

Public Document Pack

COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Council held on Wednesday, 24 February 2021 in the remotely via Zoom at 6.00 pm

Members Present:

Mr T Adams	Ms P Bevan Jones
Mr D Birch	Mr H Blathwayt
Mr A Brown	Dr P 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	Mrs G Perry-Warnes
Mr J Punchard	Mr J Rest
Mr E Seward	Miss L Shires
Mrs J Stenton	Dr C Stockton
Mr J Toye	Mr A Varley
Ms K Ward	Ms L Withington
Mr A Yiasimi	

Also in attendance: The Chief Executive, The Director of Resources, the Monitoring Officer, The HR Manager, The Assistant Director of Organisational Resources, the Democratic Services Manager, the Democratic Services & Governance Officer (Scrutiny)

1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Cllr S Butikofer and Cllr E Spagnola.

2 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2020 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS FROM MEMBERS

None received.

4 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None received.

5 CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Chairman welcomed Members to the meeting. He spoke briefly about his nominated charity, the Norfolk Wildlife Trust, had been holding several 'Cley Calling' remote events. The talks to date had been very good indeed and a small amount of money had been raised too.

6 LEADER'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Deputy Leader, Cllr E Seward, spoke on behalf of the Leader. He invited the Chief Executive to provide an update on the Covid situation.

The Chief Executive began by saying that Members would appreciate that with high and rising rates of COVID19 nationally over the Christmas and New Year holiday period, the Government had announced a third national lockdown on 4th January, which is to continue through until the 29th March.

North Norfolk had seen some of the lowest levels of COVID cases in the country during the first peak of the pandemic in spring of last year, throughout the summer and into the autumn. Up until 14th December, there had not been more than 100 cases on any day in the rolling 7-day reporting system used by the Government and the number of deaths from COVID in the District up until that date was 65. However, from 14th December cases nationally and locally rose rapidly and on 4th January North Norfolk recorded 442 cases or a rate of 421.6 per 100,000; when the Norfolk rate was 505 per 100,000 and the England national rate was 680.5 per 100,000.

Since 4th January case numbers have fallen steadily and at 17th February stood at 50 cases or a rate of 47.7 per 100,000 against a Norfolk rate of 99.3 and an England rate of 125.1 – with North Norfolk being the first authority in Norfolk to record a rate of below 50 cases per 100,000 since the New Year. North Norfolk continued to have one of the lowest cumulative rates of infection per 100,000 population of any local authority area in the country – 304th out of 314 local authority areas in England.

The total number of COVID deaths in North Norfolk at 22nd February since the pandemic started in March of this year was 181 deaths - giving a rate of 172.6 per 100,000 - compared to a Norfolk average of 196.5 and an England average of 189.3 deaths per 100,000. On this indicator North Norfolk didn't fare as well as a number of other authorities being the 190th out of the 314 local authority areas in England – possibly due to the older demographic.

The Chief Executive went on to say that the Council continued to work hard to maintain low levels of infection, supporting businesses through the payment of Government grants, people needing to self-isolate and local health partners deliver the first phases of the vaccine programme. As lockdown restrictions began to ease over the next four months, consideration was being given as to how the Council's resources would be deployed to ensure that the District, its businesses, residents and communities were in as strong a position as possible to "recover" from the recent national lockdowns quickly and safely.

Early consideration was being given to re-opening Cromer Pier from the 8th March; delivering key messages and advice to businesses, residents and visitors; supporting social distancing in the first few weeks of the restrictions being lifted, and planning for increased seasonal cleansing, litter bin emptying, beach and water safety. In addition, the Council continued to pay out Government grants to businesses; deliver local Test and Trace contacts to understand the needs of people who are self-isolating need for welfare and financial support; accommodate mobile testing facilities on District Council car parks at Cromer, Fakenham and more recently North Walsham; support colleagues in the health sector with vaccine delivery arrangements in the District and with public health colleagues considering arrangements in the coming months to support the delivery of community and workplace surveillance testing so that across the County Councils could keep on top

of any localised outbreaks which it was anticipated might occur alongside the delivery of the vaccine programme and phased lifting of restrictions; as well as planning for the delivery of the County Council and Police and Crime Commissioner elections on 6th May.

Cllr R Kershaw said that he wished to add that it had been very pleasing to see the rates falling in North Norfolk. He said that he wanted to thank officers for responding so promptly and positively to queries for information and support – particularly from other public bodies such as the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

7 PUBLIC QUESTIONS/STATEMENTS

The Chairman informed Members that three members of the public were in attendance and had submitted questions. He invited them to speak in turn:

Mr Jon Payne asked the following question:

‘Does the Deputy Leader agree that councillors should take every precaution to protect the public and abide by the current Covid regulations?’

Cllr Seward thanked Mr Payne for his question. He said that following receipt he had checked with the Chief Executive’s office as to whether any concerns had been raised regarding the behaviour of any elected member and their failure to abide with the Covid regulations and he had been assured that none had been received.

The Chairman invited Mr Payne to ask a supplementary question. He said that as a senior Liberal Democrat, Cllr Seward would be aware of the advice given by the party to deliver leaflets by hand – in contravention of government advice. He asked whether Cllr Seward would be prepared to take the opportunity to disavow this stance and affirm that all candidates and activists for all parties in North Norfolk should follow police advice and protect the public. Cllr Seward said that the North Norfolk Liberal Democrats abided by the Covid regulations and the requirements of the law.

The Chairman then invited Mrs Judy Oliver to speak. She asked:

‘What date is the Audit report into the Cromer Tennis Hub project expected to be published?’

Cllr Gay, Portfolio Holder for Leisure, replied that the report was commissioned by the Council and prepared by the Internal Audit consortium. It would be considered by the Governance, Risk & Audit Committee at their meeting on 9th March 2021. This was a public meeting and papers would be published on 1st March.

Mrs Oliver then asked Cllr Seward about comments he had made in the press recently regarding the cost burden of the project on the current administration. She referred to the decision by Full Council to proceed with the project once the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) had withdrawn funding, and said all members had voted in favour (following the approval of a business case) to continue with the project. She asked whether, in light of this, Cllr Seward now wished to retract the comments he had made to the Press. Cllr Seward said that he did not intend to retract anything that he had said.

The Chairman invited Mr Rhodri Oliver to speak. He asked the following question:

‘Does Cllr Seward, in his capacity as Portfolio Holder for Finance & Assets, agree that every step should be taken by councillors to ensure value for money is obtained for the taxpayer in all spending of public funds by NNDC?’

Cllr Seward replied that he did agree with Mr Oliver’s statement and he said that the Budget debate later in the meeting included a proposal not to increase council tax whilst maintaining services, reflected the Administration’s ambition to achieve value for money.

Mr Oliver then asked the following supplementary question:

As Cllr Seward agrees that councillors were accountable for their actions both individually and collectively. Can he explain how value for money was obtained when the capability review was commissioned in 2019 – specifically by not obtaining multiple quotes for the work, by failing to complete the contract and by awarding the contract to someone known to an elected member.

Cllr Seward replied that officers had advised that the process followed had been proper and legitimate.

8 APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES, SUB-COMMITTEES, WORKING PARTIES & PANELS

The Deputy Leader informed Council of the following appointments:

- Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party – Cllr R Kershaw to replace Cllr T Adams
- North Norfolk Community Transport (outside body) Cllr L Shires to replace Cllr N Lloyd
- Broads Futures Initiative (outside body) – Cllr A Varley to be appointed as a substitute

9 APPOINTMENT OF MONITORING OFFICER

The Chief Executive introduced this item. He explained that under Section 5 of the Local Government Housing Act 1989, the Council was required to designate a Monitoring Officer. The officer who had fulfilled this role since 2016 had recently left the Council and it was proposed that Cara Jordan, Assistant Director for Finance, Assets and Legal was appointed on a permanent basis.

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

RESOLVED

To appoint Cara Jordan, Assistant Director for Finance, Assets & Legal as the Council’s Monitoring Officer on a permanent basis and with immediate effect.

One member voted against.

10 UPDATE ON MANAGEMENT RESTRUCTURE

The Chief Executive introduced this item. He explained that following approval of the new management structure, good progress had been made in moving forwards with the process of recruiting into the new structure. As yet, no appointment had been

made into the position of Director of Place and Climate Change and it was proposed that the recruitment process for this role would commence shortly and completed in April. A further report would be brought back to the meeting of Full Council outlining the details of the new management structure and consequential savings and efficiencies.

11 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET 01 FEBRUARY 2021

The Chairman invited Cllr Seward, Portfolio Holder for Finance to speak.

- a) Agenda item 11 - Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022 -2025

Cllr Seward said that this item had been considered by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

It was proposed by Cllr Seward, seconded by Cllr L Shires and

RESOLVED to

Approve the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022 -2025

- b) Agenda item 12 – Capital Strategy

Cllr Seward confirmed that this item had been considered by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

It was proposed by Cllr Seward, seconded by Cllr J Toyé and

RESOLVED to

Approve the Capital Strategy and Prudential Indicators for 2021-2022

- c) Agenda Item 13 – Investment Strategy 2021/22

Cllr Seward confirmed that this item had been considered by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

It was proposed by Cllr Seward, seconded by Cllr P Heinrich and

RESOLVED to

Approve the Investment Strategy 2021/2022

- d) Agenda item 14: Treasury Management Strategy 2021/22

Cllr Seward confirmed that this item had been considered by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

It was proposed by Cllr Seward, seconded by Cllr J Toyé and

RESOLVED to

Approve the Treasury Management Strategy 2021/22

- e) Agenda item 15: North Norfolk Council Tax Hardship Fund

Cllr G Hayman, Portfolio Holder for Benefits introduced this item. He explained that the Council Tax Hardship policy supported the administration of the hardship fund.

It was proposed by Cllr Hayman, seconded by Cllr S Penfold and

RESOLVED

- 1. To approve the Council Tax Hardship Policy (Appendix 1) which will support the administration of the hardship fund.**
- 2. That delegation is given to the Benefits Manager to make any technical scheme amendments to ensure that it meets to criteria set by central government.**
- 3. To delegate any amendments as to funding distribution following any further funding committed by Government, to the Section 151 Officer and in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance and the Portfolio Holder for Benefits.**

12 COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT SCHEME 2021/22

Cllr G Hayman, Portfolio Holder for Benefits, introduced this item. He explained that the Council had to review and agree its 2021/22 Council Tax Support (CTS) scheme for working age people by 11 March 2021. A public consultation had been held between 11th January to 7th February 2021 and the report detailed the results of this and outlined the final CTS scheme for 2021/22.

It was proposed by Cllr G Hayman, seconded by Cllr A Brown and

RESOLVED

To approve the Council Tax Support scheme for 2021/2022

13 BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2021-2022

The Chairman outlined the process to Members, explaining that there would be a number of recorded votes.

Cllr C Cushing said that he would like clarification regarding the use of a corporate background during remote committee meetings. He said that all members had been issued with a background and the revised Remote Meetings Protocol emphasised the requirement to use it for formal committee meetings. He asked why not all members were using it, with some using their own backgrounds instead.

Cllr R Kershaw said that it did not work on his device. He said that he hoped another background would be developed that could be used.

Cllr Hayman was asked to respond regarding the use of his own background. He said that he did not feel that Cllr Cushing's concerns related to the use of an alternative background but unease around the slogan that was being displayed on it.

Cllr T FitzPatrick requested that the Monitoring Officer provide guidance to Members on the use of corporate backgrounds and whether backgrounds with a political slogan should be used.

Chairman invited the Chief Financial Officer to explain the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the reserves, as required to do by statute. He referred members to pages 118 - 122 of the agenda, which highlighted a number of financial risks to the authority which had been compounded by the Covid pandemic. Regarding the adequacy of the reserves, he directed Members to pages 122-123 of the agenda and appendix B. He said that in his opinion, the overall budgeted level of both the General Reserve and the Earmarked Reserves were considered adequate in the short term to medium term and that the Budget had been produced within a robust framework.

Cllr E Seward, Portfolio Holder for Finance, was invited to present the Budget, together with the proposed amendment (circulated prior to the meeting).

Cllr Seward began by saying that he would like to thank officers for their time and support in preparing the budget. It had been a unique and challenging period in which to set a budget and had been particularly challenging to forecast the Council's financial position in future years.

He then said that he wanted to propose an amendment. The revised recommendations 1,2,3,7,10 & 11 were outlined in the subsequent papers circulated.

The amendment proposed that there would be no increase in the charge local residents were being asked to pay for District Council services next year. This was possible as the final budget calculations showed a surplus in the Business Rates Collection Fund which has been augmented by Central Government payments and reliefs arising from the Covid pandemic. The Cabinet was of the view that part of this surplus should be used to help our residents by not increasing the Council Tax that this Council charges them. For many households the pandemic had seen them hit hard financially and Cllr Seward said that he believed that the Council should be doing what it could not to increase the financial burdens they are facing. He added that he expected the Council to be one of the few in England not to increase council tax this year and that reflected how well the finances were being managed. North Norfolk also continued to have one of the lowest Council Tax precepts amongst English District Councils with some 80 per cent having a higher Council Tax precept.

Cllr Seward then said that there would be no reductions in the services provided by the District Council. This was important given that the District Council itself provided just over 60 per cent of essential local government services. There would also be no increase on most of the Council's fees and charges. Car park charges would remain at the same level helping to encourage visitors back to the District once the area was able to reopen its vital tourist and hospitality economy.

He then outlined the work that the Council would continue to focus on as part of delivering its priorities for improving services and facilities in the District.

This included:

- a new leisure centre to open in Sheringham in August and within budget.
- Roll out of a £1.4m programme to support more affordable homes.
- Continuation of the tree planting scheme to plant 110,000 trees by 2023 under the Council's Green agenda which was supported by a £300k budget and by two newly appointed environment officers.
- Seafront chalet improvements in Cromer and Sheringham.
- More temporary housing accommodation being obtained by the Council for residents in high housing need with 11 properties bought or being purchased to date. This was projected to save the Council £187k in a full year by no longer using more expensive bed and breakfast accommodation and providing a better form of housing for homeless residents.
- The Information and Advice Budget doubled to provide support to residents who are

vulnerable and /or in need of advice and support in the current challenging environment.

- Continuation of the toilet refurbishment programme. It now included temporary toilets at the Weybourne car park. Proposals would also be brought forward to refurbish the toilets at the Leas, Sheringham with up to date facilities for disabled persons.

He said that all of these initiatives were being supported by a 'fit for purpose' management structure. This new structure was expected to be cost neutral.

Cllr Seward then referred to Cromer Pier. He said that the appendix on the Council's Capital programme showed significant expenditure on refurbishment works. The Council does this because the Pier is central to our tourism offer as the 'Jewel in the Crown' which attracted many visitors to North Norfolk. There had been recent articles in the local press about the pier which could be interpreted as suggesting that the Council wished to change the way it funded, owned and operated the Pier. He said that that the Council's administration had no plans to do this. The Council administration remained very appreciative of businesses operating at the Pier particularly given the challenging times they were going through.

Cllr Seward then spoke about the financial challenges faced by the Council in future years. Twelve months ago the Council was forecasting a deficit of £1.8 million. In reality, the Council had ended up with a surplus of £744k. In previous budget reports he said he had spoken in some detail about the problems the Council faced in knowing what level of Central Government support the Council could expect in future years so that it could better plan its finances and the services it delivered. Consequently, he welcomed the Overview & Scrutiny Committee recommendation that the Council must continue to lobby the Government on this issue. The Council appreciated the thanks it had received from Government Ministers for the work done to address the challenges posed by the pandemic. It included a personal telephone call from a Minister to the Chief Executive thanking the Council for its high performance in getting Government grants out to local business. In return Cllr Seward said that he would like to ask that the Government gave priority to removing the uncertainties faced by Councils over future funding support.

Cllr Seward continued by saying that there was however, one further development which was adding to the financial challenges faced by this and other Councils. The Government had now placed restrictions on Council's developing commercial activities to boost income and thus protecting services and keeping down Council Tax by not allowing them to borrow money from the Public Works Loan Board with its advantageous lending rates. Overnight this had curbed the Council plans to invest in commercial projects to improve its income stream, which was very disappointing.

Cllr Seward said that looking at the Council's financial position moving forward, the projected deficits were largely due to forecast reductions in Central Government funding to the Council. Officers had taken a cautious approach given the uncertainties involved. He said that he did not expect the reduction in Government support to be as great as forecast but as a financially prudent Council, it was necessary to have plans in place should the Council find itself facing a 'worst case scenario' situation. Hence there were recommendations to transfer £550k to reserves to better protect the Council's future financial position and to help with the delivery of priorities for improving services and facilities. A programme to ensure that the Council's resources were effectively meeting the Council's corporate priorities would start in the summer with a Zero Based Budgeting exercise, fees and charges would be reviewed to ensure there was a full cost recovery and suggestions made by officers and members in briefings late last year to generate income and find savings would be reviewed for feasibility with departments asked to assess the impact of a 10 per cent funding reduction as part of the 2022/23 budget process. He said that this indicated that planning was in hand to find savings to meet future deficits should this be required and would be undertaken in a way that, as far as possible, protected front line services.

Cllr Seward said that the Council had a good track record in delivering savings and the programme that was just ending had delivered annual savings of around. £744k. It was important as a Council that resources were used efficiently to enable the Corporate priorities to be supported and to ensure that value for money was being achieved in the services provided to residents.

As a billing authority for Council Tax, residents would see an increase of around £70 in 2021/22 for the average Band D Council Tax payer due to Council Tax increases being made by Norfolk County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner.

Cllr Seward said that looking at the Council's financial position moving forward, the projected deficits were largely due to forecast reductions in Central Government funding to the Council. Officers had taken a cautious approach given the uncertainties involved. He said that he did not expect the reduction in Government support to be as great as forecast but as a financially prudent Council, it was necessary to have plans in place should the Council find itself facing a 'worst case scenario' situation. Hence there were recommendations to transfer £550k to reserves to better protect the Council's future financial position and to help with the delivery of priorities for improving services and facilities. A programme to ensure that the Council's resources were effectively meeting the Council's corporate priorities would start in the summer with a Zero Based Budgeting exercise, fees and charges would be reviewed to ensure there was a full cost recovery and suggestions made by officers and members in briefings late last year to generate income and find savings would be reviewed for feasibility with departments asked to assess the impact of a 10 per cent funding reduction as part of the 2022/23 budget process. He said that this indicated that planning was in hand to find savings to meet future deficits should this be required and would be undertaken in a way that, as far as possible, protected front line services.

Cllr Seward said that the Council had a good track record in delivering savings and the programme that was just ending had delivered annual savings of around. £744k. It was important as a Council that resources were used efficiently to enable the Corporate priorities to be supported and to ensure that value for money was being achieved in the services provided to residents.

As a billing authority for Council Tax, residents would see an increase of around £70 in 2021/22 for the average Band D Council Tax payer due to Council Tax increases being made by Norfolk County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner.

Cllr Seward concluded by saying that in the current financial year, the Council had received £1.7 m in Central Government support to cater for loss of income and expenditure as a result of the COVID pandemic. The most recent estimates suggested that the Council would be able to balance its accounts for this period and not have a deficit. The Councils was grateful for the additional Central Government support it had received and as the implications of the Covid pandemic would remain for some time it was hoped that further assistance would be available. However, the Council still had to manage its financial affairs soundly and it was because of this that the budget for the next financial year had no cuts in services, no increase in Council Tax and continued with the ambitious programme to improve services and facilities in the District. He said that he commended the recommendations as amended in the Budget report to Members.

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett seconded the amendment. She began by reiterating Cllr Seward's thanks to the officers for their hard work. She said that the surplus in the business rates collection fund and the additional income from the New Homes Bonus, which had led to the amendment, had put additional pressure on officer to prepare the reports in time for the Budget debate. She then outlined the background to both the NHB and the Business Rates Collection fund and

explained how the increase in funding had come about. She went on to say that the most important people to the Council were the residents. She said that as soon as Cabinet members were aware of the additional funding available, they were in agreement that it should be used to support a freeze in council tax. She concluded by saying that she commended the amendment to Members.

The Chairman then invited Cllr C Cushing, Leader of the Opposition to respond to the Budget.

Cllr Cushing began by thanking the Director of Resources and his team for their support and hard work in preparing the Budget. He said that he felt it was a disappointing budget that did nothing to address the future needs of the Council.

On a positive note, it was a balanced budget, however the reason for this was central government's funding contribution which was around £1.2m. He added that businesses had also received a huge amount of support from government through various grants totalling £87m across North Norfolk. This together with the furlough scheme, showed that the Government had put an incredible amount of support in place during the pandemic. He went on to say that because of this additional support, the Council had been able to produce a balanced budget for the forthcoming year, however, the picture for future years looked increasingly bleak. It was predicted that there would be a deficit of £2m for every financial year from 2022/23 onwards. He said that it should be a major priority of the Administration to start putting plans in place this financial year to address these impending shortfalls. However, nothing had been done. What was striking about the budget and the MTFs was that there was no strategy in place to address future financial challenges. The Administration had been in place for two and a half years but no money saving initiatives had been presented and no income-generating proposals had been put forward. He compared this to the previous Conservative administration which had initiated a number of savings proposals during 2016/17 which were now estimated to deliver substantial savings each year. Yet there was no equivalent coming forward in 5 years' time.

Cllr Cushing went on to say that the Administration's approach seemed to be to hope that the Government continued to provide funding to bail the Council out. He said that their failure to plan for the future was an abdication of responsibility. He then spoke about the proposal to freeze council tax. He had been expecting to talk about a proposed rise as this had been in the papers that had gone to Cabinet and then Overview & Scrutiny Committee and the initial report to Full Council. He had been surprised to read Cllr Seward's comments about a proposed freeze, although he believed that it had been in response to comments made by Duncan Baker MP in Parliament. He called on the Administration to abandon any future council tax increases that may be planned in the next two years.

Cllr Cushing made reference to the recent senior management restructure and the high costs it had incurred. Had this money not been spent, it could have funded council tax freezes for this year and next year. He disputed Cllr Seward's claim that the restructure was 'cost neutral', saying that he could not see how adding three Director roles into the existing structure could help the council limit its staff costs. He believed that the money spent on this could have been spent elsewhere – such as in the local towns to provide free parking.

Cllr Cushing concluded by saying that he felt this was a 'do nothing' budget with a lack of strategic ideas. He said that his Group would continue to hold the Administration to account for the remainder of this term.

Cllr J Rest, Leader of the Independent Group, was invited to speak. He said that this had been one of the most difficult periods ever for the Council. He said that officers and members had worked tirelessly to support residents and businesses through such a challenging time. He said he was pleased to see that the Council was able to present a balanced budget whilst

proposing a freeze on Council tax. This would be a great relief to many residents. He thanked the Administration for consulting with the Independent Group on the Budget.

The Chairman then invited Cllr Seward to respond. Cllr Seward said that the Chief Executive had advised members that the management reorganisation was cost neutral. Regarding investment proposals and opportunities, he said that the Government had made this very difficult so the Council could not pursue these.

He said that he did not believe that the savings proposals he had outlined in his speech were vague. He had been clear about moving forward with zero based budgeting and with asking service areas to make 10% savings in their budgets. He felt this was real action to find achievable savings. He added that council tax had been frozen during the previous two administrations because the Government had given local authorities a financial incentive to do so. This was removed in 2017.

Cllr Cushing replied that the Council had moved from a very flat structure to a more hierarchical structure with several additional senior roles and he did not accept it was cost neutral. He felt that there had not been any investment proposals for the government to curtail. He concluded by saying that he was sceptical that a decision to freeze council tax was being taken just ahead of County Council elections.

Cllr Rest replied that he was not going to comment on the previous Administration.

The Chairman said that he would open the debate on the amendment:

Cllr L Shires said that she had enjoyed learning about what had happened previously at the Council. She had recently attended a meeting of the all-party parliamentary group of District Councils. At that session, the Institute of Fiscal Studies had made a presentation on the impact of the pandemic on District Councils. The average District Council had achieved efficiency savings of £0.6m, yet between 10-20% of the cost impact of Covid had not been funded by Government. The over-arching perspective was that this additional impact should be funded from reserves. She then referred to local communities, more than 15% of workers in North Norfolk had been furloughed with coastal communities being amongst the worst affected and it was the responsibility of the Council to ensure that local residents were protected from the worst financial impact. Cllr Shires then referred to Cllr Cushing's assertion that the Administration's approach was a 'dereliction of duty'. She said it had been raised at the all-party session that she had attended that the lack of medium term financial planning for the funding of District Councils was not the way to go and if this was compared to Cllr Cushing's view that the Council's lack of financial planning was a dereliction of duty then the Government could be accused of the same thing.

She concluded that no Conservative-led authorities across the region were proposing to freeze council tax, so that did not reflect the view that the Administration were aligning themselves with this political stance. In addition, the Government had encouraged local authorities to raise funds and fill budget gaps via council tax, so it appeared that the messaging on this issue was mixed. She said that she fully supported the proposal to freeze council tax.

Cllr G Hayman said that he endorsed the amendment. He said that the proposal to freeze council tax was to help residents of North Norfolk who had been impacted heavily by the pandemic. He added that Conservative-led administrations across Norfolk were increasing council tax and this was not a model that he would want to see in North Norfolk. He went on to say that the Administration had made savings, including the cancellation of some costly projects. Regarding commercialisation and income generation, the previous Conservative administration had an opportunity to bring forward proposals to generate funds but had not done so.

Cllr H Blathwayt said that he was disappointed at the tone of the opposition. He asked whether Cllr Seward agreed that North Norfolk was the only council in Norfolk not to increase members' allowances and the only authority not to raise council tax. He asked whether this showed good housekeeping.

Cllr S Penfold commented that he was surprised at Cllr Cushing's gloomy comments. He said that he wanted to congratulate Cllr Seward and the officers for bringing forward a balanced budget. He welcomed the news that council tax would be frozen with no cuts to services.

Cllr J Rest said that he wished to highlight item 3.32 (of the amendment) which referred to the relocation of the property company reserve. He sought clarification that this project was considered to no longer be viable but requested that consideration was given to it being revisited at a later date. Cllr Seward replied that the fund was being moved was because commercial activities on the balance sheet as it could hamper the Council's ability to borrow money from the Public Works Loans Board.

Cllr T FitzPatrick said that he believed that council tax should only be increased when it was necessary. He added that in previous years, when the former administration had frozen council tax and put money into reserves, as Leader he had been castigated for taking such an approach. He said that this was a cynical budget that would store up trouble for the future. The fact that a different budget had been debated at Overview and Scrutiny Committee just recently, indicated that it was not well planned or managed effectively.

Cllr E Withington referred back to the LGA conference where the Secretary of State had commented that councils should not be investing in commercial projects. She had been very disappointed by this approach and it would have a far-reaching impact on local authorities' ability to raise much-needed income. She concluded by saying that she welcomed the amendment and it should be welcomed during an unprecedented year that a balanced budget could be achieved without raising council tax.

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett, seconder of the amendment said that she was disappointed by the tone of some of the comments. It didn't benefit residents in any way and members were there to support their local communities.

The Chairman advised Members that the Monitoring Officer would undertake a recorded vote on the amendment.

The Monitoring Officer informed Members that they were voting on the amended recommendations 1,2,3 and 7.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that 30 Members had voted in favour of the amendment, with 7 Members abstaining. The amendment was therefore carried.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr A Fitch-Tillett and

RESOLVED to approve:

1) The 2021/22 revenue budget as outlined within revised Appendix A within this report which has been amended to reflect no increase in the District Council's precept; (**revised Appendix A (General Fund Summary)**) - showing the reduction in council tax income and associated reduction in surplus from **£744,806 to £542,058**)

2) The new surplus of £542,058 be transferred to the Business Rates Reserve (£342,058) and the Delivery Plan Reserve (£200,000);

3) The £2m Property Company Reserve be reallocated to the newly established Delivery Plan Reserve (£1.5m) and Treasury Reserve (£0.5m);

7) That Members note the current financial projections for the period 2022/23 to 2024/25 **(revised Appendix A (General Fund Summary))**;

The Chairman advised Members that the amendment would now form part of the substantive budget proposals.

Cllr E Seward proposed the substantive motion. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett seconded it.

The Chairman invited the Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Cllr N Dixon, to speak on behalf of the committee and present any recommendations to Council.

Cllr Dixon began by thanking the Finance Team for their hard work in ensuring that a balanced budget was presented. He said he welcomed the decision to support a freeze in council tax as it showed that the Administration had listened to everyone who had opposed an increase. Particularly as no savings proposals had been forthcoming.

Cllr Dixon went on to say that overall, the Budget was disappointing. He outlined three reasons for this; firstly, there were no efficiency savings being put forward. There was no evidence that, following the greatest change to working practices in a generation, that the Council was taking the opportunity to look at ways of working more efficiently. Secondly, there were no new invest to save proposals. It was not just about the coming year. It should feed directly into the MTFS and preparation should be in place to close the funding gaps over the next few years. This could be achieved by increasing income streams or reducing revenue costs. He added that the Council could use its own funds to invest to save. Thirdly, there was no evidence of contingency planning regarding the pandemic. Up to now the Government had covered the costs via grants. However, there was no plan in place should this funding no longer be available. There was an assumption that the Government would continue to cover the costs in the longer term. He questioned what would happen if this was not the case, would the Administration 'dip' into the reserves. He said that these key points were made by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee when it reviewed the Budget proposals and the MTFS in January. He added that there was real concern that the savings proposals put forward during a Finance workshop for Members in late 2020, had not been taken forward at all. He concluded by saying the Council was now far behind where it should be. He said that it was extremely unfortunate that the proposals to freeze council tax came so late as this meant that the Overview & Scrutiny committee were not able to consider them. This approach undermined the pre-scrutiny process.

He said that the Budget may meet statutory requirements but it failed to consider opportunities and prepare for the inevitable challenges ahead. He said that the Council should be prudently planning and hoping for the best.

The Chairman then opened up the substantive debate to Members.

Cllr Heinink said that he welcomed the budget for beach chalet refurbishment in his local ward of Sheringham.

Cllr L Shires said that she was insulted by the allegations that the Council was not looking to make savings and plan ahead. She referred to recent proposals made by an officer at a meeting of Standards Committee, outlining a move to a digital record keeping process that would significantly reduce resource implications, adding that similar work was ongoing throughout the organisation and should be acknowledged. Regarding proposals to Invest to Save, she said that the Council should be looking for policy driven, data driven and savings driven movements in what it was trying to achieve. She thanked the Finance Team for their support.

and hard work.

Cllr E Withington echoed Cllr Heinink's comments. She said that a lot of people would be visiting the District for 'staycation' holidays and she welcomed the investment in chalet improvements and the public conveniences. Any money that supported tourism would help local businesses.

Cllr N Lloyd said that in response to Cllr Dixon's comments regarding the lack of invest to save initiatives, he wanted to draw Members' attention to the recent investment in refuse collection trucks which meant that the Council had avoided paying the uplift that would have occurred had the contractor purchased the vehicles.

Cllr N Pearce said that he felt that the role of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee had been diminished by not having the opportunity to fully scrutinise the proposals to freeze the council tax.

Cllr H Blathwayt said that as a member of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, he felt that everything had been scrutinised except the council tax freeze.

The Chairman invited Cllr A Fitch-Tillett to speak as seconder of the motion.

Cllr Fitch-Tillett said that local government did rely on central government for many things and this should be acknowledged. Regarding Cllr Dixon's comments about remote working and using this as an opportunity for efficiency savings, she said that social contact was important and this should be considered too.

Cllr E Seward, was invited to close the debate as proposer of the motion. He began by saying that he regretted that the process whereby the Budget was set meant that all of the data was not available in January when the Overview & Scrutiny Committee considered the proposals. He wished that this was not the case but it was dictated by central government process.

He said that he had outlined clearly in his earlier speech how savings would be achieved in future years. He said that he wanted it to remain a prudent authority and he was not complacent in any way about the challenges ahead.

The Chairman informed Members that the Monitoring Officer would now take a recorded vote on recommendations 1-8 (as amended).

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr A Fitch-Tillett and

RESOLVED by 30 votes, with 7 abstentions

That having considered the Chief Financial Officer's report on the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, the following be approved:

- 1) The 2021/22 revenue budget as outlined within revised Appendix A within this report which has been amended to reflect no increase in the District Council's precept; (**revised Appendix A (General Fund Summary)**) - showing the reduction in council tax income and associated reduction in surplus from **£744,806 to £542,058**)
- 2) The new surplus of £542,058 be transferred to the Business Rates Reserve (£342,058) and the Delivery Plan Reserve (£200,000);
- 3) The £2m Property Company Reserve be reallocated to the newly established Delivery Plan Reserve (£1.5m) and Treasury Reserve (£0.5m);

- 4) The statement of and movement on the reserves as detailed at Appendix C within this report;
- 5) The updated Capital Programme and financing for 2021/22 to 2023/24 (as detailed at Appendix C1 within the 2021/22 Budget Report - February 2021 Cabinet Agenda);
- 6) The new capital bids recommended for approval (as detailed within appendix C2 within the 2021/22 Budget Report - February 2021 Cabinet Agenda);
- 7) That Members note the current financial projections for the period 2022/23 to 2024/25 **(revised Appendix A (General Fund Summary))**;
- 8) The updated 2021/22 Rate Relief Policy as set out in section 5 is approved.

The Chairman invited the Section 151 Officer to outline the different elements of the Council tax recommendations. He said that Members should consider the supplementary papers that provided revised calculations for the council tax for 2021/22. He explained that section 4.5 of the revised report set out the statutory calculations for the council tax bases. Section 4.6 gave details of the parish precepts, and section 4.7 provided details of the County Council and Norfolk Police and Crime Commissioner's precepts.

The Chairman informed members that a recorded vote would be taken on recommendations 10 and 11.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr A Fitch-Tillett and

RESOLVED unanimously (37 in favour)

10) That Members undertake the Council Tax and statutory calculations set out at section 4, and set the Council Tax for 2021/22.

11) The demand on the Collection Fund for 2021/22 is as follows:

- a. £6,253,465 for District purposes
- b. £2,573,788 for Parish/Town Precepts;

The Council Tax Base was calculated as follows for the year 2021/22.

The number of dwellings in each Council Tax band taking into account the multipliers, discounts, exemptions, rate of collection and Council Tax Support:-

a) for the whole Council area as 40,959 (Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992) being calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of The Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, as its Council Tax base for the year;

b)

PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	COUNCIL TAX BASE	PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	COUNCIL TAX BASE
Alby With Thwaite	98.01	Little Barningham	50.09
Aldborough and Thurgarton	236.15	Little Snoring	231.53
Antingham	119.30	Ludham	504.74
Ashmanhaugh	67.94	Matlaske	63.66
Aylmerton	214.94	Melton Constable	211.20

PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	COUNCIL TAX BASE	PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	COUNCIL TAX BASE
Baconsthorpe	83.85	Morston	58.50
Bacton	517.67	Mundesley	1,165.67
Barsham	98.70	Neatishead	236.09
Barton Turf	239.54	North Walsham	4,131.54
Beckham East/West	115.40	Northrepps	401.81
Beeston Regis	394.22	Overstrand	466.13
Binham	187.89	Paston	95.73
Blakeney	551.27	Plumstead	49.60
Bodham	171.07	Potter Heigham	415.43
Briningham	65.24	Pudding Norton	76.16
Brinton	122.75	Raynham	165.17
Briston	867.35	Roughton	342.55
Brumstead	24.65	Runton (East & West)	722.11
Catfield	326.33	Ryburgh	233.84
Cley	329.08	Salthouse	122.98
Colby	190.48	Scottow	293.73
Corpusty and Saxthorpe	282.28	Sculthorpe	278.61
Cromer	3,018.76	Sea Palling	207.49
Dilham	146.73	Sheringham	3,162.87
Dunton	54.35	Sidestrand	44.85
East Ruston	190.18	Skeyton	90.09
Edgefield	208.01	Sloley	96.76
Erpingham	256.51	Smallburgh	190.65
Fakenham	2,620.74	Southrepps	336.61
Felbrigg	78.80	Stalham	1,153.64
Felmingham	194.04	Stibbard	140.38
Field Dalling	139.01	Stiffkey	132.36
Fulmodeston	180.48	Stody	91.32
Gimmingham	146.42	Suffield	60.59
Great Snoring	85.26	Sustead	90.19
Gresham	168.22	Sutton	392.14
Gunthorpe	152.01	Swafield	114.25
Hanworth	97.02	Swanton Abbott	147.81
Happisburgh	308.16	Swanton Novers	86.33
Helhoughton	148.58	Tattersett	279.58
Hempstead	75.83	Thornage	93.64
Hempton	187.51	Thorpe Market	119.76
Hickling	418.57	Thurning	33.78
High Kelling	304.33	Thursford	109.18
Hindolveston	209.78	Trimingham	139.28
Hindringham	235.87	Trunch	364.32
Holkham	83.16	Tunstead	261.56
Holt	1,814.38	Upper Sheringham	105.83

Honing	123.75	Walcott	218.34
Horning	599.95	Walsingham	360.72
Horsey	32.05	Warham	92.94
PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	COUNCIL TAX BASE	PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	COUNCIL TAX BASE
Hoveton	837.69	Wells-Next-The-Sea	1,141.25
Ingham	154.88	Westwick	29.80
Ingworth	40.69	Weybourne	333.89
Itteringham	63.16	Wickmere	58.31
Kelling	99.20	Wighton	109.40
Kettlestone	93.06	Witton	130.58
Knapton	157.71	Wiveton	81.48
Langham	221.85	Wood Norton	107.04
Lessingham	228.73	Worstead	322.40
Letheringsett With Glandford	131.18		

being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 6 of The Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012, as the amounts of its Council Tax base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which special items (parish precepts) may relate.

4.1 That the following amounts be now **CALCULATED** by the Council for the year 2021/22 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and the relevant regulations and directions as follows:-

- a) £55,541,459 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the expenditure items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act.
- b) £46,671,454 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the income items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
- c) £8,870,005 being the amount by which the aggregate at (a) above exceeds the aggregate at (b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act, as its Council Tax requirement for the year.
- d) £216.55 being the amount at (c) above divided by the amount at 4.5(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts).
- e) £2,573,788 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act.

- f) £153.72 being the amount at (d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at (e) above by the amount at 4.5 (a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no special item (Parish precept) relates.

g)

PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	COUNCIL TAX BASE	PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	COUNCIL TAX BASE
Alby with Thwaite	184.32	Letheringsett with Glandford	168.96
Aldborough and Thurgarton	194.37	Little Barningham	170.68
Antingham	183.05	Little Snoring	193.88
Ashmanhaugh	212.62	Ludham	172.93
Aylmerton	186.75	Matlaske	161.57
Baconsthorpe	219.31	Melton Constable	222.42
Bacton	186.55	Mundesley	199.18
Barsham	177.78	Neatishead	188.74
Barton Turf	182.94	North Walsham	257.38
Beckham East/West	181.88	Northrepps	195.65
Beeston Regis	185.42	Overstrand	215.93
Binham	186.71	Paston	221.24
Blakeney	231.72	Plumstead	209.16
Bodham	203.40	Potter Heigham	189.82
Briningham	176.71	Pudding Norton	219.37
Brinton	178.15	Raynham	193.29
Briston	214.37	Roughton	182.91
Catfield	190.49	Runton (East & West)	174.90
Cley	195.69	Ryburgh	198.17
Colby	237.89	Salthouse	195.19
Corpusty and Saxthorpe	216.48	Scottow	201.38
Cromer	247.65	Sculthorpe	182.73
Dilham	187.79	Sea Palling	220.74
East Ruston	186.58	Sheringham	261.89
Edgefield	185.56	Sidestrand	187.16
Erpingham	197.38	Skeyton	165.93
Fakenham	234.36	Sloley	184.95
Felbrigg	195.59	Smallburgh	183.72
Felmingham	163.25	Southrepps	203.48
Field Dalling	184.76	Stalham	241.69
Fulmodeston	197.23	Stibbard	194.17
Gimingham	204.94	Stiffkey	192.94
Great Snoring	212.36	Stody	202.99

Gresham	198.30	Suffield	178.47
Gunthorpe	166.87	Sustead	183.98
Hanworth	177.42	Sutton	194.52
Happisburgh	168.15	Swafield	201.86
Helhoughton	190.53	Swanton Abbott	194.31
Hempstead	193.06	Swanton Novers	250.15
Hempton	249.71	Tattersett	165.14
Hickling	175.48	Thornage	181.17
High Kelling	175.01	Thorpe Market	203.82
Hindolveston	213.90	Thursford	192.18
Hindringham	187.55	Trimingham	233.35
Holkham	189.79	Trunch	210.87
Holt	230.48	Tunstead	178.57
Honing	171.49	Upper Sheringham	201.73
Horning	185.83	Walcott	192.80
Horsey	185.85	Walsingham	220.25
Hoveton	220.94	Warham	218.27
Ingham	170.50	Wells-next-the-Sea	223.81
Ingworth	223.27	Weybourne	209.78
Itteringham	194.88	Wickmere	213.74
Kelling	192.02	Wighton	190.28
Kettlestone	195.62	Witton	180.79
Knapton	193.34	Wiveton	202.81
Langham	197.10	Wood Norton	182.07
Lessingham	171.20	Worstead	179.89

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 4.6(f) above to the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 4.5(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

h)

PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	VALUATION BANDS							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Alby with Thwaite	122.88	143.36	163.84	184.32	225.29	266.25	307.21	368.65
Aldborough and Thurgarton	129.58	151.17	172.77	194.37	237.56	280.75	323.95	388.74
Antingham	122.03	142.37	162.71	183.05	223.73	264.41	305.09	366.11
Ashmanhaugh	141.74	165.37	188.99	212.62	259.87	307.12	354.37	425.24
Aylmerton	124.50	145.25	166.00	186.75	228.25	269.75	311.25	373.50
Baconsthorpe	146.20	170.57	194.94	219.31	268.04	316.78	365.52	438.62
Bacton	124.37	145.10	165.83	186.55	228.01	269.47	310.93	373.11
Barsham	118.52	138.27	158.02	177.78	217.29	256.79	296.30	355.56
Barton Turf	121.96	142.28	162.61	182.94	223.59	264.25	304.90	365.88

Beckham East/West	121.25	141.46	161.67	181.88	222.30	262.71	303.13	363.76
Beeston Regis	123.61	144.22	164.82	185.42	226.63	267.84	309.04	370.85
Binham	124.47	145.22	165.97	186.71	228.21	269.70	311.19	373.43
Blakeney	154.48	180.22	205.97	231.72	283.21	334.70	386.20	463.44
Bodham	135.60	158.20	180.80	203.40	248.60	293.81	339.01	406.81
Briningham	117.80	137.44	157.07	176.71	215.98	255.25	294.52	353.42
Brinton	118.77	138.56	158.36	178.15	217.75	257.34	296.93	356.31
Briston	142.91	166.73	190.55	214.37	262.01	309.65	357.29	428.75
Catfield	126.99	148.16	169.32	190.49	232.82	275.15	317.48	380.98
Cley	130.46	152.20	173.95	195.69	239.18	282.67	326.16	391.39
Colby	158.59	185.03	211.46	237.89	290.76	343.62	396.49	475.79
Corpusty and Saxthorpe	144.32	168.37	192.42	216.48	264.58	312.69	360.80	432.96
Cromer	165.10	192.62	220.13	247.65	302.69	357.72	412.76	495.31
Dilham	125.19	146.06	166.92	187.79	229.52	271.26	312.99	375.59
East Ruston	124.38	145.12	165.85	186.58	228.04	269.50	310.97	373.16
Edgefield	123.71	144.33	164.95	185.56	226.80	268.04	309.28	371.13
Erpingham	131.58	153.52	175.45	197.38	241.24	285.10	328.97	394.76
Fakenham	156.24	182.28	208.32	234.36	286.44	338.52	390.60	468.73
Felbrigg	130.39	152.13	173.86	195.59	239.06	282.53	325.99	391.19
Felmingham	108.83	126.97	145.11	163.25	199.53	235.81	272.09	326.50
Field Dalling	123.17	143.70	164.23	184.76	225.81	266.87	307.93	369.52
Fulmodeston	131.48	153.40	175.31	197.23	241.06	284.89	328.71	394.46
Gimingham	136.62	159.39	182.17	204.94	250.48	296.02	341.57	409.88
Great Snoring	141.57	165.17	188.76	212.36	259.55	306.74	353.94	424.72
Gresham	132.20	154.23	176.27	198.30	242.37	286.43	330.50	396.60
Gunthorpe	111.25	129.79	148.33	166.87	203.96	241.04	278.12	333.75
Hanworth	118.28	137.99	157.71	177.42	216.85	256.28	295.71	354.85
Happisburgh	112.10	130.78	149.47	168.15	205.52	242.88	280.25	336.30
Helhoughton	127.02	148.19	169.36	190.53	232.87	275.21	317.55	381.07
Hempstead	128.70	150.16	171.61	193.06	235.96	278.87	321.77	386.12
Hempton	166.47	194.22	221.96	249.71	305.20	360.69	416.19	499.42
Hickling	116.99	136.49	155.99	175.48	214.48	253.48	292.48	350.97
High Kelling	116.67	136.12	155.57	175.01	213.91	252.80	291.69	350.03
Hindolveston	142.60	166.36	190.13	213.90	261.43	308.96	356.50	427.80
Hindringham	125.03	145.87	166.71	187.55	229.23	270.90	312.58	375.10
Holkham	126.53	147.61	168.70	189.79	231.97	274.14	316.32	379.59
Holt	153.65	179.26	204.87	230.48	281.69	332.91	384.13	460.96
Honing	114.33	133.38	152.44	171.49	209.60	247.71	285.82	342.99
Horning	123.88	144.53	165.18	185.83	227.12	268.42	309.71	371.66
Horsey	123.90	144.55	165.20	185.85	227.15	268.46	309.76	371.71
Hoveton	147.29	171.84	196.39	220.94	270.04	319.14	368.24	441.89
Ingham	113.67	132.61	151.56	170.50	208.39	246.28	284.17	341.01
Ingworth	148.84	173.65	198.46	223.27	272.88	322.50	372.11	446.54
Itteringham	129.92	151.57	173.23	194.88	238.19	281.50	324.80	389.77
Kelling	128.01	149.35	170.69	192.02	234.69	277.37	320.04	384.05

Kettlestone	130.41	152.15	173.89	195.62	239.10	282.57	326.04	391.25
Knapton	128.89	150.38	171.86	193.34	236.31	279.28	322.24	386.69
Langham	131.40	153.30	175.20	197.10	240.91	284.71	328.51	394.21
Lessingham	114.13	133.16	152.18	171.20	209.25	247.30	285.34	342.41
Letheringsett with Glandford	112.64	131.41	150.19	168.96	206.51	244.06	281.61	337.93
Little Barningham	113.79	132.75	151.72	170.68	208.62	246.55	284.48	341.37
Little Snoring	129.25	150.80	172.34	193.88	236.97	280.05	323.14	387.77
Ludham	115.28	134.50	153.71	172.93	211.36	249.79	288.21	345.86
Matlaske	107.71	125.66	143.62	161.57	197.47	233.38	269.29	323.14
Melton Constable	148.28	172.99	197.70	222.42	271.84	321.27	370.70	444.84
Mundesley	132.79	154.92	177.05	199.18	243.45	287.71	331.97	398.37
Neatishead	125.82	146.80	167.77	188.74	230.68	272.63	314.57	377.48
North Walsham	171.59	200.18	228.78	257.38	314.58	371.77	428.97	514.77
Northrepps	130.43	152.17	173.91	195.65	239.13	282.60	326.08	391.30
Overstrand	143.95	167.94	191.94	215.93	263.91	311.90	359.89	431.86
Paston	147.49	172.07	196.66	221.24	270.40	319.57	368.73	442.48
Plumstead	139.44	162.68	185.92	209.16	255.64	302.12	348.60	418.32
Potter Heigham	126.55	147.64	168.73	189.82	232.01	274.19	316.37	379.65
Pudding Norton	146.24	170.62	194.99	219.37	268.12	316.86	365.61	438.74
Raynham	128.86	150.33	171.81	193.29	236.24	279.19	322.15	386.58
Roughton	121.94	142.26	162.58	182.91	223.56	264.20	304.85	365.82
Runton	116.60	136.03	155.47	174.90	213.77	252.64	291.51	349.81
Ryburgh	132.11	154.13	176.15	198.17	242.21	286.25	330.28	396.34
Salthouse	130.12	151.81	173.50	195.19	238.56	281.94	325.31	390.38
Scottow	134.25	156.63	179.00	201.38	246.13	290.88	335.63	402.76
Sculthorpe	121.82	142.13	162.43	182.73	223.34	263.95	304.56	365.47
Sea Palling	147.16	171.69	196.22	220.74	269.80	318.86	367.91	441.49
Sheringham	174.59	203.69	232.79	261.89	320.09	378.28	436.48	523.78
Sidestrand	124.77	145.57	166.36	187.16	228.75	270.34	311.94	374.32
Skeyton	110.62	129.05	147.49	165.93	202.80	239.67	276.55	331.86
Sloley	123.30	143.85	164.40	184.95	226.05	267.15	308.25	369.90
Smallburgh	122.48	142.89	163.30	183.72	224.54	265.37	306.20	367.44
Southrepps	135.65	158.26	180.87	203.48	248.69	293.91	339.13	406.96
Stalham	161.12	187.98	214.83	241.69	295.40	349.11	402.82	483.38
Stibbard	129.44	151.02	172.59	194.17	237.32	280.47	323.62	388.34
Stiffkey	128.63	150.06	171.50	192.94	235.82	278.70	321.57	385.89
Stody	135.33	157.88	180.44	202.99	248.10	293.21	338.32	405.99
Suffield	118.98	138.81	158.64	178.47	218.13	257.79	297.46	356.95
Sustead	122.65	143.10	163.54	183.98	224.87	265.76	306.64	367.97
Sutton	129.68	151.29	172.90	194.52	237.74	280.97	324.20	389.04
Swafield	134.57	157.00	179.43	201.86	246.71	291.57	336.43	403.72
Swanton Abbott	129.54	151.13	172.72	194.31	237.49	280.67	323.85	388.62
Swanton Novers	166.76	194.56	222.35	250.15	305.74	361.33	416.92	500.30
Tattersett	110.09	128.44	146.79	165.14	201.84	238.54	275.24	330.28
Thornage	120.78	140.91	161.04	181.17	221.44	261.70	301.96	362.35
Thorpe Market	135.88	158.52	181.17	203.82	249.11	294.40	339.70	407.64

Thursford	128.12	149.47	170.83	192.18	234.89	277.60	320.31	384.37
Trimingham	155.57	181.50	207.42	233.35	285.21	337.07	388.93	466.71
Trunch	140.58	164.01	187.44	210.87	257.73	304.59	351.45	421.74
Tunstead	119.04	138.88	158.72	178.57	218.25	257.93	297.61	357.14
Upper Sheringham	134.48	156.90	179.31	201.73	246.55	291.38	336.21	403.46
Walcott	128.53	149.96	171.38	192.80	235.65	278.49	321.34	385.61
Walsingham	146.83	171.30	195.78	220.25	269.19	318.14	367.08	440.50
Warham	145.51	169.77	194.02	218.27	266.78	315.29	363.79	436.55
Wells-next-the-Sea	149.21	174.08	198.94	223.81	273.55	323.29	373.03	447.63
Weybourne	139.85	163.16	186.47	209.78	256.40	303.02	349.64	419.57
Wickmere	142.49	166.24	189.99	213.74	261.24	308.74	356.24	427.48
Wighton	126.85	147.99	169.14	190.28	232.56	274.85	317.13	380.56
Witton	120.52	140.61	160.70	180.79	220.96	261.14	301.31	361.58
Wiveton	135.20	157.74	180.27	202.81	247.88	292.95	338.01	405.62
Wood Norton	121.38	141.61	161.84	182.07	222.53	262.99	303.45	364.14
Worstead	119.93	139.92	159.90	179.89	219.87	259.85	299.83	359.79
All Other Parts of the Council's Area	102.48	119.56	136.64	153.72	187.88	222.04	256.20	307.44

being the amounts given by multiplying (as appropriate) the amounts at 4.6(f) or 4.6(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

- 4.2 That it be **NOTED** that for the year 2021/22 the Norfolk County Council and the Office of the Police & Crime Commissioner for Norfolk have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

	VALUATION BANDS							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Norfolk County Council	981.96	1,145.62	1,309.28	1,472.94	1,800.26	2,127.58	2,454.90	2,945.88
Norfolk Police and Crime Commissioner	185.34	216.23	247.12	278.01	339.79	401.57	463.35	556.02

- 4.3 That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 4.6(h) and 4.7 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, **HEREBY SETS** the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2021/22 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

PART OF THE COUNCIL'S AREA	VALUATION BANDS							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Alby with Thwaithe	1,290.18	1,505.21	1,720.24	1,935.27	2,365.34	2,795.40	3,225.46	3,870.55
Aldborough and Thurgarton	1,296.88	1,513.02	1,729.17	1,945.32	2,377.61	2,809.90	3,242.20	3,890.64
Antingham	1,289.33	1,504.22	1,719.11	1,934.00	2,363.78	2,793.56	3,223.34	3,868.01
Ashmanhaugh	1,309.04	1,527.22	1,745.39	1,963.57	2,399.92	2,836.27	3,272.62	3,927.14
Aylmerton	1,291.80	1,507.10	1,722.40	1,937.70	2,368.30	2,798.90	3,229.50	3,875.40
Baconsthorpe	1,313.50	1,532.42	1,751.34	1,970.26	2,408.09	2,845.93	3,283.77	3,940.52
Bacton	1,291.67	1,506.95	1,722.23	1,937.50	2,368.06	2,798.62	3,229.18	3,875.01
Barsham	1,285.82	1,500.12	1,714.42	1,928.73	2,357.34	2,785.94	3,214.55	3,857.46
Barton Turf	1,289.26	1,504.13	1,719.01	1,933.89	2,363.64	2,793.40	3,223.15	3,867.78
Beckham East/West	1,288.55	1,503.31	1,718.07	1,932.83	2,362.35	2,791.86	3,221.38	3,865.66
Beeston Regis	1,290.91	1,506.07	1,721.22	1,936.37	2,366.68	2,796.99	3,227.29	3,872.75
Binham	1,291.77	1,507.07	1,722.37	1,937.66	2,368.26	2,798.85	3,229.44	3,875.33
Blakeney	1,321.78	1,542.07	1,762.37	1,982.67	2,423.26	2,863.85	3,304.45	3,965.34
Bodham	1,302.90	1,520.05	1,737.20	1,954.35	2,388.65	2,822.96	3,257.26	3,908.71
Briningham	1,285.10	1,499.29	1,713.47	1,927.66	2,356.03	2,784.40	3,212.77	3,855.32
Brinton	1,286.07	1,500.41	1,714.76	1,929.10	2,357.80	2,786.49	3,215.18	3,858.21
Briston	1,310.21	1,528.58	1,746.95	1,965.32	2,402.06	2,838.80	3,275.54	3,930.65
Catfield	1,294.29	1,510.01	1,725.72	1,941.44	2,372.87	2,804.30	3,235.73	3,882.88
Cley	1,297.76	1,514.05	1,730.35	1,946.64	2,379.23	2,811.82	3,244.41	3,893.29
Colby	1,325.89	1,546.88	1,767.86	1,988.84	2,430.81	2,872.77	3,314.74	3,977.69
Corpusty and Saxthorpe	1,311.62	1,530.22	1,748.82	1,967.43	2,404.63	2,841.84	3,279.05	3,934.86
Cromer	1,332.40	1,554.47	1,776.53	1,998.60	2,442.74	2,886.87	3,331.01	3,997.21
Dilham	1,292.49	1,507.91	1,723.32	1,938.74	2,369.57	2,800.41	3,231.24	3,877.49
East Ruston	1,291.68	1,506.97	1,722.25	1,937.53	2,368.09	2,798.65	3,229.22	3,875.06
Edgefield	1,291.01	1,506.18	1,721.35	1,936.51	2,366.85	2,797.19	3,227.53	3,873.03
Erpingham	1,298.88	1,515.37	1,731.85	1,948.33	2,381.29	2,814.25	3,247.22	3,896.66
Fakenham	1,323.54	1,544.13	1,764.72	1,985.31	2,426.49	2,867.67	3,308.85	3,970.63
Felbrigg	1,297.69	1,513.98	1,730.26	1,946.54	2,379.11	2,811.68	3,244.24	3,893.09
Felmingham	1,276.13	1,488.82	1,701.51	1,914.20	2,339.58	2,764.96	3,190.34	3,828.40
Field Dalling	1,290.47	1,505.55	1,720.63	1,935.71	2,365.86	2,796.02	3,226.18	3,871.42
Fulmodeston	1,298.78	1,515.25	1,731.71	1,948.18	2,381.11	2,814.04	3,246.96	3,896.36
Gimingham	1,303.92	1,521.24	1,738.57	1,955.89	2,390.53	2,825.17	3,259.82	3,911.78

Great Snoring	1,308.87	1,527.02	1,745.16	1,963.31	2,399.60	2,835.89	3,272.19	3,926.62
Gresham	1,299.50	1,516.08	1,732.67	1,949.25	2,382.42	2,815.58	3,248.75	3,898.50
Gunthorpe	1,278.55	1,491.64	1,704.73	1,917.82	2,344.01	2,770.19	3,196.37	3,835.65
Hanworth	1,285.58	1,499.84	1,714.11	1,928.37	2,356.90	2,785.43	3,213.96	3,856.75
Happisburgh	1,279.40	1,492.63	1,705.87	1,919.10	2,345.57	2,772.03	3,198.50	3,838.20
Helhoughton	1,294.32	1,510.04	1,725.76	1,941.48	2,372.92	2,804.36	3,235.80	3,882.97
Hempstead	1,296.00	1,512.01	1,728.01	1,944.01	2,376.01	2,808.02	3,240.02	3,888.02
Hempton	1,333.77	1,556.07	1,778.36	2,000.66	2,445.25	2,889.84	3,334.44	4,001.32
Hickling	1,284.29	1,498.34	1,712.39	1,926.43	2,354.53	2,782.63	3,210.73	3,852.87
High Kelling	1,283.97	1,497.97	1,711.97	1,925.96	2,353.96	2,781.95	3,209.94	3,851.93
Hindolveston	1,309.90	1,528.21	1,746.53	1,964.85	2,401.48	2,838.11	3,274.75	3,929.70
Hindringham	1,292.33	1,507.72	1,723.11	1,938.50	2,369.28	2,800.05	3,230.83	3,877.00
Holkham	1,293.83	1,509.46	1,725.10	1,940.74	2,372.02	2,803.29	3,234.57	3,881.49
Holt	1,320.95	1,541.11	1,761.27	1,981.43	2,421.74	2,862.06	3,302.38	3,962.86
Honing	1,281.63	1,495.23	1,708.84	1,922.44	2,349.65	2,776.86	3,204.07	3,844.89
Horning	1,291.18	1,506.38	1,721.58	1,936.78	2,367.17	2,797.57	3,227.96	3,873.56
Horsey	1,291.20	1,506.40	1,721.60	1,936.80	2,367.20	2,797.61	3,228.01	3,873.61
Hoveton	1,314.59	1,533.69	1,752.79	1,971.89	2,410.09	2,848.29	3,286.49	3,943.79
Ingham	1,280.97	1,494.46	1,707.96	1,921.45	2,348.44	2,775.43	3,202.42	3,842.91
Ingworth	1,316.14	1,535.50	1,754.86	1,974.22	2,412.93	2,851.65	3,290.36	3,948.44
Itteringham	1,297.22	1,513.42	1,729.63	1,945.83	2,378.24	2,810.65	3,243.05	3,891.67
Kelling	1,295.31	1,511.20	1,727.09	1,942.97	2,374.74	2,806.52	3,238.29	3,885.95
Kettlestone	1,297.71	1,514.00	1,730.29	1,946.57	2,379.15	2,811.72	3,244.29	3,893.15
Knapton	1,296.19	1,512.23	1,728.26	1,944.29	2,376.36	2,808.43	3,240.49	3,888.59
Langham	1,298.70	1,515.15	1,731.60	1,948.05	2,380.96	2,813.86	3,246.76	3,896.11
Lessingham	1,281.43	1,495.01	1,708.58	1,922.15	2,349.30	2,776.45	3,203.59	3,844.31
Letheringsett with Glandford	1,279.94	1,493.26	1,706.59	1,919.91	2,346.56	2,773.21	3,199.86	3,839.83
Little Barningham	1,281.09	1,494.60	1,708.12	1,921.63	2,348.67	2,775.70	3,202.73	3,843.27
Little Snoring	1,296.55	1,512.65	1,728.74	1,944.83	2,377.02	2,809.20	3,241.39	3,889.67
Ludham	1,282.58	1,496.35	1,710.11	1,923.88	2,351.41	2,778.94	3,206.46	3,847.76
Matlaske	1,275.01	1,487.51	1,700.02	1,912.52	2,337.52	2,762.53	3,187.54	3,825.04
Melton Constable	1,315.58	1,534.84	1,754.10	1,973.37	2,411.89	2,850.42	3,288.95	3,946.74
Mundesley	1,300.09	1,516.77	1,733.45	1,950.13	2,383.50	2,816.86	3,250.22	3,900.27
Neatishead	1,293.12	1,508.65	1,724.17	1,939.69	2,370.73	2,801.78	3,232.82	3,879.38
North Walsham	1,338.89	1,562.03	1,785.18	2,008.33	2,454.63	2,900.92	3,347.22	4,016.67
Northrepps	1,297.73	1,514.02	1,730.31	1,946.60	2,379.18	2,811.75	3,244.33	3,893.20
Overstrand	1,311.25	1,529.79	1,748.34	1,966.88	2,403.96	2,841.05	3,278.14	3,933.76
Paston	1,314.79	1,533.92	1,753.06	1,972.19	2,410.45	2,848.72	3,286.98	3,944.38
Plumstead	1,306.74	1,524.53	1,742.32	1,960.11	2,395.69	2,831.27	3,266.85	3,920.22

Potter Heigham	1,293.85	1,509.49	1,725.13	1,940.77	2,372.06	2,803.34	3,234.62	3,881.55
Pudding Norton	1,313.54	1,532.47	1,751.39	1,970.32	2,408.17	2,846.01	3,283.86	3,940.64
Raynham	1,296.16	1,512.18	1,728.21	1,944.24	2,376.29	2,808.34	3,240.40	3,888.48
Roughton	1,289.24	1,504.11	1,718.98	1,933.86	2,363.61	2,793.35	3,223.10	3,867.72
Runton	1,283.90	1,497.88	1,711.87	1,925.85	2,353.82	2,781.79	3,209.76	3,851.71
Ryburgh	1,299.41	1,515.98	1,732.55	1,949.12	2,382.26	2,815.40	3,248.53	3,898.24
Salthouse	1,297.42	1,513.66	1,729.90	1,946.14	2,378.61	2,811.09	3,243.56	3,892.28
Scottow	1,301.55	1,518.48	1,735.40	1,952.33	2,386.18	2,820.03	3,253.88	3,904.66
Sculthorpe	1,289.12	1,503.98	1,718.83	1,933.68	2,363.39	2,793.10	3,222.81	3,867.37
Sea Palling	1,314.46	1,533.54	1,752.62	1,971.69	2,409.85	2,848.01	3,286.16	3,943.39
Sheringham	1,341.89	1,565.54	1,789.19	2,012.84	2,460.14	2,907.43	3,354.73	4,025.68
Sidestrand	1,292.07	1,507.42	1,722.76	1,938.11	2,368.80	2,799.49	3,230.19	3,876.22
Skeyton	1,277.92	1,490.90	1,703.89	1,916.88	2,342.85	2,768.82	3,194.80	3,833.76
Sloley	1,290.60	1,505.70	1,720.80	1,935.90	2,366.10	2,796.30	3,226.50	3,871.80
Smallburgh	1,289.78	1,504.74	1,719.70	1,934.67	2,364.59	2,794.52	3,224.45	3,869.34
Southrepps	1,302.95	1,520.11	1,737.27	1,954.43	2,388.74	2,823.06	3,257.38	3,908.86
Stalham	1,328.42	1,549.83	1,771.23	1,992.64	2,435.45	2,878.26	3,321.07	3,985.28
Stibbard	1,296.74	1,512.87	1,728.99	1,945.12	2,377.37	2,809.62	3,241.87	3,890.24
Stiffkey	1,295.93	1,511.91	1,727.90	1,943.89	2,375.87	2,807.85	3,239.82	3,887.79
Stody	1,302.63	1,519.73	1,736.84	1,953.94	2,388.15	2,822.36	3,256.57	3,907.89
Suffield	1,286.28	1,500.66	1,715.04	1,929.42	2,358.18	2,786.94	3,215.71	3,858.85
Sustead	1,289.95	1,504.95	1,719.94	1,934.93	2,364.92	2,794.91	3,224.89	3,869.87
Sutton	1,296.98	1,513.14	1,729.30	1,945.47	2,377.79	2,810.12	3,242.45	3,890.94
Swafield	1,301.87	1,518.85	1,735.83	1,952.81	2,386.76	2,820.72	3,254.68	3,905.62
Swanton Abbott	1,296.84	1,512.98	1,729.12	1,945.26	2,377.54	2,809.82	3,242.10	3,890.52
Swanton Novers	1,334.06	1,556.41	1,778.75	2,001.10	2,445.79	2,890.48	3,335.17	4,002.20
Tattersett	1,277.39	1,490.29	1,703.19	1,916.09	2,341.89	2,767.69	3,193.49	3,832.18
Thornage	1,288.08	1,502.76	1,717.44	1,932.12	2,361.49	2,790.85	3,220.21	3,864.25
Thorpe Market	1,303.18	1,520.37	1,737.57	1,954.77	2,389.16	2,823.55	3,257.95	3,909.54
Thursford	1,295.42	1,511.32	1,727.23	1,943.13	2,374.94	2,806.75	3,238.56	3,886.27
Trimingham	1,322.87	1,543.35	1,763.82	1,984.30	2,425.26	2,866.22	3,307.18	3,968.61
Trunch	1,307.88	1,525.86	1,743.84	1,961.82	2,397.78	2,833.74	3,269.70	3,923.64
Tunstead	1,286.34	1,500.73	1,715.12	1,929.52	2,358.30	2,787.08	3,215.86	3,859.04
Upper Sheringham	1,301.78	1,518.75	1,735.71	1,952.68	2,386.60	2,820.53	3,254.46	3,905.36
Walcott	1,295.83	1,511.81	1,727.78	1,943.75	2,375.70	2,807.64	3,239.59	3,887.51
Walsingham	1,314.13	1,533.15	1,752.18	1,971.20	2,409.24	2,847.29	3,285.33	3,942.40
Warham	1,312.81	1,531.62	1,750.42	1,969.22	2,406.83	2,844.44	3,282.04	3,938.45
Wells-next-the-Sea	1,316.51	1,535.93	1,755.34	1,974.76	2,413.60	2,852.44	3,291.28	3,949.53
Weybourne	1,307.15	1,525.01	1,742.87	1,960.73	2,396.45	2,832.17	3,267.89	3,921.47

Wickmere	1,309.79	1,528.09	1,746.39	1,964.69	2,401.29	2,837.89	3,274.49	3,929.38
Wighton	1,294.15	1,509.84	1,725.54	1,941.23	2,372.61	2,804.00	3,235.38	3,882.46
Witton	1,287.82	1,502.46	1,717.10	1,931.74	2,361.01	2,790.29	3,219.56	3,863.48
Wiveton	1,302.50	1,519.59	1,736.67	1,953.76	2,387.93	2,822.10	3,256.26	3,907.52
Wood Norton	1,288.68	1,503.46	1,718.24	1,933.02	2,362.58	2,792.14	3,221.70	3,866.04
Worstead	1,287.23	1,501.77	1,716.30	1,930.84	2,359.92	2,789.00	3,218.08	3,861.69
All Other Parts of the Council's Area	1,269.78	1,481.41	1,693.04	1,904.67	2,327.93	2,751.19	3,174.45	3,809.34

The Chairman informed Members that a recorded vote would now be taken on recommendation 9.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr A Fitch-Tillett and

RESOLVED unanimously (37 in favour) to approve

9) The Policy Framework for the Earmarked Reserves and the General Reserve 2021/22 to 2024/25 (Appendix B within the report);

14 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 10 FEBRUARY 2021

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

15 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CONSTITUTION WORKING PARTY 04 FEBRUARY 2021

The Chairman of the Constitution Working Party, Cllr V Gay, introduced this item. She explained that after a year of holding remote meetings due to the pandemic, it was felt that a review was due to address some of the minor issues that had arisen.

It was proposed by Cllr V Gay, seconded by Cllr P Grove-Jones and

RESOLVED unanimously

To approve the revised Remote Meetings Protocol.

16 RECOMMENDATION FROM LICENSING & APPEALS COMMITTEE 23 NOVEMBER 2020

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services, Cllr N Lloyd, introduced this item. He explained that the revised Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy and Handbook was presented for approval following an extensive period of engagement and consultation with Taxi trade representatives. He thanked officers for their patience and diligence through this process and the Chairman of Licensing & Appeals Committee, Cllr P Butikofer, for chairing the sessions with the trade

representatives.

Cllr P Butikofer, Chairman of the Licensing & Appeals Committee, thanked the Licensing Officer for her support and hard work. He said that the resulting document would provide residents with the full confidence in the local taxi industry.

Cllr A Yiasimi reiterated Cllr Butikofer's comments and thanked him for chairing the working group sessions so well.

It was proposed by Cllr N Lloyd, seconded by Cllr P Butikofer and

RESOLVED unanimously

To approve the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Policy and Handbook, with implementation from 1st April 2021.

17 PAY POLICY STATEMENT 2021/22

The Deputy Leader, Cllr E Seward, introduced this item. He explained that there was a statutory requirement for the Council to produce an annual pay policy statement.

It was proposed by Cllr E Seward, seconded by Cllr P Grove-Jones and

RESOLVED unanimously

To adopt the Pay Policy Statement and to publish the statement for 2021/22 on the Council's website.

18 TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS TO A PARISH COUNCIL

The Chief Executive and Returning Officer introduced this item. He explained that the parish council for Briningham was currently inquorate and the District Council was requested to make temporary appointments to ensure that it could continue to function lawfully until such time that the requisite number of vacancies could be filled. He said that a concern had been raised that there was no formal procedure in place for dealing with such matters and he said that he would work with the Monitoring Officer to put a protocol in place to avoid the need for bringing future instances back to Council each time.

The Chairman invited Cllr A Brown, local member for Briningham to speak. He said that it was important that residents could continue to have a functioning parish council until 6th May when an election could take place. He said that he was willing to chair the parish council and wished to propose that the County Councillor for Briningham and District Cllr, John Toye were also appointed on a temporary basis.

Cllr Cushing said that as it fell within the remit of the District Council to make temporary appointments to a parish council, then only district councillors should be appointed. He added that the member for a neighbouring ward would be the most appropriate representative rather than the County Councillor.

He proposed the following amendment:

That Cllr J Stenton should be appointed in place of Mr S Aquarone (NCC).

Cllr N Pearce seconded the amendment.

When put to the vote, the amendment was supported by 21 votes in favour, 11 against and 5 abstentions.

The Chairman then advised Members that the amendment would become part of the substantive motion.

It was proposed by Cllr A Brown, seconded by Cllr J Toye and

RESOLVED

That District Councillor Andrew Brown (Study local ward member) District Councillor Jolanda Stenton (Briston ward) and District Councillor John Toye (Erpingham ward), be appointed to serve as temporary members of Briningham Parish Council until 6 May 2021, when an election (unless uncontested) will be held.

The Monitoring Officer be authorised to make the necessary order to give effect to the temporary appointments.

19 PORTFOLIO REPORTS

In the Leader's absence, Cllr E Seward presented her written report. No questions were raised.

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett, Portfolio Holder for Coast, introduced her report. She said that it was a very busy time for the Coastal team. She apologised for her meetings being omitted from the report.

Cllr V Gay, Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Wellbeing & Culture introduced her report. She said that following support for the Motion on developing health and social care skills at the December meeting of Council, work was underway to implement some of the proposals. She then said that she was delighted to be able to inform Members that the Council had just been notified that it was to be awarded £200k of funding in support of the leisure service. She thanked everyone who had worked hard to support this payment.

Cllr W Fredericks asked Cllr Gay if there had been any progress regarding the scheduling of a briefing for Members on the social prescribing service. Cllr Gay confirmed that Members would be advised of a date for this by the end of the week.

Cllr G Hayman, Portfolio Holder for Housing and Benefits, introduced his report. He drew attention to the number of applications for support for self-isolation claims. This indicated that people took the matter very seriously.

Cllr R Kershaw, Portfolio Holder for Sustainable Growth. He said that guidance had now been received regarding the payments for the next round of grant funding to businesses. The allocation was £8.277m and £7.4m would be paid in the first tranche to businesses that had already received grants and were entitled to a new one for this period. He then referred to the next phase of the additional restrictions grant, the Council would be paying out £1.3m.

Cllr N Dixon asked Cllr Kershaw to tell Members what contact the Council had had with businesses based at Scottow Enterprise Park to gain an understanding of how they were coping with the impact of the pandemic, what their needs were to help them recover and prosper in future and were there any emerging patterns and common themes. Cllr Kershaw replied that the Economic Growth team had been in regular contact with businesses at Scottow. Grants had been paid out and help provided regarding planning issues. All businesses across the District had been recently surveyed regarding their needs moving forwards.

Cllr S Penfold added that as local member, he confirmed that the Council had provided a lot of support to local businesses at Scottow.

Cllr N Lloyd, Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services, Climate Change and Environment presented his written report. He said that unfortunately several improvement notices had been issued to takeaway outlets regarding non-compliance with Covid regulations. He informed Members that the Council's waste contractor, Serco, had been catching up with refuse collection following the recent bad weather.

Cllr J Rest asked about the signage relating to electric vehicle charging points in Fakenham as nothing was in place yet. Cllr Lloyd replied that he was happy to take up this matter. The charging points had only just gone live which was why the signage was not yet in place.

Cllr J Punchard thanked officers for the helpful communication with residents and businesses following the recent period of bad weather and the impact of this on waste collection.

Cllr G Mancini-Boyle said that he felt that communication with Members and residents regarding bin collection during the bad weather could have been much better co-ordinated. Guidance issued on the website was confusing and at times conflicting. He then referred to recycling credits and asked whether the Council had undertaken any research into contamination levels so that a programme of education could be put in place to assist people with recycling and the potential for food waste collection in the future. Cllr Lloyd said that he disagreed with the view regarding communication on bin collection during the recent bad weather. He said that it was extremely dangerous for large waste vehicles to be accessing many un-gritted residential roads during very cold, icy weather. He felt the messages were very clear. He agreed with the point regarding recycling contamination, which was relatively high. Some areas of the District had been targeted recently to look at waste quantification and assess the levels of contamination. There was more work to do and he accepted that and he continued to push hard on improving this area.

Cllr S Penfold asked for an update on the progress of the Council's Environmental Charter. Cllr Lloyd that two new members of staff had been employed and a draft charter had been prepared for consultation with members and then the public. It was hoped that the final version would be published at the beginning of June.

Cllr Kershaw said that he agreed with the approach that had been taken regarding the suspension of waste collection during bad weather. He felt the communication around this had been timely and informative.

Cllr G Perry-Warnes asked for an update on the work that the Covid wardens were doing. Cllr Lloyd replied that they had been going out later in the evening dealing

with any issues. They were often accompanied by NNDC officers and the Police. This approach was very effective as demonstrated in the fall in infection rates.

Cllr Seward, Portfolio Holder for Finance, introduced his report and invited questions. None were raised.

Cllr L Shires, Portfolio Holder for Organisational Resources, introduced her report and invited questions. Cllr Cushing made reference to the increased number of NNDC staff working from home. He asked whether there would be a review of this as restrictions eased and whether consideration would be given to implementing home-working on a permanent basis to reduce the use of office resources and the environmental impact. Cllr Shires replied that she felt that this was a human resources issue rather than property related. The Chief Executive informed Members that there had been a staff group of managers overseeing the working from home policy and procedures as well as the 'return to work' policy. He added that there were several public sector tenants based in the building whose needs would also need to be taken into consideration moving forwards. He added that not all staff felt that working from home on a long-term basis was beneficial to their health and wellbeing and this would need to be considered too.

Cllr J Stenton asked what level of digital security was in place for officers working from home on their own devices, specifically could they save any sensitive documents on their own drives. The Head of IT assured Members that two modes were offered. Most officers had a council device and connected securely over a virtual private network (VPN). The remaining few used a remote working solution which effectively created a remote working solution which created a virtual PC which existed within a virtual security wall.

Cllr T FitzPatrick commented on the reference in Cllr Shires report to the ongoing rollout of 'obsolete' mobile phones. He suggested that this may be an error and was in fact a replacement programme. He asked Cllr Shires what had been done regarding the specification of these phones and their purpose and whether any consideration had been given to 'bring your own device' as many neighbouring authorities had adopted this approach. Cllr Shires thanked Cllr FitzPatrick for his question. She said that she didn't have the technical information to hand regarding the specification of the phones that were being rolled out and she was not able to advise on whether work was being undertaken on a 'bring your own device' scheme. She said that the Head of IT could provide a response now or she could provide a written response within 7 days. Cllr FitzPatrick said that a written reply would be acceptable.

Cllr A Brown said that he was pleased to see that progress on the new Uniform system was on track and that teething problems had been addressed. He asked whether it was on track to have updates and amendments by the end of April as agreed. Cllr Shires replied that the programme was on track and she had not been advised to the contrary. The Head of IT confirmed this. He said that officers had requested a delay after the initial 'go live' date as it was the financial year-end and workload in some service areas was heavy.

Cllr J Toye, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Enforcement introduced his report and invited questions. Cllr P Heinrich said that very robust standards for new housing had been agreed at the last meeting of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party. He asked whether standards for agreeing home office space and good broadband connections could be included in future housing developments. Cllr Toye said that sustainability standards were at the highest level that they could be and this

was to be welcomed. Regarding space standards, these were as good as they could be within the current framework and requirements but work would continue on this to achieve the best outcome possible.

74 QUESTIONS RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS

None received.

75 OPPOSITION BUSINESS

None received.

76 NOTICE(S) OF MOTION

None received.

77 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

78 PRIVATE BUSINESS

The meeting ended at 9.10 pm.

Chairman

This page is intentionally left blank