Minutes of a meeting of South Norfolk Council held at South Norfolk House, Long Stratton on Wednesday 22 February 2012 at 7.30pm


Apologies: Councillors Bell, Blake, Hornby, Palmer, Riches, Walden, Webster and J Wilby

Officers in Attendance: The Chief Executive, the Deputy Chief Executive, the Director of Development and Environment and the Financial Services Manager

3107 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

The following members declared personal interests in the matters listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Minute No</th>
<th>Nature of Interest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cllr P Allen</td>
<td>3114</td>
<td>Chairman of the Suffolk and Norfolk Youth Action Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr N Ward</td>
<td>3111</td>
<td>Members of Wymondham Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr C Foulger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr J Mooney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr R Savage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr T East</td>
<td>3110</td>
<td>Members of Norfolk County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr J Herbert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr J Mooney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr B Spratt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cllr M Wilby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3108 MINUTES

With reference to minute 3097, third paragraph, Cllr M Gray requested that a full stop be inserted after “committees”. He suggested the subsequent sentence should read: “However, this had resulted in a split of the housing and planning functions.”
The minutes of the meetings held 12 December 2011 and 23 January 2012 were then agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3109 CHAIRMAN’S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman was sorry to report the death of former councillor, Barry Greenway. Council stood and observed a minute’s silence in his memory.

The Chairman informed Council that she intended to change the order of the agenda; the Council would consider the Shared Services / Partnership Working – Legal Services as its first main item.

Members noted the list of engagements at page 23 of the agenda.

3110 SHARED SERVICES / PARTNERSHIP WORKING – LEGAL SERVICES

Members considered the recommendations of the Cabinet regarding the proposals for the Council to join nplaw.

Cllr D Bills briefly outlined the background to the proposals to join nplaw and referred members to the Joint Meeting of the Scrutiny Committee and the Accounts, Audit and Governance Committee held 25 January 2012, and the Cabinet meeting held 6 February 2012. At both of these meetings, there had been a unanimous decision to recommend that the Council proceeded to join nplaw.

Cllr Bills explained that the Solicitor to the Council had expressed concern that some comments in the Business Case had suggested that the Legal Services team were making decisions in respect of planning matters that the Planning Officers should be making. Cllr Bills was sorry that it had been interpreted in such a way and stressed that this had not been the intention of the Business Case. The point being made was that maybe the team was more involved in planning matters at the expense of providing a service to the whole of the Council, which led to the Council having to purchase expensive legal advice that could be delivered by the in-house team.

Turning to the letter forwarded to all members from Brian Lynch, Regional Organiser at Eastern Region Unison, Cllr Bills explained that an appropriate response from the Council was currently being drafted, which he believed adequately covered all the points raised. He did not consider, as the letter had suggested, that a separate Equality Impact Assessment was necessary, as the relevant issues had already been addressed within the Business Case itself. He understood that there would on occasions be conflicts of interests between the Council and Norfolk County Council but he reminded members that the Council would have the right to seek advice outside of nplaw if it felt necessary. Referring to the reference to redundancy costs, the Chief Executive explained that these had not been factored in to the Business Case as nplaw had confirmed that it had suitable positions for all existing legal staff currently employed by South Norfolk Council.

Mr P Grant, Branch Secretary to Unison explained that he had felt the need to seek regional advice on the matter, but acknowledged that he had done this at a late stage in the process, for which he apologised to members. He referred to each of the issues raised in Mr Lynch’s letter, and he stressed the need for members to be
certain of the real benefits of joining nplaw, reminding them that the expertise and loyalty of the current Legal Services team would be lost forever. He urged members, should they have any concerns on the matter, however minor, to vote against the recommendations.

Cllr M Gray advised Council that the Liberal Democrat Group had a free vote on the issue. It had been a very difficult decision for Cllr Gray as he felt the Business Case to be very strong. However, he referred to the superb quality of advice provided by the current service and outlined his concerns regarding access to advice should the service transfer to nplaw. Cllr Gray felt the level of service at nplaw was reasonable, but was not comparable with the service currently received day in, day out, from the current Legal Services team. For these reasons, Cllr Gray could not support the transfer to nplaw.

Cllr Gray then stressed the importance of having legal representation at every Planning Committee, and hoped that this would still be the case, should the service transfer to nplaw.

Cllr B McClenneng could not fault the Business Case when presented at the Joint Scrutiny and Accounts Audit and Governance Committee, but he too had had second thoughts and was concerned as to the risks involved. He felt therefore that he could not support the recommendations of Cabinet.

Cllr T East was not happy with the proposals to transfer to nplaw. As a county councillor, he was fully aware of the level of service provided by nplaw and it was not comparable with that provided by the in house South Norfolk team. He had been in contact with the current team on a daily basis with regard to the Queens Hill issue and he knew that this level of service was not available through nplaw. He was aware that nplaw relied heavily on external firms of solicitors and he suggested that it would be better for the Council to cut out the “middle man” and source private firms direct, in some cases.

Cllr J Fuller was concerned that some of the debate had abandoned all logic and discredited all the hard work that had gone in to achieving the savings and economies of scale that residents deserved from their local council. He reminded members that the Business Case was water-tight. There had been unprecedented changes in Local Government, and he believed that the complexity of the legal environment was too much for a small in-house team to deal with. He strongly believed that joining nplaw was the right decision for both the Council and its customers.

With 29 votes in favour and 7 against, it was

**RESOLVED:**

1) That SNC communicates to Norfolk County Council that it wishes to join nplaw from 1 April 2012, signing up for 10 years unless terminated in accordance with the provisions of the stakeholder agreement (SNC could withdraw from the partnership after 5 years if it so wishes but would need to give at least 1 years notice to do so);
2) Formal due diligence work is undertaken as part of the project planning process;

3) A Change Management Plan is developed to shape how SNC will manage the transition to nplaw, including staff resources, and will incorporate Member and Officer suggestions to feed into the Service Level Agreement;

4) A six monthly performance review is undertaken in the first year by Scrutiny Committee; Accounts Audit and Governance Committee will review Governance Arrangements in the summer of 2013;

5) Details around the framework for service delivery are delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder;

6) The Stakeholder Agreement, New Participant Agreement and Service Level Agreement can be signed by the Deputy Chief Executive/Portfolio Holder in order to commence the service;

7) Any constitutional changes be brought to the Council’s AGM in May 2012;

8) To delegate to the Deputy Chief Executive, in conjunction with the relevant Portfolio Holder, any further decisions necessary to ensure the successful transfer of the service to nplaw from 1 April 2012;

3111 NOTICE OF MOTIONS

a) Cllrs J Fuller and M Gray

Cllr J Fuller, seconded by Cllr M Gray, moved the following motion:

“This Council resolves to present a loyal address in proper form to Her Majesty the Queen on the occasion of her Diamond Jubilee and, in particular, records the thanks of the whole District for Her Majesty's unstinting devotion to public service throughout her adult life.”

The motion was unanimously carried.

RESOLVED: This Council resolves to present a loyal address in proper form to Her Majesty the Queen on the occasion of her Diamond Jubilee and, in particular, records the thanks of the whole District for Her Majesty's unstinting devotion to public service throughout her adult life
b) Cllrs J Fuller and M Gray

Cllr J Fuller, seconded by Cllr M Gray, moved the following motion:

“This Council pledges its support for the “Say Yes! to better broadband in Norfolk” campaign that is being promoted by Norfolk County Council with the support of the Eastern Daily Press and instructs the Chief Executive to make this pledge of support known to Norfolk County Council, the Eastern Daily Press and to the Members of Parliament representing the three South Norfolk constituencies."

Cllr Fuller urged members to support the motion, referring to the great team effort between Norfolk County Council and the Eastern Daily Press to campaign for a much needed better Broadband service across Norfolk.

Cllr Gray explained that he was happy to second the proposal, explaining that he had suggested this to be a cross-party motion. He referred to the poor Broadband service in some areas of the county, referring in particular to the service in the Waveney Valley.

The motion was unanimously carried.

RESOLVED: This Council pledges its support for the “Say Yes! to better broadband in Norfolk” campaign that is being promoted by Norfolk County Council with the support of the Eastern Daily Press and instructs the Chief Executive to make this pledge of support known to Norfolk County Council, the Eastern Daily Press and to the Members of Parliament representing the three South Norfolk constituencies.

c) Cllr M Gray

In accordance with Standing Order D4.11, Cllr M Gray sought the permission of Council to withdraw his motion, following Wymondham Town Council’s recent decision to put on hold plans to transfer land at Kings Head Meadow. Council agreed unanimously that the motion be withdrawn.

3112 RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE CABINET

(a) PART 1 NON-BUDGET ITEMS

i. Youth Engagement

It was unanimously

RESOLVED: That the portfolio holder for Community Empowerment and Building the Big Society formally represents the Council on the YAB management board
(b) PART 2 – THE BUDGET

i. Capital and Treasury Review Quarter 3 2011/12

Cllr G Wheatley presented the report, explaining that the overdraft limit had been exceeded due to a clerical error, and had no serious implications.

It was unanimously

RESOLVED: To

a) Note the progress of the Capital Programme for the third quarter and the financing thereof;

b) Note the treasury activity in quarter three and that it complies with the agreed strategy;

c) Note the overdraft limit being exceeded by £227,000 on 22 December 2011;

d) Approve the quarter three 2011/12 prudential indicators;

e) Approve the slippage of the provision for Travellers site £300,000 budget into 2012/13.

Cllr J Fuller then introduced the budget and reminded members that the local government landscape had changed and the days when members could sit back and wait for the RSG settlement were over. The Council needed to look ahead to a future, assuming greater risks in order to take advantage of greater rewards. The proposed budget reflected the new reality of 3 changing pillars in Local Government; localism, finance and planning. The budget needed to reflect this changing environment. Residents needed to know that they were getting value for money, with improved services.

Cllr Fuller was proud to announce that he had a balanced budget and for the fourth time in five years, council tax had been frozen at a time when residents needed it the most. This had been made possible through the staff’s efficiency and sustained approach to delivering services. He referred to the Council’s priority to support the local authority and show Economic Leadership. This year, funds had been earmarked to help build the economy. The budget supported localism through the delegation of service delivery to Neighbourhoods, and Cllr Fuller explained that one third of the New Homes Bonus would be ring fenced for local people to customise the service they received from the Council. The budget also reflected the Council’s commitment to helping those in greatest need. The Council was already leading the way in the processing of benefit claims and was currently down to the last 6 authorities for a DWP Pilot to help deliver the new Universal Credit. Whilst other authorities were cutting back, South Norfolk Council was providing for new investments to help keep future costs down, such as IT, Infrastructure Bonds and an Infrastructure Revenue Account. Cllr Fuller felt privileged to be a member of a local authority that had embraced the new opportunities from a new Government; once more South Norfolk was leading the way.

Cllr G Wheatley, in seconding Cllr Fuller’s recommendations, stated that the budget provided strength and stability. He reminded members that in May 2007, the Conservative Group had inherited the previous administration’s budget and very soon after the Council was having to find £3 million of savings to avoid serious financial problems. This could not have been achieved without the expertise and loyalty of the Chief Executive and staff, and he paid tribute to what had been
achieved. He referred to the proposed council tax freeze and reminded members that reserves had been increased to a level not experienced before.

Cllr M Gray advised Council, that as had been shown through the joint motions that very evening, the Liberal Democrats and Conservatives were often in agreement. He agreed that the Council should pay tribute to the loyalty and high quality of staff within the Council. However, although his Group was happy to agree the future Capital Programme and the Treasury Management Strategy, it could not support the Revenue Budget and Council Tax 2012/13.

Cllr Gray referred to the 2010-11 recycling rate of 39.58% which had been below the Norfolk average, the nearest neighbour average and even the national average. The Council currently stood at 194th in the league table which was poor for an authority that had an ambition to be “amongst the best in the country for recycling”. He was pleased that the estimate for 11/12 had increased to 42%, but was perplexed that the target for 2012/13 was only 41%; so the Council planned to recycle less. A second disappointment had been affordable housing provision with only 120 completions anticipated that year. The peak of affordable housing had been reached in 2008/09, as a result of the sites allocated in the 2003 Local Plan, when the Liberal Democrats were in office.

A further concern for the Liberal Democrats had been the allocation of £560,000 to the Neighbourhood Boards to spend on service improvements and social action projects. Whilst he considered these issues valid, he explained that his Group had other priorities such as helping young people and stimulating the economy of the local towns, and he reminded Council that ideas supporting these issues had been rejected by the Conservative Group the previous year.

Cllr Gray had also been disappointed that Cabinet had rejected his Group’s view that some of the Homes Bonus from significant developments should go to the towns and villages where those houses had been built as opposed to a general Neighbourhood pot. A further idea that had been rejected was that the formula to calculate the funding should include a financial weighting to those areas most deprived of facilities and benefits. However, Cabinet had taken on board some of his Group’s views, that membership of the Neighbourhood Boards needed to be reviewed, that the Chairman needed to be impartial, that Chairman and members should receive formal training and that there should be a clear criteria for grant allocations to be adhered to. These points were an acceptance that things had not been right, for example allowing groups to gain money from more than one pot for the same project.

In light of the Liberal Democrat concerns regarding the £560,000 awarded to the Neighbourhood Boards, Cllr Gray then moved the following amendment:

“That Neighbourhood Boards be given an initial allocation of £60,000 each, that £140,000 be allocated to reserves should further proposals of quality come forward and that the remaining £120,000 be used to cut Council Tax by 2%.”

Cllr T Lewis, in seconding the amendment, spoke of his concerns for the new Neighbourhood project. He also drew members’ attention to the proposed commercial development of a site at Poringland. The proposal had potential but was significant in terms of its risks. He hoped that Scrutiny would have the opportunity to consider the detail in the near future.
Cllr M Wilby could not concur with the views of Cllr Gray. He believed that the Conservative Group did support youth projects, and he referred to his appointment to the Youth Action Management Board, which supported Suffolk and Norfolk Youth Action Radio (SNYAR). With reference to Cllr Gray’s comments regarding more funding for deprived areas, he reminded members that it had been concluded at the Scrutiny Committee that recalculating the funds in this way would not make much difference to the amounts allocated.

Cllr K Tilcock referred back to the increases in council tax implemented under the last administration. Taking in to account inflation, he considered a 0% increase in council tax to be a way of giving money back to tax payers.

Cllr J Herbert could not support Cllr Gray’s amendment. He agreed that the Neighbourhood project was an experiment, but he stressed the need for the Council to remain ‘ahead of the game’.

Cllr A Pond thought the proposed budget to be fair, creating financial stability whilst protecting front line services.

Referring to the comments made by Cllr Lewis regarding the potential commercial development in Poringland, Cllr L Neal felt this to be a great opportunity to support the local economy and create local jobs.

Cllr K Weeks felt that overall it was a good budget, although he would have liked to have seen more funds put in reserves and less spent on the Neighbourhood scheme. He referred to the Community Infrastructure Levy and the financial strains on the Council. He felt the Council should be more cautious when looking to the future.

With 7 votes for and 30 against, the amendment was then lost.

Summing up, Cllr Fuller advised that the budget provided for a prudent increase in reserves to protect the Council from future risks, setting the Council in stead for 2013/14, which would be a very difficult year. He then commended the motion to members.

i. Capital Programme 2012/13 – 2014/15

It was unanimously

RESOLVED: (a) That the assumptions on which the funding of the capital programme is based is prudent
(b) To approve the capital programme for 2012/13 to 2014/15
ii. Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Investment Strategy 2012/13 to 2014/15

It was unanimously

RESOLVED:

a) To approve the Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2012/13 to 2014/15;

b) That the Prudential Indicators and Limits for 2012/13 to 2014/15 contained within Appendix A of the report, including the Authorised Limit Prudential Indicator;

c) That the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement (section 8) sets out the Council’s policy on MRP;

d) To approve the Annual Investment Strategy 2012/13 (section 5) contained in the Treasury Management Strategy, including the delegation of certain tasks to the Financial Services Manager;

e) That the Treasury Management Strategy be applicable to CNC;

f) To approve the Treasury Management Policy Statement (outlined at Appendix D).

iii. Revenue Budget and Council Tax 2012/13

With 29 votes in favour and 7 against, it was

RESOLVED:

(a) To approve the base budget, as shown in para. 8.1 of the report, subject to confirmation of the revenue support grant figures which may necessitate an adjustment through the general revenue reserve to maintain a balanced budget.

(b) To approve the creation of two earmarked reserves as listed below:

- £500,000 - council tax benefits reserve to smooth out volatility of in year claimants
- £1,500,000 – localisation of business rates to smooth out in year volatility of business rates received
(c) that the council’s demand on the collection fund for 2012/13 for general expenditure shall be £6,088,512 and for special expenditure be £77,663;

(d) that the level of council tax be £130.68 for general expenditure and £1.67 for special expenditure.

iv. Council Tax Resolution 2012/13

With 29 votes for and none against, it was RESOLVED:

1) That the Council has calculated the Council Tax Base 2012/13

   a) For the whole Council area as 46,591 (Item T in the formula in Section 31B of the 1992 Act; and

   b) For dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relates as in the attached Appendix C.

2) The Council Tax requirement for the Council’s own purposes for 2012/13 (excluding Parish precepts and special expenses) is £6,088,511.88.

3) That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2012/13 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the 1992 Act.

   a) £63,277,309 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the 1992 Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils and any additional special expenses.

   b) £54,295,149 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the 1992 Act.

   c) £8,982,160 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the 1992 Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year. (Item R in the formula in Section 31B of the 1992 Act).

   d) £192.78 being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the 1992 Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish precepts and special expenses).

   e) £2,893,648 being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts and special expenses) referred to in Section 34(1) of the 1992 Act (as per attached Appendix B).
f) £130.68 being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the 1992 Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept or special expense relates.

4) To note that Norfolk County Council and Norfolk Police Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the 1992 Act for each category of dwellings in the Council’s area as indicated in the table below.

5) That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the 1992 Act, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2012/13 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation Bands</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Precepting Authority</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>£</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Norfolk Council</td>
<td>87.12</td>
<td>101.64</td>
<td>116.16</td>
<td>130.68</td>
<td>159.72</td>
<td>188.76</td>
<td>217.80</td>
<td>261.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk County Council</td>
<td>763.3</td>
<td>890.61</td>
<td>1,017.8</td>
<td>1,145.0</td>
<td>1,399.5</td>
<td>1,653.9</td>
<td>1,908.4</td>
<td>2,290.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Police Authority</td>
<td>131.2</td>
<td>153.16</td>
<td>175.04</td>
<td>196.92</td>
<td>240.68</td>
<td>284.44</td>
<td>328.20</td>
<td>393.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate of Council Tax Requirements (excluding Parish Precepts and Special Expenses)</td>
<td>981.7</td>
<td>1,145.4</td>
<td>1,309.0</td>
<td>1,472.6</td>
<td>1,799.9</td>
<td>2,127.1</td>
<td>2,454.4</td>
<td>2,945.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) The Council’s hereby determines that its relevant basic amount of Council Tax for 2012/13, which reflects a nil increase, is not excessive in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB of the 1992 Act.

3113 REPORT OF THE MONITORING OFFICER

Members considered the report of the Monitoring Officer which provided an update to members regarding the Localism Act, and sought approval to amend the Constitution accordingly.

Cllr M Gray queried paragraph 2.4 of the report, recalling that at the AGM in May 2011, Cllr Fuller had been elected Leader of the Council for a period of 4 years.

In response, Cllr C Kemp explained that under the Localism Act, the Council had a choice to elect its Leader for a period of 4 years or annually at the Council’s AGM. The current view of the Conservative Group was that an annual election of the Leader was preferable.
Referring to paragraph 2.10, Cllr M Gray asked what the longer term plans were, following the departure of the Director of Communities. Cllr Fuller explained that he felt it too early to make any long term commitments; however, careful consideration would be given to the matter following consultations with relevant staff.

Cllr T East referred to what he felt was a genuine anomaly in legislation, which did not allow town and parish councils to consider matters of urgent business at their meetings. He referred to a recent issue in Costessey, whereby the Parish Council was unable to discuss the proposals to close the Beechcroft surgery, as it has arisen after the production of the agenda. Cllr C Kemp felt that this was a legitimate point, and agreed with Councillor East that the Local Government Association should be lobbied with regard to the matter.

It was unanimously

**RESOLVED** To approve the report, and the changes to the Constitution highlighted in paragraphs 2.4 to 2.7, 2.10 and 2.11, the revised Article 7 at Appendix 1 and the revised delegation of responsibilities at Appendix 3.

3114 MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES / OUTSIDE BODIES

The following changes to the membership of Committees were endorsed by the Council:

- Cllr V Bell to replace Cllr G Watt on the Scrutiny Committee
- Cllr G Watt to replace Cllr V Bell on the Environment and Public Protection Overview Sub-Committee
- Cllr Y Bendle to replace Cllr J Overton on the Third Wednesday Planning Committee

Cllr J Fuller nominated representatives to the following, which were duly seconded and agreed by the Council:

- Cllr A Pond to represent the Council on the Suffolk and Norfolk Youth Action Board
- Cllr F Ellis to represent the Council on the Norfolk Tourism Local Authority Group

3115 PAY POLICY STATEMENT

Members considered the report of the HR Business Partner and the Payroll Manager, which presented Council with a Pay Policy Statement for the Council, as required annually, under Section 38 of the Localism Act.

Cllr G Wheatley explained that the Pay Policy did not contain any new issues for consideration; it simply brought together a number of separate policies already in existence.
It was unanimously

**RESOLVED**

To approve the Pay Policy Statement

3116 CHAIRMEN’S REPORTS

(a) CABINET

Members noted the report of the Leader of the Council. Cllr J Fuller explained that the preferred options for the site specific policies and allocations DPD would be considered in stages over two separate Cabinet meetings. The first stage of sites would be considered at the Local Planning Steering Group meeting scheduled for 14 March.

(b) SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Members noted the report of the Chairman of the Scrutiny Committee

(c) ACCOUNTS AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

Members’ attention was drawn to the extra fees of £13,117 charged by the District Auditor due to a discrepancy in housing benefit payments of £831 in an overall turnover of £55 million. This figure had seemed wholly disproportionate to the Committee, and members were also concerned that officers had been given no prior indication of this extra charge before it was announced at a public meeting.

Cllr C Kemp agreed to write to the 3 Members of Parliament representing the District, asking them to take the issue up with the DWP, and that a more proportionate certification regime be introduced.

(d) LICENSING, APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS COMMITTEE/LICENSING AND GAMBLING ACTS 2003 COMMITTEE

Cllr R Savage announced that the Member training session, which would include discussion concerning an ongoing consultation by the Department of Culture regarding the Introduction of Late Night Levy and Early Morning Restriction Orders, had been scheduled for 26 March at 6.00pm. All members were welcome to attend.

(e) PLANNING COMMITTEES

Members noted the report of the Planning Committee Chairman
3117  REPRESENTATIVES ON STRATEGIC OUTSIDE BODIES

Cllr N Legg referred members to e-link for details of the last meeting of the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Cllr K Kiddie was pleased to report that recycling collected from South Norfolk only had a 9% rejection rate which was the lowest in Norfolk. He further explained that the DCLG had recently announced plans to provide £250 million of funding to assist local authorities in delivering weekly waste collections. The Norfolk Waste Partnership was considering bidding for funding to deliver a weekly food collection service.

The Council concluded at 9.50 p.m

CHAIRMAN