

## COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Wednesday, 16 December 2020 remotely via Zoom at 6.00 pm

**Members Present:**

Mr D Baker	Mr H Blathwayt
Mr A Brown	Dr P Bütikofer
Mrs S Bütikofer	Mr C Cushing
Mr N Dixon	Mr P Fisher
Mrs A Fitch-Tillett	Mr T FitzPatrick
Mr V FitzPatrick	Mrs W Fredericks
Ms V Gay	Mrs P Grove-Jones
Mr G Hayman	Mr C Heinink
Mr P Heinrich	Mr N Housden
Mr R Kershaw	Mr N Lloyd
Mr G Mancini-Boyle	Mrs M Millership
Mr N Pearce	Mr S Penfold
Mr J Rest	Mr J Punchard
Miss L Shires	Mr E Seward
Mrs J Stenton	Mrs E Spagnola
Mr J Toye	Dr C Stockton
Mr A Yiasimi	Mr A Varley
	Ms L Withington

**Also in attendance:** The Chief Executive, the Deputy Monitoring Officer, the Democratic Services Manager, The Democratic Services & Governance Officer, the HR Manager.

### 37 CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Chairman welcomed Members to the meeting. He updated them on the 'Cley Calling' events that were scheduled for January, February and March 2021 and said that he was in the process of notifying everyone who had attended his Civic Reception in 2019 about them and encouraging them to join the sessions.

### 38 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader, Cllr S Butikofer, began by providing an update on how the Council was responding to the pandemic. She said that cases had risen in the District during late November to a maximum number of 95 cases per 100,000, a large part of the cases being attributable to one particular setting. However, in the seven days to 10<sup>th</sup> December, numbers had dropped to 57.2 cases per 100,000, compared to an England average of 184 cases per 100,000. North Norfolk was currently rated 309<sup>th</sup> out of 314 local authority areas in England. Since March 2020, the total number of cumulative cases was 792. This meant a total of 755.5 cases per 100k compared to an England average of 2875.8 cases per 100k. This means that since March 2020, North Norfolk had one of the lowest rates of infection of any local authority. The total number of deaths from Covid was 64. This was an average of 61 per 100k, compared to an England average of 108 deaths per 100k. For this indicator, North Norfolk was the 64<sup>th</sup> lowest local authority in England. This higher figure could be

due to the District's elderly demographic.

The Council was working hard to share Government and local messaging about Covid. Since 2<sup>nd</sup> December there had been a team of six Covid Support Officers working across the District's towns, in conjunction with partners, visiting business premises offering advice and undertaking enforcement visits. The programme of fogging public conveniences, car park ticket machines and children's play equipment continued.

The Leader went on to say that as of 11<sup>th</sup> December, the Council had made 'Local Restriction Support' grant payments to 2781 businesses, totalling in excess of £4m. The Economic Growth Team was now developing the process for applications for the additional restrictions grant scheme which would be launched in the New Year. The Council had also written to any businesses which might be eligible for the Government's wet-led grants scheme for licensed premises. On 15<sup>th</sup> December, Sport England announced a national leisure recovery fund for local authority sports and leisure centres. Officers were working on applying for support through this programme. Covid testing facilities would continue to be provided at Cromer and Fakenham throughout the Christmas period.

The Leader concluded by saying that since Monday 13<sup>th</sup> December, a leaflet was being distributed to every household with information regarding the support available during the pandemic. The Council was also continuing to work with health partners on the delivery of a vaccination programme throughout Norfolk.

She thanked staff who had taken volunteer days to help with tree planting and also the public who had opted to take trees to plant in their own gardens.

### **39 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

### **41 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Received from Cllr T Adams and Cllr G Perry-Warnes.

### **42 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> November 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **43 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **44 PUBLIC QUESTIONS/STATEMENTS**

None received.

### **45 APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES, SUB-COMMITTEES, WORKING PARTIES AND PANELS**

The Leader informed Council that she had made the following appointments:

- Governance, Risk & Audit Committee – Cllrs H Blathwayt, P Butikofer and P Fisher, Cllr P Bevan Jones was appointed as a substitute member.
- Overview & Scrutiny Committee – Cllrs A Brown and P Fisher

Cllr C Cushing, Conservative Group Leader announced the following appointments:

- Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party – Cllr N Pearce to replace Cllr D Baker
- Overview & Scrutiny Committee – Cllr C Cushing

Cllr J Rest, Independent Group Leader said that he had no changes to make.

## 46 PORTFOLIO REPORTS

1. Cllr S Butikofer, the Leader, said that she had nothing to add to her written report. She reminded Members that there would be a briefing on the Census on 11<sup>th</sup> January and encouraged everyone to attend.

Cllr C Cushing referred to the recent outline planning application for 950 new homes in Fakenham. He said that when the vote was taken at Development Committee on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2020, two Cabinet Members, including the Portfolio Holder for Planning, voted against it. He said that the decision was crucial for the town and for the delivery of new homes in the District as well as being the culmination of 12 years of work and asked whether the Leader could explain how two portfolio holders could vote against it and whether the Leader supported the planning application. The Leader said that she did support the application and she had worked very closely with the applicants to ensure it was brought forward and delivered.

Cllr G Mancini-Boyle referred to the Motion on adopting the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's definition of anti-semitism which had been supported at Full Council in December 2019. He asked why, a year later, it was still not incorporated into the Council's Equality & Diversity Policy. The Leader replied that she took this matter very seriously and she was not happy it was taking so long. She reassured Cllr Mancini-Boyle that it was still very much on the agenda but that officers had been working flat out during the pandemic which had caused capacity issues. Cllr Mancini-Boyle replied that the pandemic hadn't impacted on workloads until March 2020 which had still allowed sufficient time for the work to be undertaken. The Leader confirmed that she would write to Cllr Mancini-Boyle with a confirmed date for when this matter would be resolved.

2. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett, Portfolio Holder for Coast, introduced her written report and thanked the officers for their continued hard work.
3. Cllr V Gay, Portfolio Holder for Culture and Wellbeing, introduced her written report.

Cllr G Mancini-Boyle asked whether there were plans to resurrect the companion calls service that the Council had operated during the first lockdown earlier in the year. The Leader, replying on Cllr Gay's behalf, confirmed that the telephone companion scheme was due to be re-launched shortly.

Cllr N Dixon asked Cllr Gay about the recent meeting of the North Norfolk Sustainable Communities Fund (NNSCF). He referred to the Motion regarding funding for Community Action Norfolk (CAN) which had been considered by Council on 23<sup>rd</sup> September, resulting in a recommendation for CAN to apply to the NNSCF for funding, with Cllr Gay publicly recording her thanks to CAN for their hard work. He also referred to the recent application by the Smallburgh & Stalham First Responders to the NNSCF, which had also been refused and asked why the Council appeared to be publicly supportive of such community groups but was not prepared to provide grants to them.

Cllr Gay replied that the North Norfolk Sustainability Fund was a cross-party panel which reported its decisions to Members. She said that both organisations could apply to the fund again and offered to provide a written response to Cllr Dixon detailing the thinking behind the decisions for CAN and the First Responders.

Cllr W Fredericks asked if Cllr Gay could provide more information on the social prescribing service that the Council was supporting. Cllr Gay said that she had sent out a report to Members on the service in October and had good feedback. It was highly valued and supported by 5 officers, 3 of which were funded by Norfolk County Council. She suggested that a presentation to Members could be arranged for the new year to provide more information.

4. Cllr G Hayman, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Benefits, presented his report as written. Cllr N Housden referred to the position regarding Parklands at Pudding Norton. He said that he hadn't been advised about the residents being contacted about the Green Homes grant. He said that as the local member he had had a considerable amount of contact with the residents regarding problems with their electricity connection in the summer of 2019 and it would have been helpful to have been notified about the grant. In addition, he said that he understood that an offer to purchase the Parklands site had not been pursued. He requested an update on the current situation regarding this. Cllr Hayman apologised that Cllr Housden hadn't been notified about the Green Homes grant. He said that the scheme was District wide and it was possible that was why he had not been contacted. Regarding the second question, he said this fell within the assets portfolio and Cllr Seward should be able to provide an update.
5. Cllr R Kershaw, Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Growth, said that he was happy to take any questions on his report and portfolio. Cllr D Baker made reference to written contact that he had made with Cllr Kershaw asking why businesses had not received their second lockdown grant payments and why North Norfolk continued to lag behind neighbouring authorities on issuing payments. He said that the explanations were that there were more SME's in the District and that the Council wanted to be clear on the guidance. Cllr Baker said he wanted to clarify these issues. If there were more businesses eligible for grants then more officers should have been allocated to their distribution. He also asked which aspects of the guidance were causing problems and why neighbouring authorities did not appear to have an issue with this. Cllr Kershaw replied that he had replied to Cllr Baker's letter. He said that the District was now third in paying out grants. He added that he would be happy to take any further questions and respond in writing. He added that payments to wet-led establishments were being assessed and

were due to be paid out on Friday 18<sup>th</sup> December.

6. Cllr N Lloyd, Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services, Climate Change & Environment, said that he welcomed the appointment of two officers to the new climate change team. He then paid tribute to the Environmental Health team who had been working exceptionally hard in recent months.

Cllr G Mancini-Boyle said that he was pleased to see the tree planting initiative was moving forward. He asked whether the scheme would continue once the target was achieved. Cllr Lloyd replied that the tree planting scheme was going well. There had been a lot of interest from schools and parish councils. He was certain that the target would be met and exceeded.

Cllr Mancini-Boyle then asked about renewable energy generation for new planning applications and said that the figures were currently far too low and wondered what work was being undertaken in conjunction with the Planning service to address this issue and create more energy efficient housing. Cllr Lloyd replied that he agreed, saying that he had voted against the recent planning application for housing in Fakenham, as the renewable energy offer was just 10% which he felt was appalling as at least 20% was required for a site of that size. He said a lot depended on the new Local Plan as this contained a significant number of new initiatives – including an increase in affordable homes.

Cllr N Housden queried planning applications which were being rejected by the planning department for proposing ground source heat pumps instead of oil fired heating. He said that this approach needed to be reviewed and asked when this would happen. Cllr Lloyd said that the answer lay in current planning legislation. Many of the climate change issues were not classed as material considerations within the planning regime. He found this very frustrating indeed and enabled developers to get away with minimum standards. He asked Cllr Housden to write to him with the details of the planning applications that he had referred to and said that he would look into it.

7. Cllr E Seward, Portfolio Holder for Finance & Assets introduced his report and said that he was happy to answer any questions. Referring to Cllr Housden's earlier question regarding Parklands in Pudding Norton. He said that under the Asset Management Policy the Council had a duty to achieve the best price for an asset disposal and he had asked the Estates and Assets Manager to update Cllr Housden on the Parklands situation.

Cllr T FitzPatrick asked about the publication of a leaflet issued to all the households in North Norfolk providing advice on Covid. However, leaflets had also been distributed as far afield as Brancaster and Great Yarmouth. He asked about the cost of undertaking this and the rationale behind the wider distribution. Cllr Seward said that the leaflets were designed for the residents of North Norfolk and he said that he would give a written reply regarding the cost. Cllr FitzPatrick said that he did not reply a written reply but said that he asked that consideration was given to better targeting them in future. The Chief Executive added that Royal Mail had been requested to distribute the leaflets according to postcode and acknowledged that some had been distributed beyond any communities that adjoined district postcodes – and this was being looked into.

Cllr N Dixon asked what the 'Income and savings' workshop held on 25<sup>th</sup> November 2020 had produced towards closing the gaps outlined in the Medium Term Financial Strategy. Cllr Seward replied that when the MTFS was published further information would be available. He said that deficits were often forecast but didn't always materialise. However, he acknowledged that the situation was getting more difficult, particularly regarding support from central Government.

Cllr Dixon said that he accepted uncertainty was always an issue. However, he said that most of the 'low hanging fruit' from previous years would already have been picked and far better preparation was required now. Certainly it would be very challenging for future years and should not be underestimated. Cllr Seward said that planning was starting at a much earlier stage than previously to ensure the Council was prepared.

Cllr Mancini-Boyle referred to the recent leaflet drop. He said that it may have been better to issue them in the same way that the bin collection reminders were.

8. Cllr L Shires introduced her report. She said she was happy to take any questions. Cllr V FitzPatrick referred to the license for Microsoft Office 365, which he welcomed. He asked whether the license had been finalised and what the anticipated cost savings were likely to be by 'piggy backing' on the County Council IT contract. The Head of IT said that the contract had just been signed. In the end, Microsoft were able to offer a better deal through the Council's existing software supplier than through the County Council supplier – achieving an £8,000 saving over the three years of the contract.

Cllr V FitzPatrick then asked about the recent change to the Councils online payment gateway to the GOV.PAY system. He queried whether that work had now been complete and if so, what were the anticipated savings per annum from this and how would these savings be achieved – transactional, or staff time.

The Head of IT & Digital Transformation replied on behalf of the Portfolio Holder. He said that he couldn't give a total figure for the savings as most of them were based on transactions. There was a per transaction saving – over the cost which was currently paid to Capita. In addition, there would no longer be the need to pay £11,000 to Capita for the license for the Gateway software. He confirmed that the system wasn't live yet as it had been delayed due to Covid and the Uniform (Planning) project go-live. He added that there were further savings that would be achieved on security features that were currently incurring additional costs of approximately £12,000pa. He concluded that he would provide a written response on the total savings achieved.

Cllr J Rest referred to the reference to the Fakenham Community Centre in Cllr Shire's written report (page 56). He said that none of the three local members for Fakenham had been informed about a building survey being undertaken on the centre. He said he was very concerned about the lack of communication. He asked for clarification on the following: what was the work for, what was the estimated cost and when was the building survey commissioned and by whom. He also asked whether ward members could be involved with projects from the outset. Cllr Shires replied that she was concerned to hear about the lack of communication and assured Cllr Rest

that the local members would receive all of the information requested, in writing, within 7 days.

Cllr J Punchard said that he was the representative for the Fakenham Community Centre as well as the ward member and that the pandemic was not a sufficient excuse on this occasion for not keeping him informed.

9. Cllr J Toye, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Enforcement, introduced his report. He commended the officers for all their recent hard work.

In reference to Cllr Cushing's earlier question regarding his decision to vote against the recent planning application in Fakenham, he said that he agreed with Cllr Lloyd that the renewable energy offer for the scheme was not sufficient. He added that he always listened to the debate at Development Committee before reaching a decision on how to vote.

Cllr Cushing said that his point related to the fact that both of the Members he had referred to in his earlier question were Cabinet members and consequently they had influence – particularly over major planning applications. It was for this reason that he was puzzled by their approach, especially as it had taken 12 years for the application to come to fruition.

Cllr N Pearce referred to the High Court case which resulted in the loss of affordable housing on the Cley Road development due to s106 losses. He asked how much money had been spent on this and when would Members and the public be informed as to why this had happened. In addition, could assurance be given that this would not happen again.

Cllr Toye said that he could not hear the question fully due to IT issues. The Chairman said it would be better if a written response was provided.

## **47 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET 07 DECEMBER**

### Fees & Charges 2021/22

Cllr E Seward, Portfolio Holder for Finance introduced this item. He said that it had been considered by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and there had been a lengthy discussion. Cllr Dixon, chairman of the Committee confirmed this and said that there had been no substantive issues raised.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr R Kershaw and

### **RESOLVED:**

- a) to approve the fees and charges from 1 April 2021 as included in Appendix A.
- b) That Delegated Authority be given to the Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and relevant Heads of Service, to agree those fees and charges not included within Appendix A as required as outlined within the report

**48 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 15 DECEMBER 2020**

Cllr N Dixon, Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee confirmed that there were no further recommendations to Council.

**49 DRAFT PROGRAMME OF MEETINGS 2021/22**

The Democratic Services Manager introduced this item. She explained that this was an annual report outlining the Council's formal committee meetings for the forthcoming municipal year.

It was proposed by Cllr C Heinink, seconded by Cllr W Fredericks and

**RESOLVED**

**To adopt the Programme of Meetings for 2021-22.**

**COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEWS**

The Chief Executive introduced this item. He explained that as part of the Local Government Boundary Review of North Norfolk, undertaken in 2016/17, a small number of historical parish boundary anomalies were identified which could only be corrected through the formal process of a community governance review. In addition, there were three locations in the District where, based on rates of development, provision of major infrastructure and changing land-use / community identities, parish boundaries would now appear anomalous and could benefit from some revision to better reflect community identities and the use of local services and facilities and therefore parish precepts.

Cllr T FitzPatrick referred to the changes within his ward, specifically Little Walsingham and Great Walsingham. He said that the proposal suggested that some properties appeared to fall within Little Walsingham but that they currently paid Council tax and were on the electoral register within Great Walsingham. He questioned why this should be an issue as it was one parish. He then referred to the confidential papers and queried why they hadn't been made public as the information could be found elsewhere.

The Chief Executive replied that although there was no difference in the precept for the wider Walsingham parish, the number of parish councillors representing Little and Great Walsingham was allocated according to the number of properties in the ward and this proposal sought to resolve that. In response to the second question, he said that the consultation would involve detailed information being shared, including contacting the affected households.

Cllr N Housden referred to the solar farm that was due to come into West Raynham and asked if it was currently within the Weasenham parish. The Chief Executive replied that all of the affected parishes were within the North Norfolk District boundary. He confirmed that it would not impact on any community benefit that was derived from the solar farm.

It was proposed by Cllr J Rest, seconded by Cllr J Toye and

**RESOLVED**



**To approve proposals to undertake a programme of Community Governance Reviews during 2021 based on the matters detailed in the report, with final proposals / recommendations being brought back to Full Council in November or December 2021**

**50 QUESTIONS RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS**

None received.

**51 OPPOSITION BUSINESS**

None received.

**52 NOTICE(S) OF MOTION**

The following Notice of Motion had been proposed by Cllr D Baker, seconded by Cllr C Cushing:

‘Throughout the coronavirus pandemic we have seen our care professionals rise to the challenge to look after, care for and help our elderly and most vulnerable in society.

The need for the widest recognition of the vital and hugely valuable work social care professionals do for, and in our communities has never been greater.

So many people in North Norfolk have benefitted from the tireless work of these professionals and whose quality of life is, and has been, immeasurably enhanced by the care and compassion, and the skills and knowledge of this cohort of care providers who do so much for others.

We therefore propose the following recommendation:

1. NNDC states publicly its support for and commitment to the ‘*Developing skills in health and social care*’ project.
2. A Cabinet member is identified as the member who will take responsibility for supporting this valuable project and championing the project at a senior strategic level. This Cabinet member will report to Full Council regularly on progress.
3. A member of staff is named as lead officer on supporting this project and who will work closely with members of the DSHSC project team, and project partners, to:
  - (a) promote this excellent initiative and promote links to wider initiatives across North Norfolk,
  - (b) collate information on the implementation of the project in North Norfolk,
  - (c) help to address any barriers to individuals joining the scheme’

The Chairman began by saying that he understood the following amendment had been proposed by Cllr L Shires, seconded by Cllr E Seward (changes in bold):

1. NNDC states publicly its support for and commitment to the ‘*Developing skills in health and social care*’ project. **This to include seeking financial help from Norfolk County Council and or Central Government, to enable North Norfolk District Council to be actively involved on an ongoing basis in supporting those who work in Health and Social Care.**
2. A Cabinet member is identified as the member who will take responsibility for

*supporting this valuable project and championing the project at a senior strategic level. This Cabinet member will report to Full Council regularly on progress.*

*3. A member of staff is named as lead officer on supporting this project and who will work closely with members of the DSHSC project team, and project partners, to:*

*(a) promote this excellent initiative and promote links to wider initiatives across North Norfolk,*

*(b) collate information on the implementation of the project in North Norfolk,*

*(c) help to address any barriers to individuals joining the scheme, **including lobbying for this project to include our unpaid carers.***

The Chairman asked if the proposer and seconder of the motion were willing to accept the amendment. If so, it would effectively become an alteration to the original motion so that it is included and the debate will then be on the substantive motion (as amended). If the amendment was accepted, there would be no requirement to debate and then vote on the amendment. Cllr Baker and Cllr Cushing agreed to accept the amendment.

The Chairman then invited Cllr Baker to introduce the motion. Cllr Baker began by saying that he had brought forward the motion to recognise the valuable contribution that care professionals had made during the pandemic. They had worked tirelessly throughout this very challenging period but it should be recognised that they did this day in and day out. The motion aimed to drive ambitious and tangible benefits to those who worked across the social care workforce across Norfolk and Suffolk, via the 'Developing skills in health and social care' project. The project would give those working in the sector access to a range of higher qualifications and career progression opportunities, delivered by partners across the region.

He said that carers were not given recognition for the valuable work that they did. He hoped that by supporting the motion, the Council would demonstrate its support for the sector being seen as a high status, highly skilled, specialist profession. He said that in his view, reform of social care would be one of the most important pieces of legislative reform undertaken by the Government in the coming years. By investing in social care and valuing it as a profession, it would benefit not just the care givers but those receiving care and the wider health sector too. He said that he had met with the Leader and the Chief Executive to discuss the motion and they had indicated that they were supportive of the proposals and that they could be fulfilled within the current resources available to the Council. He asked Members to support the motion. Cllr Cushing reserved his right to speak.

Cllr L Shires said that she was very pleased to see some investment in health and social care professionals. She said it was a very dedicated profession and thanked everyone for their continued hard work during such challenging times. Cllr Shires said that she was very pleased to see that the DWP had entered into a contract with Norfolk County Council and that it was such a substantial investment in social care. She said that she had proposed an amendment because the original motion had not included unpaid carers and she felt that they should also be invested in, with Norfolk having a high figure than the national average. This project would offer them the opportunity to develop their skills so they could properly support the people they cared for.

Cllr E Spagnola said that as an unpaid carer, she supported the motion, but she echoed Cllr Shires comments. She said that she was paid less than 20 pence an hour to look after her disabled children, adding that her children deserved better than that. She went on to say that her husband was a care worker and he felt that people in the sector should be paid more than the minimum wage to do a complex,

demanding job. The low pay meant that carers did not feel valued and this could mean that they did not feel motivated to take on extra training and development of their skills.

Cllr M Millership said that she supported the principle of the motion as an unpaid carer. She said that the project as it stood only supported existing paid carers. She outlined the various roles that she had taken on as an unpaid carer for several family members including both her parents and her brother. She said that she had received no training to provide such support. She said that would like to see recognition for all unpaid carers and the provision of support and training when they wanted it.

Cllr E Withington said that she welcomed the motion. However, she was disappointed to see that the project only offered Level 2 (GCSE) training and she would like to see a more advanced offer to attract skilled workers into the profession. She said that she hoped the Council could focus on providing high level training for carers – both paid and unpaid.

Cllr R Kershaw said that he was touched by the previous speakers' comments. He said that he was concerned that the project was part-funded by the EU and he sought reassurance that the Government would continue to fund the scheme.

Cllr T FitzPatrick said that he would like to thanks Cllr Baker and Cllr Cushing for bringing forward the motion.

Cllr N Pearce said that he would support the motion and acknowledged the comments made so far. There was a lot of work to be done but this was a good start that could be built on and develop.

Cllr W Fredericks said that she wanted to pay tribute to young carers. She said that this shouldn't be happening in a first world country and she would like their contribution to be acknowledged.

Cllr V FitzPatrick said that he was supportive of the motion and welcomed this issue being dealt with at a strategic level within the Council.

Cllr P Grove-Jones reiterated Cllr Fredericks comments regarding young carers. She said that they were sacrificing their friendships and schooling with very little support.

Cllr S Butikofer said that it was clear how important the motion was. She said that Members needed to work together and build on it. It was clear that those who carried out unpaid roles needed to be recognised too.

Cllr C Cushing thanked everyone for their contributions. He acknowledged that there was an enormous amount of work still to be done. The number of paid adult social carers alone in the UK was set to increase considerably from 1.65m to over 2.2m by 2025. In Norfolk alone there were 26,000 people, with 1600 vacancies. Turnover was about 30% which was causing considerable problems with recruitment. Training would help with this, increasing morale and competence and helped with career progression.

Cllr Baker closed the debate by thanking everyone for their input. He said that there was a lot of work to do yet but this was an initial step in the right direction. He said that he was totally committed to progressing the reforms. He recognised that unpaid carers were a key part of the issue – as were young carers, some of which were just 5 years old.

He thanked everyone for coming together on this issue.

It was proposed by Cllr D Baker, seconded by Cllr C Cushing and

**RESOLVED unanimously that**

*1. NNDC states publicly its support for and commitment to the 'Developing skills in health and social care' project. This to include seeking financial help from Norfolk County Council and or Central Government, to enable North Norfolk District Council to be actively involved on an ongoing basis in supporting those who work in Health and Social Care.*

*2. A Cabinet member is identified as the member who will take responsibility for supporting this valuable project and championing the project at a senior strategic level. This Cabinet member will report to Full Council regularly on progress.*

*3. A member of staff is named as lead officer on supporting this project and who will work closely with members of the DSHSC project team, and project partners, to:*

*(a) promote this excellent initiative and promote links to wider initiatives across North Norfolk,*

*(b) collate information on the implementation of the project in North Norfolk,*

*(c) help to address any barriers to individuals joining the scheme, including lobbying for this project to include our unpaid carers.*

The Chairman closed the meeting by thanking officers and Members for their support and hard work during a very challenging year. He wished everyone a Happy Christmas.

The Leader, Cllr S Butikofer, wished everyone a happy Christmas and thanked the staff for their outstanding work and continued support.

**53 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**54 PRIVATE BUSINESS**

The meeting ended at

---

Chairman