

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

Minutes of a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 17 January 2018 in the Council Chamber, North Norfolk District Council, Holt Road, Cromer at 9.30 am.

Members Present:

Committee: Cllr K Ward (Chairman)

Cllr J English

Cllr V Gay

Cllr S Hester

Cllr M Knowles

Cllr N Lloyd

Cllr R Reynolds

Cllr E Seward

Mr B Smith

Mr N Smith

Officers in Attendance: The Corporate Director (SB), the Corporate Director (NB), the Head of Economic and Community Development, the Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager, the Environmental Services Manager, the Planning Policy Team Leader, the Democratic Services Manager and the Democratic Services Officer.

Members in Attendance: Cllr A Claussen-Reynolds (Portfolio Holder for Waste and Environmental Services), Cllr J Rest, Cllr N Pearce, Cllr S Arnold, Cllr A Fitch-Tillett and Cllr P Grove-Jones.

97. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllr S Bütikofer, Cllr B McGoun, and Mr R Price (Portfolio Holder for Housing).

98. SUBSTITUTES

Mr N Lloyd for Mrs S Bütikofer.

99. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No public questions were received.

100. MINUTES

The minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 13 December 2017 were accepted as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman.

101. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

102. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To be taken, if necessary, at the appropriate item on the Agenda.

103. PETITIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

None

104. CONSIDERATION OF ANY MATTER REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE BY A MEMBER

Beach Huts and Chalets

Beach huts and chalets had been a subject of discussion when the Committee considered Fees and Charges 2018/19 at the December meeting. The Chairman reported that the Head of Finance and Asset Management intended to undertake a more fundamental review of strategy after the budget-setting process. It was proposed to form an Overview and Scrutiny Task and Finish Group to work with him on this. The Chairman would work with the Vice Chair and the Democratic Services Manager on the formation of this Group. Any Members who were interested in being part of it were asked to speak to her.

105. RESPONSES OF THE COUNCIL OR THE CABINET TO THE COMMITTEE'S REPORTS OR RECOMMENDATIONS

None

106. HOUSING STRATEGY UPDATE

The Housing Strategy 2016-2020 was approved by Full Council in November 2016. The Housing Strategy and Housing Strategy Action Plan set out the Council's priorities for housing. It has 2 strands –new homes and existing homes recognising that whilst new supply is important it only represents a small part of the existing supply of homes across the district The Housing Strategy Action Plan is reviewed on a bi-annual basis. The report set out the outcome of the second review of the Action Plan and comments on the link between the Housing Strategy and the Local Plan.

The Action Plan is a live document. A new action in relation to the Communities Housing Fund had been added in May 2017. One of the activities was now complete – the new Community Led Housing team was in place and was actively engaging with parishes and communities in the target area for the Communities Housing Fund.

A new action had been added to respond to opportunities to support housing delivery in North Norfolk. This action was on track, with the Council submitting a bid to the national Housing Infrastructure Fund in September 2017 to support the delivery of 1380 homes in Fakenham on the Fakenham Urban Extension site. The outcome of the bid was awaited, but the announcement was not expected to be made until mid-February.

Questions and Discussion

- a) Mr J Rest asked why a review of the need for and affordability of affordable housing for sale products was on hold. The Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager explained that a new Housing White Paper, which proposed new affordable homeownership products, was awaited. The Head of Paid Service (SB) commented that the White Paper will also have an impact on the Local Plan. The White Paper has been delayed by the General Election. When it was received, the review would take place.
- b) Consider how the Property Investment Strategy and Local Investment Strategy can

support the delivery of new homes of all tenures: in response to a further question from Mr Rest, it was explained that this action referred to market, not affordable, housing. The Grove Lane, Holt site had been recommended by Gleeds for residential development. The Estates and Asset Strategy Manager had explored the investment but returns were considered to be relatively modest and would require taking out some reserves. Interest had since been expressed for a commercial use which would give a greater return. The Council did not have a large retained portfolio of undeveloped land or property and would have to acquire land through the market to pursue direct provision of housing. This linked to the Asset Management Plan which the Committee would be considering further in February. In December, the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had made a recommendation that a local capital property fund should be established for acquiring town centre land. No decision had yet been taken.

- c) Mr N Smith asked if the setting up of a property committee could be revisited. The Corporate Director (SB) said that Members could scrutinise it further, if required, but that – on the basis of modelling done in summer 2016 – a property company didn't appear to be economically viable. The Estates and Asset Strategy Manager had done a lot of work on this. There had since been commercial interest in the Grove Lane site. Another possible site would have been Highfield Road, Fakenham, but this had been a subject of public concern. On 30 October 2017, Cabinet had made the decision that it should be retained as a public car park owned and operated by the District Council. This topic could feed into the discussion on Asset Management in February.
- d) Mr J Rest asked if Right to Acquire (RTA) properties should be included in the Action Plan. The Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager explained that the RTA did not apply to most affordable properties across North Norfolk. The scheme tended to apply to towns. The process sat outside the District Council. RTA discount wasn't significant and didn't necessarily make a property affordable to purchase in the way that the Preserved Right to Buy does.
- e) Mr S Hester asked how long emergency cases were allowed to stay in temporary accommodation and if it was a multi-agency decision about whether they were fit to move on. The Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager explained that people were put in temporary accommodation while the team assessed the Council's level of duty towards them as they are homeless, some clients remain in the temporary accommodation if the Council accepts a Full Duty to them until they can be secured appropriate accommodation. Bed and breakfast accommodation could only be used for up to 6 weeks in an emergency, so most clients are in some form of self-contained temporary accommodation. A two-bedroomed bungalow had been bought to address the need for temporary accommodation, especially for those with restricted mobility. If the Council had a full duty, the team had a role in finding accommodation and help was also given to get people into private rented accommodation. The Head of Paid Service (SB) clarified that supported housing is different to temporary accommodation and residents are supported to be independent, with Norfolk County Council responsible for funding supported housing.
- f) In response to a further question from Mr Hester, the Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager said that affordable homes for sale were advertised through "Your Choice, Your Home" and the main NNDC website. She could talk to the media team about increasing awareness and would take this back as an action. The Chairman asked that there should also be clarity on the website about proposed affordable housing developments. This would help prevent people

from forming a view based on what they'd read in the press.

- g) Procurement of four 2-bedroomed flats: Ms V Gay asked if these properties would meet the need for temporary accommodation. The Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager said that the ground floor flats had been specifically designed to meet accessibility needs. However, the needs of people in temporary accommodation were variable. New legislation would allow the team to work earlier with clients, and to work with a lot more clients. This could increase or decrease the need for temporary accommodation and so the need for temporary accommodation was continually monitored by the Housing Team Leader- Customer Services.
- h) Ms Gay asked if cuts being made by Norfolk County Council, including accommodation for young people, impacted on NNDC. The Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager said that our Housing List gives priority to people in hostels and other supported accommodation when they are ready to do so, enabling them to move on to independence rather than blocking supported facilities.
- i) In a further question, Ms Gay asked about the Early Help Hub. The Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager said that the Hub was based at the NNDC offices and consisted of numerous agencies, including voluntary and statutory agencies, engaging with residents as early as possible to prevent more expensive statutory and health engagements later on. Some residents weren't seeking help early enough and had complex problems, which the Hub had helped to manage. It was a success to get Mental Health engaged in the Hub. The Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager provided an example of how the Hub has successfully been able to address hoarding issues. In March, the Early Help Hub was scheduled to make a presentation to Overview and Scrutiny. The Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager would brief representatives to include housing related aspects.
- j) Mr R Reynolds observed that, based on experiences in his ward, NNDC had a good track record in providing temporary accommodation and housing homeless people.
- k) Community Housing Fund: Mr E Seward asked how many parishes this would be concentrated on and if there would be bidding for further funding this year. The Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager said that the initial focus was on 66 parishes where at least 10% of all properties are second or holiday homes and all these Parish Councils had been contacted. A recent review of second and holiday home data showed that there is now only one parish in North Norfolk where there are no second or holiday homes (previously there were three). There had been community consultation at Trimmingham and one was scheduled in the following week at Sidestrand. It was hoped to bid for funding this year but, at this stage, the criteria were not known. Mr Seward observed that, as the scheme moved forward, it should be whittled down to 6 schemes, given the funding available. The Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager replied that it was for this reason that they were working with communities to get schemes ready. The Team was looking at 4 funding options rather than focusing exclusively on the Community Housing Fund as the only funding source to deliver these vital schemes. The Corporate Director (SB) said that officers had conversations around Cromer, Holt, Blakeney and Wells. The programme was about building community capacity in areas with high numbers of second homes. A board had been set up with King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council and specialist advice was being obtained. As a planning authority, the Council was aware of local opposition

to existing schemes. This posed a real challenge to housing provision.

- l) Mr E Seward said that it was his understanding, as a County Councillor, that NNDC would have greater responsibility for services to the lonely and isolated from April 2018. He asked what this would entail. The Corporate Director (SB) explained that the County Council's budget for Supporting People (advice and support services for vulnerable people) had been reduced. However, such services were not the District Council's responsibility and were the remit of Social Services. This decision by the County Council could lead to unintended consequences which would impact on our housing options team. Two extra people had been employed but it was a challenge to meet the demands made on the Team. In reply to a further question from Mr Seward, he confirmed that people who had once gone to Social Services for advice were now approaching NNDC. The Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager said that a small amount of funding, approximately £50,000 had been given by Norfolk County Council for two years for the purpose of supporting vulnerable people at risk of homelessness. In response to further questions from Mr Seward, it was explained that social prescribing funding was to provide help and advice for people presenting to the doctor with non-health issues. At present it is not clear how this service will be managed but the Team would be happy to manage it if it came to NNDC. The Isolation service would complement social prescribing but would be separate from it. It was not certain, at this stage, if the latter would be a County or locality service.
- m) Disabled Facilities Grant: Mr N Lloyd asked why some of the work had been delayed. The Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager explained that there had been extra work for the Team in focussing on commitment and spend of an increased Disabled Facilities Grant budget in 2016/17 and also this year reflecting a significant increase in spend in 2016/17. This had delayed the work stream. More complex Disabled Facilities Grants were now being dealt with. When adaptations of property were carried out, preventative work also tended to be done to anticipate work that might be needed in the future. The Team aimed for earlier engagement with clients. The Corporate Director (NB) said that £800,000 worth of grants had been approved for this year. The level of performance and complexity had increased in the last 2 years within the same staffing resource.
- n) Mr Lloyd asked what "On hold" indicated. The Housing Strategy and Community Manager said it meant that the work was not currently being actively done but was on the radar.
- o) The Chairman invited the Planning Policy Team Leader to comment on the Strategy with regards to the Local Plan. He informed the Committee that the Team were looking at the time plan and would report to the Planning Policy and Built Heritage Working Party. Changes in legislation were likely to have an impact, especially the Housing White Paper and housing need methodology. Overall, good progress was being made.
- p) Affordable Housing sold: the Chairman observed that this could affect the Local Plan but that there was no information except "on track". The Housing Strategy and Community Development Manager said that disposal information regularly monitored. She wanted to do a piece of work to identify problems and property needs and could bring this to the Committee. Before the work could commence, she needed to see lettings information for 2017/2018 which would probably be available in June. The Corporate Director (SB) explained that this action had to be seen in the context of the Community Fund. Flexibility was needed about future provision of housing, taking into account where people lived, worked etc. The Chairman observed that this linked with the Local Plan.

- q) The Chairman said that there was no statement in the Strategy about second homes although they were part of the challenge to our District. Mrs S Arnold, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Planning Policy, said that it was important to promote affordable housing to the public in a way that would deter “nimbyism”. Ms V Gay observed that the good design of affordable schemes would convince people. In response to a suggestion from Mrs Arnold that this might be promoted in the press, the Chairman said that this was something to consider, and to include in Local Plan consultations. The Planning Policy Team Leader said that consultations would provide clarity on the land available, which could lead to more affordable housing. Not all pieces of land were of significant market value.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

107. BROADBAND UPDATE

A written report had been received from the Better Broadband for Norfolk Director, Karen O’Kane. This item was for information only.

Mrs S Arnold said that it was very important for North Norfolk to have better broadband. Mr S Hester observed that the figures looked encouraging. Original telephone cabling was becoming very old and there should be more pressure on BT Openreach to refund customers and put more effort into repairs. Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds informed Members that there would be further discussion on Broadband provision at County Hall on 22 January 2018.

Note to Minute 107

At the request of the Committee, the Democratic Services Manager contacted the Better Broadband for Norfolk Director to request that the update included a section on the provision of superfast broadband to new housing developments. Because of the Christmas and New Year break this information was not available for the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 17 January, but was received on 19 January 2018.

“Public Subsidy can only be provided if a State Aid consultation has taken place and identified the postcodes where intervention is planned. This means that new sites cannot be included in the current Better broadband for Norfolk rollout because the postcodes did not exist when the most recent State Aid consultation took place in 2014.

Both BT Openreach and Virgin Media have a process for **property developers** to register new sites. It is vital sites are registered early.

In the case of BT any development of 30 properties or more can benefit from a Fibre to the Premises solution at no cost to the developer:
<http://www.ournetwork.openreach.co.uk/property-development.aspx>

For smaller developments, the develop should contact BT, it will be able to confirm whether Superfast broadband is already available in the area, and if not discuss options

The Virgin Media site is: <http://www.virginmedia.com/lightning/network-expansion/property-developers>

It is very helpful if local planning processes can include a check to ensure the developers have considered broadband provision and are clear about how this will be achieved. Some developers have arrangements with infrastructure suppliers other than BT and Virgin Media”.

108. DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION UPDATE

This report had come to the Committee for pre-scrutiny and would go to Cabinet on 5 February and Full Council on 21 February 2018. It was introduced by the Corporate Director (NB).

Progress to date

- a) The programme had been running for 4 years and aimed to improve customer service and drive efficiency savings by investing in IT and moving as much of the Council’s business as possible to digital format.
- b) The programme budget had been originally approved and Business cases were subsequently brought to Cabinet to approve project budgets, with 6-monthly updates to Cabinet and Overview and Scrutiny.
- c) The anticipated financial savings had been exceeded and completed a year earlier than planned. The direction of travel continued to be good, but not without challenges, especially around recruitment of staff in key areas.
- d) A number of business process reviews were planned, with the largest and most complex being in Planning, where although savings being delivered and performance improved, progress was not as far forward as it had been hoped.
- e) There had been significant investment behind the scenes in IT infrastructure.
- f) The next, proposed phase of the Programme would deliver further savings by transferring even more business onto digital systems. There would be a much bigger digital customer interaction but face-to-face contact would always be available for those who needed it.

Phase 2

- a) The IT Service Desk needed additional capacity to cope with the increased IT usage across the Council.
- b) Member IT would be the subject of a focussed project in the run-up to the next election. The IT Team, Democratic Services and the Member Development Group would work together to deliver the required improvements to ensure that members were IT enabled as far as possible.
- c) Overall 99% of all IT services had been available across the year but there had been some major outages in the last year. The disaster recovery suite at Fakenham provided an initial premise based option, but it was important to continue to invest in disaster recovery and business continuity. Measures for greater resilience, including an improved level of communication, would be rolled out through the Programme. Mr E Seward expressed his support for this.
- d) Between £900,000 and £1,000,000 would be invested in Phase 2. Savings of over

£200,000 per annum would be made; these coming from a variety of sources, including a small reduction in staff numbers. There would also be a better service to customers as more people were demanding business online.

- e) Whilst the report did not detail the savings from each of the proposed projects, individual projects would continue to come to Cabinet as business case proposals. This had worked well in the past.

Questions and Discussion

- a) Mr R Reynolds said that for the project to succeed, everybody needed to be involved. He suggested help for Members who weren't confident in using iPads to enable them to do what was required of them as councillors. It was recognised that there were different levels of IT ability in Staff and Members and that appropriate training would be delivered as part of the project identified in the report.
- b) Mr N Lloyd asked about the risk of hacking. The Corporate Director (NB) explained that NNDC complied with Public Sector Network security requirements and were audited on it. This compliance required regular tests and updates. There would always be a level of some vulnerability balanced by a level of protection that must be in place. It was a matter of ongoing maintenance and keeping up-to-date.
- c) In a second question, Mr Lloyd asked if we could be sure of the level of savings. The Corporate Director (NB) said that whilst the savings were estimated, they were based on experience so far and on other organisations providing similar solutions. Therefore, there was confidence that at least the estimated levels of saving would accrue. Whilst the Council had done well so far, there were still many efficiencies that could be made.
- d) Ms V Gay said that iPads were not always easily adaptable for the work Members were required to do. A paper copy and written notes was often easier. Looking at a small screen for a long period of time was difficult and some Members could not easily do it. The Corporate Director (NB) said that part of Phase 2 would be to consider if iPads were still the best devices for Members but, whatever conclusion was reached, there wouldn't be a roll-out of new devices until the 2019 Member intake. This would be discussed with the Member Development Group.
- e) Ms Gay observed that she didn't understand the detail of the report sufficiently to make a decision and she asked for more details and examples. The Corporate Director (NB) said that he had made notes about areas of the report he would be amending before Cabinet. There would also be more detail as the Phase progressed, as business cases came forward for individual projects.
- f) Mr N Pearce asked if efficiencies in dealing with other bodies could be measured in a quantifiable way. The Corporate Director (NB) said that this was difficult to quantify. Some of it would be measured by customer satisfaction. There had been few complaints about increasing digital business. Efficiency and effectiveness went hand-in-hand. Almost 90% of Parish Councils were now engaging with Planning online. The challenge was often in how the Parish Clerk was able to present information, especially in villages with poor broadband connection. A meeting of Parish Clerks, to capture their feedback, would take place on 13 February. All Clerks had been invited. The outcome would be reported to the Committee in March or April.
- g) Mr S Hester asked if there was a dedicated air conditioning system in our server rooms, and if it was efficient. He was informed that the rooms had the right cooler systems and that they were well-maintained and caused no problems.

- h) Mrs A Fitch-Tillett expressed concern about problems with firewalls in joint service working arrangements. The Corporate Director (NB) said that this was a challenge and that work was being done on it, but that individual councils often wanted their own sovereignty in such partnerships. The Waste Procurement system had a Share Point document management system, which could be used by all 3 partners. It had to be accepted though, that joint service working could be constrained by the need for IT security. The Corporate Director (SB) said that this was common nationally and that separate IP addresses had to be created for partnerships.
- i) Mrs Fitch-Tillett also asked about problems experienced with uploading Norfolk County Council flood maps. The Corporate Director (NB) explained that the GIS refresh; a key part of the first phase of the Programme; necessitated cleansing and reinstalling over 100 layers of complex information. An extra resource had been brought into the team especially for this work. The work was within a couple of months of completion, and this would help both the Development Management work to progress and mitigate the risks in the Local Plan project. Eventually, geographical information would be better integrated with Revenues, Electoral and other systems. At the request of Mrs S Arnold, the Corporate Director (NB) agreed to ask IT to arrange a demonstration of the system for Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee as well as the Development Committee. Mrs Fitch-Tillett expressed concern about taking planning decisions without appropriate information. The Corporate Director (NB) said that in any case where officers had a concern about data, the right work was carried out to ensure that out-of-date information was not used.
- j) Mr E Seward commented on the need to keep up-to-date with IT balanced against other demands on the Council. He asked what the financial savings of Phase 2 would be to the Council. The Corporate Director (NB) again said that these could only be estimates at present, but based on the best evidence we have. He confirmed he would add a table, showing the savings to date, to the report. It was important to note that on top of the directly cashable savings, many other savings were around efficiencies leading to improved capacity for officers to do more. Each project would come forward for funding on an individual business case basis to be considered by Cabinet.
- k) The Chairman said she felt there was broad support for the additional staffing proposals and greater resilience but that the business cases would need to be evidenced as the Programme progressed. The Corporate Director (NB) confirmed that, at this stage, Members were being asked to approve the overall budget, rather than individual projects.

RESOLVED

That the report going to Cabinet on 5 February 2018 should include a table showing cashable savings to date and, if this is not possible, increased capacity.

109. WASTE UPDATE

The report was introduced by the Portfolio Holder, Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds:

- a) Iceland had announced that they would be the first chain to remove plastic from their products, with McDonalds following suit.
- b) The next phase of NNDC recycling communications – “Nappies are Rubbish not

Recycling” - was soon to be launched to educate residents not to place nappies in the recycling bin.

- c) Paper recycling: 6m tonnes were collected annually in the UK, with 2m tonnes capacity for recycling in the UK. Surplus paper was loaded in empty containers for shipping back to China.
- d) Fly-tipping performance: Kier claimed not meeting the two working days target could be explained by the way figures had been recorded.
- e) In response to a request from Mr J Rest, via Twitter, Mrs Claussen-Reynolds said that a number of cases had been successfully prosecuted during the year with 3 fly tipping prosecutions leading to £3570 in fines, £1875 in costs awarded to the Council and £40 victim surcharge. We also had 2 persons given 6 month conditional discharges for their offences. Of the cases investigated 12 warning letters and 1 simple caution were issued for fly tipping offences. 8 cases were closed with no evidence to proceed.

Questions and Discussion

- a) Mr E Seward asked about the financial implication of a short term contract extension with Kier. The Environmental Services Manager said that Kier had indicated £0.5m to £1mbut more work was being done on this. The Corporate Director (NB) said that the need for an extension had been clearly demonstrated but it would be a Cabinet or Full Council decision due to the budget implications, when set against the currently below market price for our contract. The cost of the contract had reduced by £80,000 - £90,000 each year.
- b) To a question from the Chairman, the Corporate Director (NB) confirmed that an extension would provide the extra time needed to procure a new contract. In turn this would take much of the risk out of the procurement for bidders, ensuring the best likelihood of getting a good result.
- c) Mrs S Arnold commented that fly-tipping response was a service to the community. Referring to the use of non-recyclable plastic refill coffee sachets, she asked if this and similar examples could be publicised in the media.
- d) Ms V Gay believed that recycling performance had fallen and asked if this would improve with the new contract. The Environmental Services Manager said that recycling itself was actually improving. The apparent fall in the figures was because of road sweepings which were no longer counted as recycling, and the reduction in newspaper use. However, the council was picking up more tonnage of recyclable material than in previous years, despite the weight of material in many containers having dropped. Potential contractors would be asked for costed proposals on additional recycling. Although there were small things that could be done, e.g. collection of textiles and small electrical goods, it was only a fundamental change of what was collected that would make a significant difference. 40% of the contents of black bins was food waste. A food waste collection would be the biggest possibility for increasing our “recycling” rate, but would most likely be very expensive to implement, especially given the rurality of the District.
- e) Mrs P Grove-Jones asked if collection times would have to be increased to accommodate food waste. The Environmental Services Manager said that once a week was the most common collection for food waste, often combined with less frequent collection of household waste.
- f) Mr S Hester observed that everyone could play their part in cutting down food waste,

including feeding it to domestic animals.

- g) Mrs Grove-Jones asked if garden waste generated income. The Environmental Services Manager said that the income for the service was approximately £900,000 gross, producing a net surplus of around £300,000.
- h) Mrs S Arnold asked about disposal of paint pots. Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds advised that the lid should be removed so that the paint dried out, or that the paint should be absorbed by a material such as cat litter. Mr E Seward said that this should be drawn to the attention of Norfolk County Council as a topic where there was need of information.
- i) Mr S Hester asked if every fly-tipping allegation was investigated. The Environmental Services Manager explained that the Council had a zero tolerance approach to this problem and that every reported case was investigated. Legal action was then taken as long as the evidence base was strong enough and that it was the work of the Environmental Protection Team.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

110. ARTS AND CULTURE UPDATE

The report had been requested by the Committee. There was no clear definition of Arts and Culture and no department specifically dedicated to it, but the work in this area was very significant for a district of this size.

Questions and Discussion

- a) Mrs P Grove-Jones expressed thanks for the Council's support of Sheringham Little Theatre, Cromer Pier and the Deep Coast Project.
- b) In response to a question from Mr N Lloyd, it was explained that St Seraphim's Icon Museum and Railway Heritage Centre was at Walsingham and the William Marriott Museum was the former Stalham Railway Station, now the Holt terminus of the North Norfolk Railway.
- c) Ms V Gay observed that NNDC once had an arts team and a museums officer, but was glad that we still had a presence in the Arts. She welcomed funding for Arts and Culture, and the broadening of categories.

RESOLVED

To note the report.

111. THE CABINET WORK PROGRAMME

The Democratic Services Manager reported that the Cabinet Work Programme was up to date.

RESOLVED

To note the Cabinet Work Programme.

112. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME AND UPDATE

- a) There was a large agenda for February. The Customer Services update had been pushed back to March.

- b) Mrs P Grove-Jones suggested Independent Drainage Boards as a future topic. It was suggested that contact should be made with Graham Brown, a former flood manager at Norfolk County Council, with a view to inviting him for March.

RESOLVED

To note the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Work Programme.

The meeting ended at 12.36 pm

Chairman