

### **Scrutiny committee**

**Date: Thursday, 19 November 2020**

**Time: 16:30**

**Venue: TBC, [Venue Address]**

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

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

#### **Committee members:**

##### **Councillors:**

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

#### **For further information please contact:**

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

Democratic services  
City Hall  
Norwich  
NR2 1NH

[www.norwich.gov.uk](http://www.norwich.gov.uk)

#### **Information for members of the public**

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

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

## Agenda

### Page nos

- |          |  |                |
|----------|--|----------------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Declarations of interest</b>  |                |
|          | (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)   |                |
| <b>2</b> | <b>Apologies</b>   |                |
|          | To receive apologies for absence   |                |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Public questions/petitions</b>  |                |
|          | To receive questions / petitions from the public.<br>Please note that all questions must be received by the committee officer detailed on the front of the agenda by <b>10am on Monday 16 November 2020</b> .<br>Petitions must be received by the committee officer detailed on the front of the agenda by <b>10am on Wednesday 18 November 2020</b><br>For guidance on submitting public questions or petitions please see appendix 1 of the council's constitution. |                |
| <b>4</b> | <b>Minutes</b>   | <b>1 - 8</b>   |
|          | To agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2020  |                |
| <b>5</b> | <b>Scrutiny committee work programme 2020-21</b>   | <b>9 - 18</b>  |
|          | <b>Purpose</b> - To consider the scrutiny committee work programme 2020-21   |                |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Maximising opportunities to achieve zero rough sleeping following Covid-19</b>  | <b>19 - 28</b> |
|          | <b>Purpose</b> - To consider the report and make any recommendations.  |                |
| <b>7</b> | <b>New Anglia Local Enterprise partnership recommendations</b>   | <b>29 - 32</b> |
|          | <b>Purpose</b> - To consider any recommendations   |                |

Date of publication: **Wednesday, 11 November 2020**

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

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

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

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

**Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound**

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

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



**Scrutiny Committee**

**16:30 to 18:45**

**15 October 2020**

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

Apologies: Councillors Fulton-McAlister(M), Ryan and Sands (S)

**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 17 September 2020.

**4. Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee update (verbal update)**

Councillor McCartney-Gray gave the committee a verbal update on the recent work of the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee. NHOSC had considered the ambulance response rate in North Norfolk, and a recent report on bullying within the ambulance service. In response to a member's question, Councillor McCartney-Gray said that new people had been brought into the service and the bullying allegations would be taken seriously. NHSOC had asked for an update on work around this to come back in six months' time.

**RESOLVED** to note the update of the representative on the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**5. Scrutiny committee work programme 2020-21**

The chair presented the item. He said that cabinet had considered the recommendations of the select committee on short term lets. The leader of the

council was positive about the work of the select committee but said that it was not possible to take the recommendations forward at this time. The chair said that he had written to the two Norwich MPs asking for their feedback and he would report back to the committee once he received a reply.

A motion to council on safe drug consumption rooms had asked scrutiny committee to consider adding this to its work programme. It was suggested that this could be added to the scope of the select committee on fly-tipping and anti-social behaviour. A member commented that this would perhaps add too many elements to the select committee which should be focussed only on fly-tipping, and suggested that this topic be taken to NHOSC for consideration instead. The representative on NHOSC agreed to propose this as a piece of work.

A member suggested that no select committees were taken forward due to the pressure of the Covid-19 pandemic on the work on the council. A member commented that although the select committees were due to look at crucial topics, officers were already under huge amounts of pressure with great demands on their time. A member said that the select committee on fly-tipping had already been deferred from the last civic year and the topic was extremely important to residents of the city. It was worth separating fly-tipping and anti-social behaviour to concentrate on fly-tipping as the issue had been raised by a member of the public. The chair said that it would be pragmatic to separate these topics as it would reduce the scope and should initially be member led with officer involvement later in the process. A member added that those who were willing to sit on the select committee could start the work and it could be paused if necessary. Following debate, the majority of the committee felt that select committees involved a large time commitment from all participants and that with the pressures of the Covid-19 pandemic on the work of the council, the select committee should not be taken forward.

Members discussed the work programme and the item for the December meeting. A member said that as social inclusion following Covid-19 was the item with the highest score at the work setting programme which had not been allocated a space, this should be considered for the December meeting. The strategy manager said that the scope would need to be refined but this could be done and he would work with the chair to do this.

**RESOLVED** to:

- (1) ask Councillor McCartney-Gray to take work on safe drug consumption rooms to NHOSC for consideration,
- (2) not take any select committees forward at this time; and
- (3) ask the chair to work with the strategy manager to refine the scope for the item on social inclusion following Covid-19 for the December meeting.

## **6. Norwich City Council response to enhancing community development following Covid-19**

The neighbourhood and community enabling manager presented the report. The council had good links with the voluntary and community sectors and had many enquiries from residents and organisations on how they could get involved with their communities. The Covid pandemic had highlighted that communities that were connected to each other were better able to support one another during the lockdown.

The Covid Recovery Blueprint had elements focussed on asset based community development models which focussed on the positive parts of a community model and built on those rather than looking at what was missing.

There were five main elements to the blueprint, including internal strengths and opportunities as a council to improve service design and delivery, looking at good practice from projects which worked well in the past, looking at other organisations, understanding how the council invited people to be involved and how to hear the 'unheard voices', and how technology could help with the project.

The aim was to create a living document that officers could use when redesigning a service and the neighbourhood and community enabling manager was looking for colleague and councillor input into how the document could be shaped, including what the role of the ward councillor was within community development.

The chair thanked the neighbourhood and community enabling manager and invited questions and comments from the committee.

A member asked what the timeline would be for the document and how long it would be until a final draft would be considered by cabinet or council. The neighbourhood and community enabling manager said that the aim was to have a draft document by January and then a report to cabinet in March 2021.

In response to a member's question on baseline data for the document, the neighbourhood and community enabling manager said there had been a huge piece of research undertaken as part of the reducing inequalities work. Areas had been selected for focus as they had significant issues within their data around inequalities. The work would be led by residents and once an overview of data for each area had been put together, these would be shared with members. By way of a follow up question, a member asked how less visible data would be captured, such as how groups of residents were helping each other. The neighbourhood and community enabling manager said that there were a lot of groups undertaking that kind of work and her team was looking to capture some data around this, without subjecting the groups to anything too formal. She wanted the groups to see that there was value in engaging with the council and wanted to promote a culture in which they could flourish. The strategy manager added that a report had been taken to cabinet in March 2020 around a pilot on reducing inequalities work. A question on how much people felt a part of their community had also been added to the local area survey on and this would be reported to cabinet as part of the performance framework.

A member commented that the wards across the city varied in character and makeup with variations within these wards as well. This meant that ward councillors would have a valuable input into the work. The neighbourhood and community enabling manager said that she was looking at how best to work with members to discuss and inform the work on the blueprint.

A member said that a select committee had looked at building social capital in 2015 and she suggested that the recommendations from that work were revisited as she said it was not clear as to how these had been implemented. She said that she had concerns that some decisions were 'handed down' to some wards without communication and that the council needed to allow communities to take on projects that they wanted to. She added that the council's constitution included a member / officer working protocol but there was nothing in it regarding community engagement. The neighbourhood and community enabling manager said that she had reviewed the recommendations of the 2015 select committee and these reflected the day to day work of her team.

In response to a question on the production of a vision statement, the neighbourhood and community engagement manager said that this would be developed once the initial piece of work had been undertaken with residents, to ensure that a vision was not imposed upon them.

A member said that she welcomed the positivity and openness around the piece of work. She said that with regards to barriers to engagement, people often wanted to engage with people similar to themselves, and suggested that some of those undertaking the engagement work could be people with similar life experiences to those residents.

A member questioned how principles could be formed without taking a 'one size fits all' approach. There needed to be accountability to show residents what the council was able to do for them and that it would deliver. The neighbourhood and community enabling manager said that a 'one size fits all' approach would not work but the work would need to be led by the community which would be reflected in the principles. She was keen for the document to be a blueprint rather than a list of actions as there was a will to empower officers to take the best course of action to make sure that residents were getting what they expected from the council and to build a sense of trust. The accountability would sit within the corporate performance indicators. The strategy manager added that the key challenge was that there could be dissonance between residents and the council, despite best efforts for this not to happen. There would need to be a culture change in how managers and teams were incentivised to display certain behaviours. There was a need to evaluate the feel of how well the council was doing which members would play a key role in.

A member commented that the strategy would need to consider council partners as well, such as contractors and charities. He said that there had been cases where trust had been broken with the council and wondered if there was any process for mediation. The strategy manager said that the culture of working with those residents receiving services would be considered within the blueprint. The values would inform the strategy and would be part of how services were delivered. The neighbourhood and community enabling manager said that the council was not



always seen as being separate from other statutory authorities and so it was beneficial to work with partners to develop a similar mind-set.

A member said that it was important that the council was delivering efficient public services and that it would be helpful for both councillors and residents to understand the council's internal processes.

A member commented that there was always room for improvement but the council was working in trying times with stretched budgets. The work being undertaken around community engagement was positive and would give people a vehicle in which to engage with the council.

It was therefore **RESOLVED** to:-

- (1) Ask the neighbourhood and community enabling manager to consider the following recommendations when developing the Citizen Participation Blueprint
  - a) To draft a council / councillor / citizen compact with participation and transparency at its heart to improve interactions with residents and influence and shape council culture.
  - b) For ward councillors to have a better understanding of internal council processes in order to identify improvements through an all member briefing and for this information to be made available to residents.
  - c) Make it clear to residents that councillors are a first point of contact within the council and to highlight other contact means such as online forms and the customer contact centre and to investigate barriers to people contacting the council.
  - d) Ensure that issues are followed through, by looking at the most effective way of doing so for residents.
  - e) Ensuring that services are delivered to build and maintain trust with residents
- (2) Ask cabinet to commission a piece of work to refresh the constitution so that it more accurately reflects the collaborative nature of the council, for example, in discussions with councillors to include a rationale on why a project can or cannot be taken forward.

## **7. New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership**

**RESOLVED** to ask members to email the scrutiny liaison officer with any recommendations to be considered at the November meeting of the scrutiny committee.

CHAIR





**Norwich City Council**  
**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

## **Item No 5**

**REPORT for meeting to be held on Thursday 19 November**

### **Scrutiny committee work programme 2020-21**

<b>Summary:</b>	<p>The purpose of this report is to assist committee members in setting the work programme for the rest of the civic year 2020-21.</p> <p>Members are asked to consider the report and any additional recommendations to update the work programme throughout the civic year.</p>
<b>Conclusions:</b>	<p>It is proposed that any discussion is agreed as a whole committee using 'TOPIC' criteria. This will assist members in achieving the goal of an agreed work programme that is met by consensus.</p> <p>The work programme is a standing item at each committee meeting and can be adjusted as necessary.</p>
<b>Recommendation:</b>	<p>To:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(1) consider the scrutiny committee work programme 2020-21.</li><li>(2) confirm the topic for scrutiny on 17 December.</li><li>(3) consider the scrutiny recommendations tracker.</li><li>(4) to receive a report back from the chair from both Norwich MPs on the short term lets report.</li></ul>
<b>Contact officer:</b>	<p>Emma Webster, scrutiny liaison officer emmawebster@norwich.gov.uk</p>

## Report

1. When the scrutiny committee considers which items to include on its work programme, it is useful to do so in the context of what the focus is for the council over the coming year and to look at how activity aligns to the council's corporate plan.
2. This is so that the scrutiny committee will be able to consider where and how it can add value to the work being carried out towards achievement of the council's priorities and ensure that resources are being focused effectively.
3. Although sometimes not possible to achieve, it was previously agreed that the committee should agree as few as possible substantive topics per meeting. The main reason for this is to ensure that there is enough time for the committee to effectively consider the issues and has a fair chance of reaching sound, evidence based outcomes. Ideally, one main item per meeting would be the aim.
4. Members will have the opportunity on a monthly basis to revise the work programme if and when required or due to changing events.
5. Along with this report, members have a copy of the scrutiny recommendations tracker for consideration.
6. It is proposed that any discussion is as a whole committee using the TOPIC criteria. This will assist members in achieving the goal of an agreed work programme that is met by consensus.
7. Members are reminded that any items placed on the work programme should be considered within the council's COVID-19 recovery framework.
8. At the last meeting of the scrutiny committee the topic for the December meeting was agreed as social inclusion following Covid-19. The strategy manager and chair of scrutiny have now had the opportunity to scope this work and the chair will update the committee on those discussions.
9. At scrutiny on 17 September 2020 the chair agreed to send a copy of the select committee report to the two Norwich MP's inviting their comments. The chair will give a verbal update on their response.

## Appendix A

### Annual work programme planning grid

(updated 9 November 2020)

Date of meeting	Item
<b>Thursday at 16.30</b>	
<b>2020</b>	
<b>10 June</b>	Covid-19 recovery report
<b>16 July</b>	Work programme Annual scrutiny report
<b>17 September</b>	Work programme Report back from NHOSC meeting from 30 July and 3 September Report back from Short Term Lets select committee <b>Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)</b>
<b>15 October</b>	Work programme Report back from NHOSC meeting from 8 October Enhancing community development following Covid-19 - Citizen Participation blueprint, Kate Price. Follow-up Local Enterprise Partnership (max 30 mins)
<b>19 November</b>	Work programme Maximising opportunities to achieve zero rough sleeping following Covid-19, Chris Hancock. Follow-up Local Enterprise Partnership
<b>17 December</b>	Work programme Social inclusion following Covid-19 Equality information report Report back from NHOSC meeting from 26 November (Cllr McCartney-Gray) Report back from Community Safety partnership meeting from 24 November (Cllr Giles)
<b>2021</b>	
<b>21 January</b>	Work programme Corporate plan and performance framework To consider the 2021/22 budgets, medium term financial strategy and capital programme, along with capital strategy and treasury management strategy Cllr Kendrick. Hannah Simpson, Shaun Flaxman, Adam Drane
<b>4 February</b>	Work programme Further scrutiny of the budget 2021/22
<b>18 March</b>	Work programme Report back from NHOSC meeting from 4 February and 18 March.

Date of meeting and topic	Recommendations	Outcome
<p>10 June 2020</p> <p><b>Covid-19 recovery report</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Amending bullet point 2 under section 7, Climate change and the green economy' in the recovery themes and key actions summary on p31 of the report to reflect the recommendation of the Tyndall centre to reduce carbon emissions of Norwich by 13 % annually</li>   <li>(2) Amending bullet point 4, under section 4 'business and the local economy' section, in the recovery themes and key actions summary on p30 of the report, from 'consider the opportunities to further promote sustainable travel in the city, building on the already well-advanced measures already in place' to 'consider the opportunities to further promote sustainable travel <i>on whole route approaches</i>, building on the already well-advanced measures already in place'</li>   <li>(3) Lobbying the LGA and central government for all district councils to be given some of the powers and financial resources that the Health and Safety Executive has, to allow the city council to enforce social distancing if employers are not complying.</li>   <li>(4) At section 8.4, include trade unions to the list of groups to be consulted on this document.</li>   <li>(5) Redoubling efforts with Norfolk County Council to ensure social distancing measures around the city centre are in place as soon as possible.</li>   <li>(6) Including further references to the impact of Covid-19 on the insurance industry regarding aviation, and families and young people, particularly in reference to education, including local universities.</li>   <li>(7) Revising the Commercial Property Investment Strategy to reflect the changes in the economy due to Covid-19 and how this could drive a green economy.</li> </ul>	<p>Recommendations taken to Cabinet on 10 June 2020; Response:</p> <p>Councillor Waters, leader of the council, thanked the scrutiny committee for its recommendations and said that they would be noted by cabinet and would form part of the thinking around future revisions to the blueprint as it evolved.</p>



	<p>(8) Investigating the use of purchasing powers to undertake a retrofit programme on housing as a key part of driving the economic recovery.</p> <p>(9) Looking at alternative sources of income to carparks in the city.</p> <p>(10) Looking at the experience of other local authorities which are pursuing a circular economy to take advantage of the fact that Norwich has two recycling centres in development.</p>	
<p>16 July 2020</p> <p><b>Work programme 2020-21</b></p>	<p>(1) At the September meeting of the scrutiny committee to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) receive a report from the select committee on short term lets; and</li> <li>b) ask the scrutiny liaison officer to approach the LEP to attend the meeting to pick up the work that the committee was due to undertake in March 2020</li> </ul> <p>(2) Ask the scrutiny liaison officer to add the following items to the scrutiny committee work programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Sustainable and inclusive economy following the impact of Covid-19</li> <li>b) Enhancing community development following the impact of Covid-19</li> <li>c) Maximising opportunities to achieve zero rough sleeping following Covid-19</li> <li>d) The social inclusion agenda following Covid-19</li> </ul>	<p>Items added to the work programme for 2020-21</p>

<p>17 September 2020</p> <p><b>LEP visit</b></p>	<p>(1) thank Chris Starkie and Lisa Roberts, of New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), and Councillor Alan Waters for attending the meeting and answering questions on the LEP;</p> <p>(2) ask Lisa Roberts of the LEP to provide responses to questions 10, 12 - 19, 22 and 23 (as set out in the appendix)</p> <p>(3) consider the information received at this meeting, together with the responses to the outstanding questions at the next meeting of the committee, with a view to making recommendations to cabinet;</p> <p>(4) ask members to promote the LEP's Job Support Programme to residents and local businesses.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Received</p> <p>On the agenda for 15.10.20</p> <p>Details to be published on e-councillor</p>
<p>17 September 2020</p> <p><b>Short term lets</b></p>	<p>(1) thank the members of the short term lets select committee, Councillors Carlo, Giles, McCartney-Gray and Oliver, and the following officers:</p> <p>Emma Webster, scrutiny liaison officer</p> <p>Carole Jowett, revenues and benefits operations manager</p> <p>David Parkin, area development manager (inner)</p> <p>Adam Clark, strategy manager.</p>	<p>Done</p>

	<p>(2) submit the recommendations as set out in the report to cabinet for consideration at its meeting on 14 October;</p> <p>(3) ask the chair to write to both Norwich MPs with a copy of the report to seek their views on the subject;</p> <p>(4) ask the scrutiny liaison officer to draft a full response to the comments made by a member of the public to the scrutiny select committee for sign off by the select committee.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Done. Feedback to be given at scrutiny on 19.11.20.</p> <p>In progress.</p>
<p>17 September 2020</p> <p><b>Work programme</b></p>	<p>(1) note the inclusion of New Anglia LEP on the work programme for the October meeting;</p> <p>(2) ask the scrutiny liaison officer to email members of the committee to gauge interest in serving on select committees for fly-tipping and antisocial behaviour;</p> <p>(3) ask the scrutiny liaison officer to review the topics voted on at the July meeting and make recommendations to the committee at its next meeting as to which topics to select.</p>	<p>Done.</p> <p>Completed.</p> <p>Completed – on the agenda for 15.10.20.</p>

<p>15 October 2020</p> <p><b>Work programme</b></p>	<p>(1) ask Councillor McCartney-Gray to take work on safe drug consumption rooms to NHOSC for consideration,</p> <p>(2) not take any select committees forward at this time; and</p> <p>(3) ask the chair to work with the strategy manager to refine the scope for the item on social inclusion following Covid-19 for the December meeting.</p>	<p>On the agenda for 19.11.20</p>
<p>15 October 2020</p> <p><b>Norwich City Council response to enhancing community development following Covid-19</b></p>	<p>(1) Ask the neighbourhood and community enabling manger to consider the following recommendations when developing the Citizen Participation Blueprint</p> <p>a) To draft a council / councillor / citizen compact with participation and transparency at its heart to improve interactions with residents and influence and shape council culture.</p> <p>b) For ward councillors to have a better understanding of internal council processes in order to identify improvements through an all member briefing and for this information to be made available to residents.</p> <p>c) Make it clear to residents that councillors are a first point of contact within the council and to highlight other contact means such as online forms and the customer contact centre and to investigate barriers to people contacting the council.</p>	<p>recommendations a, d and e will be included in the citizen participation blueprint and this document will ultimately be considered by cabinet next year.</p> <p>Democratic services to take forward b and c.</p>

	<p>d) Ensure that issues are followed through, by looking at the most effective way of doing so for residents.</p> <p>e) Ensuring that services are delivered to build and maintain trust with residents</p> <p>(2) Ask cabinet to commission a piece of work to refresh the constitution so that it more accurately reflects the collaborative nature of the council, for example, in discussions with councillors to include a rationale on why a project can or cannot be taken forward.</p>	<p>This will be taken to cabinet in December for consideration.</p>
<p>15 October 2020</p> <p><b>New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership</b></p>	<p>Ask members to email the scrutiny liaison officer with any recommendations to be considered at the November meeting of the scrutiny committee.</p>	<p>Received and published in papers for scrutiny on 19.11.20</p>



**Norwich City Council**  
**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**ITEM 6**

**REPORT for meeting to be held on 19 November 2020**

**Maximising opportunities to achieve zero rough sleeping following Covid-19.**

**Summary:**

The government request to house people sleeping rough on grounds of public health, together with necessary funding, allowed the city council to achieve significant and positive outcomes very quickly. The close relationship with housing charities, multi-agency working which has achieved success through Pathways Norwich, and other interventions during the pandemic, placed Norwich in a strong position. With the risk of significant rises in homelessness due to the forecast recession, removal of Section 21 notice bans on evictions and the ending of the furlough scheme in late summer has created the “perfect storm” to drive homelessness and potential rough sleeping should be anticipated. Securing support from other statutory agencies with responsibility for this will be vital to future interventions in this area.

**Conclusions:**

**Rough sleeping**

Incidences of people sleeping rough in Norwich is likely to continue for the foreseeable future. We have a strong record in getting people off the streets quickly by providing specialist services and accommodation in response to this need. We now have more emergency accommodations available than ever before. We have a high prevalence of people with multiple and complex needs in Norwich. In order to meet these needs we need more preventative services to stem the flow onto the streets; coupled with this, we need to see a continuing commitment from our local statutory partners to enable the development and protection of services. National Government needs to provide an ongoing financial commitment to end rough sleeping by funding local authorities at appropriate levels so we can bring about lasting change.

There is a likelihood that if we see increasing numbers of people sleeping rough because of Covid-19 related issues that this cohort will need a different offer to what is available, for example: around employability and debt related issues, as well as affordable housing options as opposed to our current cohort of people who have specialist support needs.

#### **Private rented sector and social economic factors**

It is very likely that as government support for people who are furloughed is reduced or removed that we will see increased numbers of people in receipt of welfare payments. This may be tempered depending on the speed of our economic recovery from the pandemic. Any further cuts to welfare spending is likely to cause significant hardship to people in Norwich with the recent increase and uptake of Universal Credit.

#### **Recommendation: Rough sleeping**

- Carry out a refresh in January 2021 of our Norwich tackling rough sleeper strategy 2017-22 to measure progress and inform further development of services that may be required due to Covid-19 related issues.

#### **Private rented sector**

- We will utilise as much as possible our discretionary housing payments to help people in the private rented sector stay in their homes.
- We have a wide range of housing options available to people who present to us: Homelessness prevention fund, Let NCC and our housing register.
- We recruited additional staff to work with private sector landlords to prevent and reduce homelessness presentations.
- We are looking to bring more private landlords on to our private sector leasing scheme, Let NCC.

**Contact Officer:** Chris Hancock, Housing partnerships officer

Phone: 07775011817

Email: [Chrishancock@norwich.gov.uk](mailto:Chrishancock@norwich.gov.uk)



## **1. Norwich and the ‘Everyone in’ initiative**

- 1.1** In response to the governments call to get ‘Everyone in’ letter dated 23 March 2020. Norwich City Council made plans to house people at risk or where sleeping rough on our streets. During the period 23 March to 31 July 2020 we helped 117 people.

Of the 117:

- We provided emergency accommodation to 82 people.
- 3 people were re-connected back to their local authority, into accommodation.
- 32 people were offered direct access hostel placement due to availability of the hostel at the time and demand and 1 bed was funded through the Ministry of Justice.

Of the 117 people who were provided accommodation (as set out above), 101 have been supported to move into alternative and more sustainable accommodation. A small number of individuals from the initial ‘everybody in scheme’ remain in emergency accommodation.

No persons sleeping rough declined an offer of emergency accommodation. Whilst initially one or two found it difficult to adjust and returned to sleeping on the street at times, all initially accepted and started to use the beds.

- 1.2** During and after the above period we continue to see people flow on to our streets. The reason for the continual flow of people can be summarised as follows:

- Lack of support and preventative services available in Norfolk and other parts of the country
- Evictions and abandonments from supported housing (often due to complex needs leading to anti-social behaviour)
- Relationship breakdown
- Relaxing of lockdown in other areas has made it easier for people to be more mobile again
- People leaving institutions such as prison, hospitals and custody
- Many people have been homeless for extended periods; sometimes years or decades since they last had settled housing

- 1.3** Numbers of people seen sleeping out were lower initially following 31 July 2020 as the following table shows but soon numbers started to climb:

Table 1

Measure	Aug 20	Sept 20
Individuals seen sleeping rough	19 (5 unknown)	34 (14 unknown)
Local connection Norwich/Other	7/7	14/6
Of the known people:		
New to sleeping rough	7	6
Returner	3	3
Already housed	2	6
Entrenched	2	5

**1.4 Successful funding bid to Next Steps Accommodation Programme (NSAP)**

The government in July 2020 released their funding prospectus in response to their call to get all rough sleepers in during the Covid-19 crisis. The overall objectives of NSAP are:

- Reduce rough sleeping and no return to it
- As Covid-19 continues rough sleepers are kept safe where they can self-isolate
- Provide long term housing for rough sleepers

Proposals were co-designed with our Rough sleeper adviser from MHCLG and had the following:

- Assessment of health/care and support needs of all the people we have accommodated during the crisis
- Focus on all rough sleepers including those people who are long term repeat cases
- Identified how support services are necessary beyond what is currently in place

- 1.5** In response to our bid the council were successful in receiving £1.4m in funding to provide the following:

- Partner with Broadland Housing Association to purchase ten homes on the open market for former rough sleepers and build 6 new homes on council owned land
- 3 years of revenue funding to provide intensive support to people housed in the above homes
- Pay for a part-time role to co-ordinate indoor food

- provision seven days a week in the City Centre
- Provide emergency accommodation options for people during the winter and spring with access to rent deposits and other associated costs in setting up their home
- Funding to help people reconnect with accommodation and support networks in their home areas.

**1.6** It is our understanding that there will be further opportunities to place bids for the Next Steps Accommodation Programme over the next two years; to either build, or purchase more homes for people who have been rough sleeping with revenue funding to provide intensive support.

## **1.7 Norwich tackling rough sleeper strategy 2017-22**

In December 2017 Norwich City Council launched its strategy to reduce rough sleeping to as close to zero as possible. The strategy set out the following objectives:

<b>Nos</b>	<b>Priority</b>	<b>Activity</b>
1.	Reduce the number of rough sleepers on our streets and develop interventions to stop it happening in the first place.	<p>Undertook a health needs audit to inform commissioning.</p> <p>Developing housing first on a larger scale with three individual projects to deliver 39 homes this year with intensive support.</p> <p>Developed a tenancy deposit scheme for people with no recourse to public funds.</p> <p>Grant commissioned Pathways Norwich to help deliver a wide variety of services.</p> <p>Introduced a criminal justice homelessness prevention protocol in October 2019.</p> <p>In the first two years of Pathways Norwich the service has prevented approximately 478</p>

Nos	Priority	Activity
		incidences of people sleeping rough and verified 628 incidences of people sleeping rough. 410 of the 628 were moved into supported housing.
2.	Develop an assertive outreach model	<p>We recently commissioned two drug and alcohol outreach workers.</p> <p>Developed specialist multi-disciplinary meetings to case manage individuals.</p> <p>We carry out comprehensive assessments of people's needs appointing a named worker specifically targeting those with complex needs.</p>
3.	Make the best use of our supported housing system to help move people away from homelessness for good.	<p>We now have specialist resettlement and floating support workers tasked with helping people transition into independent housing.</p> <p>We now have a dry house and detox facility with onsite support.</p> <p>We are in the process of reviewing our hostel move on agreement later this year to provide quicker access to housing.</p>

## 2. Covid-19: Social and economic factors

Dame Louise Casey (former leader of the government's emergency programme to tackle rough sleeping) recently stated that, "The country is

on course for a “perfect storm of awfulness, hungry children and poor families unable to cope unless the government rethinks its support for the most vulnerable.”<sup>1</sup>

## 2.1 Claimant count unemployment rate

<b>Table 2 Claimant count unemployment rate<sup>2</sup></b>								
	<b>September 2019</b>		<b>August 2020</b>		<b>September 2020</b>		<b>Monthly change</b>	<b>Annual change</b>
<b>Gt. Britain</b>	1,135,235	2.8%	2,625,750	6.5%	2,646,960	6.5%	0	+ 3.7%
<b>East of England</b>	80,070	2.1%	213,715	5.6%	214,905	5.7%	+ 0.1%	+ 3.6%
<b>New Anglia LEP</b>	21,305	2.2%	51,335	5.3%	51,240	5.3%	0	+ 3.1%
<b>Norwich City Council<sup>i</sup></b>	2,900	3.0%	6,470	6.8%	6,585	6.9%	+ 0.1%	+ 3.9%
<b>Norwich urban area</b>	3,330	2.6%	7,855	6.1%	7,950	6.2%	+ 0.1%	+ 3.6%

“Table 2 shows that the claimant count unemployment rates have grown strongly compared to the same time last year; the number of people claiming unemployment benefits has seen at least a twofold increase across each of the reported areas. Over the month of September, the region and both Norwich areas have seen a small increase in unemployment rates; nationally and across the LEP area rates were unchanged. Unemployment growth is likely to have been tempered by the Government’s temporary furlough job subsidy scheme which comes to an end in October. The magnitude of the increase in unemployment will depend not only on the strength of the economic recovery but also on whether furloughed workers will be fully absorbed back into the workforce.”<sup>3</sup>

Since the Norwich economic barometer was published in September the government have announced that they will extend the current furlough scheme. The same issue arises (as mentioned above) whether these furloughed workers will be still in employment when the scheme finally comes to an end.

## 2.2 Planned cuts to Universal Credit in April 2021

The planned cuts to Universal Credit in April 2021 have the potential to make people’s lives much harder (if they take place) especially with the increase in the number of claimants due to the pandemic. The cuts will “result in a big impact on incomes due to the relatively low replacement rates of Universal

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/nov/01/louise-casey-britain-is-facing-perfect-storm-of-awfulness-warns-welfare-expert> Accessed on 03/11/20.

<sup>2</sup> Page 11, Norwich economic barometer September 2020.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

Credit. For example, the median single worker without children who was furloughed under the Job Retention Scheme during the crisis would have had an income replacement rate of 83 per cent. If they now become unemployed that replacement rate falls to 30 per cent. And with next April's cut to Universal Credit that falls even further to 23 per cent – so losing their job would mean losing over three-quarters of their income.”<sup>4</sup>

The head of the CBI Carolyn Fairbairn have also called out the government's planned cuts as unfair, “There are going to be some people who have been kept in work through variations of the job support scheme, and others who are not so lucky. The gap between those two positions should not be so great.”<sup>5</sup>

Since the pandemic began, Norwich along with other areas of the country has seen significant numbers of people make claims for Universal Credit; coupled with the migration of legacy benefit claims such as Job Seekers Allowance. The following table shows the number of people claiming Universal Credit in Norwich compared to the Eastern region and England:

Table 3<sup>6</sup>

Area	September 2019	September 2020	% increase
Norwich	5426	14060	159%
East of England	188888	476038	152%
England	2107176	4934260	134%

## 4. Evictions in the private rented sector

4.1 In Norwich the private rented sector makes up an estimated 23% of all dwellings, as the following table shows:

Table 4

Tenure	Estimated number of dwellings <sup>7</sup>	% of total
Owner occupiers	28,327	44.54
PRS	14,727	23.15
Social rent	20,536	32.29
Total	63,590	

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.resolutionfoundation.org/publications/death-by-1000-cuts/> Accessed on 03/11/20.

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/nov/01/louise-casey-britain-is-facing-perfect-storm-of-awfulness-warns-welfare-expert> Accessed on 03/11/20.

<sup>6</sup> Source: DWP Stat Xplorer, <https://stat-xplore.dwp.gov.uk/webapi/jsf/login.xhtml> Accessed on 03/11/20. Figures are a count of the number of people on UC on the second Thursday of each month.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

- 4.2 Recent research conducted by the Resolution Foundation<sup>8</sup> found renters have been more adversely affected by the pandemic than any other housing tenure. At the start of the pandemic their research found that earnings falls were felt across all housing tenures at the start of the pandemic. “Both private and social renters are now more than twice as likely than mortgagors to have lost their job (8 per cent of private renters and 7 per cent of social renters, compared to 3 per cent of mortgagors), a finding that is consistent with recent work showing younger and lower paid workers (who are more likely to be renters) are bearing the brunt of the COVID-19 jobs crisis.
- 4.3 Research has also found that renters are more likely to be furloughed than someone living in a mortgaged home (10 per cent of social renters and 9 per cent of private renters, compared to 6 per cent of mortgagors). Private renters have reported that nearly one in eight (12 per cent) are unable to cover their rent in full compared to 7 per cent of mortgagors and 17 per cent of social renters.

#### 4.4 **Protection from eviction ended September 2020**

The government in September 2020 announced the ending of the ban of evictions (due to the pandemic) with the requirement that landlords must give tenants in arrears six months’ notice of repossession. It is anticipated that nationally around 200,000 private renters could face eviction in the UK over the next year.<sup>9</sup>

#### 4.5 **Recommendations to protect renters**

National housing charity Shelter have made a number of recommendations to government to help renters get through the current pandemic and housing crisis:

- Create a Coronavirus Renters Relief Fund to help private renters pay off ‘Covid rent arrears’.
- Lift the benefit cap to protect renters now and prevent a rising tide of homelessness.
- Make sure that the local housing allowance (LHA) remains, at the very least, aligned with the 30<sup>th</sup> percentile of local market rents and conduct an urgent review to make sure that LHA is enough to cover the rents of all those who need it.
- Build much more social housing to create much needed jobs and provide the genuinely affordable, secure homes we so desperately need.

#### 4.6 **Conclusion**

---

<sup>8</sup> Page 2, Coping with housing costs, six months on...Resolution Foundation (31 October 2020).

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

In conclusion, before the pandemic hit there were existing social and economic problems that already existed. The pandemic has made these problems even more pressing and self-evident.

### **Rough sleeping**

- We have a significant amount of emergency accommodation (40 more beds than last year) over the winter and spring period to house rough sleepers.
- We are developing housing first with 13 tenancies now with a further 26 homes available by the end of the financial year.
- We are planning to create more housing first homes in the future.
- The formation of a Norfolk strategic partnership around homelessness will provide a forum to develop ideas and services with statutory and voluntary sector partners.
- We look to continue to develop the services that Pathways Norwich provides.

### **Private rented sector**

- We have a strong record of preventing homelessness (80% of people presenting as threatened with homelessness are prevented)
- We have a nationally recognised Gold standard housing options service.
- We will utilise as much as possible our discretionary housing payments to help people in the private rented sector stay in their homes.
- We have a wide range of housing options available to people who present to us: Homelessness prevention fund, Let NCC and our housing register.
- We have recruited additional staff to work with private sector landlords to prevent and reduce homelessness presentations.
- We are looking to bring more private landlords on to our private sector leasing scheme, Let NCC.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Norwich City council area comprises the following wards: Bowthorpe, Catton Grove, Crome, Eaton, Lakenham, Mancroft, Mile Cross, Nelson, Sewell, Thorpe Hamlet, Town Close, University, Wensum



**Norwich City Council**  
**SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

## **Item No 7**

**REPORT for meeting to be held on Thursday 19 November**

### **New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership recommendations**

<b>Summary:</b>	<p>Members will recall that the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) attended the October meeting of scrutiny and took questions from the committee. Due to time constraints not all questions could be answered during the meeting so the LEP provided written answers.</p> <p>At the November meeting of scrutiny these written answers were considered but due to time constraints recommendations were requested by e-mail to be agreed at this meeting.</p>
<b>Recommendations:</b>	<p>That the scrutiny committee make its recommendations on this topic.</p>
<b>Contact officers:</b>	<p>Emma Webster, scrutiny liaison officer emmawebster@norwich.gov.uk</p>

From Councillor Jamie Osborn;

- 1) That the Leader of the Council requests from the LEP a clear plan and commitments for how they are going to meet the minimum target of reducing emissions by 13% year on year.
- 2) That the scrutiny committee or CEEEP should consider investment opportunities within Norwich that would generate the best results in reducing emissions and providing community benefit, so that these can be fed into the new Norfolk & Suffolk Investment Plan.
- 3) The LEP written answers refer to “Developing a dedicated vehicle for generating local energy in a way which benefits communities, and consider where targeted pilots could help us explore initiatives and learn from other leading areas/schemes”. We are due a report on solar financing from the cabinet member for sustainable environment, and I’d like to propose that Cllr Maguire meets with local community energy groups and the LEP to discuss a pilot in Norwich.
- 4) Most of the businesses that I’ve spoken to in my ward haven’t heard about the LEP grants. Could the council help to promote this by include details in communication with businesses when sending out business rates letters?
- 5) LEP has details of its grants programmes on the website, but it’s not clear what the impact of these is. I’d like to ask for a report on benefits delivered: impact on social mobility and local jobs. I’m concerned about jobs just being based on a “trickle-down” assumption.
- 6) A union roundtable is good, but I believe there should be permanent union representation in decision-making: thus, to ask the Leader of the Council to push for unions to be represented on the LEP board.

From Councillor Denise Carlo;

To recommend via city council leader who sits on LEP Board:

- 1) To include clean growth and protection/enhancement biodiversity as key criteria for project applications.
- 2) To ask LEP to regularly assess the net impact of its activities (policies/programmes/funding) on carbon emissions and extent to which the LEP is meeting legal targets.
- 3) To review its strategic approach to transport planning which is currently dominated by major road building schemes and to bring its policies and funding contributions into line with net zero carbon target.
- 4) LEP to assist WildEast in helping to meet its goal of dedicating 20% of all land in East Anglia to biodiversity by 2030.

From Councillor Lesley Graham;

- 1) Build on the goodwill and acknowledgement of climate emergency to press for carbon accounting. Chris Starkie acknowledged that - not

enough was being done to meet the Climate Change Act's requirements. Small acts of carbon reduction need to be weighed against, and scaled up to exceed actual ongoing emissions and the first step is measurement. Tyndall report gives 13% annual reduction of Norwich emissions to meet targets in Climate Change Act. (p15). This is an engine of economic renewal and offers genuine opportunities to the many in high carbon jobs who will need alternative employment. The sooner this transition is managed, the more manageable it will be.

- 2) Recommend to the LEP that they lobby government for UBI pilot scheme to boost local demand.
- 3) Push for meetings to be held in public in order to increase accountability, transparency, public awareness and trust.

