of food from abroad. Traditionally, agricultural land had always had a high value but it could not compete against the huge sums that such companies were willing to pay. He said that in the next 7 years, huge swathes of land lost to greenwashing and it was important that the Net Zero Strategy should reference it to create a barrier and demonstrate that it was prepared to tackle it.

Cllr N Lloyd replied that the strategy was a 'live' document and he would discuss the matter further with officers. He said that his interpretation of greenwashing was different. He saw it as talking about addressing environmental issues but not taking any action to do so. The document set out a clear strategy, was evidence based and used agreed targets to measure the Council's achievements.

Cllr Housden replied that his concern was that if nothing was done then companies could start to encroach into North Norfolk to 'greenwash' other activities that they were undertaking.

Cllr M Taylor referred to page 25 and the installation of Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points across the District. He asked why none had been installed in Stalham. Cllr Lloyd explained that the funding awarded for the scheme was based on the number of properties with no access to off-street parking or street based charge points. He said that a strategy was currently being worked on to expand the scheme and Stalham was on the list for inclusion.

Cllr G Hayman welcomed the strategy and he said that he hoped that elements of the action plan would come into effect quite quickly. He was particularly interested in how the Council intended to engage with residents and take them on the journey too. Cllr Lloyd replied that the strategy and action plan set out how the Council intended to achieve Net Zero by 2030 but there had always been a clear ambition to take residents along too. He referenced the environmental forums that had taken place and the high levels of attendance indicated the willingness to engage. He

concluded by saying that the smallest improvements made towards reducing individual carbon footprints added up to making a big difference.

It was proposed by Cllr N Lloyd, seconded by Cllr J Punchard and

RESOLVED

To adopt the Draft Net Zero Strategy and Action Plan and to delegate minor changes required to the final document to the Director for Place and Climate Change, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services, Climate Change and the Environment

b) Agenda Item 10 – Capital Strategy 2022-2023

Cllr E Seward, Portfolio Holder for Finance & Assets, introduced this item and said that he wished to propose the recommendation as set out.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr T Adams and

RESOLVED

To approve the Capital Strategy and Prudential Indicators for 2022-2023

10 members voted against the recommendation.

c) Investment Strategy 2022-2023

Cllr E Seward, Portfolio Holder for Finance & Assets, introduced this item and said that he wished to propose the recommendation as set out.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr T Adams and

RESOLVED

To approve the Investment Strategy 2022-2023

10 members abstained.

d) Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2022-2023

Cllr E Seward, Portfolio Holder for Finance & Assets, introduced this item and said that he wished to propose the recommendation as set out.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr J Rest and

RESOLVED

To approve the Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2022-2023

10 members abstained.

e) Fees & Charges 2022-2023

Cllr E Seward, Portfolio Holder for Finance & Assets, introduced this item and said that he wished to propose the recommendation as set out.

Cllr G Mancini-Boyle drew members' attention to the second recommendation to delegate authority to the S151 Officer to agree fees and charges not included within the appendix. He asked why there was no reference in Appendix A to the proposed increase to brown bin charges. He said that at the meeting of Overview & Scrutiny Committee on 9th February, the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Cllr Seward recommended a 20% increase and he asked why such a large increase was felt acceptable during a time when many households were struggling to pay basic bills.

Cllr Seward said that he had advised that the current charge for brown bins was £48.50 and the proposed increase was to £50.00. This was not considered to be high.

The Director for Communities explained that there were two elements. The first related to direct debit payments which was as set out by Cllr Seward. For those paying by other methods, the increase was slightly higher at £2.00, and this was to pay for the cost of processing payments.

Cllr G Mancini-Boyle said that the cost for customers paying by direct debit was £58.39 and then £68.40 for those residents not paying by direct debit. However, there a further 10% increase to cover the cost of replacing the bins at some point. He said that this should not be a separate increase but should be factored into the price of the bins as they would not all need to be replaced. He felt that this was misleading and should not be dealt with under delegation. It should be set out clearly in the report.

The Director for Resources said that there were some areas where certain fees were dealt with under delegation as it was not clear at the time of setting the budget what they would be. He added that there were some fees and charges which were set under delegation as the Council was operating within a competitive market and other providers would be able to undercut the charges if they were published in the public domain. He said that this was explained in detail on page 98, section 2.3.

Cllr Mancini-Boyle commented that the authority seemed to be run by officers rather than members. Cllr Seward replied that, if at any point, he, as Portfolio Holder had felt that the proposals were unacceptable then he would have said so. Cllr Lloyd agreed, saying that officers did consult with members and that the Council operated within a competitive market for trade waste and it made no sense to publish the proposed charges in the public domain.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr J Punchard and

RESOLVED

- a) To approve the fees and charges from 1 April 2022 as included in Appendix A.
- b) That Delegated Authority be given to the Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and relevant Heads of Service, to agree those fees and charges not included within Appendix A as required as outlined within the report

10 members abstained.

- f) Agenda Item 14 – Rate Relief Policy

Cllr E Seward, Portfolio Holder for Finance & Assets, introduced this item and said that he wished to propose the recommendation as set out.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr T Adams and

RESOLVED

That the Revenues Manager has delegated authority to make decisions up to the NNDC cost value of £2k as indicated in Appendix A.

That the Revenues Manager has delegated authority to make Covid-19 Additional Relief Fund (CARF) decisions as indicated in Appendix C.

That the Rate Relief Policy is revised as indicated in Appendix A, B and C.

10 members abstained.

g) Draft Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2023/2026

Cllr E Seward, Portfolio Holder for Finance & Assets, introduced this item and said that he wished to propose the recommendation as set out.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr R Kershaw and

RESOLVED

To approve the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2023/26

10 members abstained.

h) Agenda Item 16: Car Park Charges Review

Cllr Cushing said that he wished to propose the following amendment:

‘That the charges on standard tariff car parks remain unchanged’.

He said that the reason for this was that the coastal towns had seen the benefit of the increase in visitors in recent years, whereas inland towns had not. Cllr T FitzPatrick seconded the amendment and said that he agreed that although many visitors had gone to the coast they had not visited the District’s market towns and it was important to protect these.

Cllr T FitzPatrick requested a recorded vote.

When put to the vote the amendment was not supported. 15 members voted in favour and 19 members voted against.

Cllr G Hayman sought clarification on whether the tariffs for coastal car parks were all the same now. Cllr Seward explained that there were two tariffs – coastal and resort. Coastal was higher. He added that it was proposed that the Station Approach car park in Sheringham moved to a ‘resort’ tariff to keep it on the same footing as car parks in Cromer. Cllr Hayman replied that visitors to the coastal towns would not be aware of the different charges and said that an opportunity had been missed. He said that the charging should be at the coastal tariff in such towns and to maximise income generation. He added that car park charges should be reviewed more regularly too. Cllr Seward agreed with the last point but said that local residents also used car parks in the coastal towns and it was not fair for the burden of higher

charges to fall on them.

Cllr J Rest commented that season ticket prices were not mentioned. Cllr Seward said this was because they were staying the same.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr J Toye and

RESOLVED

1. That the following pricing structure should be introduced:

Standard tariff car parks - £1.20p for first two hours, 80 pence for each further hour and a day rate of £6.00. No change to 30 minute rate.

Resort tariff car parks - £1.50 for the first hour, £1.20p for each further hour, and a day rate of £8.50. No change to 30 minute charge.

Coastal tariff car parks - £1.80 per hour and a day rate of £8.50

Holt Country Park - £2.30 per day

Coaches – 24 hour stay £12, 4 hour stay - £6

2. That the following changes to car park designations should be made:

Sheringham, Chequers car park moves to 'Coastal' from 'Resort' and that Sheringham, Station Road moves to 'Resort' from 'Coastal'

3. The implementation of any new pricing changes from July 2022 and instigating the Car Park order (CPO) consultation process.

4. Budgetary provision of £25k to cover implementation costs resulting from any changes.

10 members voted against the recommendations.

149 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE - 09 FEBRUARY 2022

The Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Cllr N Dixon, said that there were four recommendations to Full Council and they had all been covered by the previous agenda item.

15 BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2022-2023

0

The Chairman outlined the process to Members, explaining that there would be a number of recorded votes. He then invited the Chief Financial Officer to explain the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the reserves, as required to do by statute.

He began by referring members to pages 179 - 184 of the agenda, which provided details of the process which had been carried out in preparing the Budget for presentation to Full Council. He explained that it also provided an analysis of the risks facing the Council in relation to the control of income and expenditure flows compared

to the budgets that were recommended for 2022/23. He referenced the recent Zero Based Budgeting (ZBB) exercise which had identified changed priorities in line with the Corporate Plan objectives.

Regarding the adequacy of the reserves, he directed Members to pages 184 – 185 of the agenda and Appendix B. He explained the reasons for holding reserves and said that when assessing the level of reserves, the Council had to take account of strategic, operational and financial risks. He said that in his opinion, the overall budgeted level of both the General Reserve and the Earmarked Reserves were considered adequate in the short term to medium term and that the Budget had been produced within a robust framework.

The Chairman then invited Cllr E Seward, Portfolio Holder for Finance and Assets to introduce the Budget for 2022 – 2023. He began by saying that he would like to thank officers for their time and support in preparing this budget. This year it included a wider range of officers who were involved in the zero based budgeting exercise which helped to ensure that the Council's expenditure was more in line with its corporate priorities.

He said that this year the Council had a balanced budget which not only maintained the services that North Norfolk District Council already provided but also allowed for growth in some of the Council's key public services. With no proposed cuts to services in North Norfolk, the Council was in a different position to many in England which, due to financial pressures, faced a further round of reducing the services they provided. It reflected the fact that the Council had strong, robustly managed finances. Cllr Seward said that this was a budget about investing in public and community services and investing in staff to bring this about. It was about striving to run services efficiently and providing value for money for council tax payers.

He then spoke about the achievements made by the Council during the current financial year, including the opening of the new Reef swimming pool and leisure centre in Sheringham which, at a cost of over £12 million, was one of the largest capital projects ever exclusively undertaken by the District Council. As a key part of the Council's Green Agenda, the Council continued to plant more trees (now over 50,000) and had been a major contributor to North Norfolk having more public electric vehicle charging points (69) than any other District Council area in the county. He said that there were long overdue improvements to beach chalets in Cromer and Sheringham and during 2021 a £4 million investment programme in new household waste collection vehicles had been completed. All this had been done without the Council having to rely on long-term borrowing to fund these programmes. Borrowing would have meant making interest payments and incurring costs. He said it illustrated how soundly the finances were being managed under the Liberal Democrat administration.

Cllr Seward then said that he would highlight some of the key improvements to our services and facilities for the coming financial year:

1. New public toilets would be opening in Fakenham and Wells to be followed by new and refurbished toilets in North Walsham and Sheringham (The Lees). This was taking place when in many areas public toilets had been closing with some Councils withdrawing altogether from this service.
2. An expected start in the Autumn of Phase 2 of the Cromer Coastal Management scheme (a £3.9 million project that with the completed phase 1 project would help safeguard 758 residential properties from coastal erosion) and the Mundesley Coastal Management Scheme (a £2.9 million project that would help safeguard 510 residential properties from coastal erosion). Thanks should also go to DEFRA and the Town and Parish Councils for their financial support.

3. Continued investment on Cromer Pier 'our Jewel in the Crown'. The new investment would improve facilities at the theatre
4. Continued investment in building up the Council's stock of temporary housing to provide quality homes to households in crisis. By the end of March, the Council would have 16 temporary housing units (most already in use) with 2 further housing units to be purchased in the coming financial year.
5. A major building programme under the Heritage Action Zone Project to improve the town centre of North Walsham. It had been extended to include a new, much needed bus interchange on part of the Council's New Rd car park and thanks should go to Norfolk County Council and North Walsham Town Council to the contributions they were making to this project.
6. The installation of LED lighting at the Cromer Office to reduce energy consumption and electricity costs.
7. Contributing £900k to infrastructure works for the Fakenham Urban Extension which in return attracted a higher rate of affordable housing in the related housing development.

These projects were all being done in a climate of supply and delivery challenges along with rising costs. For the toilets in Wells and Fakenham costs had risen 40 per cent since the original tender was approved. To try and overcome such challenges, the Council was buying up materials for projects where it could and storing them before costs rose even more. On the HAZ project in North Walsham this approach had already saved £100k and more was expected.

Cllr Seward then outlined how the budget was investing in staff to provide the services that residents needed and expected.

- Climate Change and its impact on North Norfolk. The work that the Council was doing on this was long-term and therefore, two of the key posts in the Climate Change Team were to become permanent.
- Taking enforcement action where there was a breach of planning regulations as well as the Council's ability to use the Sec 106 contributions received from developers of major projects to improve local amenities. The Planning Enforcement Team was to be strengthened and thus add to the progress already being made to reduce the number of outstanding cases. A fixed term planning post was also being created to monitor and ensure the effective use of sec 106 contributions.
- With households facing rising energy and fuel bills, the appointment of an Energy Efficiency Officer to help and support households struggling with energy bills.
- Strengthening the housing teams to provide more effective support and advice to individuals and households in housing crisis.
- Providing apprenticeships for future local governments officers. 17 people were currently completing their apprenticeships and more apprenticeships were to be offered in the new financial year.

Cllr Seward then explained that as part of the Corporate Plan, it was the Council's intention in becoming more financially sustainable by creating new income streams. Following the Government's decision to stop borrowing from the Public Works Loan Board for commercial investment, the Council had to look for alternative sources of income. He then gave some examples of a different approach:

1. Strengthening the Council's ability to successfully apply for grants from new funding initiatives to support services. This ranged from the Government, public and

community bodies and the private sector. It meant the Council could carry out projects which it would not be able to do on its own. It had already taken place with the Reef in Sheringham (external funding £1m) and the current Heritage Action Zone project in North Walsham (external funding £2.2m). It was also how the Council was able to strengthen the People's Services Teams to ensure they were best placed to take advantage of new housing and community support funding streams. Likewise, the same approach was being taken with the Economic Growth Team.

2. Organising the Council's financial resources in a way which could better accumulate funds to offer a level of match funding with other bodies (public and private) for significant capital projects. For example, the capitalisation of coastal management funds meant that the Council could build up a fund to attract through match funding, investment from other public and private bodies for schemes to protect the coastline.
3. Ensuring that the fees and charges the Council made for a range of services covered the costs of providing them.

Cllr Seward then said that the Council must also continue to strive to be more efficient in what it did. It was about identifying where money can be saved without compromising on the quality of the services the Council provided. He then gave some examples:

- a) Not wasting money on undeliverable projects that he believed was increasingly the practice of the previous administration. He referred to the Egmore Business Park project, a tennis hub in Cromer that included buying construction materials when the land on which part of the hub was to be built had not been secured and an all-weather sports pitch at North Walsham High School. All of which had run into problems.
- b) The Council had saved in the current financial year approximately £140k in bed & breakfast costs for homeless families through providing temporary housing units. This saving would rise to potentially £200k in the coming financial year.
- c) In Customers Services, savings of £72k had been achieved by no longer outsourcing revenue and benefits inquiries. Instead, the work would be done under the Council's 'One Front Door' policy.

Cllr Seward then explained that this year there had again been a one-year financial settlement from the Government as Local Government continued to wait for Government reviews into the future financing of Council services. This made financial planning for the future difficult given that 58 percent of the income the Council is to receive this year from taxpayers for its services was controlled by the Government. It was also the case that the forecast deficits for the next three financial years (£1.7m to £2.7m) were almost wholly due to the potential loss of income controlled by the Government. He went on to say that despite concerns, previous years demonstrated that forecast deficits had not, in practice, materialised. It was also the case that another financial surplus was likely to arise in the current financial year to March. Nevertheless, he said that a prudent course must be steered that took account of an uncertain financial future and a higher level of inflation than experienced for many years. That was why there were some increases in the Council's charges for certain services as well as a small increase in the amount of Council Tax that the Council charged its residents.

He then explained that a Council Tax increase of £4.95p for the financial year 22/23 for Band D domestic Council Tax properties was proposed. It was a total annual charge by the District Council for Band D rated properties of £158.67p or around £3 per week.

North Norfolk District Council had one of the lowest Council Tax rates amongst District Councils in England.

Cllr Seward explained that the District Council sent out the council tax bills. However, most of the money it collected from residents (over 90p in every pound), went elsewhere.

In conclusion, Cllr Seward said that this was a budget that invested in services for the residents of Norfolk that invested in staff to deliver those services and did so with one of the lowest District Council Tax rates in England. It met the necessary legal requirements and had been signed off by the Council's Section 151 Officer. He therefore commended the recommendations set out in the Budget and Council Tax Report 2022/23.

Cllr T Adams seconded the recommendations. He reserved his right to speak.

The Chairman invited Cllr Cushing, leader of the main opposition group, to respond. He began by thanking the Finance Team for their hard work in preparing the Budget and for briefing his group.

Cllr Cushing said that it was a very disappointing budget. It didn't address the future needs of the Council. He said that although the books would be balanced this year, the picture was not as rosy as it appeared and it was actually quite perilous when looked at closely. He drew members' attention to Appendix A and the reference to the Delivery Plan. He said that £2m had been spent on this but looking ahead there were no forecast figures. It should be acknowledged that any administration would need a corporate plan and it did not make sense that funding was not set aside for its implementation. He then spoke about the Net Zero Strategy, pointing out that there were no figures allocated to it and it was clear that the costs of implementing it would be significant. Both of these significant projects could entail substantial costs, resulting in a much higher future deficit than shown.

Cllr Cushing went on to say that for the last two Budget presentations, he had warned about impending deficits. Cllr Seward had always brushed these off, saying that he was not concerned. He said that looking at the forecast deficit now, it was likely that the Council could be in a precarious position in as little as 14 months' time. Yet nothing was being put in place to prepare for this, apart from an increase in car parking charges. He acknowledged that the delay to the Fair Funding Review caused uncertainty but said that the 'wait and see' policy of the current Administration should be a matter of serious concern. It must be recognised that the Government faced financial challenges on a scale never seen before due to the pandemic and spiralling energy costs. He said that he believed there were two ways for the Council to mitigate against future deficits – by generating income and through cost savings and efficiencies. Regarding income generation, he said that he did not advocate taking a speculative approach but there were plenty of low risk ideas that could be explored. He referred to a workshop for members on this which was held in late 2019. Many ideas had been put forward but they had not been progressed.

Regarding savings, Cllr Cushing said this should be easier. All organisations had waste and tackling it should be a standard approach to becoming more efficient. He referred back to the previous Conservative administration and said that in 2016/17 there had been money saving proposals which were now estimated to deliver £750k of savings to the Council per annum. In contrast, the current administration did not seem to have anything. He drew members' attention to the Zero Based Budgeting process which he had high hopes for and which he had hoped would produce savings. In reality, instead

of identifying ways to save money it had generated a wish list of projects with a projected spend of £2.25m. It was not clear where savings were being made.

Cllr Cushing then spoke about the capability review which he said was ill conceived and wasteful. This in turn had led to a management restructure which had created several additional roles and cost over £0.5m. In the last year, the Administration created more management and staffing roles resulting in over £1m on new roles.

He then spoke about the proposed council tax increase. He said that it was understandable that the County Council would seek to raise their share as the pressure on their budget was immense. Yet, County Council members had rejected the officers' recommendation for a raise and opted for a lower charge. He said that this was in contrast to NNDC, which had chosen to spend over £1m on new management and staffing roles. These funds alone could have been used to mitigate a council tax rise this year and next year too.

He said as Conservatives, his group wanted to help residents as much as possible and a council tax rise would not do this.

Cllr Cushing said that at the last meeting of Full Council, the previous Leader had compared the Council to an ocean going liner. He said that this was a fitting description as for the last three years it had been going round in circles and was now heading towards the rocks. The fact that no current member of Cabinet had put themselves forward for the role of Leader. This indicated that they knew the perilous position that the Council was in. He concluded by saying that the Budget was bereft of ideas to help address the funding challenges that the Council faced. He said that North Norfolk residents deserved better.

The Chairman invited Cllr Seward to respond. He began by saying that he did not know where the figure of £550k spend on additional staffing came from. The management restructure was intended to be cost neutral and as far as he was aware that was the case. Cllr Seward then said that when he became Portfolio Holder for Finance in 2018, he had inherited deficits from the previous Conservative administration.

The Chairman then invited the Leader of the Independent Group to speak. He said that at the current time, it was fair to say that there were many finance officers, Leaders and Cabinet members at a lot of local authorities across the country who would want to present a balanced budget to their members. On that point, NNDC should be congratulated. He said that the last couple of years had been extremely challenging financially. There was no 'magic wand' to deal with these issues and for this reason the Independent Group applauded some of the difficult decisions that the administration had had to take. He acknowledged that they would have liked to have seen more growth opportunities and long-term future plans presented but it was important that the Council learnt from previous mistakes. He welcomed the inclusion of some of the Independent Group's proposals in the Budget and said he was confident that his members would support it.

The Chairman invited Cllr Cushing to speak again. He clarified that the £550k questioned by Cllr Seward had come from papers presented to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee in October 2021. He concluded by reiterating that the Administration was not preparing for the future and he did not believe that enough effort was put into this and into efficiencies and savings. Any money saved could be invested in the delivery of savings.

The Chairman then opened the main debate.

Cllr J Rest referred to page 211 of the report which set out the Council Tax summary. He sought confirmation that the NNDC rose was 3.2% and the parish and town council precepts totalled a rise of 5.7%. The Chief Technical Accountant confirmed this. Cllr Rest then asked whether the figures proposed by the town and parish councils were scrutinised. The Director of Resources said that they were agreed at public meetings but that there were no restrictions imposed on third tier authorities regarding the setting of council tax precepts. He added that they were advised to stay within reasonable amounts as central government had indicated that they may impose limits in the future. Regarding reserve levels for third tier authorities, he said that they were also on the public record.

Cllr M Taylor referred to page 207 of the report and £48k for the acquisition of 7 printers, which equated to over £6000 per printer. He said that this was a huge amount of money, especially when compared to other more worthwhile projects such as the 'poverty dashboard'. He asked how this could be justified during such challenging times. The Portfolio Holder for Organisational Resources, Cllr L Shires, replied that this figure related to the replacement for all of the printers across the Council. Cllr Taylor replied that it referred to seven printers in the Print Room not across the organisation. Cllr Shires confirmed that this was the case but only if they needed to be replaced. She suggested that Cllr Taylor accompany her to look at the printers in the Print Room and she would welcome any suggestions that he may have.

Cllr V FitzPatrick reminded members that there had been a consultation with residents and businesses on the Council's budget proposals and that it was promoted on the website. He said that he had spoken with several residents in his ward and they had been sceptical that a full consultation would be undertaken. He asked for examples on how the budget was changed following the consultation process. Cllr Seward replied that one of the key responses was that people wanted the provision of services to be maintained and they also wanted value for money. Cllr FitzPatrick said that he was underwhelmed by the reply. He said no specific comments had been provided as he had requested. Value for money was not something that could be measured and he did not believe that his ward members would feel it was a sufficient response.

Cllr G Hayman asked about access to funds from the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) and whether all lending had been curtailed or whether funding was allowed for developing land or assets owned by the Council. He referred to an 'oven-ready' plan to develop the site above the Melbourne Slope toilets in Cromer which had been explored by the previous administration but not progressed. He said that this would be a good opportunity to bring in income in a prime tourist location. He then said that the Council had no deficit because, in his view, it had achieved very little. Cllr Hayman concluded by referring to the precepts set by town and parish councils. He said that Cromer Town Council had one of the highest precepts anywhere and it provided nothing for residents. The Director for Resources replied that regarding the query for PWLB funding, access was available when a Council wanted to invest in regeneration or affordable housing. However, money could not be borrowed for commercial purposes or to generate income.

Cllr S Penfold then referred to Cllr Cushing's earlier speech. He then outlined the background to the previous administration which in his view was one of mismanagement, neglect and chaos. He talked about several failed projects and compared them to the successes of the current administration, which was one of prudence, growth and service delivery. He then outlined all of the achievements that

had occurred despite a very challenging financial situation and said that the Conservative Group may want to think about this and learn from it.

Cllr T FitzPatrick commented that just a year before the next District Council elections, the Liberal Democrats were still focussing on the previous administration. He acknowledged that there had been many challenges but reminded members that the Egmore project had been supported by the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and Council officers and as a result of not investing in the project, 120 jobs had been lost from the site in the last year.

Cllr Cushing said that in reply to Cllr Penfold's comments, he wanted to remind members that nationally, the Conservatives had won the general election and locally they had taken control of the County Council and won the two recent District Council by-elections. He said that his group had increased from 6 in 2019 to 10 members now and he was confident that that this success would continue.

The Chairman then invited the Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny Committee to summarise their debate on the Budget for 2022/23. He said that the committee was satisfied that the Budget was viable and balanced. The Committee had monitored the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) over several meetings and the discussion had focussed on the projected £2m gap in future years and the significant risks on how to close it. He said that the Committee accepted that the Government's approach to providing a one year financial settlement did not help with accurate forecasting but it should be acknowledged that the Council's current financial health had benefitted from the continuation of government grant funding schemes. Cllr Dixon concluded by saying that the Overview & Scrutiny Committee had consistently called for revenue generation and efficiency based savings but to date nothing of significance had emerged. He said that the Committee had noted with concern the funding implications of the management restructure and regrading, it had also challenged how suggested increases in staff numbers would be funded and made it clear that they should not be progressed unless they were revenue generating. For these reasons, the Committee was content with the budget overall, it was concerned that there was no gap-filling, back-up plan and that some key strategic ambitions such as the Net Zero Strategy had not been fully costed and factored into forecasts. Cllr Dixon concluded by saying that storm clouds were gathering and the Administration should be cautious.

The Chairman then invited the Leader, Cllr T Adams, as seconder for the proposals, to speak. He began by saying that he was surprised to see that the main Opposition Group had not put forward any amendments and said that the Administration always welcomed proposals. He said that the suggestion that the Council was currently in a perilous financial position was just not true. It was far removed from the situation that the County Council was in. He said that residents could be confident in this Budget. It was robust and the Council was delivering on its ambitions – investing in tourism and local businesses, whilst keeping council tax low.

Cllr Seward then spoke last as the proposer of the Budget. He said that in response to Cllr Dixon's prediction of gathering storm clouds, he had no intention of being caught in the rain. He said that he was proud of the Administration's record. It had always produced a balanced budget, services had not been cut and council tax had been kept low. He maintained a steady hand on the 'tiller' and he intended to keep on doing this.

The Chairman announced that the Monitoring Officer would take a recorded vote on recommendations 1 -8:

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr T Adams and

RESOLVED by 24 votes, with 10 against

That having considered the Chief Financial Officer's report on the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, the following be approved:

1. The 2022/23 revenue budget as outlined at Appendix A within this report;
2. A balance of £500,000 from the Business Rates Reserve be reallocated to the Delivery Plan Reserve to support the delivery of the Council's Corporate Objectives
3. The statement of and movement on the reserves as detailed at Appendix D within this report;
4. The updated Capital Programme and financing for 2022/23 to 2024/25 (as detailed at Appendix C1 of this report
5. The new capital bids recommended for approval (as detailed within appendix C2 within this report
6. That Members note the current financial projections for the period 2023/24 to 2025/26;
7. The Policy Framework for the Earmarked Reserves and the Optimum Level of the General Reserve 2022/23 to 2025/26 (Appendix B within this report);
8. That the setting of the Local Council Tax Support Scheme (LCTS) for 2022/23 be delegated to officers, in consultation with the Portfolio holder for Finance

The Chairman reminded members that there was a slight adjustment to the calculation for the council tax. This had been circulated prior to the meeting. He invited the Section 151 Officer to outline the different elements of the Council tax recommendations. He explained that section 4.5 of the revised report set out the statutory calculations for the council tax bases. Section 4.6 gave details of the parish precepts, and section 4.7 provided details of the County Council and Norfolk Police and Crime Commissioner's precepts.

Cllr C Cushing requested a separate recorded vote for recommendations 9 and 10.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr T Adams and

RESOLVED unanimously

9. That Members undertake the Council Tax and statutory calculations set out at section 4, and set the Council Tax for 2022/23;

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr T Adams and

RESOLVED

10. The demand on the Collection Fund for 2022/23 is as follows:
 - 10.1. £6,513,398 for District purposes
 - 10.2. £2,724,973 for Parish/Town Precepts;

This reflects the recommended Council Tax increase of £4.95 for the District element for an average Band D property

23 members voted in favour, 10 against, 1 abstention.

The number of dwellings in each Council Tax band taking into account the multipliers, discounts, exemptions, rate of collection and Council Tax Support:-

- a) for the whole Council area as 41,031 (Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992) being calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of The Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, as its Council Tax base for the year;
- b)

PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	COUNCIL TAX BASE	PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	COUNCIL TAX BASE
Alby With Thwaite	98.20	Little Barningham	49.55
Aldborough and Thurgarton	238.24	Little Snoring	246.63
Antingham	118.99	Ludham	510.47
Ashmanhaugh	68.06	Matlaske	62.55
Aylmerton	214.35	Melton Constable	210.01
Baconsthorpe	83.23	Morston	58.12
Bacton	506.52	Mundesley	1,162.76
Barsham	98.99	Neatishead	236.61
Barton Turf	236.45	North Walsham	4,121.97
Beckham East/West	114.56	Northrepps	406.76
Beeston Regis	394.39	Overstrand	464.85
Binham	196.31	Paston	92.39
Blakeney	537.25	Plumstead	49.15
Bodham	167.47	Potter Heigham	410.55
Briningham	64.65	Pudding Norton	77.42
Brinton	121.35	Raynham	174.23
Briston	875.28	Roughton	337.07
Brumstead	24.53	Runton (East & West)	727.50
Catfield	328.89	Ryburgh	233.51
Cley	329.09	Salthouse	116.72
Colby	188.46	Scottow	288.44
Corpusty and Saxthorpe	282.30	Sculthorpe	277.87
Cromer	3,027.24	Sea Palling	206.78
Dilham	145.79	Sheringham	3,164.93
Dunton	53.29	Sidestrand	47.67
East Ruston	189.81	Skeyton	89.21
Edgefield	208.42	Sloley	98.50
Erpingham	257.78	Smallburgh	189.42
Fakenham	2,662.39	Southrepps	341.96
Felbrigg	79.19	Stalham	1,170.92
Felmingham	193.55	Stibbard	137.70

Field Dalling	143.91	Stiffkey	131.40
Fulmodeston	181.40	Stody	89.73
Gimingham	147.52	Suffield	58.31
Great Snoring	87.86	Sustead	90.09
Gresham	168.73	Sutton	388.58
Gunthorpe	151.87	Swafield	114.65
Hanworth	95.94	Swanton Abbott	146.37
Happisburgh	309.59	Swanton Novers	84.22
Helhoughton	150.61	Tattersett	281.41
Hempstead	77.89	Thornage	96.04
Hempton	183.11	Thorpe Market	121.69
Hickling	417.02	Thurning	33.10
High Kelling	305.94	Thursford	106.08
Hindolveston	209.02	Trimingham	132.91
Hindringham	236.96	Trunch	364.58
Holkham	81.85	Tunstead	262.63
Holt	1,850.78	Upper Sheringham	112.68
Honing	122.14	Walcott	215.97
Horning	598.50	Walsingham	364.65
Horsey	34.28	Warham	90.19
Hoveton	846.02	Wells-Next-The-Sea	1,132.90
Ingham	156.61	Westwick	28.96
Ingworth	40.29	Weybourne	335.39
Itteringham	62.06	Wickmere	56.34
Kelling	95.05	Wighton	107.31
Kettlestone	92.95	Witton	135.42
Knapton	158.39	Wiveton	83.46
Langham	214.34	Wood Norton	105.40
Lessingham	224.81	Worstead	320.06
Letheringsett With Glandford	127.80		

being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 6 of The Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, as the amounts of its Council Tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which special items (parish precepts) may relate.

- 4.6 That the following amounts be now **CALCULATED** by the Council for the year 2022/23 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and the relevant regulations and directions as follows:-
- a) £58,722,584 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the expenditure items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act.
 - b) £40,423,142 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the income items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.

- c) £9,064,180 being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act, as its Council Tax requirement for the year.
- d) £225.08 being the amount at (c) above divided by the amount at 4.5(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts).
- e) £2,724,873 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.
- f) £158.67 being the amount at (d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (e) above by the amount at 4.5 (a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item (Parish precept) relates.

g)

PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	COUNCIL TAX BASE	PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	COUNCIL TAX BASE
Alby with Thwaite	189.21	Letheringsett with Glandford	174.31
Aldborough and Thurgarton	200.64	Little Barningham	170.93
Antingham	188.92	Little Snoring	209.35
Ashmanhaugh	220.40	Ludham	179.98
Aylmerton	193.83	Matlaske	169.06
Baconsthorpe	227.15	Melton Constable	227.76
Bacton	192.62	Mundesley	214.57
Barsham	187.46	Neatishead	195.29
Barton Turf	189.75	North Walsham	262.35
Beckham East/West	191.84	Northrepps	202.98
Beeston Regis	190.36	Overstrand	221.05
Binham	196.87	Paston	230.79
Blakeney	238.70	Plumstead	219.70
Bodham	209.42	Potter Heigham	195.20
Briningham	181.87	Pudding Norton	223.25
Brinton	191.63	Raynham	213.40
Briston	218.09	Roughton	189.07
Catfield	195.15	Runton (East & West)	179.28
Cley	202.55	Ryburgh	217.55
Colby	243.74	Salthouse	204.93

Corpusty and Saxthorpe	221.44	Scottow	203.74
Cromer	255.61	Sculthorpe	192.56
Dilham	192.96	Sea Palling	225.92
East Ruston	191.59	Sheringham	265.67
Edgefield	190.45	Sidestrand	190.13
Erpingham	204.29	Skeyton	171.49
Fakenham	243.51	Sloley	199.50
Felbrigg	200.34	Smallburgh	188.86
Felmingham	168.22	Southrepps	208.38
Field Dalling	201.52	Stalham	308.12
Fulmodeston	202.18	Stibbard	201.97
Gimmingham	212.89	Stiffkey	211.97
Great Snoring	226.96	Stody	211.60
Gresham	204.30	Suffield	184.39
Gunthorpe	178.42	Sustead	188.97
Hanworth	184.72	Sutton	199.84
Happisburgh	173.10	Swafield	206.64
Helhoughton	194.98	Swanton Abbott	203.07
Hempstead	202.06	Swanton Novers	262.45
Hempton	246.04	Tattersett	170.01
Hickling	180.87	Thornage	189.90
High Kelling	181.12	Thorpe Market	207.97
Hindolveston	219.66	Thursford	200.14
Hindringham	192.85	Trimingham	237.53
Holkham	201.43	Trunch	219.45
Holt	238.29	Tunstead	188.37
Honing	176.68	Upper Sheringham	203.76
Horning	191.82	Walcott	198.18
Horsey	182.88	Walsingham	227.22
Hoveton	229.25	Warham	225.19
Ingham	175.27	Wells-next-the- Sea	229.28
Ingworth	228.91	Weybourne	214.48
Itteringham	200.56	Wickmere	220.79
Kelling	201.04	Wighton	198.27
Kettlestone	200.62	Witton	185.55
Knapton	199.39	Wiveton	206.59
Langham	207.26	Wood Norton	187.47
Lessingham	176.77	Worstead	185.83

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 4.6(f) above to the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 4.5(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the

basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

h)

PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	VALUATION BANDS							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Alby with Thwaite	126.1	147.1	168.1	189.2	231.2	273.3	315.3	378.4
Aldborough and Thurgarton	133.7	156.0	178.3	200.6	245.2	289.8	334.4	401.2
Antingham	125.9	146.9	167.9	188.9	230.9	272.8	314.8	377.8
Ashmanhaugh	146.9	171.4	195.9	220.4	269.3	318.3	367.3	440.8
Aylmerton	129.2	150.7	172.2	193.8	236.9	279.9	323.0	387.6
Baconsthorpe	151.4	176.6	201.9	227.1	277.6	328.1	378.5	454.3
Bacton	128.4	149.8	171.2	192.6	235.4	278.2	321.0	385.2
Barsham	124.9	145.8	166.6	187.4	229.1	270.7	312.4	374.9
Barton Turf	126.5	147.5	168.6	189.7	231.9	274.0	316.2	379.5
Beckham East/West	127.8	149.2	170.5	191.8	234.4	277.1	319.7	383.6
Beeston Regis	126.9	148.0	169.2	190.3	232.6	274.9	317.2	380.7
Binham	131.2	153.1	174.9	196.8	240.6	284.3	328.1	393.7
Blakeney	159.1	185.6	212.1	238.7	291.7	344.7	397.8	477.4
Bodham	139.6	162.8	186.1	209.4	255.9	302.5	349.0	418.8
Briningham	121.2	141.4	161.6	181.8	222.2	262.7	303.1	363.7
Brinton	127.7	149.0	170.3	191.6	234.2	276.8	319.3	383.2
Briston	145.3	169.6	193.8	218.0	266.5	315.0	363.4	436.1
Catfield	130.1	151.7	173.4	195.1	238.5	281.8	325.2	390.3
Cley	135.0	157.5	180.0	202.5	247.5	292.5	337.5	405.1
Colby	162.4	189.5	216.6	243.7	297.9	352.0	406.2	487.4
Corpusty and Saxthorpe	147.6	172.2	196.8	221.4	270.6	319.8	369.0	442.8
Cromer	170.4	198.8	227.2	255.6	312.4	369.2	426.0	511.2
Dilham	128.6	150.0	171.5	192.9	235.8	278.7	321.6	385.9
East Ruston	127.7	149.0	170.3	191.5	234.1	276.7	319.3	383.1
Edgefield	126.9	148.1	169.2	190.4	232.7	275.1	317.4	380.9

Erpingham	136.1	158.8	181.5	204.2	249.6	295.0	340.4	408.5
Fakenham	162.3	189.4	216.4	243.5	297.6	351.7	405.8	487.0
Felbrigg	133.5	155.8	178.0	200.3	244.8	289.3	333.9	400.6
Felmingham	112.1	130.8	149.5	168.2	205.6	242.9	280.3	336.4
Field Dalling	134.3	156.7	179.1	201.5	246.3	291.0	335.8	403.0
Fulmodeston	134.7	157.2	179.7	202.1	247.1	292.0	336.9	404.3
Gimingham	141.9	165.5	189.2	212.8	260.2	307.5	354.8	425.7
Great Snoring	151.3	176.5	201.7	226.9	277.3	327.8	378.2	453.9
Gresham	136.2	158.9	181.6	204.3	249.7	295.1	340.5	408.6
Gunthorpe	118.9	138.7	158.5	178.4	218.0	257.7	297.3	356.8
Hanworth	123.1	143.6	164.2	184.7	225.7	266.8	307.8	369.4
Happisburgh	115.4	134.6	153.8	173.1	211.5	250.0	288.5	346.2
Helhoughton	129.9	151.6	173.3	194.9	238.3	281.6	324.9	389.9
Hempstead	134.7	157.1	179.6	202.0	246.9	291.8	336.7	404.1
Hempton	164.0	191.3	218.7	246.0	300.7	355.4	410.0	492.0
Hickling	120.5	140.6	160.7	180.8	221.0	261.2	301.4	361.7
High Kelling	120.7	140.8	161.0	181.1	221.3	261.6	301.8	362.2
Hindolveston	146.4	170.8	195.2	219.6	268.4	317.2	366.1	439.3
Hindringham	128.5	149.9	171.4	192.8	235.7	278.5	321.4	385.7
Holkham	134.2	156.6	179.0	201.4	246.1	290.9	335.7	402.8
Holt	158.8	185.3	211.8	238.2	291.2	344.2	397.1	476.5
Honing	117.7	137.4	157.0	176.6	215.9	255.2	294.4	353.3
Horning	127.8	149.1	170.5	191.8	234.4	277.0	319.7	383.6
Horsey	121.9	142.2	162.5	182.8	223.5	264.1	304.8	365.7
Hoveton	152.8	178.3	203.7	229.2	280.1	331.1	382.0	458.5
Ingham	116.8	136.3	155.7	175.2	214.2	253.1	292.1	350.5
Ingworth	152.6	178.0	203.4	228.9	279.7	330.6	381.5	457.8
Itteringham	133.7	155.9	178.2	200.5	245.1	289.7	334.2	401.1
Kelling	134.0	156.3	178.7	201.0	245.7	290.4	335.0	402.0

Kettlestone	133.7	156.0	178.3	200.6	245.2	289.7	334.3	401.2
Knapton	132.9	155.0	177.2	199.3	243.7	288.0	332.3	398.7
Langham	138.1	161.2	184.2	207.2	253.3	299.3	345.4	414.5
Lessingham	117.8	137.4	157.1	176.7	216.0	255.3	294.6	353.5
Letheringsett with Glandford	116.2	135.5	154.9	174.3	213.0	251.7	290.5	348.6
Little Barningham	113.9	132.9	151.9	170.9	208.9	246.9	284.8	341.8
Little Snoring	139.5	162.8	186.0	209.3	255.8	302.3	348.9	418.7
Ludham	119.9	139.9	159.9	179.9	219.9	259.9	299.9	359.9
Matlaske	112.7	131.4	150.2	169.0	206.6	244.2	281.7	338.1
Melton Constable	151.8	177.1	202.4	227.7	278.3	328.9	379.6	455.5
Mundesley	143.0	166.8	190.7	214.5	262.2	309.9	357.6	429.1
Neatishead	130.1	151.8	173.5	195.2	238.6	282.0	325.4	390.5
North Walsham	174.9	204.0	233.2	262.3	320.6	378.9	437.2	524.7
Northrepps	135.3	157.8	180.4	202.9	248.0	293.2	338.3	405.9
Overstrand	147.3	171.9	196.4	221.0	270.1	319.3	368.4	442.1
Paston	153.8	179.5	205.1	230.7	282.0	333.3	384.6	461.5
Plumstead	146.4	170.8	195.2	219.7	268.5	317.3	366.1	439.4
Potter Heigham	130.1	151.8	173.5	195.2	238.5	281.9	325.3	390.4
Pudding Norton	148.8	173.6	198.4	223.2	272.8	322.4	372.0	446.5
Raynham	142.2	165.9	189.6	213.4	260.8	308.2	355.6	426.8
Roughton	126.0	147.0	168.0	189.0	231.0	273.1	315.1	378.1
Runton	119.5	139.4	159.3	179.2	219.1	258.9	298.8	358.5
Ryburgh	145.0	169.2	193.3	217.5	265.8	314.2	362.5	435.1
Salhouse	136.6	159.3	182.1	204.9	250.4	296.0	341.5	409.8
Scottow	135.8	158.4	181.1	203.7	249.0	294.2	339.5	407.4
Sculthorpe	128.3	149.7	171.1	192.5	235.3	278.1	320.9	385.1
Sea Palling	150.6	175.7	200.8	225.9	276.1	326.3	376.5	451.8
Sheringham	177.1	206.6	236.1	265.6	324.7	383.7	442.7	531.3
Sidestrand	126.7	147.8	169.0	190.1	232.3	274.6	316.8	380.2

Skeyton	114.3	133.3	152.4	171.4	209.6	247.7	285.8	342.9
Sloley	133.0	155.1	177.3	199.5	243.8	288.1	332.5	399.0
Smallburgh	125.9	146.8	167.8	188.8	230.8	272.8	314.7	377.7
Southrepps	138.9	162.0	185.2	208.3	254.6	300.9	347.3	416.7
Stalham	205.4	239.6	273.8	308.1	376.5	445.0	513.5	616.2
Stibbard	134.6	157.0	179.5	201.9	246.8	291.7	336.6	403.9
Stiffkey	141.3	164.8	188.4	211.9	259.0	306.1	353.2	423.9
Stody	141.0	164.5	188.0	211.6	258.6	305.6	352.6	423.2
Suffield	122.9	143.4	163.9	184.3	225.3	266.3	307.3	368.7
Sustead	125.9	146.9	167.9	188.9	230.9	272.9	314.9	377.9
Sutton	133.2	155.4	177.6	199.8	244.2	288.6	333.0	399.6
Swafield	137.7	160.7	183.6	206.6	252.5	298.4	344.4	413.2
Swanton Abbott	135.3	157.9	180.5	203.0	248.2	293.3	338.4	406.1
Swanton Novers	174.9	204.1	233.2	262.4	320.7	379.1	437.4	524.9
Tattersett	113.3	132.2	151.1	170.0	207.8	245.5	283.3	340.0
Thornage	126.6	147.7	168.8	189.9	232.1	274.3	316.5	379.8
Thorpe Market	138.6	161.7	184.8	207.9	254.1	300.4	346.6	415.9
Thursford	133.4	155.6	177.9	200.1	244.6	289.1	333.5	400.2
Trimingham	158.3	184.7	211.1	237.5	290.3	343.1	395.8	475.0
Trunch	146.3	170.6	195.0	219.4	268.2	316.9	365.7	438.9
Tunstead	125.5	146.5	167.4	188.3	230.2	272.0	313.9	376.7
Upper Sheringham	135.8	158.4	181.1	203.7	249.0	294.3	339.6	407.5
Walcott	132.1	154.1	176.1	198.1	242.2	286.2	330.3	396.3
Walsingham	151.4	176.7	201.9	227.2	277.7	328.2	378.7	454.4
Warham	150.1	175.1	200.1	225.1	275.2	325.2	375.3	450.3
Wells-next-the- Sea	152.8	178.3	203.8	229.2	280.2	331.1	382.1	458.5
Weybourne	142.9	166.8	190.6	214.4	262.1	309.8	357.4	428.9
Wickmere	147.1	171.7	196.2	220.7	269.8	318.9	367.9	441.5
Wighton	132.1	154.2	176.2	198.2	242.3	286.3	330.4	396.5

Witton	123.7	144.3	164.9	185.5	226.7	268.0	309.2	371.1
Wiveton	137.7	160.6	183.6	206.5	252.5	298.4	344.3	413.1
Wood Norton	124.9	145.8	166.6	187.4	229.1	270.7	312.4	374.9
Worstead	123.8	144.5	165.1	185.8	227.1	268.4	309.7	371.6
All Other Parts of the Council's Area	105.7	123.4	141.0	158.6	193.9	229.1	264.4	317.3

being the amounts given by multiplying (as appropriate) the amounts at 4.6(f) or 4.6(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

- 4.7 That it be **NOTED** that for the year 2022/23 the Norfolk County Council and the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Norfolk have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

	VALUATION BANDS							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Norfolk County Council	1011.30	1179.8	1348.4	1516.9	1854.0	2191.1	2528.2	3033.9
Norfolk Police and Crime Commissioner	192.00	224.00	256.00	288.00	352.00	416.00	480.00	576.00

- 4.8 That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 4.6(h) and 4.7 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, **HEREBY SETS** the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2022/23 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	VALUATION BANDS							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Alby with Thwaite		1,551	1,772	1,994	2,437	2,880	3,323	3,988
	1,329.44							
Aldborough and Thurgarton	1,337	1,559	1,782	2,005	2,451	2,896	3,342	4,011

Antingham	1,329	1,550	1,772	1,993	2,436	2,880	3,323	3,987
Ashmanhaugh	1,350	1,575	1,800	2,025	2,475	2,925	3,375	4,050
Aylmerton	1,332	1,554	1,776	1,998	2,442	2,887	3,331	3,997
Baconsthorpe	1,354	1,580	1,806	2,032	2,483	2,935	3,386	4,064
Bacton	1,331	1,553	1,775	1,997	2,441	2,885	3,329	3,995
Barsham	1,328	1,549	1,771	1,992	2,435	2,877	3,320	3,984
Barton Turf	1,329	1,551	1,773	1,994	2,437	2,881	3,324	3,989
Beckham East/West	1,331	1,553	1,774	1,996	2,440	2,884	3,327	3,993
Beeston Regis	1,330	1,551	1,773	1,995	2,438	2,882	3,325	3,990
Binham	1,334	1,556	1,779	2,001	2,446	2,891	3,336	4,003
Blakeney	1,362	1,589	1,816	2,043	2,497	2,951	3,406	4,087
Bodham	1,342	1,566	1,790	2,014	2,462	2,909	3,357	4,028
Briningham	1,324	1,545	1,766	1,986	2,428	2,869	3,311	3,973
Brinton	1,331	1,552	1,774	1,996	2,440	2,883	3,327	3,993
Briston	1,348	1,573	1,798	2,023	2,472	2,922	3,371	4,046

Catfield	1,333	1,555	1,777	2,000	2,444	2,889	3,333	4,000
Cley	1,338	1,561	1,784	2,007	2,453	2,899	3,345	4,015
Colby	1,365	1,593	1,821	2,048	2,503	2,959	3,414	4,097
Corpusty and Saxthorpe	1,350	1,576	1,801	2,026	2,476	2,927	3,377	4,052
Cromer	1,373	1,602	1,831	2,060	2,518	2,976	3,434	4,121
Dilham	1,331	1,553	1,775	1,997	2,441	2,885	3,329	3,995
East Ruston	1,331	1,552	1,774	1,996	2,440	2,883	3,327	3,993
Edgefield	1,330	1,551	1,773	1,995	2,438	2,882	3,325	3,990
Erpingham	1,339	1,562	1,785	2,009	2,455	2,902	3,348	4,018
Fakenham	1,365	1,593	1,820	2,048	2,503	2,958	3,414	4,096
Felbrigg	1,336	1,559	1,782	2,005	2,450	2,896	3,342	4,010
Felmingham	1,315	1,534	1,753	1,973	2,411	2,850	3,288	3,946
Field Dalling	1,337	1,560	1,783	2,006	2,452	2,898	3,344	4,012
Fulmodeston	1,338	1,561	1,784	2,007	2,453	2,899	3,345	4,014
Gimingham	1,345	1,569	1,793	2,017	2,466	2,914	3,363	4,035

Great Snoring	1,354	1,580	1,806	2,031	2,483	2,934	3,386	4,063
Gresham	1,339	1,562	1,786	2,009	2,455	2,902	3,348	4,018
Gunthorpe	1,322	1,542	1,762	1,983	2,424	2,864	3,305	3,966
Hanworth	1,326	1,547	1,768	1,989	2,431	2,873	3,316	3,979
Happisburgh	1,318	1,538	1,758	1,978	2,417	2,857	3,296	3,956
Helhoughton	1,333	1,555	1,777	1,999	2,444	2,888	3,333	3,999
Hempstead	1,338	1,561	1,784	2,007	2,453	2,899	3,345	4,014
Hempton	1,367	1,595	1,823	2,050	2,506	2,962	3,418	4,101
Hickling	1,323	1,544	1,765	1,985	2,427	2,868	3,309	3,971
High Kelling	1,324	1,544	1,765	1,986	2,427	2,868	3,310	3,972
Hindolveston	1,349	1,574	1,799	2,024	2,474	2,924	3,374	4,049
Hindringham	1,331	1,553	1,775	1,997	2,441	2,885	3,329	3,995
Holkham	1,337	1,560	1,783	2,006	2,452	2,898	3,343	4,012
Holt	1,362	1,589	1,816	2,043	2,497	2,951	3,405	4,086

Honing	1,321	1,541	1,761	1,981	2,421	2,862	3,302	3,963
Horning	1,331	1,553	1,774	1,996	2,440	2,884	3,327	3,993
Horsey	1,325	1,546	1,766	1,987	2,429	2,871	3,313	3,975
Hoveton	1,356	1,582	1,808	2,034	2,486	2,938	3,390	4,068
Ingham	1,320	1,540	1,760	1,980	2,420	2,860	3,300	3,960
Ingworth	1,355	1,581	1,807	2,033	2,485	2,937	3,389	4,067
Itteringham	1,337	1,559	1,782	2,005	2,451	2,896	3,342	4,011
Kelling	1,337	1,560	1,783	2,005	2,451	2,897	3,343	4,011
Kettlestone	1,337	1,559	1,782	2,005	2,451	2,896	3,342	4,011
Knapton	1,336	1,558	1,781	2,004	2,449	2,895	3,340	4,008
Langham	1,341	1,565	1,788	2,012	2,459	2,906	3,353	4,024
Lessingham	1,321	1,541	1,761	1,981	2,422	2,862	3,302	3,963
Letheringsett with Glandford	1,319	1,539	1,759	1,979	2,419	2,858	3,298	3,958
Little Barningham	1,317	1,536	1,756	1,975	2,414	2,854	3,293	3,951

Little Snoring	1,342	1,566	1,790	2,014	2,461	2,909	3,357	4,028
Ludham	1,323	1,543	1,764	1,984	2,426	2,867	3,308	3,969
Matlaske	1,316	1,535	1,754	1,974	2,412	2,851	3,290	3,948
Melton Constable	1,355	1,580	1,806	2,032	2,484	2,936	3,387	4,065
Mundesley	1,346	1,570	1,795	2,019	2,468	2,917	3,365	4,039
Neatishead	1,333	1,555	1,777	2,000	2,444	2,889	3,333	4,000
North Walsham	1,378	1,607	1,837	2,067	2,526	2,986	3,445	4,134
Northrepps	1,338	1,561	1,784	2,007	2,454	2,900	3,346	4,015
Overstrand	1,350	1,575	1,800	2,026	2,476	2,926	3,376	4,052
Paston	1,357	1,583	1,809	2,035	2,488	2,940	3,392	4,071
Plumstead	1,349	1,574	1,799	2,024	2,474	2,924	3,374	4,049
Potter Heigham	1,333	1,555	1,777	2,000	2,444	2,889	3,333	4,000
Pudding Norton	1,352	1,577	1,802	2,028	2,478	2,929	3,380	4,056
Raynham	1,345	1,569	1,794	2,018	2,466	2,915	3,363	4,036

Roughton	1,329	1,550	1,772	1,994	2,437	2,880	3,323	3,988
Runton	1,322	1,543	1,763	1,984	2,425	2,866	3,307	3,968
Ryburgh	1,348	1,573	1,797	2,022	2,471	2,921	3,370	4,045
Salthouse	1,339	1,563	1,786	2,009	2,456	2,903	3,349	4,019
Scottow	1,339	1,562	1,785	2,008	2,455	2,901	3,347	4,017
Sculthorpe	1,331	1,553	1,775	1,997	2,441	2,885	3,329	3,995
Sea Palling	1,353	1,579	1,805	2,030	2,482	2,933	3,384	4,061
Sheringham	1,380	1,610	1,840	2,070	2,530	2,990	3,451	4,141
Sidestrand	1,330	1,551	1,773	1,995	2,438	2,881	3,325	3,990
Skeyton	1,317	1,537	1,756	1,976	2,415	2,854	3,294	3,952
Sloley	1,336	1,559	1,781	2,004	2,449	2,895	3,340	4,008
Smallburgh	1,329	1,550	1,772	1,993	2,436	2,879	3,323	3,987
Southrepps	1,342	1,565	1,789	2,013	2,460	2,908	3,355	4,026
Stalham	1,408	1,643	1,878	2,113	2,582	3,052	3,521	4,226

Stibbard	1,337	1,560	1,783	2,006	2,452	2,898	3,344	4,013
Stiffkey	1,344	1,568	1,792	2,016	2,465	2,913	3,361	4,033
Stody	1,344	1,568	1,792	2,016	2,464	2,912	3,360	4,033
Suffield	1,326	1,547	1,768	1,989	2,431	2,873	3,315	3,978
Sustead	1,329	1,550	1,772	1,993	2,437	2,880	3,323	3,987
Sutton	1,336	1,559	1,782	2,004	2,450	2,895	3,341	4,009
Swafield	1,341	1,564	1,788	2,011	2,458	2,905	3,352	4,023
Swanton Abbott	1,338	1,561	1,784	2,008	2,454	2,900	3,346	4,016
Swanton Novers	1,378	1,607	1,837	2,067	2,526	2,986	3,445	4,134
Tattersett	1,316	1,536	1,755	1,974	2,413	2,852	3,291	3,949
Thornage	1,329	1,551	1,773	1,994	2,438	2,881	3,324	3,989
Thorpe Market	1,341	1,565	1,789	2,012	2,460	2,907	3,354	4,025
Thursford	1,336	1,559	1,782	2,005	2,450	2,896	3,341	4,010
Trimingham	1,361	1,588	1,815	2,042	2,496	2,950	3,404	4,084

Trunch	1,349	1,574	1,799	2,024	2,474	2,924	3,374	4,048
Tunstead	1,328	1,550	1,771	1,993	2,436	2,879	3,322	3,986
Upper Sheringham	1,339	1,562	1,785	2,008	2,455	2,901	3,347	4,017
Walcott	1,335	1,557	1,780	2,003	2,448	2,893	3,338	4,006
Walsingham	1,354	1,580	1,806	2,032	2,483	2,935	3,386	4,064
Warham	1,353	1,579	1,804	2,030	2,481	2,932	3,383	4,060
Wells-next-the-Sea	1,356	1,582	1,808	2,034	2,486	2,938	3,390	4,068
Weybourne	1,346	1,570	1,795	2,019	2,468	2,916	3,365	4,038
Wickmere	1,350	1,575	1,800	2,025	2,475	2,926	3,376	4,051
Wighton	1,335	1,558	1,780	2,003	2,448	2,893	3,338	4,006
Witton	1,327	1,548	1,769	1,990	2,432	2,875	3,317	3,981
Wiveton	1,341	1,564	1,788	2,011	2,458	2,905	3,352	4,023
Wood Norton	1,328	1,549	1,771	1,992	2,435	2,877	3,320	3,984
Worstead	1,327	1,548	1,769	1,990	2,433	2,875	3,317	3,981
All Other Parts of the Council's Area	1,309 .08	1,527	1,745	1,963	2,399	2,836	3,272	3,927 .24

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

151 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2022 - 2023

The Leader, Cllr T Adams, introduced this item. He explained that Section 38 of the Localism Act 2011 required the Council to produce an annual pay policy statement for the start of each financial year. The attached statement was drawn up cover the period 2022/23. It was a legal requirement that Full Council formally signed off the statement.

It was proposed by Cllr T Adams, seconded by Cllr E Seward and

RESOLVED

To adopt the Pay Policy Statement and to publish the statement for 2022/23 on the Council's website.

152 PORTFOLIO REPORTS

The Chairman invited Cabinet members to provide a brief update to their written report if they wished to do so.

Cllr R Kershaw, Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Growth, said that over the period of the pandemic there had been several Covid Support Officers who had provided invaluable support across the District, making 10,000 contacts with residents and businesses. Their efforts had ensured that the District had maintained one of the lowest rates of Covid infection in the country. As their roles came to an end, he said he wanted to thank all of them for outstanding service to the community.

The Chairman invited members to put questions to Cabinet members.

Cllr G Hayman said that he would like ask the Leader what he intended to do to address the rat problem in Cromer and other coastal towns. He said it was particularly bad in North Lodge Park in Cromer and on the seafront. Cllr Adams replied that the question related to his role as ward member rather than as Leader. He said that he would discuss the matter with officers and provide a written response. He said that he was aware there had been some complaints but did not accept that it was of wider public concern, adding that it was a common occurrence over the winter period.

Cllr J Rest asked Cllr W Fredericks, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Benefits, for more information about the post of Energy Officer which was referred to in her report. He asked if it was a full or part-time role and whether the Council intended to charge a fee for advice or whether it was a free service. Cllr Fredericks replied that the new Energy Officer would start on 7th March. The improvement works fell within the 'warm homes grant' and they would advise them on how save energy and improve efficiency within their homes. She confirmed that it was a full time post and costs were covered by the Warm Homes Grant scheme.

Cllr N Housden asked Cllr Fredericks about 'test and trace' support payments – of which 258 had been approved. He asked what the total financial value for these was. Cllr Fredericks said that she would provide a response in writing.

Cllr T FitzPatrick asked Cllr V Gay, Portfolio Holder for Culture, Wellbeing & Leisure, about visitor numbers to the Pavilion Theatre on Cromer Pier. He said that her written report referred to numbers being 64% of pre-Covid attendance figures. He asked for details of the actual numbers and commented that 64% seemed quite a low figure when other non-subsidised, local venues had been sold out over Christmas. Cllr Gay referred Cllr FitzPatrick to the forthcoming Member briefing on this. She said that she had been advised that 64% compared well with other similar venues and the operators, Openwide, were very pleased with the figures. Cllr FitzPatrick asked for the exact attendance figures and whether there was an opportunity to explore making the Pavilion Theatre cost free. Cllr Gay replied that until 2020, Openwide was returning money to the District. The pandemic had impacted considerably but it was hoped that it would return to pre-Covid attendance rates soon.

Cllr N Lloyd asked Cllr Fredericks about the Landowners event on 16th March and what the current take-up rate was. Cllr Fredericks replied that there had been nine expressions of interest from agents to date. She said that it was a pilot scheme and if it was successful it would be rolled out further.

Cllr V FitzPatrick referred to the Housing Support Fund which was mentioned in her written report. He asked how the 10% administration fee worked and whether there was any profit or if it just covered costs. Cllr Gay replied that it was intended to pay for the provision of the service. She explained that it was a special fund that was established to support people and that 10% of the fund was allocated to cover the cost of operating the fund.

Cllr C Cushing asked Cllr N Lloyd, Portfolio Holder for Environment, how confident he was, on a scale of 1 -10, that the remaining 49,100 trees of the tree planting project would be planted by end of April 2023. Cllr Lloyd replied that he was as confident as he could be but there was a lot of competition out there. He said, as it currently stood, there were more than enough trees on the books for planting next season.

Cllr S Penfold asked Cllr Lloyd what would happen to old brown bins that were being replaced. Cllr Lloyd confirmed that they would be recycled and the Council would be paid for this.

Cllr J Stenton asked Cllr L Shires, Portfolio Holder for Organisational Resources, for more information regarding the handling of benefits queries and the outsourcing of this service. Cllr Shires confirmed that they had come back in-house as part of the Councils 'one front door policy' and revenues queries would be coming back in-house from June 2022. Cllr Stenton asked what the current cost of outsourcing these enquiries was. Cllr Shires confirmed that Civica currently handled these and the cost was £72k.

153 QUESTIONS RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS

None.

154 OPPOSITION BUSINESS

None.

155 NOTICE(S) OF MOTION

None.

156 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

157 PRIVATE BUSINESS

The meeting ended at 8.15 pm.

Chairman
