



Council

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

Tuesday, 23 January 2018

19:30

Agenda

Page nos

1 Lord Mayor's announcements

2 Declarations of interest

(Please note that it is the responsibility of individual
members to declare an interest prior to the item if they arrive
late for the meeting)

3 Questions from the public

Please note that all questions must be received by the
committee officer detailed on the front of the agenda by
10am Thursday 18 January 2018.

For guidance on submitting questions please see appendix 1
of the council's constitution.

4 Petitions

Please note petitions must be received by the committee
officer detailed on the front of the agenda by **10am Monday
22 January 2018.**

For guidance on submitting petitions please see appendix 1
of the council's constitution.

5 Minutes **11 - 48**
Purpose: To approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 28 November 2017.

6 Questions to cabinet members / committee chairs

(A printed copy of the questions and replies will be available at the meeting)

7 Treasury Management mid-year Report 2017-18 **49 - 64**
Purpose: This report sets out the Treasury Management performance for the first six months of the financial year to 30 September 2017. This is in accordance with the requirements of the Prudential Code. It also contains proposals to change aspects of the 2017/18 Treasury Management Strategy.

8 Motion - International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance definition of antisemitism

Proposer Councillor Wright

Seconder Councillor Ackroyd

Many people are rightly alarmed by the rise in anti-Semitism in recent years across the UK. This includes incidents when criticism of Israel has been expressed using anti-Semitic tropes. Criticism of Israel can be legitimate, but not if it employs the tropes and imagery of anti-Semitism.

On 11 December 2016 the UK Government announced that it will sign up to the internationally recognised International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA) guidelines on anti-Semitism which define anti-Semitism.

Council **RESOLVES** to:-

1. Ask cabinet to alter the Equality Information Report to make it explicit that the council has adopted the following definition of anti-Semitism in its entirety:

Antisemitism is a certain perception of Jews, which may be expressed as hatred toward Jews. Rhetorical and physical manifestations of antisemitism are directed toward Jewish or non-Jewish individuals and/or their property, toward Jewish community institutions and religious facilities.

To guide IHRA in its work, the following examples may serve as illustrations:

Anti-Semitic acts are criminal when they are so defined by law (for example, denial of the Holocaust or distribution of anti-Semitic materials in some countries).

Criminal acts are anti-Semitic when the targets of attacks, whether they are people or property – such as buildings, schools, places of worship and cemeteries – are selected because they are, or are perceived to be, Jewish or linked to Jews.

Anti-Semitic discrimination is the denial to Jews of opportunities or services available to others and is illegal in many countries.

- Manifestations might include the targeting of the state of Israel, conceived as a Jewish collectively. However, criticism of Israel similar to that levelled against any other country cannot be regarded anti-Semitic. Anti-Semitism frequently charges Jews with conspiring to harm humanity, and it is often used to blame Jews for “why things go wrong.” It is expressed in speech, writing, visual forms and action, and employs sinister stereotypes and negative character traits.
- Contemporary examples of anti-Semitism in public life, the media, schools, the workplace, and in the

religious sphere could, taking into account the overall context, include, but are not limited to:

- Calling for, aiding, or justifying the killing or harming of Jews in the name of a radical ideology or an extremist view of religion.
- Making mendacious, dehumanising, demonising, or stereotypical allegations about Jews as such or the power of Jews as collective — such as, especially but not exclusively, the myth about a world Jewish conspiracy or of Jews controlling the media, economy, government or other societal institutions.
- Accusing Jews as a people of being responsible for real or imagined wrongdoing committed by a single Jewish person or group, or even for acts committed by non-Jews.
- Denying the fact, scope, mechanisms (e.g. gas chambers) or intentionality of the genocide of the Jewish people at the hands of National Socialist Germany and its supporters and accomplices during World War II (the Holocaust).
- Accusing the Jews as a people, or Israel as a state, of inventing or exaggerating the Holocaust.
- Accusing Jewish citizens of being more loyal to Israel, or to the alleged priorities of Jews worldwide, than to the interests of their own nations.
- Denying the Jewish people their right to self-determination, e.g., by claiming that the existence of a State of Israel is a racist endeavour.
- Applying double standards by requiring of it behaviour

not expected or demanded of any other democratic nation.

- Using the symbols and images associated with classic antisemitism (e.g., claims of Jews killing Jesus or blood libel) to characterise Israel or Israelis.
- Drawing comparisons of contemporary Israeli policy to that of the Nazis.
- Holding Jews collectively responsible for actions of the state of Israel.

2. condemn all forms of racism, islamophobia, homophobia and sexism and commit to continue fighting against them.

9 Motion – Care leavers council tax exemption

Proposer Councillor Wright

Seconder Councillor Ackroyd

A 2016 report by The Children's Society found that when care leavers move into independent accommodation they begin to manage their own budget fully for the first time. The report showed that care leavers can find this extremely challenging and with no family to support them and insufficient financial education, are falling into debt and financial difficulty.

Research from The Centre for Social Justice found that 57% of young people leaving care have difficulty managing their

money and avoiding debt.

The local authority has statutory corporate parenting responsibilities towards young people who have left care up until the age of 25.

Council RESOLVES to

1. note that The Children and Social Work Act 2017 places corporate parenting responsibilities on district councils for the first time, requiring them to have regard to children in care and care leavers when carrying out their functions.
2. include in the next consultation for the 2019/20 council tax reduction scheme a provision for the scheme to include a reduction to zero council tax payable by care leavers up to the age of 25 regardless of income
3. write to the county council's Leader and Director of Children's Services to urge them to use their convening powers and expertise in corporate parenting to work with all council tax collecting authorities within the county area to exempt all care leavers in the county from council tax up to the age of 25, sharing any arising costs proportionately.

10 Motion - The 'gig economy' in Norwich

Proposer: Councillor Waters

Seconder: Councillor Davis

Nationally, according to the TUC, 3.2 million people now face insecure work which has risen by 27% over the last 5 years (this work includes those in zero-hour contracts, in agency and other insecure temporary work, and in low-paid self-employment). In recent years there has been an increasing

development of the 'gig economy' in Norwich - a relatively new and expanding industry characterised by the prevalence of short-term contracts or freelance work as opposed to permanent jobs.

Council RESOLVES to:-

(1) Note with concern

- a) the woefully inadequate rates of pay which leave some people financially worse off than had they been unemployed;
- b) the poor treatment of workers who require time off to see to a family emergency, recover from sickness, or mourn a deceased relative
- c) the 'grey area' of self-employment in which many of the flexibilities and commonly accepted practices that are associated with this way of working is totally absent
- d) The confusing and changeable ways in which monthly earnings are calculated; and the ever-present threat of losing work and with it one's sole source of income, with no notice and no right of appeal.

(2) ask the cabinet to commission research into the changing nature of work in Norwich with a view to using the findings to promote good employment practices across the city

(3) ask the Leader of the Council and the cabinet member for resources to write to The Secretary of State for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy asking him to:

- a) Ban zero hours contracts so that every worker gets a guaranteed number of hours each week.
- b) Give all workers equal rights from day one, whether part-time or full-time, temporary or permanent – so that

working conditions are not driven down.

- c) Shift the burden of proof so that the law assumes a worker is an employee unless the employer can prove otherwise.
- d) Levy punitive fines on employers not meeting their responsibilities, helping to deter poor practice.
- e) Involve trade unions in enforcement and set up a Ministry of Labour with the resources to enforce all workers' rights.
- f) Ban payroll companies, sometimes known as 'umbrella companies', which create a false structure to limit employers' tax liabilities and limit workers' rights.
- g) Give employment agencies and end-users joint responsibility for ensuring that the rights of agency workers are enforced.
- h) Roll out sectoral collective bargaining and strengthening trade union rights, because empowering people to claim their own rights in the workplace is the most effective means of enforcement and ensuring that workers have greater job security and adequate levels of pay to enjoy a decent quality of life.

(4) Ask the leader of the council to write to the two Norwich MPs to support resolution (3)



Anton Bull
Director of business services

For further information please contact:

Lucy Palmer, democratic team leader
t: (01603) 212416
e: lucypalmer@norwich.gov.uk

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

Date of publication: **Monday, 15 January 2018**

Information for members of the public

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

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



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



MINUTES

Council

19:30 to 22:05

28 November 2017

Present: Councillors Fullman (Lord Mayor), Ackroyd, Bögelein, Bradford, Brociek-Coulton, Button, Carlo, Coleshill, Davis, Driver, Grahame, Harris, Haynes, Herries, Jackson, Jones(B), Jones(T), Kendrick, Lubbock, Maguire, Malik, Maxwell, Packer, Peek, Price, Raby, Sands (M), Sands (S), Schmierer, Stonard, Waters, Woollard and Wright

Apologies: Mr David Walker (Sheriff); and, Councillors Bremner, Henderson, Manning, Ryan, Thomas(Va) and Thomas (Vi)

1. Lord Mayor's Announcements

The Lord Mayor announced that he had attended a number of events and had hosted an event in the parlour to observe Transgender Day of Remembrance, to honour the memory of transgender people who have lost their lives to acts of violence against them. This was part of Transgender Awareness Week to raise awareness of the issues faced by transgender people. It was important that transgender people were not marginalised in our city.

On behalf of Brenda Ferris, Chair, and the trustees of the Saint Michael and All Angels Ruin Trust, Councillor Button presented the council with "The Bowthorpe Book" which had been written and donated to the council by Rebecca Domek and David Blake, for the people of Bowthorpe to celebrate 40 years of Bowthorpe as a "modern community, 1977-2017."

Councillor Sands (M) said that the Armed Forces Covenant had awarded the council the Silver Award under its Employee Recognition Scheme. The scheme sought to assist service personnel, some of whom had been injured during service, and bereaved families of service personnel. The city council had received the award because it was an employer that demonstrated its support to tackle service personnel issues, and actively communicated its status as an Armed Forces friendly organisation. The certificate would be placed in the display cabinet on the first floor.

2. Declarations of interest

There were no declarations of interest.

3. Questions from the public

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

Question 1 – Energy efficiency in council flats

Ms Sue Carpenter to the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing:

“The council has put a lot of resource into helping people reduce their energy bills by switching supplier. However, much more could be done to reduce bills by reducing waste, and especially waste in blocks of flats where open windows and doors in stairwells drain heat from every flat, not just those whose occupants want the windows and doors open.

Will the council undertake an education campaign explaining this issue (the walls between the flats and stairwell not being cavity), reminding people to close doors and windows in communal areas when the temperature drops below a certain temperature (e.g. 15 degrees Centigrade), and include this responsibility in tenants’ agreements?”

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

“I would like to thank Sue for her question.

The council has put considerable resources into helping council tenants reduce their energy bills by installing double glazing, solar PV panels, more energy efficient hot water and heating systems and through insulation as well as by providing opportunities to switch suppliers through the council’s switch and save initiative.

More recently the council completed its first new council housing to Passivhaus house standard.

All of these measures are effective in reducing fuel poverty and show the commitment the council is making to reducing fuel poverty

I am aware a number of officers from the housing service and environmental strategy have discussed Ms Carpenter’s concerns including visiting the flats concerned. As well as providing Ms Carpenter with advice and tips to reduce heat loss from her flat, the officers also looked at her concerns about open windows in communal areas. The view of the officers concerned was that as the walls concerned are external walls, very little heat would be lost by these areas being ventilated over the winter.

I would also like to suggest that good ventilation is equally important in communal areas, so whilst I welcome Ms Carpenter’s comments and suggestions, I would not wish to make the closing of windows a condition of the tenancy agreement for a variety of reasons, not least because it would be unenforceable.

There may always be more that could be undertaken by the council but also by tenants themselves as we all have a role to play to be more energy efficient which helps the council and the city, reduce its carbon footprint.

I will discuss with the head of housing and the environmental strategy manager, whether an article might be included in the tenants' and leaseholders' community magazine on reducing fuel costs as well as guidance on the management of communal areas."

By way of a supplementary question, Ms Carpenter asked whether the cabinet member considered that it was good use of public tax payers' money to have a council officer come out to her home to tell her to put silver foil behind her radiator to avoid loss of heat through the walls, and knock on doors to ask people to consider changing energy supplier. Councillor Harris said that she had every faith that the time that the officer had spent with Ms Carpenter discussing options had been worthwhile. It was Ms Carpenter's choice whether she wanted to follow the advice given by the officer.

Question 2 – Universal Credit

Mr Ben Hardie to ask the cabinet member for social inclusion:

"The government's failing Universal Credit programme is plunging millions of people into poverty, leaving them unable to pay rent or put dinner on the table, and facing debt and eviction as a result. Nationally the Labour Party has argued that the British public deserves better than this and demanded that the Tories urgently pause and fix Universal Credit now. Given the disasters of Universal Credit in Great Yarmouth last year, can the cabinet member for social inclusion comment on the ongoing steps this council is taking to better meet the challenges of universal credit when it goes fully live in Norwich next June?"

Councillor Davis the cabinet member for social inclusion's response:

"The city council has been aware for a number of months of the expected date for the implementation of the 'full' service of Universal Credit (UC) here in Norwich, and both internally and externally are working to put systems in place that ease people's transition into this new benefit. The recent announcements about changes to the system and that the implementation in Norwich has been postponed to October 2018 shows that this is a changing environment. However, we shall continue to plan as best we can with the information available.

This builds on the approach that the council has been taking to UC since before the commencement of the existing 'live' service in December 2015. Whilst UC is administered by the Department of Works and Pensions (DWP), as there are potential negative impacts on our residents, particularly the most vulnerable, as a local authority and landlord we have a role to play in smoothing the transition and are doing so in the following ways:

Universal Credit Full Service

UC brings together into a single benefit, 6 currently separate benefits to make a single payment directly into the claimant's bank account, monthly in arrears. Claims will only be dealt with online, claimants must have a bank account and claimants will have to prove to the jobcentre that they are adhering to their terms of their individual 'claimant commitment'.

Although some people who would have previously claimed Jobseekers' Allowance are already claiming UC in Norwich, from October 2018 the scope will increase considerably. So where working age people would previously have claimed Housing Benefit (which is currently administered by the city council), their housing costs will form part of a UC claim, as will elements that take over from working and child Tax Credits, Employment Support Allowance, Job Seekers Allowance and Income Support.

Digital Inclusion

A major and fundamental change to affect claimants will be the requirement to make and administer your claim online and the city council recognised early on that this requirement was going to need significant planning both to ensure that technology was available for people who would need it but also that people would have the skills needed to adequately address the maintenance of a claim for Universal Credit.

We therefore implemented a Digital Inclusion strategy encompassing both the city council's own staff as well as local volunteers through Voluntary Norfolk. The main aim being to 'upskill' individuals to provide support to people who need to use the technology to manage their claim. We have also set up digital hubs throughout the city to provide support and assistance to residents.

Enhanced digital skills will not only assist those people on Universal Credit but can help people avoid the worst excesses of the 'poverty premium' by being able to carry out all sorts of transactions online where they wish to.

Budgeting

Another change with Universal Credit is that claims are paid a month in arrears, requiring effective budgeting skills. To support this, the council have a dedicated team that can support tenants to budget and manage their money effectively, which particularly targets UC claimants. Tenancy Awareness courses are part of this and are regularly run for people on the council's housing waiting list.

We also commission wider money, advice and financial capability support for residents from a consortium of VCSE sector advice providers in the city.

Rent

The city council is the single largest landlord in the city and it is therefore important that rent arrears are monitored and addressed at the earliest opportunity. This is of course important to all landlords (social and private) and we are regularly in touch with others to look at ideas from other areas that can aid landlords in helping their tenants with any difficulties that arise.

External Partners

As you can see from the above, the council is being highly proactive in attempting to cover as many different aspects of this rollout as possible but we could not do this alone and we are constantly working with partners around the city to smooth out this introduction in the city. These partners are as wide and diverse as banks, government departments, voluntary sector and the county council.

New Initiatives

The city council is currently rolling out a new web platform through its website that can help people access advice and information on benefits and claiming, looking for work, advice on debt and budgeting. It is called Betteroff Norwich and can be accessed through the city council's website at www.norwich.gov.uk/Betteroff

We have shared this with key partners and members of the public are able to access at any time to give clear advice.

We will continue to monitor the issues and challenges that come with the development of UC, attempt to mitigate those issues that we can, support residents as appropriate, and liaise with DWP to let them know about issues so that they can resolve these."

Mr Hardie confirmed that he had did not have a supplementary question.

Question 3 – Air quality

Ms Jenn Parkhouse to ask the cabinet member for safe city environment:

"There is ever-growing concern at national level of air pollution causing an increased number of premature deaths; the most recent figure stands at 50,000. How successful has Norwich City been with the Local Air Quality Management Action Plan of August 2015, in response to Environmental Act 1995 Part IV?"

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

"Thank you for asking your question on this important topic. As you rightly record, Norwich City Council issued an air quality action plan in November 2015: it sets out measures to reduce nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) levels in the central air quality management area. The aim is to work towards achieving the air quality objectives by managing traffic flows as well as promoting

cycling, walking and bus use. The aim is also to reduce the number of more polluting buses and replace them with Euro 5 or better as part of the Planning regime and the Local Transport Plan as well as working closely with key stakeholders such as bus and taxi companies, county council, public health, and other Local Authorities. A key element in reducing nitrogen dioxide levels is the improvement of vehicle emissions.

Where land is to be developed, the council aims to ensure risks to land, controlled waters, property, and ecological systems from any form of contamination are minimised. In doing so, the aim is to ensure that development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

The council aims to work with local businesses to drive down emissions to atmosphere under the Pollution Prevention and Control (PPC) regime and ensure compliance with permit conditions through an educational and hand holding approach as well as a polluter pays policy. The council ensures that all newly identified businesses are permitted in accordance with regulations where required.

Air quality is reported on an annual basis, incorporating the data for a full calendar year. The report for the most recent full year, i.e. Jan-Dec 2016 which is not yet published and therefore it is not possible to give an updated view at this time. The draft report is currently with DeFRA for consultation and is unlikely to be published until the new year. However, key points that will be reported in that statement are:

Results 2015-17 (to be reported in the Environmental Statement)

- Reductions in pollution levels in parts of the air quality management area such as St Stephens, Castle Meadow, Cattlemarket St, King St, & Chapelfield North.
- Infrastructure changes to address traffic congestion areas.
- Removal of extraneous city centre traffic as part of Transport for Norwich
- Continued the successful remediation of many contaminated sites through the planning regime.
- Achieving compliance with PPC permit conditions.

In summary, the council has developed a comprehensive strategy and has taken, as it always does, a sustainable and measured set of steps to improve air quality. The steps are already beginning to bear fruit and, because the approach is a sustainable one, will reap greater benefit in the future. To answer your question, we are progressing and we will succeed."

By way of a supplementary question, Ms Parkhouse said that she was glad about the reduction in emissions but that if the council was serious about tackling air pollution it should consider a zero emission zone, like Oxford County Council's proposal to introduce a zero emission zone in Oxford's city centre by 2020 and extend this city wide by 2035, so that its entirely free of non-electric vehicles. Councillor Maguire thanked Ms Parkhouse for her question, and pointed out that by

2035 there would be all sorts of options available and that it was necessary to ensure that policies were sustainable and based on evidence.

4. Petitions

No petitions were received.

5. Minutes

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 26 September 2017.

6. Questions to Cabinet Members and Committee Chairs

The Lord Mayor said that 18 questions had been received from members of the council to cabinet members for which notice had been given in accordance with the provisions of appendix 1 of the council's constitution.

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| Question 1 | Councillor Lubbock to the cabinet member for health and wellbeing on tree felling at Eaton Park. |
| Question 2 | Councillor Woollard to the cabinet member for social inclusion on tackling food poverty. |
| Question 3 | Councillor Maxwell to the cabinet member for safe city environment on tackling rough sleeping. |
| Question 4 | Councillor Peek to the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing on progress on the Gold Street development. |
| Question 5 | Councillor Driver to the cabinet member for social inclusion on the Switch and Save Scheme. |
| Question 6 | Councillor Malik to the cabinet member for safe city environment on the carbon reduction target and the environmental strategy. |
| Question 7 | Councillor Sands (M) to the leader of the council on 2040 Norwich City Vision consultation. |
| Question 8 | Councillor Thomas (Vi) to the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing on work and support for people experiencing domestic abuse. |
| Question 9 | Councillor Brociek-Coulton to the cabinet member for social inclusion on the Cosy City initiative and the provision of Winter Wellbeing packs to constituents in need. |

- Question 10** Councillor Ackroyd to the cabinet member for health and wellbeing on raising awareness of the locations of defibrillators in the city centre.
- Question 11** Councillor Schmierer to the cabinet member for safe city environment regarding the antisocial behaviour related to the sale and drinking of strong alcohol in public spaces.
- Question 12** Councillor Jackson to the cabinet member for safe city environment about graffiti on residential premises.
- Question 13** Councillor Raby to the chair of licensing committee regarding the need to update the council's Gambling Statement.
- Question 14** Councillor Carlo to the leader of the council on addressing climate change and reducing transport emissions in the Greater Norwich area.
- Question 15** Councillor Bögelein to ask the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth on access to the planning application system.
- Question 16** Councillor Price to ask the cabinet member for safe city environment about air quality and the publication of the council's report DeFRA.
- Question 17** Councillor Jones (T) to the leader of the council on the arrangements for the Future of Norwich conference.
- Question 18** Councillor Grahame to the cabinet member for resources regarding council investment in commercial property.

(Details of the questions and responses and any supplementary questions and responses are attached as Appendix A to these minutes.)

7. Local Government Boundary Review

(A written statement by the Green Group was circulated at the meeting, and with the Lord Mayor's agreement is appended to these minutes at Appendix B.)

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

RESOLVED, with 24 members voting in favour and 9 members against, to retain the current electoral arrangements for Norwich City Council with 39 city councillors representing 13 wards and election by thirds.

8. Municipal Bonds Agency Borrowing Framework

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

RESOLVED, with 24 members voting in favour and 9 members against, to approve the council's entry into the UK Municipal Bonds Agency (UK MBA) framework agreement and its accompanying schedules, including the joint and several guarantee.

9. Treasury Management Full Year Review Report 2016-17

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

RESOLVED, unanimously, to:

- (1) approve the actual 2016-17 prudential and treasury indications as set out in the report;
- (2) note the Annual Treasury Report for the year ended 31 March 2017.

10. Adjustment to the 2017-18 Non-Housing Capital Programme

(A revised version of the report was circulated at the meeting and had been published on the council's website in advance of the meeting. The revised report had been amended to include a second recommendation.)

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

RESOLVED, with 25 members voting in favour, 0 members voting against and 8 members abstaining from voting, to:

- (1) increase the asset investment for income budget by £15m, and as a result of recent asset acquisition opportunities, to further increase this budget at the recommendation of officers and with the approval of the leader and portfolio holder by £10m, giving an increase of £25m; and,
- (2) increase the New Build – Three Score Phase 2 budget by £1.6m.

11. Review of Corporate Code of Governance

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

RESOLVED, unanimously, to adopt the revised Code of Corporate Governance (as appended to the report) and amend the council's constitution accordingly.

12. Motion – Britvic Manufacturing Plant Norwich

Councillor Waters moved and Councillor Stonard seconded the motion as set out on the agenda, and following debate it was:

RESOLVED, unanimously, that:

Britvic and Unilever employ hundreds of people from Norwich and across Norfolk. They are a crucial part of the city and county's manufacturing base and economy. Robinsons, one of Britvic's brands, has been based in Norwich for more than 90 years, while Unilever produces arguably Norwich and Norfolk's most iconic brand, Colman's Mustard, made in the city for more than 200 years.

Council therefore resolves to ask the cabinet to:

- (1) support the campaign, including that led by the Evening News and Eastern Daily Press to save Britvic;
- (2) work with the management of Britvic and Unilever, trade unions, LEP, Norfolk County Council, Members of Parliament in Norwich and the wider business community to seek the continuing operation of this much valued and important business.

13. Motion – Council Housing

The Lord Mayor announced that notice had been received in advance of an amendment to the motion from Councillor Wright, on behalf of the Liberal Democrat group, which had been circulated at the meeting, as follows:

“To add a new clause 2 to read:

“Ask Councillor Waters, as vice-chair of the Norfolk Pension Fund committee, to make representations on behalf of this council calling for the fund to make direct investment in house building programmes in Norwich, such as those already undertaken by this council, in order to not only generate a positive return for the fund, but also mitigate against the lack of vision from this Conservative government in delivering the housing that is so desperately needed in this city.””

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

Councillor Harris moved and Councillor Davis seconded the motion as set out on the agenda and as amended above.

Following debate, it was:

RESOLVED, unanimously, that:

The government recently announced a policy which they claimed would deliver more council housing, the centrepiece proposal being £2 billion to build affordable homes.

This means the government has cut affordable housing building investment, from over £3.5 billion in the last year of the previous Labour government, to around £1.8 billion a year over the next five years. According to government figures, this extra money only delivers 5,000 homes a year which is nothing compared to the 1.8 million households on council waiting lists and the 100,000 who remain on lists for council and social housing for the last five years.

Council therefore resolves to:

- (1) ask the leader of the council to write to the Prime Minister to request:
 - (a) Giving councils the fair funding to deliver not just a large-scale house building programme, but also the range of vital services communities rely on. Councils have seen their budgets cut by 40 per cent in just the first five years of this decade.
 - (b) Ditching the ban on long-term council tenancies to give council tenants security in their home,
 - (c) Drop legislation to force the sale of council homes through their high value levy.
 - (d) Clarify the law to make sure that councils can offer homes to local people first without facing challenge in the courts.
 - (e) Lift the Housing Revenue Account borrowing cap.
 - (f) Suspend right-to-buy, allowing councils to reinstate it only if they can prove a plan to replace homes sold one-for-one and like-for-like.
 - (g) Scrap the punitive bedroom tax, which indiscriminately punishes social tenants for not downsizing even when there are no smaller properties available to move to.
 - (h) Recycle housing benefit savings from the affordable housing programme into helping tackle the causes of the housing crisis, rather than relying on higher housing benefit spending to deal with its effects.
 - (i) Build new homes for 'living rent' over the Parliament, with rents capped at a third of local incomes to give private renters the breathing room to save for a deposit on a first home.
 - (j) Build 100 000 new affordable homes to rent and buy a year by the end of the parliament including at least 100,000 FirstBuy Homes

where mortgage costs do not exceed a third of average local incomes.

- (k) Restore funding for the Decent Homes programme to help bring more council and housing association homes up to a decent standard.
- (2) ask Councillor Waters, as vice chair of the Norfolk Pension Fund committee, to make representation on behalf of this council to explore the opportunities for Norfolk Pension Fund investment in housing in the city.

14. Motion – Prioritising Public Transport

The Lord Mayor said that notice had been received in advance of an amendment from Councillor Stonard and circulated at the meeting. Councillor Carlo had indicated that she was not willing to accept the amendment. It would therefore be dealt with in the usual way after the substantive motion had been moved and seconded.

Councillor Carlo moved and Councillor Grahame seconded the motion as set out on the agenda.

Councillor Stonard moved and Councillor Davis seconded the following amendment to the motion:

“To:

- (1) insert the word “Conservative” before “county councillors” in the second paragraph of the introductory text;
- (2) under resolution (1) delete the word “highest” before “priority” and insert “and continue to further improve walking and cycling routes in Norwich.”
- (3) under resolution (2) delete “Oppose the” and insert “consider all the implications of, including the ability to oppose if necessary” and add the following text:

until:

- (a) A suitable route being agreed with any environmental concerns being satisfactorily mitigated or dealt with.
- (b) Agreement on any other consequential changes required to the road system being agreed and implemented or programmed and funded as part of the Western Link scheme.
- (c) Equal priority being given to public transport spending as to road improvements.

- (d) Funding being secured and in place before the final go ahead.
 - (e) A satisfactory business case to show there is real merit in the western link in the same way the JCS supported the NDR.
 - (f) A robust project and financial management regime that could give Norwich residents and the wider county the Western Link, if agreed, on time and on budget with no major unfunded overspends like on the NDR.
- (4) under resolution (3) delete “before any further local spending on new roads”

On being put to the vote, with 24 members voting in favour and 9 members voting against, the amendment was carried and became part of the substantive motion.

During debate, Councillor Carlo indicated that she would like to withdraw the motion and had the agreement of the seconder, Councillor Grahame. On being put to the meeting, with 9 members voting in favour and 20 members voting against with several members abstaining from voting, the procedural motion was lost.

Following further debate, it was:

RESOLVED, with 24 members voting in favour and 9 members abstaining from voting, that:

Public transport has a vital role in enabling Norwich residents – especially the 33 per cent of households without a car – to access employment and services. The Joint Core Strategy (JCS) Implementation Framework (2014) programmed delivery of Bus Rapid Transit for the Norwich area in three phases, as a key part of the sustainable transport plans to accompany the NDR. The first phase should now be complete, but the timetable has slipped and it is unclear how future phases will be funded.

Meanwhile, last month, Conservative county councillors voted to cut bus subsidies and spend £1 million on investigating extending the NDR across the Wensum valley.

Council therefore resolves to:

- (1) Acknowledge that in order to achieve sustainable development for Norwich, it is essential to give priority to delivering Bus Rapid Transit, Core Bus Routes and continue to further improve walking and cycling routes in Norwich.
- (2) Consider all the implications of, including the ability to oppose if necessary, the spending of any further public money on investigating an extension of the Northern Distributor Road (NDR) across the Wensum River Valley until:

- (i) A suitable route being agreed with any environmental concerns being satisfactorily mitigated or dealt with;
 - (ii) Agreement on any other consequential changes required to the road system being agreed and implemented or programmed and funded as part of the Western Link scheme;
 - (iii) Equal priority being given to public transport spending as to road improvements;
 - (iv) Funding being secured and in place before the final go ahead;
 - (v) A satisfactory business case to show there is real merit in the western link in the same way the JCS supported the NDR;
 - (vi) A robust project and financial management regime that could give Norwich residents and the wider county the Western Link, if agreed, on time and on budget with no major unfunded overspends like on the NDR;
- (3) actively seek, through its representation on the Greater Norwich Development Partnership, a policy commitment in the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan that the Bus Rapid Transit and Core Bus Routes will be delivered.
 - (4) ask the leader of the council to write to the Greater Norwich Growth Board, Norfolk County Council and New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) informing them of the above resolutions.

(Two hours having passed since the start of the meeting the Lord Mayor invited members to consider any unopposed business. Item 15, below, was taken as unopposed business.)

15. Fixed Odds Betting Terminals

An amendment to the motion as set out on the agenda had been received from Councillor Maguire which had been circulated, as follows:

“To:

- (1) insert a new resolution to:

“Note and castigate this government’s timid and tentative approach to such an important issue affecting many members of society”.
- (2) amend the resolution to “respond to the government’s consultation...” by reformatting the response and inserting the following text at the end:
 - (d) Request the government provides:

- (i) new planning powers to place betting shops in a separate use class so that councils can use planning powers to control the number opening in their area;
- (ii) extend licensing powers to give councils the power to revoke or reduce existing licenses for FOBTs;
- (iii) better mitigate harm caused by these machines by increasing the time between plays, requiring pop-ups and breaks in play;
- (iv) enforce data collection to ensure that gambling operators are required to collect data on machine use;
- (v) ensure correct staff training and security by providing all employees with adequate training and stop single staffing;
- (vi) require customers to top up FOBTs over the counter giving staff the opportunity to interact with people and intervene if they are playing for a long time and losing too much money;
- (vii) insert pop-ups on screens to appear to warn players who have been playing for longer than the average amount of time;
- (viii) impose a limit on what can be staked without registering with the shop so that if a player wants to stake more than a set limit on a FOBT they must be registered with the shop and use a loyalty card. The limits will be set on the basis of research data."

Councillor Ackroyd had indicated that she was willing to accept the amendment, and as no other member objected, the amendment became part of the substantive motion.

RESOLVED, unopposed, that:

Following a recent decision of the council's licensing committee, concern has been raised about the proliferation of gambling premises on our high streets and the harm they pose to people vulnerable to problem gambling.

There is currently a government consultation underway entitled 'Consultation on proposals for changes to Gaming Machines and Social Responsibility Measures' for which this council should supply a response.

Council therefore resolves to:

- (1) note and castigate this government's timid and tentative approach to such an important issue affecting many members of society;
- (2) respond to the government's consultation:

- (a) expressing a call for the current £100 maximum FOBT stake to be brought in line with maximum stakes for other gaming machines allowed elsewhere on high streets (£2) and in casinos (£5);
- (b) calling for cumulative impact tests to be introduced to enable councils to reject applications for new betting shops where there are already existing clusters of shops;
- (c) for licensing law to be updated to allow councils to take health issues associated with problem gambling and anti- social behaviour concerns into account when considering applications;
- (d) request the government provides:
 - (i) new planning powers to place betting shops in a separate use class so that councils can use planning powers to control the number opening in their area;
 - (ii) extend licensing powers to give councils the power to revoke or reduce existing licenses for FOBTs;
 - (iii) better mitigate harm caused by these machines by increasing the time between plays, requiring pop-ups and breaks in play;
 - (iv) enforce data collection to ensure that gambling operators are required to collect data on machine use;
 - (v) ensure correct staff training and security by providing all employees with adequate training and stop single staffing;
 - (vi) require customers to top up FOBTs over the counter giving staff the opportunity to interact with people and intervene if they are playing for a long time and losing too much money;
 - (vii) insert pop-ups on screens to appear to warn players who have been playing for longer than the average amount of time;
 - (viii) impose a limit on what can be staked without registering with the shop so that if a player wants to stake more than a set limit on a FOBT they must be registered with the shop and use a loyalty card. The limits will be set on the basis of research data.
- (3) ask the leader and chief executive to write to our local MPs to reinforce our response and call for new powers so Norwich City Council can do more to help some of the most vulnerable people in our community.

LORD MAYOR

Questions to cabinet members / committee chairs

Question 1

Councillor Lubbock to the cabinet member for health and wellbeing:

“I have received numerous criticisms of the council following the felling of 15 mature Red Horse Chestnut Trees in Eaton Park which formed an important avenue leading up to the Rotunda.

Whilst I was informed ahead of time that these trees would be felled, I was not prepared for the visual impact their felling would have on the park and sympathise with those users of the park who contacted me.

I have therefore asked officers if in future the following process be followed in order to lessen the loss of so many mature trees in one go:

- Immediately following felling, the trunks are completely removed including stump grinding.
- Replace with appropriate trees of adequate size and protection to show planned succession as soon as possible.
- Give as much information to the public as possible on why the trees are being removed rather than ‘these trees have been inspected and recommended for removal’.
- Give consideration to the removal of a few trees each year over a few years, rather than 15 in one go, where this is possible.

Whilst I understand that the officers need to make judgements on whether trees are dangerous if diseased or at the end of their lives, consideration must be given to the impact such loss of so many mature trees all in one go has on Park users and the loss of confidence the public has in the council’s tree policies.

Can the cabinet member, please comment on the process given the above?”

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

“Can I thank Councillor Lubbock for my first question at council. The removal of any tree in the city can be very emotive and can have a definite impact on the local environment which is why a decision to remove a tree is not taken lightly. This will be if the tree is dead, dying or diseased or has health and safety implications. Councillor Lubbock makes a number of good points which I welcome the opportunity to respond to.

Stump grinding is carried out by a sub-contractor and work is accumulated as this is a more cost effective than having multiple visits. Where there is a delay between felling and carrying out the stump

grinding the stumps are left high so that they are clearly visible to avoid being a trip hazard. Stump grinding for the trees that were removed in Eaton Park, started on 23 November and was due for completion on 24 November enabling the trees to be replaced in the New Year.

A list of suitable replacement tree species which are known to grow well in Norwich, have wildlife benefits and reach a mature size and shape befitting an avenue in such a prestigious location, was provided to the Friends of Eaton Park. The Friends have selected walnut trees to be purchased for replanting.

The mature height of the walnut trees will be greater than the red chestnuts reaching 25 to 35m tall at maturity and they will live much longer than the chestnuts living for around 150 - 200 years.

The trees that will be planted will be approximately 3.0 to 3.5 m in height and a girth of 12-14cm at a metre above ground. This size strikes the best balance of:

- Having an immediate impact and thus being able to replace the avenue which I feel is important;
- Being robust enough to withstand vandalism but young enough to establish quickly;
- Whilst reducing the amount of 'transplant shock' a tree suffers when being moved and planted. Transplant shock can result in dieback and slow growth for a number of years. They require increased aftercare, increased water use and the need for multiple anchor points for each tree. The anchor points would create a hazard to park visitors, interfere with the yew hedge and be unsightly in the park.

The new trees will be protected by the wooden frames that are used for new tree planting across the city including Eaton Park. The guards will sit well in the formal landscape setting and have proven resistant to all but the most determined acts of vandalism.

In terms of notification, posters were placed on the trees; the portfolio holder and ward councillors were notified at the beginning of October, making them aware of the work.

The notice contained general information and the feedback may indicate the need for notices for trees to be removed which are in prominent locations or which are prominent in size, to contain more detailed information and this will be considered.

Discussions were had with the Friends of Eaton Park on the reasons for the tree removal and the tree teams' recommended approach, that the trees be removed in one go.

Whilst having a significant impact on the park, this bold approach to replacement was recommended as the best approach to reinstate the

avenue and so the trees grow evenly. Trees removed in different years would not, at least in the short term achieve this as quickly and the result would be an uneven age of trees and spacing.”

Councillor Lubbock thanked Councillor Packer for his response and explained that the purpose of her question was to express the strong feeling that people had about these trees and also the ones in Lakenham Road. The council's tree policy was out of date and needed to be updated. Councillor Packer referred to his recent appointment to the cabinet, and said that he understood that at no point during the consultation with the Friends of Eaton Park had any concerns been raised about the approach taken. He said that he had confidence in the council's policy which was to nurture trees wherever possible and to only remove trees that were very diseased or a risk to the public.

Question 2

Councillor Woollard to the cabinet member for social inclusion:

“I read with concern on the Wednesday, 8 November front page of the Evening News, regarding the fears that the foodbanks in Norwich would soon be empty due to ever increasing demand. Given this increasing problem can the cabinet member for social inclusion comment on the efforts this council is taking to tackle food poverty?”

Councillor Davis to the cabinet member for social inclusion's response:

“As per the report to cabinet on 13 September 2017, the council is working with a range of stakeholders around the complex issue of food poverty in the city. As was outlined in the report, the council has delivered a holiday hunger programme, increased take up of free school meals, and provides in kind support to a range of groups that tackle food issues through provision of allotments and storage space. Council officers are also using an enabling approach to support the diverse network of food poverty related agencies in the city to identify areas of potential collaboration to ensure that use of resource is optimised and the maximum number of residents helped. The council also works with colleagues in the health sector to support initiatives around food literacy such as the Healthy Norwich awareness-raising campaign about the risks of high sugar drinks.

However, as the scrutiny committee heard when it looked at the issue earlier this year, food poverty is also driven by a number of factors, including low income, benefits changes and sanctions. The council is therefore also focussed on addressing these in order to prevent individuals and households experiencing food poverty in the first place. This includes its commitment to the living wage, its continuation of 100% relief on council tax for the most vulnerable, provision and commissioning of advice on benefits, money and housing issues and provision of affordable housing. With the effects of full Universal Credit still to be experienced in the city, it is important that we retain an

approach that seeks to address these wider socio-economic issues that drive inequality in the city, rather than simply seeking to pick up the pieces when things have gone wrong.”

Councillor Woollard confirmed that she did not have a supplementary question.

Question 3

Councillor Maxwell to the cabinet member for safe city environment:

“According to the government statistics released earlier this year, the number of rough sleepers in the autumn of 2016 was up by 16 per cent on the same period in 2015. Rough sleeping has risen by 50 per cent in the last two years, and has more than doubled since 2010. Given these shocking figures can the cabinet member for social housing comment on the steps this council is taking to support homeless people in the city despite the appalling supported housing cuts implemented earlier this year?”

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

“We believe the most effective way to deal with homelessness and rough sleeping is to prevent it from happening and we place great emphasis on this approach through the provision of specialist housing advice and assistance to all those facing homelessness or in housing difficulty in the city.

As well as performing our statutory obligations regarding homelessness, we also recognise Norwich, as a City at the centre of a wide rural area, is a magnet for those facing homelessness or rough sleeping in the region and dedicate significant resources to assist anyone who finds themselves on the street. This includes the employment of a specialist rough-sleeper co-ordinator to provide intensive support and assistance to rough sleepers, provision of Severe Emergency Weather Provision (SWEP) for the sub-region, reconnection to home areas, and provision of outreach support through our partners at St Martins Housing Trust.

We are not complacent however and recognise the challenges ahead. The recent cuts to the supported housing budget by the county council have reduced the options available to us in order to help people to move on from rough-sleeping and we face the challenge of increasing numbers of rough sleepers with complex and multiple needs.

We have been carrying out considerable work with local agencies and statutory bodies following the recent cuts. As a result, we are currently developing options which will incorporate this mutual interest in joint working and funding to achieve an integrated approach to address rough-sleeping and tackling the complex needs that lead to it.”

Councillor Maxwell confirmed that she did not have a supplementary question.

Question 4

Councillor Peek to the deputy leader:

“I saw that the cabinet member for council housing recently had the pleasure of showing the Mayor of Ipswich and our Lord Mayor around the Goldsmith Street development. Can the cabinet member for social housing comment on progress towards completion on this site which will deliver badly needed new council housing?”

Councillor Harris, deputy leader’s response:

“I was delighted to be able to showcase the Goldsmith Street development of new Passivhaus homes to the Mayor of Ipswich and the Lord Mayor. The development is progressing well with the timber frame now erected for most of the units and brickwork also well underway. Good progress is also being made with the internal fit out and it was very good to see the inside of the various house types to get a feel for what we will be handing over to new tenants; who will hopefully be able to move in during Autumn 2018.

I am particularly pleased that that the council will be offering high quality and spacious homes that meet the highest standards currently available for thermal efficiency. This will drastically reduce fuel bills for our tenants as well as benefitting the environment.”

Councillor Peek confirmed that he did not have a supplementary question.

Question 5

Councillor Driver to the cabinet member for social inclusion:

“I noticed that the excellent Switch and Save scheme launched in the summer, recently finished. Can the cabinet social inclusion comment on the savings once again achieved through this initiative through this latest tranche?”

Councillor Davis cabinet member for social inclusion’s response:

“Thank you for highlighting this practical and popular scheme that has helped thousands of Norwich citizens to save money. Through the power of collective purchasing we work to secure the lowest energy prices for our registrants each winter, therefore helping to reduce the cost of energy and offset rising energy prices.

The fifteenth edition of the Norwich Big Switch and Save closed today. I’m delighted to report that switchers will save an average of £224 a year per household on dual fuel tariffs. Over the 15 tranches 22,000

people have registered for the Norwich Big Switch and Save. If all homes took up the offered savings a total of at least £5 million would be saved on energy bills.

I'm very pleased to announce that the next tranche of the Big Switch and Save will commence on Tuesday 5 December. I would urge residents to take advantage of the council's energy savings service. They can register either online by visiting www.bigswitchandsave.co.uk or offline by calling the council's contact centre.

Norwich City Council endeavours to engage with fuel poor households regularly to ensure that they are aware of the Switch and Save and other available help. We will continue to work hard to help our residents out of the fuel poverty trap.

So while fuel poverty levels are increasing nationally, we have bucked the trend in Norwich for the fourth consecutive year. Norwich now has 1,126 less families in fuel poverty, not having to make the agonising decision of whether to heat or eat."

Councillor Driver confirmed that he did not have a supplementary question.

Question 6

Councillor Malik to the cabinet member for safe city environment:

"Can the cabinet member for safe city environment comment on the significant progress made toward achieving the Carbon reduction target and objectives set in the environmental strategy, as reported to cabinet last month?"

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

"Thank you for your question.

Firstly I'm delighted to report on the excellent progress the council has made towards its target to reduce carbon dioxide emissions from its own operations.

The target of a 40% reduction (against a 2007 baseline) was set in 2014 in the second phase Carbon Management Plan. At this time the council had already achieved a 29% reduction in carbon emissions, only narrowly missing meeting its first target of 30% over the first 5 years of the Carbon Management plan.

The 2014 target of 40% was due to be met by the end of the second phase of the Carbon Management Plan which expires in early 2019. However, progress in reducing the council's carbon footprint has been excellent and I am therefore delighted to report that the council has exceeded its carbon reduction target of 40% by some considerable

margin, achieving an impressive 54.1% reduction in the council's carbon emissions to date and well ahead of the 2019 deadline.

Officers are currently busy scoping opportunities for further carbon reductions and early indications are that the next carbon reduction target could be set at an ambitious 70% (against a 2007 baseline) which is excellent and far exceeds the targets set at a national level which are for a 57% reduction by 2030 (against a 1990 baseline).

In October 2016 the council signed up to an OFGEM compliant renewable energy tariff with our electricity provider which means that all electricity supplied to city council assets is renewable energy and can included in the carbon footprint as such. In addition a wide range of energy saving projects have been implemented across our assets, including, but not limited to, server virtualisation, LED lighting upgrades, insulation works and boiler management to fleet management, pool bikes and building rationalisation.

I applaud the impressive carbon emissions reduction of 54.1% to date, and recognise it is not the work of a single officer or team, but of many officers and contractors working collaboratively across services to continuously find opportunities to reduce carbon emissions wherever possible.

The environmental strategy team are currently collating the next environmental statement which details progress made against the objectives set in the environmental strategy and gives a flavour of the carbon reduction projects being implemented by the council both on our own assets and across the wider city."

Councillor Malik confirmed that he did not have a supplementary question.

Question 7

Councillor Sands (M) to the leader following question:

"Can the leader comment on the importance of the 2040 Norwich City Vision consultation and what it hopes to achieve for our city?"

Councillor Waters leader of the council's reply:

"The city vision conference is part of an important and ongoing dialogue with other key stakeholders in the city that will establish a shared approach to some of the very real challenges that face Norwich, whilst building on the successes and assets of our fine city. It is not a one-off event, but an important milestone alongside focus groups and conversations with members and partners that we are facilitating. As a key champion and voice for the city, we hope it will provide important civic leadership and a steer as to how we develop our role in delivering the shared vision, as well as shaping our approach to partnership working and service delivery over coming years."

Councillor Sands (M) confirmed that he did not have a supplementary question.

Question 8

Councillor Vivien Thomas to the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods:

“Last Saturday (25 November) was White Ribbon Day, part of the campaign to eliminate domestic violence in our city. Can the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods comment on the ongoing work and support offered by this council to support people experiencing this abuse?”

Councillor Herries cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhood's response:

“Norwich has long blazed a trail in the County in relation to supporting victims of domestic abuse – recognised in 2015 by the council receiving White Ribbon Status. On your way in this evening, you will have seen the White Ribbon flag flying from the main flagpole on top of City Hall and the large white ribbon sign on the front of the building proclaiming the council's proactive approach to help eliminate all domestic abuse. You may also have seen some of the White Ribbon Windows in businesses across the City Centre; where the council's community engagement officer has been working to raise awareness of domestic abuse with the Norwich business community and their customers.

In 1974, Norwich City Council allocated to a newly established domestic abuse support service – Leeway - a three bedroomed property to establish its first women's refuge in the city, along with a small establishment grant.

The council's relationship with Leeway has remained and developed further over the years: We currently commission Leeway to provide refuge services to women presenting to the council as experiencing abuse and we offer 'in kind' support to Leeway with outreach housing advice for people in Norwich refuges. Norwich City council also offers 'in kind' outreach housing advice to people using the services of Norfolk community law service – a voluntary sector organisation offering pro bono legal advice and information to marginalised groups and people on low income in Norwich and Norfolk.

Norwich City Council's Home Options team has recently recruited a Domestic abuse advisor – an officer with specific skills and experience to undertake Domestic abuse, stalking and harassment (DASH) risk assessments and to work with Norwich residents experiencing abuse on safety planning. This officer attends daily risk assessment conferences for those residents assessed as high risk, refers and

signposts to other relevant support organisations and coordinates the work of the council's network of 16 domestic abuse champions – across all relevant service areas.

Last year, the council was successful in a partnership bid with Leeway to DCLG, to obtain funding for a new Safe House in Norwich – which increases refuge provision in Norwich and allocates dedicated space for domestic abuse victims that have no recourse to public funds - a first in the County. This project also provides a dedicated support worker for Leeway clients that, as a result of the abuse they have experienced, have additional needs in relation to mental health and / or substance misuse.

The council's Specialist support team provides intensive support and advocacy for tenants with complex needs – including those with current or historic experience of domestic abuse - to develop a programme of direct and indirect support, including signposting and referral to other relevant organisations, to build resilience and help ensure retention of a healthy tenancy.

This work is coordinated by making full use of the Norwich early help hub – hosted here at City Hall by the council – which is attended by a range of public and voluntary sector organisations offering support to individuals and families in Norwich – including those experiencing domestic abuse; to help ensure victims have all information on options available to them, that they are safe and that they remain so.

In response to developing needs, the council is currently piloting a scheme with Leeway to help identify the need in relation to male victims of domestic abuse. The council is providing temporary accommodation to male victims through Leeway, where victims identify a need, to help inform Leeway's future service provision.

We know that Norfolk police receive most reports of domestic abuse from residents in Norwich. Of the 17,000 reported domestic abuse incidents last year, 25% of them were in relation to Norwich residents.

We also know that reports of domestic abuse have increased year on year for the last three years. However, we see this as a success of our ongoing campaigning to raise awareness of domestic abuse; what it is, what support is available – and ultimately to reduce the stigma and encourage more people to seek help earlier. This is what will keep them and their families safe.

However, we also know that there are some gaps in local domestic abuse provision:

- Primarily in provision for perpetrators of abuse; work to change behaviours to reduce people suffering the impact of abuse.
- Also in relation to specific support for children and young people as witnesses, victims and as perpetrators of abuse

- There is a lack of services for people coming out of an abusive relationship. We know that domestic abuse victims return to their abuser an average of 14 times before they leave the relationship for good. The biggest risk to returning to an abusive relationship is when the outreach service following refuge services ceases. There is a requirement for ongoing support albeit at a lesser level.
- We also know that people experiencing abuse don't want to have to tell their story to the various services available for the complex and varied support required. Therefore, we all need to get better at sharing information safely and at the right time, so that victims can tell any public or voluntary sector provider and need only tell their story once, should they wish.

Norwich City Council is excited to be part of an innovative new domestic abuse support programme called Connect that will wrap around the current support services and address all of those current gaps in service.

This holistic support programme for domestic abuse victims, perpetrators and their families is part funded by SafeLives, a national domestic abuse organisation and match funded by six local funders, of which Norwich City Council is one. Other funders include:

- Norfolk County Council – incorporating public health; children's services and adult services;
- Norfolk Police and crime commissioner;
- Norfolk Police.

Connect is a SafeLives pilot programme that will be delivering services totalling £1.67million in Norwich from July 2018, for three full years. During this period, as well as delivering direct services, the programme will be upskilling officers from mainstream services to help ensure the sustainability of the work, where possible, beyond 2022.

The Connect programme is designed to work alongside current support services – not duplicate them, to have a real and lasting impact on domestic abuse in Norwich. It will provide evaluation information throughout the programme, to inform the development of the service and future commissioning in relation to domestic abuse. We are thrilled that Norwich was selected for this pilot programme and look forward to seeing a very real difference on the ground for people experiencing abuse.”

There was no supplementary question.

Question 9

Councillor Brociek-Coulton to cabinet member for social inclusion:

“As part of the Cosy City Initiative I was pleased to be able to secure a Winter Wellbeing pack for an elderly constituent suffering from fuel poverty. Can the cabinet member for social inclusion comment on the success of these packs and how they can be provided to constituents in need?”

Councillor Davis cabinet member for social inclusion’s response:

“As the cold weather approaches we are aware that many elderly residents may be suffering from fuel poverty and illness due to cold. As part of our strategy to reduce fuel poverty and excess winter deaths in Norwich we are providing ‘Winter Wellbeing’ packs which include thermal gloves, thermal socks, thermal hats, soup, microwavable soup mugs and blankets to vulnerable residents free of charge.

We are working with a range of partners such as Gasway, Age UK, Norfolk Social Services and Community Nursing as well as a range of city council teams in order to make sure these packs reach those in real need. We hope to provide almost 150 of these packs to vulnerable residents over the next month.”

Councillor Brociek-Coulton confirmed that she did not have a supplementary question.

Question 10

Councillor Ackroyd to the cabinet member for health and wellbeing:

“Eaton Councillors have successfully raised funds for two defibrillators in Eaton, one outside Waitrose and the other in Eaton Park. Both are sited where a lot of people are gathered together and both have been deployed. It started me thinking ‘where are the defibrillators in Norwich city centre?’

Please could the cabinet member for health and wellbeing consider what the city council in conjunction with the Business Improvement District (BID) could do to raise awareness of defibrillators in the city centre and their use?”

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

“Thank you for your question. May I offer my congratulations on the fund raising efforts of the Eaton community which I understand saw a defibrillator installed in Eaton Park for the first time in its history. I will ask officers to liaise with our partners at the Business improvement

District and see how we can work together to raise awareness in the city centre of these important public assets.”

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Ackroyd asked could the council put out a challenge to the Norwich technical community to create an app which showed the location of defibrillators in the city centre.

Councillor Packer said that he would speak to the officers and would reply to Councillor Ackroyd outside the meeting.

Question 11

Councillor Schmierer to the cabinet member for safe city environment:

“Over the last few months, an increasing number of my constituents have reported that they are suffering from ever more antisocial behaviour, particularly linked to people drinking alcohol, especially super strength alcohol in public spaces near residential areas around the city. I would like to ask the cabinet member what actions the council is taking to tackle this issue, in particular around Quayside, New Mills Yard, Elm Hill and the city centre, and how effective the cabinet member believes they will be?”

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

“Councillor Schmierer will be aware that the council declared two designated public place orders (DPPO) under the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 at the request of the Norfolk Constabulary. These set out to prevent public drunkenness and associated antisocial behaviour, from the drinking of alcohol in public places and enables a police constable to require a person to stop drinking alcohol in a designated place and allows a police constable to seize any opened container of alcohol. The new powers therefore assist the police in taking a proactive role to avoid public anti-social behaviour where it is alcohol related.

The two areas cover the city centre, incorporating the Gas Hill area, Riverside and King Street; with a further area covering Jenny Lind Park, Vauxhall Street across to Old Palace Road.

The Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014, introduced Public Space Protection Orders which set out to counter unreasonable and persistent behaviour that affects the quality of life of its residents.

Government guidance is that any DPPO in force at 20 October 2017 will be automatically treated as if they were provisions of a PSPO from that date.

In recent months the council and police have reviewed the current DPPOs including the levels of crime and anti-social behaviour reported to the police that relate to street drinking to understand if the designation remains valid and also to consider if other types of behaviour should be included.

The police have investigated street drinking and drunken behaviour in Norwich and have recorded 409 drunken behaviour incidents and 323 drunken behaviour crimes in the year to July 2017. These figures are specifically related to drinking and drunkenness on the street but exclude incidents and crimes at licensed premises. On this basis it is considered that the order, which now becomes a PSPO remains valid.

Whilst this work continues regarding other street offences, the views of residents and businesses will be sought if any additional powers are required. In the meantime, Councillor Schmierer can be reassured that the powers which allow the police to continue to confiscate alcohol from individuals who are causing antisocial behaviour from the drinking of alcohol in public places remain in place and will be actioned as they are required.”

Councillor Schmierer asked a supplementary question referring to the use of Public Protection Orders, working in partnership with other organisations, including the police and licensing. Councillor Maguire confirmed that a multi-agency approach was needed to address antisocial behaviour and that the council would continue to work closely with the police and other agencies.

Question 12

Councillor Jackson to the cabinet member for safe city environment:

“Over the last six months I have received a disturbing increase in the number of reports of graffiti in the area I represent, particularly in the city centre. A number of residents’ premises have been continually defaced and the repeated costs for these individuals can be considerable. Does the cabinet member agree that this imposes an unfair burden on the residents concerned, and if so what will the council do to address this?”

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

“Nobody likes graffiti, especially on their own property, and so I understand something of how your constituents feel when they experience it. When the council receives a report of graffiti, it will remove it where it is on public land and/or if it is offensive. If offensive and on private land then the council will, with the landowners involvement, remove the graffiti.

Where possible, the council will remove graffiti on public buildings and property within 24 hours if it is offensive or within 14 days for all other graffiti.

This council’s general graffiti removal service does not extend to privately owned buildings, which is quite common in local authorities, and these remain the responsibility of the land owner.

Where private residents or local businesses require a graffiti removal service these can be found via the internet. In circumstances where residential or private buildings are being targeted, the council's area management team will provide advice on how this can be resolved including working jointly with the police.

The head of citywide services recently discussed the increased levels of graffiti in some parts of the city centre with police colleagues and some problem locations will be targeted jointly to prevent and remove the graffiti.

Residents, members and officers are reminded that they can report incidents of graffiti they come across using the easy to complete web form on the council's website."

Councillor Jackson said that he did not have a supplementary question.

Question 13

Councillor Raby to the chair of licensing:

"The council's Gambling Statement of Principles was last updated in 2007. As the council has a statutory duty to update this statement every three years, it is now seven years out of date. With a large new gambling venue having recently been granted a licence, this is particularly important if councillors are to limit the proliferation of gambling premises across the city, in particular in the most deprived communities. When will the out-of-date Gambling Statement of Principles be updated in line with the council's legal obligation?"

Councillor Button the chair of licensing's response:

"Thank you for your question. I have requested that the council's gambling statement of principles be updated as a priority.

The process to update the statement will include the development of a local area profile to include with the policy. This profile, whilst not a statutory requirement, is considered important as it will increase awareness of local risks in addition to improved information sharing, that will support engagement with licensees, a more coordinated response to local risks, and particularly help to inform specific risks that operators will need to address in their risk assessment.

An effective local area profile is likely to take account of a wide range of factors and require proactive engagement with responsible authorities and other organisations in the area that help identify local risks in their area. These are likely to include public health, mental health, housing, education, community welfare groups and the Constabulary.

I have asked officers to provide me with a timetable for when the new statement of principles will be completed during 2018. Given the

requirement to engage these and other organisations in the development of the local area profile, which is a key element, as well as to undertake a consultation on the revised statement, officers will need to discuss with partners their ability to contribute to this important piece of work.

Discussions have taken place with nplaw about the requirements to undertake this revision and I will update members in due course on progress.”

Councillor Raby asked as a supplementary question that the matter be pursued as soon as possible. Councillor Button said that she hoped that the revised statement would be in place by November 2018.

Question 14

Councillor Carlo to the leader:

“The latest national statistics for local carbon emissions show that Norwich’s per capita emissions have been falling. However, they do not reflect the fact that many of Norwich’s residents travel by car to employment and facilities which have been located outside the city boundary such as the N and N Hospital.

Emissions from transport in Broadland and South Norfolk increased in 2015, sharply so in the case of South Norfolk. A11 dualling, further development on the city periphery and related traffic growth have undoubtedly contributed to the increase. Future year-on-year increases in CO2 emissions can be anticipated from new traffic generated by the Postwick Hub, the NDR, airport expansion and increased flights, A47 dualling, A11/Thickthorn junction improvements and further planned major urban expansion of Norwich. Development of bus rapid transit, walking and cycling were factored into the NDR modelling and so they will not make a great deal of difference to projected carbon emissions unless local transport policy is changed to encourage a massive modal shift and traffic reduction.

Norwich City Council cooperates with South Norfolk and Broadland through bodies such as the Greater Norwich Development Partnership, which have facilitated carbon-generating development around the edge of on the city. Norwich therefore shares responsibility for the associated greenhouse gas emissions. What policies will the leader of the council be proposing to reduce (and not simply minimise) emissions from existing transport and development and future growth on the outskirts of Norwich in order to help meet the Paris Agreement, in particular through the emerging Greater Norwich Local Plan?”

Councillor Waters, leader of the council’s reply:

“Thank you for drawing attention to the success of Norwich in reducing its per capita transport emissions over time. These are indeed a

success story and arise both because of actions the council take (such as its investment in the standard of our housing stock and the promotion of cycling), and due to broader changes in society (such as the changing nature of industry in the city and the increasing proportion of people employed in the hi tech and low carbon sectors).

We continue to make efforts to address climate change across all council activities and not just by focusing on a single document such as the Greater Norwich Local Plan. However, in the case of the Greater Norwich Local Plan we will not be able to commit to an absolute reduction in carbon emissions, all we will be able to do is to work with our partners to seek that the choices made in the formulation of the document promote the growth options that are genuinely sustainable when considered against all the other reasonable alternative options identified.

It should be remembered that following the preparation of the Joint Core Strategy and signing of the City Deal the City is committed to deliver a major and sustained period of growth involving significant numbers of new homes, jobs and supporting infrastructure and the government has not ascribed carbon targets down to local areas in order to deliver its commitments made in the Paris agreement.

I can assure you that the council is determined to do what it can to address climate change, both through mitigating our contribution to it and adapting to the inevitable impacts that a changed climate will have on our society.”

Councillor Carlo reiterated her concern about the development around the periphery of the city and that she considered this would increase carbon emissions. She referred to the minutes of the council meeting on 26 September 2017 and referring to her question about the New Anglia LEP's Green Economy Pathfinder Manifesto said that she had not received a response to her supplementary question around targets. Councillor Waters said apologised for this oversight and said that the information that she sought would be provided as soon as possible. He said that he was proud of the council's strong track record in reducing carbon emissions and that further reductions would be challenging and difficult. The council would continue to monitor air quality and that he hoped that she recognised the good work that it did – not just in the Norwich but in the broader urban area to meet the needs of the Norwich area.

Question 15

Councillor Bögelein to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth:

“I submitted an enquiry through the council system in May about making planning applications easier for the public to navigate and understand. I have since resubmitted this, but have still received no response. Could the cabinet member please update me on whether any changes have been

made, or are planned, in relation to any of the following concerns raised in my original enquiry?

- (1) Very cryptic headings of planning applications. When searching for planning applications it is often very difficult to determine from the headlines what these applications are concerned with, as they are often updates on previous applications and list a number of references and technical terms. I understand that it may be a legal requirement to list the applications in such a way, but am wondering if search results could include a layman's version of the application/changes.
- (2) Complicated process to receive updates on search results. To receive updates one needs to save a search, which means that often one receives updates about other applications in the area/ the street. Would it not be possible to have a simple tick box next to the application, where one can opt into receiving updates about this specific application.
- (3) Documents related to an application. It is very difficult to find specific documents related to the application in the current online system, as these documents are not labelled and at times not retrievable. Would it be possible to have a better labelled system?
- (4) Announcement of planning committee dates to objectors. If an objector wants to speak on an application they have to look up themselves when the planning application is coming to committee. This is quite a difficult thing to navigate and remember. Would it not be possible to at least send an automated email with the committee date to objectors (and in fact all those that have saved the application to receive updates, as the next update is only on whether it is approved or not)."

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

"Thank you for your question. Firstly, please accept my apologies for our failure to respond to the questions you raised. This was due to an oversight on the part of the officer dealing with the matter.

The questions you raise deal with how the public access system works to allow the public to view and comment on planning proposals. Overall the public access system is a valuable and well used tool allowing the public to fully engage with the planning system, however, we do recognise that the system is not as user friendly as it might be and we do intend to improve this as part of our efforts to increase the efficiency of the council.

Instead of dealing with the detail of the matters raised in this forum I suggest it would be appropriate for you to sit down with officers in the planning service who will be able to discuss the issues you raise in more detail. But in summary you may wish to note that:

- (1) There are restrictions on the description of the proposals that appear on the website as these descriptions are those that will ultimately appear on the decision notice when the application is determined so they do need to be technically correct to accord with legislation;
- (2) Officers will be able to explain this matter to you in more detail when you meet but the public system access does give the functionality you seek;
- (3) The labelling of documents is restricted somewhat by the need for public access to draw documents from a different document management system. It is hoped to address this matter in due course alongside other improvements to the system;
- (4) Although presently the system cannot notify respondents of committee dates we do hope to be able to introduce this feature to the application tracking function in due course."

In reply to Councillor Bögelien's supplementary question, Councillor Stonard confirmed that she could contact the officers for discussion on this.

Question 16

Councillor Price to the cabinet member for safe city environment:

"Norwich has ongoing problems with air quality, as revealed most recently in a report in the Lancet which listed the city among 41 places in the UK that are above recommended limits for particulate pollution.

Norwich City Council has a duty to review and assess air quality and to submit an annual status report to the government by 30 April each year. Annual figures are usually made available to councillors in provisional form on request, with adjusted figures following in March or April. However, the 2016 figures have still not been published, and despite repeated requests from me and my Green group colleagues, dating back to March, we have not received this data in any form.

We have requested this data numerous times by email, phone and through the councillor enquiry system, including on 14 February (when the response was that figures were "better than last year" but were yet to be adjusted), 18 March, 23 March and 17 October.

Will the cabinet member please ensure that this data is published as a matter of urgency, in accordance with the council's statutory obligations?"

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

"Air quality is reported on an annual basis, incorporating the data for a full calendar year. The Norwich report for the most recent full year Jan-Dec 2016 has been submitted to DeFRA and is with them for appraisal. Once the report is verified by DeFRA it will be published."

By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Price asked that he was notified of the exact date that the officer submitted the report to DeFRA. Councillor Maguire said that he would come back to Councillor Price with this information.

Question 17

Councillor Tim Jones to the leader following question:

"The council is currently consulting on what kind of city and what kind of council people want to see in the future. This has included the recent Future of Norwich conference as well as various focus groups. However, backbench councillors were not invited to the conference; nor were we informed about the focus groups and related activities; nor have we at any point been asked for our views on the future of the city and the neighbourhoods we were elected to represent.

This is a matter both of democratic representation and of making sensible use of the considerable skills and knowledge councillors have.

Can the cabinet member comment on why Norwich City Council is sidelining its own elected councillors in the debate on the future of our city?"

Councillor Waters leader of the council's reply:

"The councillor is correct to say that we are undertaking a wide-ranging piece of engagement to establish a shared vision for the city over coming years. Although the city council is a key player in facilitating this and has a central role in delivering any vision, it is by no means the only voice that needs to be heard. We have taken a collegiate approach to include a diverse range of organisations and individuals in this process, and, whilst all city council political groups are attending the conference alongside cabinet members, it would be disproportionate to dominate the attendance with all council members. The conference is not a decision-making exercise, but is simply providing an opportunity to establish a level of consensus within which decisions can be made in the fit and proper democratic space.

Furthermore, as has been agreed with all group leaders, there will be all-member focus groups to enable all elected councillors to contribute to the process and ongoing engagement with the council's scrutiny

committee who were informed about the approach we are taking in September.”

Councillor Jones (T) confirmed that he did not have a supplementary question.

Question 18

Councillor Grahame to the cabinet member for resources:

“As will be discussed in two other items on this evening’s agenda, the council is increasingly investing in commercial property in order to generate income. However, the council’s choices about where to invest have an impact on the city it exists to serve. We could benefit Norwich by investing locally; but if this is not written into the council’s investment policy, its money is likely to be invested elsewhere.

The council has recently adopted a ‘social value in procurement’ framework. Building on this excellent work, will the cabinet member support a proposal to update our investment policy to require the council to factor in social and environmental costs and benefits to the local area when seeking to acquire new income-generating assets?”

Councillor Kendrick cabinet member for resources’ response:

“Thank you for your question.

In April this year cabinet agreed a criteria based approach to rationalising its commercial property, which will result in disposal of those properties that perform badly in financial terms or are associated with either high maintenance or management costs.

Alongside this cabinet agreed a complimentary strategy for acquiring new commercial property. This is to ensure that the council’s property portfolio is put onto a financially sustainable and self-sufficient footing and to contribute to the council’s income more generally and thereby help support services.

The key driver to these acquisitions is therefore to generate a financial return and it relies on purchasing property that is already tenanted – for a minimum of 3 years - and with good prospects of re-letting. Also the tenants need to have very good financial standing – as we would not least prefer the tenant renews their lease on expiry to ensure a continued income stream and no void costs. For sound risk management reasons such investments are not also limited to Norwich.

It is important to understand that commercial properties of this nature are attractive to a wide range of investors including pension schemes, property funds and other local authorities for example. If the council is unsuccessful in securing such a property it is only because another party has been successful. However, as the property is already

tenanted with such tenants having protection under the Landlord and Tenant Act their business will continue whether the council owns the property or some other party. It also follows that because the tenant is already trading in an established way and in accordance with the lease already in place it is not possible, at the time of purchase, to also secure social value outcomes in the same way that a procurement exercise potentially can.

Where the council may have an opportunity to consider social outcomes is at the end of a tenant's lease, assuming the existing tenant does not want to renew. Here, if there is a choice to be made between new tenants which would otherwise achieve the same financial outcome, then application of the principles embodied in the council's social value in procurement could be a useful means of informing the eventual decision. I will ask officers to develop a suitable framework for consideration by cabinet."

Councillor Grahame referred to her question and commented on the response and the development of a suitable framework for consideration by cabinet and asked assurance that decisions were made on a sound financial footing. Councillor Kendrick referred to the Asset Investment Strategy and said that the views of the panel were taken into account when acquiring property.

Statement from the Green Group – Local Government Boundary Review

The Green Group consider that before a decision on electoral arrangements is made, a well-advertised public consultation should be carried out asking the people of Norwich how frequently elections to the city council should be held, with the democratic and financial implications clearly outlined. The council should use the consultation response to inform the decision to proceed with one of the following options:

- (1) To retain the current electoral arrangements for Norwich City Council with 39 city councillors representing 13 wards and election by thirds.

or

- (2) To retain the current number of councillors but move to a system of four-yearly 'all-out' elections starting in 2019, which may allow for wards of varying sizes dependent on the size of the communities on which they are based.

Report to	Council	Item
	23 January 2018	
Report of	Chief finance officer (Section 151 Officer)	7
Subject	Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy Mid-year Review Report 2017/18	

Purpose

This report sets out the Treasury Management performance for the first six months of the financial year to 30 September 2017. This is in accordance with the requirements of the Prudential Code. It also contains proposals to change aspects of the 2017/18 Treasury Management Strategy.

Recommendation

To approve the revised:

- a) authorised limit and operational boundary prudential indicators for the current financial year 2017/18.
- b) Minimum Revenue Provision policy to take effect this financial year onwards.

Corporate and service priorities

The report helps to meet the corporate priority of providing value for money services.

Financial implications

The proposed changes to the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy will result in an overpayment of £7.4m having been made in MRP costs dating back from 2007/08 to date. This amount can be used to reduce existing MRP budgets from this financial year onwards over a period of some 20 to 40 years depending on the methodology employed to credit this sum back to the General Fund revenue budget.

Ward/s: All wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Kendrick - resources

Contact officers

Karen Watling, chief finance officer 01603 212440

Tina Stankley, senior technical accountant interim 01603 212562

Background documents

None

Report

Background

1. The prudential system for capital expenditure is now well established. One of the requirements of the Prudential Code is to ensure adequate monitoring of capital expenditure plans and the treasury management response to these plans. This report fulfils that requirement and includes a review of compliance, as at 30 September 2017, with the 2017/18 Treasury and Prudential Limits and the Prudential Indicators approved by Council on 21 February 2017.
2. This council has adopted the CIPFA Code of Practice for Treasury Management in the Public Sector and operates its treasury management service in compliance with this Code. This requires that the prime objective of treasury management activity is the effective management of risk, and that borrowing activities are undertaken on a prudent, affordable and sustainable basis.
3. Following council's decision to increase the 2017/18 capital programme by £26.647m on 28 November 2017, coupled with an internal review of the council's Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy, this report also includes proposals to make changes to the 2017/18 prudential indicators and MRP policy. This report was considered by cabinet at its meeting on 17 January 2018.

Investment Strategy

4. The Treasury Management Strategy Statement (TMSS) for 2017/18 which includes the Annual Investment Strategy was approved by the council on 21 February 2017. It sets out the Council's investment priorities as being:
 - Security of capital;
 - Liquidity; and
 - Yield
5. No policy changes are being proposed to the investment strategy.
6. The council will aim to achieve the optimum return (yield) on investments commensurate with proper levels of security and liquidity. In the current economic climate it is considered appropriate to keep investments short term to cover cash flow needs, but also to seek out value available in higher rates in periods up to 12 months, with highly credit rated financial institutions, using Link Asset Services' suggested creditworthiness approach.
7. The council held £78.350m of investments as at 30 September 2017. The following table shows the movement in investments for the first six months of the year.

Investments	Actual 31 March 2017	Investments	Maturities	Actual 30 September 2017
	£'000	£'000	£'000	£'000
Short term				-
Banks	28,000	8,000	(15,000)	21,000
Building Societies	27,400	159,415	(146,965)	39,850
Cash Equivalents				-
Banks	10,660	24,125	(24,785)	10,000
Local Authorities	7,500	9,500	(11,000)	6,000
Money Market Funds	-	1,500		1,500
Total	73,560	202,540	(197,750)	78,350

8. The council's investment return for the first six months of 2017/18 is £271,503. The full year budget is £400,000.
9. During the second half of the year it is anticipated that the level of investments held by the council will decrease. This is because the additional funding for on-lending to Norwich Regeneration Limited (NRL) and for commercial property acquisition (approved at council on 28 November 2017) will both be funded by using internal balances (cash) instead of external borrowing on a temporary basis. Although this will have an adverse impact on the level of investment income that can be generated during the second half of the year, this is more than compensated for by the new net income returns generated from both schemes. For example, the income returns for external financial investments are currently averaging 0.64% whereas the net returns from commercial property acquisitions are averaging 3.8%.
10. The chief financial officer confirms that all investment transactions undertaken during the first six months of 2017/18 were within the approved limits as laid out in the Annual Investment Strategy.

External Borrowing

11. The table below shows the council has actual external borrowing of £209m most of which relates the Housing Revenue Account. There has been no new borrowing to date in this financial year.

Borrowing Long Term	TMSS	Actual 01-Apr-17	Actual 30-Sep-17
	£'000	£'000	£'000
Public Works Loan Board	203,680	203,106	203,106
Money Market	5,000	5,000	5,000
3% Stock (Perpetually irredeemable)	499	499	499
Corporate Bonds and External Mortgages	74	74	74
Finance Leases	1,003	1,189	1,189
Total	210,256	209,868	209,868

Debt Rescheduling

12. No debt rescheduling was undertaken during the first six months of 2017/18. None will be undertaken during the remainder of the financial year.

Prudential Indicators

13. The following sections of this report provide an update on:

- Changes to the council's capital expenditure plans;
- How capital expenditure is being financed;
- The impact of these changes on the prudential indicators and the underlying need to borrow.

Capital Expenditure

14. The table below shows the 2017/18 original and revised capital programme, the latter agreed by council on 28 November.

	2017/18 Original	2017/18 Revised
	£'000	£'000
General Fund	35,075	67,489
HRA	51,281	47,094
Capital Expenditure	86,356	114,583
Financed by:		
Capital receipts	16,246	12,382
Capital grant and contributions	8,897	10,713
Capital reserves	6,925	0
Major Repairs Reserve	0	13,871
Revenue	22,366	19,927
Total Resources	54,434	56,893
Net borrowing need for the year	31,922	57,690

15. On 28 November 2017 council agreed an increase in the 2017/18 General Fund capital programme for on-lending to NRL and for commercial property acquisition.
16. In addition, the Neighbourhood Housing programme within the HRA capital budget has been re-profiled resulting in a reduction in the budget.

Financing of the Capital Programme

17. The table in paragraph 14 above shows how the revised capital programme will be financed and shows that the net borrowing need for the year has

increased from that anticipated in the TMS agreed by council in February 2017. The consequence of this is that it will also increase the council's Capital Financing Requirement (CFR).

18. The principal changes in financing the capital programme are a reduction in the use of capital receipts, a reduction in the use of HRA revenue contributions which are replaced with the use of the Major Repairs reserve, and the increased need to borrow (either externally or internally from cash) to fund the on-lending to NRL and the commercial property acquisitions .

The Capital Financing Requirement

19. The first table below shows the council's Capital Financing Requirement (CFR), which is the council's underlying need to borrow for a capital purpose. The second table compares the original and revised expected actual debt position over the year with the CFR and gives the over/(under) borrowing position.

	2017/18 Original Estimate	2017/18 Revised Estimate as at 30.09.17
	£'000	£'000
General Fund CFR	64,539	89,432
HRA CFR	217,665	205,624
Total CFR	282,204	295,056
Movement in CFR	31,620	57,351
Movement in CFR represented by:		
Borrowing need for the year	31,922	57,690
Less MRP	(302)	(339)
Movement in CFR	31,620	57,351

	2017/18 Original Estimate	2017/18 Revised Estimate as at 30.09.17
	£'000	£'000
Gross borrowing	215,856	266,085
CFR	282,204	295,056
Over/(Under) Borrowing	(66,348)	(28,971)

Prudential Indicators relating to Borrowing Activity

20. Given the revisions to the 2017/18 capital programme and its financing two changes are being proposed, namely:

21. **An increase in the Authorised Limit** – This represents the limit beyond which borrowing is prohibited, and needs to be set and agreed by council. It is the maximum borrowing need with some headroom for unexpected movements. This is the statutory limit determined under section 3 (1) of the Local Government Act 2003.

	2017/18 Original Estimate	2017/18 Revised Estimate as at 30.09.17
Authorised Limit for external debt	£'000	£'000
Borrowing	253,707	290,000
Other long term liabilities	1,576	1,576
Total	255,283	291,576

22. **An increase in the Operational Boundary** – This indicator is based on the probable external debt during the course of the year; it is not a limit and actual borrowing could vary around this boundary for short times during the year. CIPFA anticipate that this should act as an indicator to ensure the authorised limit is not breached.

	2017/18 Original Estimate	2017/18 Revised Estimate as at 30.09.17
Operational boundary for external debt	£'000	£'000
Borrowing	253,107	270,000
Other long term liabilities	1,576	1,576
Total	254,683	271,576

Other Prudential Indicators

23. This section of the report gives details on the updated position on the remaining prudential indicators agreed by Council in February 2017.

Borrowing Activity

24. Long-term fixed interest rates are currently low and the Bank of England expects them to rise by a further 0.5% over the three-year treasury management planning period. The Chief Finance Officer, under delegated authority, will undertake the most appropriate form of borrowing depending on the prevailing interest rates at the time and taking into account the associated risks e.g. counterparty risk and risk of interest rate increases.
25. Opportunities for debt restructuring will be continually monitored. Action will be taken when the chief finance officer feels it is most advantageous.

Investment Performance

26. The objectives of the council's investment strategy are firstly the safeguarding of the repayment of the principal and interest of its investments, and secondly ensuring adequate liquidity. The investment return is the third objective. The current investment climate is one of over-riding risk consideration i.e. that of counterparty security risk. As a result of this underlying concern, officers continue to implement an operational investment strategy, which adheres to the controls in place in the approved investment strategy.
27. The council held £78.350m of investments at 30th September 2017 and the investment profile is shown in the table in paragraph 7 above.

Risk Benchmarking

28. The 2017/18 Investment Strategy for financial investments includes the following benchmarks for liquidity and security.
29. Liquidity – The council has no formal overdraft facility and seeks to maintain liquid short-term deposits of at least £1 million available with a week's notice.
30. The weighted average life (WAL) of investments for the year was expected to be 0.45 years (164 days). At 30 September 2017 the Council held liquid short term deposits of £78.350 million and the WAL of the investment portfolio was 0.28 years (103 days). The reduction in the WAL of the investment portfolio is due to most of the investments over 1 year in duration maturing and being replaced with shorter term investments.
31. The chief finance officer can report that liquidity arrangements were adequate during the year to date.
32. Security – The council's maximum security risk benchmark for the portfolio as at 30 September 2017 is 0.066%, which equates to a potential loss of £0.052 million on an investment portfolio of £78.350m.
33. This is slightly higher than the anticipated maximum risk of 0.05% in the Treasury Management Strategy (i.e. a potential loss of £0.039m) but still represents a very low risk investment portfolio. The current investment portfolio carries a very much lower level of risk than Link's model portfolio and other local authorities within our benchmarking group.
34. The target set within the 2017/18 Strategy is that a minimum of 75% of the portfolio must be held in low risk specified investments. At 30th September 2017, 100% of the investment portfolio was held in low risk specified investments.
35. The chief finance officer can report that the investment portfolio was maintained within this overall benchmark during the year to date.

Proposed Changes to the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy statement

36. The council is required to approve an MRP Policy Statement prior to each financial year. Council approved the current statement as part of the overall Treasury Management Strategy on 21 February 2017. MRP is a charge to the council's General Fund budget, and hence a cost to council tax payers, designed to set aside a prudent sum of money to repay borrowing needed to fund the capital programme. The policy sets out how MRP charges will be calculated.
37. During 2003 the Department of Communities and Local Government issued statutory guidance on the future options available for calculating MRP charges from 2008 onwards (Regulation 28 of the 2003 Regulations). The council must have regard to this guidance. The guidance is not prescriptive and makes it clear that councils can follow an alternative approach, provided they still make a prudent provision. The broad aim of a 'prudent provision' is to ensure that debt is repaid over a period that is reasonably commensurate with that over which the capital expenditure provides benefits to service delivery.
38. In 2015/16 in light of this guidance, this council, along with many others across the country, undertook a review of its MRP policy to establish whether the existing approach was prudent and fair. Following this review a change in the council's MRP policy was approved by council in February 2016. The new policy was to charge MRP on a 2% annuity basis. This was a change from the method previously applied which was to charge MRP on the 4% reducing balance Regulatory Method.
39. This change was considered to be both more prudent as well as fair as it would:
- Provide a provision to repay borrowing over a 50 year period - rather than the 150+ years it would take using the reducing balance method.
 - Promote intergenerational fairness as the previous MRP policy meant that future tax payers could still be paying for assets that would perhaps no longer be in use in 150 years' time.
 - Deliver savings to the General Fund revenue budget.
40. This changed policy was applied to the CFR balance from 2015/16 onwards.
41. Ahead of undertaking the mid-year review of the 2017/18 treasury management activity, the MRP policy has been reviewed again because it is now considered that the application of the annuity basis provision can be back-dated and applied from its inception, i.e. apply the annuity basis method of calculation from 2007/08 onwards rather than just from 2015/16 onwards.
42. The rationale for backdating the policy agreed by council in February 2016 is the same as for the original review (see paragraph 39 above) plus upon reflection it is a fairer approach to use.
43. A further change is also proposed within the MRP policy, namely that no MRP charges will be made for borrowing undertaken by the council for the purpose of on-lending to its wholly owned companies. Currently the council has one

such company, Norwich Regeneration Limited (NRL). As shareholder the council will only on-lend if the company's financial model shows that the loan interest charged to the company can be serviced through the on-going income generated by the company and that the loan amounts can be repaid in full either during the loan agreement term or at the end of the agreement. Therefore the council considers that it can take a prudent view that the debt will be repaid in full at the end of the loan agreement (or during if it is an instalment loan). So the MRP charge in these instances is not necessary.

44. Both the above changes have been explored with our advisors, Link Asset Services as well as our external auditors (Ernst and Young) who have advised on the approach that is being taken.
45. If the proposal is agreed the revised MRP charges will apply for this current year 2017/18 onwards as well as being included in the 2018/19 Treasury Management Strategy proposed to council in February 2018.
46. Council is recommended to approve the revised MRP Statement, the formal wording for which can be found at Appendix 1.

Integrated impact assessment



NORWICH
City Council

The IIA should assess **the impact of the recommendation** being made by the report

Detailed guidance to help with the completion of the assessment can be found [here](#). Delete this row after completion

Report author to complete	
Committee:	Cabinet
Committee date:	13/12/17
Director / Head of service	Karen Watling
Report subject:	Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy Mid-year Review Report 2017/18
Date assessed:	04/12/2017
Description:	This is a mid-year report to inform council on the performance of the treasury management activity for the first 6 months of the year and it includes revisions to the prudential indicators for the authorised and limit and operation boundary. Also the report includes proposals to update the MRP policy.

	Impact			
Economic (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Finance (value for money)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The prudential indicators show that for the first 6 months of the year treasury management activity has produced positive results e.g. achieving an investment interest rate above the target.
Other departments and services e.g. office facilities, customer contact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ICT services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Economic development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Financial inclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Social (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Safeguarding children and adults	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<u>S17 crime and disorder act 1998</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Human Rights Act 1998	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Health and well being	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

	Impact			
Equality and diversity (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Relations between groups (cohesion)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Eliminating discrimination & harassment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Advancing equality of opportunity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Environmental (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Natural and built environment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Waste minimisation & resource use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Pollution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sustainable procurement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Energy and climate change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
(Please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments

	Impact			
Risk management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Managing risk is a major part of undertaking the treasury management activity. All the indicators and limits put in place to reduce the level of risk have been adhered to thus reducing the risks to an acceptable level as stated in the Treasury Management Strategy.

Recommendations from impact assessment	
Positive	
Negative	
Neutral	
Issues	

Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) policy statement

For capital expenditure incurred:

(A) Before 1st April 2008 or which in the future will be Supported Capital Expenditure including the Adjustment A, the MRP policy will be to charge MRP on an annuity basis so that there is provision for the full repayment of debt over 50 years;

(B) From 1st April 2008 for all unsupported borrowing (excluding finance leases) the MRP policy will be to charge MRP on a 2% annuity basis so that there is provision for the full repayment of debt over 50 years; Asset life is deemed to begin once the asset becomes operational. MRP will commence from the financial year following the one in which the asset becomes operational.

(C) MRP in respect of unsupported borrowing taken to meet expenditure, which is treated as capital expenditure by virtue of either a capitalisation direction or regulations, will be determined in accordance with the asset life method as recommended by the statutory guidance.

(D) Expenditure in respect of the Local Authority Mortgage Scheme will not be subject to a minimum revenue provision as this is a temporary arrangement and the funds will be returned in full.

(E) Expenditure in respect of loans made to the council's wholly owned companies will not be subject to a minimum revenue provision as the council will have undertaken sufficient due diligence to expect these loans will be repaid in full to the council by a capital receipt either during the loan agreement term or at the end of the agreement. Therefore the council considers that it can take a prudent view that the debt will be repaid in full at the end of the loan agreement (or during if it is an instalment loan), so MRP in addition to the loan debt repayments is not necessary.

This is subject to the following details:

An average asset life for each project will normally be used. There will not be separate MRP schedules for the components of a building (e.g. plant, roof etc.). Asset life will be determined by the Chief Finance Officer. A standard schedule of asset lives will generally be used (as stated in the Statement of Accounts accounting policies).

MRP will commence in the year following the year in which capital expenditure financed from borrowing is incurred, except for single assets when expenditure is being financed from borrowing the MRP will be deferred until the year after the asset becomes operational.

Other methods to provide for debt repayment may occasionally be used in individual cases where this is consistent with the statutory duty to be prudent, as justified by the circumstances of the case, at the discretion of the Chief Finance Officer.

There is no requirement on the HRA to make a minimum revenue provision but there is a requirement for a charge for depreciation to be made. Transitional

arrangements with respect to depreciation, revaluation and impairments; put in place at 1 April 2012 were due to expire on 31 March 2017. However the Item 8 determination released on 24 January 2017 has extended indefinitely the ability to charge depreciation, revaluations and impairments to the HRA but reverse in the Movement in Reserves Statement.

Repayments included in annual finance leases are excluded from MRP as they are deemed to be a proxy for MRP.