



EXECUTIVE

5.30 p.m. - 6.25 p.m.

28 May 2008

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

In attendance: Councillor Stephenson

1. PUBLIC QUESTION

Changes to Public Question Procedure

The Chair explained that the Council's constitution Appendix 1 now applied to Executive meetings. A question could only be asked if notice had been received in writing or by electronic mail direct, no later than 10.00 a.m. on the working day before the Executive meeting.

At any meeting no person may submit more than one question and no person shall be entitled to ask more than one question in any six-month period.

2. MINUTES

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meetings held on 19 and 26 March 2008.

3. NORFOLK LOCAL AREA AGREEMENT

The Policy and Improvement Consultant presented the report. He explained the Council had a duty to co-operate to deliver targets, and these would be picked up as part of the Corporate Plan process.

RESOLVED to:-

- 1) write to the Government Office and Norfolk County Council stating that the Local Area Agreement as drafted does not focus on meeting some of the key issues facing the City;
- 2) note the final form of the Norfolk LAA and this Council's duty to co-operate to deliver targets as set out in the agreement.

4. NORWICH CONNECT - AUDIT COMMISSION STUDY

The Deputy Chief Executive and Director – Corporate Resources presented the report and explained the background Audit Commission Study. The findings of the benchmarking would be brought back to Executive in October 2008.

During discussion members welcomed the report and highlighted the importance of member being engaged in the benchmarking.

RESOLVED to note the timetable for the benchmarking process.

5. PROPOSED OPTIONS FOR THE PRIORITISATION OF ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE WINDOW REPLACEMENT PROGRAMME TO COUNCIL OWNED PROPERTIES

The Housing Property Manager presented the report.

During discussion members welcomed the report and thanked officers for identifying the 16 areas of deprivation in the Council owned stock. An Executive member asked that tenants should be given some indication at when their windows would be replaced.

RESOLVED to:-

- (1) agree the options as set out in paragraph 13 for prioritising the spending of the additional £7m identified to further accelerate the replacement window programme, from 2015 to 2012;
- (2) agree to option two as the method to be used in future;
- (3) note that the remaining £3m of the programme each year will continue to be prioritised as at present, i.e. using asset condition.

6. CNC BUILDING CONTROL PARTNERSHIP

The Head of Finance presented the report. He explained this was a new venture with normal commercial risks. The loan would be dealt with through the statutory process set out in Section 12 of the Local Government Act 2003.

RESOLVED to:-

1. approve in principle the granting of a loan to the Trading Company created by the CNC Building Control Partnership;
2. devolve authority to the Head of Finance and the Head of Legal & Democratic Services, in consultation with the Executive Member for Sustainable Development to agree the loan agreement and make the loan.

7. POST OFFICE NETWORK CHANGE PROGRAMME

The Head of Legal and Democratic Services circulated a response by Scrutiny Committee following their meeting with representatives from the Post Office on 22 May 2008.

During discussion Executive members made additional comments as follows:-

- look at alternatives such as Post Offices closing due to retirement etc;
- inadequacies of Castle Mall;
- Vauxhall Street Post Office, good disabled access, would cause considerable stress to disabled people;
- Eaton Post Office, Eaton Street, very bad access, whereas Intwood Road only a short distance from Eaton had very good disabled access.

RESOLVED to oppose the closure of any of these branch post offices on the following grounds-

- They provide a vital service to the local community.
- The closure will increase the level of social exclusion to people in these communities.
- The fact that the post offices are in areas of deprivation has not been taken fully into account by the Post Office in reaching its decision.
- The demographics of the area have not been fully taken into account.
- The decision to close these post offices has not been taken using up to date statistical data.
- The Post Office has failed to provide support to increase local franchises.

CHAIR