

CABINET

Minutes of a meeting of Cabinet held at Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich, held on Tuesday 6 July 2021 at 6.00pm.

**Cabinet Member
Present:**

Councillors: S Vincent (Chairman), T Mancini-Boyle (Vice-Chairman) , J Copplestone, J Emsell, S Lawn, J Leggett and F Whymark.

**Other Members in
Attendance:
Officers in
Attendance:**

Councillor: M Murrell

The Managing Director, Director of People and Communities, Chief of Staff, Assistant Director of Finance, Assistant Director of Individuals and Families, Assistant Director of Planning, Assistant Director of Regulatory, ICT and Digital Manager, Economic Growth Administrator and Democratic Services Officers (LA, JO)

12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Minute No 19 – Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) – Submission to the Secretary of State for Independent Examination

Cllr S Vincent declared that through his consultancy Abzag, he was promoting, on behalf of the landowner, a site for residential development in Colney which had not been taken forward under the Greater Norwich Local Plan, through the Greater Norwich Local Plan.

Should this site come under further consideration he shall declare a disclosable pecuniary interest and shall vacate the chair and leave the room.

In this case under the provisions of the Code of Conduct he did not have any interests to declare which would prevent him from participating in the debate and chairing the meeting.

13 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of Cabinet held on 15 June 2021 were agreed as a correct record.

14 MATTERS ARISING

Minute No: 7 – Covid-19 Recovery Plan

In answer to a query from the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Excellence, Cabinet was advised that the contract with the YMCA to provide mental health support for young people had been signed off on 1 July 2021. Referrals would be made both through the Help Hub and directly from the YMCA, who would also work within the Help Hub.

The Leader requested that this item come back to Cabinet in September and should include a revised Appendix A, as he had suggested at the 15 June 2021 meeting.

Minute No 228 – Member IT (20 April 2021 Cabinet)

The Leader was pleased to note that Member IT had been placed on the Forward Plan for the 19 October 2021 Cabinet.

15 PUBLIC SPEAKING

Mr Trevor Bennett, Chairman of Aylsham Town Council, in respect of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) (Agenda item 19)

There were a significant number of objections to the Plan from the residents of Aylsham. These were reasoned, articulate comments which highlighted the lack of consultation moving from one to two sites. There is no evidence that this has been seriously considered by either officers or the council representatives. There has been no contact from the GNLP to discuss these issues with Aylsham Town Council.

The Town Council would like to meet with Planners from Broadland District Council to discuss the allocation of two sites in the Town, which he considered to have been in response to the Planning White Paper, which was now likely to change. He suggested that there was no urgency to submit a flawed Local Plan and that it should be put deferred in order to hold a consultation.

Response from the Portfolio Holder for Planning

Mr Bennett was thanked for his question and his attention was drawn to page 114 of the Cabinet papers (Greater Norwich Development Partnership Submission Report) where it was explained that the 2012 Planning Regulations anticipated that there would be changes in whatever has been consulted upon after the Regulation 18 consultation.

At the Regulation 18C draft plan stage of the GNLP, overall housing numbers were consulted on, alternative sites were consulted on as well as those proposed for allocation.

It was common for new sites to be proposed for allocation for the first time at the Regulation 19 stage, either because they had only recently become available or the local planning authority needed to supplement its allocations in order to better meet needs. The report highlighted that representations had been made on the plan-making process and on the consequential increasing housing numbers for Aylsham.

Further to this, the overall housing numbers had been raised in response to new evidence from the 2018 household projections and the Government's clear national policy priority of addressing the housing crisis. This rise in overall housing numbers had included an additional site in Aylsham for 250 homes, which was consulted on as a potential alternative through the Regulation 18C consultation in early 2020. The Norwich Road site would provide 250 homes in a sustainable location, including housing for the elderly and the potential for a car park, as included in Aylsham's Neighbourhood Plan. In addition to the site in Aylsham, to assist in providing for the additional housing overall, numbers had been doubled in East Norwich to 4,000 homes and changes to sites had been included in Acle, Colney, Cringleford, Harleston and Wymondham. Overall housing numbers in the plan in Aylsham were similar to those of Diss and Harleston and significantly lower than those of the other main towns of Long Stratton and Wymondham.

Concerns had been raised over the capacity of Aylsham's infrastructure to cope with the additional homes, including schools, sewerage, highways and integrating new communities. In relation to these concerns, infrastructure providers had been involved throughout the plan-making process and were fully aware of the need to provide additional capacity as and when growth took place. This included a new primary school on the Burgh Road housing site.

It was understood that the Burgh Road site was the preferred option, but the Norwich Road site was seen as a reasonable alternative, hence the reason for its inclusion under the Regulation 19 process.

With the release of the Government's White Paper 'Planning for the Future' it was realised that housing numbers would have to be increased and as the second site in Aylsham had been consulted upon it was appropriate to include the Norwich Road site in the Plan.

There were numerous references to consultation with residents in Aylsham in the report, for example:

- The Process section (page 124)
- Growth in Main Towns section (page 129)
- Consultation section (page 131)
- Location of Growth Section (page 134)
- Aylsham topic of Main Towns (page 141)
- In the Sites section under Main Towns (pages 153,154)

Page 123 of the report gave a breakdown of the number of representations for Aylsham sites and there was to be the opportunity for residents to make representations to the independent Inspector, either in writing or in person.

The GNLP applies to over 400,000 residents and the 69 objections from Aylsham had been listened to and detailed for submission to the Inspector.

Three Regulation 18 consultations had taken place on the Plan, including consultation events in Aylsham and meetings with Aylsham Town Council. We are now at the “soundness” stages of plan-making, which would include an examination in public if the GNLP is submitted. For such an examination, the independent Inspector will have access to the full representations made, which are on the GNLP web site. The Inspector would also have the representation summaries and responses in the Statement of Consultation. Discussions on specific sites and locations for growth such as Aylsham would no doubt be a key part of the examination. The Inspector would then determine whether specific sites should be included in the Plan or not.

Therefore, Broadland District Council was confident that the GNLP was sound and legally compliant and should be submitted for Independent Examination.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning confirmed that she would be happy to arrange a meeting with the Town Council and officers and members from the District Council to discuss their concerns, as soon as possible.

16 REPRESENTATIONS FROM NON CABINET MEMBERS

The Chairman agreed that, at his discretion, all non-Cabinet Members in attendance be allowed to join the debate at the relevant point of the proceedings on request.

17 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Cabinet received the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 15 June 2021.

18 PLACE SHAPING POLICY DEVELOPMENT PANEL

Cabinet received the Minutes of the meeting of the Panel held on 28 June 2021

19 GREATER NORWICH LOCAL PLAN (GNLP) – SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION

The Assistant Director of Planning informed Cabinet that the report set out the main issues raised through the Regulation 19 consultation stage of plan-making for the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP), which had taken place over 1 February to 22 March 2021 and had sought comment on the soundness and legal compliance of the Plan.

The 1,316 representations made had all been assessed and were summarised in the report and it had been concluded that the representations received had identified no significant issues, in principle, that could not be addressed or were such a risk to the GNLP that it should not be submitted to the Secretary of State for Public Examination in the near future.

However, some representations had raised issues which had to be addressed before submission, in particular, with Natural England on protecting key habitats from increased visitor pressure due to growth. This would be addressed through a Statement of Common Ground in relation to the mitigation necessary to protect sites under the Habitat Regulations.

Ongoing work was also required to proactively identify and bring forward sufficient Gypsy and Traveller sites to meet identified need.

The recommendation provided the caveat that submission of the Plan was subject to progress being made on these key issues; however legal advice had confirmed that these issues did not make the Plan unsound.

The other recommendations in the report were procedural and would allow the planning inspector to make any main modifications necessary to make the Plan sound and legally compliant. The modifications would be reported back to each authority to ensure that they were satisfactory.

It was confirmed that the Statement of Common Ground relating to habitat protection would be updated under the auspices of the Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework. The identification of Gypsy and Traveller sites would be undertaken by all three Greater Norwich local authorities and Norfolk County Council and would need to identify sites before the examination took place. Members were advised that Norwich City would be bringing 21 pitches forward shortly.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

1. Agree that the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) is sound and to submit the Plan to the Secretary of State for independent examination subject to reaching an agreement in principle with Natural England, in the form of a signed statement of common ground, in relation to the mitigation necessary to protect sites protected under the Habitat Regulations.

2. Commit to proactively identify and bring forward sufficient Gypsy and Traveller sites to meet identified needs in accordance with the criteria based policies of the current and emerging Development Plans.
3. Agree to request that the appointed independent inspector make any Main Modifications necessary to make the plan sound and legally compliant;

and,
4. Delegate authority to the Assistant Director for Planning in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning, and in conjunction with Norwich City and South Norfolk Councils, to:
 - a. agree minor modifications to the GNLP prior to its submission.
and,
 - b. negotiate any main modifications necessary to make the GNLP Sound as part of the Independent Examination.

Reasons for decision

To ensure that the Council's Development Plan remained effective and continued to have full weight in determining planning applications.

20 CAPITAL BUDGET

The report recommended that the Capital Budget for Refuse Services be increased from £3m to £5.7m.

Cabinet was advised that when the budget was agreed in February 2021 it was uncertain whether the Council would need to purchase refuse vehicles and / or update the Frettenham Depot. This was because, as part of the re-tender of its Strategic Environment contract, the Council wanted to see whether it would be more cost effective: to use an alternative depot, and / or for the contractor to purchase the refuse vehicles.

It had since become clear during the initial stages of the procurement process that local authority funding of the refuse vehicles was the most cost effective solution. Although the actual capital cost of the vehicles was not known it was evident that more than £3m would be required.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance noted that the proposed figure of £5.7m was at the top end of the cost range and the actual cost was likely to be lower.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

That the 20/21 Capital Budget for Refuse Services is increased from £3m to £5.7m.

Reasons for decision

To provide additional resource for the purchase of refuse vehicles.

21 INSURANCE CONTRACT – REQUEST FOR DELEGATION TO AWARD

The Portfolio Holder for Finance advised the meeting that as the next Cabinet meeting was being rescheduled for 31 August 2021, it would allow time for this item to be determined by Cabinet rather than being delegated and she, therefore, requested that a decision on the insurance contract be deferred.

AGREED

To defer a decision on this item to the 31 August 2021 meeting of Cabinet.

22 BROADLAND USE OF THE NORFOLK STRATEGIC FUND GRANT

The report sought Cabinet's endorsement of a revised programme of work funded by the Norfolk Strategic Fund grant and requested that authority be delegated to the Assistant Director of Economic Growth, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development to determine the use of the balance of the grant monies in support of the economic recovery.

The Norfolk Strategic Fund was a one-off grant programme, funded primarily from Norfolk's pooled business rates, that was to be used to support economic recovery activities.

In October 2020 the Council was awarded £428,573 from the Norfolk Strategic Fund based on a proposed programme of works that had been informally agreed by Cabinet in late 2020, where it was provisionally agreed to allocate most of the funding to an entrepreneurship development programme known as Enterprise Facilitation®.

However, following a presentation and further internal discussions, it was decided by Members not to proceed with the Enterprise Facilitation® programme, as it was not seen to represent good value for money nor to add significantly to services currently being delivered locally by the Council and other organisations.

A new programme of work had subsequently been drafted that remained consistent with the aims of the Norfolk Strategic Fund grant and the Council's emerging programme of business support activities. These funds were due to be expended by December 2022.

The Portfolio Holder for Economic Development advised the meeting that she wanted to propose some further revisions to the programme of work. These were:

- Start-up/SME business mentor (a two year appointment, with on-costs) increased from £60,000 to £130,000.
- Marketing and Communications - £10,000.
- SME/Start-up grants increased from £100,000 to £173,527
- Contingency reduced from £98,527 to £85,000

In addition, she proposed that recommendation 8.2 be amended to the following:

To agree to delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Economic Growth, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development to determine the use of the ~~balance of the grant monies~~ contingency amount of (~ £85,000) ~~in support of the economic recovery and to decide on the governance arrangements for the SME / Start-Up Business Grants over the value of £5,000.~~

The revised recommendations were duly seconded and by a show of hands it was unanimously:

RESOLVED

1. To endorse the revised programme of activity to be funded from the Norfolk Strategic Fund grant; and
2. To agree to delegate authority to the Assistant Director of Economic Growth, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development to determine the use of the contingency amount of (~ £85,000) and to decide on the governance arrangements for the SME / Start-Up Business Grants over the value of £5,000.

Reasons for decision

To support existing businesses and those looking to start a new business in the District.

23 MOVING TOWARDS A FIRST-CLASS CUSTOMER SERVICE

The report presented the Customer Strategy and Customer Charter for approval and adoption, as well as asking Cabinet to note details of a Customer Experience and Insight lead role and a new Complaints Handling Policy.

Research into the Council's current approach to customer satisfaction and approach of other organisations both in the private and public sectors, had been undertaken in late 2020.

Staff workshops had been held to identify areas of strength and weakness in the current customer service provision and best practices and agreed ambitions were identified and used to formulate the proposed Customer Strategy, as well as a Customer Charter.

The Strategy aimed to put customers at the heart of the Councils activities and could provide benefits in customer satisfaction, efficiencies through service improvements and reduce waste by identifying and resolving causes of dissatisfaction and complaint.

The Strategy placed an emphasis on being able to understand and react to changing customer behaviours and expectations in order to shape and transform services to meet needs. To do this effectively the Council would seek to put the right resources and mechanisms in place to gather, collate and analyse customer feedback and insight and ensure that decisions were informed by data.

Cabinet were advised that a pilot customer satisfaction survey had been carried out on the old website and that this information was being analysed and would be reported back to cabinet in due course.

The Portfolio Holder for Transformation and Organisational Development noted the importance of customer service for residents and businesses and commended the report, which clearly set out a strategy for improving the Council's customer service.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Wellbeing noted that complaints had previously been reviewed by the same person who had originally assessed them and he was pleased to see that this practice had now been changed. However, he expressed concern that there were no contact details in the policy and requested they be included. Officers confirmed that the policy would be updated accordingly.

In response to a query it was confirmed that it was aimed to resolve complaints within 15 working day, unless they were complex and a longer period was agreed with the complainant.

In answer to a query about the means of measuring the performance of the Customer Experience & Insight Lead to assess if the initial two year contract would be extended, the Managing Director advised the meeting that there was currently a huge hidden cost involved under customer engagement because it dealt with by a wide variety of staff across the organisation. By having a dedicated resource it would reduce capacity elsewhere and avoid duplication. This would be measurable either in efficiencies or by financial savings.

In answer to a query from the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Excellence, the meeting was informed that analytical work by the Customer Experience & Insight Lead could be carried out using existing software systems and complaints and service requests were separated, but if a service request was received as a complaint it was recorded. If staff were in doubt about the nature of a request it would also be recorded as a complaint.

Following a show of hands, it was unanimously:

RESOLVED

1. To adopt the Customer Strategy; and
2. To adopt the Customer Charter; and
3. To note the appointment of a new Customer Experience & Insight Lead role.

RECOMMENDED TO COUNCIL

1. The adoption of the proposed Complaints Handling Policy.
2. The adoption of the proposed Unreasonably Persistent Complainants Policy.

Reasons for decision

To introduce an approach for delivering a first class customer service.

24 SKILLS AND TRAINING PROJECT

The report provided an overview of the changes in policy and the economic environment that had impacted upon skills and training and defined the target cohorts for the Council's skills and training offer. It also set out a summary of the Council's current skills and training provision and outlined a project plan to enable a positive impact for the identified cohorts.

Research by the Centre for Progressive Policy predicted that Broadland and South Norfolk would be amongst the third of local authorities whose economies would fully recover in five years. Additionally, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation has published research suggesting that recovery in both Districts would feature in the best 20 percent of the country.

Crucially, this might mean that future targeted support would not go towards Broadland and South Norfolk (especially in light of the 'levelling up' agenda).

This presented a strong case for reviewing the current skills and training offer to ensure that the Councils were providing a good level of support for those who needed it most.

It was recognised that other organisations already made significant contribution to skills and training and, therefore, to avoid duplication of effort, it was intended to focus on specific cohorts of residents who had been adversely affected by the economic consequences of the pandemic and to target gaps to help those who would not otherwise benefit from skills and training.

The cohorts identified for these interventions were:

- School leavers
- Higher education leavers
- Recently unemployed including underemployed
- Start-ups (individuals and entrepreneurs looking to start their own business)

Consultations had been held with both internal and external stakeholders to understand the impact of their services and identify areas where additional support could be provided by the Council. These areas were:

- Direct delivery by both Councils
- Signposting / facilitating other skills and training provision
- Advocacy / influencing

Direct delivery included an Apprenticeship Scheme to ensure both Councils utilised their Apprenticeship Levy funding and met the Local Government Association's requirement of 2.3 percent of new entrants (this was anticipated to be in the region of 24 members of staff). Cabinet was informed that this scheme would be funded through existing underspend and would not incur any additional cost.

The apprenticeships would be mostly vocational, in areas such as planning, environmental health and occupational therapy, but would also include some graduate apprenticeships. A Skills Training Board would be established to assess what skills were needed at the Council in order to target apprentices. It was intended that apprentices would come from a mix of age groups and it was confirmed that as this cohort increased details would be reported to Members.

The Managing Director emphasised that this represented an opportunity for the One Team to develop staff at all levels of their careers.

In answer to a query about links to educational establishments, it was confirmed that the Council was in contact with a wide range of educational bodies and youth organisations and would seek to explore these further to promote apprenticeships in local government.

Members were also informed that a report on the future use of Carrowbreck would be brought to Cabinet later in the year.

The Portfolio Holder for Economic Development proposed amending recommendation one in order to galvanise the direct delivery of projects by the Council, to the following:

To note the impacts on skills, training and the wider economy in South Norfolk and Broadland and to note the intended approach to ~~tailor our support to specific cohorts of residents and start-up businesses~~ support direct delivery projects, as outlined in paragraphs 4.3.1 to 4.3.6.

The Leader noted that this was a very exciting area and he commended officers for their ingenuity in funding the apprenticeship budget through recurring underspends.

He also proposed the following further amendment to recommendation 1, as Cabinet sought to discourage recommendations that were 'to note'.

To agree ~~note the impacts on skills, training and the wider economy in South Norfolk and Broadland and to note~~ the intended approach to support direct delivery projects, as outlined in paragraphs 4.3.1 to 4.3.6.

Following a show of hands it was unanimously:

RESOLVED

1. To agree the intended approach to support direct delivery projects, as outlined in paragraphs 4.3.1 to 4.3.6; and
2. To agree to the establishment of a centralised apprenticeship budget comprised of existing apprenticeship posts across all directorates, topped up through increasing the vacancy factor from 2% to 3.5% to generate an additional £245,000 from recurring underspend across both councils.

Reasons for decision

To provide skills and training opportunities for Broadland's residents and businesses.

25 EMERGENCY PLANNING STRUCTURES

The Assistant Director Regulatory presented the report, which proposed establishing a 24/7/365 Emergency Incident Officer Scheme to provide a guaranteed response to defined serious emergency incidents.

Cabinet was advised that the Council was a Category 1 Emergency Planning responder, with formal responsibilities under the Civil Contingency Act 2004 and maintained operational Emergency Plans to fulfil this duty.

These Plans were updated over time to reflect changes in organisational arrangements and learning from emergency incidents and it had been identified that it would be beneficial to augment the Council's emergency planning mechanisms with a 24/7/365 Emergency Incident Officer Scheme to guarantee a response to the scene of a serious incident. The depth of knowledge about local communities and their vulnerabilities and the resourceful problem-solving skills of officers would demonstrate emphatically and visibly the Council's commitment and support during emergency incidents.

The proposed role of the Emergency Incident Officer would cover the following three main areas:

- a. To provide the initial call receipt and point of contact for other agencies regarding emergencies in the District. The Emergency Incident Officer would make an assessment on whether he/she needs to attend the scene and whether other Council resources were required.
- b. To attend emergency scenes under defined response commitments and/or when requested by other agencies or the officer's own determination. Once on-scene, to assess the incident and whether additional Council resources are required.
- c. To provide a visible and constructive physical presence working with local people and partner agencies to best respond to this incident without taking unacceptable risks. NB: We do not aim to replicate or disrupt any other agency's remit and responsibilities.

The Council would look for approximately eight officers to volunteer to be trained and rostered to provide the basic cover on a one week in eight basis. The cost would comprise of a weekly gross standby payment and an allowance for a payment for call-out to major incidents. A budget of £15,000 was proposed to cover these costs.

A senior officer would also always be 'on call' on a rota system to provide senior decision making in support of the Emergency Incident Officer. This would not require any additional payment.

Cabinet was informed that the proposal was over and above the statutory duty of the Council, but would provide for a robust, efficient and more reliable service. The Managing Director advised the meeting that he recommended the proposal and that an increase in capacity from two officers to eight would add value to the service, which he likened to an insurance policy in risk management terms.

In response to a request for a practical example of how the proposed increase in capacity could improve the service, the Assistant Director for Regulatory drew members' attention to the flooding in Long Stratton over 23-26 December 2020, where with no resource on hand it was not known that fast flowing water was obstructing the entrance to the rest centre. If this had been known an alternative venue could have been found. Having an officer on the ground at the incident would have allowed for rounded, problem-solving response that the blue light services did not have the resources to do.

It was confirmed that if the scheme was in place a larger cohort of officers would allow for a number of separate incidents to be responded to at the same time, if necessary.

Following a show of hands, with five in favour and two abstentions, it was

RESOLVED

To establish a 24/7/365 Emergency Incident Officer scheme offering a guaranteed response to defined serious emergency incidents, at an additional annual revenue cost of £13k revenue and £2k equipment, tools and clothing annually borne 45% BDC / 55% SNC.

Reasons for decision

To provide an increased capacity for responding to local major emergency incidents.

26 PENSIONS DISCRETIONS POLICY

The Chief of Staff introduced the report, which confirmed that the Council was required by law to create a Pensions Policy in relation to the discretions under the Local Government Pension Scheme.

The Policy was linked to the One Team terms and conditions and was appropriate for the same pensions' discretions to be awarded.

RESOLVED

To approve Councils Pension Discretion Policy.

Reasons for decision

To meet legislative requirements.

27 EXCLUSION OF THE 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.

28 SHARED PROCUREMENT SERVICE BUSINESS CASE

The exempt report set out a business case for a shared procurement service. Members were advised that it had been concluded that a shared service would provide greater resilience and value for money for the Councils' contractual expenditure.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance advised the meeting that this was a sensible proposal that would make for a more efficient service and it was hoped that other local authorities might eventually join the consortium.

The Portfolio Holder reminded the meeting that the Environmental Strategy encouraged sustainable procurement and it must be ensured that the other local authorities shared the same ambition.

In response, the Assistant Director for Finance confirmed that most local authorities had similar goals and a larger team would make this easier to achieve.

Following further discussion it was:

RESOLVED

1. To agree to the establishment of a shared procurement service, with Breckland Council being the host authority (subject to South Norfolk Council and Breckland Council also agreeing this); and
2. To agree to delegate the detail of the agreement to the Director Resources, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder Finance and Resources.

Reasons for decision

To realise the benefits of a shared procurement service

29 ICT AND DIGITAL STRATEGY REVIEW

The exempt report summarised the objectives of the ICT & Digital Strategy, which would enable the Council to drive forward the alignment, development, and expansion of ICT & Digital Services in a coordinated and efficient manner.

In response to a query regarding budgets for individual elements of the technical landscape in the Strategy, the chief of Staff explained that the overall indicative costs were in the Medium Term Financial Plan, but to detail individual costs would lead to a significant delay in meeting the timelines for delivery of the service. She reassured members that each element of the Strategy would be brought to Cabinet for determination on a case by case basis.

The Managing Director reminded members that the proposed ICT upgrades would have to be undertaken, as many of the systems currently being used were near to end of life.

Following further discussion it was:

RESOLVED

To approve

1. The ICT & Digital Strategy in terms of its direction and action plan; and
2. The proposals to deliver digital services for our customers.

Reasons for decision

To bring forward the consolidation and improvement of the shared ICT and Digital services

30 FINANCE SYSTEM BUSINESS CASE

The exempt report proposed a business case for a Joint Finance System, which it was suggested would bring significant operational benefits.

Following discussion it was unanimously:

RESOLVED

To award a contract, as set out in the report.

Reasons for decision

To realise the benefits of a single joint finance system.

31 FOOD WASTE AND GARDEN WASTE DISPOSAL CONTRACT

The exempt report asked for approval to award a new contract for the disposal of food waste and to extend the current garden waste disposal contract.

Following discussion it was unanimously:

RESOLVED

To

1. Proceed with the award for the processing of food waste, as set out in the report; and
2. Proceed with the award for the processing of garden waste, as set out in the report; and
3. Proceed with a joint procurement of a garden waste disposal contract, as set out in the report and to delegate any decisions regarding the length/type of contract to the Director of People and Communities, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Excellence.

Reasons for decision

To award extensions to the Food and Garden Waste Disposal Contracts.

(The meeting concluded at 8.32pm)

Chairman

DRAFT