



7.30pm – 9.30pm

19 June 2012

Present: Councillors Gayton (Lord Mayor), Ackroyd, Arthur, Barker, Blunt, Bradford, Bremner, Brumblecombe, Brociek-Coulton, Carlo, Driver, Galvin, Gee, Gihawi, Grahame, Grenville, Harris, Henderson, Howard, Kendrick, Lay, Little, Lubbock, MacDonald, Manning, Neale, Price, Rogers, Sands(M), Sands(S), Stammers, Stephenson, Stonard, Storie, Thomas, Waters, Wright

Apologies: John Jennings (Sheriff) and Councillors Button and Haynes

1. LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Lord Mayor said that since the last meeting he had taken part in jubilee celebrations at the Holy Trinity pre-school playgroup and the Angel Road Infant School. Together with the Leader and other members of the council and officers he had attended the Royal Garden Party at Sandringham. He had visited Chapel Break Infant School for a private view of the children's art which was an impressive exhibition and a wonderful example of inspired teaching. He had also attended a performance by the Royal Marines, Portsmouth at the Theatre Royal for a charity concert in aid of the local royal Naval Association. The previous Sunday had been the annual civic service at Norwich Cathedral and he expressed his gratitude to the Dean and to those members of the council who were present.

As this was the first ordinary meeting of the council in the civic year he welcomed the 13 new members of the council and hoped they would enjoy their tour of office and make a full contribution to the work of the council. He reminded all members that if they wished to speak on any item they should indicate by raising their hand and to be respectful in addressing each other by their title of office ie councillor and to address him as Lord Mayor.

At the invitation of the Lord Mayor, Councillor Alan Waters informed members that this would be the last meeting attended by Barry Marshall, the outgoing head of finance, who was leaving the council. He commented on the important Contribution Barry Marshall had made to ensuring that the council's finances were in a healthy position and members showed their appreciation in the usual way.

At the invitation of the Lord Mayor, Councillor Brenda Arthur, leader of the council, outlined her vision and priorities for the city in the coming months. This is attached at Appendix A.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

The Lord Mayor said that a public question had been received in advance of the meeting.

Mr Agombar to Councillor Arthur, Leader of the Council:

I have been operating the sightseeing tour of olde Norwich for seven years. Visitors from all over the world have enjoyed the unique service I provide from my unique vehicle.

I have asked for help from the council to support my business, particularly from highways and the Tourist Information Centre, but this has not been received. I am also unhappy that emphasis is being placed on promoting Norwich as a shopping centre rather than a heritage city. I believe that council responsibility for tourism should be moved from being a small part of culture & communications to economic development as tourism is the biggest money earner in this county, not in £millions but £billions.

Could the Leader of the Council ensure that the council does everything it can to support the unique service I operate in future?

Councillor Arthur, Leader of the Council replied:-

Thank you for your question.

I understand that since you started your business you have been in regular contact with the council. In particular, officers in our highways and tourism teams have spent a great deal of time trying to help you find solutions to a number of your issues. They have provided you with extensive help and advice to assist you to run your tours in a legal and safe manner. I also believe that other agencies in the city have given you support

Norwich City Council recognises the importance of tourism to Norwich and helps promote the city as a visitor destination. This city has much to offer, including heritage, culture and shopping. Norwich is marketed as a tourist destination by Visit Norwich, and its work is fully supported by the city council. In 2011, Norwich had 17.7 million day visits, generating £572 million, ahead of York which had 13 million day visits generating £385 million (GB Day Visitor survey 2011). Making us the 6th most visited city in the England. Only last month, Visit England declared Norwich TIC in the top five in the country for visitor experience with helpful staff, attractive souvenirs and an inviting atmosphere .

I have both responsibility for culture and economic development in my portfolio and the officer's work together regardless of where something sits.

We see a healthy tourism offer as vital to the success of the city and will continue to work in collaboration to do everything we can to promote Norwich.

However, in terms of your own business I believe we have done everything we can to help you.

Mr Agombar asked, as a supplementary question, if the council was not willing to include tourism within economic development, would the Leader of the Council consider giving responsibility to Norwich HEART ? Councillor Arthur said that, as detailed in her reply above, she had responsibility for both and the officers working in all areas worked closely together. The council had a much broader remit and greater range of responsibility than HEART, to which the council was a major funder. The council worked collaboratively with all partners, including HEART, and would continue to do so.

4. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

5. MINUTES

RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 20 March 2012 and the annual general meeting on 22 May 2012.

6. QUESTIONS TO CABINET MEMBERS AND COMMITTEE CHAIRS

The Lord Mayor advised that 8 questions had been received from members of the council to cabinet members and committee chairs, of which notice had been given in accordance with the provisions of appendix 1 of the council's constitution. The questions were as follows:-

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| Question 1 | Councillor Little to the cabinet member for environment and neighbourhoods on the management of verges and grassed areas. |
| Question 2 | Councillor Galvin to the cabinet member for housing on the public consultation on the development of garage sites and car parks. |
| Question 3 | Councillor Price to the cabinet member for environment and development on the community infrastructure levy. |
| Question 4 | Councillor Neale to the cabinet member for housing on land at the corner of Onley Street and Leicester Street. |
| Question 5 | Councillor Lubbock to the cabinet member for environment and development on the implementation of 20mph speed limits. |
| Question 6 | Councillor Ackroyd to the cabinet member for environment and neighbourhoods on flyposting. |
| Question 7 | Councillor Wright to the cabinet member for customer services on using the Post Office network to support delivery of council services. |
| Question 8 | Councillor Stammers to the cabinet member for environment and neighbourhoods on Norfolk's waste strategy. |

(Details of the questions and replies together with any supplementary questions and replies are attached at Appendix B to these minutes).

7. APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES TO OUTSIDE BODIES

Councillor Waters said that since the list of nominations to outside bodies had been published, Vic Howe had sadly passed away. She said that Vic Howe had been a gentle and courteous man and a strong lobbyist and advocate for the improvement of the Norwich War Memorial and he would be missed.

Councillor Arthur moved and Councillor Waters seconded the recommendations in the annexed report.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to –

- (1) make the appointments to outside bodies for 2012/13 as set out in the appendix to the report;
- (2) grant devolved authority to the head of law and governance, in consultation with the leaders of the political groups, to agree nominations to any outstanding vacancies, including the Norwich War Memorial's Trust, together with any vacancies arising during the year.

8. MEMBERS CODE OF CONDUCT AND STANDARDS FRAMEWORK ARRANGEMENTS

Councillor Driver moved and Councillor Waters seconded the recommendations in the annexed report.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to adopt, as of 1 July 2012, the standards framework arrangements set out in the annexed report, including the:-

- (1) code of conduct, together with the guidance for members, set out as appendix 1 of the report;
- (2) establishment of arrangements for dealing with standards allegations and the establishment of a standards committee all as set out in appendix 2;
- (3) appointment of an independent person and reserve independent persons in accordance with paragraph 18-23 of the report;
- (4) establishment of a register of interests to be kept and maintained by the monitoring officer and to contain those matters set out in appendix 3 until such time as the Secretary of State publishes regulations relating to 'disclosable pecuniary interests' when the council may be asked to consider new proposals and changes to standing orders in relation to the registration and declaration of interests;
- (5) delegation of dispensing powers under section 33 of the Localism Act 2011 to the standards committee and the designation of the monitoring officer as proper officer for the receipt of applications for dispensations;
- (6) adoption of such other changes to the council's constitution as are necessitated by the changes outlined above;

- (7) delegation to the monitoring officer of the power to take all steps and deal with all such ancillary matters as are required to implement any of the above and to render the council compliant with the act.

9. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NORFOLK POLICE AND CRIME PANEL

Councillor Driver moved and Councillor Arthur seconded the recommendations in the annexed report.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to –

- (1) approve the establishment of a Police and Crime Panel for Norfolk, as a joint committee of the district, borough and county councils and the proposed panel arrangements;
- (2) endorse the proposed rules and procedure and recommend to the Police and Crime Panel that they be adopted.

10. SCRUTINY REVIEW 2011/12

Councillor Stephenson moved and Councillor Waters seconded the recommendation in the annexed report.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to receive the scrutiny review 2011/12.

11. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Councillor Arthur outlined the main points in the report of the chair of the standards committee, which had been received by standards committee the previous week. She apologised that a hard copy had not been attached to the agenda papers received by members.

Councillor Arthur moved and Councillor Gihawi seconded the recommendation in the report.

RESOLVED, with 19 voting in favour, 12 against and 5 abstentions, to note the annual report of the chair of the standards committee.

12. GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS

The Lord Mayor said that the following amendment had been received in advance from Councillor Arthur –

‘after **RESOLVES** to... delete ‘...set up a cross party working group...’ and replace with ‘...ask constitution working party...’

Councillor Stephenson indicated that she was happy to accept the amendment and, with no other member objecting, the amendment was accepted and became part of the substantive motion.

Councillor Stephenson moved and Councillor Neale seconded the motion, as amended above.

RESOLVED to ask Constitution working party to make recommendations to council on future governance arrangements from May 2013 onwards including consideration of –

- The impact of a committee system and other possible governance arrangements on value for money, quality of decision making, accountability, openness and transparency.
- Preparation and overseeing of a programme of transition to any new arrangements.
- Training needs for councillors and officers that may arise.
- Future scrutiny arrangements.

13. MOTION – OPEN DATA

Councillor Grahame moved and Councillor Brimblecombe seconded the motion as set out on the agenda.

RESOLVED, unanimously, that –

‘in the past few years, government at all levels has embraced the concept of ‘open data’. This makes data collected by councils, quangos and government departments more open to the public for their use and analysis by citizens’.

Council **RESOLVES** to ask the cabinet to review how more data about the council and the city collected by the council can be made public, with the aim of embracing the open data concept as fully as is practical.

LORD MAYOR

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Arthur's vision and priorities for the city in the coming months

"Thank you Lord Mayor.

As we start a new civic year I wanted to take this opportunity to describe my vision and priorities for the city in the coming months.

I still strongly believe that the council has a civic leadership role. Elected councillors have the mandate to represent and work with their communities and this is an area of work which I feel should be strengthened. The Chief Executive and I have already discussed ways in which this might happen. I look forward to us developing those ideas into something more substantial and to ensuring that we equip councillors with the tools to undertake their role of community leaders.

The results of our recent Peer Challenge showed that we can be proud of what has been achieved over the past four years. To take £19 million from our controllable spend, a third of that spend with only having to make direct service reductions in year four is impressive but we have to make a further £3.5million savings over the next year. However I would not want us to just look at cuts but to take every opportunity there is to increase our own income by for example taking on work for others. Clearly we cannot do this alone and I want us to build our successful joint working through the GNDP, our work on Economic Development with the business sector together with our emerging closer working with Health, social care and the Police. I continue to want us to collaborate even more effectively with external partners. Our Peer Challenge review indicated that we are increasingly seen by our peers and other organisations across the county as a leading authority, a trusted partner and an organisation that is outward looking and is good to work with. However we cannot be complacent and in developing this into the future we need to ensure that we grow our relationship with the voluntary sector which is often supporting the more vulnerable in our communities.

Increasingly the changes imposed by central government are threatening local government but I want us to seek to be expansive although I realise that this will be challenging

As a political group we believe in equality of opportunity, protecting the delivery of public services, ensuring we continue to enable the provision of decent homes and working to maintain a buoyant economy. Through the Corporate plan council has agreed to :-

- bring more jobs and training to the city
- increase recycling to 55%
- help individuals, families and communities to thrive and prosper.
- use money wisely by demonstrating value for money.

In addition we will be looking at :-

- becoming a member of the Co-operative Councils network
- the opportunities presented through the Green bank

And building the good work from last year we will continue to:-

- to work with the Homes and Communities Agency to enable the delivery of new homes.
- strengthen of our links with the business sector and trade unions
- work with our partners in the GNDP to deliver the joint core strategy
- undertake a series of consultation exercises with stakeholders and people in Norwich on how to make best use of our diminishing resources.
- use Democracy week to deliver a range of events demonstrating what we as a local authority provide in order to encourage more people to vote.
- ensure that our work in neighbourhoods is strengthened such that it can respond to any changes required as a result of the Localism Act

As an authority we need to continue to develop our “one council” approach encouraging collaboration between colleagues and across departments. The new model which was endorsed through our Peer challenge provides a good opportunity to do this. So looking inwards I would wish to see:-

- The successful implementation of the PACE model.
- continued improvements in our financial management which will also include ensuring we make best use of all of our assets and resources.
- given the depth of the cuts we will need to go back to base budgets in some areas and review these and look at what we can do to minimise the pressure on the general fund

I do not underestimate the challenges which we have in the next few months as we face further deep cuts, the issues presented by the Localism Bill, the Community Right to Challenge and the “invigorated” Right to Buy agenda. But we are committed to ensuring that our values underpin our political priorities for the coming year. As a political group we believe that when public services are directly delivered they are more accountable, efficient and cost effective than when moved into the hands of an outsourcing private sector provider. So we do want to look at options around service delivery which bring those services closer to home or as with the LGSS model within the family of the public sector.

We know that the current anti poverty strategies can only mitigate not fundamentally reduce the growing poverty and hardship in our city. Investment in Norwich is still not creating enough well paid secure jobs. We are not building sufficient homes that people can afford to live in. So as politicians we have to lobby central government for more resources and as I stressed last year I remain convinced that it is only by taking a more collaborative approach that we can protect precious public services.”



Question 1

Councillor Little to the cabinet member for environment and neighbourhoods:

“Residents and visitors have noted that the management of many verges and other grassed areas around the city has this year not been of the standard they would expect. Grassed areas have just been left to grow long and have neither been cut nor properly managed as wildflower areas. In my own (Town Close) ward these include Eagle Park and also verges in the Trafford Road/Grove Walk area which, according to residents, until they were recently cut had not been touched all year. This has affected the overall appearance of the city and could be said to be a cause of some potential embarrassment, for instance, ahead of the Olympic Torch coming to Norwich. Can the Council demonstrate that it will ensure that the contractors fulfil their obligations and adhere to the agreed cutting and management regime?”

Councillor Keith Driver, cabinet member for environment and neighbourhoods’ reply:

“Members are probably aware that many of our grass verges are planted with bulbs. Where the verges are planted with crocuses the grass is normally cut at the end of May. Where they are planted with daffodils the verges will be cut at the end of June. This regime is exactly the same as previous years. This does mean that at this time of year many of our verges will look untidy.

In addition, as part of the savings programme, some Members will recall that a decision was made last year to reduce the grass cutting of our verges from every two weeks to five times a year in accordance with the standards adopted by Norfolk County Council, the Highway Authority. In effect this means that the rest of our grass verges will only have been cut once so far this year with the second cut due before the end of June.

Finally, I don’t have to remind members that we have had one of the wettest springs on record which has meant some of the grass cutting programme has been delayed. It is difficult to cut grass in the rain and slows the rate at which machines cut putting the programme further behind. Our contractors are fulfilling their obligations and are making every effort to keep up with the grass cutting programme.

The council is fully aware of the Olympic Torch coming to Norwich and I am satisfied that both the Council and our contractor will make sure that the city is presented in its best light.”

Councillor Stephen Little asked as a supplementary question, if the cabinet member would support the suggestions he had put forward for maximising community involvement . **Councillor Driver** said he could see no reason why not but would discuss it with the relevant officers.

Question 2

Councillor Galvin to the cabinet member for housing:

“While councillors and residents are pleased that a consultation is going on before the allocation of garage sites across the city to housing is taken to cabinet, many have had concerns about the way this was carried out. Councillors have not been kept informed of changes to the consultation, for example the extension of the response date. Not all residents in the area have been informed, with one side of a road being told and not the other, and meetings were sometimes held at inaccessible places, preventing residents from being able to attend. Can the cabinet member assure me that all residents and councillors have been notified of the changes to the consultation dates, and that the problems arising from this consultation will be avoided in the future?”

Councillor Macdonald, cabinet member for housing’s reply:

Can I thank Councillor Galvin for her question.

The delivery of new affordable housing is a top priority for the Council and I am sure this view is shared by all members. The provision of sites to enable social landlords the opportunity to build new homes is an essential part of this process. Therefore I am deeply disappointed that there have been a number of issues that have arisen as a result of the public engagement around the current round of proposals to build affordable homes on some of the council’s garage sites and car parks. Lessons have been learnt and as a result there will be some changes to how any similar engagement is carried out in future. For example I accept that some of the meetings took place at locations some distance from the proposed sites. Officers will, in future, ensure that they use a venue that is closer to the location in question.

With any public engagement it can be difficult to be clear about where the boundary between those who are invited and those who are not should be drawn. Care is usually taken to think through who might be affected as well as who live in the immediate proximity of the suggested development. In the case of Hanover Road, the invitations were restricted to households immediately around the proposed site. However, bearing in mind the foreseeable concerns about traffic and parking I accept that they should have been extended at least to the other side of the street.

Full information about the engagement is available on the home page of the council’s website. All members were also sent an email on the 30th May to clarify our approach which included information about the end date. The outcome of the consultation will be considered by Cabinet in July.

Question 3

Councillor Price to the cabinet member for environment and development:

"A report to Norfolk County Council Cabinet on 2 April 2012 on the NDR/NATS (Item 12 Appendix B) stated that the Norfolk County Council local authority contribution towards Northern Distributor Road (NDR) funding totalling £53.33 million will be 'supported by GNDP (Greater Norwich Development Partnership) funding up to £40million'.

Can you specify the amount of funding that Norwich City Council has agreed to contribute to an NDR, to be met by the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) on new development in Norwich? Will the City Council reconsider its funding support for an NDR? Has the City Council considered spending all the CIL income on affordable housing, if permitted by the government and/or on essential community infrastructure such as health, education or public transport, rather than on an NDR and other major road building schemes?"

Councillor Bremner, cabinet member for environment and development's reply:

In responding to this, it is important that all members understand that, as a key partner in the development of the Joint Core Strategy, the Council has been adamant that in supporting major growth in homes and jobs it is absolutely essential that the investment required to fund the infrastructure to deliver that growth should also be forthcoming. This view is shared by all the organisations in the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP). As part of this approach the local authority partners have made a commitment to introduce a community infrastructure levy on new development to help secure developer funding that will contribute to the costs of delivering this infrastructure across the GNDP area.

In this context, in March 2011, the GNDP Policy Group supported, in principle, the use of a significant proportion of future CIL revenues to establish a shared investment fund to support delivery of priority 1 key infrastructure projects. This includes key items of work contained in the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy (of which the NDR is part). The stage we have reached with CIL is that we are currently working on developing a charging schedule for the City (working collaboratively with GNDP colleagues). The likely timescale is that CIL will be adopted towards the end of 2012.

However it is important to appreciate that no decisions have been taken about any mechanisms for pooling CIL resources within GNDP and as a CIL collecting authority, the City Council has not made any commitment to use the CIL that it collects from development for any specific items of infrastructure. I appreciate that as a new member, Councillor 'Price may not be aware but the Leader of the Council has confirmed this to be the case at previous meetings of the Council.

In responding to the specific comment about the use of CIL for affordable housing members may wish to note that this opportunity will be dependent on changes to the CIL regulations. These changes may be laid before parliament

before the summer recess in which case the earliest the legislative changes would be in force would be autumn 2012. In commenting on the government consultation on this proposed change, the Council indicated that it welcomed the flexibility to allow CIL to be used to fund affordable housing, albeit recognising that it may be necessary to restrict the amount of CIL funding used for this element to ensure that other essential infrastructure is also delivered.

As a key partner in the GNDP officers are working with the other member authorities on a business plan for the next 5 years to establish how essential items of infrastructure can be delivered. This includes education, open space, play facilities, community facilities and transportation. For Norwich the transportation measures are set out in the Norwich Area Transportation Strategy and includes improvements to walking, cycling and public transport such as bus rapid transit and improvements in the city centre and in residential areas, as well as a NDR. This investment plan will require the approval of all the GNDP local authorities.

Councillor Ben Price asked, as a supplementary question, if the cabinet member could give a commitment that funding would be targeted towards affordable housing not the NDR if the regulations were changed. **Councillor Bert Bremner** referred Councillor Price to his answer above and said that the council had not made any commitment to use the CIL to date he would not make such a commitment now.

Question 4

Councillor Neale to the cabinet member for environment and neighbourhoods:

"Residents have consistently raised the issue of land at the corner of Onley St and Leicester St which is currently disused and is in a particularly poor state. It is overgrown with metal fencing often left leaning against walls. We understand there are various outstanding issues such as responsibility for maintenance of the retaining wall, but while these are being resolved, please could the Council agree to tidy up the area, manage the vegetation and keep it maintained to ensure it is safe and presentable?"

Councillor McDonald, cabinet member for Housing reply:

Can I thank Councillor Neale for his question.

I can appreciate that this is not a satisfactory situation. However this site is housing land and for some time the suitability of developing this small infill area for housing has been under consideration. I have asked officers to seek to bring this options assessment to a conclusion and I am hopeful that in the near future we will have clarity over the future use of this area. In the meantime the site will be inspected with a view to tidying it up and cutting back the vegetation in order to make it safe and presentable.

Question 5

Councillor Lubbock to the cabinet member for environment and development:

"This Council's corporate plan contains a commitment to implementing a blanket 20mph speed limit in Norwich.

I am keen to know what progress has been made with this commitment, as I understand officers have attended a conference looking at how other authorities have implemented this and how the Government have facilitated it."

Councillor Bremner, cabinet member for environment and development's reply:

I thank Councillor Lubbock for her questions it gives us the opportunity to put the record straight and explain the background to so much of our highway work.

To introduce 20 mph speed limits remains challenging but I am committed to pursuing the Corporate Plan (2012-15) commitment to advocate for the introduction of 20mph zones in residential areas. Please note that is not "a blanket 20mph speed limit".

An officer from the transportation team did attend a conference last month hoping to learn from the experiences of other local authorities in implementing 20mph. Disappointingly, nothing came out of the conference that wasn't already known to us.

New members may not be aware, but about 3 years ago we piloted the use of signed only 20mph speed limits in 3 residential areas of the city. The key results we found were:

- 20mph speed limits are very popular with residents
- 20mph speed limits had a small impact on reducing vehicle speeds
- 20mph speed limits had no obvious impact on casualty rates.

The conference confirmed that many other authorities across the country had made similar findings when they introduced 20mph speed limits.

I had hoped the conference would assist officers in finding lower cost ways of implementing a 20mph speed limit in residential areas in Norwich. It did not. The signing requirements and legal processes remain the same as they always have. This means that the cost of introducing a 20mph limit in our city would still cost several hundred thousand pounds.

As background information to this, the integrated transport grant to Norfolk has been cut by 80% making it harder to fund implementation of either speed limits or other highway safety improvements. As you will be aware, the council receives funding for highway improvement schemes from Norfolk County Council. Whereas the City used to receive in the region of £1 million to £1.5 million a year, with changes in Government funding this year it will only be £215,000 with these appallingly low funding levels set to continue for the foreseeable future. At such levels, funding the implementation of the 20 mph

would require the entire budget through into 2014 - 2015. For three years there would be no other worthwhile measures such as pedestrian crossings, cycle routes, schemes to address specific safety problems and changes to parking restrictions, etc.

So we wait to see what level of funding Norfolk County Council receives from Government and what proportion they deem enough for Norwich road network, and what priority they set for extra safety works etc over maintenance of the existing network.

That said, the council remains committed to 20mph speed limits in our residential areas. Officers are continuing to look at ways of achieving this within the funds available and more information should be available in the autumn when Norwich Highways Agency Committee (NHAC), the joint committee of the City and County, with County having the overall control, considers its' funding priorities for 2013/14.

Councillor Judith Lubbock said that this was national bike week and asked the cabinet member if he agreed that introducing 20mph limits was the most important measure that could be introduced to encourage cyclists. **Councillor Bert Bremner** said that it would be one such measure.

Question 6

Councillor Ackroyd to the cabinet member for environment and neighbourhoods:

"I was delighted to read that the Council's environment protection team had brought a successful prosecution against a Norwich businessman for stapling advertising flyers to trees and tree support frames in Bracondale and Newmarket Road and would like to thank officers for their hard work in this matter.

Could the cabinet member give me up-to-date information on the number of reports received of fly-posting in the last three years and how many resulting prosecutions there have been?"

Councillor Driver, cabinet member for environment and neighbourhoods' reply:

Can I thank Councillor Ackroyd for her question.

I am pleased to report the council recognises the blight that fly-posting can bring to an area and show that we do intend to bring action against those who are caught fly-posting in the city

So far this year we have had one successful prosecution and have served two £80 fixed penalties for fly posting. Both fixed penalties have been paid (£160).

There are also 2 pending cases which are being investigated and may end up going to court.

The number of fly posting reports the council has received for the last three years are as follows:

2009 - 10 reports
2010 - 12 reports
2011 - 16 reports
2012 - 5 reports (so far)

Although no successful prosecutions were made in the preceding years, the council has recognized the growing prevalence of incidents and has therefore made it a priority within the work of the Environmental Protection Team to stop it spreading.

Councillor Caroline Ackroyd welcomed the steps taken and asked, as a supplementary question, if the council would make the general public aware. **Councillor Keith Driver** said that there had been a large article in the Eastern Evening News and he would check if information was on the council's website.

Question 7

Councillor Wright to the cabinet member for customer services:

"The Council has recently changed the way that services are delivered via neighbourhood offices, and this has led to a reduction in the range of services that are provided within the community.

At the same time this government has provided security for local post offices and has put a stop to the programme of post office closures favoured by the previous government, with Minister responsible for Post Offices, Norman Lamb, recently speaking at a joint event held by the LGA and Post Office Ltd about how councils can work with their local post offices.

Could the portfolio holder please outline for me what steps this council is taking in order to make full use of our valuable Post Office network to support the delivery of Council services?"

Councillor Brociek-Coulton, cabinet member for customer services' reply:

Can I thank Councillor Wright for his question

Payment of services through the Post Office network is actively encouraged through the use of barcodes on documentation. This enables our customers' to pay in cash at one of the post offices if they have not already arranged for payment via another method like direct debit or chosen to use an electronic method of payment using a debit card.

Question 8

Councillor Stammers to the cabinet member for environment and neighbourhoods:

“Is the cabinet member happy with supporting Norfolk's Waste Strategy, despite the fact that the County Council's project board has chosen to procure 'suitable waste treatment technology' that the City Council do not support?”

Councillor Driver, cabinet member for customer services' reply:

Can I thank Councillor Stammers for her question.

Along with all other Norfolk council's the city council supports the overall objectives of the Joint Municipal Waste Strategy for Norfolk. Principally the waste strategy is about reducing the volume of waste and the amount of waste that can be reused and recycled. As such the city council has been focussing its attention on its role as a waste collection authority and in particular on our own waste and recycling collection systems. Included with this work is how we can work with our neighbouring authorities to enhance the level of domestic waste that can be reused and recycled. The waste treatment technology referred to is for the disposal of waste and is solely down to Norfolk county council in its role as the waste disposal authority.

The city council has been particularly effective in delivering those elements of the Waste Strategy that relate to district councils. I am sure Members will be pleased to note that in 2012/13 the council is likely to recycle just over 30% of dry recycling household waste (i.e. paper, card, glass, plastic bottles and cans). This impressive achievement will put us as the lead district council in Norfolk. In addition, our overall projected recycling rate for last year (i.e. dry recyclables and compostable waste) is 44% and this will put us in second position in the county. It is my view that the waste strategy has produced significant and tangible benefits for the City. We are now producing less waste for disposal and our current level of recycling is something both the council and residents can be very proud of. Furthermore, we intend to continue our commitment to the delivery of the waste strategy by encouraging increased and sustained participation in the councils recycling service.

Councillor Amy Stammers, asked as a supplementary question, if the cabinet member was happy that the council's support for the Norfolk Waste Strategy has been taken to mean that it supports the procurement of waste treatment technology. **Councillor Driver** emphasised that Norwich City Council had not made a decision to support the procurement of waste treatment technology.