



Council

Members of the council are hereby summoned to attend the meeting of council to be held in the council chamber, City Hall, St Peters Street, Norwich, NR2 1NH
on

Wednesday, 29 September 2021

14:00

Members will be aware that only a minimum quorum of councillors, as nominated by Group Leaders on a politically balanced basis, are expected to attend this meeting.

Agenda


	Page nos
1 Apologies	
To receive apologies for absence	
2 Public questions/petitions	
To receive questions / petitions from the public submitted in accordance with 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	5 - 28
To approve the accuracy of the minutes of the informal meeting held on 20 July 2021 and the formal meeting to ratify decisions made on 20 July held on 21 July 2021.	
5 Treasury Management Full Year Review 2020 -21	29 - 42

Purpose - To set out treasury management performance for the year to 31 March 21.

6 Motions

43 - 50

To consider motions for which notice has been given in accordance with the council's constitution.



Annabel Scholes
Executive director of corporate and commercial services

For further information please contact:

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

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

Date of publication: **Tuesday, 21 September 2021**

Information for members of the public

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

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



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



Council

19:30 to 21:35

20 July 2021

Present: Councillors Maguire (Lord Mayor), Ackroyd, Bogelein, Brociek-Coulton, Carlo, Champion, Driver, Davis, Everett, Fulton-McAlister (E), Fulton-McAlister (M), Galvin, Grahame, Hampton, Harris, Haynes, Huntley, Kendrick, Lubbock, Manning, Maxwell, Oliver, Osborn, Packer, Price, Schmierer, Stonard, Stutely, Waters, Wright and Youssef

Apologies: Councillors Button, Giles, Jones, Peek, Sands (M), Sands (S), Thomas (Va) and Thomas (Vi)

1. Lord Mayor's Announcement

The Lord Mayor explained the procedures for this informal meeting of the council that was being held remotely, on public health grounds, in response to the increasing Covid rates of infection in Norwich. Members would discuss the items on the agenda and then a vote taken. The votes cast would be ratified and used to inform decisions made at an in person meeting of a quorum of members of the council (Council, 21 July 2021).

The Lord Mayor said that he had attended several engagements and specifically mention was made to a virtual meeting with Year 1 pupils at Lakenham Primary School and a prize giving at St Edmunds where he had been accompanied by the Sheriff. Members could follow his engagements on Twitter.

2. Declarations of interests

Councillor Stonard declared an other interest in item 6 (below) Adjustments to the Capital Programme 2021-22, as a director and chair of the Norwich Regeneration Ltd board.

3. Public questions/petitions

The Lord Mayor announced that no public questions or petitions had been received.

4. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 29 June 2021.

5. Questions to Cabinet Members/Committee Chairs

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

The questions are summarised as follows:

- Question 1:** Councillor Huntley to the deputy leader of the council and cabinet member for housing on the progress of the development of the Kings Arms Public House site, following compulsory purchase order.
- Question 2:** Councillor Fulton-McAlister (E) to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth on the deterioration of grass cutting on roundabouts and grass verges following the transfer of the highways services to Norfolk County Council.
- Question 3:** Councillor Peek to the deputy leader of the council and cabinet member for housing on the application of the Charter for Social Housing Tenants to tenants in privately rented accommodation.
- Question 4:** Councillor Everett to the cabinet member for resources on the disposal of land at Norwich Airport industrial estate.
- Question 5:** Councillor Manning to the leader of the council regarding the investment in CityFibre to improve access to broadband in the Norwich.
- Question 6:** Councillor Maxwell to the cabinet member for sustainable development and inclusive growth on the Article 4 Direction to give powers to the council to protect office accommodation being converted to residential use under permitted development.
- Question 7:** Councillor Bogelein to the deputy leader of the council and cabinet member for housing on whole house retrofitting of council dwellings.
- Question 8:** Councillor Price to the cabinet member for sustainable development and inclusive growth on the council's position to the Western Link.
- Question 9:** Councillor Youssef to the leader of the council on the administration's position on voter ID.
- Question 10:** Councillor Osborn to the leader of the council about the provision of Recycle-to-go bins in the city.

- Question 11:** Councillor Carlo to the cabinet member for sustainable development and inclusive growth on the Transport for Norwich Strategy and the council's influence on the setting of the local transport plan.
- Question 12:** Councillor Galvin to the cabinet member for health and wellbeing requesting a further biodiversity assessment of Heigham Park prior to the installation of hard tennis courts.
- Question 13:** Councillor Grahame to the leader of the council regarding arrangements to extend food waste collections to residents in privately rented accommodation.
- Question 14:** Councillor Lubbock to the cabinet member for resources with her concern that a request to Norwich Norse Building Services to remove a metal barrier across a footpath in Custance Lane has not been actioned.

(The Lord Mayor permitted the following second question from a member, as the time taken by questions had not exceeded thirty minutes in accordance with the constitution (Part 3, paragraph 53).

- Question 15:** Councillor Galvin to the chair of audit committee regarding the application of policies and procedures underpinning the project to replace the grass tennis courts at Heigham Park.

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

6. Adjustments to Capital Programme 2021-22

(Councillor Stonard had declared an interest in this item.)

Councillor Kendrick moved and Councillor Harris seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

Following debate it was,

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve the following adjustments to the capital programme:

- (1) an increase to the General Fund capital programme of £2m in 2021/22 and £2m in 2022/23 to provide loan finance and share capital to Norwich Regeneration Ltd.
- (2) an increase to the HRA capital programme of £0.152m in 2022/23 and £0.006m in 2023/24 to provide the necessary funding to proceed with the development of the Kings Arms Public House site at 100 Mile Cross Road.

7. Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) – Submission to the Secretary of State for Independent Examination

Councillor Stonard moved and Councillor Waters seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

Following debate it was:

RESOLVED, with 17 members voting in favour, and 10 members abstaining from voting, to:

- (1) agree that the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) is sound and to submit the Plan to the Secretary of State for independent examination, subject to an agreement in principle being reached with Natural England, in the form of a signed statement of common ground, in relation to the mitigation necessary to protect sites protected under the Habitat Regulations;
- (2) agree to request that the appointed independent inspector make any Main Modifications necessary to make the plan sound and legally compliant; and,
- (3) delegate authority to the executive director for development and city services, in consultation with the cabinet portfolio holder for sustainable and inclusive growth to:
 - (a) agree minor modifications to the GNLP prior to its submission, and,.
 - (b) negotiate any main modifications necessary to make the GNLP sound as part of the independent examination.

8. Members Code of Conduct and Complaints Hearing Procedure July 2021 - Update

(An additional Appendix C, Complaints, Investigation and Hearings Procedure had been circulated prior to the meeting.)

Councillor Kendrick moved and Councillor Grahame seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

Following debate it was:

RESOLVED, unanimously, to adopt the revisions to the Member Code of Conduct in Appendix B and the Complaints, Investigation and Hearings Procedure set out in Appendix C, as recommended by the Standards Committee, for inclusion in the Constitution.

9. Annual Report of the Audit Committee 2020-21

Councillor Price moved and Councillor Driver seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

Following debate it was:

RESOLVED, unanimously, to receive the Annual Report of the Audit Committee 2020-21.

10. Motions

(Notice of the following motions, 10(a) to 10(c), as set out on the agenda, had been received in accordance with the council's constitution.)

10 (a) Motion: Stop Fire and Re-Hire in Norwich

Councillor Huntley moved and Councillor Maxwell seconded the motion.

Following debate it was:

RESOLVED, unanimously, that:

“There is a concerted attack on workers’ rights taking place. Workers are being given an ultimatum to either accept reduced pay, terms and conditions or face the sack.

This strategy of ‘fire and re-hire’ has already been perpetrated against British Gas workers, a restructuring that has seen the workers offered the choice of accepting longer working hours or receiving dismissal notices.

This concerted attack on the trades unions and workers’ rights has been condemned by TUC leader Frances O’Grady, and Labour Party leader Keir Starmer. It is an attack on workers that must be resisted.

Council resolves to:

- (1) Recognise that some UK companies are using the cover of Covid-19 to embark upon a concerted attack on employee pay and benefits. A poll published by the TUC reveals that nearly one in ten (9%) workers have been told to reapply for their jobs on worse terms and conditions since the first lockdown in March 2020. ‘Fire and Re-hire’ strategies are being put into operation by some of the UK’s largest employers to reduce workers’ pay, overtime and holiday benefits. Thousands of British workers are facing a ‘levelling down’ in pay and working conditions, in stark contrast to the Government’s stated promises.
- (2) Condemn local companies that use fire and re-hire attacks on workers in our city.
- (3) Support local unions in any strike action against fire and re-hire and call on the companies to instead enter meaningful negotiations with the unions.
- (4) Refuse to enter contracts doing business with companies using these tactics, insofar as this is legally possible, utilising and updating our ethical procurement and social value policy to achieve this.

- (5) Thank Norwich South MP Clive Lewis for supporting British Gas workers and signing the letter to Chris O'Shea, the Chief Executive of Centrica, British Gas' parent company.
- (6) Call upon both local Members of Parliament in Norwich to:
 - (a) condemn the tactics of those businesses using these methods to assault local workers' terms and conditions;
 - (b) write to the Minister of Employment, Mims Davies, to demand the British Government follow countries such as Ireland and Spain in making the practice of fire and re-hire illegal."

10(b) Motion: The Future of Work

The Lord Mayor announced that he had received written notice from Councillor Bogelein that she would like the motion "The Future of Work" to be withdrawn.

(Two hours having passed the Lord Mayor moved that the following item be taken as unopposed business.)

10(c) Motion: Access to Cash

(Proposer Councillor Ackroyd, seconder Councillor Lubbock. Unopposed business)

RESOLVED that:

"Over the last few years there has been a decline in the access to cash. The decline is particularly felt by small businesses and the most vulnerable in our communities who rely on cash to survive.

Small businesses rely on cash and proximity of service to avoid being left behind, particularly those businesses reliant on time dependent services or typically cash-in-hand professions including the likes of carers, tradesmen, babysitters, barbers and beauticians. For small and medium enterprises, being able to deposit their takings into business accounts at the end of the day or week, conveniently and safely – near to where they live and work – is a lifeline.

Many vulnerable and financially excluded people depend on cash for safe deposits, to-the-penny withdrawals, the ability to budget and a friendly face to help with transactions. For people experiencing financial control and other forms of domestic abuse, being able to save and use cash can mean the ability to escape perpetrators and seek refuge. It is crucial for the 1.4 million people in the UK who don't have bank accounts, and many more who don't use online banking.

Post Office provides an existing network for cash to be accessed easily and safely.

In fact, it is the only existing cash network in the UK with the infrastructure, robust scalability and security in place to manage this role.

The council must support the Post Office's Save Our Cash campaign which highlights the importance of access to cash, noting that:

- (a) Due to bank branch closures and the loss of free-to-use ATMs across the UK, millions are at risk of losing access to cash;
- (b) all communities should be guaranteed a legal right to cash services including withdrawal and deposits, and that these services should be available to the penny and free at the point of use, recognising the importance of cash to those most vulnerable and small businesses.

To do this, council resolves to ask group leaders to write to:

- (1) the appropriate Government Minister, asking the Government to introduce legislation to ensure access to cash is protected by law;
- (2) our local MPs asking them to sign Early Day Motion 293 – 'Access to cash' which also back the Post Office's campaign."

As there was no objection, the meeting was closed.

LORD MAYOR

Council 20 July 2021 Questions to cabinet members or chairs of committees

Question 1

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

“The site of the old Kings Arms public house on Mile Cross Road is imminently to be developed, with five new properties planned, including family homes. Since the pub closed in 2000 the site has long been an eyesore and now the council has gone through the painstaking process of a Compulsory Purchase Order this derelict area will be transformed. This proactive work by the council is excellent to see, and the increased provision of much-needed housing is also to be welcomed. Could the cabinet member for social housing comment on the progress of the site?”

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

“I am pleased to say that cabinet has now approved the awarding of a contract to deliver five much needed family homes on this site, assuming the budget is approved later tonight we will be in a position to proceed with the development so far.

The builders should be on site in September. Delivering 5 family council homes using a fabric first approach with good space standards and allowing for future adaptations and wheelchair access. The housing mix on the Kings Arms site was agreed with the home options team to meet the highest need in this part of the city. I look forward to handing over the key to tenants next year.”

(Councillor Huntley did not have a supplementary question.)

Question 2

Councillor Erin Fulton-McAlister to ask the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth the following question:

“Since the loss of the Norwich Joint Highways Agreement, I have noticed how the grass cutting along main roads and particularly the major roundabouts have noticeably deteriorated, in line with the level of service which the rest of the county receive. Residents in my ward, like everyone across this city, want to see Norwich well maintained and their local environment kept presentable. Will the cabinet member for inclusive and sustainable growth comment on this issue and raise this concern through his channels at County Hall?”

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

“City council officers are aware of the concerns of the city’s elected members and residents. We have been working with our colleagues at the county council to improve maintenance standards, and they have put in place performance improvement measures with their contractors. These have resulted in an improvement in grass cutting in the short term, and officers will continue to monitor this between now and the end of the grass cutting season. In addition, £60,000 has been made available through the opening up fund to improve landscaped areas within the city. Work is now underway to clear overgrown shrub and flower beds to improve their appearance, and this work will be completed by the end of the summer. We are also in preliminary discussions with the county council to identify how reduced grass cutting at appropriate locations could contribute to biodiversity in the city.”

(Councillor Fulton McAlister (E) did not have a supplementary question.)

Question 3

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

“As a councillor who is very proud to represent a ward which contains social housing, I am pleased by the efforts taken to not only build, maintain and develop council housing in the city, but also ensure the standards, rights and protections provided are to the highest level. I am aware of the new ‘Charter for social housing tenants’ being introduced by this government, following the disaster at Grenfell in 2017, and would welcome the cabinet member for social housing’s view on its application to Norwich and whether she agrees it should also apply to the private rented sector too?”

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

“The charter for social housing tenants sets out the government’s intentions as part of its response to the Grenfell tragedy. It has been broadly welcomed by local authorities, registered providers and tenants’ organisations. It places more responsibilities and scrutiny on housing providers, more recourse for tenants. Disappointingly, there was no mention of any planned legislation in the Queen’s speech earlier this year and no timetable for implementation.

This council is doing many of things contained in the charter. we have built and will build award-winning new homes. We have invested significant sums of money to ensure our homes are of a ‘Norwich Standard’. There should be an emphasis on making sure that the voice of the tenant is heard and respected whether they be in the social rented sector or the private rented sector.”

(No supplementary question.)

Question 4

Councillor Everett to ask the cabinet member for resources the following question:

“Investing in creating the facilities for businesses to develop and prosper in the city has long been an objective of this council, and practically delivered through the provision of industrial estates within our boundaries. The proposed sale of the airport industrial estate, initiated through the decision of the majority shareholder, which is Norfolk County Council, has been covered heavily in the Evening News in recent weeks. Can the cabinet member for resources outline the positive reasons why this disposal can offer the chance for potential new investment and much needed upgrading to this facility while providing a capital receipt for this council?”

Councillor Kendrick, the cabinet member for resources’ response:

“Disposal of the estate would bring significant inward investment as well as resource, expertise and capital into the city. The scale of the estate is expected to attract an experienced commercial property investor who will be able to realise the wider economic benefits that would follow from such an investment. This would help renew and refresh this area whilst generating much needed jobs and economic growth.

This delivers a capital receipt to the council which would have a material impact in meeting future budget challenges. Additionally, accelerated investment in the estate by a commercial investor would also realise greater tax receipts to the council.

We will seek to work with a new investor via our economic development and planning teams to ensure we have continued influence over the future of the estate to ensure it is delivering the best for the city in terms of jobs and sustainable economic growth.”

(Councillor Everett did not have a supplementary question.)

Question 5

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

“Like most councillors and residents in my ward I have had to work from home more often and use the internet heavily for meetings. The importance of good quality internet provision to both reducing digital exclusion but also enhancing our capacity to deliver a socially inclusive economy in the city remains a core corporate objective. Thanks to the efforts of our economic development strategy, we now have a significant opportunity through City Fibre to invest

and enhance our internet capacity in Norwich. With work starting imminently to enhance services can the leader comment on the next steps to deliver this £50m investment project?"

Councillor Waters, the leader's response:

"Improving broadband capacity in the city is an important part of our Covid 19 recovery plan and we are making good on that commitment. The investment by CityFibre will allow 97,000 homes and businesses in Norwich to embrace full fibre Broadband technology.

A local delivery team has been recruited and contractors are in place to start in September 2021. The build will be delivered in sections with each completed section being "switched on" as work commences on the next, meaning some areas of the city will go live early in 2022.

CityFibre will inform residents and businesses around two weeks before works in their area start, with follow-up communication once works are complete explaining how to connect to the new services.

Whether using Broadband to drive businesses, access healthcare, education, entertainment, or homeworking opportunities this provides a significant economic boost to Norwich, its residents and business community."

(Councillor Manning did not have a supplementary question.)

Question 6

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

"I was pleased to see the cabinet report on an article 4 direction to remove permitted development rights for the conversion of offices to residential units receive support earlier in the month. As a city we have seen the consequences, most visibly through the appalling private sector accommodation at St Faith's Lane and subsequent legal enforcement, where conversion is carried out inappropriately and unsafely. Given the commitment and desire of this Labour council to protect and adapt our strategic office accommodation in Norwich, can the cabinet member for inclusive and sustainable growth comment on his hopes that this directive will be successful and the likely consequences for Norwich if it is not?"

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

"The introduction of an article 4 direction will give the council greater control over changes of use from office to residential to help stem the loss of office accommodation and promote a balanced mix of uses in the city centre. Whilst this approach may fail given that the government appears intent on requiring a very high standard of evidence, our case is supported by overwhelming evidence and is geographically limited.

Failure to introduce an article 4 direction is likely to result in continued loss of office floorspace, with negative impacts for the health of the city centre and the local economy. Although the government now allows more issues to be considered under prior approval this does nothing to achieve affordable housing or decent design so I hope the article 4 direction can be introduced to maximise the prospects of delivering the genuinely sustainable and inclusive growth the city deserves.”

(Councillor Maxwell did not have a supplementary question.)

Question 7

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

“At April cabinet I asked about the need to have a whole house approach to retrofitting council-owned properties. The Retrofit Academy ([What does Whole House Retrofit mean to me? | Retrofit Academy](#)) advises that a whole house retrofit plan is required to ensure a “logical highly effective pathway towards an energy-efficient, well-ventilated home”, taking into account issues such as ventilation, damp and bridging. The portfolio holder for housing indicated that the council already draws up plans for whole-house retrofitting for council properties and I have been promised a few examples of these plans. Could the cabinet member please provide an example of a whole-house retrofit plan for a council property and clarify the number or percentage of council-owned properties for which such a whole-house assessment exists?”

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

“Since we declared a climate emergency in 2019 we have been aiming to be operationally carbon neutral by 2030, with plans for the city to follow suit by 2050 or sooner. We have already achieved a 63% reduction in carbon emissions. We are committed to energy efficiency focussing on affordable warmth as much as environmental considerations. This has included insulation, upgrading windows and doors, thermodynamic hot water systems and installing energy efficient heating systems.

The council also has an on-going programme of whole house improvements to modernise and bring vacant properties up to date, with larger ongoing projects such as the renewable heating scheme at Barnards Yard. Our head of housing will email you an example of a whole house retrofit project.

We will build on our experiences and expertise and develop fully costed plans for our stock following the return of the asset management functions to the City Council.”

(Councillor Bogelein by way of a supplementary question asked what percentage of the council’s assets, including its housing stock, had a whole-house retrofit plan in place. Councillor Harris said that she could not provide an answer to this question

but would ask the head of neighbourhood housing to forward Councillor Bogelein any information that is available. It was not a simple project and she suggested that as a way forward, a meeting was arranged for herself, Councillors Bogelein and Osborn, the head of neighbourhood housing and a senior member of NPS.)

Question 8

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

“The city council's Air Quality Action Plan, approved by cabinet, states that 'The Broadland Northway is expected to further divert traffic away from Norwich as a whole, and especially when the final link-up with the A47 is completed.' It is also noted that the city council is not among the objectors to the Western Link as listed in the recent county council report on the scheme. Can the cabinet member confirm that the city council does oppose the Western Link road and ensure that all Norwich City Council policy documents are updated accordingly?”

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

“The city council's position on the Norwich Western Link remains the same as that given in my detailed answer in Cabinet on 20 January this year. Expressed succinctly, I have not seen anything to confirm that the rigorous conditions I listed in January have been fulfilled which means that we are not supporting the project at the present time.”

(As a supplementary question, Councillor Price asked when the council's Air Quality Action Plan would be updated to reflect the council's change of position on the Western Link. Councillor Stonard said that he had answered the question on the council's position on the Norwich Western Link and that all council policy documents were kept under regular review. The council's policy on Air Quality would be reviewed within its normal timescale.)

Question 9

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

“In May 2021, the Conservative Government released plans for mandatory photo ID's at elections, citing concerns over voter fraud. However, this plan disproportionately risks hitting older, disabled and homeless voters, who are less likely to have such documents. These vulnerable people are the voices which need to be heard the loudest at the ballot box, and these plans risk stripping them of this fundamental right. Does the leader agree with my concerns and will he write to the Prime Minister highlighting them?”

Councillor Waters, the leader's response:

“Thank you for your question. I do share your concerns. The legislation is fixing a problem that doesn't exist. Between 2010 and 2016 there were less than 150 allegations of voter fraud, spanning two General Elections and the

EU referendum -with only 7 convictions. The pilot schemes resulted in over 2,000 potential electors being turned away from the polls and less than half returned. That excludes any voters who were put off from attending their polling station in the first place. The Chief Executive, as Returning Officer, has already written to the Minister of State for the Constitution and Devolution expressing concerns about the proposals. I will reinforce our profound opposition to these changes, with a letter to the Prime Minister showing that as many as 2 million people in the UK could be excluded because they do not have the required forms of voter ID.”

(In reply to Councillor Youssef’s supplementary question, Councillor Waters said that he would be happy for the letter to the Prime Minister to be signed by the other group leaders and that this would demonstrate collective opposition to this proposal which would disenfranchise groups of voters across all political parties. The issue had been discussed at the Norfolk Leaders meeting and there was concern across all parties that democracy would be weakened unless local councillors cooperated to oppose it.)

Question 10

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

“There is a lack of public recycling bins in many parts of the city centre, including around Colegate where the litter bins are frequently overflowing with litter that could be recycled, causing distress for nearby residents. Officers have informed me that ‘The litter bin provision is reviewed on a regular basis and will be looked at again in due course.’ No timescale or clear objectives for this review have been provided. Can the cabinet member confirm that when the provision of litter bins is reviewed, there will be an effort to ensure that areas of the city where there are no recycling bins will be provided with them?”

Councillor Waters, the leader’s response:

“The Recycle on the Go facilities referred to by Councillor Osborn enable people to recycle materials like bottles, cans and newspapers in public places. As we strive to increase household recycling, it is important that recycling behaviour can be replicated when people are out and about. Increasing the number of facilities for people to recycle in public places supports our aim of encouraging positive change in public behaviours towards litter and recycling in public places.

Any ongoing or strategic review of litter bins will consider the possibility of providing Recycle on the Go facilities in areas where these are not currently available.”

(Councillor Osborn as a supplementary question asked whether there was a review of Recycle on the Go facilities and when it would be. Councillor Waters in reply said that there was a logic and benefit to increase opportunities for recycling from the

provision of these facilities and confirmed that the review was high in the council's priorities.)

Question 11

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

“The past decade has seen a welcome fall in city centre traffic due to traffic reduction policies. Beyond the centre, traffic has risen in the absence of demand management, especially around Norwich’s outskirts where further major road building is planned. Households reliant on foot, cycle and bus suffer social inequality and Norfolk’s transport carbon emissions continue growing. Norwich City Council submitted an excellent list of transport measures to Norfolk County Council for influencing an updated Transport for Norwich Strategy. However, the county stated the strategy will support Local Transport Plan 2021-36 which emphasises connectivity, journey reliability and reducing traffic dominance. This represents business as usual and suggests the county council has not responded favourably to the city’s suggested measures. Would the cabinet member like to see a transport strategy for Greater Norwich based on less traffic in line with the list of measures it submitted to the county?”

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

“It’s good to hear Councillor Carlo reiterate the support we received for our response to the Local Transport Plan. We made it clear that business as usual cannot continue and we have been working since then to influence the county council’s thinking around the new Transport for Norwich Strategy. We are expecting a draft document to be published soon, ahead of the meeting of the Transport for Norwich Joint Committee on 29 July. That committee will be invited to support the document being put out for public consultation. We will be comparing how the version published for consultation measures up to our transport agenda and plan to submit a formal response to the consultation, which will be taken to cabinet in September. County should be in no doubt that we are prepared to criticise the document if it fails to serve the city, its environment and wellbeing of its residents.”

(Councillor Carlo referred to the Government’s Transport Decarbonisation Plan, published on 14 July 2021, and said that there would need to be bold decisions on how people travel, including congestion and parking management to meet these challenges, and her concern was that the local transport plan advocated policies to encourage traffic growth. Councillor Stonard referred to his written response and said that the council had made radical proposals as part of the consultation on the Transport for Norwich Strategy and early indications in response were encouraging. The public would have the opportunity to comment on the strategy when it went out to consultation. There needed to be significant changes to modes of transport and there should be no backsliding.)

Question 12

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

“Meadows are cornerstones of biodiversity, powering food chains, collecting energy from the sun and pumping it into ecosystems. They are important in cities because they have been squeezed out elsewhere: we have lost 97% since the 1930s.

Heigham Park tennis courts, surveyed by ecologists in 2018, were ‘well mown’. Since then they have not been cut, and species have re-emerged to make a flourishing wildflower meadow where butterflies and moths lay eggs and bumblebees nest. Song thrush and hedgehog also call it home.

The survey in 2018 was done visually. Recent night-time bat recording with monitors has confirmed the presence of several types of bats including Soprano, Common Pipistrelle and Noctule, hunting for moths breeding and living off the expanse of dark meadow.

Will the cabinet member step in to order a resurvey of this new meadow wildlife site in order to protect this mosaic of rare and threatened species?”

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

“The council commissioned extensive ecology assessment of the Heigham Park Tennis Courts, as part of the Planning Applications in 2017 and 2018. The report stated that the grass courts had:

- negligible intrinsic value, and that the surrounding park had more significance;
- low ecological quality, and the impact of the scheme on habitats is negligible;
- amenity grassland (sports turf) of negligible biodiversity value.

The report also noted that the project would not directly affect any trees or structures potentially used by roosting bats, and that it was not in a location likely to be significant for any commuting bats.

Finally, the scheme includes an area of grassland outside the all-weather courts which could be managed in a way that provides biodiversity benefits alongside the tennis courts. The Council will continue to use expert ecologists to guide the development, but it is not appropriate to commission a further survey.”

(Councillor Galvin as a supplementary question asked the cabinet member whether he was aware that the situation at the park had changed and the biodiversity study was 4 years out of date and did not protect the diversity of species there. Councillor Packer confirmed that a professional ecologist would verify the survey and identify any changes to the species on the site. He pointed out that as part of the tennis court development, close to 60 per cent of Heigham Park would remain and

park users would have an opportunity to say how it should be used, including proposing the retention of part of the park as a meadow. The council took biodiversity, which was essential to the health of its residents, very seriously.)

Question 13

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

“The Environment Bill is due to make food waste collection compulsory for all properties by 2023. It is good to know that Norwich is already ahead of many councils in offering food waste collection. However, residents in non-council flats are currently unable to recycle their food waste due to the council saying that it is unable to clean the food waste bins. What steps are being taken by the council to ensure that it will be ready to offer food waste collection by at least 2023, or ideally sooner?”

Councillor Waters, the leader’s response:

“The Government expects all households to have food waste collections from

1. 2023/24 in those local authorities where there is currently some level of food waste collections, or
2. 2024/25 where they are not currently delivered.

Assuming there are no further delays to the implementation of the Bill, all households in Norwich would be required to have food waste collections by 01 April 2024.

The households currently not in receipt of food waste collections are primarily in privately owned flats or properties. Before we can introduce the service to these properties, we will need to conduct an options appraisal on the most effective and efficient way to deliver Food Waste collection taking into account

1. Ease of use
2. Hygiene, and
3. Cost

This process can start once the Government’s intentions and funding for expanding Food Waste collections have been clarified.”

(In reply to Councillor Grahame’s supplementary question, Councillor Waters confirmed that the city council had been in the vanguard of food waste collection and had recognised its benefits to the environment. The Government was proposing a comprehensive system of food waste collection across England as part of the Environment Bill. The council could demonstrate the benefits of expansion of this scheme but it would require additional.)

Question 14

Councillor Lubbock to ask the cabinet member for resources the following question:

“Metal barriers are blocking a footpath and denying access for those using motorised scooters on Custance Lane in Eaton, just next to a Norwich City Council sheltered housing complex.

On 28 April I asked through the normal Councillor email process that these barriers receive attention to allow access for all.

I received a reply on 5 May to say that ‘NPS have raised an order with Norwich Norse Building to request that a surveyor goes out to look at the area and assess if and potentially what adaptations can be made so that the access through the metal barriers at Custance Lane is made easier for those using mobility scooters.’

To date, 2 months later the barriers remain, and I have not heard another word.

Does the portfolio holder agree with me that this level of service is unacceptable in terms of its communications and its delivery?”

Councillor Kendrick, the cabinet member for resources’ response:

“Following the instruction of NNB the matter was looked into, but it does appear in the hand offs between the different organisations no-one has kept you informed. I will ask officers to write to you separately to do this.

I agree that this level of service is not ideal, and the responsiveness of the service and level of communication is one of the things we hope to address by bringing the service back in house or into NCSL shortly.”

(Councillor Lubbock thanked Councillor Kendrick for his response but expressed her concern that it had taken 10 weeks without any actions being taken or any communications from NPS or Norwich Norse Building, and asked how elected members could represent their communities when our contractors were providing such a poor service. Councillor Kendrick acknowledged this and said that this was one of the reasons that the council had taken the decision to bring these services in house where it would be in a situation to deal with matters more satisfactorily.)

Please note that the following question is a second question from a member and will only be taken if the time taken by questions has not exceeded thirty minutes. This in line with paragraph 53 of Part 3 of the constitution.

Question 15

Councillor Galvin to ask the chair of audit committee the following question:

“After numerous attempts to gather information into council policies and procedures regarding the proposed changes to the tennis courts at Heigham

Park; the process informing the decision to proceed with the project; the identity and nature of the company/entity which will be the responsible body and provider of the service; and the nature of the relationship and checks and balances with Norwich City Council and the said company I have the following request:

That the chair of audit committee ask officers to investigate the policies and procedures that have underpinned the project, and report back to ward councillors, so that we can be assured that due process was followed and that the process and all entities involved provide best value and are robust and fit for purpose?"

Councillor Price, the chair of audit committee's response:

"I would be very happy for the Audit Committee to discuss examining the policies and procedures you're interested in from a control, risk and governance perspective as lessons can be learned for the future and the committee's role is to protect the council from reputational and financial risk, even when risks are the result of past decisions. For the item to be included on the internal audit annual work programme, the head of finance audit and risk would need to be made aware of the specific issues so they can be considered, as the internal audit plan is agreed by CLT. I would support you proceeding in this way. CLT can then check the work requested is consistent with the organisation's priorities, objectives, and risk management framework and if deemed appropriate, report back to the committee.

Scrutiny members could also request that the topic is explored by that committee"

(Councillor Galvin said that there had been an issue in sharing the information with her either as a pdf, or viewing documents in person at City Hall, and asked for assistance in obtaining the information. Councillor Price said that he was sure that officers could facilitate her request and that he would be happy to assist. Regarding the general context of her question, to help him as chair of audit committee, and members of the audit and scrutiny committees, there would be an interactive workshop for all members on the council's policies and procedures and the constitution.)



Council

14:00 to 14:15
tin

21 July 2021

Present: Councillors Maguire (Lord Mayor), Bogelein, Champion, Davis, Grahame, Harris, Kendrick, Stonard, Waters and Wright

Apologies: Councillors Ackroyd, Button, Brociek-Coulton, Carlo, Driver, Everett, Fulton-McAlister (M) , Fulton-McAlister (E), Galvin, Giles, Hampton, Haynes, Huntley, Jones, Lubbock, Manning, Oliver, Packer, Peek, Price, Sands (M), Sands (S), Schmierer, Stutely, Thomas (Va), Thomas (Vi) and Youssef.

1. Lord Mayor's Announcement

The Lord Mayor explained the procedures for this formal meeting of the council, convened to confirm the votes cast at the informal meeting of the council on 20 July 2021; and confirmed that the meeting was quorate.

2. Declarations of interests

Councillor Stonard declared an other interest in item 5 (below) Adjustments to the Capital Programme 2021-22, as a director and chair of the Norwich Regeneration Ltd board.

3. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 29 June 2021.

4. Adjustments to Capital Programme 2021-22

(Councillor Stonard had declared an interest in this item.)

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve the following adjustments to the capital programme:

- (1) an increase to the General Fund capital programme of £2m in 2021/22 and £2m in 2022/23 to provide loan finance and share capital to Norwich Regeneration Ltd.

- (2) an increase to the HRA capital programme of £0.152m in 2022/23 and £0.006m in 2023/24 to provide the necessary funding to proceed with the development of the Kings Arms Public House site at 100 Mile Cross Road.

5. Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) – Submission to the Secretary of State for Independent Examination

RESOLVED, with 7 members voting in favour, and 3 members abstaining from voting, to:

- (1) agree that the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) is sound and to submit the Plan to the Secretary of State for independent examination, subject to an agreement in principle being reached with Natural England, in the form of a signed statement of common ground, in relation to the mitigation necessary to protect sites protected under the Habitat Regulations;
- (2) agree to request that the appointed independent inspector make any Main Modifications necessary to make the plan sound and legally compliant; and,
- (3) delegate authority to the executive director for development and city services, in consultation with the cabinet portfolio holder for sustainable and inclusive growth to:
 - (a) agree minor modifications to the GNLP prior to its submission, and,
 - (b) negotiate any main modifications necessary to make the GNLP sound as part of the independent examination.

6. Members Code of Conduct and Complaints Hearing Procedure July 2021 - Update

(An additional Appendix C, Complaints, Investigation and Hearings Procedure had been circulated prior to the meeting.)

RESOLVED, unanimously, to adopt the revisions to the Member Code of Conduct in Appendix B and the Complaints, Investigation and Hearings Procedure set out in Appendix C, as recommended by the Standards Committee, for inclusion in the Constitution.

7. Annual Report of the Audit Committee 2020-21

RESOLVED, unanimously, to receive the Annual Report of the Audit Committee 2020-21.

8. Motions

(Notice of the following motions, 10(a) to 10(c), as set out on the agenda, had been received in accordance with the council's constitution.)

10 (a) Motion: Stop Fire and Re-Hire in Norwich

RESOLVED, unanimously, that:

“There is a concerted attack on workers’ rights taking place. Workers are being given an ultimatum to either accept reduced pay, terms and conditions or face the sack.

This strategy of ‘fire and re-hire’ has already been perpetrated against British Gas workers, a restructuring that has seen the workers offered the choice of accepting longer working hours or receiving dismissal notices.

This concerted attack on the trades unions and workers’ rights has been condemned by TUC leader Frances O’Grady, and Labour Party leader Keir Starmer. It is an attack on workers that must be resisted.

Council resolves to:

- (1) Recognise that some UK companies are using the cover of Covid-19 to embark upon a concerted attack on employee pay and benefits. A poll published by the TUC reveals that nearly one in ten (9%) workers have been told to reapply for their jobs on worse terms and conditions since the first lockdown in March 2020. ‘Fire and Re-hire’ strategies are being put into operation by some of the UK’s largest employers to reduce workers’ pay, overtime and holiday benefits. Thousands of British workers are facing a ‘levelling down’ in pay and working conditions, in stark contrast to the Government’s stated promises.
- (2) Condemn local companies that use fire and re-hire attacks on workers in our city.
- (3) Support local unions in any strike action against fire and re-hire and call on the companies to instead enter meaningful negotiations with the unions.
- (4) Refuse to enter contracts doing business with companies using these tactics, insofar as this is legally possible, utilising and updating our ethical procurement and social value policy to achieve this.
- (5) Thank Norwich South MP Clive Lewis for supporting British Gas workers and signing the letter to Chris O’Shea, the Chief Executive of Centrica, British Gas’ parent company.
- (6) Call upon both local Members of Parliament in Norwich to:
 - (a) condemn the tactics of those businesses using these methods to assault local workers’ terms and conditions;
 - (b) write to the Minister of Employment, Mims Davies, to demand the British Government follow countries such as Ireland and Spain in making the practice of fire and re-hire illegal.”

10(b) Motion: The Future of Work

(The Lord Mayor invited Councillor Bogelein to give her reasons for withdrawing her motion. Councillor Bogelein explained that the motion was about flexible working and a four-day week, not for implementation but to start a discussion. She wanted to bring the motion back to another meeting with clearer wording for debate.)

10(c) Motion: Access to Cash

RESOLVED that:

“Over the last few years there has been a decline in the access to cash. The decline is particularly felt by small businesses and the most vulnerable in our communities who rely on cash to survive.

Small businesses rely on cash and proximity of service to avoid being left behind, particularly those businesses reliant on time dependent services or typically cash-in-hand professions including the likes of carers, tradesmen, babysitters, barbers and beauticians. For small and medium enterprises, being able to deposit their takings into business accounts at the end of the day or week, conveniently and safely – near to where they live and work – is a lifeline.

Many vulnerable and financially excluded people depend on cash for safe deposits, to-the-penny withdrawals, the ability to budget and a friendly face to help with transactions. For people experiencing financial control and other forms of domestic abuse, being able to save and use cash can mean the ability to escape perpetrators and seek refuge. It is crucial for the 1.4 million people in the UK who don't have bank accounts, and many more who don't use online banking.

Post Office provides an existing network for cash to be accessed easily and safely.

In fact, it is the only existing cash network in the UK with the infrastructure, robust scalability and security in place to manage this role.

The council must support the Post Office's Save Our Cash campaign which highlights the importance of access to cash, noting that:

- (a) Due to bank branch closures and the loss of free-to-use ATMs across the UK, millions are at risk of losing access to cash;
- (b) all communities should be guaranteed a legal right to cash services including withdrawal and deposits, and that these services should be available to the penny and free at the point of use, recognising the importance of cash to those most vulnerable and small businesses.

To do this, council resolves to ask group leaders to write to:

- (1) the appropriate Government Minister, asking the Government to introduce legislation to ensure access to cash is protected by law;
- (2) our local MPs asking them to sign Early Day Motion 293 – ‘Access to cash’ which also back the Post Office’s campaign.”

LORD MAYOR



Committee Name: Council

Committee Date: 28/09/2021

Report Title: Treasury Management Full Year Review Report 2020/21

Portfolio:	Councillor Kendrick, resources
Report from:	Executive director of corporate and commercial services
Wards:	All Wards
OPEN PUBLIC ITEM	

Purpose

This report sets out the Treasury Management performance for the year to 31 March 2021.

Recommendation:

To note the report and the treasury activity for the year to 31 March 2021.

Policy Framework

The Council has three corporate priorities, which are:

- People living well
- Great neighbourhoods, housing and environment
- Inclusive economy

This report meets the Healthy organisation corporate priority

This report helps to meet Treasury management strategy adopted policy of the Council

Report Details

Background

1. The Council is required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003 to produce an annual review of its treasury management activities and the actual prudential and treasury indicators for 2020/21. This report meets the requirements of both the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management (the Code) and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (the Prudential Code).
2. This report details the results of the council's treasury management activities for the financial year 2020/21. It compares this activity to the Treasury Management Strategy for 2020/21, approved by Full Council on 25 February 2020. It will also detail any issues that have arisen in treasury management during this period.

Introduction

3. Treasury Management relates to the policies, strategies and processes associated with managing the cash and debt of the Council through appropriate borrowing and lending activity. It includes the effective control of the risks associated with the lending and borrowing activity and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with the risks.
4. For the 2020/21 financial year the minimum reporting requirements were:
 - an annual Treasury Management Strategy in advance of the year (Council 25 February 2020).
 - a mid-year Treasury Management Review report (Council 16 Dec 2021).
 - an annual review following the end of the year describing the activity compared to the strategy (this report).
5. The regulatory environment places responsibility on members to review and scrutinise treasury management policy and activities. This report is therefore important in that respect, as it provides details of the outturn position for treasury activities and highlights compliance with the council's policies which have previously been approved by members. This report summarises the following:
 - Capital activity during the year (paragraphs 6 - 8)
 - Impact of this activity on the Council's underlying indebtedness (the Capital Financing Requirement) (paragraphs 9 - 16)
 - The actual prudential and treasury indicators (paragraphs 17- 21)
 - Overall treasury position identifying how the Council has borrowed in relation to this indebtedness, and the impact on investment balances (paragraphs 22-26)
 - Borrowing strategy and detailed debt activity (paragraphs 27-39)
 - Investment strategy and detailed investment activity (paragraphs 40-44)

The Council's Capital Expenditure and Financing 2020/21

6. The 2020/21 capital programme budgets were approved as part of the budget papers by full Council on 25 February 2020. Subsequent to this there were approved revisions to the 2020/21 capital budgets to include the 2019/20 capital carry forwards and new capital schemes approved during the year. The final capital programme budget is shown in **Table 1** along with the mid-year estimate as reported to Cabinet in December 2020.
7. Actual capital spending was under budget for the year by £66.210m. The actual level of revenue and capital resources needed to finance the expenditure was less than that originally estimated. The actual capital expenditure forms one of the required prudential indicators. **Table 1** shows the estimates and then the actual capital expenditure for 2020/21 and how this was financed in the year:

Table 1: Capital Programme Financing

	2020/21 Original Budget	2020/21 Final Budget	2020/21 Mid-Year Estimate	2020/21 Actual Outturn	Variance from Final Budget
Capital Expenditure	£m	£m	£m	£m	£m
General Fund capital expenditure	30.727	39.311	36.563	5.851	(33.460)
General Fund capital loans	5.700	7.390	6.990	7.390	0
HRA capital expenditure	34.816	51.268	48.348	18.518	(32.750)
Total Expenditure	71.244	97.969	91.901	31.759	(66.210)
Financed by					
Capital receipts	17.437	29.293	16.905	2.802	(26.491)
Capital grants/contributions	4.421	7.852	5.361	3.190	(4.662)
Capital & earmarked reserves	15.394	15.584	23.864	13.813	(1.771)
Revenue	3.291	12.098	13.733	2.941	(9.157)
Total Financing	40.544	64.827	59.863	22.746	(42.081)
Borrowing need for the year	30.700	33.142	32.037	9.013	(24.129)

8. Norwich Regeneration Ltd (NRL) is a private limited company wholly owned by Norwich City Council. In order to finance its housing development, NRL borrows money at commercial interest rates from the Council. As at 31 March 2021 the company had a loan outstanding with the Council of £12.65m (2019/20: £9.40m). The loan balance peaked at £15.65m during the financial year with the company making a repayment of £3m on 31 March 2021. These transactions were in line with the lending facility approved by Council. The impact of the loan movements on the capital financing requirement is shown in Table 2.
9. Norwich City Services Ltd (NCSL) is a private limited company wholly owned by Norwich City Council and incorporated on 9 June 2020. To finance the set-up of the company including the capital works on its depot building, the council has provided NCSL with both loan and equity financing during 2020/21. A 20-year

capital loan of £1.140m was advanced to the company as well as a working capital loan of £0.500m. Cash equity investment was made into the company of £0.370m. The impact of the capital loan movements on the capital financing requirement is shown in Table 2.

10. Capital expenditure may either be:

- Financed immediately through the application of capital or revenue resources (e.g. capital receipts, capital grants, revenue contributions etc.), which has no impact on the Council's borrowing need; or
- If insufficient financing is available, or a decision is taken not to apply resources, the capital expenditure will give rise to a borrowing need, which will be satisfied by either external or internal borrowing.

Council's overall borrowing need

11. The council's underlying need to borrow for capital expenditure is termed the Capital Financing Requirement (CFR). The CFR arises as the Council incurs capital spending and then if it does not apply resources immediately to finance the capital spend, (i.e. capital receipts, capital grants, capital reserves or revenue), a borrowing need arises. The 2020/21 CFR year-end balance is the cumulative total of the 2020/21 unfinanced capital expenditure i.e. £9.013m and prior years' unfinanced capital.
12. Treasury Management includes addressing the funding requirements for this borrowing need; it also includes maintaining a cash position to ensure sufficient cash is available to meet the capital expenditure and cash flow requirements. This may be sourced through borrowing from external bodies, e.g. the Government through the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) or the money markets, or utilising temporary cash resources within the Council (known as internal borrowing).
13. The council's (non-HRA) underlying borrowing need (CFR) is not allowed to rise indefinitely. Therefore statutory controls are in place to ensure that capital assets are broadly charged to revenue over the life of the asset. This requirement is met by making an annual revenue charge, called the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP), to reduce the CFR. This is effectively a repayment of the non-HRA borrowing need (there is no statutory requirement to reduce the HRA CFR).
14. The total CFR can also be reduced by either:
- the application of additional capital financing resources (such as unapplied capital receipts)
 - charging more than the statutory MRP each year through a Voluntary Revenue Provision (VRP).
15. This differs from the treasury management arrangements which ensure that cash is available to meet capital commitments. External borrowing can be taken or repaid at any time, but this does not change the CFR.

16. The Council's CFR for the year is shown below and is a key prudential indicator. It includes leasing schemes on the balance sheet, which increase the Council's borrowing need. No borrowing is actually required against these schemes as a borrowing facility is included in the contract.

Table 2: Capital Financing Requirement

	2020/21 Original Estimate	2020/21 Revised Estimate	2020/21 Outturn (unaudited)
Opening General Fund CFR	£000 125,099	£000 115,511	115,561
Prior years adjustment			4,703
Movement in General Fund CFR	37,722	6,027	2,067
Closing General Fund CFR	162,821	121,538	122,331
<i>Movement in CFR represented by:</i>			
Borrowing need (capital programme)	25,000	315	1,623
Borrowing need (NRL lending)	5,700	4,200	6,250
Borrowing need (NCSL lending)		1,140	1,140
Borrowing need (capital ambition)	8,500	0	0
Repayment of NRL lending			(3,000)
Appropriation of Mile Cross site to HRA		(1,800)	(1,800)
Less MRP and other financing adj.	(1,478)	522	(2,146)
Movement in General Fund CFR	37,722	6,027	2,067
Opening HRA Fund CFR	205,717	205,716	205,716
Movement in HRA CFR	7,206	1,800	1,800
Closing HRA CFR	212,923	207,516	207,516
TOTAL CFR	375,744	329,054	329,847

17. A review of the Capital Financing Requirement has been undertaken to reconcile the historic financing requirement amount to the council's balance sheet. This has resulted in an adjustment relating to prior years which increases the CFR carried forward.
18. Borrowing activity is constrained by prudential indicators for borrowing and the CFR, and by the authorised limit.

The actual prudential and treasury indicators

19. **Gross borrowing and the CFR** - in order to ensure that borrowing levels are prudent over the medium term and only for a capital purpose, the Council should ensure that its gross external borrowing does not, except in the short term, exceed the total of the capital financing requirement in the preceding year (2019/20) plus the estimates of any additional capital financing requirement for

the current (2020/21) and next two financial years. This essentially means that the Council is not borrowing to support revenue expenditure. This indicator allows the Council some flexibility to borrow in advance of its immediate capital needs. The table below highlights the Council's gross borrowing position against the CFR. The Council has complied with this prudential indicator.

Table 3: Gross Borrowing

	2020/21 Original Estimate £m	2020/21 Revised Estimate £m	2020/21 Actual £m
Gross borrowing	219.853	219.853	219.853
CFR	375.744	329.054	329.847
Over Borrowed/(Under Borrowed)	(155.891)	(109.201)	(109.994)

20. **The authorised limit** - the authorised limit is the “affordable borrowing limit” required by s3 of the Local Government Act 2003. The Council does not have the power to borrow above this level. The table below demonstrates that during 2020/21 the Council has maintained gross borrowing within its authorised limit.

Table 4: Authorised Limit & Operational Boundary

	2020/21 Original Estimate £m	2020/21 Revised Estimate £m	2020/21 Actual £m
Authorised Limit for external debt			
Borrowing	404.950	404.950	404.950
Other long-term liabilities	0.794	0.794	0.794
Total Agreed Authorised Limit	405.744	405.744	405.744
Operational boundary for external debt			
Borrowing	374.950	374.950	374.950
Other long-term liabilities	0.794	0.794	0.794
Total Agreed Operational Boundary	375.744	375.744	375.744
External debt (including other long-term liabilities e.g. finance leases)			220.647

21. **The operational boundary** – the operational boundary is the expected borrowing position of the Council during the year. Periods where the actual position is either below or over the boundary is acceptable subject to the authorised limit not being breached.

Actual financing costs as a proportion of net revenue stream

22. The authority is required to report on the ratio represented by its net financing costs to its net revenue stream. For the general fund net revenue is represented by the amount that is funded by government grants and council tax payers, while for the HRA it is the rental income paid by tenants. This is intended to be a measure of affordability, indicating how much of the authority's revenue is taken up in financing its debt.
23. Table 5 shows that the general outturn is lower than the estimate due lower than budgeted borrowing costs combined with a higher net revenue due to additional covid-19 related grant income. The HRA outturn is slightly higher than estimated as unbudgeted impairment costs have been charged within the year; last year's outturn was at a similar level 44.39% (2019-20).

Table 5: Affordability Ratio

	2020/21	2020/21
Affordability of financing costs	Estimate	Actual
General fund - financing costs as a percentage of net revenue	20.3%	6.7%
HRA - financing costs as a percentage of rental income	40.0%	44.0%

Treasury Position as at 31 March 2021

24. The Council's debt and investment position is managed by the in-house treasury management team. All activities are undertaken primarily to ensure security for investments, to ensure that there is adequate liquidity for revenue and capital activities, and to manage risks within all treasury management activities. Procedures and controls to achieve these objectives are well established both through member reporting detailed in the summary, and through officer activity.
25. The council's actual borrowing position at 31 March 2021 and activity during 2020/21 is detailed in the table below. Borrowing has remained within the authorised limit of £405.744m throughout the year.

Table 6: Borrowing activity 2020/21 (excluding finance leases)

	PWLB	Market	Total	Average
	loans	loans	loans	interest
	£m	£m	£m	rate %
Opening balance (1 April 2020)	214.107	5.000	219.107	
New borrowing taken	-	-	-	
Borrowing matured/repaid	-	-	-	
Closing balance (31 March 2021)	214.107	5.000	219.107	3.77%
Authorised limit for external debt			405.744	

26. The maturity structure of the debt portfolio was as follows:

Table 7: Maturity Structure of Fixed Rate Borrowing

	%	31-Mar-21 £m
Under 12 months	1.16%	2.552
Between 12 months and 2 years	23.28%	51.064
Between 2 years and 5 years	27.25%	59.779
Between 5 years and 10 years	30.09%	66.000
Over 10 years	18.21%	39.948
Perpetually irredeemable stock		0.510
Total borrowing		219.852

27. Table 8 shows the movement in investments in the year. The movement is a combinations of several factors including: an increase in the Council's internal borrowing (see table 3); repayment of loan agreements; an increase in short term creditors and a reduction in long term debtors. These can be seen on the face of the Council's Balance Sheet, shown in the draft Statement of Accounts.

Table 8: Investment Movements

	31 March 2020	Net movement	31 March 2021
	£m	£m	£m
Short term			
Banks	4.000	11.000	15.000
Building Societies	0.000	0.000	0.000
Local Authorities	5.000	10.000	15.000
Cash Equivalents			
Banks	11.300	12.450	23.750
Building Societies	0.000	0.000	0.000
Local Authorities	9.000	(9.000)	0.000
Money Market Funds	15.000	6.070	21.070
UK Government	0.000	(6.000)	0.000
Total Internally Managed Funds	44.300	30.520	74.820

28. The maturity structure of the investment portfolio was as follows:

Table 9: Maturity Structure

	31 March 2020 £m	31 March 2021 £m
Under 1 year	44.300	74.820
Over 1 year	0.000	0.000
	44.300	74.820

Borrowing Strategy for 2020/21

29. The council maintained an under-borrowed position in 2020/21. This means that the capital borrowing need (the CFR) has not been fully funded with loan debt as cash supporting the council's reserves, balances and cash flow has been used as a temporary measure. This strategy is prudent as investment returns are low and counterparty risk is relatively high.
30. Table 10 below shows the interest rate forecast to March 2024. These forecasts have been provided by the Council's treasury advisor, Link Asset Services and show gradual rises in medium and longer-term fixed borrowing rates over the next two financial years. Variable, or short-term rates, are expected to be the cheaper form of borrowing over the period.

Table 10: Interest Rate View

Link Group Interest Rate View		10.5.21										
	Jun-21	Sep-21	Dec-21	Mar-22	Jun-22	Sep-22	Dec-22	Mar-23	Jun-23	Sep-23	Dec-23	Mar-24
BANK RATE	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.25	0.25	0.25
3 month ave earnings	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.30	0.30	0.30
6 month ave earnings	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.20	0.30	0.40	0.40	0.40
12 month ave earnings	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.30	0.30	0.40	0.50	0.50	0.50
5 yr PWLB	1.20	1.20	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.40	1.50	1.50	1.50
10 yr PWLB	1.70	1.70	1.70	1.80	1.80	1.90	1.90	1.90	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
25 yr PWLB	2.20	2.20	2.30	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.60
50 yr PWLB	2.00	2.00	2.10	2.20	2.20	2.20	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.30	2.40

Source: Link Treasury 2021 (PWLB rates include adjustments for Certainty rate discounts)

31. Given the under-borrowed position of the council (Table 3) it is likely that the Council will need to undertake fixed rate long-term borrowing within the short to medium term. On 22nd July 2021 the council took out a £5m fixed rate 50-year loan with PWLB at an interest rate of 1.64%. This borrowing was in line with the Treasury Strategy and the interest costs are within the 2021/22 revenue budget provision. Any further decisions to borrow will be reported to Cabinet at the next available opportunity.

PWLB rates

32. PWLB rates are based on, and are determined by, gilt (UK Government bonds) yields through HM Treasury determining a specified margin to add to gilt yields. HM Treasury imposed two changes in the margins over gilt yields for PWLB rates in 2019-20 without any prior warning. The first took place on 9 October 2019, adding an additional 1% margin over gilts to all PWLB rates. That increase was then, at least partially, reversed for some forms of borrowing on 11th March 2020, but not for mainstream non-HRA capital schemes.
33. A consultation was then held with local authorities and on 25th November 2020, the Chancellor announced the conclusion to the review of margins over gilt yields for PWLB rates; the standard and certainty margins were reduced by 1%

but a prohibition was introduced to deny access to borrowing from the PWLB for any local authority which had purchase of assets for yield in its three-year capital programme.

34. The advice from Link, the Council's Treasury Advisers is that they do not think that the Monetary Policy Committee will increase the Bank Base Rate above 0.50% during the current and next two financial years as they do not expect inflation to return to being sustainably above 2% during this period. Regarding PWLB rates, the general situation is for volatility in bond yields to continue as investor fears and confidence ebb and flow between favouring relatively more "risky" assets i.e., equities, or the safe haven of government bonds. The overall longer-run trend is for gilt yields and hence PWLB rates to rise by around 0.5% by the end of 2023/24.
35. The Council has previously relied on the PWLB as its main source of funding; however, the council will consider alternative sources of borrowing as appropriate and in line with the treasury management strategy. We will continue to liaise closely with our treasury advisors, monitor the borrowing market and update Members as this area evolves.
36. The Municipal Bond Agency are now offering loans to local authorities. This Authority may make use of this emerging source of borrowing as and when appropriate. This is within the existing approved Treasury Management Strategy.

Forward borrowing considerations to mitigate expected future interest rate increases

37. The Council may look to arrange forward borrowing facilities should the future borrowing risk rise or predictions of a significant rate rise is expected. This would enable the Council to lock into borrowing facilities at current low rates and draw down the cash over a period of up to 3 years subject to cash flow demands. It should be noted that some of these facilities may carry brokerage and arrangement fees that will be factored into value for money assessments. The policy has been complied with in 2020/21.

Debt Rescheduling

38. No debt rescheduling was undertaken during 2020/21.

Borrowing Outturn for 2020/21

39. During 2020/21 there was no long-term borrowing and no PWLB debt was repaid. The council paid £7.997m in interest costs on external loans, this compares to a budget of £10.274m. The reduction against budget was due to the continued use of internal rather than external borrowing as a result of holding sufficient cash balances.

Investment Strategy for 2020/21

40. The TMSS for 2020/21, which includes the Annual Investment Strategy, was approved by the council on 25 February 2020. It sets out the Council's investment priorities as being:

- Security of capital;
- Liquidity; and
- Yield

No policy changes have been made to the investment strategy, the Council will continue to aim to achieve the optimum return (yield) on investments commensurate with proper levels of security and liquidity.

41. This report does not cover the Council's investment strategy in regard to non-financial investments. These investments which include the purchasing of commercial property and lending to third parties are covered under the Non-Financial (Commercial) Investment Strategy published in February 2020 as part of the Budget papers.

Investment Outturn for 2020/21

42. The investment activity during the year conformed to the approved strategy, and the Council had no liquidity difficulties.

Reserves

43. The Council's cash balances comprise revenue and capital resources and cash flow monies.

Within the earmarked reserves, the Business Rates Section 31 reserve has increased by £17.473m. This is the extra grant received in year to compensate the council for additional business rates reliefs awarded as well as the tax loss grant. These amounts are set aside and will be returned to the general fund over the next two years to offset the deficit arising on the collection fund.

The Council's reserves comprised

Table 11: Balance Sheet Reserves

	31-Mar-20	31-Mar-21*
	£m	£m
General Reserves	43.432	53.348
Earmarked Reserves	17.103	37.191
Useable Capital receipts	51.069	56.875
Capital grants Unapplied	3.462	4.274
Major Repairs Reserve	8.307	10.019
Total	123.373	161.707

* Unaudited figures

Investments held by the Council

44. The Council's year-end balance of cash and short-term investments was £74.820m. These internally managed funds earned an average rate of return of 0.086%.
45. The Council is part of a benchmarking group (run by our treasury management advisors, Link Asset Services) across Norfolk, Suffolk & Cambridgeshire. The table below shows the performance of the Council's investments when compared with this benchmark group, and also when compared with the non-metropolitan districts and all authorities that use Link's benchmarking group facility.

Table 12: Link benchmarking - position at 31 March 2021

	Norwich	Benchmark Group 7 (11)	Non met districts (87)	All authorities (217)
WARoR ¹	0.10%	0.14%	0.24%	0.21%
WA Risk ²	3.07	3.66	3.12	2.96
WAM ³	75	39	73	69
WATT ⁴	96	64	134	130

Source: Link Treasury March 2021

¹ **WARoR** Weighted Average Rate of Return This is the average annualised rate of return weighted by the principal amount in each rate.

² **WA Risk** Weighted Average Credit Risk Number Each institution is assigned a colour corresponding to a suggested duration using Link Asset Services' Suggested Credit Methodology.

³ **WAM** Weighted Average Time to Maturity This is the average time, in days, till the portfolio matures, weighted by principal amount.

⁴ **WATT** Weighted Average Total Time This is the average time, in days, that deposits are lent out for, weighted by principal amount.

46. The council's average investments return (0.10%) is comparable with that for the benchmark group (0.14%), and slightly lower to the 87 non-met authorities at 0.24% and the population of 217 local authorities at 0.21%. The average investment return in 2020/21 is slightly lower than other authorities however this allowed the authority to keep council funds readily available to pay government Covid-19 grants and make capital programme payments as they fell due. The WATT for Norwich reflects the positive decision to utilise internal resources to support capital investment, therefore Norwich has kept its investments to a shorter maturity profile averaging 3 months.

Consultation

47. The report is the outturn position statement to ensure that council are kept informed of treasury activity.

Implications

Financial and Resources

48. There are no proposals in this report that would reduce or increase resources however it does report on the performance of the council in managing its borrowing and investment resources.

Legal

49. The Council is required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003 to produce an annual review of its treasury management activities and the actual prudential and treasury indicators for 2020/21. This report meets the requirements of both the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management (the Code) and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities (the Prudential Code).

Statutory Considerations

Consideration:	Details of any implications and proposed measures to address:
Equality and Diversity	n/a
Health, Social and Economic Impact	n/a
Crime and Disorder	n/a
Children and Adults Safeguarding	n/a
Environmental Impact	<p>Sustainable investment products are an area of growth in the market. These options will be considered where the investments are in line with approved Treasury Management Strategy.</p> <p>Security, liquidity and yield remain the cornerstones of the Treasury Management Strategy, and it is vital that all investments continue to ensure the security of council funds as a priority and remain compatible with the risk appetite of the council and its cash flow requirements.</p>

Risk Management

Risk	Consequence	Controls Required
Future interest rate changes can offer both opportunity and risk.	Future interest rate changes need to be assessed against the cost of borrowing.	To mitigate the risk, we will continue to work closely with the treasury management advisors to review interest rate forecasts to assess when we would look to borrow.

Other Options Considered

50. No other options to be considered. The report is to inform council of the treasury activity for the year to 31 March 2021.

Reasons for the decision/recommendation

51. To ensure that council are kept informed of treasury activity.

Background papers: None

Appendices: None

Contact Officer:

Name: Caroline Knott

Telephone number: 01603 987615

Email address: carolineknott@norwich.gov.uk

Motion to: Council

Item 6

28 September 2021

Subject: COP26

Proposer: Councillor Hampton

Seconder: Councillor Stutely

“This summer we have seen more evidence of the immediate impact of climate change, including rampant wildfires in America, hundreds of people killed by extreme floods in Germany and China and the Met Office issuing its first ever extreme heat warning in the UK. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s Sixth Report, published in August 2021, found that the global surface temperature will continue to rise until at least the middle of this century. Global warming of 1.5C and 2C will be exceeded this century unless deep cuts to carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions are made over the coming decades.

This council **RESOLVES** to:-

(1) Note; -

- a) The UK Government is the host of COP26, being held in Glasgow in November 2021. This is an opportunity for the UK Government to radically shape global action on climate change, and to use the opportunity to shape how climate change is tackled in the UK.
- b) Norwich City Council has declared a Climate Emergency and recognised that this is inextricably linked with social and economic emergencies which affect ordinary people globally and locally.
- c) Norwich City Council has already taken a number of actions to tackle climate change locally, including setting up a renewable energy company for Norwich and Norfolk, delivering award-winning Passivhaus developments, being the first authority to run public auctions for domestic solar panels and the first city in the UK to run a collective switching programme.
- d) Local government has the ability, knowledge and tools to make an impact at a local level. However, councils have seen their funding from government cut by over 60p in every £1 since 2010, which has had a crippling effect on services and will severely impact the ability of councils to reach their full potential in tackling the causes of climate change.
- e) Ask the Leader to write to Alok Sharma MP, President of COP26, Kwasi Kwarteng MP, Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, and Robert Jenrick MP, Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government, to:
 - i. Make the case for local government having a stronger role in tackling climate change and to share examples of the work already done by Norwich City Council;

- ii. Call for the UK Government to provide councils with the resource and powers necessary to take even more ambitious action to tackle climate change;
- iii. State our support for substantial public investment in a green recovery that tackles the Climate Emergency, creates climate jobs and is underpinned by a fair deal for workers.

(2) continue to review the progress made by Norwich City Council in meeting the goals and objectives set out in Norwich City Council's Climate Emergency declaration.

(3) continue to work with employers in the city, including businesses, the third sector, charities and the public sector through the LEP, BID and Good Economy Commission, Norwich 2040 Partnership and Norwich Climate Commission to encourage them to take steps to reduce their carbon emissions and operate in a more sustainable way, and learn from any best practice that they've already put in place.

Motion to: Council

28 September 2021

Subject: Climate change adaptation

Proposer: Councillor Carlo

Seconder: Councillor Osborn

“The latest report by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change provides a stark warning. The world must drastically cut greenhouse gases this decade if we are to stay within 1.5 degrees C or else face dire consequences. Extreme weather is becoming the norm under 1.1 C and yet we are headed towards 3C. The poorest communities are least responsible for these crises and are invariably the worst affected. The Climate Change Committee has repeatedly warned of the need for adaptation to climate change, saying the risks to all aspects of life in the UK have increased over the last five years. We must now adapt to the effects of future climate change, not merely the current consequences.”

Council **RESOLVES** to ask cabinet to:

- (1) Work with partners to share and implement climate change adaptation strategies to increase the climate resilience of the city and its citizens.
- (2) Develop and implement a climate change adaptation strategy which covers all areas of the City Council’s work, including work carried out by wholly-owned companies and contractors.
- (3) Continue working with partners such as the LGA to make the case to government for additional resources for local authorities for climate change mitigation and adaptation.

Motion to: Council

28 September 2021

Subject: Glasgow Food and Climate Declaration

Proposer: Councillor Davis

Seconder: Councillor Osborn

“Over the last decade food poverty in Norwich has significantly increased, a symptom of the increasing effects of wider climate change on aspects of our food system and society. Earlier this year Norwich City Council signed the Glasgow Food and Climate Declaration, joining other local authorities in speaking with a unified voice to renew their commitments to develop sustainable food policies, promote mechanisms for joined-up action and call on national governments to put sustainable food and farming at the heart of the global response to the climate emergency.

Council **RESOLVES** :

1) To note;

- a) Its concern that the COVID-19 crisis has exposed the fragility of our food systems, the vulnerabilities of large parts of urban and rural populations and the critical need for preparedness and resilience in the face of shocks;
- b) that food systems currently account for 21-37% of total greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs), and are at the heart of many of the world’s major challenges today including biodiversity loss, enduring hunger and malnutrition, and an escalating public health crisis;
- c) that unsustainable dynamics pervade the whole food chain, primarily stemming from industrial food and farming systems which exploit all aspects of agriculture to maximise profits; this should be addressed through the involvement of all food system stakeholders in decision-making for a sustainable and just transition – including food and farm workers, civil society groups, researchers, indigenous communities, women, and especially youth whose future are the most at risk from the effects of climate change and biodiversity loss;
- d) systemic inequality is pervasive throughout the food system, and disproportionately affects communities ranging from people living in poverty, people experiencing racism, people displaced due to climate change or conflict, people with precarious legal status, and many others; and many of these same groups are exploited for their labour globally;

- e) that only Sustainable Development Goals can identify effective intervention points to accelerate climate action while delivering many complementary benefits, including the promotion of biodiversity, ecosystem regeneration and resilience, circularity, equity, access to healthy and sustainable diets for all, and the creation of resilient livelihoods for farm and food workers;
 - f) that cities and regions are leading the way in pioneering integrated food policies and strategies at the local level to reduce their environmental footprint, drive sustainable food system development and ensure greater resilience to shocks;
 - g) the number of commitments on sustainable urban and regional food policies already made by cities, local and regional governments over the last two decades, in particular the 2014 World Urban Forum Medellin, the 2015 Milan Urban Food Policy Pact (MUFPP), the 2015 Seoul Declaration, the 2016 New Urban Agenda, and the 2019 C40 Good Food Cities Declaration;
 - h) that actions must be aligned horizontally (across policy areas) and vertically (between different levels of governance) to accelerate the transition to sustainable food systems;
 - i) that cross-sectoral, multi-level, and multi-actor governance of food systems is required in order for sustainable and just food systems to take root, and that this requires national governments to take a proactive and enabling role;
 - j) that without accompanying regulatory and legislative reforms at the national level, the impact of such partnerships and policies will be limited;
- 2) That we, the undersigned elected leaders of subnational governments, in anticipation of the 26th Conference of Parties of the UNFCCC in Glasgow, commit to accelerate climate action by building and facilitating sustainable food systems transformation, by:
- a) Continuing the work with appropriate partners within existing budgets to develop and implement, where relevant, integrated food policies and strategies as key tools in the fight against climate change; and ensuring that these instruments adopt a food systems approach that involves actors across all parts of the food chain; continue to support local food producers especially community gardens and allotments; include metrics to assess GHG emissions reduction targets from food systems, as well as opportunities for cooperation and best practice sharing between subnational governments.
 - b) Reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from urban and regional food systems in accordance with the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals and building sustainable food systems

that are able to rebuild ecosystems and deliver safe, healthy, accessible, affordable, and sustainable diets for all.

- c) Calling on government to establish supportive and enabling policy frameworks and multi-level and multi-actor governance mechanisms, allowing coordinated decision-making on food systems. These mechanisms will support the drafting of inclusive national food policies to be included into the revisions of the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs).

Motion to: Council

28 September 2021

Subject: Lift the ban coalition

Proposer: Councillor Wright

Seconder: Councillor Ackroyd

As of the end of June 2021, in Norwich, there are 117 people seeking asylum in receipt of Section 95 support, and global events over the summer may well see this figure increase.

Since 2002, people seeking asylum have only able to apply for the right to work after they have been waiting for a decision on their asylum claim for over a year, and only if they can be employed into one of the narrow, highly-skilled professions included on the Government's Shortage Occupation List but currently people seeking asylum are left to live on £5.66 per day, struggling to support themselves and their families, and left vulnerable to destitution, isolation, and exploitation.

71% of people polled agreed with the statement: "when people come to the UK seeking asylum it is important they integrate, learn English and get to know people. It would help integration if asylum-seekers were allowed to work if their claim takes more than six months to process".

The potential foregone economic gain for the UK economy of allowing people to work is estimated to be £42.4million via increased taxable income and reduced payments of accommodation/subsistence support.

Council **RESOLVES** to

- 1) Recognise that:
 - a. people seeking asylum want to be able to work so that they can use their skills and make the most of their potential, integrate into their communities, and provide for themselves and their families.
 - b. restrictions on right to work can lead to extremely poor mental health outcomes, and a waste of potentially invaluable talents and skills both for the economy of Norwich and the UK.
 - c. allowing people seeking asylum the right to work would therefore lead to positive outcomes for those seeking asylum in Norwich and for the local and national economy.
- 2) Applaud the efforts of several MPs (Christine Jardine – Lib Dem, Carol Monaghan – SNP and Chris Stephens – SNP) who have introduced Private Members' Bills to grant asylum seekers the right to work.

- 3) Join the Lift the Ban Coalition, which is campaigning to restore the right to work for everyone waiting for more than 6 months for a decision on their asylum claim; and
- 4) Ask group leaders to write to the appropriate minister calling on the UK Government to give people seeking asylum the right to work unconstrained by the shortage occupation list after they have waited six months for a decision on their initial asylum claim or further submission.