



SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

16:35 to 19:20

17 October 2019

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

Apologies: Councillor Thomas (Vi) and Manning

1. Public questions/petitions

There were no public questions or petitions.

2. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Minutes

RESOLVED to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2019.

4. Mitigating Climate Change

(The chair took the item first)

(The environmental strategy manager, head of city development services, Norwich City Council and Jeremy Wiggin, Transport for Norwich manager, Norfolk County Council attended the meeting for this item).

The environmental strategy manager presented the report and highlighted the council's achievements as regards the reduction of the organisations and city's carbon footprint. The report noted that local authorities did not have a statutory duty to reduce emissions in line with the Climate Change Act. The city council had made great strides in tackling carbon emissions. However, greater resources would be needed to achieve further carbon reduction targets.

The Transport for Norwich manager said that appendix A to the report, a report presented to Norfolk County Council Transforming Cities Fund joint committee, contained the proposed programme to be submitted to the Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) for Norfolk's application. The feedback from stakeholders on the proposals had

been positive. The recommendations had been agreed with requests to amend the priorities of some of the deliverables in terms of the transport corridors included for funding.

The Department for Transport had advised the funding was constrained and the submission proposed high funding scenarios but low and medium funding scenarios were included too. The programme aims to deliver clean transport and clean shared transport. It was noted that the majority of cars on the network were single passenger vehicles. The proposal supported significant investment in public transport and the uptake of walking and cycling as transport options.

In response to member's question regarding actions taken since a climate change motion was resolved at full council in January 2019 the environmental strategy manager said that the Climate and Environment Emergency Executive Panel (CEEPP) had been constituted which required changes to the constitution. A programme of 200 actions had been identified and the Environmental Strategy had been drafted to be reviewed at CEEPP. CEEPP would enable work with key stakeholders to be undertaken and the Tyndall centre were to be invited to one of first meetings of the committee.

The director of strategy, communications and culture reminded members that actions which required budget amendments should be submitted as group proposals at budget setting time. The chair reminded members that motions could be submitted to council which committed the council to particular actions.

In response to member questions the environmental strategy manager said by 2035 the aim was that 80% of the energy of the national grid would come from renewable sources. This would be enabled by a number of technological developments such as the ability to store energy from wind power to be used as and when it was needed.

A member asked if the county council should enact the Bus Services Act (BSA) and force bus operators to upgrade to cleaner emission buses and adhere to a set of standards in relation timetables and fares. The Transport for Norwich manager said that there was a three year window to deliver the TCF programme, in this time clean diesel bus engines and electric buses would be introduced. Starting from a position of none there would be electric buses in Norwich within three years but it was not possible to say how many or on which routes they would operate. Originally the bid had asked for £100m funding from government but due to funding constraints this had been downgraded to £55m. This would still represent more funding than the city had ever received to develop and support public transport, walking and cycling.

A voluntary partnership was in place with providers of bus services across the county but the fact that it was a voluntary arrangement did not underestimate its importance and the fact companies had provided significant private investment evidenced that it was working. The BSA provided extra powers which included the option of significant legal interventions, and franchising of networks. It would be possible to review what the BSA offered in future. The final TCF application which would be ready at the end of November 2019 would provide a more comprehensive comment on the use of the BSA and the document would be in the public domain the day after the application was submitted.

The cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth pointed out that the TCF was managed by Norfolk County Council in partnership with South Norfolk and Broadland District Councils and the Local Enterprise Partnership. There would need to be an appetite to adopt the BSA across the partnership.

The chair referred to a deliverable within the application, the cross valley link which aimed to provide quicker journeys by cleaner vehicles serving the Norwich Research Park, UEA and hospital making use of a route crossing the River Yare and asked if this was still the best solution to the problem identified. The Transport for Norwich manager said that this was a work in progress and was included in the programme to ensure that if the route proved the best option, it could be included.

In response to a member question the environmental strategy manager said that the council's ROAR power scheme had been marketed proactively using a digital format.

In response to a member question the Transport for Norwich manager said the TCF application included the roll out of more 20 mph zones across the city. The environmental strategy manager, in response to a member question on the use of the spend to save budget to increase the numbers of insulated homes in the city said that all council homes were well insulated, those homes which were not insulated were in the private sector.

Councillor Carlo asked if the environmental strategy would bring forward a programme of carbon reduction in line with the Paris Agreement on carbon emissions and referred to a tool used by the Tyndall Centre to model local authority emissions. The environmental strategy manager said that the Tyndall Centre would be invited to an early meeting of CEEEP and that there would be an opportunity to review and understand the use of the tool then. In terms of an adaptation strategy, the UK's climate projections were set ten years ago, a new set of projections UKCP18 had just been published and the Norfolk Climate Change Adaption Strategy could now be renewed in line with these.

(The item was suspended 17:30 in order to hear the next item as key officers had to leave)

5. Airport Masterplan – Call in

(The cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth and the director of regeneration and development attended for this item.)

The director of regeneration and development responded to the call in and said the question which the report asked was; is it better to have an agreed masterplan than not. The purpose of the impact assessment was to act as tool for the cabinet decision which was being made, it was the assessment of the cabinet decision and not the masterplan itself which was being considered. There were notable advantages to having a masterplan in place as it could be taken account of within planning decisions. As the runway to the airport was built before 1940 the airport had extensive permitted development rights.

The history of the development of the masterplan was that it was first presented to cabinet in September 2017, it was deemed acceptable apart from two areas which

required work. It was considered that it would benefit from a Surface Access Strategy (SAS) and that there was a lack of robust evidence to support the decision to use a significant proportion of Site 4 for non-aviation purposes. In summary officers had been waiting for the airport to gather the information requested.

The director of regeneration and development noted that if the process commenced now after council and cabinet had an acknowledged position on climate change the report would be handled differently. The council's corporate plan incorporated a range of priorities in terms of the environment, the council's policy documents recognised that environmental factors were to be balanced against other factors such as the economy. In response to the point made in the call in, that the masterplan did not provide any data about the potential increase in carbon dioxide emissions resulting from the growth envisaged. The cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth said that when the airport masterplan was next reviewed the city council could request a carbon neutral plan was incorporated into it.

Members discussed the influence the city council had over the airport, it was acknowledged that a national and regional response to airports was required. It was noted that the masterplan would be a material document to be considered as part of any planning application but it was one of a number of material considerations and any application would be looked at on its own merits. In response to a member question the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth said if the masterplan was not endorsed by the city council the airport could still develop as it wished. The masterplan was beneficial as it provided a plan on what was hoped to be achieved. It was acknowledged that if looked at afresh, the airport would be asked to conduct a review of climate change and to develop a strategy to reduce carbon emissions. There were few statutory powers the city council had as the airport had considerable permitted development rights. It was better to work together and encourage the airport to adopt emerging best practice.

Members discussed whether there was evidence to support the idea that if the airport closed, footfall would be displaced to Stanstead with a higher impact on carbon emissions due to additional travel to the airport. Members debated the value of the airport to the local economy and raised a question over the benefit of jobs which impacted negatively on the environment.

Following discussion it was **RESOLVED** to:

- (1) not refer the matter back to cabinet and allow the decision to stand;
- (2) ask cabinet when the airport masterplan is reviewed to consider requesting that it incorporate a carbon reduction plan;
- (3) consider including as part of the 2040 City Vision work an analysis of the wider impact of jobs on the economy when these are in sectors which impact adversely on climate change.

6. Mitigating Climate Change

(Members returned to the substantive item)

In response to a member question the Transport for Norwich manager said that for some schemes for which funding was being applied there were different ways to deliver them. A range of funded options were submitted for these schemes.

Members discussed the use of tree planting to mitigate against air pollution. Members noted that trees planted should be appropriate to the area and the changing climate with consideration of drought resistant species.

Councillor Grahame suggested amendments to the draft resolutions agreed at the meeting on 19 September. To add the words 'and or bike' to the end of resolution (2) and to insert the words 'and the highways agency' after the word cabinet at the beginning of resolution (6).

RESOLVED to agree the draft recommendations with amendments and to agree an additional recommendation in relation to trees:

- (1) Ask cabinet to consider recommending the extension of the monitoring zone from Castle Meadow to include St Stephens Street and initially make this a minimum Euro 5 standard compliant.
- (2) Ask cabinet to consider extending the preferential rate enjoyed by the council to members of staff who may wish to purchase an electric vehicle and or bike.
- (3) Work with county to consider whether it could incorporate standard clauses into section 106 agreements to fund school travel plan work.
- (4) Ask the county council as the highways agency to consider developing bespoke responses to traffic issues in each area depending on local need.
- (5) Ask cabinet and the highways agency to consider ways of reducing background levels of air pollution across the network area; including ensuring that pollution is not displaced to areas outside of the city centre and increasing monitoring in areas not identified as 'hotspots' once appropriate resources have been secured; and
- (6) Ask cabinet to explore options on how to reduce single occupancy vehicles travelling into the city.
- (7) To ask CEEEP to consider conducting a review of Norwich City Council policies to ensure appropriate tree planting across the city.

(Councillor Oliver left the meeting at this point)

7. Scrutiny committee work programme 2019-20

Members discussed the work programme and agreed the venue for the meeting on 14 November 2019 would be The Garage or the Mancroft Advice Project (MAP). The substantive items for the meeting on 12 December 2019 was the LEP and members discussed who they would like invited to that meeting.

Following discussion it was **RESOLVED** to:

- 1) Ask the scrutiny liaison officer to arrange the venue for the meeting on 14 November 2019 to be either The Garage or Mancroft Advice Project; and
- 2) Ask the scrutiny liaison officer to invite the leader of the council and a senior officer from the LEP to the meeting on 12 December 2019.

8. Norfolk Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee update

The representative Norfolk Health and Overview Scrutiny Committee (NHOSC) presented her report.

RESOLVED to note the update.

CHAIR