



Council

Members of the council are hereby summoned to attend the
meeting of the council to be held remotely

on

Tuesday, 26 January 2021

18:30

Agenda

Page nos

1 Lord Mayor's announcements

2 Declarations of interest

(Please note that it is the responsibility of individual members to declare an interest prior to the item if they arrive late for the meeting)

3 Public questions/petitions

To receive questions / petitions from the public.

Please note that all questions must be received by the committee officer detailed on the front of the agenda by

10am on Thursday 21 January 2021

Petitions must be received by the committee officer detailed on the front of the agenda by **10am on Monday 25 January 2021**

For guidance on submitting public questions or petitions please see appendix 1 of the council's constitution.

4 Minutes

5 - 32

To approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 24 November 2020

5 Questions to cabinet members / committee chairs

(A printed copy of the questions and replies will be available at the meeting)

6 Treasury Management Mid-Year Review Report 2020-21 33 - 50

Purpose - To consider the Treasury Management performance for the first six months of the financial year to 30 September 2020.

7 Appointment of interim monitoring officer 51 - 58

Purpose - To appoint Geoff Wild as the interim monitoring officer.

8 Members allowances scheme 59 - 74

Purpose - To consider the recommendation of the independent panel to retain the current scheme of members allowances as detailed in the panel's report.

9 Motions 75 - 82

Purpose - To consider motions for which notice has been given in accordance with appendix one of the council's constitution.



Annabel Scholes
(Interim) Director of resources

For further information please contact:

Lucy Palmer, democratic team leader
t: (01603) 989515
e: [lucypalmer @norwich.gov.uk](mailto:lucypalmer@norwich.gov.uk)

Democratic services
City Hall, Norwich, NR2 1NH
www.norwich.gov.uk

Date of publication: **Monday, 18 January 2021**

Information for members of the public

Members of the public and the media have the right to attend meetings of full council, the cabinet and committees except where confidential information or exempt information is likely to be disclosed, and the meeting is therefore held in private.

For information about attending or speaking at meetings, please contact the committee officer above or refer to the council's website



If you would like this agenda in an alternative format, such as a larger or smaller font, audio or Braille, or in a different language, please contact the committee officer above.



Minutes

COUNCIL

18:10 to 20:20

24 November 2020

Present: Councillor Thomas (Va) (Lord Mayor), Ackroyd, Bogelein, Brociek-Coulton, Button, Carlo, Davis, Driver, Fulton-McAlister (E), Fulton-McAlister (M), Giles, Grahame, Harris, Huntley, Jones, Kendrick, Lubbock, Maguire, Maxwell, McCartney-Gray, Oliver, Osborn, Packer, Peek, Price, Ryan, Sands (M), Sands (S), Sarmezey, Schmierer, Stonard, Stutely, Waters, Wright and Youssef

Apologies: Councillors Manning, Neale and Thomas (Vi)

1. Lord Mayor's Announcements

The Lord Mayor introduced the meeting. He had attended several events including a Remembrance Day service, an Armistice Day service and the launch of a foodbank at Norwich Central Mosque (a full list of engagements is appended to these minutes).

He invited Councillor Alan Waters to say a few words in remembrance of Colin Thrower, a former city council employee, and Councillor Keith Driver to say a few words about former councillor Roy Durrant, both of whom had sadly passed away. Following this, a minute's silence was held.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Giles, Grahame, Osborn, Schmierer, Thomas (Va) and Youssef declared a pecuniary interest in item 9a on the agenda, motion on declaring a poverty emergency, but had received a dispensation from the council's monitoring officer to remain in the meeting for the discussion and vote.

Councillor Bogelein, declared a pecuniary interest in item 9a on the agenda, motion on declaring a poverty emergency, and would leave the meeting for the discussion and vote.

3. Public Questions/Petitions

No public questions or petitions had been received.

4. Minutes

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2020.

5. Questions to Cabinet Members/Committee Chairs

The Lord Mayor said that thirteen questions had been received from members of the council to cabinet members/committee chairs for which notice had been given in accordance with the provisions of appendix 1 of the council's constitution.

The questions are summarised as follows:

Question 1	Councillor Wright to the leader of the council on NRL governance
Question 2	Councillor Lubbock to the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment on air monitoring.
Question 3	Councillor Youssef to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth on naming streets in honour of black historical figures.
Question 4	Councillor Bogelein to the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing on the cleaning of housing.
Question 5	Councillor Schmierer to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth on planning policy on tall buildings.
Question 6	Councillor Osborn to the chair of the scrutiny committee on a select committee on fly-tipping.
Question 7	Councillor Price to the leader of the council on the Liveable City.
Question 8	Councillor Carlo to the chair of the scrutiny committee on the select committee on short stay lettings.
Question 9	Councillor Erin Fulton-McAlister to the cabinet member for resources on the postal vote campaign.
Question 10	Councillor Ryan to the leader of the council on the Towns Deal.
Question 11	Councillor Mike Sands to the leader of the council on Covid-19 funding.
Question 12	Councillor Maxwell to the cabinet member for health and wellbeing on the Green Flag Awards.
Question 13	Councillor McCartney-Gray to the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment on the 'Everyone in' campaign.

(Details of the questions and responses were made available on the council's website prior to the meeting, and are attached to these minutes at Appendix A, together with a minute of any supplementary questions and responses.)

6. Adjustment to the 2020-21 capital programme

Councillor Kendrick moved and Councillor Mike Sands seconded, the recommendations in the report.

Following debate, it was:

RESOLVED, with a majority voting in favour, to approve the following amendments to increase the General Fund capital programme by £1.536m to provide:

- 1) £0.175m to enable Heigham Park Pavilion to be rebuilt following fire damage, to be funded from £0.125m insurance claim and £0.050m insurance reserve;
- 2) £0.500m to cover cost of new laptops to be funded from RCCO / capital receipts;
- 3) £0.253m of improvements to street furniture, alternative cycling routes and traffic road blocks funded from Tourism Support grant;
- 4) £0.608m of funding for various Towns' Fund projects as set out in the main report.

7. Appointment of a deputy monitoring officer

Councillor Kendrick moved and Councillor Stutely seconded, the recommendation in the report.

Following debate, it was:

RESOLVED, unanimously, to

- 1) note the removal of Anton Bull and Bob Cronk as deputy monitoring officers;
and
- 2) appoint Graham Nelson as a deputy monitoring officer

8. Interim parliamentary polling district and places review 2020

Councillor Giles moved and Councillor Kendrick seconded the recommendations in the report.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve the recommendations as set out in the report.

(Councillor Kendrick left the meeting at this point.)

9. Motions

(Notice of the following motions, 9a to 9d as set out on the agenda, had been received in accordance with appendix 1 of the council's constitution.)

9(a) Motion: Declaring a poverty emergency

(Councillors Giles, Grahame, Neale, Osborn, Thomas (Va), Schmierer and Youssef had received a dispensation from the Monitoring Officer to participate in the debate and vote on this item. Councillor Bogelein, was removed from the meeting for the duration of the item.)

Councillor Davis moved and Councillor Huntley seconded the motion.

RESOLVED, unanimously, that:

“There is a large and growing body of evidence that highlights the disproportionate impact on low income and no income people as a result of recent global recessions and the COVID-19 pandemic. It is becoming clear that poverty is the key defining factor in how people experience the social, economic and environmental impacts of this pandemic in their lives, yet those struggling on the lowest incomes have the least influence in shaping and influencing our approach to recovery. In declaring a poverty emergency, we re-affirm our practical commitment to help build a recovery in which wealth, power and opportunity are extended throughout our community.

Council **RESOLVES** to; -

1) Acknowledge that:

- a) We have an opportunity in how we plan our recovery, firstly to give true recognition to those low-income and no income people who have kept our country running while many of us were in lockdown or isolating at home, but also to create a lasting legacy of change, where poverty is not inevitable in our society and where fairer, greener and stronger communities can emerge.
- b) In declaring a Poverty Emergency, this council recognises that this is the time for that change, and by aligning this work with our Climate Emergency declaration in 2019, this council commits to a people and planet approach to recovery and renewal which affirms; -
 - i. The harnessing and prioritisation of the appropriate resources of the council to deliver our agreed Recovery Plan, capitalise and implement the future work and opportunities of the Good Economy Commission, 2040 Vision, financial inclusion strategy, together with our partnerships including the Financial Inclusion Consortium, to reduce poverty in the city as we assertively rebuild our post pandemic economy and ensuring this poverty emergency work stream is embedded within the council's ongoing recovery planning.

- ii. The recognition that once again socio-economic deprivation as an equalities issue and acknowledges that the experience of poverty and being in crisis has a detrimental impact on health, including mental health and wellbeing, achievement, life chances, participation, resilience, and social cohesion.
 - iii. The need to prioritise our people and planet approach in identifying where the environmental, social and poverty agendas overlap in order to tackle common issues of inequality, health and wellbeing through our recovery work and community development within the city.
 - iv. The need to call on government to address the drivers of poverty to include the scrapping of the bedroom tax and for rents to be capped at local Housing Allowance, ending of bogus self-employment and creation of a single status of worker for everyone apart from those genuinely self-employed in business on their own account so that employers cannot evade workers' rights, the ending of disability discrimination and the updating of the Equality Act to introduce new specific duties including disability leave, paid and recorded separately from sick leave, delivery of gender equality by making the state responsible for enforcing equal pay legislation for the first time, and for a new Workers Protection Agency working with HMRC to ensure that employers take equal pay seriously and take positive action to close the gender pay gap, meaning that women will no longer be left to take enforcement action by themselves through the courts; remove discriminatory rules that require landlords to check people's immigration status or that allow them to exclude people on social security; implement a real Living Wage, repeal the Trade Union Act 2016 and give support to sectoral collective bargaining to improve wages and conditions for workers.
- 2) Call on other councils to join with us in declaring a Poverty Emergency as a vehicle for systemic change in our society; and
- 3) To share through networks like the LGA, our model for declaring a Poverty Emergency alongside a climate and social emergency as best practice in recovery and renewal."

(Councillor Bogelein was readmitted to the meeting)

9(b) Motion: Transitioning to a more stable Norwich economy

The Lord Mayor announced that amendments to the motion had been received from Councillor Maguire, which had been circulated:

At resolution 1, add the words 'Continue our.' at the start of the resolution, after '..Norfolk County Council.' remove '..to produce...' and replace with '..with the aim of producing..' and after '..a plan for...' add the words 'a socially, economically and environmentally just and proportionate...'

At resolution 1b) add the word 'Supporting..' at the beginning of the clause, after '..work with chemical manufacturers..' add the words '..where appropriate..' after '..taking steps..' add the words '..when necessary..' and after '..or eliminate..' add the words '..any adverse environmental..'

At resolution 1c) add 'Continue..' at the start of the clause.

At resolution 1d) add the words 'Supporting the local financial services...' at the start of the clause.

At resolution 1e) add the word "Continue..." at the start of the clause.

At resolution 1f) add the word 'Continue...' at the start of the clause.

Councillor Osborn had indicated that he was willing to accept the amendments and as no other member objected, they became part of the substantive motion.

Councillor Osborn moved and Councillor Youssef seconded the motion as amended.

The Lord Mayor said that notice had been received of a further amendment to the motion from Councillor Maguire which had been circulated:

At resolution 1) to remove the words '..' to meet the 12.8% year-on-year minimum emissions reduction target stipulated by the Tyndall Centre and...' and replace with ...'as advised by professional and scientific bodies including the Tyndall Centre and the government's own committee on climate change to..'

Councillor Osborn indicated that he was not willing to accept the amendment and it was debated in the usual way.

Councillor Maguire proposed and Councillor Stonard seconded the above amendment.

Following debate, it was **RESOLVED**, with a majority voting in favour to pass the amendment above.

The Lord Mayor had received a request to take the vote for the motion in two parts. The first vote would be on all resolutions, excluding resolution 3) which would be taken as a separate vote and it was moved accordingly:

RESOLVED, unanimously, that:

"While Norwich City Council has reduced its own operational emissions, at emissions levels, the city of Norwich, will use its entire carbon budget within seven years according to the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research. In January 2019, Norwich City Council acknowledged that climate and social emergencies are inextricably linked. We now also face the challenge of coronavirus which has been called 'a public health crisis, an economic crisis and a social crisis'. Kate Raworth has said 'Humanity's 21st century challenge is to meet the needs of all within the means of the planet.'

This council **RESOLVES**:

- 1) to continue our working together with the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership and other local partners including the Good Economy Commission and Norfolk County Council with the aim of producing a plan for a socially, economically and environmentally just and proportionate transitioning of the

Norwich city economy away from carbon as advised by professional and scientific bodies including the Tyndall Centre and the government's own committee on climate change to address the biodiversity crisis while also protecting against poverty and improving social inclusion, including by:

- a) Supporting access to training for employees and prospective employees in industries which are at risk of shrinking due to the Covid-19 pandemic and the climate emergency, such as the aviation industry in Norwich, encouraging access to alternative employment and the chance to retrain for work in renewable energy engineering or other sectors needed for a zero-carbon economy;
 - b) Supporting work with chemicals manufacturers, where appropriate, to evaluate the impact of chemicals produced in Norwich on biodiversity and on local health outcomes and taking steps, when necessary, to reduce or eliminate any adverse environmental impact.
 - c) Continue working with Norfolk County Council and local groups including residents' associations, the Norwich Access Group and campaign groups to continue to improve public transport, walking and cycling links in the city and reduce carbon emissions from transport;
 - d) Supporting the local financial services industry to stimulate investment in local highly skilled low carbon jobs;
 - e) Continue supporting the development of high-quality modular building in Norwich to accelerate the delivery of low-carbon, high-quality homes;
 - f) Continue funding a programme of retrofitting of existing housing stock to reduce energy waste and fuel poverty, including working with local education providers to train the necessary workforce to meet the skills gap in the retrofitting sector;
 - g) Continue working to support local production of renewable energy, including by supporting infrastructure for a decentralised grid and peer-to-peer trading where regulation allows;
 - h) Continue supporting the localisation of food production, including by working with community groups and developers to increase access to urban-grown local produce;
 - i) Continue supporting the reversal of species loss by working with landowners and property owners to provide space for nature, including through green roofs and living walls;
 - j) Continuing to work to encourage businesses to reduce and eliminate material, water and energy waste, and continuing to support the development of a circular economy.
- 2) to ask the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership and government, recognising that the transition to a zero-carbon economy will involve changes to

jobs and working patterns, to ensure that the working people and communities of Norwich are represented in the LEP's decision making processes, and that their priorities are supported, including by:

- a) seeking to ensure trades unions are represented on the NALEP board, sub-boards and committees;
- b) continue working with community organisations and the voluntary sector to ensure that community interests are represented at the earliest stage of development for any decarbonisation plans;
- c) review their funding model to enhance additional funding as needed for Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) organisations in recognition of the vital role they play in building community wellbeing.

The Lord Mayor then moved resolution 3) to the vote.

With a majority voting against, resolution 3) of the motion was lost.

9(c) motion: Advocating a 20mph speed restriction on most roads inside the Outer Ring Road

The Lord Mayor announced that amendments to the motion had been received from Councillor Stonard and circulated:

After 'Norfolk County Council..' remove the words 'Transforming Cities Fund Joint Committee..' and replace with '...to adopt in its emerging transport policy documents (Local Transport Plan, Transport for Norwich Strategy, Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan) the...'

At resolution 1) remove the words '...inside the Outer Ring Road..' and replace with '...on most roads inside the city boundary...'

At the end of resolution 1), add the words '...together with the above mentioned strategies and plans...'

At resolution 2) remove the words 'the joint committee'

At resolution 3) Remove the words '...the Outer Ring Road...' and replace with 'the city boundary'.

Councillor Price had indicated that he was willing to accept the amendments and as no member objected, these became part of the substantive motion.

Following debate, it was **RESOLVED** that:

"In 2012, Norwich City Council made advocacy for 20mph speed restrictions in residential areas a corporate priority. In 2015 Norwich Highways Agency Committee

(NHAC) approved a 20mph limit within the historic city centre. In 2017 NHAC resolved that 20mph should be considered the default speed restriction for all residential roads. Main roads passing through densely built-up areas and providing important walking or cycling routes to essential places were not considered for 20mph limits. A 20mph limit creates a safer environment for encouraging walking and cycling, leading to better health and air quality, greater social equity, and lower carbon emissions.

This council **RESOLVES** to ask Norfolk County Council to adopt in its emerging transport policy documents (Local Transport Plan, Transport for Norwich Strategy, Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan) the;

- (1) inclusion of the principle of 20mph as the default speed limit on most roads inside the city boundary as part of the public consultation into the Transport for Norwich Strategy, together with the above-mentioned strategies and plans, review;
- (2) to develop and adopt a plan showing a 20mph speed limit on most roads within the Outer Ring Road which, if approved would be implemented in stages; and
- (3) develop and implement a strategy for a 20mph speed limit within the city boundary if the principle and an accompanying plan are approved.

9(d) Motion: Food poverty

(As two hours had passed since the beginning of the meeting, this item was taken as unopposed business.)

Manchester United footballer Marcus Rashford has successfully campaigned on school holiday hunger and has recently formed a taskforce with some of the UK's leading food retailers and charities to help reduce child food poverty.

This taskforce has called upon the government to fund three policy recommendations from the National Food Strategy, an independent review of UK food policy, as soon as possible:

- the expansion of free school meals to every child from a household on Universal Credit or equivalent, reaching an additional 1.5m children aged seven to 16
- the expansion of holiday food and activities to support all children on free school meals, reaching an additional 1.1m children
- increasing the value of the Healthy Start vouchers from £3.10 to £4.25 per week and expanding it to all those on Universal Credit or equivalent, reaching an additional 290,000 children under the age of four and pregnant women

The taskforce has said that implementing these three recommendations would mark a 'unifying step to identifying a long-term solution to child poverty in the UK'.

Council **RESOLVES** to:

- 1) Support the conclusion of the taskforce in calling upon the government to immediately fund these recommendations.
- 2) Support the sentiment that if the Prime Minister wishes to be believed when he talks of 'building (Britain) back better' then he must address child food poverty as a top priority; for how can Britain be better when our nation's children continue to go hungry?
- 3) Express thanks and appreciation on behalf of the citizens of Norwich to those businesses and community groups who provided food for children during the recent school holidays; plugging the gap left by central government.
- 4) Endorse the cabinet decision to award £10,000 to help fund meals during the October half term break.
- 5) Ask group leaders to write to;
 - a) Marcus Rashford commending him for his initiative and offering this Council's support for his work and that of the taskforce.
 - b) Henry Dimbleby, who led the National Food Strategy, commending the work of the review panel and offering this Council's support for their recommendations.
 - c) The Chancellor of the Exchequer calling upon him to fund these three top recommendations as a matter of great urgency.
 - d) Our local MPs asking them to also make urgent representations to the Chancellor on this issue.

(The Lord Mayor closed the meeting.)

LORD MAYOR

Appendix A



Council 24 November 2020 Questions to cabinet members or chairs of committees

Question 1

Councillor Wright to ask the leader of the council the following question:

“During a discussion about Norwich Regeneration Limited at the council meeting of 23 June 2020, the leader of the council told the meeting that “most recently we have appointed two non-executive directors”.

Governance of the company has been a cause for concern, so this news of the appointment of non-executive directors (NEDs) offered some comfort.

However, as of 29 October 2020 when the company filed its most recent ‘confirmation statement’, no such additional directors are listed.

Could the leader of the council please shed some light on this apparent discrepancy?”

Councillor Waters, the leader’s response:

“Work has been taken forward this year to strengthen the governance of NRL. Two non-executive directors have been recruited and joined the Board of the company on 14 September 2020. The two new non-executive directors have extensive experience in housing development and have made a significant contribution already. Their appointments have been registered with Companies House and this can be viewed under officers. Their appointments will show in future NRL statements. In addition, in order to further strengthen the governance and maintain close links to the council, the city council’s director of resources and director of place also attend NRL board meetings as participating observers”

Supplementary question

Councillor Wright asked that given the registration of the two new non-executive directors for NRL had happened on 20 November 2020, three days after he had asked his original question, did the leader of the council have confidence in the legal advice the council were receiving in relation to NRL. The leader said that he had confidence in the governance arrangements for NRL. A strong board was in place and the company were accountable to the board, this offered reassurance in terms of governance.

Question 2

Councillor Lubbock to ask the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment the following question:

“In October I received an email from a young man resident in Norwich. He told me that he had been in hospital again for a week with another exacerbation of his lung disease and that he was now on intravenous antibiotics for another week. In the past his problems have been exacerbated by air pollution from traffic but this time it was the rise in wood burning in his area in recent weeks that had caused him to become ill.

He knows because he constantly monitors the air pollution with a personal device and the particulate matter he recorded in the 10 days before his admission to hospital was more typical of wood burning than traffic - plus the peaks did not match with rush hour traffic.

He goes on to say that there is a huge lack of awareness around just how polluting wood burning is. Recent research by the British Medical Journal indicates that a single wood burning stove can emit more highly toxic PM2.5 particles than 1000 petrol cars. In addition 38% of the UK's particulate matter air pollution is from domestic wood and coal burning. Yet there are only about 2.5 million open fires and stoves in the UK, while 40 million motor vehicles are responsible for just 12% of the same pollutant.

This council is responsible for monitoring air pollution and in the past I have been concerned that there be more effective monitoring outside schools that are heavily trafficked. However following this email I think there are further questions to be asked. Could the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment comment on what this council is doing to monitor dense residential areas, particularly in the evenings in the winter?”

Councillor Maguire, the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment's response:

“Thank you for your question on behalf of your constituent in relation to air quality in the city and for an update on the action the council is taking to monitor residential areas during the winter.

You ask a timely question on this matter as winter approaches, the temperature drops, people spend more time in their homes, and, in consequence, seek to heat their homes to the best of their ability and pocket. This is not just a Covid-related issue but Lockdown and increased working from home will have had an effect.

Your question flags up the relative contributions to pollution from traffic and from wood-burning. In the main, traffic produces nitrogen dioxide and wood burning produces fine particulate matter.

We are especially concerned with two sizes of particle; both of which have health effects: PM10 is particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter and PM2.5 is particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter, the significance of the latter being that the lungs do not exhale 2.5 micron sized particles. This is why Norwich City Council monitors pollution from

particulate matter at Castle Meadow “ground hog” unit, whilst Defra monitor the same at Lakenfields. Thus, there are 2 sites within Norwich which monitor PM10 & PM2.5. This, they do, automatically and continuously.

Between the two sites we measure two contrasting sources: heavy traffic (Castle Meadow) and mainly residential (Lakenfields). The Castle Meadow can be viewed in real time at:

https://www.norfolkairquality.net/Online.aspx?ST_ID=3;0 .

And Lakenfields

at https://www.norfolkairquality.net/Online.aspx?ST_ID=2;0

For the last 2 years the annual mean PM2.5 levels at both sites have met the stringent WHO guideline level of 10µg/m³.

The site at Castle Meadow also measures real-time nitrogen dioxide levels and numerous diffusion tube sites across the city provide nitrogen dioxide monitoring data on a monthly basis. This year we began monitoring outside the school on Jessop Road: the nitrogen dioxide levels there are also well below the national objective level set by the government in statute.

It is worth noting that the county council also engages with schools on such matters for example school travel plans, discouraging parents from parking directly outside the school and encouraging modal shift from cars to walking and cycling.

You will be aware that the council also deals with air pollution from chimneys and bonfires through Statutory Nuisance legislation. All complaints the council receives are investigated and enforcement powers exercised where necessary and possible. Very few bonfire complaints are received; we attribute this to the greater recycling of waste which continues to increase.

Chimneys are designed to give adequate dispersion under favourable weather conditions; hence the council receives very few complaints from this source of pollution. Burning of wood on an open fire or in a wood burner, while not new, would appear to be increasing. Their use, however, is not always with the attendant knowledge and practice required which is why, for some time, Norwich City Council have provided some guidance on their website
(https://www.norwich.gov.uk/downloads/file/4278/open_fires_and_wood_burning_stoves_-_a_practical_guide)

If you would like to read a summary report each year of these data, the council submits an annual status report on air quality in the city to Defra each year. The reports go back many years are available on our website.

Thank you again for your timely raising of this important issue.”

Supplementary question

In response to Councillor Lubbock’s supplementary question the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment said that he was not

clear if it was possible for the council to influence where Defra placed their air monitoring stations. He would research the answer and provide a definite answer at a later date.

Question 3

Councillor Youssef to ask the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth the following question:

“The council has a tradition of supporting Black History Month in October, of which it can be proud. However, I’m sure the cabinet will agree that celebrating Black History should not be confined to a single month. With this in mind, will the council consider naming some new roads which are to be built after historical Black figures from Norwich? I would suggest Justin Fashanu as one such person who could be remembered in this way.”

Councillor Stonard, the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth’s response:

“Thank you for your question: you make a good suggestion.

The process for street naming new roads in the city is undertaken by the council’s address referencing officer who works in discussion with the developer. Sometimes the council suggests names, others the developers have their own ideas which we have to authorise. In particular we check with Royal Mail to ensure the proposed name will not create confusion as a postal address by way of it being too similar to an existing road name, but we also need to be sensitive to the views of living relatives if for example named after a person.

Through the engagement process we have with developers I will ask officers to make your suggestion to them so that they can consider it.

The council and its wholly-owned company, Norwich Regeneration Limited, are also developers. The name we choose for future roads that we might develop is in our control therefore. I will ask that proposals are put forward to celebrate local Black History in the way you suggest as part of this for one of our future developments.”

Question 4

Councillor Bogelein to ask the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing the following question:

“In August, a resident at Ebenezer Place reported human excrement being left in her stairwell - a regular occurrence - and was told that her block would be deep cleaned. Two and a half months later, that deep clean had still not been carried out and it was only through repeated emails and phone calls that it got done. What will it take for the council to make sure that its own housing is properly cleaned at this and other locations?”

Councillor Harris, the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing's response:

"By way of background the technical operations team at Norwich NORSE Environment (NNE) will attend sites to remove faeces (and needles, bodily fluids etc.). They would not provide a deep clean of an area as the service is initially limited to an emergency clean-up service. The NNE operative who attended on this occasion reported that there were no faeces to be found, neither did he find urine or any particular odour. Separately, a request to quote a 'deep clean' for the site was sent to NNE from a housing officer on

25 September. A quote was sent and was subsequently approved on 01 October. As this request was additional to the contractual service it had to be scheduled, with the works being planned for completion within the preceding month and in accordance with normal practice.

For information, Ebenezer Place is not on any contractual cleaning regime (for any service). We did arrange a deep clean of the area as a 'one-off' following discussions with other councillors and residents from the area. This was completed by 29 October 2020. For any new requests NNE have to schedule this into their normal allocated works. In this instance they carried out the deep clean as requested. The invoice for this is covered under a Housing budget. We do however acknowledge there is necessarily a delay from request to completion due to resourcing and work allocation of a one off deep clean. If there had been any residual significant hazard then this would have been prioritised.

In future and for any emergency occurrences the technical operatives will attend and will clean up and disinfect the area as standard. Residents need to continue to report should this and continue to report such requests via the Customer Contact Centre and/or our Out of Hours service."

Supplementary question

In response to Councillor Bogelein's supplementary question the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing said that she was unable to comment further on particular details of the case as she had no access to case notes at the meeting. She would ask officers as to why a letter dated 19 August 2020 took until 25 September 2020 to show on the council's system.

Question 5

Councillor Schmierer to ask the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth the following question:

"Other cities such as Leeds have in the last few years introduced a tall buildings policy which informs their planning decisions.

I am aware that this matter was discussed at the council's sustainable development committee in July, during which it was noted that the director of place was disinclined to take this forward given that Historic England had objected to four proposals for buildings of significant height in Norwich in recent years which he considered sat comfortably with the city's skyline and

street scenes. However, the meeting was also told that “the Secretary of State’s determination on Anglia Square was expected on 7 September and the Planning Inspector’s report would be a useful tool for further discussions with Historic England on how to resolve the issue.”

Interestingly, the Secretary of State's and Planning Inspector's letters in response to Anglia Square both highlight the lack of policy on tall buildings in Norwich. Does the cabinet member agree that having a policy, which gives more clarification on which (if any) and where tall buildings are to be permitted in Norwich, especially in the city centre, would be useful going forward as a planning tool?”

Councillor Stonard, the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth’s response:

“I am aware that some other cities have introduced tall buildings policies and Historic England generally support this. However, I remain to be convinced that this is the correct approach for Norwich. The current local plan policy framework augmented by the City Centre Conservation Appraisal provides a robust and appropriate framework for making decisions on tall buildings in Norwich.

The absence of a specific policy on tall buildings for Norwich did not prevent officers providing a thorough assessment of merits of the tall building proposed for Anglia Square. That analysis was generally commended by the inspector in his report but the secretary of state reached a difference conclusion on the merits. Both the Secretary of State and the planning inspector noted that there was nothing in policy that expressly supported or prevented a tall building at Anglia Square but neither highlighted this as a problem or called for a specific policy to be produced.

My view remains that an approach where more general policy documents provide the tools to evaluate the appropriate height and mass of buildings remains appropriate.

The council is intending to update the City Centre Conservation Area Appraisal in the coming year, subject to sufficient staff resources being available. This will present an opportunity to amend policies relating to building height and views. The observations in the Anglia Square decision letter and inspectors report will be helpful because they contain some points of clarification where the secretary of state and inspector agree, such as on the subject of long range views from St James’ Hill and the legitimacy of tall buildings having a residential use.

A further matter that is also being explored is the potential of acquiring and using a 3D model of the city centre to assist the formulation of policy and decision taking. We are seeking to engage with Historic England on these and other matters.”

Supplementary question

In response to Councillor Schmierer’s supplementary question the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth said that he could not pre-empt the outcome of any review which was scheduled. He emphasised

that both the Secretary of State and the Planning Inspectorate were in agreement that the absence of a tall buildings policy was not relevant to the outcome in relation to Anglia Square.

Question 6

Councillor Osborn to ask the chair of scrutiny committee the following question:

"I would like to ask the chair of the scrutiny committee what his opinion is regarding the decision by the scrutiny committee last month to discontinue the select committee on fly-tipping. The issue of fly-tipping had been raised by a member of the public more than 18 months previously and a select committee had been formed to deal with the issue in response to the member of the public's request. While I am sure that the chair of scrutiny shares my intense disappointment that this effort to find solutions to fly-tipping, which is of great concern to many people in Norwich, has been closed down by the vote to discontinue the select committee, can he comment on what is needed to ensure that the scrutiny committee is able to fulfil its purpose and act in the interests of the people of Norwich, and not just follow the edicts of the administration?"

Councillor Wright, the chair of scrutiny's response:

"Councillor Osborn is right to highlight the scourge of fly-tipping on our communities.

Scrutiny is at its best when it is non-partisan and able to deal with issues that are of concern to members of the public, and I would like to thank all members of the public who get in contact with the committee to suggest topics that we could look into. It is therefore important that we give these requests due consideration.

Ahead of the discontinuation of the select committee at the October meeting of the scrutiny committee, I had been given confirmation by council officers that capacity exists within the council to support a select committee to look at the issue of fly-tipping.

At every meeting of the committee, we look at our work programme, and I would encourage Councillor Osborn to ask the committee to reconsider the decision to discontinue."

Supplementary question

In response to Councillor Osborn's supplementary question the chair of scrutiny said the best way to determine officer resource in relation to a particular item was to raise this as part of the work program item scheduled on the agenda of every meeting of the committee. Questions could then be directed to officers in relation to their capacity.

Question 7

Councillor Price to ask the leader of the council the following question:

“At a council meeting in July 2020, the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth deferred the car free city centre motion until the work around the ‘Liveable City’ as part of the 2040 City Vision had taken place. Councillor Stonard said this strand of the vision was ‘due this coming autumn’. As we are now nearing the end of November, it seemed appropriate to ask for an update.

The cabinet member said that the Liveable City strand of the 2040 City Vision was the place for strategic consideration of this motion in order for the ideas in it to ‘come to fruition’.

Can the cabinet member share with me the work which he said would be done in the autumn as part of the Liveable City strand and demonstrate how the ideas proposed in the motion received proper consideration.”

Councillor Waters, the leader’s response:

“The reason why the motion was deferred, to be considered at a later date, was the requirement to include its aspiration for a car free city centre in the bigger context of a ‘Liveable City’, including carbon reduction, improved air quality and physical changes to the city centre. It requires a high level of partnership working to succeed. Currently some 15 groups are actively engaged as part of the City Vision C-19 Recovery Group. This has met on a regular basis through 2020. The challenge of making the city carbon neutral has been a particular focus of the Norwich Business Leaders Climate Change Group.

Let me give you a flavour of the points arising from that discussion at one of the recent meetings. One of the strong messages was that this is an opportunity to reset, rebuild and design in sustainability – cities and businesses need to lead transition. Social wellbeing needs to be very high on the agenda. There is lots we can do – shortening supply chains, fixing short term goals. Our choices are bound by society so a shift towards a low carbon society cannot happen by individual action alone.

For the December meeting. The discussion on how we become a sustainable city will continue. This will include an update on what organisations are currently doing in regard to the environmental sustainability agenda and relevant data and intelligence to inform the discussion.

The Labour Administration at city hall, as you may recall, published in August our latest five-year environmental strategy, comprising all major campaigns and priorities for the forthcoming period and highlighting recent progress. A new work programme and target to make the city council's operational carbon emissions net zero by 2030 are among the pathways introduced within the strategy to continue the council's positive trend of environmental improvement. The strategy will build on a string of recent successes for the city council, which have been recognised by a number of awards and recommendations over recent years. These include the RIBA Stirling Prize and Edie Carbon Reduction Award in 2019 and a shortlisting for the Global Good Awards in 2020. The city council has also recently been recognised as one of the top performing councils in the country by

Friends of the Earth, for our response to the climate change emergency.

Our successful 'Towns Deal' Bid, includes urban regeneration of the public realm – with planned investment to enhance the city centre public and urban spaces and improve connectivity and navigation.

Not forgetting the positive announcement of £32m government funding of the Transforming Cities Fund programme providing a total of £58m further worth of sustainable transport investment over the next 4 years.

This I hope will provide you with the assurances you require.”

Supplementary question

In response to Councillor Price's supplementary question the leader of the council said the point was made by the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth when the original motion was discussed. The action 'a car free city' required a broad range of partners who were the users of the city centre to be on-board if it were to be successfully achieved. Considering the question within the broader landscape of the Norwich 2040 vision showed the council's commitment to achieving with its partners the broader objective of a truly Liveable City.

Question 8

Councillor Carlo to ask the leader of the council the following question:

“The scrutiny committee encourages Norwich citizens to submit issues they are concerned about for the committee's consideration. Two recent topics submitted have been short stay lettings and fly-tipping. The cabinet rejected Scrutiny's recommendations on short stay lettings on the grounds that the council doesn't have the necessary resources, but moreover, that the cabinet didn't consider it to be an issue of general importance. The work of the task and finish group and officers was wasted and the citizen's hopes dashed that something would be done about the rising number of short stay lettings in the city centre. Thereafter, ruling party members on the scrutiny committee voted to postpone an investigation of fly-tipping on grounds of limited resources during Covid-19 despite the offer of several committee members to form a task and finish group, conduct research and write a report, with support agreed by officers. What message does the council's attitude send to Norwich citizens about whether this council takes their concerns seriously?”

Councillor Waters, the leader's response:

“Councillor Carlo, we all have particular interests that we wish to pursue as councillors, one of your interests is short stay lettings. The Cabinet carefully considered the recommendations of the working party set up by Scrutiny, but decided that this was not a priority for already fully committed resources. There are just under 500 properties in Norwich listed on Air BnB that is less than 1% of our total stock. By contrast, the private sector housing motion passed by council in September of this year, supported by you and other members of the Green Group, is aimed at supporting and

protecting the 25% of Norwich residents who live in the private rented sector. This is a group who have insecure tenure, often live in poor quality accommodation and can be subject to irresponsible and exploitative landlords. Our private sector housing team are fully focused on addressing these issues.

On the issue of fly-tipping, significant resource has already been expended in responding to this problem which has been the subject of previous questions and answers in council. The recent interest by the Green Group in fly tipping was linked, to a motion about providing communal skips. These have been tried before, and they were popular, but the contents of every community skip ended up as landfill at a significant cost to the council. While data is showing that fly tipping is declining in the city, it remains a problem that requires Government to provide additional funding to councils, and a model built around the circular economy that includes giving end-of-life- manufacture and packaging a central place.

It is, I think, a misrepresentation of councillors who sit on the scrutiny committee and Cabinet to suggest that they are ignoring important issues. Fly-tipping and Airbnb/ short stay lettings are important but they necessarily have to compete, particularly at a time of national emergency and extreme pressure on budgets against other priorities. These are contained in Recovery Plan approved by council in June.

From regularly attending scrutiny committee I am aware that most councillors actually have priorities similar to that of their constituents which have enabled significant and valuable work to be undertaken in recent years around investigating such topics including homelessness, the gig economy, food poverty, social security, County Lines and other matters particularly pertaining to Norwich. On many important issues there is evidence of cross party agreement and the spirit of independent scrutiny. This has helped inform the work of cabinet in shaping council policy.”

Supplementary question

In response to Councillor Carlo’s supplementary question the leader of the council said her prognosis was gloomy. Scrutiny committee had addressed many important issues. The recommendations which were made by the committee were considered carefully by the cabinet but work had to be prioritised when resources were limited. If she considered the figures in his original response which compared the work of the council to address standards in the Private Rented Sector a piece of work for which there had been cross party agreement then it was clear that area had to be prioritised. The work conducted by the scrutiny committee was valued it had identified the issues, the scale of the problem and enabled a decision to be made. A piece of work in this area in future was not ruled out if capacity allowed. .

Question 9

Councillor Erin Fulton-McAlister to ask the cabinet member for resources the following question:

“In recent years we have witnessed several attempts by this government to make voting harder, with examples such as the introduction of Individual Electoral Registration, coming imposition of photographic identification and other measures which I believe are designed to suppress turnout. As we hopefully begin to come out of this awful pandemic next year I remain

concerned that electors will be worried about voting at the polling station and for our staff and volunteers who oversee and ensure the democratic process is upheld. Can the cabinet member for resources comment on the recent campaign, led by this council, to encourage residents to vote using a safe, secure and simple postal vote?"

Councillor Kendrick, the cabinet member for resources' response:

"Voting by post is a safe and secure way of voting. The electoral registration officer for Norwich is writing to all residents in the city who don't currently have a postal vote. This letter will include a postal vote application and a return envelope.

Doing this now, also means that it mitigates any additional pressure on the elections team from having to process lots of potential new applications closer to the postal vote deadline in April.

However for those residents who do not choose to vote by post, they can be confident that polling stations will be as safe an environment as can be to vote and the returning officer is hard at work ensuring that all venues are ready for the elections on 6 May. The council will publicising its preparations to residents in the coming months."

Question 10

Councillor Ryan to ask the leader of the council the following question:

"I was particularly pleased to hear that thanks to our hard work and leadership we have received confirmation that we will receive £25m from government from our Norwich Town's Deal. Can the leader comment on the difference this capital funding will make towards further enhancing our city?"

Councillor Waters, the leader's response:

"Thank you for your question Councillor Ryan.

The importance of our successful bid is a significant investment towards transformative regeneration and economic recovery in line with the objectives set out in the Norwich 2040 Vision and the council's Economic Strategy. For ease of reference I have included a summary of the eight projects grouped in two themes (skills and enterprise infrastructure and urban regeneration).

This is a significant achievement and an example of what partnership working can deliver for the city as part of the Norwich 2040 Vision."

Skills and enterprise infrastructure

This package of projects supports how we will grow the digital and creative economy and ensure our residents and businesses have the advanced skills in digital, construction and engineering they need to prosper.

- **Digital hub** – a new city centre workspace with start-up and grow on space for digital businesses.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Halls – investment to update and refurbish the venue including the development of a state-of-the-art making space for collaboration and high value cross sector partnerships between culture, digital and tech.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Digi-tech factory – a new skills facility providing digital tech, engineering and design courses.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advanced construction and engineering centre – a new technological advanced training facility, supporting the application of digital technology to construction, manufacturing and engineering sectors.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban regeneration These projects offer opportunities for significant levels of housing growth and employment space creation to accommodate the needs of a growing city.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Norwich – investment to accelerate the development of a new high-quality urban quarter in east Norwich.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revolving fund – investment to unlock brownfield sites to deliver modern homes and workspaces for the growing economy.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public realm – investment to enhance the city centre public and urban spaces and improve connectivity and navigation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Branding – communicating what the city has to offer by developing a commercial proposition for Norwich as the place for business and a city to live, learn and invest in.

Question 11

Councillor Mike Sands to ask the leader of the council the following question:

“I still remember during the onset of this pandemic the government told councils that they would be fully compensated for the financial impacts of Covid-19. This council undertook significant work, together with partners, to protect our citizens and businesses during this national emergency. Yet eight months later, as we move through our second national lockdown, our council is being forced to take nearly £4m out of the budget which could risk the vital services so crucial to the wellbeing of our communities. Will the Leader again make the case to government for them to honour their pledge but also launch a campaign to save our city services so that the public and our partners recognise the risks these further central government cuts pose to Norwich?”

Councillor Waters, the leader’s response:

“Councillor Sands, thank you for your timely question. It suggests that austerity for local government is set to continue, despite the Government’s reliance on local government to be its most reliable partner, alongside the NHS in tackling the pandemic. We should live in hope that the Chancellor, on Wednesday, will make good the funding shortfall in meeting the costs of COVID that Robert Jenrick promised local councils in the Spring. That sum now stands at £4 billion. A modest sum compared to the funding that has gone to private contractors who have had less than a stellar record in running a national programme of trace and test. If Government continues to fail local communities by putting vital services in

jeopardy at a time of national crisis then we will have to continue and redouble our efforts to get a fair deal for the citizens of Norwich. Why should they be punished.”

Question 12

Councillor Maxwell to ask the cabinet member for health and wellbeing the following question:

“In a year where my constituents and our city have certainly appreciated Norwich’s parks more than ever before, I was particularly proud that two of the city’s green spaces, Mousehold Heath and Eaton Park have been recognised with national Green Flag awards. Will the cabinet member for health and wellbeing congratulate the staff and volunteers who have worked so hard to deliver these real victories and commit to our future plans to further enhance, protect and expand our treasured open and green spaces?”

Councillor Packer, the cabinet member for health and wellbeing’s response:

“Thank you for your question Councillor Maxwell a very timely one, when we are yet again seeing the importance of public green space to the mental and physical wellbeing of the city’s residents as we go through a second lockdown.

The parks and open spaces have provided an uninterrupted service, an essential service, since 23 March 2020. We have always been clear about our commitment to the provision of accessible quality green space for our residents prior to covid. The current situation has shown exactly why this is so important.

The Green Flag Award scheme recognises and rewards well managed parks and green spaces. It sets the benchmark standard for the management of recreational outdoor spaces across the United Kingdom and around the world.

So I am very proud to see that Eaton Park retained its Green Flag for the 6th year in a row, and that Mousehold Heath, managed by the Mousehold Heath Conservators, and chaired by your good self also achieved this prestigious award.

Waterloo Park narrowly missed out on an award this year however, it should in no way detract from all the good work done by the Friends of Waterloo Park with officers. To be in a position to submit a management plan and application by the deadline was in itself an achievement. I have every confidence that officers working collaboratively with the ‘friends’ will be successful next time. I also hope that working with local communities further sites can achieve the award in the future.

Since 2008, the impact of austerity measures on the economy; the ongoing reduction in central government funding; and now a pandemic has made maintaining the provision of the city’s parks and open spaces challenging to say the least. To get through challenging times successfully requires a collective effort. People working together towards common goals. And hard

work. Maintaining provision, and in many cases improving it throughout that period, has only been possible because of a collective effort.

On 14 October we lit city hall up green as part of a national initiative to recognise the work of everyone involved in the delivery of the nation's green spaces during the pandemic. I would like to take this opportunity to personally thank all the council's officers, every volunteer and our partners at NorwichNorse Environmental and NPS Norwich who have been involved in looking after and improving the spaces we treasure in this fine city"

Supplementary question

In response to Councillor Maxwell's supplementary question the cabinet member for health and wellbeing agreed that the council was committed to making all parks and gardens available for the benefit and use of the residents of Norwich.

Question 13

Councillor McCartney-Gray to ask the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment the following question:

"I was pleased to learn that thanks to the tremendous efforts of our housing services between 27 March and 31 July over 120 individuals were housed in emergency accommodation, following government instructions to all local authorities to get 'everyone in'. Our record and rightful prioritisation of homelessness services for decades allowed us the capacity and skills to significantly deliver on this issue. Indeed, a vast majority of those people housed in temporary accommodation during the height of the pandemic have now been settled into more permanent accommodation, as is the aim of all our work with rough sleepers. The government, at present, has not issued an order to get 'everyone in' yet the public health situation is the same, if not worse than March. Does the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment know why the Government has not repeated their instruction to get everyone in so that they have a safe place to stay this winter, and in the absence of this can he update council on the good work we are undertaking to provide housing support to homeless people in our city?"

Councillor Maguire, the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment's response:

"While we have no understanding of why the government has chosen not to reintroduce 'Everybody In', I can confirm that money has been made available to ensure that we capitalise on the COVID action and do everything in our power to help rough sleepers come permanently off the streets.

To achieve this, from 01 December, we are seeking to replicate the success of 'Everybody In' through the provision of nightly accommodation for rough sleepers through this winter.

Working with our partners at St Martins, each rough sleeper will be provided with a bed in their own self-contained room on a nightly basis to keep them off the streets. The accommodation will be 'Covid safe', with each client taking a Covid assessment and temperature test prior to placement. We

have arranged for staff to be on hand overnight to address any issues which may arise and food will be provided through our partners at The Arc and The Feed.

We will use the opportunity to engage with clients and intensive, specialist support will be provided. Our rough sleeper co-ordinator will manage a weekly case meeting with providers and support agencies to seek bespoke accommodation solutions for each client. In this way we hope to repeat the successes of 'Everybody In', where 95% of rough sleepers that we helped were ultimately assisted to move on into settled accommodation.

Looking ahead, funding has been secured to improve our Housing First offer for rough sleepers and, through Pathways Norwich, employ resettlement workers to provide high intensity care for our clients with complex support needs. Through these means, we seek to break the cycle of homelessness for entrenched rough sleepers.

The steps that we are taking in Norwich to build on what has already been achieved demonstrate our ongoing commitment and determination, and that of our partners, to stem the tide of rough sleeping, provide sustainable solutions and deliver the best possible services to vulnerable clients in the city."

Appendix B

Lord Mayor's Announcements

- | | | |
|-----|-------------------|---|
| 1) | 29 September 2020 | Met with Lord Lieutenant of Norfolk |
| 2) | 9 October 2020 | Q&A with Lakenham Junior School via Zoom |
| 3) | 10 October 2020 | Edith Cavell Commemorative Service outside Norwich Cathedral |
| 4) | 21 October 2020 | Launched 'Mince Pies with Meaning at The Feed |
| 5) | 22 October 2020 | Marked 100 years of Council Housing at Collins Court, Angel Road |
| 6) | 22 October 2020 | Time Norfolk Service at Norwich Cathedral for those who have experienced miscarriage or loss of a baby |
| 7) | 23 October 2020 | Open Original Charity Christmas Card Shop in Peter Mancroft Church |
| 8) | 25 October 2020 | Dedication of the Garden of Remembrance outside Norwich Cathedral |
| 9) | 27 October 2020 | Q & A session via Zoom with the Charity, Opening Doors |
| 10) | 8 November 2020 | Remembrance Service at the War Memorial in front of City Hall |
| 11) | 11 November 2020 | Armistice Service outside adjacent to St Peter Mancroft Church |
| 12) | 15 November 2020 | Attended launch of the Food Bank at the Norwich Central Mosque [Feeding over 30 families from the wider community. Outside] |
| 13) | 19 November 2020 | Attended AGM of Norfolk & Norwich Assn for the Blind via Zoom [now called Vision Norfolk] |

Report to Council
26 January 2021
Report of Interim Director of resources (S.151 officer)
Subject Treasury Management Mid-Year Review Report 2020/21

Item

6

Purpose

To consider the Treasury Management performance for the first six months of the financial year to 30 September 2020.

Recommendation

To:

- 1) note the contents of the report and the treasury activity undertaken in the first six months of the 2020/21 financial year; and
- 2) approve an increase in the approved counterparty limit with an individual Money Market Fund (MMF from £5m to £10m but remaining within the existing £25m maximum for that type of financial instrument (paragraph 11).

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority of providing a healthy organisation.

Financial implications

The report details the performance of the Council in managing its borrowing and investment resources during the first half of 2020/21.

Ward/s: All Wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Kendrick - Resources

Contact officers

Annabel Scholes, Interim Director of Resources (S.151)	01603 989201
Hannah Simpson, Strategic Finance Business Partner	01603 989569
Caroline Knott, Senior Technical Accountant	01603 987615

Background documents

None

Report

Background

1. CIPFA (the Chartered Institute of Public Finance & Accountancy) defines treasury management as: “The management of the local authority’s borrowing, investments and cash flows, its banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks.”
2. The report reviews the treasury management activity during the first six months of the financial year 2020/21 and reports on the prudential indicators as required by CIPFA’s Treasury Management Code of Practice.
3. The original Treasury Management Strategy (TMS) and Prudential Indicators were reported to and approved by Council on 25 February 2020.
4. This Council has adopted the CIPFA Code of Practice for Treasury Management in the Public Sector and operates its treasury management service in compliance with this Code. This requires that the prime objective of treasury management activity is the effective management of risk, and that borrowing activities are undertaken on a prudent, affordable and sustainable basis.
5. The council’s investments in commercial property, equity shares, and lending to third parties are classified as non-financial (commercial) investments and are reviewed annually within the non-financial (commercial) investments strategy part of the budget report in February.

Investment Strategy

6. The TMS for 2020/21, which includes the Annual Investment Strategy, was approved by the council on 25 February 2020. It sets out the Council’s investment priorities as being:
 - Security of capital;
 - Liquidity; and
 - Yield
7. No policy changes have been made to the investment strategy, the Council will continue to aim to achieve the optimum return (yield) on investments commensurate with proper levels of security and liquidity.
8. The Council held £57.550m of investments as at 30 September 2020. Table 1 below shows the movement in investments for the first six months of the year.

Table 1

Investments	Actual		Actual
	31-Mar-20	Movement	30-Sep-20
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Short term investments:			
Banks	4,000	4,000	8,000
Building Societies	0	5,000	5,000
Local Authorities	10,000	(5,000)	5,000
Cash Equivalents:			
Banks	11,300	8,250	19,550
Non- UK Banks	0	0	0
Building Societies	0	0	0
Local Authorities	4,000	1,000	5,000
UK Government	0	0	0
Money Market Funds	15,000	0	15,000
Total	44,300	13,250	57,550

9. It is anticipated that cash balances will decrease during the second half of the year as Covid-19 business grants being administered by the council will be paid out and further capital expenditure is incurred.
10. Market rates have fallen since the pandemic across all types of investments and the Debt Management Account Deposit Facility (DMADF) is now charging local authorities to hold cash. The Council still aims to place surplus cash in investments with the most beneficial return bearing in mind the need to maintain security and liquidity.
11. In order to provide additional flexibility when holding short term cash, the report recommends increasing the approved counterparty limit within each of the Money Market Funds (MMF) in the Treasury Management Strategy Statement from £5m to £10m (see revised table in **Appendix A**). The MMF are designed to support local authorities' cash management. Each MMF allows the council to keep cash both liquid (instant access) and secure (AAA rated) whilst offering a small return on the investment. This will help cash management at a time where the council is receiving and paying out significant amounts of cash in relation to business grants and other Covid support mechanisms.
12. The Interim Director of Resources (S.151 officer) confirms that all investment transactions undertaken during the first six months of 2020/21 were within the approved limits as laid out in the Annual Investment Strategy.

BALANCE SHEET POSITION

External Borrowing

13. Table 2 below shows the Council has actual external borrowing of £219.879m, of which £179.590m relates the Housing Revenue Account (HRA). No additional borrowing has been required in the first six months of the year.

14. Table 2 shows the current and forecast borrowing position. At this stage there is not expected to be any further external borrowing taken for the remainder of the financial year. This is significantly below the estimate included in the TMS due to a halt in the planned commercial property acquisitions. This decision was taken in March 2020 in light of the launch of HM Treasury's consultation on the borrowing terms of the public works loan board.

Table 2

	Actual	Actual	TMS Forecast	Revised Estimate
Long Term Borrowing	31-Mar-20	30-Sep-20	31-Mar-21	31-Mar-21
	£000	£000	£000	£000
Public Works Loan Board	214,107	214,107	287,431	214,107
Money Market	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
3% Stock (Perpetually irredeemable)	499	499	499	499
Other financial intermediaries (Salix)	262	262	0	236
Corporate Bonds and External Mortgages	11	11	11	11
Total	219,879	219,879	292,941	219,853

15. There have been no repayments of debt scheduled during 2020/21.

Future Economic forecasts

16. On 4th November the Bank of England's **Monetary Policy Committee (MPC)** voted unanimously to keep Bank Rate unchanged at 0.1%. The report from the MPC highlighted the following:
- The unemployment rate rose to 4.5% in the three months to August. The extended Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme and new Job Support Scheme will mitigate significantly the impact of weaker economic activity on the labour market. The unemployment rate is expected to peak at around 7¾% in 2021 Q2.
 - Twelve-month CPI inflation increased to 0.5% in September, but remained well below the MPC's 2% target, largely reflecting the direct and indirect effects of Covid on the economy. CPI inflation is expected to remain at, or just above, 0.5% during most of the winter, before rising quite sharply towards the target as the effects of lower energy prices and VAT dissipate.
 - At this meeting, the MPC judges that a further easing of monetary policy is warranted. The Committee agreed to increase the target stock of purchased UK government bonds by an additional £150 billion in order to meet the inflation target in the medium term, taking the total stock of government bond purchases to £875 billion.
 - The outlook for the economy remains unusually uncertain. It depends on the evolution of the pandemic and measures taken to protect public health, as well as the nature of, and transition to, the new trading arrangements between the European Union and the United Kingdom. It also depends on the responses of households, businesses and financial markets to these developments.

17. Overall, the pace of recovery is not expected to be in the form of a rapid V shape, but a more elongated and prolonged one after a sharp recovery. The November MPC report noted that GDP fell by around a quarter between February and April. Activity recovered somewhat thereafter, as lockdown restrictions were eased. GDP was 9% below its 2019 Q4 level in August, and is expected to be 9% lower over Q3 as a whole.
18. There will be some painful longer term adjustments as e.g. office space and travel by planes, trains and buses may not recover to their previous level of use for several years, or possibly ever. There is also likely to be a reversal of globalisation as this crisis has shown up how vulnerable long-distance supply chains are. On the other hand, digital services is one area that has already seen huge growth.
19. The Bank's policy statement says "it does not intend to tighten monetary policy until there is clear evidence that significant progress is being made in eliminating spare capacity and achieving the 2% target sustainably". The council's treasury advisors note that this seems designed to say that even if inflation rises to 2% in a couple of years' time, do not expect any action from the MPC to raise Bank Rate – until they can clearly see that level of inflation is going to be persistently above target if it takes no action to raise Bank Rate.
20. The **Financial Policy Committee** (FPC) report on 6th August revised down their expected credit losses for the banking sector to "somewhat less than £80bn". It stated that in its assessment "banks have buffers of capital more than sufficient to absorb the losses that are likely to arise under the MPC's central projection". The FPC stated that for real stress in the sector, the economic output would need to be twice as bad as the MPC's projection, with unemployment rising to above 15%.

Interest rate forecasts

21. Table 3 below shows the interest rate forecasts from our treasury advisors through to March 2024. The coronavirus outbreak has done huge economic damage to the UK and economies around the world. After the Bank of England took emergency action in March to cut Bank Rate to first 0.25%, and then to 0.10%, it left Bank Rate unchanged at its meeting on 4th November. Some forecasters had suggested that a cut into negative territory could happen. However, the Governor of the Bank of England has made it clear that he currently thinks that such a move would do more damage than good and that more quantitative easing is the favoured tool if further action becomes necessary. As shown in the forecast table above, no increase in Bank Rate is expected within the forecast horizon ending on 31st March 2024 as economic recovery is expected to be only gradual and, therefore, prolonged.

Table 3

Link Group Interest Rate View 9.11.20														
These Link forecasts have been amended for the reduction in PWLB margins by 1.0% from 26.11.20														
	Dec-20	Mar-21	Jun-21	Sep-21	Dec-21	Mar-22	Jun-22	Sep-22	Dec-22	Mar-23	Jun-23	Sep-23	Dec-23	Mar-24
BANK RATE	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
3 month ave earnings	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
6 month ave earnings	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10
12 month ave earnings	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20
5 yr PWLB	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.80	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
10 yr PWLB	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
25 yr PWLB	1.50	1.50	1.60	1.60	1.60	1.60	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.80	1.80	1.80	1.80
50 yr PWLB	1.30	1.30	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.50	1.60	1.60	1.60	1.60

Note: The Council's treasury advisor, Link Group assist the Council to formulate a view on interest rates. Following the conclusion of the review of PWLB margins over gilt yields on 25.11.20, all forecasts below have been reduced by 1%. These are forecasts for certainty rates, gilt yields plus 80bps:

PWLB Rates

22. HM Treasury imposed two changes of margins over gilt yields for PWLB rates in 2019-20 without any prior warning. The first took place on 9th October 2019, adding an additional 1% margin over gilts to all PWLB period rates. That increase was then at least partially reversed for some forms of borrowing on 11th March 2020, but not for mainstream General Fund capital schemes, at the same time as the Government announced in the Budget a programme of increased infrastructure expenditure. At the same time it also launched a consultation with local authorities on possibly further amending these margins.
23. As part of the Spending Review announcement, the government has confirmed that it will reform the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) lending terms, ending the use of the PWLB for investment property bought primarily for yield. Alongside the Spending Review, the Government has published revised lending terms for the PWLB and guidance to support local authorities to determine if a proposed project is an appropriate use of PWLB loans. The new terms apply to all loans arranged from 26 November 2020.
24. In response to the revised lending terms the Government has cut PWLB lending rates to gilts + 100 base points for Standard Rate and gilts + 80 base points for those authorities able to make use of the Certainty Rate.
25. The Council has previously relied on the PWLB as its main source of funding and will consider the newly released guidance in detail to inform decisions over future capital projects.
26. As the interest forecast table for PWLB certainty rates, above shows, there is likely to be little upward movement in PWLB rates over the next two years as it will take economies, including the UK, a prolonged period to recover all the momentum they have lost in the sharp recession caused during the coronavirus shut down period. Inflation is also likely to be very low during this period and could even turn negative in some major western economies during 2020/21.
27. The overall balance of risks to economic growth in the UK is probably relatively even, but is subject to major uncertainty due to the virus.

28. There is relatively little UK domestic risk of increases or decreases in Bank Rate and significant changes in shorter term PWLB rates. The Bank of England has effectively ruled out the use of negative interest rates in the near term and increases in Bank Rate are likely to be some years away given the underlying economic expectations. However, it is always possible that safe haven flows, due to unexpected domestic developments and those in other major economies, could impact gilt yields, (and so PWLB rates), in the UK.

Forward borrowing considerations to mitigate expected future interest rate increases

29. The Council may look to arrange forward borrowing facilities should the future borrowing risk rise or predictions of a significant rate rise is expected. This would enable the Council to lock into borrowing facilities at current low rates and draw down the cash over a period of up to 3 years subject to cash flow demands. It should be noted that some of these facilities may carry brokerage and arrangement fees that will be factored into value for money assessments.

Debt Rescheduling

30. No debt rescheduling was undertaken during the first six months of 2020/21.
31. It is not anticipated that the Council will undertake any rescheduling activity during the remainder of the financial year. However, should borrowing rates fall significantly as a result of Brexit, the Council may consider borrowing to finance its unfinanced borrowing need as well as rescheduling some of its existing debt if this proves cost effective.

Prudential Indicators

32. This part of the report is structured to provide an update on:
- The changes to the Council's capital expenditure plans;
 - How these plans are being financed;
 - The impact of changes in the capital expenditure plans on the prudential indicators and the underlying need to borrow; and
 - Compliance with the limits in place for borrowing.

Capital Expenditure & Financing

33. The 2020/21 capital programme budgets were approved as part of the budget papers by full Council on 25 February 2020. Subsequent to this there were approved revisions to the capital budgets to include the 2019/20 capital carry forwards and new capital schemes approved during the year. The current capital programme budget is shown in Table 4 along with the mid-year estimate. A detailed breakdown of capital programme schemes can be found in the Quarter 2 budget monitoring report.

Table 4

	2020/21 Original Budget	2020/21 Revised Budget	2020/21 Forecast Outturn
	£000	£000	£000
General Fund capital expenditure	30,727	36,563	8,007
General Fund capital loans	5,700	6,990	6,990
HRA	34,816	48,348	28,689
Capital Expenditure	71,244	91,901	43,686
Financed by:			
Capital receipts	17,438	16,905	6,682
Capital grant and contributions	4,422	5,361	2,956
Capital & earmarked reserves	15,394	23,864	20,592
Revenue	3,291	13,733	6,150
Total Resources	40,544	59,864	36,380
Net borrowing need for the year	30,700	32,037	7,306

34. Table 4 above shows how the revised capital programme will be financed and shows a significant reduction in the net borrowing need for the year compared to the figure anticipated when Council approved the Treasury Management Strategy. The main reason for the reduced borrowing need for the year is the halt in the planned commercial property acquisitions pending the outcome of the HM Treasury consultation on the borrowing terms of the public works loan board.
35. In addition to the approved capital programme, the TMS incorporated a number of capital ambition schemes and non-financial investments (commercial lending). Significant delays as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic mean that it's not currently forecast that these schemes will incur spend in 2020/21. The consequence of this is that the Council's forecast Capital Financing Requirement (CFR) for 2020/21 shown in Table 5, is lower than initially anticipated.
36. The forecast net lending to the council's wholly owned subsidiary, Norwich Regeneration Limited, has also reduced from the Treasury Management Strategy. During the first 6 months of the year the Council provided additional loan finance to the company of £2.250m with further loans of £3.6m in October 2020. No further loan drawdowns are expected and based on current cash flow projections for the company £1.650m will be repaid by the company before the year end. The impact of this on the CFR is shown in Table 5.

The Capital Financing Requirement

37. Table 5 below shows the Council's CFR, which is the underlying external need to borrow for a capital purpose. The second table compares the original and revised forecast debt position against the CFR, the difference representing an under borrowing position. This under borrowed position means the capital

borrowing need (the CFR) has not been fully funded with loan debt. Instead cash in hand supporting the Council's reserves, balances, and expenditure has been used as an alternative temporary measure. This strategy is prudent in the current economic climate - as returns achievable from the investment of cash are lower than the cost of raising additional loan debt, and counterparty risk remains elevated – but this will need to be reversed over time when the original requirement for that cash arrives.

Table 5

	2020/21 Original Estimate	2020/21 Revised Estimate
	£000	£000
Opening General Fund CFR	125,099	115,511
Movement in General Fund CFR	37,722	6,027
Closing General Fund CFR	162,821	121,538
<i>Movement in CFR represented by:</i>		
Borrowing need (capital programme)	25,000	47
Borrowing need (NRL lending net of repayments)	5,700	4,200
Borrowing need (NCSL lending net of repayments)		1,140
Borrowing need (Project Place capital investment)		268
Borrowing need for the year (capital ambition)	8,500	0
Appropriation of Mile Cross Depot site to HRA		(1,800)
Less MRP and other financing adj.	(1,478)	522
Movement in General Fund CFR	37,722	6,027
Opening HRA Fund CFR	205,717	205,716
Movement in HRA CFR	7,206	1,800
Closing HRA CFR	212,923	207,516
TOTAL CFR	375,744	329,054

38. The council has maintained an under-borrowed position to date in 2020/21 (Table 6). This means that the capital borrowing need has not been fully funded with loan debt as cash supporting the council's reserves, balances and cash flow has been used as a temporary measure. It is likely that the Council will need to undertake fixed rate long term borrowing during 2021/22. Any decisions will be reported to Cabinet at the next scheduled opportunity.

Table 6

	2020/21 Original Estimate	2020/21 Revised Estimate
	£000	£000
Gross borrowing (excluding finance leases)	292,941	219,853
CFR	375,744	329,054
Over/(Under) Borrowing	(82,803)	(109,201)

Prudential Indicators relating to Borrowing Activity

39. **Authorised Limit** – This represents the legal limit beyond which borrowing is prohibited, and needs to be set and revised by Council. It reflects the level of external borrowing which, while not desired, could be afforded in the short term, but is not sustainable in the longer term. The limit represents the CFR (assumed fully funded by borrowing) plus a margin to accommodate any unplanned adverse cash flow movements. This is the statutory limit determined under section 3 (1) of the Local Government Act 2003. The authorised limit has not been breached and no external borrowing has taken place so far this year.

Table 7

Prudential Indicator	2020/21
	£000
Authorised Limit for external debt	405,744

40. **Operational Boundary** – This indicator is based on the probable external debt during the course of the year; it is set deliberately lower than the authorised limit. This limit acts as an early warning indicator should borrowing be approaching the Authorised Limit. This limit may be breached on occasion under normal circumstances, but sustained or regular breaches should trigger a review of borrowing levels. The operational boundary has not been breached and no external borrowing has taken place so far this year.

Table 8

Prudential Indicator	2020/21
	£000
Operational boundary for external debt	375,744

Borrowing Activity

41. Due to the increase in PWLB rates in October 2019, and the subsequent consultation by HM Treasury the Authority has continued the prudent approach of utilising internal borrowing to fund its borrowing requirement and reduce external borrowing costs.
42. Long-term fixed interest rates are currently low but are expected to rise slightly over the five-year treasury management planning period. The Interim Director of Resources (S.151 Officer), under delegated powers, will take the most appropriate form of borrowing depending on the prevailing interest rates or opportunities at the time, taking into account the associated risks e.g. counterparty risk, cost of carry and impact on the Medium Term Financial Strategy as well as risk of interest rate increases.
43. Opportunities for debt restructuring will be continually monitored alongside interest rate forecasts. Action will be taken when the Interim Director of Resources (S.151 officer) feels it is most advantageous.

Investment Performance

44. The objectives of the Council's investment strategy are firstly the safeguarding of the repayment of the principal and interest of its investments, and secondly ensuring adequate liquidity. The investment returns being a third objective, consummate to achieving the first two.
45. The Council held £57.550m of financial investments at 30th September 2020 and the investment profile is shown in table 1 in paragraph 8 above.

Risk Benchmarking

46. The Investment Strategy for 2020/21 includes the following benchmarks for liquidity and security.
47. **Liquidity** – The Council has no formal overdraft facility and seeks to maintain liquid short-term deposits of at least £1 million available with a week's notice.
48. Average return on investment at 30 September 2020 was 0.28% against a 7 Day LIBID benchmark average rate of -0.06% (minus). The weighted time to maturity (WAM) of investments was 26 days compared to 40 days on 30 September 2019. The slight decrease in WAM duration reflects a slightly cautious approach in holding liquid cash given the uncertainty over cash flows during the covid-19 pandemic. This has meant cash has been invested for slightly shorter periods whilst still ensuring availability for all cash flow requirements. At 30 September 2020 the Council held £57.550m of cash balances, all of which are invested for periods of less than 364 days.
49. The Interim Director of Resources (S.151 officer) can report that liquidity arrangements were adequate during the year to date.
50. **Security** – The weighted average credit risk of the portfolio at the end of the period was 3.26% (3.84% September 2019). The Council's maximum security risk benchmark for the portfolio as at 30 September 2020 was 0.005% which equates to a potential loss of £2.9k on an investment portfolio of £57.550m. This credit risk indicator is lower than the anticipated maximum risk of 0.011% in the TMS.
51. At 30 September 2020 100% of the investment portfolio was held in low risk specified investments.
52. The Interim Director of Resources (S.151 officer) can report that the investment portfolio was maintained within this overall benchmark during the year to date.

Minimum Revenue Provision Policy

53. The Council is required to approve an MRP Statement in advance of each year. Council approved the 2020/21 on 25 February 2020.

REGULATORY UPDATE

Proposed changes to IFRS 16 Leases and likely impacts for the Local Authority Accounting Code.

54. Although the standard was issued in January 2012, authorities are expected to comply from 1 April 2022. The current classification of leases into operating and finance will no longer apply with the exceptions of leases of 12 months or less and leases of low value. This change will therefore impact the Council's CFR, but have no borrowing impact. A lot will depend on the evaluation of contracts and their implications. The potential impacts of the new standard will be covered in the 2021/22 Treasury Management Strategy.

Proposed counter-party limit amendment

Counterparty/Financial instrument	Minimum Credit Criteria or Equivalent	Specified Investments		Non-specified Investments	
		Maximum duration	Counterparty Limit (£m)	Maximum duration	Counterparty Limit (£m)
DMAF - UK Government	n/a	3 months	£30m	n/a	n/a
UK Government gilts	UK Sovereign rating	12 months	£15m	3 years	£5m
UK Government Treasury bills	UK Sovereign rating	6 months	£10m	n/a	n/a
Money Market Funds - CNAV	AAA	Liquid	£5m £10m per fund £25m overall limit	n/a	n/a
Money MARKET Funds - LVNAV	AAA			n/a	n/a
Money Market Funds - VNAV*	AAA			n/a	n/a
UK Local Authority term deposits (LA)**	n/a	12 months	£10m per LA	5 years	£5m per LA
Term Deposits with UK Building Societies	ratings for banks outlined below / Asset worth at least £2.5bn or both	12 months	£5m	n/a	n/a
Banks (Term deposits, CD, Call & Notice accounts)	AAA	12 months	£15m	2 years	£10m
Banks (Term deposits, CD, Call & Notice accounts)	AA+	12 months	£15m	12 months	£5m
	AA				
Banks (Term deposits, CD, Call & Notice accounts)	AA-	12 months	£10m	n/a	n/a
	A+				
	A				
Banks (Term deposits, CD, Call & Notice accounts)	A-	6 months	£5m	n/a	n/a
Property Funds	credit loss analysis, financial and legal due diligence	n/a	n/a	n/a	£5m per fund
Loan Capital and other third party loans including parish councils	Subject to financial & legal due diligence	considered on individual basis	n/a	considered on individual basis	n/a

Integrated impact assessment



NORWICH
City Council

Report author to complete

Committee:	Council
Committee date:	26/01/2021
Director / Head of service	Annabel Scholes
Report subject:	Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy Mid-year Review Report 2020/21
Date assessed:	03/12/2020

	Impact			
Economic (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Finance (value for money)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The prudential indicators show that for the first six months of the year treasury management activity has produced positive results e.g. achieving an investment interest rate above the target.
Other departments and services e.g. office facilities, customer contact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ICT services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Economic development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Financial inclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Social (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Safeguarding children and adults	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<u>S17 crime and disorder act 1998</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Human Rights Act 1998	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Health and well being	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Impact			
Equality and diversity (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Relations between groups (cohesion)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Eliminating discrimination & harassment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Advancing equality of opportunity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Environmental (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Natural and built environment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Waste minimisation & resource use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Pollution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sustainable procurement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Energy and climate change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(Please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments

	Impact			
Risk management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Managing risk is a major part of undertaking the treasury management activity. All the indicators and limits put in place to reduce the level of risk have been adhered to thus reducing the risks to an acceptable level as stated in the Treasury Management Strategy.

Recommendations from impact assessment	
Positive	
Negative	
Neutral	
Issues	

Report to Council
26 January 2021
Report of Chief executive
Subject Appointment of (interim) monitoring officer

Item

7

Purpose

To consider the appointment of an (interim) monitoring officer.

Recommendation

To appoint Geoff Wild as the (interim) monitoring officer

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority of a healthy organisation

Financial implications

There are no direct financial implications from this report.

Ward/s: All Wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Kendrick - Resources

Contact officers

Stephen Evans, Chief executive

01603 212001

Background documents

None

Report

1. The monitoring officer is a statutory appointment under Section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989.
2. The main functions of the monitoring officer are:
 - (a) Following consultation (wherever possible) with the Chief Executive (as Head of Paid Service) and the Chief Finance Officer, to report to the council and to the cabinet in any case where s/he is of the opinion that any proposal or decision of the authority has given rise to, or is likely to, or would give rise to any illegality, maladministration or breach of statutory code under Sections 5 and 5A of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989; (LGHA 89).
 - (b) To investigate any matter which s/he has reason to believe may constitute, or where s/he has received an allegation that a matter may constitute, a reportable incident under Sections 5 and 5A of the LGHA 89.
 - (c) To investigate complaints against members in regards to the code of conduct and in accordance with the council's standards provisions.
 - (d) To undertake, with others, investigations in accordance with the council's whistleblowing procedures.
 - (e) Providing urgent dispensations for members' interests.
3. Nplaw currently has an agreement with the council to provide a monitoring officer, although the monitoring officer role will form part of the duties of the new head of legal and procurement post which will be in place in April 2021.
4. Geoff Wild has been acting as legal advisor to the council since December 2020 and it is proposed that Geoff Wild be appointed as the (interim) monitoring officer to Norwich City Council, until 31 March 2021 which requires a resolution of full council.

Integrated impact assessment



NORWICH
City Council

The IIA should assess **the impact of the recommendation** being made by the report
Detailed guidance to help with the completion of the assessment can be found [here](#). Delete this row after completion

Report author to complete

Committee:	Council
Committee date:	26 January 2021
Director / Head of service	Stephen Evans
Report subject:	Appointment of (interim) monitoring officer
Date assessed:	7 January 2021

	Impact			
Economic (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Finance (value for money)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	This appointment forms part of the council's agreement with nplaw
Other departments and services e.g. office facilities, customer contact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ICT services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Economic development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Financial inclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Social (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Safeguarding children and adults	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<u>S17 crime and disorder act 1998</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Human Rights Act 1998	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Health and well being	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Impact			
Equality and diversity (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Relations between groups (cohesion)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Eliminating discrimination & harassment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Advancing equality of opportunity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Environmental (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Natural and built environment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Waste minimisation & resource use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Pollution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sustainable procurement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Energy and climate change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(Please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Risk management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Recommendations from impact assessment
Positive
Negative
Neutral
Issues

Report to Council
26 January 2021
Report of Interim director of resources
Subject Members allowances scheme

Item

8

Purpose

To consider the recommendations of the independent panel set up to make recommendations on the members allowances scheme as required by the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003.

Recommendation

To consider the recommendation of the independent panel to retain the current scheme of members' allowances, as detailed in the panel's report.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority a healthy organisation

Financial implications

The recommendations are to continue with the current scheme of allowances, therefore the budget for this has already been built into projections.

Ward/s: All Wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Kendrick - Resources

Contact officers

Annabel Scholes, interim director of resources and S151 01603 213426

Stuart Guthrie, democratic and elections manager 01603 989389

Background documents

None

Report

Background

1. The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 states that it is for the council to decide its scheme of allowances and how much the allowance should be.
2. The council is required to establish an independent panel to review and provide advice on the scheme. Council must have regard to this advice when making recommendations on the allowances scheme.

Review by independent panel

3. An independent panel undertook a full review of the council's members allowance scheme in 2016 and the recommendations were agreed at council and implemented in March 2017.
4. Under the relevant legislation, a full review of member's allowances must be undertaken every four years by an independent panel. Council must agree a scheme of allowances and give regard to the recommendations of the panel.
5. The current independent panel's report is attached at appendix A to this report and details the considerations it made when forming the recommendations to council.
6. Members are asked to consider the report and the recommendations in order that a new member's allowance scheme can be implemented from 1 April 2021.

Integrated impact assessment



NORWICH
City Council

The IIA should assess **the impact of the recommendation** being made by the report

Detailed guidance to help with the completion of the assessment can be found [here](#). Delete this row after completion

Report author to complete

Committee:	Council
Committee date:	26 January 2021
Director / Head of service	Director of resources
Report subject:	Members allowance scheme
Date assessed:	1 December 2020

	Impact			
Economic (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Finance (value for money)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	As the recommendations are to continue with the current scheme of allowances, the budget for this has already been built into projections.
Other departments and services e.g. office facilities, customer contact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ICT services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Economic development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Financial inclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Social (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Safeguarding children and adults	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<u>S17 crime and disorder act 1998</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Human Rights Act 1998	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Health and well being	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Impact			
Equality and diversity (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Relations between groups (cohesion)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Eliminating discrimination & harassment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Advancing equality of opportunity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Environmental (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Natural and built environment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Waste minimisation & resource use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Pollution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sustainable procurement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Energy and climate change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(Please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Risk management	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Recommendations from impact assessment	
Positive	
Negative	
Neutral	
Issues	

NORWICH CITY COUNCIL

INDEPENDENT PANEL

INTO MEMBERS ALLOWANCES

REPORT TO THE COUNCIL

Members of the independent panel

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Philip Hyde (Chair) | - | Chair of the independent panel, Solicitor |
| Jackie Bush | - | Social care consultant |
| Kate Money | - | Vice chair of Age UK Norwich |

Terms of Reference

1. The Terms of reference of the panel were –

“To make an independent assessment of the current Members Allowances Scheme and to make recommendations on amendments to the scheme, if required, to Council”
2. The independent panel was asked to recommend a scheme which it believes fairly recognises the workload and responsibilities of councillors. The question of affordability of the scheme was not a matter for the panel, which understands that it is up to the council to consider if and how to implement the recommended scheme in the light of other priorities and the budget position.

Background

3. The current scheme detailed in Appendix 1 has been in place since 2017 and is indexed linked to pay increases awarded to staff by the National Joint Council for Local Government Services. Regulations limit such indices to run for a maximum of four years and the independent panel was convened to enable the council to consider the allowances scheme before that time period expires.

What allowances can be paid?

9. Under the provisions of the Local Government Act, 2000 and the Local Authorities (Members Allowances) (England) Regulations, 2003 the following allowances can be paid:-

Basic Allowance

10. Each local authority must make provision in its scheme of allowances for a basic, flat rate allowance payable to all members. The allowance must be the same for each councillor. This is intended to recognise the time commitment of all councillors, including such inevitable calls on their time as meetings with officers and constituents and attendance at political group meetings. It is also intended to cover incidental costs such as the use of their homes and private telephones, faxes, computers, etc.
11. Government guidance suggests that it is important that some element of the work of councillors continues to be voluntary. This must be balanced against the need to ensure that financial loss is not suffered by elected members, and further to ensure that, despite the input required, people are encouraged to come forward as elected members and that their service to the community is retained.

Special Responsibility Allowance

12. Each local authority may also make provision in its scheme for the payment of special responsibility allowances (SRA) for those councillors who have significant responsibilities. They can also be paid to members of a committee that meets with exceptional frequency or for exceptionally long periods.

13. Where one political group is in control, and where an authority has decided to pay special responsibility allowances, the authority must make provision for the payment of a special responsibility allowance to at least one member of a minority group.

Dependants' Carers Allowance

14. A scheme of allowances may also include the payment of dependants' carers allowance to those councillors who incur expenditure for the care of children or other dependants whilst attending Council meetings or other approved duties.

Travelling and Subsistence Allowance

15. Travel and subsistence allowances can be paid for attending council meetings or other approved duties. This can include an allowance for those who travel by bicycle or other non-motorised transport.

Co-optees Allowance

16. Each local authority may make provision in the scheme for the payment of a co-optees allowance to any co-opted and appointed members of a council's committee or sub-committee.

Backdating Allowances

17. When a scheme of allowances is amended an authority may, having regard to the recommendations of the panel, chose to apply the amendment retrospectively to the beginning of the financial year in which the amendment is made.

Annual Adjustments for Allowance Levels

18. A scheme of allowances may make provision for an annual adjustment of allowances to be ascertained by reference to an index e.g. inflation or increases in staff salary levels. If a panel makes a recommendation that allowance levels should be determined according to an index, it should also make recommendations as to how long the index should run before reconsideration. In any case, an index may not run for more than four years before a further recommendation on it is sought from an independent remuneration panel.

The Work of the Panel

19. The panel received guidance and information from the democratic and elections manager, the democratic team leader and a legal representative to the council including :-
 - a) Details of what allowances can be paid under the current regulations
 - b) Comparative data on the allowances paid by other similar local authorities.
 - c) The Council's current members allowances scheme

- d) Special Responsibility Allowances for councillor appointments as executive directors of Norwich City Services Limited
25. A representative of each of the three political groups on the council was invited to individually address the panel with an overview of their group's thoughts on the current scheme of allowances.
26. The panel considered the points made by the representatives which included:
- a) The difference in time commitment between the committees which were eligible for a tier 3 SRA
 - b) The lack of pension contributions and the allowance not being similar to a minimum wage meaning that this affected who would stand for election
 - c) The significant time commitment that was needed to be a councillor including the time to read and understand complex documents.
 - d) Access to childcare / carers for meetings
 - e) Councillors who were self-employed having to turn down work to attend committees and other meetings and the allowance not being proportionate to working time that was lost
 - f) The councillor appointments as executive directors of Norwich City Services Limited being given a tier 3 SRA
27. The representatives all commented that there should not be an increase in member's allowances at this time.
28. The panel discussed each of the points made by the political group representatives. Although the points made at paragraph 27 (a) – (c) above were compelling and certainly not without merit, the panel felt that the scheme should not be changed on these grounds. With regards to points d and e, these were not issues that the panel could address in terms of the allowances scheme.
29. In terms of point (f), the panel considered an opinion on this from nplaw (the council's legal advisors) and asked for further information around other councils paying an allowance for a similar role which was considered at a second meeting of the panel.
30. The information found from three other councils with wholly owned companies was that they were not paying an SRA to councillors who were appointed as executive directors of such boards.
31. The panel also noted that there was potential for a conflict of interest if a member allowance was to be paid to a director, as the city council is also a shareholder of the Company. Furthermore, the city council would potentially be setting a precedent if it did decide to make such a payment. As such, the suggested

allowance was not something that the panel considered to be strictly within its remit and therefore the panel could not make a recommendation at this point.

32. The panel considered the comparative data in the initial report and the fact that the political groups on the council were not asking for an increase in allowances.
33. Following these discussions, the panel believed that the basic allowance and the tiered system of SRAs, including the structure and limiting the number of SRAs should remain the same.
34. It was noted that if the council did wish to review the scheme of allowances before the end of the four year period, it could do so and the views of the independent panel would be sought at that time.
35. The panel noted that the Local Government Pensions Scheme (Transitional Provisions, Savings and Amendment) Regulations 2014 removed the eligibility of councillors to have access to the Local Government Pension Scheme so it was no longer necessary for the panel to make a recommendation on this issue.
36. With regards to the payments for carers and dependants allowances, the panel believed that this figure should be linked to percentage increases in the living wage to ensure that the hourly rate did not fall below the net living wage. .
37. The panel also felt that the amount paid to co-opted members should remain the same.
38. The panel agreed that travel and subsistence allowances should continue to be paid at the same level as those to officers.
39. Finally, panel members believed that the current system of linking future increases to staff salary levels should continue and the index should then be applied for the maximum allowable period of four years.

Recommendations

To recommend the following member's allowance scheme:-

MEMBERS' ALLOWANCE SCHEME

To recommend council to retain the current scheme of members allowances and implement, with effect from 1 April, 2021 , the following allowances to be increased annually on 1 April, indexed linked up to 31 March, 2025 to pay increases awarded to staff by the National Joint Council for Local Government Services :-

	£
1) BASIC ALLOWANCES (Payable to all councillors)	6,687
2) SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY ALLOWANCES	

Tier 1	
Leader of the Council	11,145
Tier 2	
Cabinet members & the Leader of the major minority group	5,573
Tier 3	
Chairs of Audit, Licensing, Planning Applications and Scrutiny committees and the Leader of any minority group that comprises minimum of 10% of the Council	2,788
Tier 4	
Members of Audit, Licensing, Planning Applications and Scrutiny committees	1,671
Tier 5	
Co-opted members of Standards committee	366
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only one SRA to be paid from Tiers 1, 2 and 3 ▪ Only one SRA to be paid from Tier 4 ▪ A councillor shall not receive a Tier 3 as chair as well as a Tier 4 as a member of the same committee 	

3) **TRAVEL AND SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES**

To be paid at the same rates as Norwich City Council employees and be subject to the same requirements for claims and payments

4) **CHILDCARE AND DEPENDENT CARERS' ALLOWANCES**

To be paid at the rate of £10 per hour per child/dependant etc., which allowance should be increased in accordance with the percentage increase in the living wage from time to time.

(The director of resources to be authorised to make additional payment in cases where specialist care is required)

Philip Hyde

Chair of the independent panel

Motion to Council
26 January 2021

Item

9(a)

Subject
Local government funding

Proposer Councillor Kendrick

Seconded Councillor Waters

Following the Local Government Finance Settlement last month, council remains aware that local government is now at breaking point with a catastrophic national funding gap of over £10 billion pounds for vital, local services. Throughout local government, including in Norwich, the national fight against COVID-19 has seen billions spent to protect the most vulnerable, while crucial income has been lost as the country has been in lockdown. After 10 years of cuts, local services were already stretched, particularly in more deprived areas where harsher cuts were targeted. As we face a major recession and increased infection demand on local services will increase and must be resilient and properly funded. The government must urgently fund local government.

Council **RESOLVES** to

(1) Note: -

- a) Between 2010 and 2020, Tory-led governments cut £15bn from English councils, 40% of their funding. Government cuts mean councils have lost more than 60p out of every £1 that the last Labour Government was spending on local government in 2010. Norwich City Council has seen its budgets reduced by £7.3m (or 29%) in cash terms since 2010 and is one of the hardest cut councils in the United Kingdom. This deliberate austerity has caused huge damage to our community in Norwich and throughout the UK, with devastating effects on key public services that protect the most defenceless in society – children at risk, disabled adults and vulnerable older people – and the services we all rely on.
- b) In order to help our communities throughout the pandemic the City Council were proud to rightly provide a range of extra services including examples such as food parcels for the vulnerable, housing all homeless people and supporting partners in the delivery of vital services. During this time, we have seen our various income streams decline because of government decisions and failure to provide promised support yet billions wasted on ineffective and unreliable private sector outsourcing.
- c) Both vital, valued city services, our ambitious Recovery Plan and 2040 City Vision to move our city forward in response to Covid-19 remains predicated upon effective funding from government together with resource

generated locally. Without support from government, promised at the start of this pandemic, such services will be risked, hampering our city recovery. Short-term emergency funding is no substitute against the need to provide a sustainable revenue source to local government.

- d) Last December, the Communities Secretary Robert Jenrick announced the Local Government Finance Settlement claiming to make an extra £2.2 billion available to fund the provision of “critical” public services – but it has emerged that over 85% of this increase comes from a £2bn council tax rise, which will hit every family in the country, particularly those on lower incomes. According to the Local Government Association, councils in England will face a funding gap of more than £5 billion by 2024 just to maintain services at current levels. The LGA estimates that the Government will need to provide an additional £10.1 billion per year in core funding to councils in England by 2023/24 to plug the existing funding gap and to meet growing demand pressures.

2) Ask the Leader to call for the Prime Minister and Chancellor to end austerity in local government by:

- a) Reversing the national shortfall to council budgets and cuts to our City Council budget.
- b) Immediately investing sufficient resource in children’s and adult social care to stop these vital emergency services from collapsing; and
- c) Pledge to use the forthcoming budget to restore council funding to 2010 levels so that local government can deliver the services and support critically required.

Motion to Council
26 January 2021
Subject Maintaining the tree stock in Norwich
Proposer Councillor Neale
Seconded Councillor Grahame

Item
9(b)

The city council has committed to publishing a tree strategy by 2022, but the city loses a number of trees to development each year. The Woodland Trust has said 'Local authorities must plant more trees and protect those they already have'. The Government's 25 Year Environment Plan (2018) says 'Having more trees in and around our towns and cities, close to where people live and work, brings people closer to nature and improves air quality, with consequent positive health impacts.'

This council **RESOLVES** to:

- 1) protect trees in Norwich;
- 2) produce a supplementary planning document which would clarify and strengthen council policies frequently referred to when considering the acceptability of losing a tree or major shrub for development. Whereas currently, such a loss is allowed if 'it would allow for a substantially improved overall approach to the design and landscaping of the development that would outweigh the loss of any tree or hedgerow', the new supplementary planning document will clarify what would be lost and what would be necessary to outweigh that loss in the areas of biodiversity benefits, the cooling effects of trees, air quality and the part that specific trees play in biodiversity corridors.
- 3) provide, within a new supplementary planning document, an explanation of how to calculate the biomass of any tree or major shrub which is to be removed, and a requirement that the biomass should be replaced in full at the completion of the development. This may require considering on and off site provision;
- 4) ask officers to notify ward councillors whenever trees are required to be removed from council-owned land in their wards and for the officers to explain the reason for the removal before this is undertaken. This should be the case for any trees and significant hedge and shrub masses, not only for trees protected by a tree protection order;
- 5) strongly represent the need to preserve trees and the wildlife living on them, and where this is not possible to arrange a 100% biomass replacement at the completion of highway schemes for any highway projects in the city.

Motion to Council
26 January 2021
Subject Repair
Proposer Councillor Grahame
Seconded Councillor Osborn

Item
9(c)

The Mile Cross recycling centre is to be replaced with a new facility near Norwich Airport. Saleable goods will be sold, well-sorted recyclables will be recycled, but there will be some waste going to landfill due to the lack of a repair facility. Goods which have the potential to be repaired and re-used could end up in landfill. The making and disposal of goods creates greenhouse gas emissions which need to be reduced.

Council **RESOLVES** to:

- 1) ask group leaders to write to Norfolk County Council asking for the new recycling centre to include a facility for cleaning and repairing potentially reuseable goods and explore the training and employment opportunities of investing in such a facility; and
- 2) build on the work that is already being done to lead by example and minimise its own waste by finding re-use outlets for goods and materials no longer required, for example office furniture and IT hardware.

Motion to Council
26 January 2021
Subject Advertising
Proposer Councillor Schmierer
Seconded Councillor Osborn

Item
9(d)

Paid promotion of activities or products that are potentially harmful to mental or physical health or the environment, such as junk food, gambling, alcohol or the most polluting forms of transport, are very common on our television screens, radios, social media feeds and across a variety of out of home advertising media.

There is a strong precedent for precluding such forms of advertising. Most forms of tobacco advertising and sponsorship were banned from 2003 (e.g. on billboards and in printed publications): tobacco sponsorship of international sport was banned from 2005.

Other councils, including Bristol, have developed more ethical advertising policies.

This council **RESOLVES** to:

- 1) ask cabinet to devise an advertising strategy for Norwich City Council which recognises the harmful effects that junk food, environmentally polluting products and activities, payday lenders, gambling and alcohol can have on local residents. This policy would then be used to ascertain which companies and products the council wishes to associate itself with and support, including local businesses, and ban harmful products, companies or services from being advertised in council owned premises, e.g. car parks, in our communications, or from sponsoring council organised events.
- 2) update the council's planning policy to ensure that new advertising hoardings cannot be installed within the proximity of schools.
- 3) Ask cabinet to work with partners to phase out all forms of advertising, especially via outdoor media across the city, that are potentially harmful to our communities, such as gambling, alcohol, junk food and environmentally damaging products.
- 4) Write to the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, asking for a ban on such forms of unethical advertising nationally and asking to follow the lead of Italy, which in 2018 introduced a 'Dignity Decree' that banned all advertisements for gambling services across all channels in the country, meaning gambling advertisements were no longer allowed on television, radio, print media, the internet, or any other public forum in Italy.

