

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK

CORPORATE PERFORMANCE PANEL

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Corporate Performance Panel held on
Wednesday, 4th January, 2023 at 4.30 pm in the Council Chamber, Town
Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ**

PRESENT: Councillor J Moriarty (Chair)
Councillors B Ayres, C Hudson, C Manning, C Morley, S Nash,
Mrs E Nockolds (substitute for Councillor J Kirk), C Rose,
Mrs V Spikings and D Tyler

Portfolio Holders:

Councillor S Dark	-	Leader
Councillors Mrs A Dickinson	-	Finance
Councillor H Humphrey (Zoom)	-	Corporate Services
Councillor P Kunes	-	Environment
Councillor G Middleton	-	Deputy Leader

Under Standing Order 34:

Councillor B Jones
Councillor C Joyce
Councillor M de Whalley

Observing:

Councillor R Blunt (Zoom)

Officers:

James Arrandale (Zoom)	-	Principal Lawyer
Alexa Baker	-	Monitoring Officer
Tim Baldwin	-	Communications Officer
Becky Box	-	Assistant Director, Central Services/ Management Team Representative
Barry Brandford (Zoom)	-	Waste and Recycling Manager
Lorraine Gore	-	Chief Executive
Ged Greaves	-	Corporate Performance Manager
Geoff Hall	-	Executive Director
Jamie Hay	-	Senior Internal Auditor
Matthew Henry	-	Assistant Director
Jo Hillard	-	CIC Manager
Andrew Howell	-	ICT Web Manager
Honor Howell	-	Assistant to the Chief Executive
Jo Stanton	-	Revenues and Benefits Manager
Wendy Vincent	-	Democratic Services Officer

CP75 **APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIR FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MUNICIPAL YEAR 2022/2023**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

RESOLVED: Councillor C Manning be appointed Vice Chair for the remainder of the Municipal Year.

CP76 **APOLOGIES**

Apologies for absence was received from Councillors J Kirk, J Lowe and Portfolio Holders Councillors A Lawrence and S Sandell.

CP77 **MINUTES**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The minutes of the meeting held on 31 October 2022 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

CP78 **MATTERS ARISING**

There were no matters arising.

CP79 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

CP80 **URGENT BUSINESS UNDER STANDING ORDER 7**

There was no urgent business.

CP81 **MEMBERS PRESENT PURSUANT TO STANDING ORDER 34**

Councillors B Jones and C Joyce were present under Standing Order 34.

CP82 **CHAIR'S CORRESPONDENCE**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The Chair referred to an article in the local newspaper (<https://www.lynnnews.co.uk/news/1-7m-contract-to-transform-guildhall-up-for-grabs-9291907/>) regarding a 1.7m contract up for grabs as part of the Council's plan to transform the Guildhall and asked for further information.

In response, the Deputy Leader made a statement set out below:

“The Procurement Team issued a Prior Information Notice (PIN) of the council’s intention to issue a tender on our procurement portal for the design works relating to the St George’s Guildhall site. This is the first stage of delivery of the business plan already approved by Cabinet and is within the operational delivery of procurement under the Scheme of Delegation – i.e. there is no need for there to be separate or additional authority from Cabinet to procure this contract. Part of what the engaged architect will be required to do is provide designs that will enable a consideration of what can be de-scoped from the project if the current funding gap is ultimately not filled. The estimated contract value issued in the PIN notice is an absolute maximum of the potential contract value over the life of the whole project.”

Councillor Mrs Nockolds, Chair of the Task Group and a member of the Advisory Group explained that the recent press release had not been mentioned at the above meetings and was therefore surprised to read it in the local press. In response, the Deputy Leader explained outlined the reasons why the press release had been issued and explained that it was within the Council’s Scheme of Delegation, a Cabinet decision had already been approved to progress with the operational side of the project. He explained that the press had not engaged with the Communications team prior to writing the item, so it was not presented as he may have wished.

The Leader provided clarification that this wasn’t a press release issued by this Council. He explained that, as Councillors were aware, as a result of commitment from the Government that the funding for the business cases for these projects was available meant that the projects needed to progress to the next stage within a short timescale, which is why the PIN had gone out.

Councillor Morley commented that he supported the comments made by Councillor Nockolds and added that it was common courtesy to inform the working group and all Councillors prior to the News Release – Provision of Notice was published.

The Chair commented that the Project Manager could consider providing an explanatory note to the next meeting of the Task Group and would therefore leave the decision up to the Chair of the Task Group.

CP83 **ANNUAL COMMUNICATIONS UPDATE**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The Panel received a PowerPoint presentation (copy attached to the agenda).

Councillor Nockolds asked questions on the Customer Information Centre (CIC) targets. In response, the CIC Manager explained that the telephone target was 75% but currently stood at 69.4% which was pleasing as there was a 54% increase in telephone calls between May and August 2022.

In response to a question from the Chair on the development of the new Intranet project, the ICT Web Manager explained that the current system Insite was coming to the end of its life and with the change in working practices and staff working from home, the content of the Intranet was being reviewed and also presented the opportunity to make improvements and introduce new features..

The Chair referred to the difficulties experienced with recruitment and asked if the Council had considered apprenticeships. In response, the ICT Web Manager explained that apprenticeships had been looked at and added that the Council had “grown their own” team but a number of staff had been promoted or left the authority to further their career.

Councillor Morley commented that a new Intranet would improve efficiency and expressed concern that the Council’s wish list should fit the key objectives of the Corporate Business Plan/improving customer relationships. In response, the ICT Manager explained that a collaborative approach was used involving other service areas to ensure the corporate objectives were met.

Councillor Morley referred to page 52 of the Agenda – Key Performance Indicators 1.3 % of calls answered within 90 seconds and commented that 75% seemed to be a low target and commented that a better picture was required between analogue and digital. In response, the CIC Manager invited Councillor Morley to discuss the issues raised outside the Panel meeting.

In response to questions from Councillor Jones regarding SharePoint on line and backing up of systems to a data centre, the ICT Manager explained that an evaluation and design would be considered during the process and the business continuity arrangements would be submitted to the Business Continuity Group.

The Chair thanked officers for the presentation and congratulated the teams for the annual report and invited the Panel to consider if they wished to continue to receive an annual update following the May elections.

RESOLVED: 1) The Panel noted the content of the presentation.

2) Following the May 2023 Election the Panel to determine if an annual update report was required.

CP84 Q2 2022/23 PERFORMANCE INDICATOR MONITORING REPORT

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The Assistant to the Chief Executive reminded the Panel that the monitoring report was in place to monitor progress against agreed performance indicators for the year 2022/23. It was noted that the report contained information on the corporate performance monitoring undertaken for Q2 2022/23.

The key issues were highlighted as set out in the report.

It was noted that 40 targets had been met, 9 indicators were near to target and 5 indicators required improvement.

The Panel's attention was drawn to the following indicators:

- % of rent arrears industrial units – Q1 amber, Q2 red, narrative to explain why.
- Spend on bed and breakfast accommodation had increased.

In response to questions from the Chair on the reasons for increased spend on bed and breakfast accommodation and the number of voids, Freebridge Community Housing (FCH). The Chair asked if FCH made a financial contribution. In response, the Chief Executive explained that the Council held regular discussions with FCH on the challenges being faced with regard to void properties. It was noted that an all Councillor briefing had been recently held and that there was no financial contribution from FCH.

Councillor Morley made a general comment that the next Administration would need to identify specific outcomes of the Corporate Business Plan and to monitor risks of delivery, etc. He added that the Corporate Business Plan and priorities needed to line up with the key performance indications better.

In response to a question from the Chair on indicator 5.2 no of fly tipping incidents reported, the Assistant to the Chief Executive explained that this was a new indicator and there was currently no data available.

The Chair thanked the Assistant to the Chief Executive for presenting the report.

RESOLVED: The Panel reviewed the performance monitoring report.

CP85 COUNCIL TAX SUPPORT - FINAL SCHEME FOR 2023/2024

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

In presenting the report, the Revenues and Benefits Manager explained that the Council must implement a Council Tax Support (CTS) scheme for its working age residents for each financial year. The Panel was advised that the Council must first decide on a draft CTS scheme which was open for public consultation, and then must agree a final CTS scheme, considering the consultation responses.

The Revenues and Benefits Manager highlighted that the final CTS scheme for 2023/2024 was a continuation of the 2022/2023 CTS scheme, with two minor amendments to reflect welfare reform changes during 2022/2023.

The key issues were outlined as set out in the report.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Jones addressed the Panel and made the following statement:

“To me it appears strange that a delegated decision to consult on the Council Tax Support Scheme was taken in early Autumn, but a Motion to Council should be put on a long back burner.

This Motion to Council was referred to Cabinet on 1 September last year. What and why has it taken so long to come before this Panel. Would it be too cynical to suggest a delaying tactic has been deployed with an obvious intent.

It still has to go to Cabinet where the defence to reject it will likely be “other bodies will have set their budgets for the coming financial year”.

Taxpayers in West Norfolk pay more to the county council and police than any other district. It is most welcome that a new leader and portfolio holder for finance raised the level of Council Tax Support last year to 84% from its previous minimum allowed under the law. Yet In Norwich the City Council have a 100% Council Tax Support Scheme.

Is there any councillor representing anywhere in West Norfolk who believes Norwich does not receive the lion's share of resources from the county council and police? There is a widespread opinion that West Norfolk always seems to be left out when it comes to county council and police services. Yet local West Norfolk taxpayers contribute the most.

The report for some reason separates families from lone parents. This seems in today's modern age an antiquated view. But what the report does show is that around 45% of non-protected lone parents in receipt of Council Tax Support are employed. Still they are expected to pay. Most lone parents are women. Is this why they must pay?

Everyone is struggling this year with the cost of living spiralling out of control. Only this month energy bills have been increased even though the price of natural gas has fallen below the pre Russian invasion of

Ukraine level. Oil prices have also fallen substantially, but only moderately has petrol and diesel fallen at the pumps. Increases in food prices are both eye watering and frightening as many people miss meals.

Everyone can be assured that a Labour council would have a 100% Council Tax Support Scheme. But this is not about Labour versus Conservative. The cost of living crisis is a common foe. We should all stand together united. Because this is about doing right by the people we all claim to represent.

We should not be looking to add to problems local taxpayers face. The projected cost to this Council is £17,000. A not insignificant sum, but one I am confident can be found. This Council should be encouraged by this Panel voting to help local people by having a 100% Council Tax Support Scheme.”

The Chair invited the Revenues and Benefits Manager to answer the questions raised by Councillor Jones in relation to families and lone parents.

The Revenues and Benefits Manager explained that there was no intention to separate the categories of families and lone parents and added that she was happy to merge the two categories into one. The Panel was informed that both families and lone parents with a child under 5 were within the protected group and could receive up to 100% support.

Councillor Morley outlined the problems with the current process and commented that it would be beneficial to consult with the preceptors first before going out to consultation.

The Leader responded to the key points raised by Councillor Jones and reminded the Panel that in the previous year the Administration had raised the level of Council tax relief which was not because of a notice of motion. The Leader outlined the reasons why 100% council tax support had been applied.

The Chair commented the increase in the response rate to the consultation was 250%.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor Joyce addressed the Panel and commented that the Labour Administration would apply 100% relief and referred to the comments made by Councillor Jones. Councillor Joyce stated that the cost to the council of 100% relief would be £17,000 which was a small amount of its budget.

In response to comments made by Councillor Nockolds on potential difficulties in understanding the scheme in order to respond to the consultation exercise, the Revenues and Benefits Manager agreed that

this was a fair point and undertook to review the consultation questions for 2024.

Councillor Morley made the following comment – a protocol be included within the process to consult within the Borough before going out to preceptors. Councillor Morley wished it to be recorded that he did not support the recommendation set out below.

RESOLVED: The Panel noted the consultation responses as detailed in Appendix C and agreed the draft CTS scheme for 2023/2024 which went to public consultation was recommended to Cabinet and Council as the final CTS scheme for 2023/2024.

CP86 **JANUARY 2021 TO DECEMBER 2021 REPORT ON USE, OR NON-USE OF RIPA POWERS**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

In presenting the report, the Senior Internal Auditor explained that the Council was governed by the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act, Human Rights Act, Protection of Freedom Act, Data Protection Act/GDPR, and Investigatory Powers Act in respect of surveillance and other relative activities.

The Panel was informed that the Council was inspected on these matters (usually every 3 years) by IPCO (the Investigatory Power Commissioner's Office). IPCO were required by law to gather statistical data from all public authorities on their use of Investigatory Powers available to them under the relevant legislation.

The Senior Internal Auditor explained that attached to the report was the annual statistics return reported to IPCO for the period 1 January 2021 to 31 December 2021.

The Leader advised that he had previous experience of RIPA and that this related to complicated legislation and added that he was pleased to report that the Borough Council had no RIPA investigations.

In response to a question from the Chair, the Senior Internal Auditor explained that it was a legal required under the Home Office Code of Practice to provide an annual report.

RESOLVED: The Panel noted the report.

CP87 **NORFOLK CLIMATE CHANGE PARTNERSHIP (VERBAL REPORT)**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The Chair read out the request from Councillor de Whalley for the Panel to consider as set out below:

“Failure of Norfolk Climate Change Partnership (NCCP) chaired by this Council, to meet any of its terms of reference over the first 28 months of its existence.”

The Panel received a verbal report from the Chief Executive and Corporate Performance Manager, a summary of which is set out below.

The Chief Executive of the Borough Council chaired the partnership.

Agendas, Minutes and information are published on the Norfolk Climate Change Partnership.

Click on the link below to the Norfolk Climate Change Partnership.

<https://www.norfolkclimatechange.co.uk/>

The partnership was established on 6 Jan 2020 and reports to Norfolk Public Sector Leaders Board.

Established shortly before Covid-19.

Made up of local authorities, Broads Authority, NALEP and Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework Member Forum.

Tyndall Centre and EELGA joined later.

Initially administration, coordination and chairing by BCKLWN.

Under our administration:

- Programme of meetings
- Initial TOR and Work plan
- Website created which has info about membership, work plan, projects and documents such as minutes, relevant publications
- Community Renewal Fund bid submitted and approved

Following departure of our Climate Change Officer, Breckland now provide admin/coordination and co-chaired with Steve Blatch, CEO of North Norfolk DC.

Portfolio Holder Group of councillors from each local authority formed on 16 June 2022.

Community Renewal Fund bid for £325k successful and had following elements:

- Study related to community energy in Norfolk – report published.
- High level feasibility study for hydrogen in transport – report published.
- Development of an action plan for NCCP – finalised in Jan 2023.

Action plan informed by countywide partnerships such as at Suffolk. Has a dedicated coordination resource, operational since 2007, embedded into strategic processes.

CRF projects

Community energy

Collective action to reduce, purchase, manage and generate energy. Could include:

- Community owned generation installations.
- Community switching to renewable sources e.g heat pump, biomass.
- Community group supporting energy saving measures
- Collective switching.
- Partnership working to pilot technologies.
- Collective purchasing.
- Behavioural changes.
- Car clubs, sharing, active travel.

For our borough, community energy kick-starter ideas:

- Public EV charging points at railway station – not our land but encouraged parish and town councils to consider applying for OZEV grants
- Targeted Solar Together – completed for 2022 auction, will review ongoing participation in light of sign-ups/work completed
- Applications for Govt grant funded activities to improve housing via Norfolk Warm Homes Partnership
- Fuel poverty advice – Beat the bills roadshows

Hydrogen

Developing technology for HGVs with potential for use in refuse freighters but not at that point in our contract period/revisit in EST fleet review in 2023. Some interest in hydrogen from major carbon emitters in our borough to be explored in 2023. Potential for reducing transport related emissions but significant capital costs.

Development of action plan

- Gain broader agreement of the NCCP's strategic priorities, get agreement on the way ahead in developing the action plan in 2023.
- Agree the next steps for the partnership.
- Reconfirm the aims and common goals of the NCCP, developing the collaborative working approach already in place between members and officers across the county.
- Agree the structure and approach for future decision-making for and management of the partnership.

- Introduce and embed understanding of the relevant, initial findings from the Pathfinder report from Net Zero East, including best practice, evidence-based approaches.

Future focus on energy?:

- Develop an energy plan to decarbonise energy supply for Norfolk and improve distribution of energy to citizens.
- Reduce and conserve energy demand on the system through retrofitting of buildings through behaviour change, enabling fabric first and heating.
- Enable “greener” transport solutions through statutory powers.

County Portfolio Group

A County Portfolio Group had been set up. Councillor P Kunes was the Borough Council’s representative. To date, a small number of meetings had been held and looked at a work programme to determine what could be done collectively at Portfolio Holder level.

At the invitation of the Chair, under Standing Order 34, Councillor de Whalley explained that he had prepared a statement setting out concerns but some of those concerns had been addressed in the update report.

Councillor de Whalley expressed thanks for starting to populate the NCCP website but added that improvements were required in terms of clarity and was very mindful of transparency in terms of dissemination of environmental information and that climate emergency was the most important.

Councillor de Whalley expressed a number of concerns, a summary of which is set out below:

- Meaningful public participation undertaken by the NCCP and Member Councils.
- Website yet to show an annual report which was part of the Terms of Reference and it was now almost 3 years that the NCCP was initiated.
- Need to look in terms of resilience.
- Accept that the Council had to look at adaptation measures, drought, flooding, coastal erosion.
- Levels of involvement of the wider community.
- How district leads would be implemented.
- Little involvement of Parish Councils as yet.
- Look at behavioural change programmes to involve the community as a whole towards addressing the emergency.
- Local authorities own contributions to climate change.
- District emissions.
- The Council’s scope for emissions.

- Changing outside activities.

In conclusion, Councillor de Whalley commented that he welcome the Tyndall Centre being included in NCCP and would be able give a significant contribution on wider issues.

The Chair invited officers to respond to the following points made by Councillor de Whalley:

- Annual Report.
- Public participation.
- Involvement of Parish Councils.

In response to the statement made by Councillor de Whalley the Chief Executive explained that the issue of the Annual Report would be followed up and explained the role of the NCCP but highlighted that each individual local authority had its own action plan. The NCCP was a website which was publicly accessible but took on board there was always more information to publish but the website included links to each local authority. The Action Plan would be the next stage and consideration be given on how the consultation would be undertaken. It was noted there were a number of other groups and it was important to ensure that duplication of work did not take place.

At the invitation of the Chair, Councillor Kunes the Borough Council's representative explained that the County Portfolio Group had begun to work together.

RESOLVED: That the Panel receive an annual update on progress.

CP88

REPORT OF THE INFORMAL WORKING GROUP - COUNCIL MEETING ARRANGEMENTS

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The Chief Executive presented the report which invited the Panel to consider the findings of the Council Meeting Arrangements – Informal Working Group.

The Panel's attention was drawn to the key issues set out in the report and Section 2 on page 81.

Councillor Mrs Spikings explained that she was not present at the second meeting of the Informal Working Group (IWG) but reiterated that 6 pm was considered too late to hold a Full Council meeting at 6 pm as it was too late to attend a 3 hour meeting plus travelling home.

The Chair and Councillor Morley drew the Panel's attention to page 89 5) That Full Council be held at 6 pm.

Councillor Spikings commented those present had agreed 6 pm and that she was not involved in the last discussion and added if she had been able to attend would have objected to a 6 pm start and explained that Councillors and workers had caring responsibilities for elderly relatives as well as children.

Councillor Hudson concurred with the comments made by Councillor Spikings and explained that the whole Labour group confirmed they wished to remain with a 4.30 pm start time. Councillor Hudson added that employers were obliged to grant time off to attend Council meetings and that a meeting finishing at 10 pm was not acceptable and some Councillors had to travel a long distance home.

The Chair added that he did not agree with the comments made by Councillor Hudson and drew the Panel's attention to page 81, 2.5 – The IWG considered the start time for full Council meetings. There was no agreement by the IWG on a recommended start time.

Councillor Mrs Spikings asked for clarification on the recommendation from the IWG on the proposed start time for Full Council meetings.

The Chief Executive provided clarification and outlined the discussions held at the two meetings of the IWG and advised that there was no agreement reached for either a 4.30 pm or 6 pm start time. In conclusion, the Chief Executive drew Members' attention to page 81, section 2 Findings of the IWG and invited the Panel to put forward a recommendation that could be include in the report to Cabinet.

The Chair proposed that the Panel recommend page 81 as outlined by the Chief Executive.

Councillor Mrs Spikings sought clarification and added she did not support the recommendation.

The Chief Executive explained that 6 pm was referred to in the minutes of the second meeting of the IWG when some members of the IWG were not present, page 81 of the report stated that the question to the Panel was there any recommendation they wished to put forward to Cabinet as the IWG minutes did not agree a start time for Panel or Full Council meetings.

Councillor Mrs Spikings and asked if she could propose 4.30 pm start time for Full Council. The Chair asked Councillor Mrs Spikings if she wished to press ahead with her amendment. Councillor Mrs Spikings confirmed that she did. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Mrs Nockolds.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that the Panel could determine to override the findings of the IWG.

Councillor Nash commented that the general public could not always attend a meeting before 6 pm and added that he supported a 6 pm start time and would vote against the amendment.

Councillor Mrs Nockolds stated that the statement made by Councillor Nash regarding attendance by members of the public was not substantiated and explained that other Councils held meetings at 10 am and members of the public attended.

Councillor Nash commented that the above point was taken.

Under Standing Order 34, Councillor de Whalley commented that his perception of public participation fell away as a consequence of the Pandemic and social changes as the population moved out of the Pandemic will see more in the way of public attendance at Council meetings and added that he had encountered difficulties with employers as they had not understood other government related activities. In conclusion, Councillor de Whalley stated that it was not just for this Administration but in May 2023 following the Elections there might be a different set out Councillors in post and it would therefore be wrong for the current Councillors to make it more difficult for candidates to stand as Councillors.

Councillor Hudson explained that if a member of the public was not able to attend a meeting in person then they could watch on You Tube at their own convenience and therefore did not require time off work to attend a meeting. Councillor Hudson added that any potential candidate standing for Election should take into account the roles and responsibilities as would be expected if applying for any job. Councillor Hudson stated that 4.30 pm had been an acceptable time for Panels to meet, if a Panel did not want to meet at 4.30 pm they could determine their own start time and the only meeting which had to be set in perpetuity was Full Council.

The Leader addressed the Panel and explained that Councillors over the period of 4 years had been faced with the Pandemic and could not hold face to face meetings but met via Zoom/Teams commencing at different times. The Leader advised that there were not many meetings left until the May 2023 election and that any recommendations put forward setting times would put a requirement on the class of 2023 when a number of Councillors were voluntarily retiring, not elected or in difference places and commented that if the Panel could not agree the recommendations from the IWG which seemed to be the case, should the Council continue operating under the current arrangements if there was no recommendation from the Panel the item possibly placed on the Cabinet Forward Decisions List/Panel Work Programme following the May 2023 Election.

The Chair referred to 2.5 – The IWG considered the start time for Full Council meetings. There was no agreement by the IWG on a recommended start time and asked the Panel if it wished to insert an

additional sentence along the lines of CPP would however like to recommend to Cabinet that Full Council meetings start at 4.30 pm.

The Panel voted on the amendment set out above proposed by Councillor Mrs Spikings, seconded by Councillor Mrs Nockolds. The vote was carried (7 votes for, 3 against).

RESOLVED: The Panel recommended to Cabinet that Full Council meetings commence at 4.30 pm.

CP89 **HUNSTANTON ADVISORY GROUP**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The Monitoring Officer explained that the HAG was governed by its Terms of Reference. A draft of the Terms of Reference (TOR) was produced by the external facilitator and was considered in detail by the HAG at its inaugural meeting on 26 May 2022. The Panel was advised that what appeared to be a final version of the TOR dated 26 May 2022 was subsequently produced. In preparing the Briefing Note, it had been discovered that the 'final version' of the Terms of Reference was never formally adopted after the meeting on 26 May 2022. Accordingly, the HAG had been recommended to review its TOR with a view to formally adopting them at a forthcoming HAG meeting.

Councillor Mrs Spikings commented that it was a well written report and went over and beyond what had been requested.

In response to a question from the Chair on the balance of funding from the Coastal Communities Fund, the Monitoring Officer explained that this was central Government funding and had no information on when the Fund was closed but highlighted that nothing local had been awarded recently.

The Deputy Leader provided background information on the CCT and following no further funding consideration was given to how the community could be involved in the Hunstanton Investment Plan. The Deputy Leader went on to explain the role and benefits of the HAG.

The Chair commented that he was struggling to reconcile the dates when this idea came about because it was not shared with other political groups - Christmas 2021/2022, Levelling up Paper in February 2022, the Chief Executive made an operational decision and Press Releases prepared in 2021 released in early 2022. In response the Deputy Leader explained during Covid the CCT had not met and the Deputy Leader was receiving questions/telephone calls September/October and engaged in a discussion with the Chief Executive Christmas 2021 to re-commence the meetings of the CCT and was there available officer resource to service the CCT. There as then the idea to re-launch the CCT, a press release was released in

January 2022 and one of the comments was from the Mayor of Hunstanton who welcomed the idea and previously had played an important role and over the course of February 2022 when the Levelling up Funding was announced the next Press Release in March 2022 set out the details of the meeting to be held, the CCT was invited to attend and inviting volunteers.

The Chief Executive explained that the Press Release issued in January 2022 was issued following discussions regarding the Levelling up Fund when no announcement had been made but the Council had received indications that any funding coming forward required consultation and consideration was given as to how this could be achieved. The Panel was informed that towards the end of January 2022, the Chief Executive explained that contact was made with the LGA Talent Bank to source a facilitator and in February the Council engaged with that process.

The Chair advised that he submit questions in writing regarding the timing of the issuing of the Press Releases.

The Chair referred to one of the key drivers being consultation responses received within timescales to ensure funding was not lost and asked if there were any examples.

In response, the Leader provided context and commented that a number of Councils across Norfolk including Great Yarmouth had seen that the Government had a competitive process and on a short timeframe to submit a bid. The Leader explained that part of the criteria of the Towns Board was around levels of consultation,, etc and commented that if a Council was lucky enough to be in that environment there had to be mechanism in place to undertake such consultation within communities. Examples were given of the Levelling up Fund – Oasis and the views from Hunstanton Town Council and HAG were used as evidence.

The Monitoring Officer clarified that the Levelling up Fund White Paper lists multiple pots of available funding constantly for stakeholder involvement and obtain local views.

The Chair expressed concerned regarding the Town Deal Board and there being no access to it for other Councillors apart from the Administration and added he had been informed that HAG was not like the Town Deal Board but the Council's Press Releases referred to it as a Town Deal Board.

The Leader advised that in preparation for the Panel meeting he had viewed the Press Releases and explained that the Press Release of 28 January 2022 referred to lessons learnt by the Town Deal Board and it dangerous to say that HAG was a replication of the Town Deal Board because it was an advisory group and two Borough Councillors were members of the group, one being an Independent as well as the Mayor

of Hunstanton and an Hunstanton Town Councillor. The Panel was reminded that the Town Deal Board was set up to get £25m into the Borough which would not have happened if it was not in place and reiterated that HAG was an advisory board. However, the Leader explained that there were some lessons learnt around what sectors were used, consultation, etc and was therefore not a Towns Board for Hunstanton and that the press release did not state it was a Towns Board.

The Chair commented that he revisited the Press Release and commented that one of the lessons the Council did not appear to learn was around secrecy and transparency and understood that the Leader and Deputy Leader had attended a meeting and decided that the minutes would not be made public and asked if this was correct. In response, the Deputy Leader explained that the Terms of Reference were still in process. The Deputy Leader commented that at the next HAG meeting the Terms of Reference would be placed on the agenda to discuss how to ensure openness and transparency.

The Leader explained that the membership of the HAG comprised of local volunteers from Hunstanton and that the Mayor of Hunstanton had welcomed the setting up of the group. The Panel was informed that an session had been held with an external facilitator to help share the future of Hunstanton. In conclusion, the Leader explained that in his view it provided a mechanism to consult with the community.

The Chair commented that he was disappointed in the way the HAG went ahead but welcomed the community involvement.

The Chair thanked officers for the update report.

RESOLVED: That the Briefing Note was noted by the Panel.

CP90

REVIEW OF THE UNREASONABLE COMPLAINANTS POLICY

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The Monitoring Officer explained that the purpose of the report was to report back on the work of the Informal Working Group (IWG) established to consider the Unreasonably Complainants Policy (UPC) so that the Panel may consider whether to recommend some or all of the proposed changes to Cabinet.

The Panel was advised that the majority of the proposed changes were agreed in meetings held by the IWG in 2021 and approved by CPP on 1 February 2022. Following the Cabinet meeting of 15 March 2022 at which the proposed changes to the UPC were considered, the matter was returned to the CPP/IWG to consider comments by the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman.

The Monitoring Officer advised that the sections of the tracked changes UPC was attached at Appendix 1 (shown in yellow highlighting) had been added to reflect the IWG's consideration of the Ombudsman's comments.

The Panel's attention was drawn to the key issues set out in the report.

RESOLVED: The Panel considered the changes set out at Appendices 1 and 3 and resolved to recommend all of the proposed changes onwards to Cabinet.

CP91 **KLIC REPAYMENT PLAN**

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

This item was taken after Item 13 – Climate Change.

The Assistant Director, Property and Projects presented the report and drew the Panel's attention to the key issues.

The Chair thanked the Assistant Director for the update.

Councillor Dickinson raised a point of order. The report indicated the portfolio holder was property but should have been portfolio holder for finance.

Councillor Morley commented that the Panel would benefit from receiving a summary of the current position of the building/revenue/tenants etc.

In response to questions and comments from Councillor Nockolds, the Deputy Leader advised he would be more than happy to provide a summary of the current building position in relation to revenue, tenants, etc which would bring a return to the Council.

RESOLVED: 1) The Panel noted the report.

2) The Assistant Director to present a summary of the building position/revenue to the Corporate Performance Panel on 5 April 2023.

The Panel adjourned at 6.05 pm and reconvened at 6.10 pm.

CP92 **PORTFOLIO HOLDERS QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION**

[Click her to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

There were none.

CP93 CABINET FORWARD DECISIONS LIST

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The Panel noted the Cabinet Forward Decisions List.

The Chair invited the Panel to email any items for consideration on the work programme.

CP94 PANEL WORK PROGRAMME

[Click here to view a recording of this item on You Tube](#)

5 April 2023

The following item to be included:

- KLIC – summary of the current position of the building/revenue etc – M Henry.

The Chair invited the Panel to email any items for consideration on the work programme.

CP95 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting would be held on 27 February 2023 at 4.30 pm in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn.

CP96 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

RESOLVED: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

CP97 EXEMPT REPORT: CALL-IN: WASTE CONTRACT RE-INVESTING PERFORMANCE DEDUCTIONS

The Chair outlined the reasons why the Cabinet decision had been called in.

The Panel debated the call-in.

RESOLVED: The Panel did not uphold the call-in.

CP98 **EXEMPT REPORT: REVIEW OF THE NEW WASTE COLLECTION CONTRACT**

The Waste and Recycling Manager presented the report and responded to questions and comments from the Panel.

RESOLVED: The Panel noted the content of the report.

The meeting closed at 7.27 pm