

## COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Wednesday, 22 February 2023 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	Dr P Bütikofer
Mrs S Bütikofer	Mr C Cushing
Mr N Dixon	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 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
Mrs E Spagnola	Mrs J Stenton
Dr C Stockton	Mr M Taylor
Mr J Toye	Mr E Vardy
Mr A Varley	Ms L Withington

**Also in attendance:**

### 113 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Cllrs P Fisher, C Heinink, N Housden, E Seward and L Shires.

### 114 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 December 2022 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### 115 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS FROM MEMBERS

### 116 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None received.

### 117 CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Chairman opened her communications by speaking about former Councillor, Anthea Sweeney, who had died on 22 January 2023. Anthea had been the Liberal Democrat District Councillor for Chaucer Ward from September 2005 – May 2015

She became a District Councillor in September 2005, following the death of her husband, John in July 2005, replacing him as Councillor for Chaucer Ward. She had been an active member of the Council serving on several committees.

The Chairman invited Cllr Gay, a good friend of Anthea's to say a few words. Cllr

Gay said that Anthea was the kindest of friends and an excellent councillor. She would be very much missed. At the Chairman's request, members observed a minutes silence in Anthea's memory.

The Chairman then outlined civic events that she had attended since the last meeting of Full Council:

27 January - Holocaust Day Memorial Service at St Peter Mancroft Church, Norwich

28 January – installation of the 40<sup>th</sup> Dean of Norwich, Norwich Cathedral

28 March – Easter Bake Sale and Raffle to raise funds for the Chairman's charities.

## **118 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Leader began by referring to the anniversary of the invasion of Ukraine which was on 24<sup>th</sup> February. The Council would be observing a minutes silence at 11am to show solidarity with the people of Ukraine. The Ukrainian national flag would be flown at full mast all day and the Pier would be illuminated in blue and yellow. He said that he was pleased that North Norfolk had been so hospitable to so many who had escaped the conflict.

Cllr Adams then spoke about ongoing work on the Council's assets, including Cromer Pier, areas of North Walsham and the crinkle-crankle wall at Fakenham. He highlighted the completion of the recent refurbishment of Sheringham Little Theatre, which the Council had contributed to.

The Leader said that the completion of the tree planting scheme was imminent in March and he thanked everyone for their hard work in achieving this.

He said he was continuing to engage with Serco regarding missed bin collections and although he was pleased to report they were coming down, he was still far from satisfied and would continue to press them for results.

The Leader updated members on the situation regarding the use of ring frisbees on beaches, following the motion at the previous meeting of Full Council. He said himself and two members of staff were due to meet with the Friends of Horsey Seals and representatives from the RSPCA at East Winch. Communications to highlight the issue of ring frisbees had been published.

A meeting had been arranged with Anglian Water, the Environment Agency and Norfolk County Council Highways to discuss the loss of the blue flag status at three of the District's beaches.

The Leader concluded by saying that the Council was still awaiting feedback on its unsuccessful levelling up bids and would consider its options for applying to any future funds.

At this point, the Chairman allowed Cllr G Perry-Warnes to speak. She referred to her previous comments regarding the reinstatement of prayers at the start of Full Council meetings and asked when this may commence. The Democratic Services Manager said that she needed a bit more time to explore all of the options, including offering to cover travel expenses and how this would be funded. She was also looking into the possibility of facilitating remote prayers, so that the attending member of the clergy could join the meeting via a link.

## 119 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

Two members of the public had requested to speak, Mr Martin Booth and Mr David Russell.

The Chairman invited Mr Booth to speak first. He said that he was Secretary of the North Norfolk Trade Union Council and was speaking on behalf of its members:

‘As the Council is presumably aware, there is currently a dispute involving refuse collectors in North Norfolk, currently employed by the private contractors Serco. We understand that these workers, who are highly valued by our community and who worked tirelessly through the pandemic, are currently being paid at or not much above the minimum wage and have been offered a rise far below the current rate of inflation. Clearly any dispute would have a serious impact on this vital service, so as the contracting authority we would like the Council to address these questions:

1. As the single contract covers 3 local authorities, how much autonomy does NNDC have to intervene in any dispute that would settle things for NNDC workers, if Breckland and Kings Lynn & West Norfolk resist such a conciliatory approach?
2. Given that waste contracts are being taken out of private company hands in nearby local authorities (Gt Yarmouth Borough Council and East Suffolk Council) can NNDC explore this as an option so as to take back direct control of services NNDC residents rely on? Both councils have or are setting up their own Local Authority Trading Company.
3. Have NNDC political leaders and/or officers met with the workforce to get an accurate picture of the feelings amongst the workers they have a responsibility for as commissioner of this service? They have met UNISON officials but at the time of writing have yet to take up the offer to meet with the local union reps at the Aylsham depot.
4. Does NNDC have the ability to increase the budget on this contract to ensure the NNDC element of it pays the Real Living Wage or would NNDC have to wait until the contract is re-tendered to be able to stipulate this as a requirement of the service provider?

Mr Booth concluded that there was currently a live ballot of union members and unless an improved offer was received, there was the very real possibility of waste collectors going on strike.

The Leader thanked Mr Booth for his questions. He said that he took the matter very seriously. However, Serco was the provider of a service on behalf of the Council and NNDC was not responsible for pay. He confirmed that officers had been in contact with Serco but the Council could not get involved in the negotiations with Serco employees. He said he understood that Kings Lynn depot had accepted the earlier pay offer. He said that based on the pay offer shared with the Council by Serco, it was above inflation and would be backdated to April 2022 and this would see Serco employees on rates above the Living Wage.

He said that the Council was not currently at a point where it could consider taking waste collection services back in-house. The current contract still had some way to run. Regarding an increase in the Council’s budget to pay the Living Wage, he said that the offer currently being made by Serco was above the Living Wage. In addition,

any variation to the terms of the contract would have to be agreed by the three councils involved.

He said that he was happy to meet with both speakers to discuss the matters raised this evening.

The Chairman then invited Mr D Russell, Vice Chairman of North Norfolk Trade Union Council to speak.

Mr Russell began by setting out the current rates and offers by Serco:

- HGV drivers received an hourly rate of £11.50 and were being offered £13.50
- 7.5 tonne drivers received £11.82 an hour and were being offered £12.75 ph
- 3.5 tonne drivers received £11.20 ph and were being offered £12.25 ph.
- Operatives & loaders at the Aylsham dept received £9.50 ph and were offered £11.00 ph

Mr Russell said that he understood that the Council had been in discussion with Serco about this but that it remained unresolved. He asked for an explanation as to why this was the case. He said from personal experience, his bins had previously been emptied regularly on a Monday and now, following a change to the collection dates, they were collected at random times on a Wednesday.

Mr Russell said that the Council's responsibilities were twofold:

1. To ensure that the bins were emptied as per its contract with Serco
2. To monitor this to ensure that it happened

He said that workers could not be blamed for any changes to the service.

In conclusion, Mr Russell said that if Serco were not complying with the terms of the contract, the Council must have a clause for termination which would allow them to take on the provision of the refuse collection service corporately. He asked if this was the case, why did they not do so.

The Leader thanked Mr Russell for his comments. He said that there were two issues raised. He said that there was the possibility of performance related reductions if the provided was not meeting the specifications of the contract but he did not connect this matter to the ongoing pay negotiations. He then said that he was personally supportive of the waste collection staff receiving a pay increase. He hoped that a resolution could be reached soon, however, he stressed that they were not NNDC staff and the Council had no remit to become involved in any pay negotiations. He reiterated his offer to meet with Mr Booth and Mr Russell to discuss the matter further.

## **120 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET 06 FEBRUARY 2023**

The Leader introduced the recommendations made to Council by Cabinet at the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> February.

The Chairman asked if any member wished to speak.

Cllr E Vardy referred to the final recommendation relating to Fees & Charges 2023 – 2024 and asked the Leader to give clarity and reassurance to market traders in Holt that they would not be charged a separate fee for each stall. The Leader replied that this was the intention of the recommendation. The aim was to simplify the process

until a new street trading policy was in place, adding that there would be a single fee for the whole event rather than a charge per stall.

Cllr G Hayman referred to the Capital Strategy 2023 – 2024. He highlighted section 4.7 which made reference to the Council's portfolio of commercial assets to rent within the District. He said that it was important that these were used for community benefit and that they were delivering the maximum that they could. He was aware that some were under-utilised and it was important they were reviewed regularly to ensure that they were operating as effectively as they could. The Leader said that he agreed that some of the assets were working very well and benefitting the community. However, he acknowledged there were some empty properties that presented challenges but these would be reviewed and assessed whenever the opportunity presented itself. Cllr Hayman said that he was aware that some properties that were being used were not being leveraged to ensure maximum use by the community and the Council had a responsibility to review these and ensure that they delivered fully. The Leader said he was happy to consider any specific examples and have a further discussion with Cllr Hayman.

The Chairman proposed that the recommendations were taken en bloc:

### **RESOLVED**

#### Capital Strategy 2023 – 2024

To approve the Capital Strategy and Prudential Indicators for 2023-2024

#### Investment Strategy 2023 – 2024

To approve the Investment Strategy 2023 – 2024

#### Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2023 – 2024

To approve the Treasury Management Strategy 2023 – 2024

#### Fees & Charges 2023 – 2024

To agree

- a. The fees and charges from 1 April 2023 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
- c. That there be added to Appendix A, a provision to permit the Holt Market to operate with a single Street Market fee at such amount delegated to the Director for Communities until such time as the Street Trading Policy is approved.

### **121 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 15TH FEBRUARY 2023**

The Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Cllr N Dixon, advised members that there were no recommendations from the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> February.

### **122 RATE RELIEF POLICY**

The Leader introduced this item. He explained that the report reflected all of the changes that were being implemented for the upcoming financial year. He welcomed the proposed changes and thanked staff for their hard work in supporting local businesses.

It was proposed by Cllr T Adams, seconded by Cllr R Kershaw and

**RESOLVED**

That the Revenues Manager continues to have delegated authority to make decisions up to the NNDC cost value of £4k as indicated in Appendix A.

That the Revenues Manager has delegated authority to make Hardship Relief decisions up to the NNDC cost value of £4k as indicated in Appendix C.

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

### **123 BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2023 - 2024**

The Chairman outlined the process to Members, explaining that there would be a number of recorded votes. She 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.

The Chief Financial Officer (Director for Resources and Section 151 Officer) began by referring members to pages 133, section 4 of the agenda, which provided details of the process which had been carried out in preparing the Budget for presentation to Full Council. She explained that in formulating her opinion, she had considered the 2021/2022 Outturn position, the current forecast outturn position for 2022/2023 and the Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and funding available and the budgets required for future years. She had also looked at the cashflow which had been monitored throughout the year.

She explained that there was an established budget setting process at NNDC and this had been followed again. It had been updated as required to reflect increases in staff pay, increases in fees and charges. She went on to say that there was a greater level of uncertainty and risk in setting forecasts than in previous years. Due to long awaited business rates reform and the outcome of the fair funding review, which would be introduced from 2025/26 at the earliest, it was assumed that funding levels would remain at the 2023/2024 level.

The Chief Financial Officer said it had been a challenging year but she was satisfied with the assumptions that had been made regarding forecasts. She referred to section 4.16 which highlighted high risk areas and said these would be monitored closely. In conclusion, she said that she considered that the level of general and earmarked reserves were adequate and the budget was produced within a robust framework.

The Chairman invited the Leader, Cllr T Adams, to introduce the budget. He began by saying that he was sad that the Portfolio Holder for Finance, Cllr Seward, was not able to introduce the budget. It had been a challenging budget this year and he thanked the Finance team for their hard work and support.

The Leader said that the main priorities in setting the Budget had been to retain

levels of service in supporting households and working towards the Net Zero target. The focus had been on finding savings without cutting services. Inflation had had an impact and the Council had reduced its short-term borrowing to reflect this and sources of additional income were being explored.

The Leader said that many local authorities had a challenging time ahead and there was no doubt that NNDC was in a more advantageous position than most. There was up to 40% inflation reported on some build projects in the district and this was impacting on the delivery of projects. However, the Council's treasury management advisers had indicated that the pressures would ease in the future. That said, there had been very little improvement in terms of Government funding and although the additional 3% funding guarantee was welcomed, the impact of the loss of £800k of New Homes Bonus income was substantial.

The Leader said that he had been working with Duncan Baker MP to address the shortcomings in the current proposal for the introduction of the new second homes council tax. As things currently stood, the District Council benefited from only 8% of council tax collection in North Norfolk and this would apply to any additional income raised via second homes council tax. There was a consensus across the political spectrum locally that District Councils should benefit from a larger share of this revenue.

He said that he was grateful to residents who had taken the time to respond to the Council's consultation on council tax. A very balance response had been provided, with many supporting a modest increase in council tax. He added that the Council would continue to maintain the level of council tax support and other support services such as the Community Connectors and the warm hubs. In addition, NNDC had recently awarded grant funding to Norfolk Community Law Services and the local food bank. A further £60k was allocated in the 2023/2024 Budget to further develop food hubs across the District.

He reminded members that investment in public toilet facilities would continue and there was no planned reduction in funding. Investment would also continue for temporary accommodation and the repair and maintenance of the Council's assets, including litter bins, coastal assets and sports facilities.

The Leader referred to an amended Capital Programme which included funding for replacement toilet facilities at Albert Street car park in Holt, the solar car port at the Reef in Sheringham and the renewal of sports facilities at Cromer Sports Centre. He then spoke about support for improved sports facilities at Fakenham and said that he was supportive of the Opposition's request to transfer funding currently allocated to North Walsham to the development of a multi-use sports pitch in Fakenham. He said that it would need to be fully scoped and assessed and he confirmed that the capital funding previously allocated to sports facilities in North Walsham would be re-allocated to sports facilities generally and a report would be presented to Cabinet in the future.

Finally, the Leader said that he wanted to highlight the merger of two parish councils – Pudding Norton and Hempton from 1 April 2023. This was presenting some challenges regarding the setting of the new joint precept.

In conclusion he said it was a robust budget designed to support households, deliver the Council's Net Zero targets, contribute to the tourism economy and leisure facilities. He proposed the Budget for 2023/2024.

Cllr W Fredericks seconded the Budget for 2023/2024 and reserved her right to speak.

The Chairman then invited Cllr C Cushing, Leader of the main Opposition Group to respond to the Leader's Budget speech.

Cllr Cushing began by expressing his thanks to the Finance Team for their support in assisting his group with the queries that they had raised. He said that he was pleased to introduce a number of Conservative candidates who would be standing in the District Council elections in May 2023, who were in attendance, and who were seated behind his Group.

Cllr Cushing said that it was a very disappointing budget and it did not address the future needs of the Council at all. This was the 4<sup>th</sup> occasion that he had responded on behalf of the Opposition and each time previously he had emphasised that the economic outlook was very bleak. He had always been surprised by the Administration's complacency on this and it was only last year that they had conceded that 'storm clouds were gathering' and he believed that this would have dire consequences for the future delivery of services.

Cllr Cushing said that he welcomed a balanced budget had been produced but flagged up that some of the assumptions made to achieve this were questionable. He referred to the proposed 5% increase for pay award inflation. At a recent meeting of the Joint Staff Consultative Committee, the Union representative had indicated that a pay demand of 12.7% would be presented.

He went onto say that he endorsed the approach taken regarding the consideration of savings across the Council's service areas. There were 56 lines of savings listed but it was extremely unlikely that all of them would be delivered. The Administration seemed to be taking the approach of 'hope for the best and plan for the best'. He referenced the proposed council tax increase and said that this was the third increase in 4 years. He quoted the Liberal Democrat Leader at Broadland and South Norfolk District Council who supported a freeze in council tax there, stating 'every little hurts'. He highlighted that at Broadland DC, the average Band D council tax was £129.01 compared to £163.63 at North Norfolk DC, if the proposed increase was supported. In addition, Broadland DC provided a far wider range of services including the collection of kitchen waste. Cllr Cushing said, that in his view, had the Administration 'fixed the roof whilst the sun was shining' then there would be no need to increase council tax this year. He referred to the Motion proposed by the Independent Group in September 2022 not to increase the council tax this year and the support indicated by the Administration at the time was clearly not genuine. He said that he accepted the need for the County Council and the Police Authority to increase council tax as their services were more demand-led such as adult social care.

Cllr Cushing said that the Council could do more to support residents by not increasing council tax this year. He said he was pleased to see the retention of the council tax support fund.

He then referred to the Earmarked Capital Reserves, highlighting that in the last 3 years, the main focus had been on three areas of the District; North Walsham (£2.5m), Cromer (£5m) and Sheringham (£17m). He said he did not begrudge any of this but there needed to be a fairer approach in the future. Fakenham, in contrast, had only had £0.5m spent on it. He therefore welcomed the Leader's support for reallocating the funding currently set aside for an artificial football pitch in North Walsham to Fakenham.



Cllr Cushing then referenced the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and Appendix A which forecast that there would be a deficit of £746k in 2024/2025 rising to £2.8m in 2025/2026. He said that these estimated caused him considerable anxiety as it threatened the Council's ability to provide services to residents in the future. He said that the Administration had had 4 years to prepare for these forecast shortfalls. There were two ways this could be done. Firstly, by making efficiency savings and secondly by generating more income. Neither had been done in the last 3 years, no Economic Growth Strategy had been produced and there had been no attempt to take a more commercial approach.

Cllr Cushing referred to the proposed increases in fees and charges, which could impact on the tourism offer in North Norfolk, making it less competitive. He said that one area which could be explored was more collaborative working with neighbouring district councils to fund efficiencies by sharing systems and services. He said the overall picture for local government was increasingly one of 'tightening belts' and it had to be acknowledged that government funding was unlikely to increase much in coming years.

Cllr Cushing concluded by saying that this Budget reflected the Administration's lack of ambition and a failure to acknowledge the challenges ahead. He said that this lack of planning had been exacerbated by the poor decision to undertake a capability review, several management restructures and a significant increase in staff numbers – with 40 additional officers since 2018. Staff costs contributed to a significant amount of the budget. On top of this, compared to neighbouring authorities, NNDC had failed to attract external funding. Overall, the budget lacked ideas and residents of North Norfolk served better.

The Chairman invited Cllr J Rest, Leader of the Independent Group, to respond to the Budget. Cllr Rest began by thanking the S151 Officer and her team for producing a balanced budget. He said that one word summed up his Group's view of the Budget and that was 'disappointed'. He reminded members that on 21<sup>st</sup> September 2022, he had submitted a Motion to Full Council asking the Administration to consider freezing council tax for 2023/2024 at the 2022 level to support residents who were struggling in very challenging times. He said that it was extremely disappointing that there was no evidence in the Budget papers this had been given any consideration at all and he said that unless they heard otherwise, the Independent Group would not support the Budget.

The Chairman asked the Leader if he wished to respond to the Opposition Group Leaders.

The Leader began by saying that the former Prime Minister, Lis Truss, had crashed the national economy and the resulting inflationary pressures had been very difficult to address. There were no over-spends or 'pet projects'. In addition, there was only £160k of Government funding that had been provided. He said that 5% had been allocated for wage rises and this was the advice that all local authorities had been given. He anticipated that this could be increased if necessary.

The proposed increase in council tax was modest and the public response to the consultation was balanced and it would put North Norfolk in the middle of a league table of Norfolk authorities.

Responding to Cllr Rest, he said that the request to freeze council tax had been considered but inflationary pressures had continued to grow in the last few months

and it needed to be mitigated.

He said that the Council was working more effectively than before and he believed the restructure was the right thing to do.

The Leader acknowledged that the majority of spending was focussed on three towns but said that there were fewer properties in the east and west of the District and the majority of the capital programme was focussed on maintaining and renewing existing assets.

Finally, the Leader asked why no amendments had been submitted if the opposition groups were so unhappy. He reiterated that the Budget was a good one which focussed on ambitious priorities.

The Chairman invited the Leader of the main opposition group to reply. Cllr Cushing said that inflation was already on the rise before Prime Minister Truss came to power, due to the war in Ukraine and the pandemic. He added that the Administration was willing to use the pandemic as a reason for not producing key documents such as the Economic Growth Strategy but chose to ignore it when it suited them.

In response to North Norfolk sitting in the middle of the league table for council tax levels, he said that a good authority should aspire to sit at the top. He said that there was no ambition to achieve this. He said that although the Leader claimed to have an efficient and effective council, it was not clear what measure was being applied to assess this. There had not been a Local Government Association (LGA) peer review since 2014 and there had been no indication that there was any intention to have one.

Regarding the submission of amendments, he said that he believed to make any real changes to the Budget, you had to have your hands on 'the levers of power' and he anticipated that his Group's alternative budget would be proposed when they came to power in May 2023. He concluded by saying that he was genuinely concerned that there was nothing in the Budget to address problems and challenges that would happen in the next few years.

The Chairman invited the Leader of the Independent Group, Cllr Rest to respond. Cllr Rest said that he had proposed an amendment on 21<sup>st</sup> September when he requested that council tax was frozen. He said that he was most disappointed by the fact that no alternative proposals to increasing council tax had been put forward at all. There must have been other ways to raise that money. He said he had several suggestions to save money but most of them were around Cromer and the Administration would not consider this.

Cllr J Toye raised a point of order regarding political campaigning in the Chamber. The Monitoring Officer replied that political debate and comment was allowed during Full Council meetings but if Cllr Toye wished to refer to a specific section of the Constitution that he felt was being breached then she would review it and provide a view.

The Chairman thanked the Group Leaders for their comments. She opened the debate up to members:

Cllr J Rest referred to page 163 of the agenda – the Reserves Statement and the section on 'Communities'. He said that the balance for April was shown as £294,766, however, from 1st April 2024, the balance drops to £19,776. This was a reduction of

93% in funding aimed at supporting community projects. He then referred to page 164 and the Major Repairs Reserve. He said that as the Chairman of the Governance, Risk & Audit Committee, he wanted to confirm that the Committee had been asking for a copy of the Council's asset portfolio and its value and it had never been forthcoming. The committee had been advised that the information was not available. He asked, therefore, how it was possible to anticipate how much would be needed for repairs if the value of the portfolio was not known.

The Chief Executive replied that the communities reserve related to the North Norfolk Sustainable Communities Fund (NNSCF) and it was historically funded from second homes council tax income. The arrangement to receive this from the County Council came to an end several years ago and the remainder was set aside for the NNSCF. It was now coming to an end and Cabinet felt that it could not be maintained beyond the current financial year. It was hoped that an alternative source of funding could be secured from the new premium on second homes but it was likely that this would be channelled towards supporting affordable housing.

The S151 Officer said that the Asset Register was maintained by the Council's Property Services team and used for their inspections for repairs and maintenance purposes. The Finance Team also had an asset register which was kept for accounting purposes. She said this information could be provided to GRAC. Cllr Rest said that the main concern of GRAC was that they had never been provided with valuations (including a total) of the Council's assets. The S151 Officer replied that this information could be provided to GRAC.

Cllr N Dixon said that this was a high-risk budget. There had been repeated requests in recent years to prepare cost and efficiency savings and income opportunities. If this contingency work had been done then an increase in council tax could have been avoided. The residents of North Norfolk had every right to feel let down by the Administration.

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett referred to the motion submitted by the Independent Group on 21<sup>st</sup> September, to freeze council tax. The cost of living crisis had got much worse since then. It would only play a small part but it would still help. She said that she felt a lot more could be done by the Council to cut costs, referring to the example of providing hard copy agendas for members. There were far too many 'nice to do' projects which she believed should not be financed at this time. She concluded by saying that she could not support the budget.

Cllr E Vardy referred to page 135, section 4.16b, which outlined car parking income. He said that the forecast income of £3.04m was stated as supporting the delivery of 'other services' across the Council. These were all car parks based in key towns such as Holt. He said that if this income was fed back and reinvested in the towns and places that generated it, then it would be able to grow further and support the local and tourism-based economy that was so vital to the District. He said he would like to see a breakdown of the 'other services' which this income was supporting. It was a missed opportunity and he would like to see more focussed support on this in the future. The Chief Executive replied that car park revenue funded a lot of discretionary services. The District was a tourist area and the revenue from car parks was needed to support enhanced cleansing, lifeguards on the beaches, and attractions such as Cromer Pier but also the provision of public conveniences. Cllr Vardy said that he would hope to see that this was explained better to local residents and that some visible improvements could be made in local towns that provided car park income for the Council.

The Chairman reminded members that they should try to remain seated during the debate. If it was considered that they had missed too much of the debate, they would not be allowed to vote. Cllr H Blathwayt raised a point of order. He asked where that was stated in the Council's constitution. The Monitoring Officer said she would look into it and come back to him.

Cllr S Penfold referred to the County Council's 'workhouse budget' which offered a very thin gruel to the residents of Norfolk, including a 4.99% rise in council tax, whilst the Administration at County Hall was paying £90k a day on its debt interest alone. The Liberal Democrats didn't put any amendments to that budget because they felt it was a broken budget and 'unamendable'. Several Conservatives members criticised them and said that they must have supported their budget as they had not put forward any amendments. He said all he could conclude then was that the Conservatives in North Norfolk really agreed with the Administration's budget because they too had not submitted any amendments.

Cllr J Toye commented that 40% of residents in North Norfolk lived in the countryside and not in towns. Even the Government had recognised this by providing an increase in the Rural Services Delivery grant. He sought assurances that in the future, the countryside would be considered.

Cllr W Fredericks said that she wished to comment on the future funding of the North Norfolk Sustainable Communities Fund. She said that money would be taken from the UK Shared Prosperity Fund and working with other funding agencies would also be explored. She encouraged communities to come forward and apply.

Cllr J Stenton asked why Budget questions were being answered by officers rather than members. She understood that members of the Administration should be responding to points raised during the debate, not officers. The Leader replied that any points raised that required a detailed response would be directed to officers. He said that he would reply to any question put directly to him. Cllr Stenton repeated that she would like the Administration to respond to points raised relating to their own budget, not officers. She said it wasn't just at this meeting, it seemed to be a consistent theme of Full Council meetings. The Chairman asked the Monitoring Officer to respond. The Monitoring Officer replied that the expectation was that members should respond to any points raised but if there was a level of technical detail that they could not provide then they would refer it to an officer to provide a response.

Cllr T FitzPatrick began by saying that He then said that the main theme that seemed to be coming through tonight was that the former Prime Minister, Liz Truss was to blame for everything. That didn't explain why the Council had not achieved much in the last four years, apart from increase staff. However, it did answer Cllr Stenton's question. Officers replied to points and questions raised during the debate because it was not a member-led authority. It was an officer led council and that was clear tonight. He said that some councils had a definable centre. North Norfolk did not have that, it was a dispersed area. However, the money spent by NNDC was not dispersed. It was centred on Cromer, Sheringham and North Walsham. Cllr FitzPatrick said he was often accused of having a 'bee in his bonnet' about Cromer pier but he reminded members that it cost every resident in the District £13.20 to undertake the year on year repairs. What happened in Cromer did not benefit residents in the East and West of the District. He referenced the work recently undertaken on Sheringham Little Theatre and asked if there was a commensurate spend on Fakenham Community centre. He said that he agreed with Cllr Rest, that towns outside of Cromer, Sheringham and North Walsham were the poor relations. Towns like Fakenham funded their own parks, unlike Cromer. He said that his village

of Walsingham needed to provide a new village hall as theirs burnt down a month ago. When you looked at the County Council's share of council tax, it was clear what was being funded – adult social care, education, digital infrastructure and roads. It benefitted the whole of Norfolk. Compare that to his own ward of Walsingham, despite attracting a huge influx of tourists and pilgrims each year, the only thing funded by the District Council was one public toilet. He concluded by saying that if the Administration wanted to focus on how much was done for North Norfolk, they needed to be honest about how much was done for the whole of North Norfolk.

Cllr G Hayman said that he wished to raise a point of information. He said that with an election happening in May, there was definitely an electioneering theme to the debate. He said that he felt it was appropriate for officers to respond to comments and questions instead of members, especially with the Portfolio Holder for Finance unable to attend the meeting. Officers had a granular understanding of operational issues and members didn't. Cllr Hayman said that he was supportive of the budget. These were difficult times and this was a fair budget. He added that everyone in the room had to recognise that authorities that did not share the same political complexion as the Government were unfairly punished. The people of the District were suffering as a consequence of political decisions being made elsewhere. Coastal communities were some of the most deprived and under-resourced in the whole country. The Administration had to make a budget that was sensible. He said that he would like to contribute to the discussion on car parks, referencing one owned by NNDC in Cromer and currently used by the Tennis club. He said that the Council should seek to raise revenue where it could and charge where possible. He referred to other parts of the country which charged considerably more for municipal car parks and NNDC could be more pragmatic about the officer in the District, whilst providing a discount for residents.

Cllr P Heinrich commented on the Heritage Action Zone funding for North Walsham. He said that this was the first major tranche of funding for the town since the 1960s. The town had been neglected for decades by Tory administrations.

Cllr Dr V Holliday asked how members could assured that the financial projections for 2024/2025 were sound. The net cost of services were projected to decrease, however, it was her understanding that even if inflation fell, the costs would not. Cllr T Adams said that advice had been taken from Arlingclose, the Council's Treasury Management advisors and other authorities were also proceeding on the same basis. He added that there was a degree of assumption in all of this but acknowledged there was more work to do.

Cllr S Butikofer said that there was no one in the room who wouldn't have liked to have frozen council tax, particularly during a cost of living crisis. She referenced the Leader of Norfolk County Council, Cllr Proctor, who had said 'we are grossly underfunded for what we have to do'. However, although the County Council was increasing council tax, it was also making huge cuts to crucial services such as Adult Social Care (£28m) and to Childrens' Services (£12.5m) . NNDC was not making a single cut to the services provided to the residents of North Norfolk. It should also be remembered that the District Council received just 8 pence out of every pound of council tax raised.

Cllr N Lloyd said that during 8 years of a Conservative administration not a single penny was spent in North Walsham. He said that the current administration had worked incredibly hard to obtain grant funding and he was proud to see the project coming to fruition.

Cllr H Blathwayt said that he had recently attended a meeting of the Internal Drainage Board (IDB) where he had to vote on the budget. He found that he was the only member there to vote, with no other party representatives attending. A budget increase of 10% was supported, which showed the level of inflationary pressure that was impacting on the provision of key services.

Cllr J Punchard commented that he had seconded the motion to freeze council tax in September last year and he was proud to do so. He acknowledged that times were hard but he said that he could see tangible outcomes from the money spent by the County Council on roads and infrastructure and at town council level on parks and amenities. He said he could not see what residents in his ward were getting from the District Council. As far as he could see it was just a toilet block that was running over schedule and over budget and repairs to a wall. He said that he would not be supporting the budget.

Cllr E Withington said that in 2018 she chaired the North Norfolk Town and Parish Forum and she said that in the four years since, little progress had been made on retaining the district's share of second homes council tax. To have come through with balanced budgets was remarkable. She said that it was a people and community based budget and she was proud of this and the awards that the Council had won. She said that if an increase in council tax enabled the Council to support communities, then she was supportive.

Cllr G Hayman said that he had a point of information. A cabinet member had stated that they did not support the budget and he asked whether they now needed to resign as a cabinet member and whether there was a legal premise for collective responsibility. He asked if she did not have to resign and chose not to, whether she would be sacked. The Monitoring Officer replied that a point of information was not matter that she could advise on. If it was a point of order, then Cllr Hayman should reference the relevant section of the constitution or the legal premise. He said that he did not have the constitution to hand but he believed that it as untenable for Cllr Fitch-Tillett to take the stance that she had and remain in Cabinet. The Monitoring Officer said that each member voted individually on the budget.

The Chairman then invited Cllr Dixon, Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, to speak about the committee's discussion of the Budget.

Cllr Dixon began by saying that the committee welcomed a balanced budget. He said that the Committee had highlighted three key areas that they felt should not be underestimated:

1. Heavy reliance on cost savings and income increases actually being delivered
2. Pay increases not exceeding 5%, adding that when the committee pre-scrutinised the Budget, projections for pay increases stood at 2% and the committee suggested it was raised to 5%
3. The forecast deficits in the MTFs would have to be addressed in the coming years and the gap closure actions have a lead time before they deliver.

The Chairman then invited the seconder of the budget, Cllr W Fredericks to speak. Cllr Fredericks began by apologising for leaving the meeting earlier. She then referred to the 'nice to have' things that the council didn't necessarily need to provide. Homes for the homeless weren't necessarily needed, or temporary accommodation, adding that there were 70 homeless households currently in temporary accommodation. Social prescribers, community connectors and financial inclusion officers were part of a huge outreach force but could be considered a 'nice

thing to have'. The home repair service, to help people get home from hospital faster, the poverty dashboard, which identified people heading into crisis, were both non-statutory services but were vital to residents and not just nice things to have. She said that every day the Council was mopping up the failures of central government. Officers were out and about talking to people, offering help and finding little pots of money to support them. Cllr Fredericks said that officers were being creative in their approach to tackle problems and this was a new approach that had never been taken before. She concluded by saying that, for the price of a pint of beer, these discretionary services could continue to grow and to thrive. Residents should be at the heart of what the Council did and members should not stand for election if they did not have them at their heart.

The Chairman then invited the Leader to conclude the debate on the budget. He said that he was disappointed that party politics had been so prevalent. He added that all Cabinet members had agreed to the budget proposals when they were in development. He reminded members that the proposed small increase in council tax would only generate an additional £200k. The alternative was a race to the bottom a cut to services and would involve getting rid of assets. The Council was very successful in obtaining grants, despite what was said. He referred to Changing Places funding, heritage action zone funding and the Coastal Transition Accelerator programme (CTAP). Cllr Adams concluded by saying that he remained optimistic and the Administration was delivering a robust budget that provided stability to residents.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their input. She said that she was taking a ten minute break at the Monitoring Officer's request to allow her time to check a constitutional point before the vote.

Members returned to the Chamber at 8.30pm and the Monitoring Officer made the following statement:

I've consulted the constitution following Cllr Blathwayt's question regarding the prohibition of voting when a member leaves the room during a key debate. Having looked at the constitution, the only reference I can find to this is in the Planning Code, it may be something that could be reviewed in the future but at this time, I consider that it only applies to planning meetings and that, in the light of this, the Chairman may wish to review their decision.'

The Chairman apologised to those that had to leave the room and said that she retracted her earlier statement and she would allow those members who had left the room during the budget debate to vote.

Cllr A Brown said that the only consideration that members had to abide by during the budget debate was their legal responsibility to be up to date with paying their council tax before voting on the setting of the council tax. This was the only restriction on members when voting.

The Chairman said that a recorded vote would be taken on recommendations 1 – 9.

It was proposed by Cllr T Adams, seconded by Cllr W Fredericks and

**RESOLVED**

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

**RESOLVED** unanimously

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 2023/24 revenue budget as outlined at Appendix A within this report;
- 2) The statement of and movement on the reserves as detailed at Appendix D within this report;
- 3) The updated Capital Programme and financing for 2022/23 to 2026/27 as detailed at Appendix C of this report;
- 4) The new capital bids recommended for approval as detailed at Appendix C1 within this report
- 5) That Members note the current financial projections for the period 2024/25 to 2026/27;
- 6) That Members note the results of the Budget Consultation exercise as discussed in paragraph 3.15 and shown in Appendix F.
- 7) The Policy Framework for the Earmarked Reserves and the Optimum Level of the General Fund Reserve for 2023/24 to 2026/27 as detailed at Appendix B within this report;
- 8) The Local Council Tax Support Scheme (LCTS) for 2023/24 as set out in paragraphs 3.14 to 3.16;
- 9) The Council Tax Support Fund as set out in in paragraphs 3.17 to 3.20;

The Chairman invited the Section 151 Officer to outline the different elements of the Council tax recommendations. She explained that section 5.5 set out the statutory calculations for the council tax bases. Section 5.6 gave details of the parish precepts, and section 5.2 provided details of the County Council and Norfolk Police and Crime Commissioner's precepts.

The Chairman advised members that two recorded votes would be taken – for recommendation 10 and then recommendation 11.

Cllr C Cushing requested a separate recorded vote for recommendations 11a and 11b.

It was proposed by Cllr T Adams, seconded by Cllr W Fredericks and

**RESOLVED** with 21 votes in favour and 12 against:

- 10) That Members undertake the Council Tax and statutory calculations set out at section 4, and set the Council Tax for 2023/24;

**RESOLVED** with 21 votes in favour and 12 against:



- 11) The demand on the Collection Fund for 2023/24 is as follows:  
 a. £6,722,490 for District purposes

RESOLVED with 32 in favour and 1 against

- b. £2,875,207 for Parish/Town Precepts;

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

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

- a) or the whole Council area as 41,086 (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	COU TAX I
Alby With Thwaite	104.22	Little Barningham	
Aldbrough & Thurgarton	235.25	Little Snoring	
Antingham	118.04	Ludham	
Ashmanhaugh	68.88	Matlaske	
Aylmerton	212.13	Melton Constable	
Baconsthorpe	81.80	Morston	
Bacton	510.93	Mundesley	1,
Barsham	98.90	Neatishead	
Barton Turf	236.91	North Walsham	4,
Beckham East/West	113.42	Northrepps	
Beeston Regis	392.60	Overstrand	
Binham	197.09	Paston	
Blakeney	545.19	Plumstead	
Bodham	171.16	Potter Heigham	
Briningham	64.22	Pudding Norton	
Brinton	120.59	Raynham	
Briston	884.95	Roughton	
Brumstead	24.06	Runton (East & West)	
Catfield	327.56	Ryburgh	
Cley	329.74	Salthouse	
Colby	189.32	Scottow	
Corpusty & Saxthorpe	284.58	Sculthorpe	
Cromer	3,038.86	Sea Palling	

Dilham	145.21	Sheringham	3,178.34
Dunton	50.77	Sidestrand	46.06
East Ruston	192.96	Skeyton	90.35
Edgefield	209.34	Sloley	100.03
Erpingham	256.45	Smallburgh	191.24
Fakenham	2,662.82	Southrepps	344.56
Felbrigg	81.70	Stalham	1,173.97
Felmingham	198.36	Stibbard	137.58
Field Dalling	144.38	Stiffkey	130.60
Fulmodeston	178.72	Stody	88.97
Gimingham	149.56	Suffield	58.13
Great Snoring	89.46	Sustead	93.02
Gresham	166.65	Sutton	392.17
Gunthorpe	152.31	Swafield	110.57
Hanworth	95.55	Swanton Abbott	148.48
Happisburgh	317.12	Swanton Novers	84.35
Helhoughton	92.50	Tattersett	281.54
Hempstead	76.32	Thornage	94.47
Hempton	183.04	Thorpe Market	125.91
Hickling	410.84	Thurning	33.00
High Kelling	315.52	Thursford	108.12
Hindolveston	210.69	Trimingham	134.73
Hindringham	235.68	Trunch	363.75
Holkham	85.04	Tunstead	258.87
Holt	1,883.56	Upper Sheringham	111.56
Honing	123.34	Walcott	213.96
Horning	606.92	Walsingham	362.61
Horsey	35.36	Warham	89.46
Hoveton	849.43	Wells-Next-The-Sea	1,131.92
Ingham	151.11	Westwick	29.66
Ingworth	39.97	Weybourne	332.98
Itteringham	62.26	Wickmere	54.01
Kelling	93.34	Wighton	106.22
Kettlestone	95.45	Witton	134.68
Knapton	159.38	Wiveton	82.23
Langham	211.92	Wood Norton	104.58
Lessingham	228.97	Worstead	319.88
Letheringsett Glandford	With 123.93		

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.

1.1 That the following amounts be now **CALCULATED** by the Council for the year 2023/24 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and the relevant regulations and directions as follows:-

- a) £59,015,677 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimate the expenditure items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act.
- b) £49,401,673 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimate the income items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
- c) £9,614,004 being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds 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) £233.60 being the amount at (c) above divided by the amount at 5.5 calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31E of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which special items (Parish precepts) relate.
- e) £2,875,207 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.
- f) £163.62 being the amount at (d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (e) above by the amount at 5.5 (a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the 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 I
Alby With Thwaite	192.40	Little Barningham	
Aldbrough and Thurgarton	214.62	Little Snoring	
Antingham	194.11	Ludham	
Ashmanhaugh	226.14	Matlaske	
Aylmerton	199.15	Melton Constable	
Baconsthorpe	241.85	Morston	
Bacton	197.28	Mundesley	
Barsham	196.03	Neatishead	
Barton Turf	197.74	North Walsham	
Beckham East/West	201.09	Northrepps	
Beeston Regis	195.45	Overstrand	
Binham	206.24	Paston	
Blakeney	246.16	Plumstead	

Bodham	222.04	Potter Heigham	203.70
Briningham	194.76	Pudding Norton	228.64
Brinton	205.08	Raynham	205.46
Briston	227.99	Roughton	200.01
Brumstead	163.62	Runton (East & West)	184.22
Catfield	204.52	Ryburgh	222.14
Cley	206.88	Salthouse	214.47
Colby	248.31	Scottow	208.07
Corpusty and Saxthorpe	225.88	Sculthorpe	197.19
Cromer	261.10	Sea Palling	231.57
Dilham	199.77	Sheringham	270.43
Dunton	163.62	Sidestrand	201.61
East Ruston	203.13	Skeyton	176.28
Edgefield	196.38	Sloley	203.82
Erpingham	209.47	Smallburgh	194.99
Fakenham	253.58	Southrepps	212.95
Felbrigg	228.49	Stalham	325.46
Felmingham	172.94	Stibbard	253.33
Field Dalling	208.64	Stiffkey	220.51
Fulmodeston	207.12	Stody	218.13
Gimmingham	217.11	Suffield	189.42
Great Snoring	236.27	Sustead	192.96
Gresham	212.82	Sutton	204.41
Gunthorpe	185.28	Swafield	213.36
Hanworth	189.78	Swanton Abbott	210.76
Happisburgh	178.29	Swanton Novers	267.24
Helhoughton	252.32	Tattersett	174.96
Hempstead	212.10	Thornage	211.25
Hempton	259.77	Thorpe Market	213.25
Hickling	188.88	Thurning	163.62
High Kelling	202.33	Thursford	206.16
Hindolveston	225.32	Trimingham	246.07
Hindringham	198.83	Trunch	230.23
Holkham	204.77	Tunstead	193.53
Holt	246.44	Upper Sheringham	208.70
Honing	182.26	Walcott	203.81
Horning	198.39	Walsingham	246.35
Horse	191.90	Warham	241.86
Hoveton	237.96	Wells-Next-The-Sea	234.29
Ingham	179.50	Westwick	163.62
Ingworth	234.42	Weybourne	219.83
Itteringham	205.38	Wickmere	228.42
Kelling	227.90	Wighton	205.63

Kettlestone	206.99	Witton	200.74
Knapton	205.97	Wiveton	211.49
Langham	212.21	Wood Norton	192.65
Lessingham	183.22	Worstead	191.61
Letheringsett Glandford	With 179.75		

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 5.6(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 5.5(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
Alby with Thwaite	128.27	149.64	171.02	192.40	235.16	277.91	320.67
Aldborough and Thurgarton	143.08	166.93	190.78	214.62	262.32	310.02	357.71
Antingham	129.41	150.98	172.54	194.11	237.25	280.39	323.53
Ashmanhaugh	150.76	175.89	201.02	226.14	276.40	326.65	376.91
Aylmerton	132.76	154.89	177.02	199.15	243.40	287.66	331.92
Baconsthorpe	161.23	188.11	214.98	241.85	295.60	349.35	403.09
Bacton	131.52	153.44	175.36	197.28	241.12	284.96	328.80
Barsham	130.69	152.47	174.25	196.03	239.60	283.16	326.72
Barton Turf	131.83	153.80	175.77	197.74	241.69	285.63	329.57
Beckham East/West	134.06	156.40	178.74	201.09	245.77	290.46	335.15
Beeston Regis	130.30	152.02	173.74	195.45	238.89	282.32	325.76
Binham	137.49	160.40	183.32	206.24	252.07	297.90	343.73
Blakeney	164.10	191.45	218.80	246.16	300.86	355.56	410.26
Bodham	148.02	172.70	197.37	222.04	271.38	320.73	370.07
Bringham	129.84	151.48	173.12	194.76	238.04	281.32	324.60
Brinton	136.72	159.50	182.29	205.08	250.65	296.23	341.80
Briston	151.99	177.33	202.66	227.99	278.66	329.33	379.99
Catfield	136.35	159.07	181.80	204.52	249.97	295.43	340.88
Cley	137.92	160.91	183.89	206.88	252.86	298.83	344.81
Colby	165.54	193.13	220.72	248.31	303.49	358.67	413.85
Corpusty and Saxthorpe	150.59	175.69	200.78	225.88	276.08	326.28	376.47
Cromer	174.06	203.07	232.09	261.10	319.12	377.14	435.17
Dilham	133.18	155.38	177.57	199.77	244.16	288.56	332.95
East Ruston	135.42	157.99	180.56	203.13	248.27	293.41	338.55
Edgefield	130.92	152.74	174.56	196.38	240.03	283.67	327.31
Erpingham	139.65	162.92	186.20	209.47	256.02	302.57	349.12
Fakenham	169.05	197.22	225.40	253.58	309.93	366.28	422.63
Felbrigg	152.32	177.71	203.10	228.49	279.26	330.04	380.81

Felmingham	115.29	134.51	153.73	172.94	211.37	249.81	288.24	345.89
Field Dalling	139.09	162.27	185.45	208.64	255.00	301.36	347.73	417.28
Fulmodeston	138.08	161.10	184.11	207.12	253.15	299.18	345.21	414.25
Gimingham	144.74	168.86	192.98	217.11	265.35	313.60	361.85	434.22
Great Snoring	157.51	183.77	210.02	236.27	288.78	341.29	393.79	472.55
Gresham	141.88	165.53	189.17	212.82	260.11	307.41	354.70	425.64
Gunthorpe	123.52	144.11	164.69	185.28	226.46	267.63	308.81	370.57
Hanworth	126.52	147.61	168.69	189.78	231.95	274.13	316.30	379.56
Happisburgh	118.86	138.67	158.48	178.29	217.92	257.54	297.16	356.59
Helhoughton	168.21	196.25	224.28	252.32	308.39	364.46	420.53	504.64
Hempstead	141.40	164.96	188.53	212.10	259.23	306.36	353.50	424.20
Hempton	173.18	202.04	230.91	259.77	317.50	375.22	432.95	519.54
Hickling	125.92	146.91	167.89	188.88	230.85	272.83	314.80	377.77
High Kelling	134.88	157.37	179.85	202.33	247.29	292.25	337.22	404.66
Hindolveston	150.21	175.25	200.28	225.32	275.39	325.46	375.53	450.64
Hindringham	132.55	154.65	176.74	198.83	243.02	287.20	331.39	397.67
Holkham	136.51	159.27	182.02	204.77	250.28	295.78	341.29	409.55
Holt	164.29	191.67	219.06	246.44	301.21	355.97	410.74	492.89
Honing	121.51	141.76	162.01	182.26	222.77	263.27	303.77	364.53
Horning	132.26	154.30	176.35	198.39	242.48	286.56	330.65	396.78
Horsey	127.93	149.25	170.57	191.90	234.54	277.18	319.83	383.80
Hoveton	158.64	185.08	211.52	237.96	290.84	343.72	396.60	475.92
Ingham	119.66	139.61	159.55	179.50	219.39	259.28	299.17	359.00
Ingworth	156.28	182.32	208.37	234.42	286.51	338.61	390.70	468.84
Itteringham	136.92	159.74	182.56	205.38	251.02	296.66	342.30	410.76
Kelling	151.93	177.25	202.57	227.90	278.54	329.19	379.83	455.80
Kettlestone	137.99	160.99	183.99	206.99	252.99	298.99	344.98	413.98
Knapton	137.31	160.20	183.08	205.97	251.74	297.51	343.28	411.94
Langham	141.47	165.05	188.63	212.21	259.37	306.53	353.68	424.42
Lessingham	122.15	142.51	162.87	183.22	223.94	264.66	305.38	366.45
Letheringsett with Glandford	119.83	139.81	159.78	179.75	219.70	259.65	299.59	359.51
Little Barningham	119.71	139.66	159.62	179.57	219.47	259.38	299.28	359.14
Little Snoring	146.91	171.39	195.88	220.36	269.33	318.30	367.27	440.73
Ludham	127.44	148.68	169.92	191.16	233.64	276.12	318.60	382.32
Matlaske	132.22	154.26	176.30	198.34	242.41	286.49	330.57	396.68
Melton Constable	159.82	186.46	213.10	239.73	293.01	346.28	399.56	479.47
Mundesley	166.01	193.68	221.35	249.02	304.36	359.70	415.03	498.04
Neatishead	137.56	160.48	183.41	206.34	252.19	298.05	343.90	412.68
North Walsham	178.34	208.06	237.79	267.51	326.96	386.40	445.85	535.02
Northrepps	142.73	166.52	190.31	214.10	261.68	309.25	356.83	428.20
Overstrand	150.06	175.07	200.08	225.09	275.11	325.13	375.15	450.18
Paston	161.66	188.61	215.55	242.49	296.38	350.27	404.16	484.99
Plumstead	149.81	174.78	199.75	224.71	274.65	324.59	374.53	449.43
Potter Heigham	135.80	158.43	181.06	203.70	248.96	294.23	339.50	407.40
Pudding Norton	152.43	177.83	203.24	228.64	279.45	330.26	381.07	457.29
Raynham	136.97	159.80	182.63	205.46	251.11	296.77	342.43	410.92
Roughton	133.34	155.56	177.78	200.01	244.45	288.90	333.35	400.02
Runton (East & West)	122.81	143.28	163.75	184.22	225.16	266.10	307.04	368.44
Ryburgh	148.09	172.77	197.45	222.14	271.50	320.86	370.23	444.28

Salthouse	142.98	166.81	190.64	214.47	262.13	309.79	357.46	428.95
Scottow	138.71	161.83	184.95	208.07	254.31	300.55	346.78	416.14
Sculthorpe	131.46	153.37	175.28	197.19	241.01	284.83	328.65	394.38
Sea Palling	154.38	180.11	205.84	231.57	283.04	334.50	385.96	463.15
Sheringham	180.29	210.34	240.39	270.43	330.53	390.63	450.73	540.87
Sidestrand	134.40	156.81	179.21	201.61	246.41	291.22	336.02	403.22
Skeyton	117.52	137.10	156.69	176.28	215.45	254.62	293.80	352.56
Sloley	135.88	158.53	181.18	203.82	249.12	294.41	339.71	407.65
Smallburgh	129.99	151.66	173.32	194.99	238.32	281.65	324.99	389.98
Southrepps	141.97	165.63	189.29	212.95	260.28	307.60	354.93	425.91
Stalham	216.97	253.13	289.30	325.46	397.78	470.11	542.43	650.92
Stibbard	168.89	197.03	225.18	253.33	309.63	365.92	422.22	506.67
Stiffkey	147.00	171.50	196.00	220.51	269.51	318.51	367.51	441.02
Stody	145.42	169.65	193.89	218.13	266.60	315.08	363.55	436.26
Suffield	126.28	147.32	168.37	189.42	231.51	273.61	315.70	378.84
Sustead	128.64	150.08	171.52	192.96	235.85	278.73	321.61	385.93
Sutton	136.27	158.99	181.70	204.41	249.84	295.27	340.69	408.83
Swafeld	142.24	165.94	189.65	213.36	260.77	308.18	355.60	426.72
Swanton Abbott	140.50	163.92	187.34	210.76	257.60	304.43	351.27	421.52
Swanton Novers	178.16	207.85	237.55	267.24	326.63	386.02	445.41	534.49
Tattersett	116.64	136.08	155.52	174.96	213.84	252.72	291.60	349.92
Thornage	140.83	164.30	187.78	211.25	258.19	305.14	352.09	422.50
Thorpe Market	142.17	165.86	189.56	213.25	260.64	308.04	355.43	426.51
Thursford	137.44	160.35	183.25	206.16	251.97	297.79	343.60	412.33
Trimingham	164.04	191.39	218.73	246.07	300.75	355.43	410.12	492.14
Trunch	153.49	179.07	204.65	230.23	281.40	332.56	383.72	460.47
Tunstead	129.02	150.52	172.03	193.53	236.54	279.55	322.56	387.07
Upper Sheringham	139.13	162.32	185.51	208.70	255.08	301.46	347.84	417.41
Walcott	135.87	158.52	181.16	203.81	249.10	294.39	339.69	407.62
Walsingham	164.23	191.60	218.98	246.35	301.09	355.84	410.58	492.70
Warham	161.24	188.11	214.99	241.86	295.61	349.36	403.11	483.73
Wells-next-the-Sea	156.19	182.23	208.26	234.29	286.36	338.42	390.49	468.59
Weybourne	146.55	170.98	195.41	219.83	268.69	317.54	366.39	439.67
Wickmere	152.28	177.66	203.04	228.42	279.18	329.94	380.70	456.84
Wighton	137.08	159.93	182.78	205.63	251.32	297.02	342.71	411.26
Witton	133.83	156.13	178.44	200.74	245.35	289.96	334.57	401.49
Wiveton	140.99	164.49	187.99	211.49	258.49	305.49	352.49	422.99
Wood Norton	128.43	149.83	171.24	192.65	235.46	278.27	321.08	385.30
Worstead	127.74	149.03	170.32	191.61	234.19	276.77	319.35	383.22
All Other Parts of the Council's Area	109.08	127.26	145.44	163.62	199.98	236.34	272.70	327.24

being the amounts given by multiplying (as appropriate) the amounts at 5.6(f) or 5.6(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.

That it be **NOTED** that for the year 2023/24 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
Norfolk County Council	1,061.76	1,238.72	1,415.68	1,592.64	1,946.56	2,300.48	2,654
Norfolk Police and Crime Commissioner	201.96	235.62	269.28	302.94	370.26	437.58	504

5.8 That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 5.6(h) and 5.7 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 2023/24 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	VALUATION BANDS					
	A	B	C	D	E	F
Alby with Thwaite	1,391.99	1,623.98	1,855.98	2,087.98	2,551.98	3,015.97
Aldborough and Thurgarton	1,406.80	1,641.27	1,875.74	2,110.20	2,579.14	3,048.08
Antingham	1,393.13	1,625.32	1,857.50	2,089.69	2,554.07	3,018.45
Ashmanhaugh	1,414.48	1,650.23	1,885.98	2,121.72	2,593.22	3,064.71
Aylmerton	1,396.48	1,629.23	1,861.98	2,094.73	2,560.22	3,025.72
Baconsthorpe	1,424.95	1,662.45	1,899.94	2,137.43	2,612.42	3,087.41
Bacton	1,395.24	1,627.78	1,860.32	2,092.86	2,557.94	3,023.02
Barsham	1,394.41	1,626.81	1,859.21	2,091.61	2,556.42	3,021.22
Barton Turf	1,395.55	1,628.14	1,860.73	2,093.32	2,558.51	3,023.69
Beckham East/West	1,397.78	1,630.74	1,863.70	2,096.67	2,562.59	3,028.52
Beeston Regis	1,394.02	1,626.36	1,858.70	2,091.03	2,555.71	3,020.38
Binham	1,401.21	1,634.74	1,868.28	2,101.82	2,568.89	3,035.96
Blakeney	1,427.82	1,665.79	1,903.76	2,141.74	2,617.68	3,093.62
Bodham	1,411.74	1,647.04	1,882.33	2,117.62	2,588.20	3,058.79
Bringham	1,393.56	1,625.82	1,858.08	2,090.34	2,554.86	3,019.38
Brinton	1,400.44	1,633.84	1,867.25	2,100.66	2,567.47	3,034.29
Briston	1,415.71	1,651.67	1,887.62	2,123.57	2,595.48	3,067.39
Catfield	1,400.07	1,633.41	1,866.76	2,100.10	2,566.79	3,033.49
Cley	1,401.64	1,635.25	1,868.85	2,102.46	2,569.68	3,036.89
Colby	1,429.26	1,667.47	1,905.68	2,143.89	2,620.31	3,096.73
Corpusty and Saxthorpe	1,414.31	1,650.03	1,885.74	2,121.46	2,592.90	3,064.34
Cromer	1,437.78	1,677.41	1,917.05	2,156.68	2,635.94	3,115.20
Dilham	1,396.90	1,629.72	1,862.53	2,095.35	2,560.98	3,026.62
East Ruston	1,399.14	1,632.33	1,865.52	2,098.71	2,565.09	3,031.47



Edgefield	1,394.64	1,627.08	1,859.52	2,091.96	2,556.85	3,021.73	3,486.61	4,111.11
Erpingham	1,403.37	1,637.26	1,871.16	2,105.05	2,572.84	3,040.63	3,508.42	4,232.82
Fakenham	1,432.77	1,671.56	1,910.36	2,149.16	2,626.75	3,104.34	3,581.93	4,254.53
Felbrigg	1,416.04	1,652.05	1,888.06	2,124.07	2,596.08	3,068.10	3,540.11	4,216.24
Felmingham	1,379.01	1,608.85	1,838.69	2,068.52	2,528.19	2,987.87	3,447.54	4,178.05
Field Dalling	1,402.81	1,636.61	1,870.41	2,104.22	2,571.82	3,039.42	3,507.03	4,229.76
Fulmodeston	1,401.80	1,635.44	1,869.07	2,102.70	2,569.97	3,037.24	3,504.51	4,227.87
Gimingham	1,408.46	1,643.20	1,877.94	2,112.69	2,582.17	3,051.66	3,521.15	4,240.38
Great Snoring	1,421.23	1,658.11	1,894.98	2,131.85	2,605.60	3,079.35	3,553.09	4,262.19
Gresham	1,405.60	1,639.87	1,874.13	2,108.40	2,576.93	3,045.47	3,514.00	4,235.71
Gunthorpe	1,387.24	1,618.45	1,849.65	2,080.86	2,543.28	3,005.69	3,468.11	4,197.42
Hanworth	1,390.24	1,621.95	1,853.65	2,085.36	2,548.77	3,012.19	3,475.60	4,204.93
Happisburgh	1,382.58	1,613.01	1,843.44	2,073.87	2,534.74	2,995.60	3,456.46	4,188.79
Helhoughton	1,431.93	1,670.59	1,909.24	2,147.90	2,625.21	3,102.52	3,579.83	4,251.54
Hempstead	1,405.12	1,639.30	1,873.49	2,107.68	2,576.05	3,044.42	3,512.80	4,238.61
Hempton	1,436.90	1,676.38	1,915.87	2,155.35	2,634.32	3,113.28	3,592.25	4,285.16
Hickling	1,389.64	1,621.25	1,852.85	2,084.46	2,547.67	3,010.89	3,474.10	4,191.41
High Kelling	1,398.60	1,631.71	1,864.81	2,097.91	2,564.11	3,030.31	3,496.52	4,213.83
Hindolveston	1,413.93	1,649.59	1,885.24	2,120.90	2,592.21	3,063.52	3,534.83	4,246.34
Hindringham	1,396.27	1,628.99	1,861.70	2,094.41	2,559.84	3,025.26	3,490.69	4,207.90
Holkham	1,400.23	1,633.61	1,866.98	2,100.35	2,567.10	3,033.84	3,500.59	4,217.80
Holt	1,428.01	1,666.01	1,904.02	2,142.02	2,618.03	3,094.03	3,570.04	4,254.05
Honing	1,385.23	1,616.10	1,846.97	2,077.84	2,539.59	3,001.33	3,463.07	4,184.58
Horning	1,395.98	1,628.64	1,861.31	2,093.97	2,559.30	3,024.62	3,489.95	4,206.00
Horsey	1,391.65	1,623.59	1,855.53	2,087.48	2,551.36	3,015.24	3,479.13	4,200.37
Hoveton	1,422.36	1,659.42	1,896.48	2,133.54	2,607.66	3,081.78	3,555.90	4,271.11
Ingham	1,383.38	1,613.95	1,844.51	2,075.08	2,536.21	2,997.34	3,458.47	4,186.98
Ingworth	1,420.00	1,656.66	1,893.33	2,130.00	2,603.33	3,076.67	3,550.00	4,260.00
Itteringham	1,400.64	1,634.08	1,867.52	2,100.96	2,567.84	3,034.72	3,501.60	4,219.20
Kelling	1,415.65	1,651.59	1,887.53	2,123.48	2,595.36	3,067.25	3,539.13	4,241.75
Kettlestone	1,401.71	1,635.33	1,868.95	2,102.57	2,569.81	3,037.05	3,504.28	4,226.83
Knapton	1,401.03	1,634.54	1,868.04	2,101.55	2,568.56	3,035.57	3,502.58	4,225.96
Langham	1,405.19	1,639.39	1,873.59	2,107.79	2,576.19	3,044.59	3,512.98	4,239.17
Lessingham	1,385.87	1,616.85	1,847.83	2,078.80	2,540.76	3,002.72	3,464.68	4,189.09
Letheringsett with Glandford	1,383.55	1,614.15	1,844.74	2,075.33	2,536.52	2,997.71	3,458.89	4,188.11
Little Barningham	1,383.43	1,614.00	1,844.58	2,075.15	2,536.29	2,997.44	3,458.58	4,187.82
Little Snoring	1,410.63	1,645.73	1,880.84	2,115.94	2,586.15	3,056.36	3,526.57	4,251.18
Ludham	1,391.16	1,623.02	1,854.88	2,086.74	2,550.46	3,014.18	3,477.90	4,203.41
Matlaske	1,395.94	1,628.60	1,861.26	2,093.92	2,559.23	3,024.55	3,489.87	4,215.38
Melton Constable	1,423.54	1,660.80	1,898.06	2,135.31	2,609.83	3,084.34	3,558.86	4,273.17
Mundesley	1,429.73	1,668.02	1,906.31	2,144.60	2,621.18	3,097.76	3,574.33	4,281.66
Neatishead	1,401.28	1,634.82	1,868.37	2,101.92	2,569.01	3,036.11	3,503.20	4,228.31

North Walsham	1,442.06	1,682.40	1,922.75	2,163.09	2,643.78	3,124.46	3,605.15	4,311.81
Northrepps	1,406.45	1,640.86	1,875.27	2,109.68	2,578.50	3,047.31	3,516.13	4,221.96
Overstrand	1,413.78	1,649.41	1,885.04	2,120.67	2,591.93	3,063.19	3,534.45	4,232.11
Paston	1,425.38	1,662.95	1,900.51	2,138.07	2,613.20	3,088.33	3,563.46	4,242.26
Plumstead	1,413.53	1,649.12	1,884.71	2,120.29	2,591.47	3,062.65	3,533.83	4,232.11
Potter Heigham	1,399.52	1,632.77	1,866.02	2,099.28	2,565.78	3,032.29	3,498.80	4,202.66
Pudding Norton	1,416.15	1,652.17	1,888.20	2,124.22	2,596.27	3,068.32	3,540.37	4,242.26
Raynham	1,400.69	1,634.14	1,867.59	2,101.04	2,567.93	3,034.83	3,501.73	4,212.81
Roughton	1,397.06	1,629.90	1,862.74	2,095.59	2,561.27	3,026.96	3,492.65	4,202.66
Runton (East & West)	1,386.53	1,617.62	1,848.71	2,079.80	2,541.98	3,004.16	3,466.34	4,172.81
Ryburgh	1,411.81	1,647.11	1,882.41	2,117.72	2,588.32	3,058.92	3,529.53	4,232.11
Salthouse	1,406.70	1,641.15	1,875.60	2,110.05	2,578.95	3,047.85	3,516.76	4,222.26
Scottow	1,402.43	1,636.17	1,869.91	2,103.65	2,571.13	3,038.61	3,506.08	4,212.81
Sculthorpe	1,395.18	1,627.71	1,860.24	2,092.77	2,557.83	3,022.89	3,487.95	4,202.66
Sea Palling	1,418.10	1,654.45	1,890.80	2,127.15	2,599.86	3,072.56	3,545.26	4,242.26
Sheringham	1,444.01	1,684.68	1,925.35	2,166.01	2,647.35	3,128.69	3,610.03	4,311.81
Sidestrand	1,398.12	1,631.15	1,864.17	2,097.19	2,563.23	3,029.28	3,495.32	4,202.66
Skeyton	1,381.24	1,611.44	1,841.65	2,071.86	2,532.27	2,992.68	3,453.10	4,172.81
Sloley	1,399.60	1,632.87	1,866.14	2,099.40	2,565.94	3,032.47	3,499.01	4,202.66
Smallburgh	1,393.71	1,626.00	1,858.28	2,090.57	2,555.14	3,019.71	3,484.29	4,202.66
Southrepps	1,405.69	1,639.97	1,874.25	2,108.53	2,577.10	3,045.66	3,514.23	4,212.81
Stalham	1,480.69	1,727.47	1,974.26	2,221.04	2,714.60	3,208.17	3,701.73	4,411.81
Stibbard	1,432.61	1,671.37	1,910.14	2,148.91	2,626.45	3,103.98	3,581.52	4,242.26
Stiffkey	1,410.72	1,645.84	1,880.96	2,116.09	2,586.33	3,056.57	3,526.81	4,232.11
Stody	1,409.14	1,643.99	1,878.85	2,113.71	2,583.42	3,053.14	3,522.85	4,232.11
Suffield	1,390.00	1,621.66	1,853.33	2,085.00	2,548.33	3,011.67	3,475.00	4,202.66
Sustead	1,392.36	1,624.42	1,856.48	2,088.54	2,552.67	3,016.79	3,480.91	4,202.66
Sutton	1,399.99	1,633.33	1,866.66	2,099.99	2,566.66	3,033.33	3,499.99	4,202.66
Swafield	1,405.96	1,640.28	1,874.61	2,108.94	2,577.59	3,046.24	3,514.90	4,212.81
Swanton Abbott	1,404.22	1,638.26	1,872.30	2,106.34	2,574.42	3,042.49	3,510.57	4,212.81
Swanton Novers	1,441.88	1,682.19	1,922.51	2,162.82	2,643.45	3,124.08	3,604.71	4,311.81
Tattersett	1,380.36	1,610.42	1,840.48	2,070.54	2,530.66	2,990.78	3,450.90	4,172.81
Thornage	1,404.55	1,638.64	1,872.74	2,106.83	2,575.01	3,043.20	3,511.39	4,212.81
Thorpe Market	1,405.89	1,640.20	1,874.52	2,108.83	2,577.46	3,046.10	3,514.73	4,212.81
Thursford	1,401.16	1,634.69	1,868.21	2,101.74	2,568.79	3,035.85	3,502.90	4,212.81
Trimingham	1,427.76	1,665.73	1,903.69	2,141.65	2,617.57	3,093.49	3,569.42	4,242.26
Trunch	1,417.21	1,653.41	1,889.61	2,125.81	2,598.22	3,070.62	3,543.02	4,232.11
Tunstead	1,392.74	1,624.86	1,856.99	2,089.11	2,553.36	3,017.61	3,481.86	4,202.66
Upper Sheringham	1,402.85	1,636.66	1,870.47	2,104.28	2,571.90	3,039.52	3,507.14	4,212.81
Walcott	1,399.59	1,632.86	1,866.12	2,099.39	2,565.92	3,032.45	3,498.99	4,202.66
Walsingham	1,427.95	1,665.94	1,903.94	2,141.93	2,617.91	3,093.90	3,569.88	4,242.26
Warham	1,424.96	1,662.45	1,899.95	2,137.44	2,612.43	3,087.42	3,562.41	4,242.26
Wells-next-the-Sea	1,419.91	1,656.57	1,893.22	2,129.87	2,603.18	3,076.48	3,549.79	4,232.11

Weybourne	1,410.27	1,645.32	1,880.37	2,115.41	2,585.51	3,055.60	3,525.69	4,2
Wickmere	1,416.00	1,652.00	1,888.00	2,124.00	2,596.00	3,068.00	3,540.00	4,2
Wighton	1,400.80	1,634.27	1,867.74	2,101.21	2,568.14	3,035.08	3,502.01	4,2
Witton	1,397.55	1,630.47	1,863.40	2,096.32	2,562.17	3,028.02	3,493.87	4,1
Wiveton	1,404.71	1,638.83	1,872.95	2,107.07	2,575.31	3,043.55	3,511.79	4,2
Wood Norton	1,392.15	1,624.17	1,856.20	2,088.23	2,552.28	3,016.33	3,480.38	4,1
Worstead	1,391.46	1,623.37	1,855.28	2,087.19	2,551.01	3,014.83	3,478.65	4,1
All Other Parts of the Council's area	1,372.80	1,601.60	1,830.40	2,059.20	2,516.80	2,974.40	3,432.00	4,1

## 124 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2023 - 2024

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 2023/24. It was a legal requirement that Full Council formally signed off the statement.

It was proposed by Cllr T Adams, seconded by Cllr W Fredericks and

### RESOLVED

To adopt the Pay Policy Statement and to publish the statement for 2023/24 on the Council's website.

## 125 PORTFOLIO REPORTS

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

Cllr A Brown, Portfolio Holder for Planning & Enforcement, referred to page 196 and the Glaven Valley Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan. He said he wanted to advise member that the public hearings for Holt and Blakeney would now take place on 9<sup>th</sup> March (both on the same day).

Cllr Dr V Holliday asked Cllr N Lloyd, Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services, how and why a resident had died of Leptospirosis following a rat infestation in their property. Cllr Lloyd replied that this was a very sad incident. There was an extensive infestation which resulted in a case of Weil's disease. It had been reported to the Council but the matter was being dealt with by a commercial company which was dealing with the infestation. Cllr Lloyd said that support was being provided to the affected family.

Cllr N Pearce asked Cllr R Kershaw, Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Growth, for more information on how the first tranche of the UK Shared Prosperity Fund would be dispersed. Cllr Kershaw replied that the late delivery of the first tranche would be

allowed to roll over into year two. He said the Council had received confirmation that its investment plan was approved and work was underway with the panel, which included both local MPs and stakeholders, to begin working on the delivery mechanism. Cllr Kershaw said that the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) would be distributing funds and ensuring that there would be no cross-over with other local authorities. Consultation with businesses would commence soon.

Cllr S Penfold asked Cllr A Brown to provide more information on how the proposed Joint Venture company which was being established to deliver mitigation against the impact of nutrient neutrality. Cllr Brown replied that the intention was to establish a company with other affected Norfolk authorities and Anglian Water to invest in environmental credits to sell to developers who wished to 'unlock' sites affected by nutrient neutrality. There was still work to do regarding how the funds would be divided up, there were several possible options that could be considered, although it was likely that priority would be given to minor developments as these could be delivered quickly. He said that a report would be going to Cabinet on 6<sup>th</sup> March, setting out more detail. More work needed to be undertaken on how credit 'banking' could be avoided. It was anticipated that sites could be unlocked for development in the next couple of months.

Cllr M Taylor asked Cllr Lloyd about missed bin collections. He made reference to a resident in his ward whose brown (garden) bin had been missed three times. Given that residents paid for this service, Cllr Taylor wondered whether the Council was able to provide compensation. He also asked Cllr Lloyd to confirm how much the Council had collected in fines from Serco (the waste collection service) for missed collections. Cllr Lloyd said that payments from Serco only applied if they did not collect bins the day after they were reported as missed. In the vast majority of cases, the bins were collected on the next day. He said that he would provide a written update with the figure. Cllr Lloyd said that he was disappointed with Serco's performance. However, the cost of a brown bin was approximately £50 a year, for a fortnightly collection, so the administration costs for offering any compensation did not add up. Cllr Taylor sought clarification that the mechanism was in place to fine Serco but the amount of compensation that could be offered was so small, it wasn't worth it. Cllr Lloyd concurred.

Cllr P Heinrich asked Cllr Brown about the tight deadline of 3<sup>rd</sup> March for responding to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) consultation and any implications this may have for the Planning Policy team. Cllr Brown replied that the Council was duty bound to respond. He said the proposals were broadly positive and there were some significant changes that would impact on the Council's Local Plan, resulting in some adjustments if it was approved. He said the main alteration was to the housing delivery test and the methodology that would have to be adopted to comply with this. There was also a proposed change to supplementary planning documents in that they would no longer just be material considerations but would form part of the Local Plan. However, the major concern for NNDC, was that there was a legacy from the White Paper, proposing that decision-making is taken away from local councils and a 'pattern book' of local development was adopted instead and this was one of the key issues that the Council would be feeding back on in response to the consultation.

Cllr G Mancini-Boyle asked Cllr N Lloyd about the Council's decarbonisation ambitions and whether it was simply virtue signalling to state a target of 2030. He said unless the fuel in the waste collection vehicles was changed and all council owned buildings were decarbonised, it would never be achieved. He said changing light bulbs and planting trees was not enough. He asked why textile collections were

not offered as part of the waste service and if any of this work had been costed up at all and how would it be paid for. Cllr Lloyd said he took offence at the suggestion that the Council's Net Zero pledge was virtue signalling. The portfolio holder report to Full Council was just a summary of projects that officers had been working on in recent weeks. He said that he was fully aware that changing lightbulbs would not help the Council reach its target. There was a wide range of aspects which were set out comprehensively in the Net Zero Action Plan. The first few years of costings were included in the action plan, but beyond that it was hard to predict, especially when rising inflation was factored in. In terms of decarbonisation, all of the issues mentioned by Cllr Mancini-Boyle would have to be tackled. This included decarbonisation of council buildings and moving away from fossil fuels. In 2028/2029, as the target date of 2030 approached, a decision would have to be taken as to whether the Council was on track or whether off-setting need to be considered. As it currently stood, it was anticipated that this would not be necessary. Cllr Lloyd concluded by saying that he did not like Cllr Mancini-Boyle's comment regarding tree planting. The value in trees was about well-being, health and biodiversity. It was a good thing to do and that was why the Council was doing it. Cllr Mancini-Boyle asked to come back with a response, however, the Chairman would not allow it.

The Chairman concluded the meeting by reminding members that there was an Extra-ordinary meeting of Full Council on 1<sup>st</sup> March to discuss the submission of the Draft Local Plan.

**126 QUESTIONS RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS**

**127 OPPOSITION BUSINESS**

**128 NOTICE(S) OF MOTION**

**129 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**130 PRIVATE BUSINESS**

The meeting ended at Time Not Specified.

---

Chairman