

CABINET

Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on Monday, 11 July 2022 at the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 10.00 am

Committee

Members Present:

Mrs W Fredericks
Ms V Gay
Mr N Lloyd
Mr T Adams (Chair)

Mrs A Fitch-Tillett
Mr R Kershaw
Mr E Seward
Mr A Brown

Members also attending:

Cllr C Cushing
Cllr J Rest
Cllr E Withington

Officers in Attendance:

Chief Executive, Democratic Services Manager, Assistant Director for Finance, Assets, Legal & Monitoring Officer, Director for Communities and Corporate Business Manager

Apologies for Absence:

Cllr T Adams

19 CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

Cllr R Kershaw welcomed members to the meeting. He said that he would be chairing the meeting as the Leader, Cllr Adams, was currently on paternity leave. He welcomed Cllr Brown as the new Portfolio Holder for Planning & Enforcement and thank Cllr Toye for his hard work and dedication to the role previously.

20 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 6th June were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman, subject to the following amendment to Minute 8: Recommendations from Cabinet Working Parties – it should state 'Glaven Valley Villages Conservation Area Appraisals'.

21 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

None received.

22 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None received.

23 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received.

24 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

The Chairman advised members that they could ask questions as matters arose during the meeting.

25 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Cllr Dixon, was unable to attend the meeting and had sent his apologies. Members were advised that the following three matters were reported to Cabinet report for information only. Neither was a formal recommendation:

MANAGING PERFORMANCE QUARTER 4 AND CUMULATIVELY FOR 2021/2022

1. To revise and present new performance management framework data focusing on outcomes/issues and/or exceptions reporting and present at the September O&S meeting.
2. To review the new performance management framework and agree on key outcomes/issues or exceptions reporting at September O&S meeting.

NNDC PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKING

1. Use the CIPFA nearest neighbours comparator group.
2. Report on a quarterly basis at the same time as the performance reporting.
3. Seven key benchmarking areas to be included in the initial report as laid out in appendix 1.
4. Performance areas are reviewed on a six-monthly basis.

ENFORCEMENT UPDATE - JUNE 2022

1. To request that Members are notified of all major enforcement action taken, or any significant progress made on cases within their wards, as outlined in the Member-Officer Protocol.

26 OFFICER DELEGATED DECISIONS - MAY TO JUNE 2022

The Democratic Services Manager introduced this item. She explained that it was a statutory report, detailing the decisions taken senior officers under delegated powers between May and June 2022. There were just two decisions to report to members at the current time. They would be reported to the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and then published on the website.

Cllr Seward said that he welcomed the publication of this information on the website as it aided full transparency of the decisions taken by the Council.

It was agreed to note the report.

27 LEVELLING UP FUND ROUND 2 - SUBMISSION OF BIDS

The Chairman explained that there were two bids and they would be outlined separately to members. He invited the Corporate Director for Communities to introduce the bid for Fakenham. He outlined the background to the Levelling Up

Fund, round two for which North Norfolk was a priority area. Bids were based on Parliamentary constituency areas and therefore the Council was submitting two bids – one for the Broadland constituency and one for the North Norfolk constituency. He explained that there had been a delay in submission of the bids due to technical issues with the portal. The original deadline of 6th July had therefore been postponed to an unspecified date. The special meeting of Cabinet that had been scheduled for 4th July to consider the bids ahead of the original deadline, had therefore been cancelled and the bids were now being brought forward to the scheduled July meeting.

He then outlined the bid for Fakenham which proposed an extension to the current Council-owned leisure centre to allow for construction of a 25m, 4 lane swimming pool which would include a moving floor to provide learning facilities and associated wet side changing rooms and changes to the existing internal structure and extension to provide a new fitness suite. In addition, there would be provision of a 3G pitch to the north of the existing centre. The Corporate Director for Communities then shared several slides outlining the proposals and the site plan. He added that several carbon reduction measures were being included as part of the bid.

In terms of preparation for the bid, the Council had used FMG, who had provided support for the designs of the Reef Leisure Centre in Sheringham. They were very experienced in this sector. There had been extensive engagement with stakeholders and over 1000 responses to the public consultation, almost all were overwhelmingly positive. Regarding cost, he said that there was an indicative figure of just over £10m of investment, with a 10% match-funding contribution, made up of money from Fakenham Town Council, Football Foundation funding (towards the 3G pitch) and NNDC making up the difference. He explained that FMG had undertaken a business planning process and suggested that there would be a small additional cost in addition to the current operating costs of the leisure centre.

The Chairman thanked him for his presentation and clarified that if the Council was not successful in the bids for funding that the projects would not go ahead. He thanked the officers for working so hard against an unrealistic timescale.

Cllr N Lloyd reiterated the Chairman's comments and thanked officers for their exceptional work on both bids.

Cllr L Shires sought clarification regarding as to whether Broadland District Council had also submitted a bid to the Levelling Up fund – as the constituency boundary cut through both districts. The Director for Communities replied that they had not as Broadland was a Priority 3 Area. He added that the MP, Jerome Mayhew, supported the Fakenham bid.

Cllr A Brown said that he echoed the thanks to officers for their hard work against a challenging timescale. He then asked if it would be a competition standard swimming pool. The Director for Communities replied that it would be built to Swim England standards and would have 4 lanes.

The Chairman then invited the Chief Executive to introduce the second bid which was for Cromer.

The Chief Executive explained that the Cromer proposals were a programme of investment in the public open space and related infrastructure of Cromer's clifftop gardens and wild spaces, based on increasing the accessibility, health and wellbeing of local residents and visitors to the town, complementing wider investment made by the District Council over many years in Cromer Pier, the promenades and town

centre. He outlined the proposals in detail and said that there would be a focus on increasing accessibility and supporting mobility, especially for older people. The town had a lot of houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) and small cottages with no outdoor space and these proposals would provide access to a range of attractive open spaces. He concluded by saying that with North Norfolk being a Priority 1 area, it was felt to be a strong proposal, although it should be acknowledged that construction cost inflation was a concern and could prove challenging. He concluded by outlining the costs and said that if Cabinet endorsed the principles of the two bids, a further report would be presented to Full Council on 27th July, seeking approval for the Council's financial contribution towards the projects (if successful in receiving Government funding).

The Chairman thanked the Chief Executive for his presentation and said that the public areas in Cromer were due an overhaul and a successful bid would take the pressure off other public areas in North Norfolk.

Cllr V Gay said that she supported the Fakenham bid and said that she had previously had some concerns that the Cromer bid was made up of several disparate parts. However, having seen the presentation and the pulling together of the various open spaces and public areas under the umbrella of the 'Gem of the Norfolk coast' it was now much clearer that they formed a series of linked landscapes and the bid was about 'knitting' them together and reinforcing the District's existing investment into Cromer and making these areas more appealing and accessible to residents and visitors.

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett commented that caution should be exercised around the cliff top paths. Laying hard surfacing could cause more rubble to fall.

Cllr J Rest referred to previous, unsuccessful proposals to construct a car park in North Lodge park, Cromer. He said that it would generate significant revenue for the Council and could offset some of the costs. The Chief Executive replied that there had not been any public support for the proposals when they had come forward previously. The bid proposed to expand on the Runton Road car park offer and he said it was about striking a balance between the historic townscape and North Lodge Park. He added that as part of the bid submission process, the Council was asked if there were any objections to the proposals from the local community and the inclusion of a car park was likely to generate considerable opposition.

Cllr E Withington said that she welcomed the Cromer bid. She said that she felt that signage could be improved in the town as people did not always know where they were. It could help in pulling the overall vision together. The Chief Executive agreed that it was crucial and said that it had been included in the proposition. He said that signage was currently skewed towards Runton Road as this was the main car park and adjacent to the key areas of interest in the town. He explained that officers had considered the wider narrative and whether the cliff top gardens proposal could be linked to Sheringham and Mundesley but the guidance was clear that it must be geographically and thematically focussed. He concluded by saying that the bid process was highly competitive but because of the constituency boundary issue, they were not in direct competition with each other.

Cllr N Lloyd said that he would suggest a cherry tree walk would enhance the proposed planting scheme and would attract visitors to the area. The Chief Executive replied that there were some challenges planting certain species in a maritime environment but he would take it away for further consideration if the bid was successful.

It was proposed by Cllr V Gay, seconded by Cllr L Shires and

RESOLVED

To endorse the Council's submissions for Cromer and Fakenham for round two of the Government's Levelling up Fund

Reason for the decision:

1. To inform Members about the second round of the Levelling Up Fund (LUF)
2. To seek Members endorsement of the submission of two bids, ahead of any capital budget approval, if the bids are successful

28 LONG LEASE AT MUNDESLEY PROMENADE AND DISPOSAL OF LAND AT BEESTON PUTTING GREEN, SHERINGHAM

Cllr E Seward, Portfolio Holder for Finance & Assets, introduced this item. He explained that the report outlined two transactions relating to the Council's land portfolio. The first related to a 50 year lease for the Mundesley Inshore Lifeboat and the second to the disposal of land to Sheringham Town Council for continued use as the Beeston Putting Green.

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett said that she welcomed and supported the proposals regarding Mundesley Lifeboat, they provided a vital service for that section of the coast.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr A Fitch-Tillett and

RESOLVED

To approve the following two property transactions as outlined in this report and the exempt appendix:

1. 50 year lease of land for inshore lifeboat at Mundesley Promenade
2. Disposal of land at Beeston Putting Green, Sheringham.

Reason for the decision:

For the continuation of community services within the district.

29 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

30 PRIVATE BUSINESS

The meeting ended at 10.52 am.

Chairman