

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee of Broadland District Council, held at Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich on Tuesday 1 February 2022 at 10.00 am when there were present:

Committee Members Present: Councillor: S Riley (Chairman), M L Murrell (Vice-Chairman), T Adams, N J Brennan, P E Bulman, S J Catchpole, L Hemsall, S I Holland, C Karimi-Ghovanlou, D King, KG Leggett MBE, E Laming, S M Prutton and N C Shaw.

Other Members in Attendance: Councillors: J Leggett, and T Mancini-Boyle.

Officers in Attendance: The Director of Resources, Director of Place, Director of People and Communities, Governance Manager (Deputy Monitoring Officer), Assistant Director of Individuals and Families, Assistant Director Finance, Assistant Director ICT/Digital and Transformation, Strategy and Programmes Manager and Democratic Services Officers (LA, JO)

102 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Davis, Cllr Harpley, Cllr Kelly and Cllr Nurden.

103 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2022 were agreed as a correct record.

CABINET REPORTS

The Chairman advised the meeting that item 9 on the Cabinet agenda - In Year Budget Options, was not available for consideration by the Committee. He had received an email that morning explaining that the following reasons for this were:

The report is still in the process of being finalised to provide members with the correct options for their contemplation, and will therefore report directly into Cabinet, to make recommendations to Council. There will still be the opportunity for any councillor to ask questions or input into recommendations via Cabinet or when/if received by Council. Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are of course able to go to Cabinet and ask questions directly on the report at that time. Cabinet was not making the decision, but were recommending this onto Council, which did not allow for the item to be called in.

The Chairman informed the meeting that he disagreed with this view, as when the report went to Council the Committee would not have had the opportunity to fully scrutinise the report ahead of a decision being made.

Several members agreed with the Chairman and he confirmed that he would put his views on this matter in writing for the minutes and circulate them to the Committee for agreement.

104 REVENUE BUDGET AND COUNCIL TAX 2022/23

The Assistant Director Finance introduced the report, which presented a summary of the Council's draft 2022/23 Revenue Budget and contained details of the proposed fees and charges for 2022/23.

The main area to highlight in the report was that the Council would keep its Council Tax for a Band D property at £129.91 for 2022/23, the same as 2021/22.

The report showed the revenue budget requirement for each Directorate, which had been reviewed to ensure they were sufficient to deliver services.

The proposed budget included provision for a cost of living rise of two percent in 2022/23 as well as £180,000 for performance related pay. Local pay bargaining arrangements and negotiations were currently ongoing.

No new additional Covid budgets had been included for 2022/23. However, it was likely that some of the budgets allocated to support the Covid response in the current year would be carried forward as a number of support programmes would continue.

Within the 2022/23 Budget was also included; the cost of the new Strategic Environmental Services Contract and the roll out of a forward funded food waste collection service to the whole District from October 2022.

The Provisional Local Government Finance settlement for 2022/23 was announced in December 2021, with the final settlement being announced in the coming weeks. The provisional settlement was better than expected, however, again it only covered one year, which made longer term finances harder to predict.

The Government had introduced a one-off Services Grant in 2022/23. The new Grant provided funding in recognition of the vital services delivered at every level of local government.

The Council undertook a budget consultation via its website between 9 December 2021 and 17 January 2022. The consultation was promoted on the website and via twitter and received 122 responses. Slightly over 50 percent of respondents supported no increase in Council Tax for 2022/23.

It was proposed to increase most discretionary fees and charges this year in line with inflation, based on the September RPI figure of 4.9%. Garden waste fees would be frozen at current levels.

The Medium-Term Financial Plan (MTFP) showed a funding gap developing in 2023/24 of approximately £1m. The primary reason for this was the expected reduction in New Homes Bonus grant after this year and the cessation of one-off Government Grants.

The figures in the Plan were based on the 2022/23 Local Government Finance Provisional Settlement. Future year funding figures were uncertain due to the Government's ongoing funding review, which was expected to be consulted on in 2022/23 and introduced for 2023/24.

The Council had benefited from growth in Business Rates income, but changes to the Business Rates retention scheme were expected in 2023/24. As yet, the impact these would have on the Council remained uncertain.

The projected General Fund balance remained above the recommended minimum level of £1.2m. However, there was a need to address the funding gap over the medium term.

The Council recouped its costs for street lighting in Great Witchingham and Hellesdon through the Special Expense's mechanism. It was proposed to keep these at the same level as 2021/22.

The advice of the s151 officer in determining the Council's budget and Council Tax, as required by the Local Government Act 2003, was:

- Overall, in my opinion the budget has been based on a reasonable set of assumptions with due regard to the risks and is therefore robust.
- Assuming Cabinet and Council agree the revenue budget, as set out in this report, then in my opinion the level of reserves is adequate for known and potential risks at this time.

The Chairman noted that the Agenda was a very large one and that the Committee had received it a day later than usual. He appreciated that officers were stretched (which he suggested was an area that the Committee might want to look into further), but the Committee was not being given enough time to read the reports before it.

In answer to a query about public awareness of the £1m funding gap in the MTFP and the level of support seen for no increase in Council Tax, the Committee was advised that it could be difficult to balance the right level of information alongside the consultation, but this could be an area looked at for future consultations. The Council was also establishing a Customer Panel to seek to provide a more in-depth understanding of residents' opinions and needs.

The Committee was asked to note that Members had a difficult decision regarding whether or not to increase Council Tax this year. Increasing Council Tax protected the Council's income base and helped address the future predicted funding gap. However any increase would be an extra cost to taxpayers.

The Vice-Chairman raised some questions about the future of the New Homes Bonus, the length of time that no increase in Council Tax was factored into the MTFP and how this would affect drafting a balanced budget.

In response the Assistant Director Finance drew members' attention to Appendix C to the report, which set out the assumptions for the MTFP. He pointed out that in 2022/23 the £1.3m in New Homes Bonus was made up of a £500,000 legacy payment and £800,000 for the in-year payment. The legacy payment would cease from 2023/24 and a new scheme would be introduced. It was assumed that this would be in the region of £500,000, but it was emphasised that this was very much an assumption and there was the risk that although the Council was delivering growth it might not be rewarded for this as much as it had been in the past.

The MTFP provided calculations for a £5 Council Tax increase and no increase options over the five year period to 2026/27 and Cabinet would be able to make a decision on this each year according to circumstances.

Members were asked to note that the decision of whether to increase Council Tax could not be carried forward. For example, Council Tax could not be frozen one year and increased by £10 the following year.

The responsibility for setting a balanced budget was for the current year and whilst being mindful of future years a balanced budget would be drafted when that year in question was reached.

In response to a suggestion that the proposed two percent staff pay increase was not sufficient, the Assistant Director Finance reminded the Committee that the staffing budget had to be affordable and that it did include an additional element for Performance Related Pay that would increase pay for staff rated good or excellent. Negotiations were ongoing under local pay bargaining arrangements.

In answer to a question about apprenticeships at the Council the meeting was informed that there were approximately 18 apprentices in the One Team and another five or six coming forward. This would meet a key target in the *One Team Apprenticeship Strategy* to meet the Local Government Association target of 2.3% of new entrant headcount as apprentices.

The Chairman questioned how in the face of the £1m funding gap could not increasing Council Tax be justified?

In response, the Assistant Director Finance informed the meeting that this would be a challenge, but there would be opportunities for savings and income generation and the financial settlement might be better than assumed. However, he emphasised that setting the level of Council Tax remained a political decision.

It was also confirmed that if there was a £1m funding gap the Council had sufficient reserves to cover this as a short-term measure, although this was not recommended as it was not a sustainable funding source.

The Assistant Director Finance also confirmed that the organisation was on target to make the £8.5m savings from collaboration.

The Chairman noted that at the 16 November 2021 meeting the Committee had requested that they be provided with a breakdown of actual savings achieved from collaboration, as well as the transitional costs, which should be separated from the One Team transitional staff costs. He stressed that this information was long overdue.

Following a show of hands it was unanimously:

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

That Cabinet recommends to Council:

- 1.1 The approval of the 2022/23 base budget; subject to confirmation of the finalised Local Government Finance Settlement figures which may necessitate an adjustment through the General Revenue Reserve to maintain a balanced budget. Authority to make any such change to be delegated to the Assistant Director of Finance;
 - 1.2 That the Council's demand on the Collection Fund for 2022/23 for General Expenditure shall be £6,165,139 and for Special Expenditure shall be £120,154;
 - 1.3 That the Band D level of Council Tax be £129.91 for General Expenditure and £2.53 for Special Expenditure.
- 2 That Cabinet agrees:
- 2.1 Changes to the proposed fees and charges as set out in section 5.
- 3 That Cabinet notes:
- 3.1 The advice of the Section 151 Officer with regard to section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003, contained in section 10 of this report;
 - 3.2 The Medium-Term Financial Strategy projections.

105 CAPITAL STRATEGY AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2022/23 TO 2026/27

The Assistant Director Finance introduced the report, which presented the Capital Strategy and proposed Capital Programme for 2022/23 to 2026/27.

Members' attention was drawn to the Capital Programme at Appendix B, which totalled £9.1m for 2022/23. The overall Capital Investment Programme over the five year period to 2026/27 was £22m.

Included in the Capital Programme was £7m for Broadland Growth Ltd, £1m for an IT replacement programme, £185,000 for street lighting, £153,000 for the Food Hub Project and £5m for Disabled Facilities Grants. It was confirmed that Broadland Growth Ltd had completed a development in Great Plumstead and was actively looking for a new site to develop.

Financing for the programme was through a mix of Government Grant, Revenue Reserves and Capital Receipts. There was no requirement for borrowing in the Capital Programme.

A new item in the Capital Programme was Waste Vehicles, which was a more cost effective means for funding the Waste Service.

A deliberate omission from the Capital Programme was new office accommodation, as no final decision on this had been made. Works for Thorpe Lodge, therefore, would remain in the Programme until this matter was decided.

In response to a query, it was confirmed that a Government Grant of £20,000 had been received for changing places facilities. A business case would be drafted for member approval and further funding could be added to this pot, if it was considered necessary. Members were informed that many parish and town councils were receiving significant sums from the Community Infrastructure Levy and had the funding to take on responsibility for public conveniences themselves.

The Committee was also informed that Broadland Country Park had funding through a S106 agreement that it could draw upon for some time to come. There were also external investment sources that the Country Park could draw on, rather than the Capital Programme. A masterplan for the Country Park would be considered by the Economic Success Panel in March 2022.

In respect of Special Expenses, the Portfolio Holder for Finance informed the meeting that all of the money collected was ring-fenced for street lighting. She added that if Hellesdon wished to take on responsibility for the street lights it would receive any balance held by the Council for their maintenance.

The meeting was advised that a budget for acquiring temporary accommodation would be in the In Year Budget Options report that was 'to follow' and would be looked at when a business case was brought to Cabinet later in the year.

The Greater Norwich Local Plan had identified a need for 30 Traveller pitches in Greater Norwich over the next five years and beyond. A budget of £300,000 had, therefore, been set aside for travellers sites in the District, which should equate to two smaller sites.

Following a show of hands it was:

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

Cabinet is asked to recommend to Council the Capital Strategy (Appendix A) and the Capital Programme for 2022/23-2026/27 (Appendix B).

The Committee adjourned at 11.20am and reconvened at 11.34am, when all the Committee members listed above were present.

106 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT 2022/23

The Assistant Director Finance introduced the report, which set out the Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2022/23 and associated policies.

The Council had three key treasury management principles:

1. Security – To ensure monies were not placed at undue risk, by ensuring all monies were invested in appropriate counterparties or instruments commensurate with the organisation's risk appetite.
2. Liquidity - To ensure that cash flow was adequately planned, with cash being available when it was needed, and that sufficient funding was available to finance the organisation's capital investment plans.
3. Yield - To maximise investment returns (commensurate with risk) and minimise borrowing costs to minimise the costs to the organisation.

As at the end of December 2021 the Council had treasury investments of £61.8m.

The Bank Rate rose from 0.10% to 0.25% in December 2021. However, the Council's treasury advisors, anticipated no higher rate than 0.75% by March 2023. On that basis the expected investment return for 2022/23 had been calculated as £400,000.

Broadland was currently debt free and the current capital expenditure plan showed that there was no requirement to borrow.

The Council was making ethical investments through its treasury management function and supported the ethos of socially responsible investments through a £6m sustainable investment fund. Broadland also had £10m invested in very liquid assets.

It was confirmed that the Council did have the ambition to secure a greater return on its investments through Broadland Growth Ltd, which was looking to develop a pipeline of development sites.

Following a show of hands it was:

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

Cabinet is recommended to approve the following and recommend these to Council:

1. This Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2022/23
2. The Treasury Management Policy Statement 2022/23 (Appendix 1)

3. The Annual Investment Strategy 2022/23 (Appendix 2)
4. The Treasury Management Practice (TMP1) (Appendix 3)
5. The Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation (Appendix 4)
6. The Prudential Indicators (Appendix 5)
7. The Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement (Appendix 6).

107 COUNCIL TAX ASSISTANCE SCHEME 2022/23

The Housing and Benefits Manager introduced the report, which proposed changes to the Council Tax Assistance Scheme for the financial year 2022/23.

The Council was required to review and approve its Council Tax Assistance Scheme on an annual basis.

Following the review it was proposed to make changes to the scheme to optimise the way Council Tax Assistance was assessed and target financial help to those who were most in need. The changes were drawn up in collaboration with members over the course of four member workshops.

The changes proposed would ensure the Council was being responsive to the current economic climate and ensure that assistance was effectively distributed to residents to ensure help is provided where it was needed.

The Housing and Benefit Team and members had also been working in collaboration with Policy in Practice to model the effect the proposed changes would have on the overall cost of the Council Tax Assistance Scheme. The model indicated that there would be an increase in the overall cost of the scheme of £89,069.

A Member noted that some Norfolk local authorities had more generous Council Tax Assistance. Although the meeting was also informed that the proposed scheme was in line with South Norfolk and King's Lynn.

Concern was expressed about proposal 2, which sought to increase the non-dependant deduction to £5 for all non-dependents.

In response, the Housing and Benefits Manager informed the meeting that alternative pots of funding were available at officer's discretion to mitigate the increase, if claimants were vulnerable, such as the Hardship Fund and the Council Tax Discretionary Relief. All claimants were advised by letter of the increase in the deduction of Council Tax Assistance.

The numbers in this category were quite small, but the aim of the change was to encourage them to contribute to the household normally through work.

The Chairman asked that the scheme be remodelled to identify the cost difference between providing 84 percent Council Tax assistance and 100 percent.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance emphasised that it would be the householder who would be paying the increase in Council Tax, not the non-dependent. She also added that comparing the 84 percent assistance at Broadland to 100 percent at another local authority, was not comparing like with like, as other parts of the Council's policy could mitigate the percentage difference.

Members were also advised that Norfolk County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner would also need to be consulted about any further changes, as they would lose their element of Council Tax as well.

The Assistant Director for Finance advised the meeting that he roughly calculated that to take the Council Tax Assistance scheme from 84 percent to 100 percent would cost Norfolk Council Taxpayers in the region of £1m, Broadland's share of this cost would be approximately £120,000 and Norfolk County Council would have a £750,000 additional cost.

The Chairman noted that Norwich City Council absorbed these costs, although it was also pointed out that the City Council had a higher level of Council Tax than Broadland

Following a show of hands the recommendation in the report was lost, with 6 votes in favour and 7 against.

The Chairman proposed that the Committee recommend that Cabinet consider not implementing the £5 deduction in proposal 2.

A member suggested that the report needed to be re-costed and represented, as it appeared safeguards for vulnerable groups had not been taken into account in the report.

In response, the Portfolio Holder for Finance informed the meeting that she and the Portfolio Holder for Housing and Wellbeing had done a great deal of work on the report with officers over a nine month period and had considered the proposals in it very carefully.

The Chairman proposed that Cabinet consider if the £5 a week increase to the non-dependent deduction in Council Tax Assistance (as set out in Proposal 2) was a reasonable change to the Council Tax Assistance Scheme.

Following a show of hands it was:

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

That Cabinet consider if the £5 a week increase to the non-dependent deduction in Council Tax Assistance (as set out in Proposal 2) was a reasonable change to make to the Council Tax Assistance Scheme.

The Committee adjourned at 12.45pm and reconvened at 13.00pm, when all the Committee members listed above were present, except for Cllrs Adams, Bulman, Hemsall and K Leggett.

108 DELIVERY PLAN 2022-2024

The Strategy and Programmes Manager introduced the report, which proposed that the Council approved the adoption of the Delivery Plan for 2022-24. The Delivery Plan outlined the activities and projects the Council would be undertaking to meet the priority areas outlined in the four-year Strategic Plan and if approved, the Plan would commence in April 2022.

This year, for the first time, the Council had produced a two-year plan, which would take it to the end of the Strategic Planning period.

The Delivery Plan was broken down into the following key areas:

- An introduction to the Plan and how it linked with the Strategic Plan and vision for the Council
- An overview of the Council's income and how it was planned to be spent in 2022-24
- The key and major projects that would be delivered across the two-year period
- An overview of the business as usual activities broken down by service area and;
- The key Delivery Measures that would be reported to Cabinet in Q2 and Q4, enabling the Council to track its performance against the Delivery Plan

The Delivery Plan was a dynamic document that would be updated on a six monthly basis in order to show progress with activities and projects, as well as any significant changes such as the scope or timelines of a project or changes in priorities.

In response to a suggestion from a member that the top priority should be 'Supporting individuals and empowering communities' rather than 'Growing

the economy', the Director for Resources explained that there was no top priority, all four priorities were equal. Growing the economy was listed first purely for presentational purposes.

The Chairman noted in the Delivery Programme that reference GE3 (page 111 of the agenda) appeared to cover two different areas; a Car Parking Strategy and the provision of electric vehicle charging points.

In response, the Director for Place advised the meeting that these two areas were not reliant on one another and the wording could be changed to the following:

Work with the Norfolk Parking Partnership to develop and implement a car parking strategy for Broadland and South Norfolk ~~including~~ and/or the provision of electric vehicle charging points.

The Committee **AGREED** to recommend this amendment to Cabinet, as it could allow the provision of electric vehicle charging points prior to the completion of the Car Parking Strategy.

In answer to a query about GE7, (page 112) the Housing Development Strategy, Director for Place confirmed that there were a number of means of providing affordable housing. This Strategy however was mainly focused on the Housing Team within Economic Growth and the use of S106 money to provide additional affordable housing, over and above what was already being delivered. This was more of an issue in South Norfolk, which had a greater amount of S106 money for affordable housing, but the Strategy covered both Districts.

A member noted that the Council was very good at putting its residents first, and he commended the work of the Help Hub, especially its availability seven days a week until 10.00pm. He also commended the Council on its rapid distribution of Government grants at the start of the pandemic.

In response to a query about reference MT15, (page 120) Review and alignment of Constitutions, the Governance Manager advised the meeting that this was a long-term piece of work to ensure that processes and delegations were aligned to assist with effective governance across the One Team. However, both Constitutions would retain certain differences to reflect the two sovereign councils.

The Chairman asked that when amendments to the Constitution were made they be tracked, so that the Members could identify what the changes were.

In answer to a query regarding reference MT4 (page 117) Review of office accommodation, the Director of Resources confirmed that this work was

ongoing and would come to members in due course. She reminded members that the One Team worked very differently now than they did prior to Covid and the review was about maximising the efficiency of the available office space. She added that running two offices was expensive and both would require significant investment over the next 20 years, so this was seen as a priority.

The Chairman reiterated his irritation that the Accommodation Review report had been withdrawn from the November Cabinet agenda, as he considered that it should have proceeded through the Committee cycle.

Following a show of hands it was unanimously.

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

To recommend that Council approves the adoption of the Delivery Plan for 2022-24, *as amended*.

109 GREATER NORWICH JOINT FIVE-YEAR INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PLAN AND ANNUAL GROWTH PROGRAMME

The Assistant Director Planning introduced the report, which sought agreement of the draft Greater Norwich Joint Five Year Infrastructure Investment Plan 2022 to 2027, approval of the allocation of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to projects included within Annual Growth Programme and to agree the draft loan agreement for the drawdown of £6.733M to support the delivery of the Long Stratton Bypass.

The Committee were advised of the following three projects proposed within the Broadland area:

- Broadland County Park Horsford Crossing
- Yare Boat Club
- Yellow Pedalway extension (Airport to Broadland Northway)

In addition to the seven projects listed in the report, it was also proposed to allocate a further two million into the education programme at Norfolk County Council. This was set to be allocated to Hethersett School, if approved.

The Assistant Director for Planning explained that the Infrastructure Investment Plan also recommended a drawdown of £6.733 million of borrowing to support the delivery of the Long Stratton bypass.

Members were asked to note that the Place Shaping Panel had recommended approval of the Infrastructure Investment Plan, Growth Programme and the draft loan agreement for the Long Stratton bypass.

A member questioned the car based transport in the Plan and the delivery of the Long Stratton bypass, as a climate change risk assessment had concluded that the UK was not doing enough to address climate change and the Greater Norwich Local Plan made it clear that car use should be reduced and alternative public transport encouraged. She, therefore, could not support the Plan.

In response the Director for Place confirmed that the Long Stratton bypass was a long-term strategic ambition of Norfolk County Council. There was a broader strategy across Greater Norwich that included significant investment in alternative public transport that centred on the City. However, a bypass was much needed for Long Stratton and this work would also include improvements to footpaths and cycleways in the village. A planning application, including an Environmental Impact Assessment would be going to the South Norfolk Planning Committee in the spring.

Following a show of hands it was:

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

It is recommended that Cabinet recommends to Council that it:

- a) approves the Draft Five Year Infrastructure Investment Plan 2022-27 (Appendix 1);
- b) approves the proposed 2022/23 Annual Growth Programme (section 3 of Appendix 1);
- c) agrees the draft legal loan agreement for the draw-down of £6.733m through the Greater Norwich City Deal, to support the delivery of Long Stratton Bypass (Appendix E of Appendix 1) and to allocate £350,000 of the Infrastructure Investment Fund (IIF) to the cash reserve;

and

- d) Subject to the agreement of recommendation c), to delegate authority to the Council's Section 151 Officer and Director of Place in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to finalise the terms and sign the legal loan agreement on behalf of the Council.

110 ADOPTION OF THE NORFOLK GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE AND RECREATIONAL AVOIDANCE AND MITIGATION (GIRAMS) STRATEGY

The Assistant Director for Planning introduced the report, which proposed the adoption of the Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy (GIRAMS) and the collections of related obligations from applications for residential development and other relevant development proposals, in accordance with the GIRAMS evidence and Policy three of the Greater Norwich Local Plan and to ensure that the Council continued to meet its legal duty under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.

The Assistant Director Planning confirmed that the regulations would apply to new and reserved matters. They could not be applied retrospectively.

Following a show of hands it was:

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

Cabinet to recommend to Council that it adopts the Norfolk Green Infrastructure and Recreational Avoidance and Mitigation (GIRAMS) Strategy and resolves to begin collecting obligations from applications for residential development, and other relevant development proposals in accordance with the following requirements of Policy 3 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan:

All residential development will address the potential visitor pressure, caused by residents of the development that would detrimentally impact on sites protected under the Habitats Regulations Directive through:

- the payment of a contribution towards the cost of mitigation measures at the protected sites (as determined under the Norfolk Green infrastructure and Recreational Impact Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy plus an allowance for inflation); and,*
- the provision or enhancement of adequate green infrastructure, either on the development site or nearby, to provide for the informal recreational needs of the residents as an alternative to visiting the protected sites. This will equate to a minimum of 2 hectares per 1,000 population and will reflect Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard.*

111 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED

That the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining items of business because otherwise, information which is exempt information by virtue of Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government

Act 1972, as amended by The Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006, would be disclosed to them.

112 MICROSOFT ENTERPRISE AGREEMENT – CONTRACT AWARD

The Assistant Director ICT/Digital and Transformation introduced the exempt report, which provided details of a procurement exercise to award a new contract for the provision of Microsoft Licence Agreements for Broadland and South Norfolk Councils.

The procurement was delivered in accordance with the agreed timetable and the Councils' Contract Procedure Rules and formal approval to award the contract was sought from Cabinet.

Following a show of hands it was:

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET

That Cabinet approves the decision to appoint the provider for the Microsoft Licence Agreement, for a period of three years.

(The meeting concluded at 1.45pm)

Chairman