

COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of North Norfolk District Council held on 16 November 2016 at the Council Offices, Holt Road, Cromer at 6.00 pm.

Members Present:

Mrs S Arnold	Mr M Knowles	Mr R Reynolds
Mrs S Butikofer	Mr J Lee	Mr E Seward
Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds	Mr N Lloyd	Mr S Shaw
Mrs H Cox	Mrs B McGoun	Mr R Shepherd
Mr N Dixon	Mrs A Moore	Mr B Smith
Mrs J English	Mr P W Moore	Mr D Smith
Mrs A Fitch-Tillett	Mr W J Northam	Mr R Stevens
Mr T FitzPatrick	Mrs J Oliver	Mrs V Uprichard
Mr V FitzPatrick	Miss B Palmer	Mrs L Walker
Ms V R Gay	Mr N Pearce	Mr G Williams
Mrs A Green	Mrs G Perry-Warnes	Mr A Yiasimi
Mrs P Grove-Jones	Mr R Price	Mr D Young
Mr B J Hannah	Mrs M Prior	
Mr S Hester	Mr J Rest	

Officers in Attendance: The Corporate Directors, the Monitoring Officer, the Head of Finance, the Communications and PR Manager and the Democratic Services Team Leader

Press: Present

22. PRAYERS

The Chairman invited Reverend Denys Lloyd, parish priest, Our Lady and St. Joseph to lead prayers.

23. CHAIRMAN'S COMMUNICATIONS

The Chairman said that it he had been privileged to attend the wreath laying on Remembrance Sunday at County Hall. This was followed by a very moving service at the Cathedral and then attendance at the war memorial in Cromer to lay a wreath on behalf of the Council.

The Chairman said that he had been honoured to attend the presentation of the British Empire Medal at the Bishopsgate Hospital in Norwich.

The Chairman concluded by reminding Members that he was hosting a service to recognise the work of volunteers across the District on 26th February in Cromer Church. He encouraged anyone with links to local voluntary organisations to encourage people to attend.

24. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM MEMBERS

The following Members declared an interest in Agenda Item 9a: Determination of Council Tax Discounts & Charges for 2017/18;

Mr N. Dixon, Mr T FitzPatrick, Mr B Hannah, Mr W Northam and Mr E Seward.

Reason: Elected member of Norfolk County Council.

25. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mr P Butikofer, Mr N Coppack, Mr J Punchard, Mr P Rice, Mr N Smith and Mrs K Ward

26. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 21st September 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

27. ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None

28. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None

29. APPOINTMENTS

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED

To make the following appointments;

- 1) Mr A Oram to be appointed as Independent Person to the Standards Committee
- 2) Mr N Dixon to be removed from the Rural Development Programme England – LAG Boards (this will be an officer appointment in future)
- 3) Mrs K Ward to be appointed as a substitute on the Development Committee
- 4) Mrs K Ward to be appointed as a substitute on the Governance, Risk & Audit Committee

30. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET 03 OCTOBER 2016

a) AGENDA ITEM 04: DETERMINATION OF COUNCIL TAX DISCOUNTS & CHARGES FOR 2017/18

Mr W Northam, Portfolio Holder for Revenues & Benefits, introduced this item. He explained that the report recommended the level of council tax discounts and premiums which would apply to empty properties and uninhabitable dwellings for the financial year 2017/18. Discounts for second homes were being reviewed and would be presented to Members for approval later in the year.

Mr Northam said that the proposed changes would provide additional income to the Council and if approved, would be incorporated into the calculation of the tax base for 2017/18 which would be considered at the December meeting of Council.

Mr Northam went onto say that since April 2013 the Council had given a 100% discount for a period of 3 months on empty and substantially unfurnished properties (Class C discount) and on uninhabitable properties a discount of 50% had been awarded for up to 12 months (Class

D discount). Removing these discounts from the 2016/17 tax base would have resulted in 391 Band D properties, equivalent to £54,298 a year as well as encouraging the bringing of properties back into use. Norfolk County Council was offering the Council a one-off payment of £50,000 towards the cost of implementing the changes to Class C and D discounts.

The Chairman invited the Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee to speak.

Mr P W Moore said that the Committee had considered the recommendations at their meeting on 14th October 2016 and agreed to support them.

Mr N Pearce commented that the Council needed to be innovative in obtaining savings in the future.

Mr D Young queried whether the 50% premium on empty homes came into effect after 2 years or whether it could come in part way through a council tax year. Mr N Baker (Corporate Director) replied that the premium came into effect on the date it became empty.

RESOLVED

That the Council be asked to RESOLVE that under section 11A and 11B(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, and in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Finance Act 2012 and other enabling powers that:

- i. the council tax discount for dwellings defined as being within Class 'C' to be removed for the year 2017/18;
- ii. the council tax discount for dwellings defined as being within Class 'D' to be removed for the year 2017/18.
- iii. A premium is charged for properties which have been empty and substantially unfurnished for two years or more of 50% of the council tax payable in relation to that dwelling.

In accordance with the relevant legislation these determinations shall be published in at least one newspaper circulating in North Norfolk before the end of the period of 21 days beginning with the date of the determinations.

31. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET 31 OCTOBER 2016

a) AGENDA ITEM 11: HALF YEARLY TREASURY MANAGEMENT REPORT FOR 2016/17

The Portfolio Holder for Finance, Mr W Northam, introduced this item. He said that it was a requirement of the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy's (CIPFA) Code of Practice for Treasury Management that this mid-year review was prepared and presented to Council. The report provided information on the Treasury Management activities undertaken in the first six months of 2016/17. He added that the treasury activities for the half-year had been carried out in accordance with the CIPFA Code and the Council's Treasury Strategy.

Mr Northam said the income level from the LAMIT pooled property fund was expected to be maintained. There had been a reduction in the value of the investment but it was still a good investment. All maturing investments had been repaid in full and on time. He concluded by saying that the Council remained debt free and thanked the Technical Accountant for his hard work and support.

The Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee said that the Committee had supported the recommendations at their meeting on 9th November 2016.

RESOLVED

To approve the Half Yearly Treasury Management Report for 2016/17.

b) AGENDA ITEM 13: HOUSING STRATEGY 2016-20

The Leader, Mr T FitzPatrick, introduced this item. He explained that the Housing Strategy set out an overarching objective for housing and the priorities which the strategy would address in relation to both new and existing housing, He said it was accompanied by an Action Plan which would be reviewed on a bi-annual basis. He explained that it would be a strategic framework to the Council's actions and interventions in relation to housing.

The Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee said that the Committee had requested for a report to come before them on a six-monthly basis each time the strategy was reviewed.

RESOLVED

To adopt the Housing Strategy 2016-2020 and Action Plan.

c) NORTH NORFOLK ECONOMIC GROWTH STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN

Mr N Dixon, Portfolio Holder for Business and Economic Development said the report presented an Economic Growth Strategy and Action Plan whilst referencing the findings of the 'Business Growth and Investment Opportunities' study undertaken in the latter part of 2015. He said it aligned with the Corporate Plan which made Economic Growth a priority of the Council and the report developed this objective and a number of projects had been developed and that the document was evolving.

The Chairman invited Members to speak:

Mr N Lloyd said that small businesses and retailers were concerned about the impact of rising business rates which could result in their closure. He said that there was nothing in the report that indicated support for small businesses and high streets. Mr Dixon replied that there was a work-stream around supporting existing and new businesses. He said that there was flexibility to accommodate any such measures on a case by case basis and that he was open to considering any ideas and suggestions. Mr T FitzPatrick added that the setting of business rates did not rest with NNDC, however, this was likely to change under the proposals for localised business rate retention. He added that he felt the Strategy would help small to medium sized businesses. Mr Lloyd replied that the proposals were unimaginative and he had hoped to see more support for SMEs.

The Chairman invited the Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee to speak.

Mr P W Moore said that the Committee had considered the recommendations at their meeting on 9th November 2016 and agreed to support them.

d) JOINT BACTON AND WALCOTT COASTAL MANAGEMENT SCHEME- DRAFT

Mrs A. Fitch-Tillett, Portfolio Holder for the Coast, introduced this item. She said that the plans involved the biggest ever recharge of a coastal frontage in the UK. She said the 2013 storm surge affected communities especially those of Bacton and Walcott. Bacton Gas was a strategic part of the Country's infrastructure distributing 30% of the UK's gas. Mrs Fitch-Tillett said the gas pipes could be exposed or undermined at the next storm and as the company was privately owned, the government could not fund enhanced protection. NNDC had to authorise any works. It was a wonderful opportunity to provide further protection to coastal communities with a lifespan of 20 years; meaning it would establish a future for those

residents. Mrs Fitch-Tillett said the complete scheme could cost £30m including £6.8m for communities with funding from a number of sources and the recommendation was to release £500,000 towards the project to help fill the funding gap.

The Chairman invited the Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny Committee to speak.

Mr P W Moore said that the Committee had considered the recommendations at their meeting on 9th November 2016 and agreed to support them.

Mr E Seward said that he fully supported the proposals and hoped that the financial gap could be bridged. It was a very exciting project and a first for Norfolk.

Mr R Price echoed these comments, saying it was a true partnership and a lot of money was being invested in addressing the problems faced along that stretch of coastline.

RESOLVED

To include £500,000 in the capital programme as an NNDC partnership contribution towards the scheme.

e) SHANNOCKS HOTEL SITE SHERINGHAM

The Chairman advised Members that this item was exempt. He said that if Members wished to debate it then the meeting would have to go into private business. Mr B Hannah requested that this item was dealt with under Agenda Item 22: Private Business.

32. FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE 09 NOVEMBER 2016

There were no further recommendations from the Overview & Scrutiny committee meeting held on 9th November 2016.

33. REVIEW OF PARLIAMENTARY CONSTITUENCY BOUNDARIES

The Corporate Director, Mr S Blatch, introduced this item. He outlined the review which was being undertaken to meet Parliament's proposals to reduce the number of Members of Parliament in the House of Commons from 650 to 600. Mr Blatch explained that the following proposals were put forward for the administrative area of North Norfolk District Council:

- Proposed North Norfolk Parliamentary Constituency:

The draft proposal issued for consultation proposes the current North Norfolk Parliamentary Constituency area - i.e. 28 of the 34 North Norfolk District Council wards (all except for Astley, Lancaster North, Lancaster South, The Raynhams, Walsingham and Wensum which are in the adjoining Broadland Parliamentary Constituency) **less** the North Norfolk Briston ward (which would move into the Broadland Constituency) **plus** the Aylsham ward of the Broadland District Council area which would move into the new North Norfolk Parliamentary Constituency. This would give the proposed constituency an electorate of 71,657.

- Proposed Broadland Parliamentary Constituency:

The draft proposal issued for consultation proposes the current Broadland Parliamentary Constituency area - i.e. 21 Broadland District Council ward areas and 6 North Norfolk District Council ward areas (Astley, Lancaster North, Lancaster South, The Raynhams, Walsingham and Wensum) **less** the Aylsham ward of the Broadland District Council area;

plus the North Norfolk Briston ward and the Breckland Hermitage ward. This would give the proposed constituency an electorate of 71,085.

Mr Blatch said that officers had considered the proposals and did not believe that a strong case had been made on grounds of either strong socio-economic, demographic characteristics and communities of interest or the efficient administration of the election. He explained to Members that responses to this initial consultation must be submitted by 5th December and he sought Member's view as to whether the response should be made on behalf of Council as a corporate body.

The Chairman invited Members to comment:

1. Mrs J English said that Briston did not want to be included in the Broadland Parliamentary constituency and that they would submit an objection. Mr E Seward commented that Fakenham was already included in the Broadland Parliamentary constituency. Mr S Blatch said that the changes were not exclusive to Aylsham and that there was scope for confusion which was compounded in the election of May 2015 when different postal voting packs were required and costs were incurred by the moving of ballot boxes to counts outside the District. He added that there was no requirement for the Council to respond to the consultation.
2. Mrs A Claussen-Reynolds said that she felt it worked very well in Fakenham and had no concerns about being in the Broadland constituency.
3. Mr E Seward said that he felt that North Walsham and Aylsham linked well together, however, if the intention was to keep in line with local authority boundaries then Briston and Astley wards should remain in the North Norfolk constituency. He added that Fakenham should be kept with the surrounding villages or it would not fit with the principles of geographical location.
4. Mr T FitzPatrick commented on the proposal to bring Walsingham back into the North Norfolk constituency. He said that there should be continuity for the villages and that it was easier for the towns. He concluded by saying that the matter of electoral equality was a continual issue for debate and that once way forward would be to change the names of the constituencies to tie-up with the wards.
5. Mrs S Arnold queried the impact of removing Briston from the proposal to include it in the Broadland constituency. Mr S Blatch replied that any change would have a consequential 'knock on' effect on neighbouring wards.

34. OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REVIEW 2015/16

Mr P W Moore, Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, introduced this item and outlined the key points in the report. He said that the committee worked well together and worked towards achieving the right decision. He thanked the previous Vice-Chairman, Mr N. Smith for his support and Democratic Services. He concluded by saying that the committee had had a favourable reaction from the public and he hoped this would continue.

The Vice-chairman of the committee, Mr G Williams, highlighted the key challenges for 2016/17. He said that the committee needed to focus on important issues where they could have an impact and that pre-scrutiny was an effective way to achieve this. He added that the Committee was beginning to look at ways to address the heavy workload.

RESOLVED

To receive the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Annual Review 2015 – 2016

35. FUTURE MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE AUTHORITY

Mr T FitzPatrick introduced this item. He began by outlining the series of events that had led to the departure of three senior officers from the authority. He said that it was a consequence of the interim shared services arrangements. Cabinet had taken the view that the business case was not robust enough and withdrawn from entering into a permanent arrangement. He said their departure was an opportunity for the Council to move forward and try a new approach. The Council was well run and this had been indicated by the recent award of an Investors in People gold standard. There were two options moving forward – to continue with the interim senior management structure or to opt for a full restructure and advertise for a replacement chief executive. Mr FitzPatrick said that he felt continuity was important. Building on the strengths of existing officers showed faith and avoided an extended period of uncertainty for staff and key partners.

Mr FitzPatrick went onto say that the Council would save in excess of £240k a year but that this was not about savings but about better working and support for staff. It would also provide increased resilience going forward. He added that the current Corporate Directors were already well known to the local community and the proposed structure would provide better links across service areas as well as supporting the key priorities of the Corporate Plan by realigning the responsibilities of the Heads of Service.

The Chairman invited Members to comment:

1. Mr N Lloyd acknowledged that the Corporate Directors were both highly regarded officers. He wondered what the authority would do differently moving forward to prevent them leaving too.
2. Mrs S Butikofer said that she wished to make it clear that her concerns related to procedural issues and were not a reflection on the Corporate Directors. She said that the report should be about designing a good organisation and making sure the right people are in the right jobs. She said that NNDC was not a poor Council and cutting costs could sometimes result in a product that does not always represent the best value for money. She then referred to the Cabinet meeting on 5th September 2016 where work capacity issues were given as the reason for bringing the interim arrangements to an end. She queried how two of these posts could now be removed significantly diluting the strength of leadership of the Council. Mrs Butikofer went onto say that removing the key post of Chief Executive undermined the work previously undertaken to make NNDC a high performing Council and added that usually when people were appointed to a job-share role there was a decline in performance – a phenomenon referred to as ‘Noah’s Ark Syndrome’. Mrs S Butikofer concluded by referring to the minutes of the Council meeting held on 21 September 2016 and section 1.1 of the report which covered the interim arrangements for covering the statutory positions. She said that Council had resolved that the Leader, in consultation with Cabinet and the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the authority to appoint on an interim basis to the statutory posts and she therefore queried why the permanent appointments were being made so quickly and why the Employment Committee was not established to consider them.
3. Mr V FitzPatrick said that he supported the proposed management structure as it was flexible and effective.
4. Ms V Gay said that she had thought very carefully about the proposals but had several reservations. Referring to section 2.1 of the report which mentioned a ‘unique opportunity to review and restructure the Council’s management arrangements’, Ms Gay said that it was not an innovative approach but simply a job share and the only reason given for restructure was saving money. Ms Gay went onto say that there was no explanation within the report on how the two corporate directors would share the Head of Service role. The authority was Member-led but the position of Chief Executive had a national presence and it was not clear which director would attend high profile meetings and events. Ms Gay said that authorities such as Gloucester, Essex and Wiltshire had appointed shared Heads of Paid service but these were all on an interim basis. She felt that the Council deserved a better case than the one put forward. It was 12 years since

anyone from outside the organisation was appointed to the top position and it would be better to stick to the formal process.

5. Mr R Price said that he had worked with both corporate directors for 12 years. He said they were very experienced and knew what worked well. Mr Price felt that there was a new mood of optimism across the Council and that it would be demoralising for staff to assume that it would be better to appoint someone new. Promotion from within inspired others and this was the best way forward.
6. Mr D Young commented that the interim arrangements were still in the early stages and it was premature to make permanent appointments so soon. He said he had great confidence in the officers concerned but that he did have reservations about how the role would be split. He queried the rush to make the appointments permanent and said that it would be better to continue with the interim arrangements for now.
7. Ms M Prior said that three senior officers had chosen to go to new jobs and that was their choice. While they were working away on an interim basis the Council had had the benefit of watching the Corporate Directors step up and cover the work. She said that they knew their roles well and there was no need to include the detail of their jobs in the report. Ms Prior added that she felt all of the points raised should have been brought up before. She disagreed that the proposals were premature – they offered stability and built on the current feeling of optimism across the organisation.
8. Mrs B McGoun queried where the transparency was in the report as there was very little detail.
9. Mr G Williams said that he understood the concerns raised. He said that if it was simply about saving money then he would support them but it was not about that. Shared management arrangements were common in the private sector. The skills and knowledge were already in place. It was not simply about the top jobs at the Council but about empowering staff. He concluded by saying it was a bold step but the Council needed to be innovative.

The Monitoring Officer advised Members that there were two functions under the Representation of the People Act and at Parliamentary level appointment to the post of Electoral Registration Officer was required. Recommendation 3 should therefore be amended to include the post of 'Electoral Registration Officer'

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED

To agree to the revised management structure as detailed in Section 2 of the report, which includes:-

- a) Retaining the Head of Paid Service at Corporate Director level as a jointly held role.
- b) To appoint Duncan Ellis to the post of Section 151 Officer.
- c) To appoint Steve Blatch to the post of Returning Officer and Electoral Registration Officer

One Member abstained.

36. REVISED PAY POLICY STATEMENT

The Corporate Directors, Monitoring Officer and s151 Officer left the meeting for this item.

Mr T FitzPatrick introduced this item. He said that he was pleased that the recommendations from the previous item had been carried. He said that he had sent the report through to the Leader of the Opposition at the same time as he had shared it with his Group.

Mr FitzPatrick explained that Section 38 of the Localism Act 2011 required the Council to produce an annual pay policy statement for the start of each financial year. Due to the

appointments of the Corporate Directors to Head of Paid Service and the appointments to the post of Monitoring Officer and Section 151 Officer, there was a requirement for the pay policy to be amended to reflect the supplements applicable to these statutory posts.

Mrs J Oliver supported the proposals, saying that the supplements reflected the hard work of the officers involved.

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED

To adopt the attached amended Pay Policy Statement and to publish the statement for 2016/17 on the Council's website.

37. TO RECEIVE THE APPROVED MINUTES OF THE UNDERMENTIONED COMMITTEES

The minutes of the meetings below were noted as a correct record;

- a) Cabinet – 05 September 2016
- b) Cabinet – 03 October 2016
- c) Development Committee – 25 August 2016
- d) Development Committee – 22 September 2016
- e) Licensing & Appeals Committee – 12 September 2016
- f) Overview & Scrutiny Committee – 13 July 2016
- g) Overview & Scrutiny Committee – 14 September 2016

38. REPORTS FROM THE CABINET OR MEMBERS OF THE CABINET

None

39. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

Mr D Young had submitted the following question:

'In the final outturn for 2015/16 and in the current projections for 2016/17 can you advise the total of savings against original budget due to

- a) Unfilled staff vacancies, and
- b) Posts removed or amalgamated following the post-holder leaving?'

The following written response had been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting:

'2015/16 – total saving, all from staff turnover and vacancies, equals £399k. However this was offset in part by additional overtime (£96k) and salary supplements/honorarium payments (£43k) resulting in a net figure of £260k, which represents 2.9% based on an annual pay bill of c£9m.

2016/17 - total saving, again all from staff turnover and vacancies, equals £286k to date, the full year effect of this is however anticipated to be in the region of £153k at the year end. Based on the annual pay bill of around c£9m this equates to 1.7%.

There is a separate report on the agenda which covers the recent senior management changes and these are not reflected within the figure above.'

The Chairman invited Mr Young to respond.

Mr Young commented on the significant saving due to the failure to recruit to vacancies. He said that the Council had actually saved £260k after overtime and this year the saving was £286k to date. He queried why the anticipated saving was £153k by year end and how the figure was substantially reduced in the second half of the year and whether it was due to the overtime bill?

The Head of Finance replied that when budget monitoring reports were compiled the full year effect was looked at. It was currently forecast that it would reduce with overtime payments and supplements. He added that fees such as payments to consultants could also offset budgets.

Mrs S Arnold commented that the Council was continuing to try and recruit to posts but this was not always possible.

40. OPPOSITION BUSINESS

None

41. NOTICE(S) OF MOTION

Mrs S Butikofer had submitted the following Motion: 'This Council no longer has confidence in the Leader of North Norfolk District Council'

Before beginning, Mrs Butikofer said that Mr FitzPatrick had offered to talk to her about the proposed organisational structure but she was unable to do so due to personal issues.

Mrs Butikofer started by saying that she had not taken the decision lightly to put forward the motion, or without regard for the Council itself and its dedicated officers and members. She said that this was about the way the Council did things rather than what they did. Mrs Butikofer then referred to the meeting of 21st September when, during the debate on shared services, she had raised concerns about the way the Council was being led. During that meeting she had also spoken about wanting to work with colleagues and the Administration to enable the Council to provide the best possible service and results for the people of North Norfolk. She said that it said a lot about the strength of feeling amongst officers at the top of the organisation and the way the Council conducted its business that the Council was faced with the situation of losing three very experienced officers in one afternoon.

Mrs Butikofer then said that there was a lot of evidence to show that the most effective Councils were those where the skills and capabilities of the Members are combined with the expertise of the officers to work in a more inclusive way. This was also demonstrated by the visit to Redditch Borough Council which showed the results that could be achieved through the sharing of knowledge and the benefits of cooperation and mutual respect across the political divide.

Mrs Butikofer went on to say that parish councils, community groups and other district councillors had all raised concerns about the autocratic style of the Leader. She had also received several letters in support of the motion. She said that the earlier decision regarding the removal of the post of Chief Executive should have come to Council first for debate before any appointments were made. It could be argued that the circulation and announcement of the proposed appointments and organisation structure chart before it had been agreed by Full Council reinforced the perception that decisions were taken without including the wider membership of the Council. She concluded by saying that the time for change had come and that the Council should move towards a better, more inclusive way of working. Residents needed a council they could respect and trust.

The Chairman invited Members to comment:

1. Mrs B McGoun said that in the twelve years since she had been a Member that she had never felt so out of step with the Leader. She said the good running of the Council was more important than one person and it was time for him to show courage and integrity and step down.
2. Mr B Hannah said that he had been a Member for 19 years. There was no doubt that the Council had recently gone through a very difficult and challenging time and this had resulted in the Opposition Group being side-lined and three senior officers resigning. He said that something had clearly gone wrong to allow this to happen and that the public were also perplexed. Ultimately the Leader had to take responsibility for what had happened and if he had any honesty and integrity he would stand down.
3. Mrs S Arnold said that it was shameful motion. Mr FitzPatrick had worked tirelessly for the Council and few people fully appreciated the amount of work he undertook. She outlined some of his key achievements which included excellent financial management, coastal management, promotion of tourism, support for businesses, increased numbers of affordable homes, a reduction in empty properties and the success of the Big Society Fund.
4. Ms M Prior said that the 3 senior officers concerned had chosen to leave of their own accord. She strongly objected to blanket statements and generalisations. She said that the motion had created huge upset and was very unpleasant. Ms Prior concluded by saying that Mr FitzPatrick was a strong Leader who had led the Council through a difficult time.
5. Mrs V FitzPatrick said that he had only been a councillor for 18 months but it should be remembered that the electorate had returned a Conservative Administration only 15 months previously and Mr T FitzPatrick had already been Leader for 3 years at that point. He went onto say that information was shared across the Council and Members could not complain that they were not receiving anything.
6. Mr W Northam said that according to a MORI poll North Norfolk residents were the happiest in the region and that this did not reflect the situation that was currently being discussed.

Mr B Hannah requested a recorded vote. 13 Members voted in favour of the motion, 26 Members voted against. The Motion was therefore defeated.

42. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED

That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item(s) of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph(s) 1,3 & 6 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A (as amended) to the Act

43. PRIVATE BUSINESS

Mrs J Oliver outlined the recommendations to Members. Local Members, Mr D Smith and Mr B Hannah said that they were fully supportive of the proposals.

The Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee said that the recommendations had been supported at the meeting held on 9th November.

It was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED

To support the recommendations as outlined in the report.

The meeting concluded at 7.42 pm.

Chairman