CABINET

Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet held on Monday, 6 July 2026 at the Council Offices, Holt Road, Cromer, NR27 9EN at 10.00 am

Committee Members Present:	Cllr L Shires (Deputy Chair) Cllr H Blathwayt Cllr L Withington	Cllr T Adams (Chair) Cllr J Toye Cllr J Boyle
Members also attending:	Cllr C Cushing Cllr A Fitch-Tillett Cllr Dr V Holliday	
Officers in Attendance:	Chief Executive, Assistant Director for Finance, Assets, Legal & Monitoring Officer and S151 Officer and Director of Resources	
Apologies for Absence:	Cllr A Brown Cllr C Ringer Cllr A Varley	

57 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 01 June 2026 were approved as a correct record.

58 PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

None received.

59 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None received.

60 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

61 MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

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

62 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Chair invited the Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Cllr V Holliday to introduce this item. She said that the recommendation was related to the section in the Action Plan on the Rural Position Statement. Members felt that churches provided an important community role, in addition to worship, and it would be worth contacting them for information on non-faith community projects they supported across the district.

The Chair replied that the diocese may not keep records of local level projects, it could be within the domain of individual churches. Cllr Boyle said that she was not sure where such information was retained and agreed to look into it.

It was **AGREED** to support the recommendation from the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

63 2025/26 OUTTURN REPORT

Cllr L Shires, Portfolio Holder for Finance, Estates & Property Services, introduced this item. She explained that the report presented the provisional outturn position for the 2025/2026 financial year, which showed a General Fund underspend of £0.354m. It also provided an update in relation to the Council's capital programme and use of reserves. She said that she wanted to propose the following change to Recommendation C – 'the surplus of £0.354m to be transferred to the New Burdens Reserve' (not the General reserve as stated in the report). This change was in anticipation of the significant number of directives coming from Central Government, including Local Government Reorganisation (LGR), domestic food waste collection, renter's rights and the new Local Plan.

The Chair invited members to speak:

Cllr V Holliday said that 'slippage' was referenced a few times in relation to capital programmes and she asked if there was a capacity issue and if the Council would be able to achieve all the investment that it had planned. Cllr Shires replied that she had met with the Property Services Manager and the S151 officer to receive an update and she had been advised that many of the projects that had been progressing slowly were now moving forward. She said that she was confident that the Council would be able to achieve everything set out in the capital programme. The Chair added that there were some cases where the Council was awaiting the movement of external bodies across the capital programme, such as the North Walsham 3G pitch.

Cllr J Toye, Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Growth, welcomed the creation of a new burdens reserve to support the funding of all the new directives from central Government.

It was proposed by Cllr L Shires, seconded by Cllr J Toye and

RESOLVED

To recommend the following to Full Council:

a) The provisional outturn position for the General Fund revenue account for 2025/26 (as shown in Appendix A);

b) The transfers to and from reserves as detailed within the report (and Appendix C);

c) The surplus of £0.354m proposed to be transferred to the New Burdens Reserve

d) The balance on the General Reserve of £4.266m. (Please note does not currently include the above surplus of £0.354m)

e) The financing of the 2025/26 capital programme as detailed within the report and at Appendix D.

f) The updated capital programme for 2026/27 to 2031/32 and scheme financing as outlined within the report and detailed at Appendix E;

g) Approval of additional funding to cover capital project overspends of £0.012m as detailed in paragraph 5.7.

h) Approval of capital project budget roll-forwards from 2025/26 into 2026/27 paragraph 5.10.

i) To note the addition of £26,834 towards Property Services Electric Vehicles, to be funded by the Asset Management Reserve over a four-year lease period. This budget has been approved by the Deputy s151 Officer under constitutional powers.

j) To approve the addition of £188,539 to renovate Fakenham Play Area to be funded from capital s106 Contributions in 2026/27.

k) To approve the addition of £0.100m to the Community Housing Fund (Grants to Housing Providers) project, to be funded by Capital Receipts following a repaid grant in 2025/26.

l) To approve the updated Cromer Coast Protection Scheme budget to reflect that the approved RFCC (Environment Agency) grant has been awarded to the Mundesley Coastal Defences project only. This leaves the 2025/26 budget as £1,037,656. This is a movement of budget from the Cromer scheme to the Mundesley Scheme to meet grant conditions.

m) To approve the updated Mundesley Coastal Management Scheme budget to reflect that the approved RFCC (Environment Agency) grant has been award to the Mundesley Coastal Management Scheme project only. This leaves the 2025/26 budget as £998,217. This is a movement of budget from the Cromer scheme to the Mundesley Scheme to meet grant conditions.

Reasons for the recommendation

To provide a draft outturn position for the General Fund, Capital Accounts and Reserves which will form the basis to produce statutory accounts for 2025/26. Also to provide a draft opening position for the financial year 2026/27.

64 DEBT RECOVERY 2025-26

The Portfolio Holder for Finance, Estates & Property Services, introduced this item. She explained that it was an annual report detailing the council's collection performance and debt management arrangements for 2025/26. It included: a summary of debts written off in each debt area showing the reasons for write-off and values, collection performance for Council Tax and Non- Domestic Rates, level of arrears outstanding and level of provision for bad and doubtful debts. Cllr Shires said that council tax write-offs were lower than the previous year and business rates write-offs were slightly higher. The main reason for council tax write-offs in 2025/2026 was bankruptcy, liquidation or debtor abscondment.

The council tax collection target was 98.2% and for non-domestic rates it was 99.2%. For council tax, 98.34% was achieved and for non-domestic business rates it was 99.1%. Cllr Shires commended the officers for their exceptional efforts. For this last year, the Council had finished 11th out of all local authorities for the collection of non-domestic business rates and 14th for council tax. The Council was top for collection rates of all the Norfolk authorities.

The Chair said that there was an extraordinary commitment from the team to achieve the best outcome that they possibly could.

Cllr J Toye said that the team achieved these outcomes in a proper and appropriate way. Cllr Shires added that having early conversations with struggling residents was really important as it meant the Financial Inclusion team could be involved at an earlier stage. This was the same for local businesses too.

It was proposed by Cllr L Shires, seconded by Cllr T Adams and

RESOLVED

To recommend to Full Council to:

1. approve the annual report which details the Council's write-offs, in accordance with the Council's Debt Write-Off Policy and performance in relation to revenues collection.

2. approve the continued delegated authority as shown in appendix 2 for write offs.

Reason for recommendations

The recommendations ensure the Council makes best use of its staff resources and manages its finances to ensure best value for money.

65 HOUSING BUDGETS 2026/27

Cllr J Boyle, Portfolio Holder for Housing & People Services, introduced this item. She explained that NNDC would claim 25% of the additional income raised from the 200% Council Tax charge for second Homes. As was the case in 2025/26, NNDC proposed to use this additional income to mitigate the potential impact of high levels of second and holiday homes - to help tackle homelessness and to support building more affordable homes for local households. The report provided details of housing projects the Council was proposing were funded from the additional income.

The Chair added that the second homes council tax income was subject to negotiation with Norfolk County Council on an annual basis. He welcomed the recommendations in the report.

Members were invited to speak:

Cllr V Holliday welcomed the report. She said that a lot of the second homes income came from a small area of the district and asked whether those areas could be prioritised when the spending was allocated. The Chair replied that the spending had to be prioritised according to impact. He acknowledged that in terms of proportion, the number of second homes was largest in villages such as Morston but number-wise it was highest in Sheringham and Cromer. He said that the Council had to realise the greatest opportunities to achieve the best results for residents across the district.

Cllr Shires said that the benefits of the second homes premium were clearly set out in the Outturn report, section 3.8, with some of it being used to offset the shortfall in the Department for Work & Pensions (DWP) provision for accommodation. She added that it was important for those families facing homelessness, to be placed in an area that they felt connected to.

Cllr Withington said that the Outturn report demonstrated that the Council took a holistic approach to tackling issues, including the prevention of homelessness.

Cllr J Toye welcomed the transparent approach to setting out how the second homes council tax premium was being spent.

It was proposed by Cllr J Boyle, seconded by Cllr L Withington and

RESOLVED

To support the proposed use of additional income from Second Homes Council Tax to fund the housing projects set out in the report.

Reason for recommendation

To seek approval for the use of resources to help tackle homelessness and housing need

66 COASTAL ADAPTATION PILOT - EXTENDING DELIVERY OF COASTWISE

Cllr H Blathwayt, Portfolio Holder for Coast, introduced this item. He said the report demonstrated a ‘vote of confidence’ in the Council’s use of Government funding for coastal matters. He said it was a continuation of outstanding work of national and international importance.

Cllr J Toye thanked officers for ensuring the best options were delivered for residents.

Cllr L Shires sought clarification from the S151 Officer regarding which reserve the £500k spend would be coming from. The S151 Officer replied that there may be a need to borrow for capital purposes rather than using reserves. He added that he understood that a joint application had been made with several members of the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (RFCC) who had also been offered access to the Coastal Adaptation Pilot (CAP scheme. He hoped that this joined up approach would be successful and there would be no need for the Council to provide match funding.

It was proposed by Cllr H Blathwayt, seconded by Cllr J Toye and

RESOLVED

1. Agrees to participate in the Coastal Adaptation Pilot (CAP) programme, accepting grant funds to continue the delivery and to further develop the Coastwise initiative under the existing governance arrangements.

2. Delegate to Coastal Manager, in consultation with the Coastal Portfolio Holder and Director of Resources, the formulation of the updated business case and submission to the Environment Agency.
3. Recommend to Full Council, the allocation of up to £500,000 as match funding for the programme, to be sourced from reserves if Local Levy (from the Regional Flood and Coastal Committee, RFCC) or other grant sources is not forthcoming.
4. To extend the contracts of existing Coastwise personnel to the end of March 2029.

Reason for recommendations

To enable continued development and delivery of Coastal Adaptation activity, supporting local at-risk communities and contributing towards national policy development.

To maintain the momentum established by the Coastwise initiative, the success of which has been recognised by the proposed inclusion of North Norfolk District Council as a participating authority in the Coastal Adaptation Pilot programme.

67 LOCAL PLAN REVIEW: SCOPING CONSULTATION

In the absence of Cllr A Brown, Portfolio Holder for Planning & Enforcement, this item was introduced by Cllr J Toye. He began by reading out a statement from Cllr Brown which explained that, as part of the new Plan Making System, the Council was required to undertake an early scoping consultation inviting feedback from Stakeholders on how to engage with them and what the Plan should contain. This was timetabled to take place for six weeks starting 20.7.26 – 31.08.26 or sooner if achievable following the publication of the notice of intention to commence Local plan preparation. Cllr Toye said that the approval of the current Local Plan 2024 – 2040 was conditional on a new plan being commenced by 20th June 2026. There was now a need to progress to the next stage of consulting with stakeholders. Alongside the consultation it was intended to also run a second opportunity for potential development sites to be submitted for assessment through the ‘call for sites’. The consultation must conclude prior to the publication of the Gateway 1 self-assessment summary which was the start of the 30-month Plan making period and which was mandated for 31 October 2026. He added that the current plan had taken 8 years to prepare but Central Government expected the new plan to be completed in 30 months. In future, local plans would be reviewed every five years. Cllr Toye said that there was a concern that a limited process of just two consultations would damage local consensus building and democracy associated with previous plan-making.

Cllr Toye said that there were concerns about the very tight timescales and the impact on officer’s workload. Recruitment was underway to ensure that there was sufficient resource in place to support the progression of the new plan. He added that the current plan was suitable for the district, acknowledging that 60% of the population lived outside of towns as well as 84% of small businesses. It was concerning that such local factors may not be reflected in a fast and streamlined process.

The Chair reiterated the standardised approach of the new process and agreed with Cllr Toye that it was being imposed by central government with no alternative but to comply.

Members were invited to speak:

Cllr C Cushing said that the public needed to understand the appalling impact that this imposed process would have on North Norfolk. The Government was now insisting on a policy that would make sure 900 houses were built every year, which was unachievable and undesirable. He had concerns that this new, expedited process had to be undertaken during Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) and staff were already under a huge amount of pressure and he questioned whether it was achievable. Cllr Toye replied that the next report set out some proposed changes to ensure deliverability but he acknowledged concerns that there was a huge amount going on and it would be a challenge. The Assistant Director for Planning said that the 30 month deadline was certainly challenging but a timeline had been set out on how the Council intended to achieve it. He added that two new posts were being recruited to and he was hopeful that they would be filled soon.

The Chair said that he agreed with the points raised and said there was a wider concern, nationally that the new process would actually translate into housing growth.

Cllr L Shires said that she agreed with Cllr Cushing's concerns. In her own ward of North Walsham where 2,500 new homes were planned, services were under huge pressure. She highlighted page 157 of the agenda which set out the 'threats' including water scarcity and said that when Anglian Water had attended the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, they had stressed concerns about connectivity to the sewerage network. This was yet another example of the different and often complex challenges that rural areas faced and demonstrated that central government did not understand North Norfolk and the issues residents faced due to rurality. She urged the Government to look at the issues that rural communities faced, outside of a 'blanket' approach. She added if it was only affordable and social housing that was being proposed, then local communities would support it but residents were being outpriced by private housing and it was hard to promote a message of positivity around the loss of open, rural space when it was being used to provide housing they could never afford.

Cllr L Withington sought clarification on the use of 'exception sites' to bring forward affordable housing and whether it was correct that such sites did not contribute to the district's housing targets. The Assistant Director for Planning confirmed that they were 'windfall' sites, so not allocated but that they did count towards the overall housing figures.

Cllr Cushing referred to page 143 of the agenda and the seven main settlements that were listed. He queried why Sheringham was not included. The Chair replied that it appeared to be an error.

Cllr V Holliday asked how great a reach the consultation would have. She was concerned that the intention was for the public to have limited input into Local Plans in the future and this may be one of the few chances for them to engage. The AD for Planning replied that future consultations would be heavily publicised on social media and using all the methods at the Council's disposal. He said it was difficult to put a figure on it but he assured Cllr Holliday that it would be heavily promoted. Cllr Holliday replied that many residents were not on social media and that there was not sufficient time for them to respond via other, more traditional means. She added that she also didn't feel there was not enough emphasis on infrastructure in the consultation. Finally, referring to the Norfolk Coast National Landscape, she said there was an option to build significant developments there, which was against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and she was surprised this was being offered as a possibility.

The Chief Executive said that the report before Members set out the steps that the Council had to take over the next 30 months to be compliant with Government expectations and guidance. The timeframe for which development was proposed was many years into the future. The biggest constraint to delivering against the target number of houses which had significantly increased from previous levels was not deliverable in North Norfolk. There was not sufficient water or electricity. There was no answer in the report that addressed the infrastructure capacity issues and this should be one of the key messages to come out of the process. He added that it was not an option to argue against the targets set by the Government, however, the practical reality of delivering this level of development in North Norfolk over a sustained period of time was not going to be realised. The Council had to send that message back to the Government as it did not stack up economically. He went onto say that developers had indicated that they were already struggling to deliver schemes that were in the current, adopted Local Plan and unless this issue was addressed, this process was essentially academic and something that the Council had to engage with but it was unlikely to become a reality.

Cllr Blathwayt echoed the Chief Executive’s comments and added that a lot of the district was protected landscaoe and his own ward was largely in this category but was also a Zone 3 flood risk, which meant that there could not be any building and there was no anticipated influx of young people.

The Chair agreed with all the comments. He said that he was increasingly concerned about the environmental constraints. In terms of the consultation arrangements, the Council had to try as best it could to encourage people to respond to the process. He encouraged members to share it with their parish councils and residents.

Cllr Toye encouraged members to share the consultation with local businesses too, as they were key stakeholders along with the town and parish councils.

Cllr Holliday said that she agreed with all of the discussion so far but felt that the crisis regarding infrastructure did not come out strongly enough in the Scoping document and that residents may not grasp the severity of the issue. The AD for Planning replied that the evidence base that was being commissioned and the engagement with the statutory undertakers on key infrastructure matters, was ongoing but that if members felt that the infrastructure section wasn’t robust enough then the planning policy team would review it and seek to improve it. He assured members that the evidence base and engagement with stakeholders was ongoing and would feed into the g process as it progressed. Cllr Toye asked if the infrastructure section could be strengthened and highlighted then he would welcome that. Members agreed.

It was proposed by Cllr J Toye, seconded by Cllr L Shires and

RESOLVED

1) To progress the scoping consultation based on the material detailed in Appendix 1 in line with Government expectations, statute requirements and the project timescales.
2) Delegates authority to the Planning Policy Manager to make any further

necessary non-material modifications including consultation set up format as required.

Reason for recommendations

To maintain an up-to-date Local Plan and to comply with statutory requirements in order to provide appropriate planning policy and guidance for the district.

68 LOCAL PLAN REVIEW GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

Cllr J Toye introduced this item in Cllr Brown's absence and read out a statement on his behalf, thanking officers for their hard work and advising members that the new expedited Local Plan process needed a mechanism for quicker and more efficient decision-making. The Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party had previously considered a wide range of issues, including but not limited to the Local Plan. It was therefore proposed that the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party was replaced with a Local Plan & Conservation Task Group which would have decision-making powers, ensuring that the Council would meet the Government-imposed 30-month deadline for the new Local Plan. Guidance was requested on how and when existing neighbourhood plans would be reviewed, so that the expectations of parish and town councils on this matter could be managed.

Clarification was also sought on the validity of the new Local Plan when the District Council ceased to exist and its powers were transferred to a new, unitary authority. Regarding conservation area appraisals, advice was sought regarding the status of those that had been approved between 2020 and 2023.

Cllr Toye concluded by saying that the proposals would make the decision-making process quicker as it would focus on the key objectives needed to deliver a new Local Plan. It was a Cabinet Working Party and as stated in the terms of reference for the new task group, Cabinet has the right to discharge its delegated powers. Cllr Toye said, as a Cabinet member, the significant issues of LGR and Devolution required a lot of focus and work and this was an efficient way to ensure decisions were taken quickly.

The AD for Planning responded to the questions raised. He said that those councils with neighbourhood plans had been contacted recently with regards as to how they could take those forward. He added that there was no Government funding available for new neighbourhood plans.

He clarified the situation for the transfer to a new unitary authority. All the districts had been collaborating on timelines and co-commissioning evidence-based documents where appropriate. The Plans would then move over to the new authority.

The AD for Planning said that there were a number of Conservation Area Appraisals and they would be taken forward as they currently stood.

The Chair thanked everyone for their input. He acknowledged that it was a significant change in how the Council dealt with planning policy matters.

Cllr L Shires sought clarification that the Task Group would be taking decisions and not recommending through to Cabinet, and confirmation that Full Council was responsible for approval of the Local Plan. The Monitoring Officer confirmed that was the case.

It was proposed by Cllr J Toye, seconded by Cllr T Adams and

RESOLVED

1) Replace the current Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party with a new Local Plan & Conservation Task Group
2) Adopt the Local Plan & Conservation Task Group 'Terms of Reference'

and recommend that Full Council:

1) Approves changes to the overall Committee seat allocations, ensuring that political balance rules are reflected.
2) Approves any consequential changes to the Constitution arising from the establishment of the new Local Plan & Conservation Task Group
3) Receives nominations from the Group Leaders to appoint Members and substitutes to the Task Group (in line with recommendation 3 above).

Reason for recommendations

To recognise the requirements and statutory obligations of the new planning system, as introduced through the 2023 Levelling Up and Regeneration Act and the 2025 Planning and Infrastructure Act, and to provide appropriate governance arrangements for Member engagement and decision making in producing a new Local Plan.

69 DELEGATED DECISIONS JANUARY 2026 ONWARDS

The Chair, Cllr Adams, introduced this item. He explained that the law required the Council to record executive and non-executive decisions taken by officers under delegated powers and to publish them on the Council's website. This report covered the period from January 2026 to date.

It was **RESOLVED**

To receive and note the report and the register of decisions taken under delegated powers.

Reason for recommendation

The Constitution: Chapter 6, Part 2, details the functions which are delegated to officers. In addition, it requires that any exercise of such powers should be reported to the next meeting of Council, Cabinet or working party (as appropriate).
The law requires the Council to record executive and non-executive decisions taken by officers under delegated powers and to publish them on the Council's website.

These requirements apply to decisions that would have been taken by Council or the Cabinet if delegated powers had not been given to an officer either -

- under an express delegation granted at a meeting of Cabinet, Council or a Committee.
- Or under a general delegation (where responsibility is delegated in the

Constitution)

70 MARRAMS BOWLS CLUB OPTIONS

The Chair reminded members that there was an exempt appendix to this item and said that the meeting would need to go into private session if they wished to discuss any matters withing the appendix.

Cllr L Shires, Portfolio Holder for Finance, Estates & Property Services, introduced the report. She explained that three options were presented for the future of the Marrams Club House site in Cromer, a Council owned asset currently occupied by the Marrams Bowls Club. The building was in poor condition, with significant roof deterioration and water ingress, and required substantial investment to remain a usable asset.

Consultation had taken place with stakeholders including the Bowls Club which supported Option 2 in principle but had previously opposed redevelopment proposals.

The Surveyor (MC) explained why Option 2 was preferable and thanked the Bowls Club for their proactive engagement with the Council.

The Chair said he felt this was the right route to secure the operation of the site for the long-term.

Cllr C Cushing said that he was surprised that section 1.13 in the exempt appendix was not in the public realm and sought clarification from the Monitoring Officer. She said that it may have been included to provide context. There did not seem to be a reason for it being exempt. Cllr Shires confirmed that the information had already been included in the Outturn report. The Chief Executive agreed that it was included in the exempt appendix to provide context for the decision that members were being asked to take. Cllr Shires said that it was relevant to section 2.2.4.5.4 of the exempt appendix.

It was proposed by Cllr L Shires, seconded by Cllr J Toye and

RESOLVED

To provide approval for officers to proceed with Option 2 to transfer the freehold of the Property, known as the Marrams Bowls Club and Marrams Putting Greens, to the Marrams Bowls Club.

To delegate authority to the Asset Strategy Manager or the Assistant Director for Finance and Assets to agree to the final terms of the transfer.

Reason for recommendations
Option 2 is recommended because it provides a sustainable long term solution that supports continued community use of the Bowls Club while addressing the constraints of the site and reducing the Council's future maintenance liabilities.

A freehold transfer can be lawfully progressed under Section?123 of the Local Government Act 1972, as the proposal meets the requirements of the General Disposal Consent (England) 2003, enabling disposal at less than best consideration where it demonstrably promotes community wellbeing. The Bowls Club's established health, social and economic benefits provide a clear basis for relying on this exemption.

Progression of the transfer would remain subject to legal due diligence, the inclusion of appropriate safeguards such as pre?emption rights and restrictive covenants, and confirmation that the Bowls Club is willing and able to proceed with the transfer.

71 CROMER FILM LOCATION PROPOSAL

The Chair advised members that this item was exempt and the meeting would need to go into private session. At 11.12am it was proposed by Cllr T Adams, seconded by Cllr L Shires and

RESOLVED

"That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A (as amended) to the Act."

At 11.22am, the meeting returned to public session.

It was proposed by Cllr T Adams, seconded by Cllr L Shires and

RESOLVED

That the Cabinet approves the Council's in-kind and financial support for the film production as detailed within the report.

Reason for recommendations

Support for the basing of this film in Cromer recognising the significant direct local spend associated with the production during on site filming and secondary spend anticipated by tourist visitors having seen the film through national release.

72 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

73 PRIVATE BUSINESS

The meeting ended at 11.23 am.

____
Chairman