



## EXECUTIVE

**5.00 p.m. – 6.20 p.m.**

**23 June 2010**

Present: Councillors Morphew (Chair), Morrey (Vice-Chair), Arthur, Blakeway, Bremner, Brociek-Coulton, Sands and Waters (from item 4)

Also present: Councillors Stephenson (to end of item 8) and Wright (from item 5)

### 1. MINUTES

#### Item 3 – Dibden Road Development Proposal

The Chair confirmed that the Executive had not discussed the Dibden Road Development Proposal at its meeting on 9 June 2010. A revised report, containing information relating to the outcome of the consultations with residents, would be considered as a later item on this agenda.

**RESOLVED** to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the Executive meeting held on 9 June 2010.

### 2. UNITARY STATUS – FUTURE OF THE IMPLEMENTATION EXECUTIVE

The Director of Transformation presented the report and explained that the decision following the judicial review on unitary status had been announced on 21 June 2010 and that the Order to create Unitary Norwich would be revoked. The recommendations in the report calling for the formal ending of the Implementation Executive were still valid but could be overtaken by the passage of the Local Government Bill through Parliament to revoke the Order.

The Chair said that it would be possible to move amendments at the Council meeting on 29 June 2010 to update the decision that the Council had to make.

**RESOLVED** to:-

- (1) note that since the announcements of the government's intention to revoke unitary status for Norwich, a number of steps have already been taken to suspend implementation work, and to cease expenditure on implementation wherever possible;
- (2) note that the Implementation Executive needs to remain in place in order to fulfil our statutory duty to implement;

- (3) recommend to full Council to formally suspend member allowances for the Implementation Executive with effect from 1 July 2010;
- (4) recommend to full Council, that if the Local Government Bill is passed, officers should be authorised to seek reimbursement for implementation costs incurred since the Structural Change Order was approved by Parliament on 25 March 2010.

### **3. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT PROPOSAL CONSULTATION**

The Finance Control Officer presented the report and circulated a draft response to the consultation proposal at the meeting.

Councillor Arthur, Executive Member for Housing and Adult Services, spoke in support of the proposals and said that this would be a real opportunity for the Council to invest in the council housing stock in the city. The presentation by officers to tenants on the proposal had been excellent and positive. The situation could change if the coalition government presented alternative proposals. The majority of the local authorities with retained council housing stock were in support of the proposed changes contained in the review of Council Housing Finance.

Councillor Stephenson, Chair of Scrutiny Committee, said that discussion of the proposal was not on the Scrutiny Committee's work programme and therefore it would be unlikely to provide comments by 6 July 2010 deadline.

#### **RESOLVED to:-**

- (1) approve the draft response to the consultation proposal that was circulated at the meeting;
- (2) delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio holder, to agree any minor amendments to the letter.

### **4. PROCUREMENT STRATEGY**

The Head of Procurement and Service Improvement presented the report. The financial impact of the strategy had been discussed with the Head of Finance. No figure had been agreed upon because the strategy was about balancing costs with customer need and continuous improvement and was not focused purely on cost. The following amendments to the Strategy were suggested to include a reference within the Strategic Aims of the Procurement Strategy to the Single Equality Act, as it contained specific instructions on procurement for the public sector, and with reference to the Key Principles, paragraph e, to delete the existing text and replace with the following:-

'Equality - in order to meet duties to promote equality of opportunity in public procurement, we will use appropriate mechanisms in the procurement, contracting out and monitoring of services to promote diversity in suppliers, encourage equality in their recruitment practices, and ensure consistently accessible services are delivered.'

The Chair welcomed the review of the Strategy at a time when there was increased pressure on the Council's budget and it was necessary to ensure continued service improvement and protection of services for local people.

Councillor Waters, Executive Member for Corporate Resources and Governance, then spoke in support of the Strategy and said that there was an important role for elected members and with stakeholders through consultation, to ensure that procurement and the commissioning of services was what people wanted.

**RESOLVED** to approve the Procurement Strategy, as appended to the report, and subject to the amendments proposed.

## **5. DIBDEN ROAD DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

(Councillors Brociek-Coulton and Sands, as Ward Councillors for Sewell Ward, declared a pre-determined view in this item.)

The Senior Development Officer (Enabling) presented the report and referred to the consultation findings contained in Appendix 1 of the report.

A resident who lived close to the Dibden Road site addressed the Executive and said that he thought the proposal would be good for the local area. There was antisocial behaviour on the site which included vandalism and drug taking. The proposal would improve the area and the property would be covered by CCTV. The St Edmund's Society had a good record of working with the local community.

Two local residents then addressed the members and outlined their concerns about the suitability of the supported housing scheme being in the vicinity of George White Middle School and the Patchwork Community Project. They also expressed concern about the extent of the consultation and that some residents had not been included.

The Senior Development Officer (Enabling) said that 85% of the responses received had been against the proposal and 15% had been in favour of it. Copies of the correspondence received in response to the consultation were available at the meeting. There had been discussions with the Patchwork Community Project about the concerns raised by OFSTED and officers would work with both parties to address these issues.

Discussion ensued in which members considered that the Executive was being asked to consider the transferral of land to Broadland Housing Association but that the development of the land would be subject to the planning process and further consultation on planning considerations.

Councillor Brociek-Coulton said that she had attended a meeting of the Mousehold Tenants' and Residents' Association at the Heathgate Community Centre and members had reported that they had not received letters about the consultation. She also pointed out that the concerns of the Patchwork Community Project had not been included in the report and that there had been another open day event as well as the one held on 9 April 2010. She thanked members of the Sewell Community Action Group their support and distributing leaflets to residents.

Councillors Waters and Blakeway spoke in favour of the proposal and the possible development of the site. There was evidence to support St Edmund's Society's running of the facility in Earlham Road and the proposal for Dibden Road would be positive for the area. The St Edmund's Society had a very good track record but there was a misconception about its work and it was hoped that the officers could work with the community to address those fears.

The Chair of the St Edmund's Society responded to comments made by members of the public and said that 50% of the residents were ex-offenders and the other 50% were homeless young men. All residents were low risk and underwent a strong assessment before being accepted by the Society which was reflected in the low levels of re-offending.

The Chair said that the Council was interested in the wellbeing of the residents of the new development and the surrounding neighbourhood and therefore suggested the involvement of the Ward Councillors and the Neighbourhood Team to help resolve the concerns raised in the consultation.

**RESOLVED** with 6 members voting in favour and 2 members abstaining (Councillors Brociek-Coulton and Sands, having declared a pre-determined view) that the Council owned site at Dibden Road be transferred to Broadland Housing Association for the purpose of building the new St Edmund's Society supported housing scheme, as described in the report.

## **6. PARKING MANAGEMENT IN EATON PARK CAR PARK**

The Head of Transportation introduced the report and said that the Executive was being asked to agree the introduction of the time limit for parking at Eaton Park car park prior to public consultation.

Councillor Morrey, Executive Member for Sustainable City Development, said that the proposal had been considered by the Norwich Highways Agency Committee at its meeting on 27 May 2010 and approved subject to the Executive's approval. Councillor Bremner said that there was a problem of long stay parking at Eaton Park car park and both he and Councillor Arthur, as University Ward Councillors, had requested this.

Councillor Wright said that Councillor Lubbock, Ward Councillor for Eaton Ward, had stated a preference for a 3 hour time limit rather than 2.5 hours as proposed.

### **RESOLVED to:-**

- (1) agree to the introduction of a time limit in Eaton Park car park of 2.5 hours, 9am till 3pm, Monday to Friday, from the third Monday in September to last Friday before the late May bank holiday;
- (2) ask the Head of Transportation to investigate using automatic number plate enforcement for both Earlham Park and Eaton Park car parks; and,
- (3) ask the Head of Transportation to complete the necessary statutory processes for securing the time limit, through the Norwich Highways Agency Committee.

## **7. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

**RESOLVED** to exclude the public from the meeting during consideration of items 8 and 9 below on the grounds contained in the relevant paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

### **\*8. SHAREHOLDER DEED FOR NORWICH AIRPORT (PARAGRAPH 3)**

The Solicitor to the Council presented the report and answered members' questions.

During discussion members considered the consequences of entering into a deed as proposed by Omniport Holdings Limited and the best interests of the Council. Members recommended that the deed should be reviewed annually and the provisions of the deed should not apply in the event of Norwich International Airport Limited becoming insolvent.

**RESOLVED** to:-

- (1) approve in principle that the City Council enters into a deed as proposed by Omniport Holdings Limited, and the draft of which is appended to the report, subject to the following conditions:-
  1. the deed being effective for a period of 1 year and reviewed annually thereafter;
  2. that the provisions contained in the deed do not apply upon any insolvency of Norwich International Airport Limited;
- (2) delegate to the Director of Regeneration and Development, in consultation with the relevant portfolio holders, the detailed negotiations and any ancillary or supplementary decisions related to this matter.

### **\*9. LEGI PROGRAMME 2010/11 BUDGET UPDATE (PARAGRAPH 3)**

The Economic Development Manager presented the report and together with the Chief Executive answered members' questions.

Members discussed the financial consequences relating to managing the reduction in LEGI revenue funding for 2010/2011 and considered that a sum of £25,000, allocated in the Economic Development budget under SPC6, should be retained to pump-prime initiatives rather than the using the entire allocation of £50,000 to meet the shortfall in LEGI funding and provide a contingency as recommended in the report. The Chief Executive confirmed that it would be appropriate for £25,000 of the contingency funding to come out of the Council's general revenue contingency fund.

Discussion ensued. Members expressed concern that assistance was given to organisations affected by the reduction in government funding.

**RESOLVED** to:-

- (1) note the options analysis (as set out in the report);

- (2) approve Option 3 and associated revised budget as set out in the body of the report, subject to the allocation of £25,000 of the funding allocated in the Economic Development budget for 2010/2011 under SPC6, to meet the shortfall and provide a contingency;
- (3) agree to minimise the impact on the core programme arising from the reductions in the budget and work with key stakeholders and providers through this difficult period of transition.

CHAIR