



## **COUNCIL**

**19:30 to 21:30**

**27 November 2018**

**Present:** Councillors Schmierer (Lord Mayor), Bradford, Brociek-Coulton, Button, Carlo, Driver, Fullman, Fulton-McAlister (M) (from item 10 below), Harris, Henderson, Huntley, Jones, Kendrick, Lubbock, Manning, Maguire, Maxwell, Packer, Peek, Price, Raby, Sands (M), Sands (S), Stonard, Stewart, Thomas (Va), Thomas (Vi), Trevor, Waters and Wright

**Apologies:** Councillors Ackroyd, Coleshill, Davis, Fulton-McAlister (E), Hampton, Malik, Ryan, Smith and Stutely

### **1. Lord Mayor's Announcements**

The Lord Mayor said that he had attended the civic events to mark the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Armistice and the switching on of the Christmas lights in Norwich. It was not always acknowledged that these events required a lot of hard work from the events team and he thanked the officers and people who had worked on these events.

The Lord Mayor said it was with regret that he had to announce the recent deaths of two former councillors: Baroness Patricia Hollis and John Walker.

Councillor Waters paid tribute to Baroness Patricia Hollis as a member of the council 1969 to 1991, leader of the council and as member of the House of Lords, and her influence on the city which included Bowthorpe, sheltered housing schemes within communities, and the preservation of many Victorian terraces in the city, and her life-long commitment to fight poverty and inequality, including parity for women's pension rights.

Councillor Fullman paid tribute to John Walker who had been a member of the council from 1963 to 1990 and served as a ward councillor for Earlham, on the parks subcommittee and was chair of the amenities and then personnel committees, and rising to deputy leader of the council. He had been committed to the extension of the riverside walk and the introduction of pitch and putt. During his period of office he had been very active in the community and was chair of the children's centre, Treehouse.

The Lord Mayor led the meeting in a moment's silence for quiet reflection on Baroness Patricia Hollis and John Walker.

## **2. Agenda order**

The Lord Mayor said that because of the public interest in the agenda item 9(a) – Motion Brexit, there had been a suggestion that this item be brought forward for consideration earlier in the meeting.

Councillor Wright moved and Councillor Harris seconded the proposal and it was:

**RESOLVED** to consider Motion –Brexit after public questions/petitions.

The Lord Mayor announced that Councillor Jones had exercised her right to withdraw her motion on “Protecting Tenants in the Private Rented Sector” from consideration at this meeting and that the motion would be deferred to the next meeting.

## **3. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Waters declared an other interest in item 11, Motion – Renewable Energy in New Developments in Greater Norwich to 2036, as chair of the Greater Norwich Growth Board and the council’s representative on the board.

(During consideration of item 9 (below), Housing Development at Bullard Road, Councillors Stonard and Kendrick declared an other interest in that they were both directors of Norwich Regeneration Ltd).

## **4. Public Questions/Petitions**

The Lord Mayor said that four public questions had received.

(No notice had been received of any petitions.)

### **Question 1 – Climate Change**

Dr Jo-anne Veltman, Climate Hope Action in Norfolk, asked the cabinet member for safe city environment the following question:

“The new 1.5°C Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report is in the words of UN secretary general Antonio Guterres, ‘an ear-splitting wake up call to the world.’

The report details that: climate change is already affecting people, ecosystems and livelihoods all around the world, some changes are occurring faster than predicted, limiting warming to 1.5°C is possible within the realms of physics and chemistry but requires unprecedented transitions in all aspects of society and is critically dependent on political will and every fraction of a degree matters.

We also know that Norwich and Norfolk face specific impacts, including but not limited to: flooding, land loss, impacts on the Broads, water scarcity, agriculture and public health.

We are currently on a pathway to for temperatures to increase 3-4 °C within my teenage daughter's lifetime and we are risking catastrophic, unstoppable climate change.

We know from medical authorities around the world, including The Lancet Commission in the UK, that climate change is the greatest threat to public health this century. These authorities also tell us that climate action offers potentially, the greatest opportunities to tackling successfully, public health issues we are dealing with today, including within our own city.

In that context, Bristol City Council earlier this month passed unanimously, a motion declaring a climate emergency and committed to Bristol being zero-carbon by 2030. Manchester has also this month committed, following advice from the Tyndall Centre, to urgent comprehensive planning & action for a zero carbon city by 2038.

Will the cabinet member for safe city environment commit to supporting Norwich declaring a climate emergency: prioritising climate mitigation and adaptation across all departments within the council's remit and implementing actions to support Norwich achieving carbon neutrality in a timeframe that is compliant with the IPCC scientific recommendations and the goals and commitments the UK is signed up to in the Paris Agreement?

Councillor Maguire, the cabinet member for safe city environment's replied as follows:

"Thank you for your question, Dr Veltman. The council is very much aware of the impact that climate change can have at global, regional and local levels. This is why, in 2008, we took the initiative to work with the Energy Saving Trust to benchmark the council's carbon footprint. Following this exercise, we have been working hard year-on-year to reduce the council's own carbon footprint. To date we have achieved an impressive carbon emissions reduction of 57.1 per cent, which far exceeds our target of a 40 per cent reduction by 2018. In fact, to set some context, the government's national 5<sup>th</sup> carbon budget target of 57 per cent carbon emissions reduction is due to be delivered by 2030, so Norwich city council have achieved this national target 12 years ahead of that date, within their own carbon footprint.

In the wider Norwich area per capita emissions have also been falling over time from 6.9 tonnes of carbon emissions per capita in 2005 to 3.8 tonnes of carbon emissions per capita in 2016, the most recent dataset available at this time. It is interesting to note that both Norwich and Bristol City have achieved a per capita carbon emissions reduction of 44.3 per cent to date.

Some of the reductions achieved to date will be directly attributable to projects implemented by the council: For example, we have been increasing the energy efficiency of our own housing stock as well as working with private sector landlords and homeowners to increase the energy efficiency of their own houses. In addition, we have implemented a great many initiatives around increasing sustainable transport options, including but not limited to, the introduction of bus priority around the city and a comprehensive network of new cycleways and walking routes. More details of the council's

environmental work can be found in the current environmental strategy document. Progress made against the objectives set in the strategy is reported upon biennially in the council's environmental statement.

Only last week we launched the City Vision 2040 document. Over the past year we have engaged with focus groups, conducted public and stakeholder interviews and organised two conferences in order to bring together the views of the city of Norwich into one document, the purpose of which is to detail how the people of Norwich want their city to be as a place to live and work in the future. Sustainability was identified as a top priority for those we engaged with and accordingly, "A liveable city" is one of the key themes in the City Vision 2040 document. Most specifically the document states that we are "committed to shifting to clean energy by 2040 and becoming carbon-neutral by 2050".

Sustainable living, defined as a need to ensure that *'today's citizens meet the needs of the present without compromising future generations'*, is a common thread which runs throughout the work of the council and is not a new concept for this Labour led city council. Now that the City Vision document is finalised, the council will seek to complete the council's Corporate Plan and correspondingly work to produce the new Environmental Strategy, which will be launched next year.

We are engaging with colleagues at the Tyndall Centre UEA to help us shape the next update of the council's Environmental Strategy: this will include consideration of the need to provide focus on climate mitigation and adaptation. I will feed your views into the process. Questions such whether Norwich should join Bristol and Manchester in committing to become carbon neutral by a particular date, or declaring a climate emergency, will no doubt form part of the discussion within the councillor workshops and the outcomes will be reflected in the new environmental strategy.

Finally, in 2019 we will also update the council's Carbon Management Plan and increase the council's carbon emissions reduction target in the light of our 57.1 per cent reduction well ahead of time."

By way of a supplementary question, Dr Veltman said that the measures that the council was taking were all very well but no-where the level required as evidenced by scientific research into Climate Change. She asked how the council would discuss and be transparent about its actions which she considered were not adequate. In reply, Councillor Maguire referred to the council's measures to reduce carbon emissions being transparent and documents were published on the council's website. He would be having a meeting at the Tyndall Centre to consider the council's Environmental Strategy. The council would not make empty promises which could not be backed up. He pointed out that Bristol City Council had received external funding to become carbon neutral. The city council had been successful in making incremental changes to reduce its carbon emissions and would continue to do so. Collection of foodwaste for recycling had exceeded the council's targets. The council was transparent about its measures to reduce carbon emissions and was doing plenty. Dr Veltman's comments would be incorporated into these discussions.

## **Question 2 – Bus stop, Theatre Street**

Mr Graham Innes asked the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth the following question:

“Bus users are concerned about the lack of accessibility in Norwich city centre for those using certain routes. For example, there are over 3,000ft between two stops on the 25 route in the city centre, but only 1000ft between stops along Unthank Road.

These distances may not seem much, but for those with mobility issues they really matter.

Will the council therefore commit to supporting the installation of a bus stop on Theatre Street near the Theatre Royal?”

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

“Thank you for your question. This issue was considered in some detail when Chapel Field North was made two-way and the bus stop located alongside Chapelfield Gardens was removed. At that time a replacement stop outside the Theatre was considered but concerns were raised about the conflict between large numbers of people exiting the Theatre, particularly matinee performances, and people waiting for a bus. There were similar concerns around an emergency evacuation of the Theatre should it ever happen.

Norwich is one of 12 cities across the county that is in line for a share of the £1.2 billion transforming cities fund which is aimed at reducing congestion and promoting access to jobs. One of the key things the local authorities are seeking to improve is public transport and one of the early pieces of work will be to identify where there can be new bus stops in the city centre because the existing ones are at capacity; if we are going to be successful in encouraging more people to use public transport then we need those additional stops.

I cannot give a firm commitment to install a bus stop on Theatre Street at this time. However this will certainly be one of the areas where we will look to see if additional bus stops can be provided.”

Mr Innes did not have a supplementary question but commented that for 98 per cent of the time there were no buses or coaches parked in the waiting bays on Theatre Street and that he had raised the same question at the Norfolk Bus Forum and suggested that officers attend the forum in the future and that a number of bus services served Theatre Street.

## **Question 3 - Brexit**

Ms Evelyn Gash asked the leader of the council the following question:

“What is the council doing, either on its own or with partners, to prepare for any form of Brexit? Especially in relation to Norwich's businesses and the supply of medicines for its people that usually come from Europe.”

Councillor Waters, leader of the council, replied as follows:

“Well may you ask Ms Gash: the best part of two years has been frittered away by Theresa May's minority Conservative Government failing to enter into meaningful negotiations with our European Union partners. Only when it became necessary to face the prospect of a no-deal Brexit have minds been belatedly concentrated in Government about how to minimise the multiple potential disruptions that are the inevitable consequence of the United Kingdom being deeply embedded in the structures and institutions of the European Union for close to 50 years. That is a relationship a majority of the citizens of Norwich wished to maintain when in the referendum they voted by a clear margin to remain part of the European Union.

Frankly local councils and the communities they represent have been kept in the dark about the impact of Brexit. Earlier in the year I wrote to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and for Local Government to ask, using powers under the 2007 Sustainable Communities Act, for information held by the Government about the specific impact of Brexit on Norwich. In a reply received from James Brokenshire on 14 November the Secretary of State refused to release any information specific to Norwich because ‘it would have the potential to negatively impact Brexit negotiations and the government's planning for Brexit.’

Throughout negotiation of the Brexit deal has been conducted at a national level with little information on the detail of this being available until the recent publication of the draft withdrawal agreement and the political declaration. Many questions and points of detail still remain to be determined and it is uncertain as to the fate of that draft agreement. We are looking through a glass darkly.

I can tell you is that belatedly ‘The Norfolk Resilience Forum’ (one of a number of Resilience Forums set up across England by the Government) have arranged a teleconference the day after this council meeting to discuss EU exit preparedness and council officers are taking part to try to glean any information on steps we can take now.

Council officers are also attending a regional EU exit preparedness event run by the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government in December. Gov.uk has also issued various technical notices in various areas regarding a “no deal” scenario.

However, there is little information available to us to conduct any sort of meaningful planning or preparation. Proper planning can only take place when we know what we are planning for.

The simple truth is that as a council, we have little influence over any form of Brexit and can only truly prepare once we know what the Brexit deal is and

therefore how we, as a council, can then act in the best interests of our residents, businesses and all who enjoy our fine city.”

At a political level, now that we know about the draft agreement signed off (more in sorrow by our European partners) by Theresa May on Sunday, we are clearer, for the first time about the realities of what Brexit means. There are going to be many twists and turns in the next few weeks and months. But there really should be an opportunity for citizens of this city and across the United Kingdom to have their say through a public vote on a final deal that includes an option of retaining full EU membership.”

Ms Gash said that it was very encouraging to hear of the discussions were taking place between national government and local government and that she would welcome any information that was not sensitive and could be made public.

#### **Question 4 – Council acquisitions of commercial property outside the city**

Mr Peter Kemp asked the cabinet member for resources of the council growth the following question:

“Does the city council consider it a legitimate and appropriate use of public money, drawn from council tax and business rates, to purchase out of county properties such as:

- (1) A cold store in Corby (Cambridgeshire) at a cost of £1.2 million;
- (2) A gym in the Isle of Thanet (Kent);
- (3) And any other under consideration?

Would it not be more reasonable, a better use of locally levied council tax and business rates to purchase local properties?

Will there be a risk of financial loss to the detriment of Norwich residents if losses are incurred in the transactions mentioned earlier, which will include, presumably; legal fees, surveys and so forth?”

Councillor Kendrick, the cabinet member for resource, replied as follows::

“The council invests in commercial property in order to generate a new net income stream and thereby help protect services that would be at risk of being cut or reduced.

Like all local authorities, Norwich City Council is facing further cuts to the money it gets from the government. The council has to make £10m of savings in the next four financial years from a total gross budget of £57m - this is in addition to £33m of savings already made in the last 5 years.

We know the government's revenue support grant is disappearing and further austerity is likely to continue for district councils. Therefore we must ensure that we are a forward-thinking council with a proactive and ambitious appetite for income generation so that we can help maintain the services that matter most to local people – that is the basis for us investing in commercial property.

This commercial approach means the council will be able to lessen the required cuts to council spending and help protect services that would otherwise be at risk.

The council does not purchase commercial properties using funds drawn down from Council Tax or Business Rates. Instead the investments are ultimately funded by borrowing money. The investment is only pursued if the new rental income stream demonstrates a clear profit margin that exceeds the cost of borrowing. In addition, the council can borrow money cheaply, mainly from the Public Works Loans Board.

To date, the council's recent commercial property acquisitions total £33m generating a net initial return of 2.9 per cent. By value, 60 per cent of the property acquired has been within the city council's boundaries. In addition we also have 200 other commercial properties (valued at £43m) within the city council's area that we have owned for decades. The majority of our commercial property portfolio therefore is located with the city council's boundaries.

The council approaches the process of purchasing property prudently using external advisors and also has a policy of setting aside part of the net income to provide funding for future costs that may need to be incurred, such as lost income from vacancies.

From a risk management perspective it makes sense to diversify the portfolio by acquiring some property in other locations so that the income generated is not dependent on one economic locality. The council's approach in this regard is similar to many other local authorities. During the last financial year, 2017/18, 28 per cent of the £2.5 billion of property purchased by local authorities was invested outside the local authority's area in question. Saville's, one of the UK's largest property agents, reported on their website (UK Commercial Market in minutes – 20 August 2018) that "...while the proportion of investments by local authorities that are outside their operational area has risen to 39 per cent this year (i.e. 2018/19), we believe that this is justifiable in the context of spreading investment risk."

By way of a supplementary question, Mr Kemp asked if the council understood the saying "Neither a lender nor a borrower be" and said rather than invest outside the city the city council could put money into children's centres, education and social services. Councillor Kendrick explained that the city council was investing to protect its services. The services that Mr Kemp had referred to were county council services and the county council was not in the favourable situation that the city council was in.

## **5. Motion - Brexit**

(Notice of the following motion had been received in accordance with Appendix 1 of the council's constitution. Members had taken the decision to move consideration of this motion forward on the agenda.)

Councillor Wright moved and Councillor Carlo seconded the motion below:

"The government has now published the text of the draft deal on the UK's exit from the European Union. The People's Vote campaign seeks to ensure that the government's Brexit deal is put before the country in a public vote, so that



we can decide if a decision that will affect our lives for generations makes the country better or worse off.

Council therefore

**RESOLVES** to:

- (1) join other councils in endorsing the cross-party People's Vote campaign.
- (2) ask group leaders to write to our two MPs, expressing this council's strong desire for a popular vote on the final deal, including the option to maintain full EU membership."

The Lord Mayor said that notice had been received in advance of an amendment to the motion from Councillor Waters, seconded by Councillor Manning which would introduce a new proposal.

Councillor Waters moved and Councillor Manning seconded a procedural motion to suspend standing orders to suspend rule 60 of Appendix 1 of the council's constitution relating to amendments to motions. On being put to the vote the procedural motion was carried unanimously.

Councillor Wright indicated that he was willing to accept the amendment and as no other member of the council objected, the amendment became part of the substantive motion.

Following debate it was:

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, that:

"The government has now published the text of the draft deal on the UK's exit from the European Union.

The People's Vote campaign seeks to ensure the government's Brexit deal is put before the country in as public vote, so that we can decide if a decision that will affect our lives for generations makes the country better or worse off.

Council therefore **RESOLVES** to:

- (1) welcome other councils' endorsement of a public vote on whether to accept the final Brexit deal negotiated by government;
- (2) acknowledge that the diverse environment created by Brexit can only be addressed by tackling the issues of inequality and lack of opportunities that led so many people to support to leave the EU;
- (3) ask group leaders to write to Norwich's two MPs, expressing this council's strong desire that, in the event that Parliament rejects the final deal, a public vote be held upon it with retaining full EU membership an option."

## 6. Minutes

**RESOLVED** to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 25 September 2018, subject to the following amendment, to item 1, Lord Mayor's Announcements, second paragraph, second sentence, by deleting "100" and replacing with "78<sup>th</sup>" to accurately record that the Battle of Britain took place in 1940, so that the sentence now reads:

"The recent Battle of Britain commemoration had been particularly poignant coming on the 78<sup>th</sup> year of the anniversary of the battle."

## 7. Questions to Cabinet Members/Committee Chairs

The Lord Mayor said that eight questions had been received from members of the council to cabinet members/committee chairs for which notice had been given in accordance with the provisions of appendix 1 of the council's constitution.

- |                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| <b>Question 1</b> | Councillor Carlo to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth on the council's response to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report.  |
| <b>Question 2</b> | Councillor Raby to the chair of licensing committee on the progress of updating the council's gambling policy.  |
| <b>Question 3</b> | Councillor Henderson to the cabinet member for health and wellbeing on the use of main foyer for displays of work by local artists and community groups.  |
| <b>Question 4</b> | Councillor Wright to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth about income generation by investing in a project similar to South Somerset District Council's investment in a battery storage facility. |
| <b>Question 5</b> | Councillor Ackroyd to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth about demarcation of shared space for pedestrians and cyclists.   |
| <b>Question 6</b> | Councillor Manning to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth about the benefits to the city in terms of further reduction of pollution emitted from vehicles.  |
| <b>Question 7</b> | Councillor Button to the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing on the award winning housing development at Goldsmith Street and shortlisting for a Local Government Chronicle (LGC) award.              |
| <b>Question 8</b> | Councillor Sands (M) to the cabinet member for safe city environment on CCTV provision.   |

(Details of the questions and responses were circulated at the meeting, and are attached to these minutes at Appendix A, together with a minute of any supplementary questions and responses.)

## **8. Introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy Exceptional Circumstances Relief Policy**

(An extract from the minutes of the scrutiny committee meeting on 22 November 2018 relating to the call-in of the cabinet decision made on 14 November 2-018 was circulated at the meeting.)

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

Following debate, it was:

**RESOLVED**, with 24 members voting in favour, 4 members against and 1 member abstaining to:

- :
- (1) approve the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy Exceptional Circumstances Relief Policy, as set out in appendix 1 of this report;
  - (2) amend appendix 4 to the constitution to include the “Power to determine applications for Exceptional Circumstances Relief from the Community Infrastructure Levy. Approval of such applications is not to be delegated to officers” within the list of powers available to planning applications committee.

## **9. Housing Development at Bullard Road**

(Councillor Kendrick and Stonard declared an other interest in this item as directors of Norwich Regeneration Ltd.)

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

Following debate it was:

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to allocate a total of £1,100,000 in the housing revenue account capital programme for the proposed works, by increasing the 2018/19 housing revenue account capital programme by £300,000 with the remaining £800,000 to be spent in 2019/20.

## **10. Appointment of Deputy Monitoring Officer**

(The directors attending the meeting and who were affected by the proposal to appoint deputy monitoring officers left the meeting at this point.)

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

Following debate it was:

**RESOLVED**, with 26 members voting in favour and 4 members voting against, to appoint Anton Bull, Bob Cronk, Dave Moorcroft and Nikki Rotsos as a deputy monitoring officers.

(The directors were readmitted to the meeting at this point.)

(Two hours having passed since the start of the meeting the Lord Mayor invited members to consider any unopposed business. Members agreed to take Item 11- Motions as set out in agenda items 9(b) to 9(d) as unopposed business. Councillor Carlo and Councillor Raby had indicated that they would accept the amendments to the motions on Renewable Energy in New Developments in Greater Norwich to 2036 and Local Business that had been circulated at the meeting. The following items were taken as unopposed business.)

### **11. Motions**

(Notice of the following motions 9(b) to 9(d) as set out on the agenda had been received in accordance with Appendix 1 of the council's constitution and were taken as unopposed business.)

#### **Motion – Dignity for Fast Food and Service Industry Workers in Norwich – Unopposed Business**

Councillor Fulton-McAlister (M) moved and Councillor Waters seconded the motion as set out in the agenda papers.

#### **RESOLVED**

“Like most cities Norwich has seen an increase in low paid, often zero hour contract forms of work, with a significant rise in global and multinational corporate fast food outlets in recent years.

Currently many of their staff are paid below the rate recommended by the Living Wage Commission as the minimum necessary to enable a decent standard of living.

Furthermore, promises to allow workers the opportunity to move off zero-hours contracts of employment have thus far yet to be delivered; no trade union recognition agreement is in place and cases of bullying and harassment by managers widespread.

Council RESOLVES to:

- (1) Applaud and support the courageous actions last month of fast food and service industry workers across the country, in particular the workers of global giants McDonald's, Deliveroo, Uber, TGI Fridays, fighting to better the lives of thousands of underpaid, overworked people.

- (2) Note with encouragement the role young people are playing in these successful actions and the difference these actions can make to the whole trade union/labour market.
- (3) Express support to their unions (including the BFAWU, Unite, GMB and the IWGB) who are demanding better pay and conditions, union recognition and an end to exploitative, precarious contracts.
- (4) Ask the Leader to write to Norwich Members of Parliament and the Rt Hon Greg Clark MP, Secretary of State for the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy requesting that workers should be protected through:
  - (a) cracking down on exploitative work practices and make tackling poverty the priority it should be, ending zero-hour contracts, equalising the minimum wage to ensure its the same rate regardless of age, introducing a minimum wage of at least £10 per hour giving a pay rise to over five and a half million workers.
  - (b) giving all workers equal rights from day one, including sick pay, paid holiday, and protection from unfair dismissal.
  - (c) strengthen the enforcement of those rights by properly resourcing HMRC and imposing fines on employers who breach labour market rights and regulations.
  - (d) make it illegal for employers to make deductions from tips, so staff get to keep 100%, and customers know who their money is going to.
  - (e) banning businesses from taking a cut of any tips paid via card, as well as charging waiters to work and keeping "optional" service charges.
  - (f) preventing employers from using contractual clauses (Non-Disclosure Agreements) which stop disclosure of future discrimination, harassment or victimisation
  - (g) doubling the time-frame within which employment tribunals can be taken, and require employers to publish their sexual harassment policy publicly, alongside the steps they are taking to implement it.
  - (h) ensuring all employment rights begin from day one rather than having to wait two years to be free from fear of dismissal.

**Motion - Renewable Energy in New Developments in Greater Norwich to 2036 – Unopposed Business**

(Councillor Waters had declared an interest in this motion.)

Councillor Carlo moved and Councillor Raby seconded the motion as set out in the agenda papers.

“Increasing the amount of renewable and sustainable energy generation in new development is essential if Norwich is to play its part in reducing carbon emissions. However, the Greater Norwich Local Plan Regulation Consultation states that it is not possible to require more than 10% renewable energy as “there is no current evidence that this is achievable”. This statement lacks ambition in relation to what is technically possible and to local authority renewable targets elsewhere.

This council RESOLVES to ask the council’s representatives on the Greater Norwich Development Partnership to encourage the partnership to adopt a much higher target for achieving renewable or sustainable energy on new sites in the Greater Norwich Local Plan”

An amendment had been received from Councillor Maguire which had been circulated. Councillor Carlo had indicated that she was willing to accept the amendment and with no other member objecting it became part of the substantive motion.

**RESOLVED** that:

“Increasing the amount of renewable and sustainable energy generation in new development is essential if Norwich is to play its part in reducing carbon emissions. However, the Greater Norwich Local Plan Regulation Consultation states that it is not possible to require more than 10% renewable energy as “there is no current evidence that this is achievable”. This statement lacks ambition in relation to what is technically possible and to local authority renewable targets elsewhere.”

This council RESOLVES to ask the council’s representatives on the Greater Norwich Development Partnership to consider the further evidence being produced on sustainable energy generation and seek to promote a police encouraging challenging targets for achieving renewable or low carbon energy generation in new development sites proposed in the Greater Norwich Local Plan.”

**Motion - Local Business**

Councillor Raby moved and Councillor Carlo seconded the motion as set out in the agenda papers.

“Many retailers on British high streets are struggling. This year alone House of Fraser, Maplin and Toys R Us have all gone into administration while household names like Marks & Spencer, Carpetright and Mothercare have together announced hundreds of store closures. This has had a considerable impact on Norwich.

This council therefore RESOLVES to:

- (1) ask cabinet to:
  - a) Work more closely with councils outside Norwich to ensure that out of town shopping centres do not draw people away from the shops in the centre of Norwich.

- b) Be more active in promoting start-ups in the centre of Norwich by offering free short term hot desking and office/retail space in unoccupied properties owned by the council.
  - c) Further promote the services and expertise that organisations like the Norwich Business Improvement District, Norfolk and Waveney Enterprise Services and the council's own staff can provide in particular to start-up businesses and other small and medium-sized businesses on our high streets.
- (2) ask the leader of the council to write to the secretary of state to:
- a) unilaterally implement a fairer taxation system which ensures that online traders pay their fair proportion of tax, within the next two years
  - b) note that 100% business rate retention proposals for local authorities are likely to lead to significant divergences in English councils' funding without benefitting their residents and that this policy needs to be shelved until its implications are fully understood
  - c) Provide tax relief for shops that wish to renovate their existing premises rather than close them in favour of newly built units.

(An amendment had been received from Councillor Wright and Councillor Stonard which had been circulated. Councillor Raby had indicated that he was willing to accept the amendments and with no other member objecting it became part of the substantive motion.)

**RESOLVED:**

“Many retailers on British high streets are struggling. This year alone House of Fraser, Maplin and Toys R Us have all gone into administration while household names like Marks & Spencer, Carpetright and Mothercare have together announced hundreds of store closures. This has had a considerable impact on Norwich.

This council therefore RESOLVES to:

- (1) ask cabinet to:
  - (a) Continue to work more closely with councils outside Norwich to ensure that out of town shopping centres do not draw people away from the shops in the centre of Norwich.
  - (b) Continue to be active in promoting start-ups in the centre of Norwich by offering free short term hot desking and office/retail space in unoccupied properties owned by the council.
  - (c) Continue to promote the services and expertise that organisations like the Norwich Business Improvement District, Norfolk and Waveney Enterprise Services and the council's own

staff can provide in particular to start-up businesses and other small and medium-sized businesses on our high streets.

- (2) ask the leader of the council to write to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy Industrial Strategy:
  - (a) implement a fairer taxation system which ensures that online traders pay their fair proportion of tax, within the next two years
  - (b) note that 100% business rate retention proposals for local authorities are likely to lead to significant divergences in English councils' funding without benefitting their residents and that this policy needs to be shelved until its implications are fully understood
  - (c) Provide tax relief for shops that wish to renovate their existing premises rather than close them in favour of newly built units.

LORD MAYOR



## Appendix A

### Council 27 November 2018 Questions to Cabinet Members or Chairs of Committees

#### Question 1

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

“As the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth has previously indicated, per capita carbon emissions for Norwich fell between 2011 and 2016. However, per capita figures are measured by Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) for three categories: industry/commercial, domestic, and transport. They exclude significant sources, notably consumption (e.g. overseas manufacturing of goods and services) and from residents’ air flights and shipping. Can the cabinet member give the true per capita emission figures for Norwich and explain what action the city council is planning to take in the light of the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report which urges the need for radical cuts by 2030 if human civilisation is to survive in its current form?”

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

“Thank you for your question, which I need to break down into two parts. Firstly, the use of the per capita carbon emissions data produced by DEFRA is an extremely efficient way for the council to measure its progress which is independently verified by an external source. The DEFRA dataset also allows us to compare ourselves against other local authority areas, which helps to identify if our policies are effective.

The DEFRA dataset follows the internationally agreed standard for reporting greenhouse gas emissions to the UN. However DEFRA acknowledge that this is not a perfect indicator of “the true” per capita emissions consumption of the UK and have been working on consumption-based emissions reporting for a number of years. Consumption-based emissions do not have to be reported officially by any country, but in the UK these figures are reported by DEFRA. The latest data for the UK is 2015 but this data does not report down to a Local Authority (LA) level. Therefore until DEFRA produce a robust and statistically reliable dataset for the UK which goes down to LA level the council will continue to report emissions using the internationally agreed standard methodology. In this respect per capita emissions have fallen over time from 6.9 tonnes of carbon emissions per capita in 2005 to 3.8 tonnes of carbon emissions per capita in 2016, the most recent and statically certain dataset available at this time.

The second part of your question asks what action the city council is planning to take in light of the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report.

The reports you reference make it clear that we do need to dramatically improve our use of resources and ensure our future services are sustainable in the long term. If we are to minimise the risks highlighted by the IPCC then it would not be about maintaining civilisation in its “current form” or “business as usual”. It would be something more.

The council is very much aware of the impact that climate change can have at global, regional and local levels. This is why, in 2008, we took the initiative to work with the Energy Saving Trust and Carbon Trust to benchmark the council’s carbon footprint. Following this exercise, we have been working hard year-on-year to reduce the council’s own carbon footprint. To date we have achieved an impressive carbon emissions reduction of 57.1 per cent, which far exceeds our target of a 40 per cent reduction by 2018. In fact, to set some context, the government’s national 5th carbon budget target of 57 per cent carbon emissions reduction is due to be delivered by 2030, so Norwich City Council has achieved this national target 12 years ahead of that date. This is one of the reasons the council has been nominated for a UK-wide sustainability leader’s award.

As noted above Norwich area per capita emissions have also been falling over time from 6.9 tonnes of carbon emissions per capita in 2005 to 3.8 tonnes of carbon emissions per capita in 2016. It is interesting to note that both Norwich and Bristol City have achieved a per capita carbon emissions reduction of 44.3 per cent to date. More details of the council’s environmental work can be found in the current environmental strategy document. Progress made against the objectives set in the strategy is reported upon biennially in the council’s environmental statement.

Last week we launched the City Vision 2040 document. Over the past year the council have engaged with focus groups, conducted public and stakeholder interviews and organised two conferences in order to bring together the views of the city of Norwich into one document, the purpose of which is to detail how the people of Norwich want their city to be as a place to live and work in the future.

Sustainability was identified as a top priority for those we engaged with and accordingly, “A liveable city” is one of the key themes in the City Vision 2040 document. Most specifically the document states that we are “committed to shifting to clean energy by 2040 and becoming carbon-neutral by 2050”. Sustainable living, defined as a need to ensure that “today’s citizens meet the needs of the present without compromising future generations”, is a common thread which runs throughout the work of the council and is not a new concept for us. Now that the City Vision document is finalised, the council will seek to complete the council’s Corporate Plan and correspondingly work to produce the new Environmental Strategy, which will be launched next year. You will be aware of the UK Committee on Climate Change which is an independent, statutory body established under the Climate Change Act. Their purpose is to advise the UK Government and Devolved Administrations on

emissions targets and report to Parliament on progress made in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and preparing for climate change.

To meet the targets set under the Climate Change Act, the government has set five-yearly carbon budgets which currently run until 2032. They restrict the amount of greenhouse gas the UK can legally emit in a five year period. The UK is currently in the third carbon budget period (2018 to 2022).

Norwich City Council will therefore support the UK's Committee on Climate Change report 'Reducing UK emissions, 2018 Progress Report to Parliament' which draws attention to government inaction in a host of areas as well as not providing the correct levels of finance to allow councils to properly engage with citizens on sustainability and climate change."

### **Supplementary question:**

Councillor Carlo referred to Councillor Maguire's response to the public question earlier in the meeting and said that Councillor Stonard had repeated the statistics. Then as a supplementary question referred to the comment that the City Vision was "committed to shifting to clean energy by 2040 and becoming carbon-neutral by 2050" and said that this was not a sound scientific response to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change which was calling on radical cuts to emissions by 2030 and that the council should reset its targets. Councillor Stonard said both he and Councillor Maguire were using the same statistics and would not say anything different to what they believed. The target date for the city to be carbon neutral was part of the City Vision. Councillor Maguire would be having further discussion with the Tyndall Centre and others to refine the council's response. He said that he was very proud of the council's achievements to date which had exceeded targets.

### **Question 2**

**Councillor Raby to ask the chair of the licensing committee the following question:**

"At November's full council meeting last year, I asked the chair of the licensing committee when the council's out of date gambling statement of policies would be updated. May I remind the chair that Norwich City Council's gambling statement of principles was last updated in 2007, even though the Gambling Commission expressly tells councils that it should be 'reviewed at least every three years.'

I am disappointed that over the last year there seems to have been no progress made on this important policy statement which could allow councillors to limit the proliferation of gambling premises across the city, especially in some of the most deprived communities. In answer to my question in November 2017, the chair of licensing expressly said that she had asked that 'the council's gambling statement of principles be updated as a priority.' 'A timetable for when the new statement of principles will be completed during 2018' was also requested by the chair of licensing. Given that we are now a year on from when I originally raised this question, could I

urgently ask the chair what the progress on this very important matter is, and why this does not seem to have been prioritised as originally promised?"

**Councillor Malik, chair of the licensing committee's response:**

"I cannot understand why Councillor Raby is so disappointed since we are only one month behind the original timetable.

I am pleased to be able to tell council that progress has indeed been made not only with the gambling policy but also with the revision of other important licensing policies namely the Sexual Entertainment Venue policy, the cumulative Impact Policy, and the Local Area Profile: these all require revision.

The draft policies will all be presented to licensing committee on the 18 December 2018 for members to review.

If licensing committee endorses the draft policies, this will allow the council to undertake consultation during January and February with the comments and final policies being presented to the first meeting of licensing committee after the May elections."

**Supplementary question:**

Councillor Raby by way of a supplementary question pointed out that licensing committee's had not been convened and asked the cabinet member for reassurance that a licencing committee would take place on 18 December 2018 for the committee to consider the draft policies. Councillor Maguire answered in the absence of Councillor Malik, referred to the quasi-judicial status of the licensing committee and said that he could not issue an edict as to when policies would be considered but pointed out that the next licensing committee would be a very full one and held at the appointed time.

**Question 3**

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

"The welcome renovation of the customer centre has left other parts of City Hall, such as the main foyer, looking a little dull in comparison. I was pleased that a portrait of Mary Seacole was recently displayed in the main foyer to City Hall. I note that the foyer is sometimes used for other displays, such as the results of elections and I wonder whether the cabinet member would agree to it being used for displays of work by local artists and community groups?"

**Councillor Packer, cabinet member for health and wellbeing's response:**

"Thank you for your question. The Mary Seacole painting was on display as part of Black History month and it is our intention to occasionally display, one off pieces, as part of other events. For example, you will probably have seen

that we most recently hosted one piece from the White Ribbon Window Display trail, organised in partnership with Leeway.

The main foyer is really not suitable for larger art exhibitions as it is a main exit and entrance, so we are constrained in what we can do in that space.

However, we have the very successful arts space, the Undercroft, situated at the back of the Market, which is already extremely well used by individual artists and groups. Exhibitions in that space can also include works for sale, which City Hall cannot. Information about how to hire the Undercroft is on our website.”

**Supplementary question:**

Councillor Henderson said that the Undercroft was not suitable for displaying art work as it had a leaking roof, art work could not be attached to the walls and was subject to occasional flooding. She asked the cabinet member whether the council could investigate whether there were any other council premises that could be used to display works by local artists and community groups. Councillor Packer replied “absolutely.”

**Question 4**

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

“As part of its income generation strategy, South Somerset District Council has recently partnered to build a 25MW Battery Storage facility that will provide essential power management assistance to the National Grid. It will be one of the largest and most-advanced in the UK.

The batteries store excess energy production at low usage periods, that would otherwise be wasted, and resupply it to the grid when needed at peak times.

Could the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth advise if this council is considering going forward with such a project?”

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

“Thank you for your question.

The UK is facing potential energy shortages as the gap between supply and demand narrows ever closer, mainly due to the closure of coal power stations and the intermittent nature of renewables. It is therefore common knowledge in the industry that levelling the grid is key and batteries of commercial and domestic scale present some exciting new investment opportunities.

As part of our balanced investment portfolio the council is continually horizon scanning for new investments. Renewable energy and other energy services

including the “capacity market” or “balancing services” present some potentially rewarding returns.

However these are not without risk. As the battery storage market in the UK develops and more projects are completed it is increasingly important to track the types of projects being built, by who and which revenues they are accessing. This allows us to see which projects are being proposed and who is active in the different segments to identify future market gaps, trends and their associated investment associated opportunities

For example only very recently the investment landscape has been altered by the capacity market being suspended due to state aid rules (European General Court) and the UK balancing market changing the rules on battery storage by asking for longer grid enforcement (usually 1-2 hours) which can be beyond most facilities capacity.

I can confirm that we have already had discussions with ENGIE and the DNO in regards to our investment aspirations and plan to have further discussions in the future with a number of other significant local and national stakeholders.”

**Supplementary question:**

There was no supplementary question.

**Question 5**

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

“Cycling is both a means of fitness and a way of reducing our carbon footprint, and the implementation of the pedalways across the city is therefore welcome.

But walking is equally important.

Currently on some stretches of the pedalway, shared use is in place – acceptable for cyclists and pedestrians to mix, but with apparently insufficient width to allow for clear demarcation between them. This leaves many pedestrians feeling nervous about cyclists who suddenly head towards them or appear behind them with no warning.

Could the cabinet member advise if this situation could be improved - perhaps by a change to the rules that prevent white lines being painted or clearer signage as seen for example in Winchester?”

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

“When we are delivering new cycling infrastructure, wherever possible we look to provide facilities for cyclists that are separated from both pedestrians

and vehicles. However this is not always possible and sometimes we have to provide shared use footpath cycleways. This can either be segregated or unsegregated. In order for a path to be segregated there needs to have a minimum width of 4m; this is national policy and we have no scope to change that.

Members may have noticed that in recent weeks 'share with care' signs have been erected at the entrances to the pedestrianised areas in the city centre; these are not officially authorised traffic signs but are part of a publicity campaign to encourage safe cycling in the city centre. Officers advise me that it would be possible to provide similar temporary signs at other locations across the city where there are shared use footpath cycleways. They are currently making arrangements to provide such signing on the Bluebell Road facility which I understand is the path you have raised concerns with them about."

**Supplementary question:**

Councillor Ackroyd was not present and therefore there was no supplementary question.

**Question 6**

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

"Reducing air pollution is a significant issue for many of my constituents particularly those living near busy roads. Reducing the level of pollution emitted by cars vehicles while parked can make a real difference. I was therefore pleased to see the city council take a bold step in asking enforcement officers to request drivers turn off their engines when parked. Can the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth comment on the benefits this can offer the city in terms of reducing pollution still further?"

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

"Enforcing stationary vehicle idling is a small but significant step in reducing engine emissions in the city centre areas where pollution levels are greatest. As these are busy areas with high footfall and where many businesses have their doors open, the benefits here can be quickly realised.

An idling engine can produce up to twice as many exhaust emissions as an engine in motion. Reducing the time that vehicles spend idling will therefore directly reduce Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) emissions from vehicles which are known to be detrimental to health. This is an issue that the council and all drivers in the city can really get hold of and together make a difference.

Since enforcement began in October, our enforcement officers have given eight verbal warnings. We publicised the initiative beforehand and we are pleased that the majority of drivers are already switching their engines off

when stationary. It is clear that a large proportion of the bus and taxi drivers have been briefed by their companies, read the signs, or had some knowledge of the change via published articles etc., which is very positive. So far no fixed penalty notices have needed to be issued as the drivers had complied with the request.

Our enforcement officers' patrols are a key part of making this work but this is also about winning hearts and minds to get people to change their habits. A combination of the signs, posters, web information, press releases and media coverage has got this off to a good start.

The council continues to be committed to providing a range of transport alternatives to enable people to make healthy and low emission trips."

**Supplementary question:**

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Manning asked for further clarity on the council's position. Councillor Stonard said that enforcing stationary vehicle idling could apply to any vehicle but had been targeted at public transport, taxis and buses, and particularly diesel vehicles. The bus companies had been very supportive but had not been able to ensure that all drivers switched off engines. The issue of fixed penalty notice of £20 would change driver behaviour. Warnings had been given and the drivers had complied. The council wanted to change public behaviour so that drivers would turn off engines when queueing or at waiting at traffic lights.

**Question 7**

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

"As a council tenant who knows the value of decent, well maintained and democratically accountable social housing I was further impressed to learn that our award-winning housing development on Goldsmith Street has been further shortlisted for a top accolade in next year's prestigious Local Government Chronicle (LGC) awards. Will the cabinet member for social housing comment on this exciting news?"

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

"Thank you for your question. We welcome Goldsmith Street being shortlisted for the housing initiative award by the LGC. As we said in our submission, in recent years we've purposely stepped away from adopting a typical local authority approach as a housing provider at Norwich City Council. We felt we had a choice: go for safe, standard housing or be bold and ambitious. We choose the latter. As a result, we can proudly boast that we're now delivering what will be the country's largest Passivhaus scheme for social rent in Norwich.



Thanks to Passivhaus technology, our residents should see up to 70 per cent savings on their energy bills due to the technology in use – a big help to a significant proportion of residents in Norwich who we know are in fuel poverty. As a result of the council's commitment to developing Passivhaus homes it has also significantly upskilled the local workforce, allowing them to create a niche in the construction market. Goldsmith Street will see the city council deliver the largest Passivhaus scheme for social rent in the country and was recently presented as an exemplar case study to the UK Passivhaus Conference.

The shortlisting for the LGC awards also follows the recent success for Goldsmith Street at the Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE) Norfolk awards where the scheme won the Green Build Award.

We have a particularly proud history of seeking higher environmental standards for affordable housing by working in partnership with local registered providers and wanted to ensure our own development projects set that standard even higher and help to address fuel poverty for our residents. All in all, as a council housing provider, we're taking bold steps to provide energy efficient, high quality homes to meet housing demand for the people of Norwich and surrounding areas. And that's something we're deeply proud of."

#### **Supplementary question:**

As a supplementary question Councillor Button asked if there was any news on the council's nomination for the LGC award for Goldsmith Street. Councillor Harris said that the outcome would not be available until March 2019 and that she would keep members informed. The Campaign to Protect Rural England had awarded the scheme its Green Build Award.

#### **Question 8**

**Councillor Mike Sands to ask the cabinet member for safe city environment the following question:**

"As crime continues to rocket and the full effects of 'county lines' are felt within our city, many residents have commented on the positive impact of CCTV, particularly around reassurance and the prevention of crime. Despite huge cuts to our council budgets since 2010, I was pleased to see the cabinet report which will see the procurement of new CCTV for our city. Given the opportunities this will give can the cabinet member for safe, city environment comment on the benefits which will be secured through this policy?"

**Councillor Maguire, cabinet member for safe city environment's response:**

"The current CCTV equipment is now out of date and requires an upgrade to continue to support the Norfolk Constabulary in managing public order and responding to emerging crime and anti-social behaviour issues in the city.

The council is investing in the region of £500,000 in a cutting edge CCTV system with its own wireless collection points, which will provide improved

imaging for evidential support and reduced maintenance costs on an ongoing basis.

The new CCTV suite will be based at City Hall, which will make it easier for colleagues and partners to liaise directly with the council's CCTV monitoring operators particularly during city centre events and demonstrations, for improved visibility and coordination of community safety response.

The new system has been developed and designed in conjunction with police and other stakeholders to ensure evidence based high priority areas are covered. The new CCTV system will retain a comparable number of CCTV cameras to what the council currently holds, although some of the new cameras will be re-sited to improve visibility of key locations.

The council will retain the policy of recording CCTV footage 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days of the year and retain that footage for 28 days. In addition, live monitoring of the CCTV system by trained and licensed council officers will continue on a Friday and Saturday evening from 6pm until 6am the following morning, as well as on Bank holidays, all council events and one off events and demonstrations that give the police cause for concern.

Cameras will still be live and be able to be monitored by the Norfolk Constabulary outside of these periods.

In line with the national surveillance camera commissioner's code of practice, all of the council's CCTV camera locations are published on the CCTV pages of the council's website and individuals can request access to footage recorded of them via the website, as well as via traditional routes if required.

In addition to the static CCTV cameras, the council jointly owns with local police, a set of re-deployable CCTV cameras, which can be moved to locations for specified periods of time, to help address evidenced high level or prevalence crime and antisocial behaviour.

With the new CCTV system, the council's data sharing agreement with the police will be retained, to enable the police to access and review the council's CCTV footage, either retrospectively or in almost real time, from one of its 27 remote access sites across Norfolk.

This clearly identifies the importance that the council affords community safety and how CCTV contributes to all of the current council objectives."

**Supplementary question:**

Councillor Sands asked a supplementary question about who had access to the CCTV footage. Councillor Maguire replied that information about access to CCTV footage was available on the council's website<sup>1</sup>. Footage was subject to the Data Protection Act.

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.norwich.gov.uk/info/20328/cctv/2030/access\\_to\\_cctv\\_records](https://www.norwich.gov.uk/info/20328/cctv/2030/access_to_cctv_records)

## Question 9

### **Councillor Sue Sands to ask the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing the following question:**

“Like all councillors in this chamber, access to housing remains a key concern for my constituents. I was therefore pleased that the city council announced plans to re-develop the former Bullard Road Housing Office into new social housing. Can the cabinet member for social housing comment on the scheme and the great opportunities this development will offer people in Norwich?”

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

“The national housing crisis and continued shortage of homes for people to live in is of great concern to this council. The local picture shows that:

- there are over 4000 households on the council’s housing waiting list which shows the considerable demand for the council’s own housing
- between 1 April 2014 and 31 March 2018, 662 properties were purchased under the right to buy scheme
- The most recent strategic housing area assessment from 2017, which looks at all housing need in Norwich, highlighted that an additional 278 ‘affordable’ housing units are required each year.

This illustrates the demand for housing in Norwich and the importance of the council looking at all options and opportunities to build new council homes.

The new scheme on Bullard Road, along with other new developments across the city, will assist in meeting the demand for affordable and sustainable homes in thriving communities.

At the recent awards ceremony where the city council won the prestigious award for the “Green Build Award,” from the Norfolk Campaign for Protecting Rural England, it was pointed out on more than one occasion, how exciting it was to see a housing stock retaining council building and creating new homes.

The Bullard Road project proposes to convert numbers 1 to 23 Bullard Road from offices to a number of residential properties, which will meet ‘lifetime homes’ principles and the construction of an additional single bungalow which will be adapted for disabled used. The precise details are subject to planning approval and to be specified by housing needs. However, the project will deliver much needed housing provision.

When deciding on how best to meet the housing need, consideration will be given to ensure that the new development compliments the existing environment.

Cabinet agreed that the work will be undertaken by Norwich Regeneration Limited (NRL) and will demonstrate how NRL, as a wholly owned company of

the council, can deliver projects of this type and maximise returns which will directly benefit the council as well as the residents.

As cabinet member I know much more is needed and the Bullard Road development is one further example, where this administration is making a positive difference to the lives of families in Norwich.”

**Supplementary question:**

There was no supplementary question.

**Question 10**

**Councillor Trevor to ask the cabinet member for safe city environment the following question:**

“As a councillor who represents a ward which contains high levels of constituents experiencing both poverty, but particularly fuel poverty, I am acutely aware of the impact this has. Positive policies such as Big Switch and Save and our wider affordable warmth strategy have made significant differences to thousands of people within Norwich. I was therefore particularly excited by the launch of the new Energy White Label and decision to award this at cabinet earlier in the month. Can the cabinet member for safe city environment comment on the opportunities and benefits this policy will offer?”

**Councillor Maguire, cabinet member for safe city environment’s response:**

“Thank you for your question on the new Energy White Label. The programme will particularly support efforts to reduce fuel poverty and health inequalities in Norwich via working with and supporting vulnerable customers in areas of high fuel poverty whilst also offering access to affordable renewable energy to all.

Firstly I would like to take this opportunity to highlight that in Norwich 12.3 per cent of households, or 7,804 homes, are experiencing fuel poverty. This means our elderly citizens are at greater risk of catching the flu or developing other chest infections and/or other respiratory problems, all of which can be fatal or put extra pressures on our overstretched NHS. Sadly the UK has a high rate of excess winter deaths, with over 3,000 people dying every year solely due to cold homes.

Regretfully the numbers of fuel poor are expected to rise due to the increasing cost of utilities. In 2017 alone electricity prices increased by 6 per cent which disproportionately affected fuel poor households, and households who are often only just above the fuel poverty line with incomes which are either static or being decreased by the implementation of universal credit.

The vision of the new energy supply service will be to create an attractive local energy brand offering a long term ‘fair deal’ to our consumers, so they are encouraged to stay and not shop around. This means people will be able to take advantage of long-term affordable tariffs. We are also hoping to invest

any potential profits into a fund to help fight fuel poverty which can offer highly targeted support, which may include discounted tariffs, to our most vulnerable residents helping them to heat their homes.

Aside from helping people access fairly priced energy all tariffs will be 100 per cent renewable (gas and electricity) at no extra cost. Therefore future customers of the scheme will be able to save on average 3 tonnes of CO2 (approximately the equivalent of 45 trees growing 30 years) per year as well as getting a fair deal when compared to other companies offering green energy at a premium. In addition to also being cheaper than many of the standard energy deals available.

This project therefore one more step towards delivering our city vision aspiration to be shifting the city to clean energy by 2040 and helping our citizens to take practical steps to lowering their CO2 emissions whilst making the city more liveable and fair.”

**Supplementary question:**

There was no supplementary question.

**Question 11**

**Councillor Lubbock to the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing:**

“Please can the portfolio holders for housing or property comment on why the council does not comment on planning applications in their capacity as a landlord or land owner, when an application has an impact on tenants and their environment?”

Other departments of the council do comment and these comments are on the website for all to see and prove to be helpful to residents; for example the tree officer’s comments.

In terms of openness and transparency I think this would be extremely helpful.”

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

“Whilst I cannot comment on particular applications, Councillor Lubbock makes an interesting point. The housing service is not a statutory consultee on planning applications unlike the tree officer and in most circumstances would not have a view that was distinct from council policy in relation to planning matters or applications.

However, where applications that it was considered would have a detrimental impact on land held within the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), council estates and tenants enjoyment of a council property, or group of council properties, and were brought to the attention of officers via tenants or others

as part of the statutory consultation process, then tenants, officers and indeed, councillors, would be encouraged to comment accordingly. Officers will identify the best way of ensuring this happens.”

**Supplementary question:**

Councillor Lubbock said that she was referring to a planning application adjacent to a sheltered housing scheme and that the residents wanted the council as landlord to support their comments. Housing services was responsible for its tenants and it would be a simple procedure for the head of housing to respond to planning applications which would be published on the planning portal for everyone to see. Councillor Harris said that she was aware of the background to the question and would ask the head of housing to contact Councillor Lubbock. Housing services was not a statutory consultee and the response from the service had to be appropriate. Residents could make comments to planning applications and have the support of their ward councillors. Sometimes housing officers were contacted by developers at an early stage. She would take up Councillor Lubbock’s concerns with the head of housing.

**Question 12**

**Councillor Carlo to ask the cabinet member for resources the following question:**

“Can I ask the cabinet member for resources whether the city council will adopt ethical and sustainability criteria in deciding whether to purchase commercial properties? This follows from Norwich City Council’s purchase of The Gym for £2.3 million at the Westwood Cross Shopping Centre near Ramsgate.

I recently visited the Isle of Thanet and the towns of Ramsgate and Margate. The high streets of these two towns have been gutted by the Westwood Cross Shopping Centre which I was forced to visit because all the shops have relocated from the town centres to a vast shopping centre in open countryside several miles equi-distant from three towns on the Kent peninsular. In my view, it is one of the worst planning decisions I have seen. The impacts on the local economies and community facilities are apparent. Access is mainly by car and if people can’t afford to use the dedicated buses, they either have to walk many miles or go without. The environmental impact is heavy – the shopping centre is reliant on high fossil fuel energy usage.

It is regrettable that Norwich city council has purchased a commercial property in a retail development which on the sustainability scale is at the lowest end?”

**Councillor Kendrick, cabinet member for resources’ response:**

“I thank the councillor for her views on the Westwood Cross shopping centre in Kent. The property, which has an A rating Energy Performance Certificate, makes a net initial return to the council’s general fund of 2.1 per cent. This is used to fund council services as previously explained and discussed.

Whilst we are planning to introduce some ethical considerations into the commercial property investment strategy which comes to cabinet for approval in December, this would not include automatically excluding investments located in out-of-town shopping centres. Westwood Cross would have received planning consent taking into account comments such as those raised by Councillor Carlo. The development has been subsequently constructed and as regards this building there were other parties who submitted bids. Had the council not been successful, the building would still have been completed but sold to a different party.

I lived in Margate between 1992 and 1997 and even then the town centres of Margate and Ramsgate were in serious decline. The reason was the collapse of the holiday trade in the towns. Instead of the towns being full of hotels with tourists with money in their pockets, those hotels had become Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) mainly filled with those living on social security benefits.

At that time I attended a local gym, there were no gyms in the high streets of Margate or Ramsgate. So the Gym in Thanet, Councillor Carlo mentions has in no way diminished the town centres in Thanet. Instead a good gym provides a useful resource to the community to improve health and fitness.

The Green Party has opposed the commercial purchases of this council. Yet it is the income from those properties that have allowed this council to protect front line services, unlike many other councils, which instead have had to cut front line services, often dramatically. Norwich City Council remains one of the few councils, left in England that still provides 100 per cent council tax rebates to its poorest citizens.

It is about time that the Green Party had the honesty to tell the people of Norwich what front line services they would cut if the council were not to have this income stream from commercial properties.”

**Supplementary question:**

Councillor Carlo said that she would prefer a sustainable model of income generation such as the Preston Model. Councillor Kendrick said that the 60 per cent of the council’s commercial properties were in the city and that it was good practice to have a diverse property portfolio to ensure that the council could protect its services.



## **COUNCIL**

**19:30 to 22:20**

**29 January 2019**

Present: Councillors Schmierer (Lord Mayor), Bradford, Button, Carlo, Davis, Driver, Fullman, Fulton-McAlister (E), Fulton-McAlister (M), Hampton, Harris, Huntley, Jones, Kendrick, Lubbock, Maguire, Malik, Maxwell, Packer, Peek, Price, Raby, Ryan, Sands (M), Sands (S), Smith, Stonard, Stewart, Stutely, Thomas (Va), Thomas (Vi), Waters and Wright

Apologies: Councillors Ackroyd, Brociek-Coulton, Coleshill, Henderson, Manning, and Trevor

### **1. Lord Mayor's Announcements**

The Lord Mayor said that he had attended many fantastic celebrations over the Christmas period. He had recently attended the University of Sanctuary event at the University of East Anglia which highlighted that Norwich was and had been a welcoming city for many decades. He had also attended the Holocaust memorial service at Norwich Cathedral.

The Lord Mayor invited the leader of the council to say a few words in remembrance of John Packer, former chief executive officer of Norwich City Council and following this, the Lord Mayor led the meeting in a moment's silence for quiet reflection.

The Lord Mayor invited the leader of the council to announce the administration's nomination for Lord Mayor for the civic year 2019-20. Councillor Alan Waters said that the nominee was Councillor Vaughan Thomas.

Finally, the Lord Mayor said that the director of business services had received written notice from Councillor Denise Carlo that she would like to withdraw her motion on the Western Link (item 8e on the agenda) and this would be deferred to a later meeting.

### **2. Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **3. Public Questions/Petitions**

The Lord Mayor said that five public questions had been received.

(No notice had been received of any petitions.)



## Question 1 – Climate Change

Ms Teresa Belton asked the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth the following question:

“The city council’s statement of commitment to sustainability in its environmental strategy 2015-18 is welcome. It points to the council’s key role in facilitating the implementation of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures across the city of Norwich. Following the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)’s latest report, the public face an urgent predicament of extreme gravity. It is vital that the council’s policy commitment is fully operationalised across all departments, and that this is fully transparent to the public. Decision-making at every level must be informed by scientific reality.

With respect to the council’s decision-making process in matters of planning, what training is given to the planning committee’s officers and councillors in carbon accounting, and what criteria regarding total climate and other environmental impacts must applications meet in order to be deemed eligible for planning permission to be granted?”

Councillor Stonard, the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth’s replied as follows:

“Climate change considerations inform the overall spatial strategy of the Local Plan with its focus on promoting development in sustainable locations and seeking to minimise the need to travel. The current development plan for Norwich also includes a number of policies recognising the significance of climate change. Most notably JCS1 (Addressing climate change) and JCS3 (Energy and Water) which requires larger developments to provide for a proportion of expected energy requirements from decentralised and low carbon energy sources.

All members of the Council’s Planning Applications Committee undergo training in relation to the development plan prior to be participating in meetings. This training includes background to importance of climate change and the role of the Council and how the particular policies can be taken into account in planning decision making.

However, the Local Plan does not require carbon accounting of particular developments to be done as part of the planning process. Therefore there has been no specific training given to planning application committee members on this matter.”

By way of a supplementary question, Ms Belton said that it was imperative that carbon emissions were reduced and that the conversion of grass tennis courts to all weather tarmac tennis courts would increase flooding risks as well as produce carbon emissions from laying the tarmac to producing and running the floodlights. With this in mind, she asked whether the cabinet member would refer this decision back to the planning applications committee. Councillor Stonard explained that planning decisions were made on an evidence basis within national and local policy and guidance. There were no powers to refer this back to the planning committee but there was an appeal process in place.

## Question 2 – Marlpit Community Centre

Ms Lucy Galvin, chair of Marlpit Community Centre asked the cabinet member for health and wellbeing the following question:

“As you know the Marlpit Community Centre is owned by Norwich City Council and run as a charity by volunteers. As Leader of Norwich City Council I am sure you are interested in and supportive of the work we are seeking to do to increase the economic viability and decrease the carbon footprint of the centre. Especially as it's potentially all being made possible by the council's own Solar Together scheme. The centre's fuel bills are our highest cost - around £3000 a year. We have already taken action to improve insulation and renegotiated our power suppliers, and are happy that now through the Solar Together scheme we have been offered solar panels, which we can pay for. This is the last chance to get these panels in time to benefit from the government's Feed in Tariff (FiT), which ends in March. This system will cost £9,600 but pay for itself in 8 years, after which time the centre will be able to generate a profit and thus income from it - an incredible return on investment for the community. If the centre does not proceed with this scheme it will lose out on £546.54 p.a. over the next 20 years – nearly £11,000 in FiT (as well as normal savings of £649.68 p.a) thereby doubling the payback time. It will also lose the £2000 savings from being part of the Solar Together scheme. As you know, time is of the essence in terms of carbon reduction for our planet as well as our centre.

This is our last chance to benefit - that's why I am taking the step of asking you to detail how you are going to help us gain the Feed in Tariff, make the most of the Norwich City Council's Solar Together scheme on behalf of the community and get those panels on the centre by this spring.”

Councillor Packer, the cabinet member for health and wellbeing responded as follows:

“I would like to thank Ms Galvin for her question as well as the work all the committee do at Marlpit community centre on behalf of local residents.

I do also want to recognise that a proactive approach being undertaken by the committee to be more financially sustainable as well as to reduce the carbon footprint of the centre.

The charities running our fifteen community centres have invested heavily in improving their buildings in a multitude of ways. This makes them more sustainable and suitable for the local neighbourhoods they serve which the council are very grateful to them for and will continue look for ways to support this.

While I fully support organisations looking at both their own sustainability and that of the environment, some concerns have been raised by officers as to whether the installation of solar panels on Marlpit Community Centre will provide a saving to the running costs of the building or result in a possible liability to the Community Association as license holder as well as the council as landlord of the property.

As has been explained to the community association, should they wish to install these panels, they would be liable both for the costs of installation, which they have clearly investigated, but also the ongoing maintenance and insurance.

Within the council's portfolio of buildings there are starting to be examples of using solar panels such as on our housing stock, City Hall and Rose Lane car park, however none of these installations are comparable to the size and location of the centre, to allow officers to anticipate accurately what these costs might be to advise the committee.

Many of our centres in recent months have been targets of ASB and criminal damage which has been a cost both to the council and community associations to repair. There is therefore a concern that the panels may be at risk of damage from anti-social behaviour and should this occur, the costs to repair the panels, which would be borne by the community association, would be excessive and severely diminish the savings anticipated from the installation.

From research undertaken it would appear to cost between £80 and £1,500 to repair a panel depending on the level of damage.

The panels may also need to be removed each time roof access is required by the council for repairs, which would be an additional cost to the association as part of the maintenance.

Should the association be planning to pay for the upfront costs with grant funding, they will need to be aware that many grant providers for capital works will require the property to have a lease for a minimum amount of time. Most community centres are currently run under an annual rolling licence, not a lease which will make them ineligible for a significant proportion of capital funding streams though some centres have requested leases in order to access such funding.

Officers have looked at the centre's reason for investigating solar energy and aside from the positive environmental benefits; it appears to be based on a concern of the costs of energy usage.

Taking the costs into context from the data from other centres, this suggests that these costs are in fact quite typical and therefore the benefits may be less. From the last Star Award return from the centre, the electric costs were £2,300, which is below the £2,800 average of all the city's centres. Officers would be happy to look at ways this cost can be reduced with the association.

What was found at the centre and more concerning in terms of energy usage was the gas costs as these were the 4<sup>th</sup> highest of any community centre of £1,800. This would indicate that there is possibly more significant savings to be made regarding the heating than the electricity costs which officers would be happy to investigate with the association.

When considering the request from the community association to install solar panels, officers put the best interests of the association and its long-term future first. They considered that the potentially unknown financial liability to an association which, whilst increasing its user groups and income through the hard work of its committee

and volunteers, does not hold significant financial reserves. This could be a burden and put them in a difficult financial position.

It is not the desire of the council to place any undue pressure on residents who are running key community assets as volunteers.

However, the concerns raised by officers do still remain with a risk from unknown liabilities.

Officers have explored alternative options to support the association's ambition with grant income of £9,600 to cover installation costs rather than the current proposal of £11,000 income from the current FiT tariff.

An initial discussion with a possible grant funder by officers indicates this may be possible as the association would appear eligible.

If this approach was implemented, whilst it would result in a small reduction to the overall savings from Solar Together, it would mean time could be taken to properly assess the possible costs to the association before coming to a decision and ensuring that the right option is taken.

Officers have also spoken to a funder who the association would be able to approach for a free assessment of all their energy efficiency needs and help them develop a plan for improving their finances and environmental impact.

I won't guarantee that solar panels will be placed on Marlpit Community Centre. What I will commit to is to offer the centre support to help them to explore all options, which will increase their efficiency, reduce their carbon footprint and save them money including solar panels. They would also support the association to make the required changes such as a formal lease to make them eligible for grant funding or undertake their own additional fundraising.

Please let me know if the community association wishes to proceed with this support."

By way of a supplementary question, Ms Galvin said that the offer was appreciated but a fully costed plan was already in place. She asked if the cabinet member was aware that she had been told by email that permission would not be given for solar panels and whether this could be discussed further. Councillor Packer asked that this information be forwarded to him and that he would be pleased to discuss this with Ms Galvin as soon as possible.

### **Question 3 - Norwich Castle: Gateway to Medieval England**

Mr Chris Smith asked the chair of Norwich area museums committee the following question:

"We have heard a lot about the 'Norwich Castle: Gateway to Medieval England' project which will see Norwich Castle transformed over the next

couple of years. Please can I ask the Chair of Norwich Area Museums Committee how the project will benefit Norwich and its communities?"

Councillor Erin Fulton-McAlister, the chair of Norwich area museums committee responded as follows:

"Norwich Castle has been part of the fabric of our city for hundreds of years, and an icon on the city's skyline. In that time it has been a palace, a fortification, a prison, and, most recently, a museum and art gallery. It is vital that this significant building, which is owned by the City Council, and run by the county museum services, continues to adapt and thrive. The next phase in the castle's history is soon to start and this will be one of the largest museum projects currently live in the UK, supported by a grant of £9.2m from the Heritage Lottery Fund.

This investment will provide a broad range of inclusive activities with strong city-wide resonance. It will tell the stories of medieval Norwich, supporting sustainable partnerships and participation across the City and wider County of Norfolk. Once complete, Norwich Castle will become the premier heritage attraction in the East of England, attracting 300,000 visitors per year and ensuring the long-term viability of the site.

There are a huge number of benefits to Norwich and its communities from this project. There will be a positive impact on the regional economy, with 15 new jobs, including 6 project posts; 3 apprenticeships; 2 traineeships and 3 internships created through the project. The project will also safeguard 193 Norfolk Museums Service posts and support 136 indirect jobs in the wider tourism economy.

Norwich Castle will be the first Norfolk museums attraction to provide a fully accessible Changing Places toilet facility, transforming the way people with disabilities and their companions can access and enjoy the building. All visitors will be able to access the Keep roof platform with direct level access to the principal floor also possible via a new internal bridge and lift.

Over 1,000 objects, including 60 national treasures, will be showcased in a stunning new medieval gallery that will be developed in partnership with the British Museum. This gallery will be the first of its kind in the UK and the first permanent presence for the British Museum in the East of England, and will challenge and inspire visitors and make the medieval world relevant to diverse and contemporary audiences.

Our 5-year Activity Plan will deliver 24 programmes of public events with 90,000 attendances, 17 creative and targeted activities that actively involve over 2,500 people, 29 types of formal learning sessions - from pre-school to adult education, and 120 new volunteering opportunities.

Furthermore the health and wellbeing of local people will be supported through a pioneering new Social Prescribing scheme. This will be through giving new opportunities to support Social Prescribing at Norwich Castle. These will include a Community Café and a Community Herb Garden working in partnership with Age UK Norwich and Norwich MIND, alongside tailored

volunteering opportunities. The Activity Plan also offers outreach opportunities to keep older people active and socially included.

Perhaps most importantly, vulnerable and hard to reach audiences will be engaged and supported, with the project changing perceptions and empowering local people to view Norwich Castle and their heritage in a positive way.

I would like to take this opportunity to invite councillors from across the chamber to keep an eye out for these public activities as they are individually announced, and to encourage, help and facilitate involvement from their local schools and community groups. For more information please contact Steve Miller, director of Norfolk Museums or Robin Hanley, director of the Keep project.”

#### **Question 4 - Climate change policies**

Ms Sandra Bögelein asked the cabinet member for safe city environment/sustainable and inclusive growth the following question:

“The city council is one of the decision makers for the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP). The Greater Norwich Development Partnership provides advice to Norwich as well as Broadland, Norfolk and South Norfolk councils but has no decision making powers itself. There is a the legal obligation on local authorities to have fit-for-purpose climate change mitigation policies in development plan documents and statutory guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) for councils to have a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change which is in line with the objectives and provisions of the Climate Change Act 2008 [revised NPPF 149 & footnote 48]. What criteria and methodologies will Norwich City Council be using to ensure that the policies on climate change in the GNLP will be fit-for-purpose, and meet statute and guidance, so that the council can safely make the decision to put the draft plan to Norwich residents for this autumn's Regulation 18 consultation?”

Councillor Stonard, the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth replied as follows:

“The Greater Norwich Local Plan is still at a relatively early stage in its preparation. The options document which was consulted on in early in 2018 included specific consultation over the proposed policy response towards climate change. The response to this consultation is still being considered and this will need to be done alongside consideration of the significance of the latest scientific evidence on the matter and government policy including the updates to the National Planning Policy Framework.

The specific response to climate change issues will need to be considered during the course of this year to inform draft policies that are due for further consultation in the autumn. At this stage in the process there is not a lot further that can be said as the policy formulation work has not been done but please rest assured that the city council will be seeking a policy framework that is not only fit for purpose in terms of statute and guidance but minimises

our contribution to climate change and maximises the extent to which we are able to successfully adapt to the inevitable consequences it will have on our area.”

By way of a supplementary question, Ms Bögelein asked whether the cabinet member agreed that the early plans had inadequate criteria. Councillor Stonard said that he did not agree and that having a lot of detail in an early plan would have been inappropriate as it was simply a first draft.

### **Question 5 - Norwich Western Link**

Ms Jenn Parkhouse asked the cabinet member for /sustainable and inclusive growth the following question:

“Induced traffic from new roads is a well-established phenomenon - increased traffic increases carbon emissions, carbon emissions contribute to climate breakdown. The city council supported the building of the Northern Distributor Road (NDR), including financially, even when the public inquiry had established it would increase carbon emissions. Despite recent and damning evidence from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) declaring the world faces a climate emergency, why does the city council now support the construction of a Norwich Western Link when it will induce traffic and increase emissions? This is totally contrary to the council's stated aspirations to tackle climate change and reduce carbon emissions.”

Councillor Stonard, the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth gave the following response:

“The council’s support was conditional so it could be withdrawn at any time. There were a number of schemes asked for in conjunction with the Northern Distributor Road to ensure massive improvements in the city. The same approach is being taken with the Western Link. There is planned growth for the city and we do not want unsustainable new settlements. These will need transport infrastructure in place. New jobs will be created so access to these will also be needed.

We are taking a balanced approach with the aim of the Western Link being largely carbon neutral. People voted for a Labour council to create communities and decent lives whilst balancing carbon emissions. We are offsetting the effect of the Western Link with other measures which will take traffic out of western Norwich.”

By way of a supplementary question, Ms Parkhouse said that a report from the IPCC made it clear that there were only twelve years in which measures could be put into place to reverse climate change. She asked what would happen to this with another road building project beginning in 2022. Councillor Stonard said that the council was taking a balanced approach and was serious about carbon reduction. He asked that the council be judged on its record with as one of the cities with the best carbon reduction. The target of a 2.2% carbon reduction had been exceeded.

#### 4. Minutes

The Lord Mayor said that due to an administrative error, the minutes of the previous meeting had not been circulated with the agenda papers.

**RESOLVED** to bring the minutes of the meeting held on 27 November 2018 to the February meeting of council for approval.

#### 5. Questions to Cabinet Members/Committee Chairs

The Lord Mayor said that eleven questions had been received from members of the council to cabinet members/committee chairs for which notice had been given in accordance with the provisions of appendix 1 of the council's constitution.

- |                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <b>Question 1</b>  | Councillor Raby to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth on cycle paths.                               |
| <b>Question 2</b>  | Councillor Carlo to the cabinet member for health and wellbeing on tennis courts   |
| <b>Question 3</b>  | Councillor Price to the cabinet member for cabinet member for safe city environment on the removal of shrubbery.         |
| <b>Question 4</b>  | Councillor Sands (M) to the cabinet member for social inclusion on the SureStart centre closure.                         |
| <b>Question 5</b>  | Councillor Fulton-McAlister (E) to the cabinet member for safe city environment on violent crime.                        |
| <b>Question 6</b>  | Councillor Fullman to the cabinet member for safe city environment on the police budget.                                 |
| <b>Question 7</b>  | Councillor Ryan to cabinet member for resources on asset investment.   |
| <b>Question 8</b>  | Councillor Smith to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth on the Tombland Transforming Cities Project. |
| <b>Question 9</b>  | Councillor Vaughan Thomas to the cabinet member for social inclusion on fuel poverty.                                    |
| <b>Question 10</b> | Councillor Trevor to the cabinet member for safe city environment on Severe Weather Emergency Protocol.                  |
| <b>Question 11</b> | Councillor Malik to the leader of the council on the Heatrae Sadia factory closure.                                      |

(Details of the questions and responses were circulated at the meeting, and are attached to these minutes at Appendix A, together with a minute of any supplementary questions and responses.)



## 6. Appointment of the Electoral Registration Officer

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

Following debate, it was:

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to appoint Laura McGillivray, chief executive officer, as the Electoral Registration Officer for Norwich City Council.

## 7. Interim polling district and places review 2018

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

Following debate it was:

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to approve the following changes to the Norwich City Council polling districts:

- (1) Bowthorpe Ward – Due to boundary changes made at the LGBCE ward review, move the area south Earlham Green Lane to the proposed BO3 polling district and to rename the current BO5 polling district BO4.
- (2) Catton Grove Ward – Due to boundary changes made at the LGBCE ward review, make a minor amendment to the boundary between CG3 polling district and Mile Cross Ward to include all electors in Eglington Mews and Boston Street in Mile Cross Ward.
- (3) Crome Ward- Remove the current CR5 polling district and split the area between the proposed CR2 and CR4 polling districts along the middle of Frere and Watling Road. Due to changes made at the LGBCE ward review, create CR3(S) and CR5(S) polling districts for the areas of Crome Ward which have moved from the current Thorpe Hamlet Ward.
- (4) Eaton Ward – move the parts of Osborne Road and Pettus Road and all of Hurd Road in the current EA3 polling district to the proposed EA1 polling district. Move parts of Sunningdale and Rosslare and all of Fulford Close in the current EA2 polling district to the proposed EA3 polling district. Move the part of Greenways which is currently in EA3 polling district to the proposed EA4 polling district with the rest of Greenways. Due to changes made at the LGBCE ward review, add the area from the current Town Close Ward around Mount Pleasant to the proposed EA5 polling district.
- (5) Lakenham Ward – Combine the current LA1 and LA2 polling districts and rename as LA1 polling district and rename the current LA5 polling district as LA2 polling district. Due to changes made at the LGBCE ward review, add the area from the current Thorpe Hamlet Ward around Richmond Hill and north of Bracondale to the proposed LA3 polling district and move the rest of the

current part of Thorpe Hamlet Ward around Bracondale Millgate to the proposed LA2 polling district.

- (6) Mancroft Ward – Due to changes made at the LGBCE ward review, combine the current MA3 polling district and the remaining parts of the current MA4 polling districts and rename as a new MA1 polling district. Also due to changes made at the LGBCE ward review, create a new MA4 polling district from parts of the current MA5 polling district south of All Saints Green, adding the area from the current Thorpe Hamlet ward west of King Street. Create a new MA3 polling district from the remaining part of the current MA5 polling district.
- (7) Mile Cross Ward - Due to boundary changes made at the LGBCE ward review, make a minor amendment to the boundary between Catton Grove Ward and MX1 polling district in Mile Cross Ward to include all electors in Eglington Mews and Boston Street in MX1 polling district.
- (8) Nelson Ward - Due to boundary changes made at the LGBCE ward review, create a NE5 polling district adding the area of the current Mancroft Ward north of Earlham Road and east of Heigham Road, add the part of the current Wensum Ward around Bond Street and Merton Street to NE1 polling district.
- (9) Sewell Ward – A minor amendment to land on the boundary with Crome Ward west of Gurney Road and the proposed SE4 polling district
- (10) Thorpe Hamlet Ward – Due to boundary changes made at the LGBCE ward review, create a new TH1 polling district from part of the current TH3 polling district and part of the current TH5 polling district south of Koblenz and Carrow Road. The remaining part of the current TH5 polling district will be renamed TH3 polling district. Also due to boundary changes made at the LGBCE ward review, the small area of the current TH1 polling district which is not moving to Crome ward will move to the proposed TH2 and TH4 polling districts.
- (11) Town Close Ward – Move the north side of Town Close Road in the current TC1 polling district and the area east of Ipswich Road, south of Cecil Road in the current TC3 polling district to the proposed TC4 polling district.
- (12) University Ward - Due to boundary changes made at LGBCE ward review, create a new UN1 polling district north of Earlham Road, west of Gipsy Lane and east Wilberforce Road and Larkman Lane, taking in parts of the current Bowthorpe and Wensum wards. Move the boundary between UN3 and UN4 taking in all of George Borrow Road and Earlham Road and also adding the area from the current Wensum Ward east and south of the middle of Gipsy Lane. Add to the proposed UN5 polling district, the area on Earlham Road around Hadley Drive and Fairhaven Court from the current Wensum Ward. Also due to boundary changes made at the LGBCE ward review, create a new UN6 polling district taking in part of the current UN1 polling district and an area of the current Bowthorpe Ward around Wilberforce Road and Calthorpe Road.
- (13) Wensum Ward – Due to boundary changes made at the LGBCE ward review, create a new WE2 polling district from part of the current WE2 polling

district north of Dereham Road, east of the middle of Northumberland Street and the area of the current Mancroft Ward west of Old Palace Road. Also due to boundary changes made at LGBCE ward review, create a new WE3 polling district from parts of the current WE2 and WE3 polling districts east of the middle of Guardian Road and west of the middle of Northumberland Road

## 8. Motions

### Motion – Declaring a climate emergency

The following amendment had been received from Councillor Carlo to her own motion:

Replacing word 'irreversible' with the word 'profound'

This had been circulated and as no other member objected it became part of the substantive motion.

Councillor Carlo moved and Councillor Price seconded the motion as amended.

The Lord Mayor said that notice had been received in advance of an amendment to the motion from Councillor Maguire, seconded by Councillor Waters which would introduce a new proposal. Councillor Carlo had indicated that she was not willing to accept the amendment.

Councillor Maguire moved and Councillor Waters seconded a procedural motion to suspend standing orders to suspend rule 60 of Appendix 1 of the council's constitution relating to amendments to motions. On being put to the vote the procedural motion was carried with 27 voting in favour and 6 against.

Councillor Maguire moved and Councillor Waters seconded the following amendment:

- (1) Removing the following from resolution 1: Declare a 'Climate Emergency'; and instead inserting the following: "Acknowledge the conclusions of scientists that climate temperature rise should be limited to 1.5°C. This is a Climate Emergency."
- (2) Inserting the following as resolution 2: "Understand that declarations of 'Climate Emergency' are inextricably linked with Social and Economic emergencies which affect ordinary people globally and locally: all of these are equally important in achieving truly sustainable communities."
- (3) Resolution 2 becomes resolution 3 and the following inserted after "pledge to": "continue the work to" and inserting the following after "carbon neutral" "as soon as possible"
- (4) Inserting resolution 4 which reads as follows: "Continue and expand its work of building climate-change resilient social housing"

- (5) Inserting resolution 5 “Continue promotion of climate-change resilient planning and building”
- (6) Resolution 3 becomes resolution 6 and adding to the end: “this possible”
- (7) Resolution 4 becomes resolution 7
- (8) Resolution 5 becomes resolution 8
  - a) Resolution 5(a) becomes resolution 8(a) and the following added to the end: “framed by the 2040 Vision”
  - b) Resolution 5(b) becomes resolution 8(b)

With 27 voting in favour, 6 against and no abstentions, the amendment was carried and became part of the substantive motion.

**RESOLVED**, with 29 voting in favour and 4 abstentions:-

“Humans have caused profound climate change. The world is set to overshoot the Paris Agreement’s 1.5°C limit.

The recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report describes the enormous harm that a 2° rise in temperature is likely to cause, saying that limiting temperate rise to 1.5° may still be possible with ambitious action. In order to limit the effects of Climate Breakdown, humans must urgently reduce our carbon equivalent emissions from their current 6.5 tonnes per person per year to less than 2 tonnes.

Authorities around the world are declaring a ‘Climate Emergency’ and committing resources to address this emergency.

Council **RESOLVES** to:

- (1) Acknowledge the conclusions of scientists that climate temperature rise should be limited to 1.5°C. This is a Climate Emergency.
- (2) Understand that declarations of ‘Climate Emergency’ are inextricably linked with Social and Economic emergencies which affect ordinary people globally and locally: all of these are equally important in achieving truly sustainable communities.
- (3) Pledge to continue the work to make the city of Norwich carbon neutral as soon as possible, taking into account both production and consumption emissions
- (4) Continue and expand its work of building climate-change resilient social housing
- (5) Continue promotion of climate-change resilient planning and building

- (6) Call on Westminster to provide the powers and resources to make this possible;
- (7) Work with other local authorities to determine and implement best practice methods to limit global warming to less than 1.5°C;
- (8) Ask Cabinet to:
  - a) Continue to work with partners across the city and region to deliver this new goal through all relevant strategies and plans, framed by the 2040 Vision.
  - b) to report to council within six months with the actions the cabinet will take to address this emergency. “

(At 21:25, Councillor Waters moved and Councillor Maxwell seconded a procedural motion to suspend standing orders to suspend rule 16 of Appendix 1 of the council's constitution relating to taking items as unopposed business after two hours. On being put to the vote the procedural motion was carried with 29 voting in favour, 2 against and one abstention)

### **Motion – Protecting tenants in the private rented sector**

Councillor Jones moved and Councillor Maguire seconded the motion as set out in the agenda papers.

**RESOLVED** unanimously that:-

“People in Norwich who are renting from a private landlord often have to put up with insecure tenancies, poor standards and rising costs.

Over the last 8 years we have seen a very significant increase in the private rented sector within Norwich, whereby at least one in five households now rent privately.

Recent media coverage of the appalling conditions experienced by tenants residing in St Faith's Lane demonstrate the ever serious need for radical housing reform to better protect and improve the private rented sector.

Council **RESOLVES** to:

- (1) Thank the officers in the private sector housing and home options teams for their hard work and dedication to supporting tenants within this city, but particularly those at St Faith's Lane.
- (2) Request the government provide the true funding required to cover the costs of effective enforcement within this city.

- (3) Ask the leader of Norwich City Council to write to the Secretary of State for Housing demanding policy change so that tenants in the private rented sector have new protections including;
- a) Giving security and peace of mind by legislating for 3-year tenancies giving renters a stable home and landlords the confidence to invest in their properties.
  - b) Ending excessive rent increases by putting a ceiling on rent increases during the new 3-year tenancies.
  - c) Banning rip-off letting agent fees for tenants by effectively legislating to stop letting agents charging tenants fees, rather than the watered down proposals of the Tenant Fees Bill.
  - d) Introducing a national register of landlords to drive up standards and ensure tough sanctions are in place for bad landlords.
  - e) Creating a new benchmarking system for property standards.
  - f) Bringing an end to cold homes and reduce fuel poverty by setting a new target to upgrade the energy efficiency of properties in the private rented sector.”

### **Motion - Trams**

Councillor Raby proposed the following amendments to his own motion which had been circulated:

Inserting the following sentence after the first: “The Transforming Cities vision includes more efficient and more sustainable system of public transport for the Greater Norwich area.”

Inserting the following after the final sentence: “Conversely, in the UK, the government’s approach to the funding and delivery of public transport infrastructure makes it very hard for a city the size of Norwich to have a viable Tram or LRT system. For this reason, the Transforming Cities initiative was anchored on delivering improvements to bus infrastructure to deliver the vision of a connected Norwich. However, we believe that a Tram or LRT system could be a key part of an integrated transport system which delivers this vision for Norwich and that national government should actively support such initiatives in ways that would make them viable in urban areas the size of Norwich”

Removing the following from resolution 1: “inclusion of a tram or LRT project as a high priority in the Greater Norwich Local Plan” and adding the following: “amendments to national regimes to enable tram or LRT systems to be more realistically considered as a transport for the future development of Norwich;”

Removing the following from 2 (which becomes 2(a)) “the Department of Transport” and “a project” instead adding the following at the end “an initiative”

Adding the following as 2(b): lobby national government to provide support to the development of Tram and LRT systems to improve their viability and enable urban areas the size of Norwich to deliver them.”

As no other member objected, these became part of the substantive motion.

Councillor Raby moved and Councillor Stonard seconded the motion as amended.

**RESOLVED**, unanimously that:-

“Norwich’s 2040 Vision sees the City as a “connected” City “having a clean, affordable, integrated transport system”. The Transforming Cities vision includes more efficient and more sustainable system of public transport for the Greater Norwich area. Plans for new homes and jobs in the city also require additional means of transportation for residents.

Trams and light rail transport (LRT) systems are efficient, clean, comfortable and reliable, and growing numbers of cities in the UK and beyond have or are considering tram or LRT systems. In Germany, France, the Netherlands and elsewhere several cities the size of Norwich or even smaller have such systems. Conversely, in the UK, the government’s approach to the funding and delivery of public transport infrastructure makes it very hard for a city the size of Norwich to have a viable Tram or LRT system.

For this reason, the Transforming Cities initiative was anchored on delivering improvements to bus infrastructure to deliver the vision of a connected Norwich. However, we believe that a Tram or LRT system could be a key part of an integrated transport system which delivers this vision for Norwich and that national government should actively support such initiatives in ways that would make them viable in urban areas the size of Norwich.

This Council therefore **RESOLVES** to:-

- (1) Ask the Greater Norwich Development Partnership to press for amendments to national regimes to enable tram or LRT systems to be more realistically considered as a transport considered for the future development of Norwich; and
- (2) To;
  - a) ask the Local Enterprise Partnership and the Region’s MP’s to lend their support to such an initiative; and
  - b) lobby national government to provide support to the development of Tram and LRT systems to improve their viability and enable urban areas the size of Norwich to deliver them.”

## **Motion – Universal Credit**

Councillor Davis moved and Councillor Smith seconded the motion as set out in the agenda papers.

**RESOLVED** unanimously that:-

Despite knowing Universal Credit causes serious problems for claimants, the government is pressing ahead with the roll out which increased in Norwich last autumn.

In Norwich, like elsewhere in Britain, claimants are descending into debt, relying on food banks, getting into rent arrears and in some cases getting evicted from their homes because of in-built problems with Universal Credit.

Council **RESOLVES** to;

- (1) agree that this council has no confidence in Universal Credit;
- (2) call on the leader of the council to make representations to the Rt Hon Amber Rudd, Secretary of State at the Department for Work and Pensions to urge her to scrap Universal Credit and to replace it with a social security system that supports people and ensures that nobody is worse-off, rather than driving them into greater poverty; and
- (3) continue to commit appropriate resources from within the council's budget to support residents affected by Universal Credit.

LORD MAYOR



## Appendix A

### Council 29 January 2019 Questions to Cabinet Members or Chairs of Committees

#### Question 1

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

“Over the last couple of years a number of residents have reported concerns about people cycling on the pavement. This is a particular nuisance for elderly residents and mothers with their children in pushchairs. It is clear that the council and the police need to do more to tackle this issue. One cheap idea, which would be easy to implement would be to stencil reminders on the pavement saying “cyclists please dismount on the pavement” or words to that effect. Does the cabinet member agree with me that this matter needs to be prioritised and will he consider implementing the measure suggested?”

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

“I think we will all agree that cycling on footways that were not designed to be shared use is a problem for us all. However I do not agree that stencilling messages on the pavement is the right way to solve the issue. There is no evidence to suggest that it would be effective. Also when we for instance used this technique to promote pedestrians and cyclists to be mindful of each other, it promoted a spate of commercial organisations thinking it was acceptable for them to stencil the pavement with adverts. Stencilling is therefore to be used with caution.

Of course we want cyclists to behave responsibly and not cycle on unsuitable pavements. The city council is making great strides in offering cyclists dedicated facilities through the City Cycle Ambition Grant programme. We are shortly to implement a scheme along Earlham Road, a location that I know where cycling on the pavement causes problems, which will make it safer for cyclists to stay on the carriageway.

I’m sure most people who cycle on the pavement know that they shouldn’t be doing it, but lack the confidence to cycle on the road. Norfolk county council does offer cycle training and through their Pushing Ahead project they are promoting this to a wider audience.

While we are encouraging cyclists to use appropriate facilities we should remember that the responsibility for dealing with cycling on the pavements ultimately is not a city council responsibility. It is an offence to cycle on a footway and the only authority that has powers to enforce this are Norfolk constabulary.”

**Supplementary question:**

Councillor Raby said that stencilling had been used recently by the city council for other events such as Living Wage week and asked whether the cabinet member could give assurances that the council would actively pursue further measures.

Councillor Stonard replied that the city council was not able to enforce this as it was

a police matter. He would speak to the police but said that it would be a matter for them to prioritise.

## **Question 2**

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

“Norwich City Council plans to spend of £232,000 capital spending on developing all-weather courts, a large proportion of which is proposed for replacing grass courts at Heigham Park with three all-weather floodlit courts. Heigham Park Grass Courts Group have offered to take on the running and maintenance of grass tennis for free. A large number of local residents want to retain grass tennis at Heigham Park. Nelson has the second lowest level of deprivation in the city; there are wards where deprivation is high and the need for capital spend far greater. Will the Cabinet member allow the community to take on maintenance of Heigham Park grass courts and divert the capital saved to areas of the city where the need is greater and residents support all-weather courts?”

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

“I do wonder how many times an answer to this same question from councillor Carlo will need to be provided; the Leader, my predecessor and I have done so on many occasions either in this chamber or in email correspondence. My support for the all-weather courts was also confirmed at the Planning Committee meeting in November, which I believe she attended.

So, for sake of clarity may I provide some important points.

The city’s parks when they were laid out were, and this is very much the same today, provided for all residents. I would suggest that it is not about distinguishing between providing parks facilities in the more deprived areas for less affluent people and parks facilities in the less deprived areas for the better off. This council should be integrating facilities so that they can be used by all of our communities, not setting out to segregate them, with our residents encouraged to use any park they wish to regardless of where they live.

The area where the grass courts were has not had any fine turf management since their closure and would require reinstatement works beyond routine maintenance if they were brought back into use, which will not happen. Therefore, there is no current tennis court facility for a community group to take on the maintenance and running of.

The proposed investment in tennis provision is about providing a sustainable and affordable resource that will generate income to help maintain tennis courts into the future given that the council’s budget continues to decline. This includes bringing in external funding into our parks, which the Green party has encouraged the council to do in this chamber.

This is an opportunity to build on the proven success of Norwich Parks tennis and expand it to Heigham Park, Lakenham Rec and Harford Park. The facility at Heigham Park, as well as the funding for it, cannot be viewed in isolation and is an important part of the delivery model which will enable the provision of affordable quality tennis, which is economically sustainable and available all year round. This is about long-term planning and investment which will open up increased access to tennis courts at affordable costs for our residents.

The investment will also provide tennis provision at Heigham Park from 0800 – 2200 for 52 weeks per year and not for the limited period of time the previous grass provision was provided.

There is a need to increase the number of tennis courts available, particularly as at peak time the courts at other parks are full. Demand is increasing year on year and the provision of all-weather courts will increase the availability of courts year round.

The removal of grass tennis at Heigham Park has already provided a contribution of £40,000 to the council's overall gross savings requirements of £2.5m per year over the next five years.

The expansion of Norwich Parks Tennis will bring benefits to Heigham Park, Lakenham Recreation Ground and Harford Park and the communities that use them. Unfortunately, the objectives of Heigham Park Grass Courts Group did not align with those of the council through Norwich Parks Tennis with regards to Heigham Park and the wider expansion of tennis provision.

I do think that it is worth highlighting again that the increased accessibility to tennis courts 52 weeks a year for a household membership fee of just £30 per year is good value. I have been told by residents from across the city that they feel this is extremely good value, which makes it more accessible for them to access the facilities and improve their health. Incidentally, the proposed membership in the Heigham Park Grass Courts Group revised business plan the council received in August 2018 was £60 per person for free play; 100% more expensive than Norwich Parks Tennis for a single member; and 8 times more expensive, based on a family of four playing.

All-weather courts at Heigham Park will benefit Norwich by contributing towards delivering our key priorities of:

1. A fair city – through the provision of affordable tennis where people are not socially or financially excluded by high membership fees or the cost of court hire; membership being £30 per household per year with no additional court costs (unless floodlights are required), contributing to reducing inequalities in the city.
2. A safe and clean city – tennis being delivered by a Sport England Tennis + accredited provider, which recognises venues that are safe to play at and provide an all year round tennis programme.
3. A prosperous and vibrant city - where more people will be able to access affordable leisure facilities, in the form of high quality all-

weather tennis courts, 365 days a year from 0800 until 2200 increasing use and public presence in the parks.

4. A provider of value for money services – with a commitment to ensuring the provision of efficient quality services to residents and visitors, whilst continuing to face challenging savings targets; by protecting and improving tennis provision through capital investment with partners. Norwich Parks Tennis generating a sinking fund to cover the annual maintenance costs and scheduled re-colouring and re-marking of Norwich Parks Tennis Courts across the city into the future.
5. A healthy city – by increasing the opportunity for people to play tennis that is affordable, that can be booked online by members or on a pay and play basis by visitors to the city or non-members. The focus being to promote tennis throughout the year for all age groups, both adults and children, through social play, internal competition, matches and to offer professional coaching to any members who want to improve their standard of play.

To be clear, the proposed investment in tennis provision is about providing a sustainable and affordable resource that will generate income to help maintain tennis courts across the city into the future whilst the council's budgets continue to decline. This will enable residents, from across the city, to access the facilities at affordable costs and will have the impact of improving health outcomes.

Although the city council will not be providing grass courts at Heigham Park, there are ten grass courts available for hire through Schools Plus at Hewett Academy.

For complete clarity, my answer to the question is 'no'."

### **Supplementary question:**

Councillor Carlo asked whether the cabinet member was embarrassed that the council was spending £232,000 on Heigham Park in a time of austerity when a local community group was willing to take these on for free. Councillor Packer replied that if this opened up tennis for residents of Norwich, no matter where they lived, it would increase health outcomes which should be celebrated.

### **Question 3**

**Councillor Price to ask the cabinet member for safe city environment the following question:**

"The Green group was contacted by a resident from the Marlpit estate on 10 January, and told that city council contractors were removing shrubbery and hedgerows in the area. The resident said that a contractor said the removal of vegetation was to save money. She also said that she enjoys seeing wildlife, such as hedgehogs and hedge sparrows near her home, but these species rely on shrubs and hedges. Can the cabinet member please tell me how much similar vegetation is being removed and not replaced across the city? What is the rationale behind the removal of these shrubs and hedges?"

**Councillor Maguire, cabinet member for safe city environment's response:**

“Each year our joint venture partners, Norwich Norse Environmental, complete a considerable annual programme of grounds maintenance. On average they are cutting over 3 million square metres of grass every two/three weeks during the growing period and maintaining 23 formal parks, 60 natural areas (including woodland and marshland habitats), 89 play areas, 18 allotment sites (over 1900 plots) 15 football pitches, 4 bowling greens, 4 cricket wickets, 16 games courts, 18 tennis courts, 2 operational cemeteries, 28 closed churchyards, 2 pitch & putt courses and around 200,000 sq. metres of shrub beds. The council has continually sought to improve maintenance standards whilst at the same time recognising an ongoing requirement to manage costs.

During 2017/18 officers reviewed the provision and maintenance of shrub beds alongside the council's neighbourhood strategy. This strategy sets out a vision that a successful, sustainable neighbourhood will:

- be clean and well cared for by the community and the Council
- feel safe to live in and move around
- contain community facilities and activities that cater for the needs of its community; whether young, old or with special or particular needs and interests
- have local people who take responsibility for their own lives and those of their families
- have lively challenging community organisations that champion the needs of the people and the neighbourhood and who work to meet those needs independently.

As part of this review it was noted that a number of shrub beds did not meet the neighbourhood strategy vision, for a variety of reasons including -

- historical issues with inappropriate planting and maintenance
- general wear and tear
- damage caused by people and animals
- health and safety issues (e.g. shrubs obscuring line-of-sight for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists)
- access issues for maintenance (often due to later developments around the shrub bed)
- extremes of weather
- shrubs acting as 'litter traps'

To address all these issues a shrub bed improvement project was launched in 2018. The overriding aim of this project is to improve the quality of shrub beds without increasing maintenance costs. To do this it was necessary to identify sites where more appropriate planting and/or alternatives to planting could be provided. This included sites where there are issues gaining access for maintenance (or problems removing green waste), sites that are poor quality or are sparsely filled and sites that needed substantial remedial works to bring them back to an appropriate standard.

For every site where the current issues suggested that the maintenance requirement should be reduced this would free-up resources to ensure that other sites throughout the city can be maintained to a high standard on an annual basis. The project will also have an emphasis on encouraging local communities to take ownership of planting in their local area and take on a level of maintenance where possible, or to encourage local businesses to support shrub bed maintenance, either financially or through donating equipment. This has been successful in other areas of the City and we are keen to build on these successes.

Marlpit was identified as one of the areas where the existing planting was inappropriate and where action was required to improve the quality of the bed. Consequently some of the existing shrubs have been removed to be replaced with healthier and more suitable plants and parts of the bed will be grassed. In this way the project will provide for the ongoing maintenance of shrub beds to a higher standard than currently whilst maintaining the council's commitment to the provision of green spaces and prudently managing the ongoing and future costs"

**Supplementary question:**

Councillor Price said that any reduction in shrubs would reduce biodiversity and asked how this approach fitted in with government plans to boost biodiversity in urban areas. Councillor Maguire said that the replacement shrubs were more appropriate planting and he was pleased to see an increased emphasis on native species which would increase biodiversity.

**Question 4**

**Councillor Mike Sands to ask the cabinet member for social inclusion the following question:**

"The announcement that the Conservative run Norfolk County Council will close 38 SureStart centres, including a significant number in Norwich, has been met with horror from my constituents in Bowthorpe Ward. Will the cabinet member for Social Inclusion condemn these closures and examine all options for what support might be provided to the communities who rely so heavily upon them in the future?"

**Councillor Davis, cabinet member for social inclusion's response:**

"Thank you for your question.

Yes, I will absolutely condemn the closure of the children's centres. Once again, we see the Tories making short-term decisions which will have a long-term impact on the children of our city.

The county council has given no details about how what remnants of a service will be weighted by deprivation and need - and there is no clarity on what the criteria will be to access the new service. Some areas of high deprivation, such as Tuckswood and Heartsease will see their communities removed from easy access to children's centres. Without transport, or the money for public transport we will see vulnerable families unwillingly disengaged from the service.

Some sessions, which were previously universal, may now be chargeable, which will automatically exclude low-income families. The majority of universal services, once provided in centres, will now be available online, and despite Norwich City Council's excellent digital inclusion work there is a large risk that families will be unable to access the online offer. Many families relied on using IT equipment at their children's centres as they do not have computers. An enhanced focus on signposting and self-help can entrench inequalities by only meeting the needs of more naturally enfranchised families.

There are safeguarding risks where interventions are de-professionalised and delivered in community settings, and it is still unclear as to where these delivery points will be. There is real concern about the capacity of other community building in the city, as these are already in use by existing community groups. It is also completely unclear how this links to the Norwich Opportunity Area's aims of social mobility, particularly when this new service has been built around budget cuts, rather than assessment of community need.

Any local authority that disposes of buildings funded through Sure Start capital grants from the Department for Education is at risk of having the money clawed back under the terms of the contract. In Norfolk, there is a risk of a £16million clawback from the 38 centres earmarked for closure. The only way to prevent this is for the buildings to be taken over by other groups or organisations for the provision of services to under 5s. However, the county council has only made £500k provision for the whole of Norfolk to adapt or upgrade these buildings – that is £13k per building earmarked for closure. With early years' providers struggling to make ends meet and the pressure on school budgets increasing, this does not seem like a realistic prospect. I have further concerns about the ability to provide a new model by November 2019, and there is something that sticks in the craw about skilled women losing paid employment and being replaced by volunteers. This does nothing to lessen inequality in our city.

Any new model for Norwich needs to have clearly articulated outcomes that relate to local issues that are evidenced to be mitigated by services proposed. As data supplied with the consultation on the current or proposed model is limited, we believe that what evidence there is should be used to shape services to improve:

The level of development at age 5 of the third of children in Norwich in Norwich who do not meet this level (in some wards this is 50%)

The long-term social outcomes of the cohort (including those falling short of a good level of development at aged 5) who are more likely to require additional support in school (via pupil premium), lack good GCSEs, and ultimately transition into adulthood with less chance of secure, well-paid employment.

In order to achieve this, a new model would also need to reflect the higher levels of household and child poverty that are current in Norwich compared with neighbouring districts, and are geographically located in the same areas of sub-optimal development age 5.

Whilst the changes have resulted in 3 children's centres in Norwich rather than 1 proposed, the new services need to be resourced to meet the levels of need in the city.

This would necessarily include addressing socio-economic factors and household-specific issues such as parenting.

Although evidence locally seems to be partial on the impact of the current services, individual children's centres are able to evidence that:

They are working with families from deprived communities

That those who engage with children's centres on a consistent basis reach a better level of development at age 5 than their comparator peers

Recently published evidence from the House of Commons library indicates early year's attainment in Norwich South and Norwich North is better than for overall social mobility. This suggests that the current children centre provision is mitigating some of the negative effects of wider socio-economic factors. In addition, the proposed model does not appear to be supported by any evidence that it would retain the best elements of this current effective practice.

A future model should therefore be constructed around this evidence and policy framework, even where causality is difficult to ascertain, with improved data collection, evidence-gathering and analysis built into the new model so that it can be monitored and effectively targeted on an ongoing basis. Without taking this longer-term, evidence-led approach, we believe that the decrease in resource proposed will lead a higher demand over future years for more expensive public sector interventions, including an increase in the Looked After Child population."

**Supplementary question:**

There was no supplementary question.

**Question 5**

**Councillor Erin Fulton-McAlister to ask the cabinet member for safe city environment the following question:**

"Before Christmas one of my constituents was stabbed in an attempted murder at Godric Place, as part of the County Lines drug fuelled crime wave, which has hit our city. Given the escalating problem of violent crime and devastating consequences for Norwich can the cabinet member for Safe City Environment comment on the ongoing work this council is taking to combat this growing problem?"

**Councillor Maguire, cabinet member for safe city environment's response:**

"The continuing issues of county lines which are occurring across the city and other parts of the county are of considerable concern to this council and other agencies in Norfolk.

Not only have there been incidents of violence occurring in our city, but Norwich is also seeing vulnerable tenants being cuckooed and young people exploited.

Whilst much good work has been undertaken by the Norfolk Constabulary to arrest offenders, I do support the Chief Constable's view, that the problems cannot be resolved by the police alone.

Norwich City Council has a very definite role to play and is playing its part.

The council's primary operational response to county lines is through the anti-social behaviour and tenancy enforcement (ABATE) team. The ABATE team



is co-located with a team of police officers within the Norwich operational partnership team (OPT), based at Bethel Street police station. Working jointly with the police, Operation Gravity focuses a lot of the ABATE team's resources due to the level of risk and harm to vulnerable residents and the impact of cuckooed properties on the wider community.

Whilst successes are achieved with the closing down of drug operations in council tenancies and the ceasing of cuckooing activity, a new location will spring up in another part of the city.

Over the 12 months, ABATE have worked with the police to issue section 8 misuse of drugs act letters in cases of cuckooed properties, following their successful implementation in elsewhere.

These letters are presented to residents in cuckooed properties jointly by ABATE and police officers where county lines activity is evidenced to be taking place. The resident is advised that police and council are aware of the drug dealing, how they are breaking the law and the subsequent consequences of that if it continues. The residents are also offered support to cease activity and how they can safely provide information on those operating the county line.

This might include a move to alternative accommodation and the property temporarily secured to stop the activity. This helps disrupt activity and protect vulnerable residents from violence, exploitation and unwilling cuckooing of their property. A review of the effectiveness from the use of 'Section 8' letters will be undertaken this year.

The council will also make use of the absolute ground for possession power in suitable circumstances. This enables some respite for neighbours that have endured ongoing antisocial behaviour from county lines activity.

The council's antisocial behaviour manager has provided briefings to all of the council's front line officers, to provide information on:

- What County Lines is
- What Operation Gravity is
- Indicators of county lines activity – what to look out for
- Risk to vulnerable residents
- How to report suspected county lines activity.

Information has also been provided to the council's safeguarding champions as well members.

The circulation of Crimestoppers information has also been used. Crimestoppers allows the public to report issues of crime and disorder anonymously and one area of the city was targeted by officers from the council's tenancy management and area management teams, the police and ward councillors, to encourage reporting and provide reassurance that the council and police officers will not tolerate drug dealing. Information was provided on what residents should look out for and how to report anonymously any activity taking place.

Officers met with police colleagues only last week to review the effectiveness of joint working and to consider what further action is required to protect vulnerable people and help rid the city of this menace.

I hope to bring forward proposals to cabinet very shortly which will develop further the already good work undertaken by this council in conjunction with the Norfolk Constabulary to target County Lines.”

**Supplementary question:**

There was no supplementary question.

**Question 6**

**Councillor Fullman to ask the cabinet member for safe city environment the following question:**

“Representing a ward heavily affected by County Lines drug activity and serious crime I was concerned that hear the chief constable of Norfolk confirm that extra potential budget cuts, due to officer pensions contributions, could mean that numbers would fall to their lowest level since 1968, with a loss of 110 police officers. On top of previous serious police officer cuts, the abolition of the much loved PCSO’s in 2017 and further reductions in the community safety support offered to my constituents, can the cabinet member for safe city environment confirm that he will support our local police force in securing the budget needed from central government to safeguard those engaged in protecting our city?”

**Councillor Maguire, the cabinet member for safe city environment’s response:**

“The Norfolk Constabulary like all public services is having to cut services due to the Government’s continued austerity programme. This is hitting some of your most vulnerable communities hard who are facing services which have been reduced.

Whilst the Norfolk Constabulary have taken steps to reduce costs such as sharing services and re-modelling how it delivers policing in Norfolk to meet reduced funding, the latest threat is the loss of more than 100 police officers due to the Government seeking increased employer pension contributions from an already decreasing budget.

It has been reported that the Constabulary will have to find an additional £5.6m of savings by April 2020 which is of the scale that will result in the loss of front line officers.

I can reassure Cllr Fullman that I shall be writing to the Home Secretary and Norfolk Police and Crime Commissioner with this council’s concerns as this is not what the residents of our city deserve.”

**Supplementary question:**

There was no supplementary question.

### **Question 7**

**Councillor Ryan to ask the cabinet member for resources the following question:**

“In recent weeks there have been repeated attempts to challenge the asset investment strategy of this council, culminating in a recent Conservative leaflet accusing this council of spending £40m when it could be funding amongst other things “the police”. Can the cabinet member for resources comment again, to help avoid the smallest shred of doubt, as to why this council invests in assets, the returns already achieved by adopting this strategy and how this desperately needed income can help support crucial discretionary and statutory services?”

### **Councillor Kendrick, cabinet member for resource’s response:**

“As per previous responses to questions about the council’s asset investment strategy, the council invests in commercial properties in order to generate a new net income stream and thereby protect front-line services that would be at risk of being cut or reduced. To date the recent acquisitions have achieved a net initial return of 2.9 per cent.

Tory controlled District Councils such as Ashford, Canterbury, East Hampshire, Spelthorne, Woking and Uttlesford have all spent more on commercial properties recently than Norwich City Council. Both Labour and Conservative councils are investing in commercial properties from borrowing capital funds from the Government’s own Public Works Load Board, in order to produce revenue incomes to help protect vital local services from the effects of the massive cuts in Government Revenue Support Grants to Local Government. Tory controlled Spelthorne Borough council has borrowed a billion pounds in recent years for this purpose.

Speaking recently before Parliament’s Housing, Communities and Local Government Committee a senior civil servant Melanie Dawes said “there are only one or two councils that we are aware of that are really pushing the envelope beyond the guidance we updated with CIPFA (the professional accountancy body)”. So perhaps those responsible for writing this leaflet, should have bothered to consult their own Government and Conservative councillors elsewhere in the county before writing such drivel.”

### **Supplementary question:**

Councillor Ryan said that a Conservative leaflet stated that the council should use capital to pay for policing when the city council has no statutory obligation to do so and this was funded by the Conservative Police and Crime Commission and the Home Office. He asked whether the cabinet member would take this issue up with the local Conservative party agent. Councillor Kendrick replied that that he condemned the leaflet and would take this up with local Conservative representatives.

## **Question 8**

**Councillor Smith to ask the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth's the following question:**

"I was pleased that the Tombland Transforming Cities Project was announced late last year. The opportunity to secure significant additional investment to uplift this historic and important part of the city centre is particularly welcome. The scheme presented would see the old public toilet removed, substantial aesthetic enhancements and better access for pedestrians, cyclists and those enjoying the open space outside the many busy restaurants. Can the cabinet member for Sustainable and Inclusive Growth comment on the scheme and progress to secure the funding for it?"

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

"The city council supported the county's application for Transforming Cities funding last June. It was based on bold vision to create a healthy environment and a productive economy by investing in clean transport. The Department for Transport really liked our application and Norwich has been shortlisted as one of twelve cities that can bid for a share of £1.28bn. The ease with which people can walk around the city centre and reach public transport is vital to achieving the vision in the application. Tombland is a key space where many competing uses need to be reconciled in a very special historic environment. The southern part of the space near the Ethelbert Gate needs a thorough redesign because it is currently a mess with redundant structures, surfacing that is hard to walk on, a lack of footways, a poor bus waiting environment and intrusive vehicle access. I am delighted that officers have come up with proposals to solve these problems whilst retaining the necessary vehicle access to create a really excellent space in the same way that we achieved with the area in front of the Maid's Head a few years ago. We will be gathering views from the public between 31 January and 28 February so we can see what improvements need to be made to the proposals. I hope lots of people will share their thoughts so we can maximise our chances of having the best possible scheme and securing the money to pay for the work.

The county council will be submitting a business case to the Department of Transport in the summer which will detail the schemes that have been identified to deliver the vision for transport improvements in the greater Norwich area and Tombland will form part of the package of measures for the city centre. It is expected that an announcement on exact schemes to be funded will be made in the autumn."

**Supplementary question:**

Councillor Smith said that on a related issue, she had read that Norfolk County Council had voted not to renew the highways agency agreement with the city council. She asked what the implications of this change would be. Councillor Stonard replied that the decision by Norfolk County Council's environment, development and transport committee to end the highways agency agreement, which had worked well for 45 years, was regrettable. The partnership working had brought money into the city for projects such as cycling improvements and

Transforming Cities money. He said that the city council needed to find ways to work with the county council in a bi-partisan way and this should be a priority.

### **Question 9**

**Councillor Vaughan Thomas to ask the cabinet member for social inclusion the following question:**

“I was pleased to see that this council took the title of ‘Best Regional Council’ at the East of England Energy Efficiency Awards in May last year and then another national trophy for our free hot water for social housing project in September. Representing a ward where I regularly see thermodynamic installations on our tenants roofs I am aware of the significant positive difference such improvements can make to providing free hot water and lower energy bills. On the back of these successes can the cabinet member for social inclusion comment on the ongoing efforts this council will take to further prevent fuel poverty in Norwich?”

### **Councillor Davis, cabinet member for social inclusion’s response:**

“Thank you, Councillor Thomas, for your timely question.

Norwich City Council is committed to working with those in fuel poverty. We support our residents in a number of ways to help them avoid tipping into the fuel poverty trap.

Within the council’s own housing stock our award winning thermodynamic project has benefitted 641 homes to date, and a further £500,000 has been requested to enable us to continue the rollout of this energy saving technology for the next financial year. This would serve to benefit recipient households financially by reducing energy bills, whilst also reducing carbon emissions.

In addition to the Thermodynamic Project, we also continue to install External Wall Insulation (EWI) to the council’s housing stock. We are now nearing the point where we have completed installs to nearly all the homes possible. To date, 426 properties have benefitted from EWI. Further investigations regarding other non-traditional buildings which could benefit from additional insulation measures are ongoing.

Loft and Cavity Wall Insulation continues to be delivered across the city, with many council homes receiving upgrades in the loft and/or cavity walls. NPS Norwich uses information from their continuous programme of Energy Performance Certificates (EPCs), local knowledge, contractor feedback, tenant feedback and thermal imaging to ensure budgets are targeted to the homes in the most need.

Finally, Norwich City Council is upgrading lighting in communal areas to more energy efficient LED (Light Emitting Diode) lighting. This ongoing programme will reduce service charge bills for tenants and leaseholders as well as improving the energy efficiency/ carbon emissions of the block, as well as reducing maintenance costs. This is a project that will span a number of financial years due to its scale.

Elsewhere in the council, our Private Sector Housing team are ensuring landlords are providing sufficient heating to meet the needs of their tenants. Where this is not the case and an excess cold hazard is identified, an enforcement notice is issued by the council and action must be taken by the landlord to remedy the problems identified and bring the property up to standard.

In the private sector, the council will continue to promote the take up of any available government funding, via the Cosy City project, to improve thermal and fuel efficiency in privately owned homes. Such measures could include: loft and cavity wall insulation, external wall insulation and/or boiler replacements, depending on the qualifying criteria stipulated by the funding body.

Finally, the council will continue to actively promote ways in which Norwich citizens can lower their energy bills with a number of different partners and stakeholders which include: the Citizen's Advice Bureau, NHS and other Non-Governmental Organisations. This includes the successful Big Switch and Save and our exciting and innovative new White Label project due for launch later this year.

Our comprehensive programme of work across homes of all tenures will help prevent fuel poverty in Norwich, and assist our citizens to heat their homes for less.”

**Supplementary question:**

There was no supplementary question.

**Question 10**

**Councillor Trevor to ask the cabinet member for safe city environment the following question:**

“The cold weather snap last year impacted on our city most heavily in February and March, rather than the more traditional winter months. Given the rise in homelessness since 2010 can the cabinet member for safe city environment confirm that the council is prepared with its Severe Weather and Emergency Provision (SWEPE) arrangements to meet the challenges which any cold weather snap can pose?”

**Councillor Maguire, cabinet member for safe city environment's response:**

“To be clear, nobody in Norwich should be homeless, let alone sleeping out when temperatures drop to zero and below. It is a disgrace that in the 21st century we live in a society where thanks to supercharged austerity since 2010 we now see rocketing homelessness and rough sleeping reminiscent of the worst days of the 1980s Thatcher government period. In responding to homelessness and rough sleeping, Norwich City Council officers have made arrangements in the event of cold weather snaps occurring at unexpected times.

The Severe Weather and Emergency Provision (SWEP) arrangements are in place and have been activated on two separate episodes in January 2019 offering warm accommodation to known rough sleepers and anyone at risk of sleeping out.

Currently there are arrangements for 18 spaces (including gender and age appropriate places), which are coordinated by the Housing Options team here at the council.

In addition to the above, council's officers are working to enable community groups in Norwich to develop a winter night shelter provision. This is currently based on two different locations offering safe and warm for 20 individuals over five nights.

Volunteers who have received appropriate training and receive informal support and supervision by peers and practitioners lead the provision, which is not dependent on the weather.

Access to the winter night provision is through referrals from Pathways Service with council officers providing support and monitoring.

In addition, the Pathways Service has access to nine spaces of emergency accommodation for those that are new to the streets or present with high needs.

As well providing individuals with accommodation, the facility enables the service to assess individuals prior to moving them into appropriate and long-term accommodation.

This all winter provision is still developing and it is hoped further groups and facilities will come on board to widen availability.

This new service is part of the changes introduced by this administration during 2018-19 to support the increased number of individuals sleeping rough in our city created due to the impacts of the Government's austerity programme. The city is already starting to see positive results from the introduction of the Pathways Service, which was commissioned by the council.

More needs to be done but I would like to recognise the excellent work that has been undertaken by our partners so far and thank all those involved."

**Supplementary question:**

Councillor Trevor had sent apologies for the meeting so there was no supplementary question.

**Question 11**

**Councillor Malik to ask the leader of the council the following question:**

"The closure of the Heatrae Sadia factory in Norwich, announced earlier this month, is a bitter blow to workers, their families and our city. This factory had enjoyed nearly 100 years successful trading in Norwich and the proposed closure will once again damage our crucial manufacturing base. Can the leader comment on his efforts to work with employers and unions to see what opportunities might exist to keep this important asset in the city?"

**Councillor Waters, the leader's response:**

"Heatrae Sadia is currently engaged in a consultation process with their workforce with regard to a possible relocation of the Norwich plant into their larger site in Preston. This consultation is ongoing and to date closure of the Norwich factory has not been formally confirmed and no redundancy notices

have been issued to Norwich workers at the site. I am in contact with the UNITE Regional official directly dealing with the Heatrae Sadia factory and we share the view that everything should be done to help the factory expand on the Norwich site and not move to Preston.

Heatrae Sadia have been an active and valued part of Norwich's Advanced Manufacturing sector and the news of a potential closure of the Norwich site is extremely saddening, whilst nothing has yet been confirmed thoughts are with workers and families who must be finding the uncertainty extremely stressful and worrying. We are in regular contact with the company at the moment and with the Jobcentre, local manufacturing sector groups, New Anglia LEP and other partners we are ready to support the workers and the business through this difficult time whatever the outcome of the consultation.

Obviously our preferred option would be to retain the Heatrae Sadia business here in Norwich but, in the event that we are unable to do this; the local manufacturing sector has a buoyant job market with several local businesses that would see the transferable skills and knowledge of Heatrae Sadia's workforce as a valuable asset to their own businesses. Other workers may wish to access re-training or business start-up support in order to explore self-employment or work in alternative sectors.

In any eventuality we stand ready with our partners to offer a comprehensive package of support."

**Supplementary question:**

There was no supplementary question.

LORD MAYOR