

Public Document Pack

COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Wednesday, 24 September 2025 in the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 6.00 pm

Members Present:

Cllr T Adams	Cllr P Bailey
Cllr M Batey	Cllr H Blathwayt
Cllr J Boyle	Cllr A Brown
Cllr S Bütikofer	Cllr C Cushing
Cllr N Dixon	Cllr P Fisher
Cllr A Fitch-Tillett	Cllr A Fletcher
Cllr W Fredericks	Cllr M Gray
Cllr M Hankins	Cllr C Heinink
Cllr P Heinrich	Cllr V Holliday
Cllr N Housden	Cllr R Macdonald
Cllr G Mancini-Boyle	Cllr P Neatherway
Cllr S Penfold	Cllr P Porter
Cllr J Punchard	Cllr C Ringer
Cllr C Rouse	Cllr L Shires
Cllr M Taylor	Cllr E Tooke
Cllr J Toye	Cllr K Toye
Cllr A Varley	Cllr L Withington

Also in attendance:

42 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllrs K Bayes, D Birch, T FitzPatrick, K Leith, L Paterson and L Vickers.

43 MINUTES

The minutes of the meetings held on 23rd April and 23rd July 2025 were approved as a correct record subject to the following amendments:

Cllrs J and K Toye and Cllr A Varley were in attendance at the meeting of 23rd July but were not recorded as such.

44 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS FROM MEMBERS

The Monitoring Officer (MO) informed members that she had granted dispensations to those members that were also Norfolk County Council councillors (known as 'Twin Hatters') to enable them to participate in the debate and vote on Local Government Reorganisation (Agenda item 9)

The following members declared that they had received such a dispensation:

Cllr T Adams, Cllr N Dixon, Cllr S Penfold and Cllr L Shires.

Cllr J Punchard declared that he had been granted a dispensation as an employee of Norfolk County Council.

45 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None received.

46 CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Chair thanked the Vice-Chair, Cllr M Taylor for attending several events in recent weeks. The Chair said that he had attended the following:

10 August - VJ Day 80 Civic Service at Blakeney Parish Church

15 August - VJ 80 Commemoration at North Norfolk District Council

The Vice-Chair had attended the following events:

17 August - Parade & Service of Thanksgiving and Reflection VJ80 Anniversary - South Holland District Council at St Mary's and St Nicholas Church, Spalding

09 September - Norfolk County Scout Council AGM at Easton College

12 September - Battle of Britain Parade & Commemoration at County Hall

14 September - Mayor of Dereham's Civic Service at St Nicholas Parish Church

15 September - Battle of Britain Service at City Hall

47 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader, Cllr Adams, said that he wished to hand over to Cllr H Blathwayt, as he had an announcement to make. Cllr Blathwayt said that the Cromer and Mundesley coastal management schemes had been awarded the Institute of Civil Engineers Award, which was on display in front of the dias. He thanked the Coastal team for their hard work and diligence.

48 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

None received.

49 APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES, SUB-COMMITTEES, WORKING PARTIES AND OUTSIDE BODIES

There were no appointments made.

50 FINAL PROPOSAL FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION IN NORFOLK - "FUTURE NORFOLK - PEOPLE, PLACE, PROGRESS - THE POWER OF THREE"

The Chair invited the Leader, Cllr Adams, to introduce this item.

Cllr Adams began by saying that it had taken months of hard work to reach the point of publishing the business case, ready for submission to Central Government. He thanked members, parish councils, statutory bodies and the 5,500 residents who had helped steer the development of the proposals. It was the most responses to any of the consultations on the various proposals that were being put forward.

He said that the engagement at the parish council briefings had led to the galvanisation of the approach on boundaries.

There had been significant commitment from officers and he thanked them too.

There would be further consultation on the most appropriate model with residents over the winter period, subject to an announcement by the national government. He went on to say that the three unitary proposal had been backed by the most councils, councillors and MPs with support from across the political spectrum. This was the only proposal to achieve this level of support and consensus. It was a genuine collaboration that had achieved such a positive outcome.

Cllr Adams then spoke about his concerns regarding LGR, which he had expressed previously. It required significant resources and he was concerned about the 'fallow' years following the adoption of the chosen model. He reminded members that LGR was being imposed on councils, it had not been asked for and local authorities were being asked to submit proposals but not opinions. That said, he believed that the three unitary proposal was the best opportunity to keep local government in Norfolk, local. It was the most detailed proposal of the three being put forward. It shared a vision of transformation, development of services, outlined options around council tax and proposals for social care and coastal management.

The proposal was for three unitary authorities for Norfolk which respected the geographical distinctiveness of such a large county which included rural areas a city and a long coastline, whilst keeping businesses and residents at the heart of the proposal. It achieved the strongest possible identity and representation across all areas of Norfolk with appropriate numbers of councillors. It also achieved the original government ambition of a city unitary council and unlike other proposals removed the inbuilt tension and polarisation of funding distribution across the County. Crucially it met the Government tests for size and scale.

The proposal included an 8-year financial business case that would ensure the three authorities would be financially viable from day one, with a plan to deal with the County Council's debts and a focus on early intervention and prevention across services to reduce demand. Again, crucially, the proposals would ensure that local decisions were made by local people.

Cllr Adams said that there was no desire to follow in the footsteps of several existing over-sized councils and Norfolk deserved to learn from such experiences. He went on to say that the record for Norfolk County Council (NCC) securing investment in Norfolk had been poor and this needed to be changed. It was likely to continue if a larger, single authority was created. The district councils would simply be absorbed into a larger council and NCC's record of overspending would continue unchecked.

A single unitary would be too large and remote and harmonisation of council tax would be hard. The proposal for two would be poorly linked with the functional economic geography of the county and would have inbuilt tension between the city and rural areas. He added that this proposal relied on significant service cuts in year one.

Cllr Adams said that the three unitary model could deliver the smoothest aggregation of services and harmonisation of council tax arrangements, whilst working towards the big strategic goals and delivering on the reform of services. He added that East Norfolk had a valid mission ahead including the achievement of the energy coast, protecting and growing the economy and securing more interventions around public transport and developing a skills profile for the east, whilst addressing deprivation around social care, children's issues and housing. It was an opportunity to redesign services and develop data driven decision-making in a geography that was achievable.

He thanked Members for their patience whilst this matter progressed and it was now a case of awaiting the Government's decision.

Cllr Adams proposed the recommendation. Cllr W Fredericks, seconded the proposal and reserved her right to speak.

The Chair opened the debate:

Cllr C Cushing began by saying he was appalled by the local government reform process and the blatant disregard that central government had shown to rural areas. He was particularly shocked that there had not been any commissioning of an up-to-date analysis of the impact of the costs for LGR. Ultimately, the proposed changes would result in higher council tax bills, poorer service provision and a lack of democratic representation. He believed that an independent body should have been tasked with coming up with the proposals for LGR in each area and that would have avoided the current situation of the County Council being pitched against the District Councils.

Cllr Cushing said that he had two fundamental concerns – whether the new authority would be financially sustainable and how it would work in terms of democratic representation. This was where he felt the proposal for a three unitary model was fundamentally flawed. He referred to the invitation to tender which stated that the objectives of the procurement were to deliver a structured and convincing proposal for a three unitary model. He said that this meant that no other options were considered and it was essentially pre-determined, with no objectivity.

Cllr Cushing then referred to the allocation of council tax spend, saying that over 90% was spent by NCC on adult social care, children's services, education and highways and less than 10% by the district councils. He was really concerned that this proposal grossly underestimated the complexities and cost of splitting out the County Council responsibilities across three unitaries.

He went onto say that in terms of democratic representation, there were currently 399 district and county councillors across Norfolk. Under the three unitary option it would go down to 200 and under the one unitary option proposed by NCC it would be 168. He believed that this would result in an appalling democratic deficit across the County. England was already the most under-represented country in Europe in terms of local government. This would make it even worse and it was probably a deliberate ploy by the Government. It would remove hundreds of rural councillors, most of whom did not represent the Labour Party.

Finally, he spoke about the size of the unitary divisions. He said as he understood it the initial election would be done on the County Council divisions which had an electorate of 8,500 for two elected members. In the Fakenham and the Raynham wards, where there were currently 5 councillors, this would be reduced to just two, meaning that they would be doing their roles on a full time basis. This discriminated against a lot of people standing for election due to the time commitment required. For the reasons stated above, Cllr Cushing said that he was not supportive of the three unitary model and would not be voting for it.

Cllr S Butikofer began by saying that did not support the proposed changes to local government, however, the process had begun and there was no option but to proceed with it. She thanked officers for their work in pulling the proposal together and said that she hoped the figures were more reliable than those used by Central

Government. As Chair of Governance, Risk & Audit Committee (GRAC) she had written to the Auditor General requesting that they look into the figures that the Government had used. Cllr Butikofer then spoke about the partnership working across the districts and the coming together to deliver the best possible outcomes for local communities. She said that she believed this was the best model and that there was a need to do more at source and at an earlier stage. She said that she was also concerned about the number of councillors representing the area but it was a flaw in the unitary model and members needed to be realistic about this. In conclusion the best had been done to deliver the best outcomes and she would be supporting the proposal.

Cllr C Rouse said that he believed the proposal set out a good vision, albeit not one that members would have chosen. It was the only proposal that supported Norwich as an economic hub which was important for the wider county.

Cllr C Ringer said that he agreed with Cllr Cushing regarding the democratic deficit, however, he differed in that he would support the proposal. The two options were to either support a three unitary model or not submit a proposal at all. NCC would just absorb the districts if they achieved their ambition for a one unitary model and a two unitary model would just rip the county in half. He went on to say by voting against the three unitary model and not submitting anything to Government, then Cllr Cushing would allow them to achieve what he feared – a labour vision of unitarization that he so opposed. This was by far the least worse option and he urged all members to support it.

Cllr L Shires said that she wanted to touch on Cllr Cushing's concerns about financial stability going forward. The financial projections in the business case predicted three very financially stable councils, however, no one knew what the Government had planned. There was no certainty and the forecasts could only be based on what was currently known. She thanked the Finance and Revenues Teams who had worked across Norfolk in providing information to make sure every proposal started with the same information. Cllr Shires said that it was important to emphasise that any authority in the future would not be able to operate without proper funding and local government reorganisation was not the solution to the problems local communities faced. This proposal was a forward facing council structure across three areas and put residents at the heart of the work that they will do. This would provide better outcomes for residents and save money in the long-term. She would be supporting the proposal.

Cllr J Toye said that he wanted to thank officers for their hard work on this. He said that in his view, one unitary would have the worst demographic representation and the two unitary model shifted all the power to the right of the county, dividing communities. The three unitary model, however, had been delivered by collaboration across the political spectrum, providing the best option possible. Members had agreed on supporting the three unitary model in March. This meeting was not about selecting the preferred model but supporting the submission for three unitaries.

Cllr J Punchard acknowledged the comments so far and accepted that it was the best of a bad deal, however, he said it would be remiss of him not to represent the people who had elected him and share their views that Fakenham did not sit within the east but was a better fit with the west of the county. He agreed with Cllr Toye's comment about power shifting to the right in terms of finance and said he felt that North Norfolk would be dragged down by propping up the less financially viable eastern side of the district. He agreed with Cllr Cushing's comments about reduced democratic representation and being a councillor would essentially become a full-

time job, which would not attract the wide variety of people that currently sat in the Chamber.

Cllr V Holliday said that she felt that there was a certain amount of pre-determination in the proposal and that it was a flawed process. It would have been helpful for members to have a comparison of the three submissions that were being put forward. There had been minimal input from opposition members into the proposal that was being considered. She said that she agreed that a smaller unitary would have greater representation but with this proposal, she was struggling with the viability of disaggregated statutory services and she couldn't find the evidence base for the two new service models. She concluded by saying that what was presented was hypothetical and she was struggling to understand this fully.

Cllr L Withington began by saying that no one wanted local government reform but there was no choice. Currently, adult social care, children's services and SEND were all broken under NCC and a single unitary model would have difficulty in generating change. Cllr Cushing's comment about 10% of council tax income going to the district councils was interesting because the services and support coming from the district councils was considerably more than 10%. It was therefore clear that district councils were very efficient at providing extensive services at a reduced cost. It was important to remember that the three unitary model was being proposed by District councils and was based on the way that they wanted to work. NNDC already worked to achieve 'demand avoidance' through early prevention work and it was at the heart of everything that NNDC did and was also at the heart of the three unitary model. It also aligned with the 10 year NHS plan and fitted with the command areas for the Police. Like others that had spoken, she recognised the demographic deficit in the unitary model, but said that this proposal ensured that councillors were as closely connected to local communities as they could be.

Cllr N Housden said that when he was first elected, he referred to the Raynhams ward as the 'wild west' because it had been forgotten. Its location at the far west of the North Norfolk district meant that democratic representation would fall further and the west side would be forgotten as all the resources and key elements would be pulled to the east. He said that it was important to fight for the west of the district or it would be left behind and dragged backwards instead of forward.

Cllr H Blathwayt said that many councils had already gone through the process of unitarisation and those that were mainly rurally based had shown that large geographic areas did not work as there was too much separation between the various geographical points both socially and economically. It was therefore important to have the smallest amount of geographical area represented as possible. One county unitaries in rural areas were not working and were therefore unlikely to work in Norfolk. He said that there was also the issue of devolution and Members had to decide how best they could represent their voters to the Mayor when they were elected. The new Mayor would find it harder to ignore three unitaries. Cllr Blathwayt said he would therefore be supporting the proposal.

Cllr M Gray said, that like most Members, he did not support the LGR process. However, by submitting this proposal, there was no guarantee that the Government would choose it. Even so, there was a clear choice for Members. They either opted to take no action and be 'done to' or stand up and represent their electors and make a choice and that was what was being asked here. Not choosing anything was a non-option and should not even be considered.

Cllr N Dixon said that in his view there were three flaws in the process. Firstly,

central government had issued an edict that this exercise should be completed in a very short period of time. It was unrealistic to carry out a lot of complex work for something that should potentially last for decades. He acknowledged that efforts had been made to gather information to present to the government in line with their requirements but realistically speaking it was never going to produce an outcome that Members would all feel comfortable with. Secondly, the group of six second tier councils issued a commissioning brief which he believed on predetermination and bias when it should have been based on an open-mind approach and several comparative options should have been presented to Full Council so that Members could assess and evaluate the different models. As it stood, he felt unable to assess if the three unitary model was the best option for Norfolk residents and businesses.

He went onto say that all the models being promoted were skeletal in form and more was needed for members to make a realistic assessment as to whether they were viable, deliverable and sustainable in the long term. They all carried considerable risk around evidence and its credibility and accuracy and whether the evaluation process had been carried out without optimism bias. He said that from his knowledge of the other options being promoted, the three unitary model provided the greatest risk and he could therefore not support it.

Cllr W Fredericks then spoke as seconder of the proposal. She asked what Members would be backing if they were not going to support this proposal. They had been given every opportunity to engage and put forward suggestions and ideas but nothing had been forthcoming. She said that Members had seen what happens when a council held all the money – £1bn in debt and still not delivering the services that were required. In North Norfolk, the District Council was providing services because the County Council didn't/ NNDC did the preventative work and saved NCC millions of pounds a year. If a proposal was not submitted then the Government would impose a structure. She said that she was extremely proud of the Leader, Cllr Adams. He had worked tirelessly, along with the Chief Executive to bring this forward. This was the only proposal that made any sense. Opposition members could choose to abstain as they had done during the pandemic and for every big decision that the Council had taken in recent years. She said that she was proud of the work that had gone into this proposal because it highlighted how much the Council cared about its residents. If Members felt their ward was neglected then they should step up and bring those problems to the Council so they could be looked at.

This proposal was the best opportunity and the best chance.

The Chair then asked Cllr Adams, the proposer of the motion, to close the debate.

Cllr Adams thanked Members for contributing to the debate. He said that for the most part, views were very balanced and well expressed. He said that he agreed with Cllr Cushing on the number of councillors, the lack of an up to date cost analysis by central government and that an independent body should have undertaken the work for possible unitary models.

He reiterated that a three unitary model was better placed to respond to localised demand. NCC was essentially bankrupt and District Councils had led on place-making, strategic planning and securing and in NNDC's case, improving the north Norfolk economy. He said that he could not see that a single unitary model would improve financial sustainability. It would be more of the same but bigger. The two unitary model would just divide the county.

Cllr Adams said that 85% of council tax income went to NCC but they did not provide

85% of services. The three unitary proposal was more detailed on social care than its rivals. A lot of consideration had been made in respect of statutory services and it was the only model that proposed any change in terms of how they were approached.

There had to be a plan in place to deal with the County Council's debts. Even if the process was stopped, it needed to be addressed.

In terms of the Fakenham boundary, he said that there had been a steer from the local community on this. Feedback from the parish briefings indicated that people felt Holt, Wells and Fakenham were indistinct in terms of service provision. The deep rurality that existed in the far west of the District meant that there was a natural boundary there and those in the Raynhams looked towards Fakenham rather than Kings Lynn. He assured Cllr Housden that he would work with him to ensure that the Raynhams were on the map as LGR progressed. All of the District's market towns should be on the radar.

Cllr Adams said that this was the only proposal that was genuinely cross-party and it was heartening to see a consensus develop from Kings Lynn, Norwich, Great Yarmouth and Breckland to secure a visible and accountable local government over this geography. A lot of work had been done over the financial proposals. Like many members, he was concerned over the 'fallow' period that would follow the adoption of the preferred Government model. Following the Government consultation, the District Councils in the east of the County would need to work together and give thought as to how to set the framework.

In conclusion, he thanked everyone for their contributions. Residents were concerned about their involvement in the process and the future of services and he wanted to reassure them that their views had influenced the development of this proposal.

Cllr M Gray requested a recorded vote.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed the following outcome to the recorded vote:

27 in favour, 4 against, 3 abstentions.

It was therefore RESOLVED

1. To note the content of the report and supporting documents detailing the proposal
2. To endorse the final proposal for a three-unitary model for local government reorganisation in Norfolk
3. To delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader, the approval and submission of the final proposal to the Minister of State for Local Government and English Devolution for consideration in accordance with the Government's prescribed process

51 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET

The Leader proposed that the following Cabinet recommendations were taken en bloc. The Chair sought members agreement and then proceeded to the vote:

It was RESOLVED unanimously:

1. Local Authority Housing Fund Round 3 - Funding for Temporary Accommodation

To allocate £0.9m of the additional income from the Second Homes Premium (both from the County Council and District Council elements) as match funding for the LAHF grant.

2. Coastal Management - Budget for reactive coastal works

To establish a dedicated cliff works budget (£125k), administered by the Coastal Management Team.

3. Coast Protection Works at Overstrand

To approve the required works to the Overstrand sea wall (option 4 of the report at paragraph 3.9) and that £1.280m be added to the Capital Programme for 2025/26 for this scheme and that this be funded by £0.245m of capital receipts, £0.386m of grant funding if able to obtain grant funding and the balance from borrowing.

To approve that the scheme be funded by up to a maximum of £1.035m of borrowing. It should be noted that the Council may be able to access grant funding (c. £0.386m) for this scheme and if successful it is proposed that the level of borrowing be reduced to £0.649m.

4. Budget Monitoring Period 4 2025/26

a) To decrease the 2025/26 capital budget for the Mundesley Coastal Defence scheme to £1,139,806 to reflect the apportionment of £250k from external contributions to the Cromer Scheme.

b) To increase the 2025/26 capital budget for the Cromer Coastal Defences scheme to £1,096,067 to reflect the apportionment of £250k from external contributions from the Mundesley Scheme.

c) To note the contents of the Q1 Treasury Management update report, appendix F.

52 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Chair of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Cllr Holliday, confirmed that the Committee had endorsed the Cabinet recommendation – Budget Monitoring P4, 2025 -2026. There were no other recommendations to Full Council at this time.

53 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CONSTITUTION WORKING PARTY - REVIEW OF THE CONSTITUTION

The Chair invited Cllr A Varley, Chair of the Constitution Working Party to introduce this item. Cllr Varley began by thanking the Monitoring officer and Democratic Services & Governance Manager for all their work in undertaking the review of the Constitution. He then explained that initially a full overhaul of the Constitution had been planned but once the LGR process began, the decision was taken to do a lighter touch review. It had been thorough and would ensure that the Constitution was up to date and fit for purpose for the next few years.

Cllr Varley then outlined the key changes which included an increase in the key decision threshold to £250K, an increase in the number of words for notices of motions and items of opposition business and an additional chapter for Development Committee.

It was proposed by Cllr A Varley, seconded by Cllr L Shires and

RESOLVED unanimously

- **To approve all the proposed changes to the Council's constitution.**
- **To delegate to the Monitoring Officer to make any further amendments that may arise as a consequence of the proposed changes.**

54 PORTFOLIO REPORTS

The Chair explained to members that 30 minutes was allocated for this item.

Cllr G Mancini-Boyle asked Cllr A Varley, Portfolio Holder for Climate Change & Net Zero, for a breakdown of numbers for people applying for grant funding across the five categories of the Norfolk Warm Homes programme and a list of completed projects in North Norfolk. Cllr Varley said that he did not have the figures to hand and would provide a written response as soon as possible.

Cllr S Penfold asked Cllr A Brown, Portfolio Holder for Planning, about the Corporate Plan which stated 'that people should feel well informed about local issues and have opportunities to get involved, influence local decision-making and shape their area'. He said these were excellent aspirations but wondered how these tallied with the recent decision of the Development Committee meeting where the Chair used his casting vote to approve the application for a cold storage unit at the Albert Bartlett site in Worstead. Cllr Penfold said that the local community in Worstead felt completely overlooked and ignored by the Council when they expressed their opposition to such a major application and which continued to cause so much distress and anxiety in Worstead. Cllr Brown thanked him for the question. He said that the Council endeavoured to consult communities on every planning application. Parish council clerks were informed and they were well advertised in the local area. He said that that Corporate Plan was satisfied by any planning consideration because consultation happened as a matter of course. He fully understood the anguish in Worstead. The application was not dealt with by officer delegation but called into the Development Committee for consideration by the Assistant Director for Planning. Objectors and supporters were able to speak at the meeting and a decision was taken in line with agreed meeting procedures. However, he explained the reasons for objecting to a planning application were quite limited. If there had been an error in the process then this could be challenged by Judicial Review. If there was an error of fact then it could be challenged in the courts. He said that the decision was properly arrived at and the only recourse now was for the community to lobby the applicant and see if they were prepared to submit a revised application which could address the concerns raised during the meeting by the objectors. He

added that he would also check the early stages of the application process to see if the applicant had approached the Parish Council, he would also see if a pre-application form was submitted to NNDC.

Cllr Penfold thanked Cllr Brown. He said that he believed there were significant flaws in the process from start to finish and Cllr Dixon shared those concerns. Representations were being made to Albert Bartlett and the MP to highlight resident's concerns. He said that he would welcome engagement with himself and Cllr Dixon to review the whole process from start to finish.

Cllr V Holliday asked Cllr L Withington, Portfolio Holder for Leisure, about the over-subscription for classes at the Reef in Sheringham. She said that most of the classes were over-subscribed and this then had a knock-on effect. She asked Cllr Withington if she had any suggestions on how to improve the situation. Cllr Withington said that it reflected the success of the facility and that membership numbers had also exceeded expectations. Some matters had already been addressed, such as cleansing issues. Regarding over-subscription of classes, this was harder to deal with as there were only so many opportunities during the day to run classes and numbers for each session were limited. The issue would be monitored.

Cllr Holliday asked if there were any plans to offer more classes. Cllr Withington replied that timings were an issue but the provider, Everyone Active, was aware of the issue and they were keen to address it, if possible.

Cllr N Dixon, asked Cllr A Varley, Portfolio Holder for Climate Change & Net Zero, about the Council's flagship corporate objective of the Administration was to create a strong response to the challenges of climate change and the net zero agenda. He said that for the Council to become an exemplar in this sector, the larger businesses in the District needed to collectively make a large scale impact on the Net Zero target. He asked for a range of examples across the business sector where the Council had inspired large scale carbon footprint reductions and where possible, quoting the metrics of the scale. Cllr Varley said that he could provide a list of such initiatives in writing. He then referred to a current initiative called 'Make my House Green' which was aimed at ensuring that households and Small and Medium Sized Enterprises (SMEs) had the available opportunities for solar energy but also relied on local contractors for installation. Cllr Dixon said that he would like the written response to focus on businesses which had followed NNDC's example at scale, particularly those with a large carbon footprint. Cllr Varley referred to the solar panels that had been installed on the Council's leisure centres.

Cllr C Cushing asked Cllr L Shires, Portfolio Holder for Finance, Estates & Property Services, about the reference in her report to the disposal of the Highfield car park in Fakenham. He asked if there was any indication when the disposal might go ahead.

Cllr Fredericks, Portfolio Holder for Housing, said that it sat within her portfolio. She acknowledged that it was taking a long time to resolve issues regarding resident's rights of way across the car park. The Housing Association that was developing the site had taken legal advice around indemnity insurance to minimise any future claims and it was this ongoing work that had delayed the project. Cllr Fredericks said that she was frustrated by the lack of progress but was hopeful that work would be able to commence soon.

Cllr J Toye, Portfolio Holder Sustainable Growth said that the Economic Growth Team would provide some information to support the response to Cllr Dixon's question to Cllr Varley.

- 55 QUESTIONS RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS**
- 56 OPPOSITION BUSINESS**
- 57 NOTICE(S) OF MOTION**
- 58 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**
- 59 PRIVATE BUSINESS**

The meeting ended at 7.32 pm.

Chairman