

CABINET

Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on Monday 05 September 2017 at the Council Offices, Holt Road, Cromer at 10.00am

Members Present:

Mrs S Arnold	Mr W Northam
Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds	Mrs J Oliver
Mr N Dixon	Miss B Palmer
Mr T FitzPatrick(Chairman)	Mr R Price
Mr J Lee	Ms M Prior

Also attending:

Mrs S Butikofer	Mr N Smith
Mrs G Perry-Warnes	Mr R Shepherd
Mr B Smith	Ms K Ward
Mr N Pearce	Mr J Rest
Mr R Reynolds	Mrs A Fitch-Tillett

Officers in Attendance:

The Corporate Directors, the Monitoring Officer, the Head of Finance and Asset Management, the Chief Technical Accountant, the Policy & Performance Management Officer, the Major Projects Manager, the Health and Communities Team Leader, the Democratic Services Manager and the Democratic Services Officer.

Also in Attendance: David Bale, Eastern Daily Press and Mike Liggins, BBC Look East

Public Speakers:

For Agenda Item 12: Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Development

Mr William Horabin (on behalf of the Friends of North Norfolk), Katie Taylor, Ray Pearce, Beverley Wigg and Peter Solomon.

For Agenda Item 14 Itteringham Community Shop

Mrs Paddy Seligman and Mr Nigel Clifford.

The meeting was chaired by the Leader who welcomed the press, media and members of the public. He informed Members that the press and BBC wished to record the proceedings and that he had agreed to this. Because the press, BBC and public were present for items 12 (Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Development) and 14 (Itteringham Community Shop), they would be taken earlier in the meeting, rather than in the order in which they appeared on the agenda.

34. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None

35. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 03 July 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

36. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Public questions were received on items 12 (Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Development) and 14 (Itteringham Community Shop).

The Corporate Director (SB) responded to questions on Hornsea Project Three Offshore Wind Development:

- a) The Council's proposed response to the Section 48 consultation on DONG Energy's proposed Hornsea Project Three offshore wind development at item 12 of the agenda had been made on the basis of DONG Energy being made a grid connection offer from National Grid at Norwich Main. Separate to the DONG Energy Hornsea Project Three proposal, another company, Vattenfall, had been offered a grid connection for their proposed Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas developments at Necton, meaning that the two onshore cable routes would cross each other near to Reepham. This gave the impression to the public that the schemes were not co-ordinated.
- b) Recognising these concerns the Leader of the Council had written to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy in November of 2016 asking that the Government took a more strategic approach to facilitating connections of new offshore wind generation into the National Grid infrastructure.
- c) This correspondence had resulted in a meeting between the Leader and Corporate Director (SB) with a senior official at National Grid in March of this year, when it was explained that there was little opportunity for National Grid infrastructure to be extended into North Norfolk so as to provide a more co-ordinated connection for the Hornsea Project Three and Norfolk Vanguard and Boreas schemes into the National Grid. This was because any proposals to extend overhead pylons and power cables would be expected to meet with significant public opposition and planning / public inquiry processes which would create significant uncertainty for the offshore wind companies.
- d) The Leader of the Council had informed the official from National Grid of the somewhat perverse situation which the District faced in seeing large volumes of new electricity generated from offshore wind developments crossing the district, whilst at the same time there were constraints in the capacity of the local electricity distribution networks serving the east of the North Norfolk District which was limiting economic and housing growth. The National Grid official he advised that he recognised the Council's frustration in this regard, but that it would be necessary for the Council to take up these concerns with the local network distribution operator UK Power Networks.
- e) To date the District Council had been supportive of the principle of offshore wind developments and the earlier Sheringham Shoal and Dudgeon schemes had had no long-term negative impact on the District from the laying of the onshore cables. Further the Operations and Maintenance facilities in support of the Sheringham Shoal development had created up to 100 new jobs at Egmere and Wells-next-the-Sea. However, the developments now proposed would involve lasting impacts on the local landscape through the development of booster or relay stations, potentially involved extended or protracted construction programmes and offer few, if any, wider or long term benefits to the area through additional jobs etc. In this respect the Council was concerned that local communities in North Norfolk would potentially experience significant disruption /

inconvenience through the schemes without any of the benefits of such developments.

- f) In terms of landscape and cumulative impact, the Council view was that the Hornsea Project Three scheme would have a generally benign long-term impact on the District except for the proposed booster station, although the site identified for this installation was the least harmful of the three sites considered and officers felt that this facility could be contained with the landscape through sensitive siting and screening
- g) In terms of potential health implications of electro-magnetic fields: the Corporate Director (SB) suggested that the Council should seek further advice on this. However, health implications of underground cables were not proven and there was a duty on the District Council to appraise the outlined options.
- h) Impact on communities: the Council would further lobby the Government in respect of compensation payment awards.

37. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

38. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

39. MEMBERS QUESTIONS

The Leader confirmed that Members could ask questions as each item arose.

40. CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE CABINET BY THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE OR COUNCIL FOR RECONSIDERATION

None

41. CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS FROM THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

None

42. PLANNING POLICY AND BUILT HERITAGE WORKING PARTY

This item was introduced by the Portfolio Holder, Mrs S Arnold, who asked that the fishing industry should be included in the document.

RESOLVED

1. Agenda Item 7: Norfolk Strategic Framework Consultation:

That the Council submits the comments in Table 1 of this report as its response to the consultation.

2. Agenda Item 8: Planning for Health Protocol

That the Council approves the Planning for Health Protocol

43. BUDGET MONITORING REPORT 2017/18 – PERIOD 4

The report was introduced by the portfolio holder, Mr W Northam. It summarised the budget monitoring position for the revenue account and capital programme to the end of July 2017. The overall position at the end of July 2017 showed an under spend of £857,491 to date for the current financial year on the revenue account, this was currently expected to deliver a full year under spend of £91,185. It was an achievement to be able to forecast an underspend and thanks were due to our finance officers.

It was proposed by Mr Northam, seconded by Mr T FitzPatrick and

RESOLVED

- 1. Cabinet note the contents of the report and the current budget monitoring position;**
- 2. Recommend the release of £45,000 from previously identified Digital Transformation Funding to enable the extension of the Business Process review team leader.**

44. MANAGING PERFORMANCE Q1 2017/18

The report was presented by the Leader.

The majority of the 71 activities were on track or ahead of plan (58) and four activities had been completed successfully. Six activities were having some problems, one needed attention/was off track, one activity was on hold and one had not started. The 71 activities reported on included 63 from the Annual Action Plan 2017/18 and eight activities from the Annual Action Plan 2016/17 that were not completed last year. Performance was being closely monitored, particularly for the activities where issues or problems had been identified (seven).

Work was being done on streamlining the report and improving the way information was presented.

It was proposed by Mr T FitzPatrick, seconded by Miss B Palmer and

RESOLVED

- 1. That Cabinet notes this report, welcomes the progress being made and endorses the actions laid out in Appendix 1 being taken by management where there are areas of concern.**
- 2. That Cabinet approve the removal of the Economic Growth performance indicators J 023 and J 024 for the reasons given in Section 2 of this report.**

45. HORNSEA PROJECT THREE OFFSHORE WIND DEVELOPMENT

The report was presented by the portfolio holder, Mrs S Arnold, who thanked officers for a full and excellent report. She also thanked the members of the public for their contributions. She proposed two additions to the recommendation:

- 1. Seek advice regarding potential health implications of underground cables on the local community.**
- 2. Lobby the Government for clarity over its position on whether offshore wind developments should adopt the High Voltage Direct Current transmission system**

rather than High Voltage Alternating Current system, the latter of which requires the provision of offshore and onshore booster or relay stations.

She also suggested that the Government should be lobbied so that any Contract for Difference awards should allow developments to be built out in a single phase so as to minimise the impact of cable corridor engineering works on local communities

Mr N Dixon seconded the proposal. He commended the public speakers for raising points that the Council would want to pursue, especially as there would be further projects at a later date. The present scheme was positive and the Council's response was very measured.

Discussion:

- a) Mr R Price endorsed the report. He said that National Grid was a profit-making company and a way should be found to bring the infrastructure further into North Norfolk.
- b) Mrs G Perry-Warnes agreed that the Direct Current option needed to be explored as it was more environmentally friendly. She asked that access proposals should be announced in advance and that disruption to local communities should be compensated.
- c) The Corporate Director (SB) explained that the recommendation concerned how the Council should respond to this Section 48 consultation on the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report for the DONG Energy Hornsea Project Three proposal. There would be further opportunities for the Council to comment on the detail of the proposal in the 2nd quarter of 2018 when the Development Consent Order application would be submitted. DONG Energy had considered 3 sites for the onshore booster station facility and the proposed location was the most southerly site and officers believed it would have least impact on the District. The Council should lobby government harder regarding mitigation of disruption to local communities. It was custom and practice for offshore wind developers to set up and operate a community fund in the long term and the Council should indicate that it would have such expectations around the schemes now being proposed in the district. However the Council should not compromise itself in the short-term, in terms of scrutiny of the proposals, on the basis that there could be community funds available to the area in the future..
- d) Mrs S Butikofer welcomed the additions proposed by the portfolio holder but didn't feel that the recommendation was sufficiently robust, particularly regarding impact on coastal villages. She urged that local businesses should be compensated and informed Members that Norman Lamb MP had made contact with the Government on the matter. She was assured by the Corporate Director (SB) that the Council recognised, and was mindful of, the impact on local communities. Mr D Young, a local Member, had suggested that the route through Kelling might have less impact. The provisional impact assessment was looking at all 3 routes. The Council would seek to minimise the impact.
- e) In response to a question from Mrs Butikofer regarding the impact of construction traffic, the Corporate Director (SB) explained that a construction access management plan would be agreed with Norfolk County Council. NNDC would suggest evening movements of Heavy Goods Vehicles accessing the site and a different route to that previously used in the delivery of the Dudgeon cable route, although options were limited in the Weybourne area.
- f) Mr J Lee expressed appreciation that the impact on the fishing industry had been considered by the report. Offshore developments were generally built on fishing grounds.
- g) Ms K Ward supported further investigation of the Direct Current option.

- h) The Corporate Director (SB) informed Members that a similar report would be made in October or November when Vattenfall submitted their proposals for the Norfolk Vanguard scheme.

It was proposed by Mrs S Arnold, seconded by Mr N Dixon and

RESOLVED to

- **Endorse the content of this report as being the Council's formal position and response to the current round of consultation being undertaken in respect of DONG Energy's Hornsea Project Three offshore windfarm development, and**
- **Re-state the Council's ongoing commitment to discuss and negotiate with DONG Energy to achieve the best outcome for North Norfolk from this major development proposal.**
- **Seek advice regarding potential health implications to the local community.**
- **Further explore the Direct Current option.**

46. RESPONSE TO NORTH NORFOLK CONSULTATION – CABINET REPORT

The report was introduced by the portfolio holder, Ms M Prior. She thanked the Health and Communities Team Leader for much background work.

The purpose of the report was to provide a response from North Norfolk District Council (NNDC) to the public consultation and engagement document published by North Norfolk Clinical Commission Group (NNCCG) in respect of Benjamin Court Healthcare Unit. The proposed changes to the Benjamin Court Healthcare Unit would increase specialist inpatient and outpatient services at Benjamin Court. This would benefit residents across North Norfolk. However, the consultation covered all 4 areas in North Norfolk (Kelling Hospital, North Walsham Memorial Hospital, Benjamin Court and Cranmer House) and NNDC would be keeping a watching brief on them all.

The process was ongoing before a final decision was reached. Overall the proposals were supported although further information had been requested and confirmation sought on a number of identified issues.

Mr J Lee seconded the recommendation saying that it was vital to have these services in North Norfolk, with its aging population.

Mr R Reynolds supported the recommendation. He said that Cranmer House was important to Fakenham and he was pleased with the statement that it would not close.

It was proposed by Ms M Prior, seconded by Mr J Lee and

RESOLVED

To approve the response to the consultation document and to ask NNCCG to formally respond to the questions raised in the response.

47. ITTERINGHAM COMMUNITY SHOP

It was reported that, as well as the two public speakers, there had also been a letter of support from a member of the public.

The report was introduced by the portfolio holder, Mrs J Oliver, who proposed the recommendation. She explained that the shop has been in the premises since 1637 and, since 1994, it had been run by the Itteringham Community Association (“the ICA”). More than 20 volunteers from the village were involved. The shop provided an asset which was greatly valued by the community and visitors.

The owners of the shop and house had served notice on the ICA to terminate the lease and the notice was due to expire on 8th October 2017. The parties were currently in dispute in relation to the notice. The shop had also been listed as an Asset of Community Value and this was under appeal by the current owners, who had indicated a willingness to sell Fair Meadow House and the shop. The ICA had commenced fundraising but were unlikely to be able to raise the purchase price for the shop, given the restricted timescales. There had been a significant amount of press coverage, both locally and nationally and it was clear from visiting the village and the large number of “Save Our Shop” posters displayed by homes there, that this was an important issue for Itteringham and the surrounding villages.

The purchase of the community shop and house would represent a prudent investment for the District Council in line with the Council’s Asset Commercialisation Strategy and would maintain the viability of an important community asset. Fairmeadow House was an attractive building in an attractive village and would be suitable for residential and holiday use.

The recommendation was seconded by Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds, who had been responsible for bringing the issue to Cabinet. She told Members that the shop was a lifeline to the community.

Mr N Dixon commended the proposal, saying that the shop was an asset of community value. It was incumbent on the Council to consider if such assets – when at risk – could be maintained. Purchase of the shop would be an example of how the Council could respond to other needs in the future.

Ms K Ward supported the proposal and said that it was important that the Council should be financially sustainable. However, as Chair of Scrutiny, she was concerned about the process and the lack of time for Members to read papers. She spoke of Member concern regarding the underlying policy and the choice of this project above others. The Leader said that the policy had previously been discussed by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee but could be re-visited. The portfolio holder observed that the papers had been published on 24 August 2017 and no Members had contacted her about them.

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services explained to Members that, because the notice was due to expire on 8th October 2017, the matter was urgent. She asked Members to nominate the decision as urgent in accordance with Standing Order 8.13 (a) and (c). This would prevent a call-in which would delay the purchase of the property beyond the date of expiry of the notice.

Mr N Smith said that Itteringham was an isolated village with elderly residents. The shop was an invaluable asset to them. The project would be using Council money to help the community and generate income. Mrs G Perry-Warnes, who asked not to be filmed, supported this. It was a function of the Council to listen to local communities and support their aims. She thanked the Corporate Director (SB) and the Head of Legal and Democratic Services for their work and commended Members to support the project. The Leader informed Members that there had also been a significant amount of work on the project by Cabinet.

It was proposed by Mrs J Oliver, seconded by Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds and

RESOLVED

- 1. That Cabinet agree the purchase of Fair Meadow House and Community Shop on the terms set out in Appendix A to be funded through the Asset Management Reserve.**
- 2. That the decision is deemed urgent in accordance with Standing Order 8.13 (a) and (c)**

The meeting ended at 11.45 am

Chairman