

Scrutiny committee

Date: Thursday, 15 October 2020

Time: 16:30

Venue: TBC, [Venue Address]

All group pre-meeting briefing – 15:45 (details to follow)

This is for members only and is not part of the formal scrutiny committee meeting which will follow at 16:30. The pre-meeting is an opportunity for the committee to make final preparations before the start of the formal meeting.

Committee members:

Councillors:

Wright (Chair)
Ryan (Vice chair)
Carlo
Fulton-McAlister (M)
Giles
Grahame
Manning
McCartney-Gray
Oliver
Osborn
Sands (S)
Sarmezey
Thomas (Vi)

For further information please contact:

Committee officer: Lucy Palmer
t: (01603) 989515
e: lucypalmer@norwich.gov.uk

Democratic services
City Hall
Norwich
NR2 1NH

www.norwich.gov.uk

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

Agenda

Page nos

1 Apologies

To receive apologies for absence

2 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 Monday 12 October 2020**.

Petitions must be received by the committee officer detailed on the front of the agenda by **10am on Wednesday 14 October 2020**

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

3 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)

4 Minutes

7 - 24

To approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 17 September 2020.

5 Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee update

25 - 26

Purpose - To note the update of the NHOSC representative.

6 Scrutiny committee work programme 2020-21

27 - 36

Purpose - To consider the work programme and make any amendments as necessary.

7 Norwich City Council response to enhancing community development following Covid-19

37 - 44

Purpose - To consider the recommendations as set out in the report.

8 New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership

45 - 52

Purpose - To consider recommendations on the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership item.

Date of publication: **Wednesday, 07 October 2020**

- T** is this, the right **TIME** to review the issue and is there sufficient officer time and resource available?
- O** what would be the **OBJECTIVE** of the scrutiny?
- P** can **PERFORMANCE** in this area be improved by scrutiny input?
- I** what would be the public **INTEREST** in placing this topic onto the work programme?
- C** will any scrutiny activity on this matter contribute to the council's activities as agreed to in the **CORPORATE PLAN**?

Once the TOPIC analysis has been undertaken, a joint decision should then be reached as to whether a report to the scrutiny committee is required. If it is decided that a report is not required, the issue will not be pursued any further. However, if there are outstanding issues, these could be picked up by agreeing that a briefing email to members be sent, or other appropriate action by the relevant officer.

If it is agreed that the scrutiny request topic should be explored further by the scrutiny committee a short report should be written for a future meeting of the scrutiny committee, to be taken under the standing work programme item, so that members are able to consider if they should place the item on to the work programme. This report should outline a suggested approach if the committee was minded to take on the topic and outline the purpose using the outcome of the consideration of the topic via the TOPIC analysis. Also the report should provide an overview of the current position with regard to the topic under consideration.

By using the flowchart, it is hoped that members and officers will be aided when giving consideration to whether or not the item should be added to the scrutiny committee work programme. This should help to ensure that the scope and purpose will be covered by any future report. The outcome of this should further assist the committee and the officers working with the committee to be able to produce informed outcomes that are credible, influential with SMART recommendations.

Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound

Scrutiny committee and a protocol for those attending meetings of the scrutiny committee

- All scrutiny committee meetings will be carried out in a spirit of mutual trust and respect
- Members of the scrutiny committee will not be subject to whipping arrangements by party groups
- Scrutiny committee members will work together and will attempt to achieve evidence based consensus and recommendations
- Members of the committee will take the lead in the selection of topics for scrutiny
- The scrutiny committee operates as a critical friend and offers constructive challenge to decision makers to support improved outcomes
- Invited attendees will be advised of the time, date and location of the meeting to which they are invited to give evidence
- The invited attendee will be made aware of the reasons for the invitation and of any documents and information that the committee wish them to provide
- Reasonable notice will be given to the invited attendee of **all** of the committees requirements so that these can be provided for in full at the earliest opportunity (there should be no nasty surprises at committee)
- Whenever possible it is expected that members of the scrutiny committee will share and plan questioning with the rest of the committee in advance of the meeting
- The invited attendee will be provided with copies of **all relevant** reports, papers and background information
- Practical arrangements, such as facilities for presentations will be in place. The layout of the meeting room will be appropriate
- The chair of the committee will introduce themselves to the invited attendee before evidence is given and; all those attending will be treated with courtesy and respect. The chair of the committee will make sure that all questions put to the witness are made in a clear and orderly manner

Scrutiny Committee**16:30 to 18:30****17 September 2020**

Present: Councillors Wright (chair), Ryan (vice chair), Carlo, Fulton-McAlister (M), Giles, Manning, McCartney-Gray, Oliver, Osborn, Sands (M) (substitute for Councillor Sands (S)), Stutely (substitute for Councillor Sarmezey) and Thomas (Vi)

Apologies: Councillor Sands (S) and Sarmezey

1. Public questions/petitions

There were no public questions or petitions

2. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2020.

(The chair agreed to amend the order of the agenda as there were invited guests and to consider the substantive items earlier in the meeting.)

4. New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)

(Chris Starkie, chief executive, New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership and Lisa Roberts, head of strategy, New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership, and Councillor Alan Waters, leader of the council and the council's representative on the LEP, were admitted to the meeting for this item.)

The chair introduced Chris Starkie and Lisa Roberts, from the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership, to the meeting.

Chris Starkie gave a brief introduction the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership and said that it was one of 38 local enterprise partnerships (LEPs) that operate across England which have a defined geographical area. The New Anglia LEP's coverage was Norfolk and Suffolk. It brought together partners from local government, private and voluntary sectors and education, who met as a board. The

board members were all volunteers who met 10 times a year. The overarching principle of the LEP was a strategic function to develop a blueprint for economic prosperity and growth across Norfolk and Suffolk. It also acted as an intermediary for government and European funding, but also to persuade and encourage investment from the private sector as well. In terms of delivery, the LEP: ran a growth hub to provide free at point of access support to businesses; operated a number of enterprise zones; ran a grant programmes to support businesses; worked in the skills-base around enterprise engagement and career support in schools, and a capital programme, which invested in key infrastructure, whether that was flood defence, broadband, roads or other connectivity infrastructure.

The chair then referred to the questions from members of the committee, that had been submitted to the LEP ahead of the meeting, and explained the procedure for members to ask questions. (A copy of the questions is appended to these minutes.)

Questions were asked by members of the committee. Members were also invited to ask a supplementary question.

During consideration of this item it was apparent that due to time constraints not all of the questions could be considered at this meeting. The chair proposed, with the agreement of the representatives of the LEP, and the consensus of the committee that written responses would be provided for questions 10, 12 -19, 22 and 23.

The following questions were considered at the meeting:

Business theme

- 1. Do you have an estimate of the number of businesses in the region in receipt of government loan schemes who will not be able to repay? What support will be available to businesses in managing debt repayments, in the months and years ahead?**

Chris Starkie explained that he could provide figures for the numbers of businesses who had recently received loans. Loans ranged in size from the minimum £2,000 that was available to tens of millions for multi-national corporations. The number of awards made to businesses in Norwich (based on the Parliamentary boundaries for Norwich North and Norwich South) was 160 businesses awarded Coronavirus Business Interruption Loans (CBILS), totalling £31.5 million; and 2,500 micro or smaller businesses had accessed the Coronavirus Bounce Back Loans, amounting to a total £75 million in loans ranging from £2,000 to £50,000. This made a total of just over £100 million awarded to businesses in Norwich in recent months. These were loans from banks guaranteed by the Treasury.

It was impossible to predict how many of these businesses would not be able to repay the loans. Banks, although there was up to an 80 percent payback guarantee from the Treasury, were lending CBILs and Bounce back loans based on the criteria used ordinarily. Criteria for Bounce Back loans could be more flexible and was less stringent. There was an expectation that the majority of businesses would be fine and could repay the loan, but it would be speculative to provide an estimate. There was support available for businesses from the growth hubs, as mentioned in the introduction to the work of the LEP above, which was a network of business advisors

on expansion, finance etc and also advice from local authorities such as the economic development team at the city council. There was also a range of money advice services, including the Money Advice Network, Small Business Commissioner and national debt line to provide support for small businesses.

2. Do you have an estimate of the regional increase in unemployment following the end of the furlough scheme?

Chris Starkie said that the LEP had commissioned some external work to look at this. It was of significant concern. The furlough scheme had been used extensively by businesses in Norwich and the region. The LEP had figures on the percentages of the workforce. The modelling for economic recovery was based on three scenarios. The first was for a quick “L” shaped economic recovery which was considered unlikely. The middle case was a slow return to economic growth over a longer period, or “U” shaped recovery to full economic growth. The third scenario was a lingering cloud over economic growth. Modelling was based on what was known and predictions. None of the scenarios looked great. The potential peak in the first scenario was estimated at 50,000 people out of work at the end of the last quarter of 2020. The best case scenario therefore equated to the previous recession and was projected to reach 6.3 per cent unemployment by the quarter 4 of 2020 and to reach 4 per cent by the end of the last quarter of 2021, taking a year to get back to where we were. This scenario was the least likely. In the case of the mid-case scenario unemployment would increase sharply to 16 per cent in 2020 and remain above 10 per cent in quarter 4 of 2021. This was the level of unemployment last seen in the late 70s or early 80s. In the worst case scenario, the rate of unemployment would rise sharply to 26 per cent by quarter 4 of this year and remain at 20 per cent through to quarter 4 of 2021. The worst case scenario was based on there being no government interventions and worst case in terms of businesses performance. In context, members were advised that Norfolk had higher rates of unemployment than its counterparts in Suffolk. In the best case scenario in Norfolk, unemployment rates were projected as a median of 6.3 per cent in Norfolk, medium case 15.9 per cent in Norfolk and worst case 26 per cent in Norfolk. Overall the economy has responded overall in line with the rest of the UK economy in terms of universal credit and furloughing. The rate of people furloughed in the UK was 32 per cent and 31 per cent in Norwich (or around 20,000 employees).

A close eye was being kept on all of the statistics as the furlough scheme came to an end.

In reply to a supplementary question, Chris Starkie said that retail and hospitality were the sectors that would find it most difficult. The retail sector was undergoing change anyway before Covid. Sectors like insurance were relatively sheltered. Brexit was more likely to affect manufacturing. The cohort most affected would be young people as a sector of the workforce.

3. Can you please provide more detail on the aspiration to invest in re-skilling and will there be a particular focus on sectors which are facing greatest difficulty? Which employment sectors have been identified as having potential for economic growth and job creation?

Chris Starkie said that this cut to the heart of the next few weeks and months. The economic strategy, which builds on the Norwich 2040 vision, had identified a number of sectors for potential growth in future years. These were ICT and digital, clean energy and agri-food, all brought together under “a clean growth umbrella”. Covid had not affected this belief. There was significant growth and potential in Norwich for digi-tech in Norwich and earlier that day there had been the launch of Tech 100 in partnership with colleagues at Tech East. There was huge potential for green energy and agri-food. Other areas of focus would be the tourism and leisure sectors, working with Visit Norwich and including the culture sector. The third area of focus would be the health and social care which had hitherto been an unrecognised sector.

In conclusion, Chris Starkie said that the areas of focus in terms of facilitating support for training and reskilling and job creation would be the clean growth umbrella (digi-tech, clean energy and agri-food), tourism and leisure, and health and social care.

By way of a supplementary question, another member asked whether resources would be for reskilling people already working in those industries or people who wanted to work in them, and what support was there for the aviation sector. Chris Starkie said that it would be about opportunities and how those businesses could be taken forward. In the health and social care sector it was also about supporting businesses to be sustainable. There had been significant investment at City College Norwich and Eastern College to provide opportunities and skill training, particularly in the digital skills. Also the LEP would work with its partners such as Job Centre Plus and the Kick Start programme to provide opportunities for reskilling.

In relation to the aviation industry, Chris Starkie said that there was concern about the number of job losses at the airport and the LEP was in discussion with the Norwich Airport Ltd. Whilst not in the top four or five sectors of priority of focus, aviation was an important part of the local economy. The LEP had invested in the Aviation Skills Academy and it would want to see sustainability of jobs in that sector.

(The following questions relating to Covid economic recovery were taken as one question.)

4. & 5 What assessment has the LEP made of the impact of both Covid and Brexit on Norwich Research Park?

Could you detail what role, if any, the LEP is playing in the regeneration of East Norwich?

Chris Starkie said that there had been no specific work on the impact of Covid on the Norwich Research Park (NRP) but it had been looked at as part of the LEP's wider Covid restart plan. In terms of jobs at the NRP, there was still reasonable funding for the types of jobs there, where people worked in the NHS at the hospital or at the Research Institute. There had been some downturn on businesses located at NRP but it had escaped relatively unscathed. South Norfolk Council and the LEP topped out a new building at NRP earlier that week. The impact of Brexit on NRP could be greater as it would affect scientific exchanges. The LEP had done some analysis of the impact of a “No Deal” or a “Deal” Brexit some time ago with a “Deal” being a better option.

The LEP was a partner of in the East Norwich Partnership. It had been an unofficial partner for several years working with Graham Nelson (director of place) and Homes England. The LEP would be an active partner of the partnership. It chaired a group comprising Network Rail, Broadland District Council and the city council to specifically look at issues surrounding the Trowse rail bridge. The director of place was seeking funding from the Norfolk Strategic Fund to take this piece of work forward.

In reply to a supplementary question, Chris Starkie said that they would secure funding from the Norfolk Strategic Fund through the core business rates fund to support the regeneration of the economy post Covid. In terms of funding, new rail infrastructure takes time and Network Rail understood the need for a new rail bridge and the partnership needed to build the case for it.

6. What sustainability assessments did the LEP conduct before deciding to award £1m to the Honingham food enterprise park?

Chris Starkie said that he assumed that the question was on the infrastructure funding to kick start the food enterprise park. All capital projects were subject to the necessary planning permissions and an environment impact assessment would be part of that process. The LEP did not do a separate environment impact assessment as that would be duplication and not good use of public funding. Part of the infrastructure required on this site was for water storage. Previously under old licences, Colmans had emptied water straight into the river. In moving the production of drinks and mustard to the new site, the environmental mitigation was to provide water storage that complied with higher standards and was an environmental benefit of the scheme. The scheme also retained the dry milling of condiments in the county which could have been lost to other regions of the UK or the world. The only other mustard milling facilities in the world were in Canada. It enabled local mint and mustard growers to continue to supply the production of condiments.

In reply to a supplementary question, Chris Starkie said that the building at Honingham food enterprise park was an exemplar of environmental credentials. It would attract “cottage” industries, where a business was being run out of people’s kitchens, and encourage and nurture these businesses as how to best serve the local Greater Norwich area. There would be some relocation of larger businesses, but this would be about how they improved the use of electricity and water in their production. The emphasis was on smaller food producers making better use of fuel and water, and reducing food miles. It was not a “bog standard” industrial estate on the edge of the city.

7. What is the benefit to local people from Enterprise Zones? (specific reference was made to jobs lost in the gas, oil and aviation sectors and what would be done to help these people.)

Chris Starkie said that there were a number of enterprise zones in Norfolk and Suffolk. Critics of business parks in the 1980s were that business would have grown without support and there was no benefit of the local economy. This was not the case now. One hundred per cent of business rates from enterprise zones were retained for local investment. In Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft the LEP was looking to utilise the skills of the gas/oil and aviation sectors in the retro-fitting of buildings,

renewable energy or hydrogen. There were big opportunities in renewables and the first cohort of two to three businesses in Norwich was part of that. Norwich Research Park was an enterprise zone and sought to retain and encourage businesses to stay in Norwich and not to be attracted to Cambridge and elsewhere.

As a supplementary question, the member said that she was pleased about retrofitting and the use of transferrable skills. She referred to the opportunities for tidal power and asked whether Hitachi would pull out of Sizewell. Chris Starkie said that it was a decision for EDF to make around Sizewell. There were aspirations to look at tidal power, though the South West was better placed for this. There were also aspirations to look at hydrogen and retrofitting. The creation of pathways so that young people could enter these new careers was as important as the creation of jobs.

Business theme – concluding question. This related to question 2 and the projections of figures of unemployment and whether the expectation was that these would be distributed evenly across the county or whether Norwich would take the biggest hit, and secondly what would be the impact of a second lockdown on the local economy?

Chris Starkie answered the last part of the question first and said that a second lockdown had been factored into the worst case scenario. In relation to the projected unemployment figures, unemployment was spread fairly evenly across the county. Broadland and South Norfolk had been more badly affected than Norwich. He did not consider that Norwich would be particularly badly hit.

Covid Recovery and Social Equality

8. & 9. The LEP Covid recovery plan talks about “Working with DWP, Job Centre plus and professional services to ensure employers and employees are aware of and have access to available support programmes at the earliest point”. That “earliest point” is usually Universal Credit, which means a 5-week wait for many without any access to support. What is being done to work with employers to prevent people being made destitute for that time? And how are people accessing that support?

There seems to be a great focus on creating jobs as a general strategy for growth in the region, for example through the Town Deal bid and through the LEP’s economic strategy. What is being done to ensure that the effects of job creation are beneficial for social mobility?

(Whilst asking the questions, the member also suggested that in terms of social mobility there was a potential “K” shape model of the economy, where some sectors will go up and others will go down.)

Chris Starkie said there were a large number of programmes that the government had made available to support businesses. LEP recognised that there was a lot of help available and tried to encourage and ensure that businesses look at other options before they consider making people redundant through its Job Support programme. It was a two strand programme (<https://newanglia.co.uk/>). The first

strand was engagement with employers, to reach out to companies to explain the options that were available, for instance, how do they get involved with the Kick Start programme or how can they consider more flexible pay and other options before changing people's lives irrevocably by making them redundant. As well as information for employers, there was a web based triage scheme for people concerned about redundancy who had not yet been made redundant or who had been made redundant, providing information about careers advice, information on mental health support and alternatives if made redundant such as becoming self-employed or apprenticeships. The Job Support programme brought these strands together, with the full backing of the DWP and partners, including the city council. The LEP was keen to promote this opportunity. Also on the website was the Employment Opportunities page for people looking for work. Over 300 businesses had promoted vacancies with 23,000 people having viewed the site since its launch summer. The Job Support programme was launched in September and in its first week 500 people had used the service.

Regarding social mobility, the LEP's economic strategy had two pillars: one around clean growth and the other around inclusive growth. A "K" recovery would be a disaster. A significant cohort was young people who should not be left behind. As a supplementary question, the member asked what specific actions could ward councillors take to support social mobility. Chris Starkie referred to the Growing Business fund where there had been investment of £2 million in Norwich, creating 100 jobs, in recent years. When considering this investment consideration should be made as to how low social mobility attainment could be addressed at the same time as creating jobs. The LEP, through the Norwich Opportunity Area, worked with schools and enterprise advisors, and businesses to "bridge the gap" in understanding.

Accountability

20. Question to Councillor Waters – as a member of the LEP Board, how do you ensure accountability to the public for your role on the board and how do you gather the views of members on Norwich City Council for helping to shape NALEP policy/programmes/funding and reporting back?

Councillor Waters said that he was one of 6 local authority representatives appointed to the LEP (which included the "permanent four: the leader of Ipswich Borough Council and both the leaders of Norfolk and Suffolk County Councils; and two other district councillors, one each from Norfolk from Suffolk). The LEPs had been established under the Coalition government in 2010 and replaced regional government offices and the regional assemblies of the 1990s. He regularly attended meetings of the investment board, and considered that he was a credible member, and was a member of the board, with its wider remit. The LEP's broad strategies around social mobility, investment, supporting people to gain skills and issues, surrounding carbon neutrality, were ones that the city council was particularly concerned about. There was an opportunity to reflect those issues and others through the prism of the policies agreed collectively as a council. The city council had a corporate plan that was approved at council and considered at the scrutiny committee, audit committee and cabinet, and the wider piece of work on Norwich 2040, where every party was represented on that broad partnership of stakeholders

and other partner organisations. When attending LEP meetings, he sought to reflect the things that he had been charged with through the democratic process in his contribution to the LEP board and the development of LEP policies and initiatives. He explained that the LEP had a focus on place, important key sectors that it collectively wanted to strengthen and enhance, but there was also an economic social and political dynamic to make sure that voices were heard, which both he and David Ellesmere, leader of Ipswich Borough Council, ensured that urban areas got the recognition they deserved as important drivers of the economy. In terms of partnership, he met Chris Starkie and other LEP Board members on any number of partnerships that met in the city, including the Business Improvement District and the Good Economy Commission, and shared and contributed to the LEPs ambitions for carbon neutrality. As a representative of the council on the LEP, he had brought to the table the Living Wage and good employment practices. The LEP board accepted that when investing public money there was an understanding about what kind of jobs that were being funded. It was important that people had good job opportunities. He was working with Chris Starkie to set up a trade union round table as it was important that workers were represented. The council was therefore not just represented on the board but was part of the partnership.

In terms of accountability, Councillor Waters said that he often circulated key documents produced by the LEP to colleagues and officers and pointed out that the LEP website was comprehensive. Meetings like this were an opportunity for the scrutiny committee to ask about the work of the LEP and its thinking, and reports were made to cabinet and full council. That was how he considered his accountability. Fundamentally it was bringing to the LEP table policies and strategies that had been developed and issues engaged and shaped, not just by the administration, but by consultation and engagement with other members of the council and its partners.

Accountability – additional question

Having looked at information available on line and looking at recent minutes of available on the LEP website, the member asked whether local authority members were represented on the panel that determined applications for loans and grants. He asked whether local authority members had a say on where funds go? From the minutes it looked like decisions had been made on a small grant scheme and represented only by the private sector, where a £100,000 had been provided. Were these decisions ratified anywhere for approval? Do board members have a say?

Chris Starkie said that the board was the ultimate decision making body of the LEP and had a number of sub-boards within. The main decision making on funding was the investment appraisal committee. It was chaired by David Ellesmere, with Alan Waters as a member, and had the same configuration as the main board, comprising private and public sector members. The scheme of delegation was available on the LEP website. All investment decisions were therefore taken by the board or the investment appraisal committee unless there were particular funding streams. The investment appraisal committee had delegated authority to fund schemes up to £500,000. Anything over £500,000 was submitted to the investment appraisal committee for consideration and recommendation to the board. There were two delegated grant schemes for small grants which were determined under delegated

powers. Decisions were notified to the investment appraisal committee which had oversight of that and then through the main board. The small grant scheme was funded by EU funding and had to be signed off by central government as well as the LEP. The same applied to the business fund which was determined by a panel comprising of private sector members making recommendations to the investment appraisal committee. Details were available on the website.

Councillor Waters commented that the investment appraisal committee looked very thoroughly at requests for investment from developers, particularly of greenfield sites without social housing. The main board did not have the capacity to give applications the scrutiny that the committee did. Andrew Proctor, leader of the county council was also a member of this committee.

21. What monitoring of its policies/programmes/funding does NALEP carry out, with a view to understanding their impact on sustainable development? (relates also to questions 12,13,14)

Chris Starkie said that like any organisations LEP published its policies on its website. There was an internal process where the officers monitored policies on a weekly basis. Reports were provided on performance and funding to every board and investment appraisal committee for formal consideration.

Environment

11. Is it the intention of the Clean Growth Taskforce to set a target for carbon neutrality and what plans are there to engage civil society, unions, and the public in the development and delivery of the Clean Growth Taskforce?

(The member requested that he asked question 11 instead of questions 22 and 23 where a written response would be acceptable. In asking the question he questioned how the targets recommended by the Tyndall Centre would be met, where was the funding for the retrofit programme that the LEP was supporting, and questioning the support for clean growth whilst still supporting the aviation industry which was one of the biggest users of fossil fuels.)

Lisa Roberts said the intention is not to develop any targets. The establishment of the Clean Growth Taskforce had been delayed given the distractions in responding to the Covid-19 response. The Clean Growth Taskforce was very important to them to meet the standards of a UK Clean Growth region. Arrangements were in place to get it started by the end of this year. They would not be looking at setting targets as organisations had set their own targets. The taskforce was identifying two to three themes that would make a big impact across Norfolk and Suffolk and then would develop its own targets. This included working with the big emitters to work with them collectively to bring down emissions. Chris Starkie said that the LEP believed in a number of tangible actions rather than getting distracted by setting targets which organisations had other ways of measuring.

By way of a supplementary question, the member said that there was no need to debate the targets as there was a national target and referred to the Tyndall Centre analysis sector by sector targets. He said that he did not see that the actions at a

regional level would meet requirements of a national 2050 target rather than a sooner one that both Norfolk and Suffolk had set. He asked for an action plan to see how carbon neutrality would be achieved. In response Chris Starkie said that it was a fair challenge and the truth was that they had not been able to do as much work on this as they would have liked to do over the last 3 to 5 months because they were dealing with the worst economic crisis since the 1930s. He referred to the challenges going forward that would be the need to create jobs and create clean growth jobs, at the same time. He accepted the point that just doing a few things was ignoring the problem and that what was needed was some significant bold action but the feeling was that it needed to have popular support from businesses or the public, as the wrong direction could be taken. The LEP's approach therefore was to work with businesses or the industries. The gas fired power station at Great Yarmouth was one of the largest emitters in the area. The production of hydrogen could offset this. The strategy to promote electric vehicles across Norfolk and Suffolk would reduce carbon emissions because in a rural community it was necessary for people to drive to get about. This was the challenge in how to square those circles whilst realising that doing a little was not enough. The member referred to the recession and said that it was also an opportunity to make the system changes to move to a fairer and cleaner society with those environmental targets in mind, to which Chris Starkie agreed.

New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership Covid recovery plan

The final question to the LEP was from a member referred to page 22 of the LEP report and said that he was interested the launch of the Peer to Peer programme next summer and asked how it would work and help Norwich.

Chris Starkie said that the government had awarded funding to all LEPS to develop a Peer to Peer network. The NALEP had been awarded £300,000 and was in the process of developing the network which would commence next month. (The report was out of date and government had made funding available sooner than originally anticipated.) The LEP would work with 250 businesses, divided into cohorts of eleven businesses. The objective of the scheme was for businesses to support each other through the challenges that we faced, which included decarbonisation and the green economy, Brexit and loans. The cohorts would comprise a range of businesses in terms of sector and size. The LEP was currently developing the scheme and recruiting businesses and facilitators to run the programme.

In reply to a supplementary question from the member, Chris Starkie said that some businesses had contacted the LEP and details were available on the website. Other businesses would be encouraged to participate in this scheme or if appropriate the Fit for Offshore Programme through the growth hubs. It was not a case of first come first served. There was no cost to businesses participating but they would need to spend time. The scheme would provide free advice and training, but did not provide direct funding to businesses. Members were reminded that there was a range of grant programmes available.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) thank Chris Starkie and Lisa Roberts, of New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), and Councillor Alan Waters for attending the meeting and answering questions on the LEP;
- (2) ask Lisa Roberts of the LEP to provide responses to questions 10, 12 - 19, 22 and 23 (as set out in the appendix);
- (3) consider the information received at this meeting, together with the responses to the outstanding questions at the next meeting of the committee, with a view to making recommendations to cabinet;
- (4) ask members to promote the LEP's Job Support Programme to residents and local businesses.

5. Report of the Scrutiny Select Committee for Short Term Lets

(Carole Jowett, revenues and benefits operations manager, and David Parkin, area development manager (inner) attended the meeting for this item.)

The chair thanked the select committee for the work they had done to produce an excellent report.

Councillor Carlo paid tribute to the other members of the select committee and the officers who had assisted them, and introduced the report. The research indicated an increase in the number of whole properties let on a short term basis in Norwich and this had fallen below the radar of the council, and its impact on neighbours and the housing supply, whether properties comply with health and safety regulations and to what extent they were a benefit or a drain on the council's finances. The council does not have any policies on short term lets because the development management plans were adopted before short term lets took off. The lack of policies was raised by a letter from a member of the public. She referred to the recommendation that a policy should be taken into consideration as part of the review of the council's development management plan and that the director of place would comment on this.

Councillor Giles referred to the report and said that the common thread was the deregulated nature of the short term lets and until the government established a licensing scheme under which short term lettings could operate, there was a reliance on planning law to set up a separate use class and nothing would change. The government appeared to be set on the deregulation of the planning system and therefore he was not hopeful that the issues set out in the report would be resolved anytime soon. There were some concrete recommendations to the city council (cabinet) which could be reflected on.

Councillor McCartney-Gray said that since the select committee had first met, the impact of Covid had put further constraints on resources identified in the report on page 78 of the agenda papers, but there were recommendations in the report that cabinet could take forward.

Discussion ensued on the recommendations to write to the Norwich MPs and the timing of this in the context of the government's consultation on the planning white

paper. The director of place explained that, as alluded to by Councillor Carlo, the council reaffirmed its intention to review its development management policies plan next year as set out in our local development scheme. The government white paper sets out to simplify the local plan process so that a single map based zonal planning system replaced the plans and policies that comprise development management plans. This would erode the ability of councils to introduce a policy as proposed by the select committee. The sustainable development panel would be considering the council's draft response to the government white paper at its meeting on 1 October and would provide an opportunity for members to consider whether the issue of short term lets was adequately addressed before it was presented to cabinet.

The chair pointed out that the recommendations would also be presented to cabinet as well as the recommendations of the sustainable development panel on the white paper and could be considered in the round. A member said that he would be interested that the local MPs' views were sought and with a consensus the recommendation was amended. It was also noted that the sustainable development panel was an advisory subcommittee to cabinet and could recommend rather than make a decision.

The area development manager (inner) said that he was concerned about the resource implications of some the recommendations going forward in terms of monitoring. The monitoring of health and safety and the suggestion that planning investigates those could not be done on its own because they did not enforce those standards. They would need to co-opt the services of other services and potentially the fire service.

The revenues and benefits operations manager said that from her service's perspective the major problem was identification and any system that could be put in place would be welcome as there was no planning policy. She explained that they only became aware of properties when the council tax premium on empty properties was removed. The property was put under business rates where it had to be available to rent out 140 days a year, but in practice there were often reasons for it not to be rented out for even one day, which was frustrating and made it difficult to administer it properly.

A member of the select committee said that the report talked about limited resources and suggested the insertion of "where city council and partner resources were available". The chair said that as the sustainable development panel was advisory to the cabinet, so was the scrutiny committee and that in making these and any recommendations the resource implications were a matter for the cabinet suggesting that the recommendations should be made as presented for consideration at cabinet on 14 October 2020.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) thank the members of the short term lets select committee; Councillors Carlo, Giles, McCartney-Gray and Oliver, and the following officers:

Emma Webster, scrutiny liaison officer
Carole Jowett, revenues and benefits operations manager
David Parkin, area development manager (inner)

Adam Clark, strategy manager.

- (2) submit the recommendations as set out in the report to cabinet for consideration at its meeting on 14 October;
- (3) ask the chair to write to both Norwich MPs with a copy of the report to seek their views on the subject;
- (4) ask the scrutiny liaison officer to draft a full response to the comments made by a member of the public to the scrutiny select committee for sign off by the select committee.

6. Scrutiny committee work programme 2020- 21

The chair proposed that the consideration of the written responses and continuation of the scrutiny of the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (as agreed earlier in the meeting) be added to the work programme for the next meeting of the committee. A member suggested that this was restricted to half an hour. The chair agreed as they were essentially at the recommendation stage. The chair said that he was in discussion on the scoping of the rough sleeping item for the November meeting and hoped to share this with members at this at the next meeting. The report for the next meeting on community development had already been prepared. The corporate leadership team was taking an active interest in the work of the scrutiny committee by considering the scrutiny work programme at its weekly meetings.

During discussion two members asked about taking forward the select committees on fly tipping and antisocial behaviour. A member of the public had recommended scrutiny of these issues. The chair suggested that interested members contacted the scrutiny liaison officer.

A member asked about the other three substantive items voted through at the July meeting and asked how to progress the three topics to the one that had received the most votes, suggesting that the March meeting had capacity. The chair said that there was scope to another topic at the February meeting, as it was further scrutiny of the budget, giving capacity for two of the three meetings could be added to the work programme. The scrutiny liaison officer said that she was looking at the four items voted through at the last meeting and would make recommendations in the work programme report as to which of the four should be considered at its February meeting. The performance framework was likely to move to January rather than December. A member asked that consideration should be taken of the capacity within teams when considering the topics. The topic given the most priority by the committee might not have capacity within the relevant teams which should be taken into account.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) note the inclusion of New Anglia LEP on the work programme for the October meeting;

- (2) ask the scrutiny liaison officer to email members of the committee to gauge interest in serving on select committees for fly-tipping and antisocial behaviour;
- (3) ask the scrutiny liaison officer to review the topics voted on at the July meeting and make recommendations to the committee at its next meeting as to which topics to select.

7. Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee Update

Councillor McCartney-Gray agreed to circulate a written report on the subjects considered at the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny committee she had attended. The committee had considered the Norfolk and Waveney Clinical Commissioning Group, a new commissioning organisation and its recovery plan for Covid; dentistry; end of life care and the NSFT recovery plan. Councillor Oliver thanked Councillor McCartneyGray for attending a meeting in her place at short notice due to technical problems.

(Councillor Giles said that he had not received any information on the Community Safety Partnership. The scrutiny liaison officer said that she would make enquiries and get back to him.)

RESOLVED to note.

CHAIR

APPENDIX

Questions submitted to the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership in advance of the meeting

Business theme lines of enquiry

1. Do you have an estimate of the number of businesses in the region in receipt of Government loans who will not be able to repay? What support will be available to businesses in managing debt repayments?
2. Do you have an estimate of the regional increase in unemployment following the end of the furlough scheme?
3. Can you please provide more detail on the aspiration to invest in re-skilling and will there be a particular focus on sectors which are facing greatest difficulty? Which employment sectors have been identified as having potential for economic growth and job creation?
4. What assessment has the LEP made of the impact of both Covid and Brexit on Norwich Research Park?
5. Could you detail what role, if any, the LEP is playing in the regeneration of East Norwich?
6. What sustainability assessments did the LEP conduct before deciding to award £1m to the Honingham food enterprise park?
7. What is the benefit to local people from Enterprise Zones?

Covid recovery and social equality lines of enquiry

8. The LEP covid recovery plan talks about “Working with DWP, Job Centre plus and professional services to ensure employers and employees are aware of and have access to available support programmes at the earliest point”. That “earliest point” is usually Universal Credit, which means a 5-week wait for many without any access to support. What is being done to work with employers to prevent people being made destitute for that time? And how are people accessing that support?
9. There seems to be a great focus on creating jobs as a general strategy for growth in the region, for example through the Town Deal bid and through the LEP’s economic strategy. What is being done to ensure that the effects of job creation are beneficial for social mobility?

The environment lines of enquiry

10. What impact do you think Covid will have on the timescale for achieving a net-zero carbon economy?
11. Is it the intention of the Clean Growth Taskforce to set a target for carbon neutrality and what plans are there to engage civil society, unions, and the public in the development and delivery of the Clean Growth Taskforce?
12. What practical contributions have the LEP made to reducing global carbon emissions and to reversing biodiversity loss (actual measures implemented rather than a list of strategies/ policies)?
13. In what ways has the LEP contributed to increases in carbon emissions and biodiversity loss through its policies/programmes/funding and what are the measurable impacts of LEP's policies/programmes/funding on carbon and biodiversity?
14. To what extent do the LEP policies/programmes/funding have an overall net benefit on reducing carbon and increasing biodiversity or a net disbenefit?

15. The LEP's Clean Growth Action Plan (Feb 2020) reported an increase in transport's share of CO2 emissions in the region from 29% in 2005 to 38% today. At the same time the Clean Growth Action Plan proposes business as usual, ('On-going work on the road network to reduce congestion/improve air quality'). The LEP Green Recovery Plan states that it will deliver the existing portfolio of infrastructure priorities to support the local construction sector. This would further increase transport's share of carbon emissions and entrench car use. The trend for more flexible working patterns and greater home working underlines a need to switch money from road building to broadband and digital. Will LEP re-evaluate its whole approach to transport infrastructure, travel and development?
16. A [January 2020 report](#) on decarbonisation for the East of England found that in order to meet targets of being carbon-neutral by 2030, approximately 1.3 million homes in the region would need to have their energy efficiency upgraded to the highest standard, beginning with 156,000 homes insulated in 2020. In addition, 1.5 million homes would need to have air- or ground-source heat pumps installed to transition away from fossil fuels. What is the LEP doing to meet that requirement?

17. The Local Energy East (LEE) Strategy, which does not have any target for carbon neutrality and was adopted before targets were set by national and local governments, supports the potential for new gas extraction. The LEP's Economic Strategy includes a commitment to supporting the Bacton Gas Terminal until 2048. Do you agree that continued expansion of and long-term support for gas is incompatible with carbon neutrality targets and will the energy strategy and economic strategy be revised to take account of that?
18. The LEE Strategy also references the Government ambition to transform DNOs into DSOs by 2030. Given the potential of decentralising the grid in supporting decarbonisation and local renewable energy production and the necessity of doing so in order to meet the requirements for increased electrification of transport, are there plans to accelerate the decentralisation of the energy system? If so, how will community energy groups be included in the process?
19. Recently a project has been launched to get landowners to devote at least 20% of their land to nature, in order to halt and reverse species extinction. Is this something the LEP supports?

Accountability theme lines of questioning

20. Question to Councillor Waters – as a member of the LEP Board, how do you ensure accountability to the public for your role on the board and how do you gather the views of members on Norwich City Council for helping to shape NALEP policy/programmes/funding and reporting back?
21. What monitoring of its policies/programmes/funding does NALEP carry out, with a view to understanding their impact on sustainable development?

Voluntary sector engagement lines of enquiry

22. Given the changes likely to working patterns, have unions been consulted on the LEP's Covid recovery plan, 2020-21 Delivery Plan, and Economic Strategy?
23. Page 8 of the Covid recovery document highlights the impacts on mental health and wellbeing, and talks of the role of the voluntary, community and

social enterprise organisations in supporting workplace wellbeing. Will funding for VCSE organisations be available to support this work? Will there also be support for those who are no longer working and for young people?

Norwich City Council
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item No 5

REPORT for meeting to be held on Thursday 15 October

Norfolk Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee (NHOSC)

Summary: Councillor Laura McCartney-Gray is the council's representative on the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and will give a verbal update at the meeting.

The meeting of NHOSC took place on 8 October 2020.

Conclusions: The purpose of this report is to receive a verbal update from Scrutiny's representative on NHOSC.

Recommendation: To note the update of the NHOSC representative.

Contact Officers: Emma Webster, scrutiny liaison officer
preferred contact by e-mail
emmawebster@norwich.gov.uk

Norwich City Council
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item No 6

REPORT for meeting to be held on Thursday 15 October

Scrutiny committee work programme 2020-21

Summary:	<p>The purpose of this report is to assist committee members in setting the work programme for the rest of the civic year 2020-21.</p> <p>Members are asked to consider the report and any additional recommendations to update the work programme throughout the civic year.</p>
Conclusions:	<p>It is proposed that any discussion is agreed as a whole committee using 'TOPIC' criteria. This will assist members in achieving the goal of an agreed work programme that is met by consensus.</p> <p>The work programme is a standing item at each committee meeting and can be adjusted as necessary.</p>
Recommendation:	<p>To:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(1) consider the scrutiny committee work programme 2020-21.(2) consider the recommendation from the cabinet motion tracker regarding safe drug consumption rooms.(3) agree the membership of the scrutiny select committee for anti-social behavior; and(4) consider the scrutiny recommendations tracker.

Report

1. When the scrutiny committee considers which items to include on its work programme, it is useful to do so in the context of what the focus is for the council over the coming year and to look at how activity aligns to the council's corporate plan.
 2. This is so that the scrutiny committee will be able to consider where and how it can add value to the work being carried out towards achievement of the council's priorities and ensure that resources are being focused effectively.
 3. Although sometimes not possible to achieve, it was previously agreed that the committee should agree as few as possible substantive topics per meeting. The main reason for this is to ensure that there is enough time for the committee to effectively consider the issues and has a fair chance of reaching sound, evidence based outcomes. Ideally, one main item per meeting would be the aim.
 4. Members will have the opportunity on a monthly basis to revise the work programme if and when required or due to changing events.
 5. Along with this report, members have a copy of the scrutiny recommendations tracker for consideration.
 6. It is proposed that any discussion is as a whole committee using the TOPIC criteria. This will assist members in achieving the goal of an agreed work programme that is met by consensus.
 7. Members are reminded that any items placed on the work programme should be considered within the council's COVID-19 recovery framework.
 8. There has been some recent work undertaken to update the motions tracker for council. This work has highlighted that at its meeting on 28 January 2020 council resolved to;
 - *Ask the scrutiny committee to consider examining the implications of Norwich becoming a pilot city for safe drug consumption rooms, which have been shown to save lives;*
- The committee may want to include this topic in the scope for the anti-social behavior select committee.
9. At the last meeting of scrutiny it was agreed to re-focus and revitalise the select committee for anti social behavior. Cllrs Carlo, Sarmezey, Oliver and Osborn have indicated that they would like to stand on this committee. If scrutiny committee are happy with this then we will now proceed on that basis.
 10. At the last meeting of the scrutiny committee it was agreed to revisit the ranking of the topic forms submitted for this civic year with a view to

adding to the annual work programme planning grid. The topics and their ranking is reproduced in **appendix A** for the consideration of the scrutiny committee.

Annual work programme planning grid

(updated 6 October 2020)

Date of meeting	Item
Thursday at 16.30	
2020	
10 June	Covid-19 recovery report
16 July	Work programme Annual scrutiny report
17 September	Work programme Report back from NHOSC meeting from 30 July and 3 September Report back from Short Term Lets select committee Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)
15 October	Work programme Report back from NHOSC meeting from 8 October Enhancing community development following Covid-19 - Citizen Participation blueprint, Kate Price. Follow-up Local Enterprise Partnership (max 30 mins)
19 November	Work programme Maximising opportunities to achieve zero rough sleeping following Covid-19, Chris Hancock.
17 December	Work programme Report back from NHOSC meeting from 26 November Equality information report
2021	
21 January	Work programme Corporate plan and performance framework To consider the 2021/22 budgets, medium term financial strategy and capital programme, along with capital strategy and treasury management strategy Cllr Kendrick. Hannah Simpson, Shaun Flaxman, Adam Drane
4 February	Work programme Further scrutiny of the budget 2021/22
18 March	Work programme Report back from NHOSC meeting from 4 February and 18 March.

Scrutiny committee recommendation tracker

Date of meeting and topic	Recommendations	Outcome
<p>10 June 2020</p> <p>Covid-19 recovery report</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Amending bullet point 2 under section 7, 'Climate change and the green economy' in the recovery themes and key actions summary on p31 of the report to reflect the recommendation of the Tyndall centre to reduce carbon emissions of Norwich by 13 % annually (2) Amending bullet point 4, under section 4 'business and the local economy' section, in the recovery themes and key actions summary on p30 of the report, from 'consider the opportunities to further promote sustainable travel in the city, building on the already well-advanced measures already in place' to 'consider the opportunities to further promote sustainable travel <i>on whole route approaches</i>, building on the already well-advanced measures already in place' (3) Lobbying the LGA and central government for all district councils to be given some of the powers and financial resources that the Health and Safety Executive has, to allow the city council to enforce social distancing if employers are not complying. (4) At section 8.4, include trade unions to the list of groups to be consulted on this document. (5) Redoubling efforts with Norfolk County Council to ensure social distancing measures 	<p>Recommendations taken to Cabinet on 10 June 2020;</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Councillor Waters, leader of the council, thanked the scrutiny committee for its recommendations and said that they would be noted by cabinet and would form part of the thinking around future revisions to the blueprint as it evolved.</p>

	<p>around the city centre are in place as soon as possible.</p> <p>(6) Including further references to the impact of Covid-19 on the insurance industry regarding aviation, and families and young people, particularly in reference to education, including local universities.</p> <p>(7) Revising the Commercial Property Investment Strategy to reflect the changes in the economy due to Covid-19 and how this could drive a green economy.</p> <p>(8) Investigating the use of purchasing powers to undertake a retrofit programme on housing as a key part of driving the economic recovery.</p> <p>(9) Looking at alternative sources of income to carparks in the city.-</p> <p>(10) Looking at the experience of other local authorities which are pursuing a circular economy to take advantage of the fact that Norwich has two recycling centres in development.</p>	
<p>16 July 2020 Work programme 2020-21</p>	<p>(1) At the September meeting of the scrutiny committee to:</p> <p>a) receive a report from the select committee on short term lets; and</p> <p>b) ask the scrutiny liaison officer to approach the LEP to attend the meeting to pick up the work that the committee was due to undertake in March 2020</p>	<p>Items added to the work programme for 2020-21</p>

	<p>(2) Ask the scrutiny liaison officer to add the following items to the scrutiny committee work programme</p> <p>a) Sustainable and inclusive economy following the impact of Covid-19</p> <p>b) Enhancing community development following the impact of Covid-19</p> <p>c) Maximising opportunities to achieve zero rough sleeping following Covid-19</p> <p>d) The social inclusion agenda following Covid-19</p>	
<p>17 September 2020 LEP visit</p>	<p>(1) thank Chris Starkie and Lisa Roberts, of New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), and Councillor Alan Waters for attending the meeting and answering questions on the LEP;</p> <p>(2) ask Lisa Roberts of the LEP to provide responses to questions 10, 12 -19, 22 and 23 (as set out in the appendix)</p> <p>(3) consider the information received at this meeting, together with the responses to the outstanding questions at the next meeting of the committee, with a view to making recommendations to cabinet;</p> <p>(4) ask members to promote the LEP's Job Support Programme to residents and local businesses.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Received</p> <p>On the agenda for 15.10.20</p> <p>Details to be published on e-councillor</p>

	(3) ask the scrutiny liaison officer to review the topics voted on at the July meeting and make recommendations to the committee at its next meeting as to which topics to select.	Completed – on the agenda for 15.10.20.
--	--	---

Appendix A

Details of each of the proposed topics can be found in the agenda papers for the meeting of the scrutiny committee on 16 July 2020 which are available on the council's website.

Topic	Ranking	Comments
Sustainable and inclusive economy following Covid-19	1	
Enhancing community development following Covid-19	2	This topic is on the work programme for 15 October 2020
Maximising opportunities to achieve zero rough sleeping following Covid-19	3	This topic is on the work programme for 19 November 2020
Social inclusion agenda following Covid-19	4	
LEP	5	This topic was considered at the meeting of the scrutiny committee on 17 September 2020 and resolutions will be formed at the meeting on 15 October 2020
Young people and wellbeing	6	
Reducing waste in Norwich	7	
Progress on the safer neighbourhood initiative	8	
The benefits of extending the Public Space Protection Order when it is due for renewal	9	
Alternatives to car parking revenue	10	
Council finances	11	Scrutiny committee will be considering the budget proposals on Thursday 4 February

Norwich City Council

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item No 7

REPORT for meeting to be held on 15 October 2020

Norwich City Council response to Enhancing community development following Covid-19

Summary:

Norwich City Council has long been committed to encouraging and supporting community led action of all types, which can be seen through projects like LUMI which was developed by the council to support grassroots organisations and individuals.

During the recent crisis, both existing and new groups took fundamental roles in delivering much needed services like food deliveries, medication collections, signposting to partner agencies and general befriending activities, and demonstrated that areas with high social capital were better able to support one another. Many of the new groups which emerged remain as small, grassroots residents groups are looking to continue their improved neighbourliness and the council has a careful and at times delicate role to play in nurturing this. There is also a role for the council to understand in which areas this did not happen organically and if there are any ways in which we can invite residents to work alongside us to understand why and potentially catalyze new activity.

Community development has been at the core of the council corporate objectives for many years and in places this will look to build on existing projects and work, look at opportunities to do better and pilot new ideas. It will also be important, to embed this approach across council teams and services so residents feel able to shape and contribute to the improvements of the city as a whole, increasing their sense of agency and their social capital, and leading to services which better match the needs of residents.

The council's covid recovery blueprint includes actions which further enhance community development, namely:

- Creating a blueprint for citizen participation within the city incorporating LUMI
- embedding an asset-based and place-based approach to working
- testing new models of service delivery which involve residents
- participating in national and global discussions on how best to achieve this
- understanding the role of communications better to encourage social action
- reduction of bureaucracy in allowing residents more control over their own lives and neighbourhoods

There was also worked picked up in 2019 on the role of the ward councillor which can be revised to ensure councillors are aware of all options open to their residents in terms of support and guidance.

Conclusions:

The report provides members with key information on how the council plans to continue and evolve community development works, and the development of the work to embed this council wide.

Recommendation:

That the scrutiny committee considers the information presented at this meeting and considers:

- (1) How members might contribute to developing the Citizen Participation Blueprint
- (2) How the role of members within community development can be supported and enhanced
- (3) Suggestions or recommendations it may wish to make to support activity being developed; and
- (4) Any other recommendations the committee wishes to make

Contact Officers: Kate Price
Neighbourhood and community enabling manager
kateprice@norwich.gov.uk
01603 989532

Report

Context

1. People who feel they have the ability to make a positive change in their lives and community have an improved sense of themselves and this is a positive impact on their wellbeing. Improved relationships with citizens, especially those in marginalized communities, improves wellbeing and social capital which in turn improves life chances and sense of agency. It links to wellbeing, social mobility, health, inequality and more which makes it vital to invest in.
2. When agencies such as local government ask people who live where we work to inform our thinking, we are better able to get things right first time which improves outcomes and efficiency. People who live in the area know it better than those who do not and residents with lived experience understand complex situations better than those looking in. As a council the quality of our services improve and getting further upstream to look at prevention not crisis interventions, as well as improving the compliance where people buy into decisions they help make.
3. Stronger, resilient communities are better able to look after themselves and therefore need less costly council interventions. This was well demonstrated in the Covid-19 response and neighbourhood support thrived which meant that residents needs were met where they lived and did not need council services. It is worth noting this tends to happen more in affluent communities so more support and guidance is needed in deprived neighbourhoods.
4. Citizen participation allows for support in maintenance of public spaces as well as less physical support in terms of befriending and social inclusion. There may be long term cost savings but the driver must be doing the right thing and savings would follow.
5. There is a possibility of offering too much support which creates dependency whereas too little exacerbates inequality so the line needed in terms of walking will always be narrow. It requires better clarity on what the council does and doesn't do and a better understanding for residents of where the council sits alongside other agencies such as the County Council, Police and CCG within the city's social infrastructure.
6. This is also fundamental in supporting the wider development of the council in terms of culture change and power shift, as working in this way empowers not only citizens but officers which leads to innovative ideas being brought forward and more fulfilling roles.

What within our control impacts community development?

7. **'Neighbourliness' development** – Mobilizing citizens to support one another. Understanding and developing those who came forward as part of the covid-19 response developing mutual aid groups and the transition to more general community support and better understanding of what it means to be an active citizen.

8. **Asset usage** – Looking at existing assets and how their alternate usage may better deliver on local priorities, including community asset transfer and grant in kind rentals. Refocusing on the value of the usage in the community, as much as the value in income and understanding how to evidence this well.
9. **Equality and inequality** – Defining equality impact assessments and project development to support making all council services and projects more accessible and more focused on the end user. Focusing on the voices we usually hear the least and being proactive in how we do that. Understanding that social capital and a sense of agency has a positive impact on the wider determinants of a happy life but also present significant barriers so both understanding these and focusing on reducing them will be key.
10. **Communication** – language is key and how you ask is as important as the fact that you do. What we don't say matters as much as what we do when building trusting relationships with residents. This includes formal and more informal communication, messaging, methods and frequency.
11. **Growth and development** – both in engaging citizens for their specialist local knowledge to inform development and also in working alongside the existing community where development occurs to help welcome new neighbours without creating a "new" community within an existing one to ensure integration and inclusion.
12. **Officer engagement and empowerment** – ensuring officers have the right and expectation to disrupt where needed and be flexible and agile in making the right decisions. Staff training and skill development around asking the right questions interpreting and acting on feedback. Inter-team working and removal of silos and barriers to engagement.
13. **Consultation** – While the council never fails to fulfil the statutory duty to consult, there are opportunities to do this better and in ways which better engage and inspire people. It also needs to take place earlier to input on design, not consult on finished products. This will allow co-design over consultation and give residents more confidence in being able to affect change.
14. **Council spending power** – Revisiting the social value in procurement and how spending can be focused on bringing additional value to purchasing decisions which benefit communities. Looking at grant giving and its impact in the community.
15. **Councillors and democracy** - Working with councillors as representatives and frontline voices of the council and working to ensure better engagement in the democratic process from all communities.

How will this be achieved and grown

16. Existing work will continue as business as usual within the Community enabling team and linked projects such as the Reducing Inequalities Target Area work (RITA) which have been working on community development for a number of years with great success.

17. Within those roles, there will be a focus on support for those groups which formed during covid and how to support those to continue, as well as support for those charities and community groups adversely affected by covid.
18. Linking the wider work around covid recovery, the Citizen Participation Blueprint aims to research and then present principles which, if adopted council wide, will embed understanding of the role the council plays in supporting and developing communities, as well as identify practical next steps which will enhance the work further:
- i. **Phase one - Research and conversations.** Five research work streams with internal and external workshops, 121 interviews and desk top research being undertaken during September and October:
 - (1) Great internal and external practice examples
 - (2) Our internal strengths and why we don't already work this way
 - (3) Communication – when and how to invite people into the conversation
 - (4) Hearing the unheard voices – understanding better engagement
 - (5) Technical tools – what platforms and solutions exist to be utilised
 - ii. **Phase two - Draft principles and testing with teams.** Workshopping these draft principles with teams looking at how these could be embedded into their specific working practices and services and whether they are practical in terms of implementation or need any adjustment and development. Also to highlight any recommendations which may need to be made which would allow them to be adopted. Test to be done concurrently with councillors. Understand the criteria for success and what and how to measure in terms of social capital, social network impact, impact of having a sense of community and agency etc.
 - iii. **Phase three - Blueprint revision and sign off.** Revise blueprint based on feedback from teams and testing.
 - (1) CLT review and amendments
 - (2) Cabinet review and sign off
 - iv. **Phase four - Making it real.** Council wide supported adoption ongoing through 2021. Expand the workshop and facilitation offer more widely.
 - (1) Support SMT to identify opportunities to make significant change and support these adaptations
 - (2) Look at training needs and action for officers
 - (3) Make recommendations in other areas for changes needed to support this way of working
 - (4) Continue to review and update as pilots and changes progress
19. Continuing to work alongside County Council, district and health partners to explore opportunities for better place-based working post-covid based on the successful partnership working during the pandemic. Looking to ensure a reduction in duplication and maximisation of appropriate resources in the right places, especially from commissioned services.
20. Continuing to take part in national and global discussions on good practice such as

NLGN Innovation Network and the Centre for Welfare Reform led Neighbourhood Democracy work, and sharing best practice and innovative ideas to pilot where suitable to the local context.

21. Explore local and national funding opportunities around supporting projects and pilots as many of the recommendations may have a cost attached and current capacity within existing teams given austerity will limit what can be achieved.

Key risks and considerations

22. The approach being taken is a long term one and in many places will need to be looked at as generational change, therefore the time scales need to be committed to upwards of ten years, ideally more and simply ongoing.
23. Austerity and resources meaning we are limited at what we can deliver. Embedding the approach council wide will widen the scope of the council to do more within BAU but there is still a need for officers to be available for the type of support needed for residents to build their confidence and abilities which is currently limited by budgets.
24. The requirement to reduce red tape and formality, but not at the risk of governance internally. This will need to be understood and mitigated where needed and new processes of sharing information (e.g. with contractors for maintenance) need to be reviewed.
25. Lack of council wide buy-in as this is easily undermined if it is not being adopted fully as it will damage trust. If one team does something which is not in-keeping with developing communities, the effect can be to destroy the trust built by another and therefore impact outcomes.
26. Not giving genuine power and control and reverting to conciliatory consultation as an easy tick box. Lack of authenticity diminishes resident trust and belief in the system of change.
27. Need to be willing for approaches not to work and learn from failure. Officers must feel confident that they are able to take managed risks or try something new without fear of reprisal or reprimand.
28. Need to focus on proactive engagement of marginalised communities otherwise the approach may exacerbate inequalities. This involves careful and culturally sensitive working and links to the work already being undertaken on improvements in EIAs.
29. Many good examples of impactful change have been externally or internally funded with significant investment in other places which the council does not have access to. Either consideration needs to be given to making budget available where possible or an acknowledgement that more cannot always be done with no additional resource.
30. Existing inequalities make fully representative engagement more difficult. In areas which have seen multiple interventions or long-term inequalities, including embedded generational issues and culture, can be resistant to new ways of working and engaging with agencies.

31. Navigation of statutory duties in developing new models (e.g. planning requirements and public committees). The council cannot deviate from what it legally has to do and so any new ways of working need to reflect these restrictions.

Norwich City Council
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Item No 8

REPORT for meeting to be held on Thursday 15 October

New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership

- Summary:** At the last meeting of scrutiny representatives from the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) attended and took questions tabled in advance from members. Due to time constraints not all questions were answered during the meeting and the LEP have now provided written answers to these questions.
- Conclusions:** That these written answers are now considered along with those minuted from the meeting.
- Recommendation:** That the scrutiny committee make its recommendations to cabinet on this topic.
- Contact Officers:** Emma Webster, scrutiny liaison officer
preferred contact by e-mail
emmawebster@norwich.gov.uk

Norfolk Scrutiny Committee 17th September
Written response to questions from New Anglia LEP

Thank you for the opportunity for the LEP to participate in the Norwich Scrutiny Panel on 17th September. Please find below the LEPs response to the question that we were unable to discuss given the time pressures.

10. What impact do you think Covid will have on the timescale for achieving a net-zero carbon economy?

The lockdown resulted in improvements to air quality and reductions in carbon emissions that demonstrated the scale needed to achieve a zero-carbon economy. It has also presented an opportunity to do things differently and has brought together organisations to deliver change such as the active travel measures at accelerated speeds.

The Government has committed to building a green and resilient recovery and the New Anglia LEP [Covid-19 Economic Recovery Restart Plan](#) looks to economic recovery with investment in low-carbon technologies that offer significant economic benefits from job opportunities to spending, while at the same time building a clean and resilient net zero economy.

The costs associated with decarbonising, mixed with the need for alternative low-carbon technology and infrastructure which does not exist at scale yet are challenges to achieving a net zero economy. The LEP is recommending through its variety of channels in to government that it commits to a longer-term economic package with strategic investments at the scale required to achieve net-zero emissions.

Being more ambitious as available options are now cheaper including efficiency retrofits of homes, zero carbon new homes, zero carbon enabling infrastructure (including for renewable energy) and connected demand response mechanisms, public transport and electric vehicles. There is also the opportunity to review barriers to delivery including policy frameworks, regulation, and planning policies that can accelerate progress towards a net zero economy.

12. What practical contributions have the LEP made to reducing global carbon emissions and to reversing biodiversity loss (actual measures implemented rather than a list of strategies/ policies)?

13. In what ways has the LEP contributed to increases in carbon emissions and biodiversity loss through its policies/programmes/funding and what are the measurable impacts of LEP's policies/programmes/funding on carbon and biodiversity?

14. To what extent do the LEP policies/programmes/funding have an overall net benefit on reducing carbon and increasing biodiversity or a net disbenefit?

These three questions have been grouped together as they are interrelated. We have also assumed that question 13 is about decreasing rather than increasing carbon emissions.

The LEP Growth Deal has supported enabling projects to support the reduction of carbon emissions –

-
- £10m to broadband infrastructure which has helped make the current 'work from home' regime possible in our area and enables businesses and individuals to work effectively from home/rural locations and reduce travel time.

- £7.35m to the Norwich Area Transportation work in the city centre which reduces vehicle emissions for people in the city.
- (approx. £15m) £8.85m in Great Yarmouth, £4.62m in Attleborough and £2.25m in Bury St Edmunds for sustainable transport measures to support walking, cycling and public transport use and reduce car use.

LEP Growing Places Fund has supported projects which enable the purchase of land to develop new nature reserves to protect biodiversity and improve public engagement with, and access to, nature –

- £100,000 to the Hawk and Owl Trust to buy additional land for their work, and to create new jobs and apprenticeships
- £250,000 to create a new nature reserve at Carlton Marshes in Suffolk

The LEP funding programmes have also contributed significantly to projects which mitigate the damage from climate change to our local economy for example:

-
- Bacton to Walcott Coastal Management project - £1.08m towards a c£20m 'Sea Scaping' project to prevent coastal erosion and the damage to nature and settlements it causes.
 - Over £26m to flood defences projects - £10m towards Lowestoft flood defences, £8.2m Great Yarmouth flood defences, £6.6m to Ipswich flood defences and £0.25m Snape Maltings Flood Defences. These support the protection of homes and businesses, but also reduce the risk to biodiversity and the landscape from flooding events.

The LEP Growth Hub signposts businesses looking for small grants to reduce their carbon footprint to the [BEE Anglia](#) scheme which the LEP helped to secure over £4m from the ERDF EU programme.

The LEP was also instrumental in establishing the new Low Carbon Innovation Fund with a total of £8m available to invest in businesses to help them reduce their carbon footprints. We are actively working on a Norfolk and Suffolk Investment Plan with partners to pull together the next tranche of major projects for the area – there will be a strong focus going forward on reducing emissions and mitigating climate change driven by our Clean Growth Task Force.

Current work in this area includes recent 'Funding Fit' workshops to discuss Innovate UK funding opportunities around sustainability and reducing emissions with key businesses to try to generate projects – on 29th September, we have a workshop at our restart festival on the Industrial Energy Transformation Fund to generate ideas for projects which improve energy efficiency in industrial processes.

We are also working closely with environmental organisations and farmers (including our Agri-food Industry Council) to develop collaborative projects to build on the best practice in our area (eg Holkham Estate) in promoting biodiversity and improving carbon retention in productive soils, and are actively looking for funding opportunities to support these initiatives. To date, the core metrics by which the activity of the LEP (including programmes) have been assessed has related to specific economic or skills support outputs/outcomes directed by the funding government department– most typically business creation, job creation, new dwellings, median wage levels, new learners, and the level of private investment secured or attracted to specific projects this is due to the direction of government funding criteria. Thus far, criteria pertaining to clean growth or protection or preservation bio-diversity have not featured in our project applications.

However, we are now in the process of drawing up a set of additionality factors, which will be taken into consideration alongside the core economic output/outcome measures.

We are working on finalising an organisation wide commitment including the criteria applied to LEP funded project applications, and at the heart of the work undertaken by the clean growth taskforce. We are working with partners in the development of this with the aim to get commitment across Norfolk and Suffolk so that all partners consider these new criteria.

15. The LEP's Clean Growth Action Plan (Feb 2020) reported an increase in transport's share of CO2 emissions in the region from 29% in 2005 to 38% today. At the same time the Clean Growth Action Plan proposes business as usual, ('On-going work on the road network to reduce congestion/improve air quality'). The LEP Green Recovery Plan states that it will deliver the existing portfolio of infrastructure priorities to support the local construction sector. This would further increase transport's share of carbon emissions and entrench car use. The trend for more flexible working patterns and greater home working underlines a need to switch money from road building to broadband and digital. Will LEP re-evaluate its whole approach to transport infrastructure, travel and development?

The New Anglia LEP fully supports projects that improve digital connectivity as set out in the [Covid-19 Economic Recovery Restart Plan](#) and [Infrastructure Brochure](#).

Two projects - Extending ultra-fast broadband infrastructure in Norfolk and Extending full fibre broadband in Suffolk successfully secured funding through the recent Government's Getting Building Fund.

As a rural county a range of transport measures will need to be identified by the Taskforce to reduce carbon emissions whilst ensuring accessibility for all residents, alongside improving strategic road connections we are working with Local Authorities to progress the delivery of electric vehicle infrastructure, will utilise the [Integrated Transport Strategy](#) to improve access to/use of sustainable modes/models through integration and behaviour change and are lobbying for improved rail services through the [Great Eastern Rail Campaign](#).

16. A [January 2020 report](#) on decarbonisation for the East of England found that in order to meet targets of being carbon-neutral by 2030, approximately 1.3 million homes in the region would need to have their energy efficiency upgraded to the highest standard, beginning with 156,000 homes insulated in 2020. In addition, 1.5 million homes would need to have air- or ground-source heat pumps installed to transition away from fossil fuels. What is the LEP doing to meet that requirement?

The New Anglia LEP fully supports the decarbonisation of housing through the retrofitting of existing homes and building of new energy efficient homes. We are working closely with the Greater South East Energy Hub and Local Authorities to deliver the recent Government call for home energy efficiency retrofits deliverable in 2020/21. The [Norfolk and Suffolk Economic Strategy](#) under the Construction and Development sector is exploring how new technologies and practices like 3D printing, robotics, and modular construction could stimulate innovation and increase productivity. The industry is ready to tackle the challenges and be proactive, piloting new approaches to housebuilding, such as custom and self-build.

But we recognise we need to go further.

New Anglia LEP has submitted a bid to the Energy Systems Catapult to be one of six pilot areas to set up a Decarbonisation Academy which is something the Catapult is currently pursuing with government.

Our bid to the catapult is backed by the Greater South East Energy Hub.

The programme will:

- Develop the wide range of skills needed to decarbonise 25m homes in the UK
 - Develop the institutional and physical infrastructure to support a rapid deployment of high-quality training schemes linked to cutting edge home decarbonisation schemes
 - Establish incubators to support the creation of new types of businesses delivering quality home decarbonisation
-

- Demonstrate innovative approaches to decarbonising existing homes that can be scaled up across the country, based on the learning from the BEIS Electrification of Heat programme and BEIS local supply chain demonstration projects
- Provide open software tools to accelerate the training of the professionals and increase their productivity

17. The Local Energy East (LEE) Strategy, which does not have any target for carbon neutrality and was adopted before targets were set by national and local governments, supports the potential for new gas extraction. The LEP's Economic Strategy includes a commitment to supporting the Bacton Gas Terminal until 2048. Do you agree that continued expansion of and long-term support for gas is incompatible with carbon neutrality targets and will the energy strategy and economic strategy be revised to take account of that?

The Local Energy East Strategy (LEES) does identify the potential for new gas extraction as an opportunity for jobs in the energy sector but also considers the National Grid projections which suggest that gas demand will fall significantly over the coming decade, as it becomes more expensive and more environmentally-friendly means of heating become available.

Bacton Gas Terminal as a major component of UK energy infrastructure, providing one third of the UK gas supply, making it an essential component in ensuring the future energy security of the UK but similarly to the LEES wants to explore new technologies across our energy system and connect residents with the opportunities afforded by the energy sector.

This will include investigating the potential of utilising the existing infrastructure at Bacton for for hydrogen production and distribution (see next answer).

As set out in question 18 we should be seeking new methods of distributing energy and the speed of this transition will depend on movement towards a decentralised energy system, something the LEP and the LEES activities are looking to support.

The LEES covers the New Anglia, Greater Cambridge and Peterborough and Hertfordshire LEP areas with an extended Stakeholder Group including more than 400 people from all 38 constituent local authority areas and related organisations and this issue would need to be considered by the range of stakeholders.

18. The LEE Strategy also references the Government ambition to transform DNOs into DSOs by 2030. Given the potential of decentralising the grid in supporting decarbonisation and local renewable energy production and the necessity of doing so in order to meet the requirements for increased electrification of transport, are there plans to accelerate the decentralisation of the energy system? If so, how will community energy groups be included in the process?

The New Anglia All Energy Industry Council has identified major opportunities for the development of a regional hydrogen economy that connects supply and demand in East Anglia as well as the creation of multi-energy generation systems. In support of the drive to net zero, a number of transformational energy hubs could be created in Norfolk and Suffolk including locations such as Bacton, with plans for a blended transition from gas to hydrogen, and Sizewell, offering an integrated system of heat and power generation and storage, including the production of hydrogen on site.

There is scope for the Bacton site be developed into a major innovation and demonstration project for new energy, including hydrogen. The project is referred to as Bacton 2.0.

This work strategically aligns with the aims and aspirations of the draft Local Industrial Strategy and focus on clean growth with hydrogen being an important part of the energy mix going forward. The 'decarbonising' of the whole energy system and drive towards net zero is a key priority. This work is also supported by the All Energy Industry Council.

Early feasibility work is progressing at Bacton, led by Hydrogen East and supported by the Oil and Gas Technology Centre (OGTC), the Oil and Gas Authority (OGA), New Anglia LEP and North Norfolk District Council.

There is enormous scope for the green energy transformation in our region through practical demonstrator projects and new research working across agencies including CEFAS, UEA, Catapults, Norwich Research Park, Adastral Park etc. We have the real opportunity to leverage our unique energy assets, knowledge and experience to support the UK's drive to a net zero economy.

The LEES sets out the need to decentralise the energy system, stating we should be seeking to take advantage of new decentralised methods of distributing energy. Not only will this enhance the sustainability and resilience of the network, it will also incentivise the development of small-scale renewable projects.

The LEES sets out the strategic leadership activities needed to accelerate this transition. The LEES fully supports the role and contribution of community scale energy schemes and wants to support communities to benefit from local renewable energy generation through a range of actions: Supporting the development of new community-owned schemes, Supporting the development of local smart grids, Developing a dedicated vehicle for generating local energy in a way which benefits communities, and consider where targeted pilots could help us explore initiatives and learn from other leading areas/schemes.

The New Anglia LEP is also working with the GSEEH to promote the Rural Community Energy Fund, a £10 million programme that supports rural communities in England to develop renewable energy projects with community benefit.

19. Recently a project has been launched to get landowners to devote at least 20% of their land to nature, in order to halt and reverse species extinction. Is this something the LEP supports?

It is an interesting concept and something we are interested in learning more about.

22. Given the changes likely to working patterns, have unions been consulted on the LEP's Covid recovery plan, 2020-21 Delivery Plan, and Economic Strategy?

The unions have fed into and helped shape the development of LEP strategies. The TUC shared with us their regional recovery report for the East of England and the LEP is working with the Leader of Norwich City Council to set up a Unions roundtable which will play into the on going development of the Economic Recovery Plan.

23. Page 8 of the Covid recovery document highlights the impacts on mental health and wellbeing, and talks of the role of the voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations in supporting workplace wellbeing. Will funding for VCSE organisations be available to support this work? Will there also be support for those who are no longer working and for young people?

The LEP coordinates the European Social Fund programme in Norfolk and Suffolk, which is bringing almost £40m investment into skills and employability projects in Norfolk and Suffolk. This investment includes some major projects either led by VCSE organisations – such as [On Track](#), an employability project for young people in Norfolk, led by the Matthew Project with other VCSE partners – and many projects in which VCSE organisations are delivery partners. ESF also includes the [LIFT Programme](#), run by Norfolk County Council, which provides grants to small VCSE organisations to help people facing barriers to work. The LEP has developed the Programme locally with funder DWP, and supports

applicants to apply and to manage projects, as well as convening project managers groups to share good practice and advice.

In terms of future funding for the VCSE sector, the LEP is working with Norfolk and Suffolk County Councils, Voluntary Norfolk, Community Action Suffolk and Community Action Norfolk to develop Social Investment East Anglia, a partnership which aims to help VCSE organisations access the wealth of social investment opportunities now available to the sector.

We have stressed to government that integration of the VCSE sector into funding programmes will be vitally important, with recognition of the particular issues that the sector faces around match funding, and of the contribution they make to the wider economy, particularly the most deprived areas that are hardest to reach.

