



COUNCIL

19:30 to 21:35

24 September 2019

Present: Councillor Thomas (Va) (Lord Mayor), Ackroyd, Bogelein, Brociek-Coulton, Button, Carlo, Davis, Giles, Grahame, Harris, Jones, Kendrick, Lubbock, Maguire, Maxwell, McCartney-Gray, Neale, Oliver, Osborn, Packer, Peek, Price, Sands (M), Sands (S), Sarmezey, Schmierer, Stonard, Stutely, Thomas (Vi), Utton, Waters and Wright

Apologies: Councillors Driver, Fulton-McAlister (E), Fulton-McAlister (M), Huntley, Manning, Ryan and Youssef

1. Lord Mayor's Announcements

The Lord Mayor introduced the meeting.

The Lord Mayor invited Councillor Waters to say a few words about Audrey Brown, who had passed away recently.

Councillor Waters said that the Audrey Brown, whose funeral had been held earlier that day, had represented Lakenham Ward together with her husband, former councillor, Ken Brown. She had been both a city and county councillor and was Sheriff from 1997 to 1998, when Harry Watson had been Lord Mayor. She had served on a wide number of committees and outside bodies, and had made a contribution to the city and the people of Lakenham.

The Lord Mayor announced that he had attended a number of events or visits since the last meeting: Lights Camera Action – celebrating OPEN Youth Trust; Norwich Pride at City Hall and Chapelfield Gardens; Open Service for all Faiths at Norwich Synagogue; relaunch of Taste of Malabar, Magdalen Street; send off for East Coast Truckers Annual Children's Convoy; Grand Norwich Duck Race at St Georges Bridge; Eaton Park Miniature Railway fundraising for Norwich and District Society of Model Engineers; Great Yarmouth Mayor's Summer Reception at the Boating Lake; Goldsmith Street party celebrating new council houses built to Passivhaus standard; MA degree show at Norwich University of the Arts; Kwik Fit Tour de Branch, 2,500 mile cycle ride for 84 staff supporting Children with Cancer; 2nd Air Division USAAF Memorial Trust at Millennium Library visit; Revealing Munnings Art Exhibition at the East Gallery, Norwich University of the Arts; the Feed lunch and graduation; Norwich School's prize giving at Norwich Cathedral; opening of new Langley's toy shop in Chapelfield Shopping Centre; African and Caribbean market at The Forum; launch of the Beth Alexander Foundation at Norwich City Korfbal Club, UEA SportsPark; Power and Beauty Gospel Concert 2019 at Norwich Central Baptist Church; commemoration of Battle of Britain Opening Ceremony at City Hall; Norwich High School for Girls – opening of its heritage orchard; private view of the Portraits of Life exhibition in the Gallery, The Forum; Norfolk County Council's Battle of Britain event

at County hall with Spitfire flypast; Battle of Britain closing ceremony at Norwich Cathedral; launch night for OPEN's Creative Anthology at Dragon Hall; Royal British Legion's President's Reception at the Great Hospital; night with Norfolk police's public order team, briefing and patrol 10 pm to 4 am; Norwich Peace Camp and Peace Cycle at The Forum; 175th Anniversary Service at St Mark's Church on Hall Road; 39th birthday lunch for the Norfolk and Norwich/Koblenz Friendship Association; and, the Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital annual general meeting.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillors Brociek-Coulton, Button, Harris, Oliver, Kendrick and Waters declared other interests in relation to item 8 (below), replacement tenancy and estate management system.

The monitoring officer had granted dispensations to members with a pecuniary interest in item 10(b) (below): Councillors Bogelein, Giles, Grahame, Oliver, Osborn, Neale, Schmierer, Thomas (Vi), Thomas (Va) and Utton. Councillors Brociek-Coulton, Carlo, Jones, Kendrick, Price and Waters declared other interests in relation to item 10(b) (below), Motion – unfair evictions.

Councillors Harris, Mc Cartney-Gray, Maxwell and Oliver declared an other interest in item 10(d) (below), motion – on vehicle emission reduction.

3. Public Questions/Petitions

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

Question 1

Mr Shan Barclay asked the cabinet member for resources the following question:

"I am deeply concerned by the government's move in the High Court to prevent councils from operating their own Ethical Procurement and Investment Policy and from divesting from organisations which the councils deem unethical.

Some years ago, Norwich residents were assured that our city council had an Ethical Procurement Policy. In view of the government's current stance and in the interests of democracy, I would be glad if you could confirm that this is still the case and whether this policy also applies to investments."

Councillor Kendrick, cabinet member for resource's response:

"I would like to reassure you that the council continues to take into consideration ethical issues in both its procurement and investment practices.

This is supported and documented in the strategy documents detailed below:-

Our Procurement Strategy states our vision which is "to procure goods, services and works by the most efficient, transparent, ethical and sustainable

means, ensuring accountability, achieving value for money and deriving maximum benefit to support the Corporate Plan”.

The Treasury Management Strategy, states ‘The council will not knowingly invest directly in businesses whose activities and practices pose a risk of serious harm to individuals or groups, or whose activities are inconsistent with the council’s mission and values.’ This applies to direct treasury investment only. The council’s normal money market activity would usually be with financial institutions which may have unknown indirect links with companies which the council will be unable to monitor. However, where know links are publically available the council will not knowingly invest.

The Commercial Property Investment Strategy states ‘The choice of investment will take into account ethical considerations relating to the vendors of the property in addition to the intended use of the property and its current or future tenants. The council will not engage with sellers or tenants who may present a significant reputational risk.”

Mr Barclay referred to the challenges faced by all councils and asked whether this meant that the council did not invest in companies selling arms, caused pollution, engaged in fracking or other illegal activities. In reply, Councillor Kendrick said that the council followed its policies as closely as possible and only engaged with companies with ethical investment.

Question 2

Mr Anthony Clarke asked the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment the following question:

“Does the Norwich City Council accept the substance and detail of the Report: "Air Quality a Briefing for Directors of Public Health March 2017 - Department for Environment & Rural Affairs, Public Health England and Local Government Association"? In the event that Norwich City Council disagree or dispute this document could they provide relevant scientific references in support.”

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

“The council takes the issue of air quality and its impact on health very seriously. I therefore welcome the government providing guidance to directors of public health as it helps ensure that not only district councils but also county councils – where directors of public health sit – take the issue seriously. This is particularly important in Norwich where there are hotspots of poor air quality due to nitrogen dioxide pollution which are transport related and where Norfolk County Council is the local transport authority.

As the report is aimed at directors of public health it is therefore not something the council has hitherto had familiarity with. On the basis that it reflects advice more generally from government then there would be no reason not to accept the report’s substance and detail however.”

As a supplementary question Mr Clarke asked why the Director of Public Health had decided not to be involved in the Anglia Square inquiry. Councillor Maguire said that the inquiry was part of the planning process. However, he could not answer for the county council on its decision not to take part in that process.

Question 3

Mr Matthew Winterburn asked the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth the following question:

“In the spirit of trying to preserve as many car parking spaces as possible on Earlham Road around the Mitre pub, I would like to challenge the decision to create two short stay spaces outside the Mitre pub. Therefore my question is: would the council consider revoking the plan to offer short stay spaces outside the Mitre Pub?

Even though it is apparently "standard" practice to offer two short stay spaces for businesses, in this situation, the Mitre does have its own car park which should have had some influence on this decision. The church is getting some short stay spaces further up and so reversing the double yellows to accommodate. This means that Mitre will have its own car park and some short stays outside the church which should be more than adequate for the persons who use the Mitre. Officers have commented already that the short stays are not outside residential property but this does not take into account that actually they are opposite residential properties who currently are often able to use the space for parking due to having double yellows directly outside their own residential properties.

The council is also planning to put double yellows outside the gates of the Mitre Public House which will consume yet another space which will be a waste as the pub does not use the gate for vehicular access. Any deliveries or bin emptying or emergency services would park as far off the road as possible in front of the Mitre's car park. They would not park in front of the gates as it would be too narrow for them. The only outcome is the loss of a further space.”

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

“Thank you for raising this matter with the council. However the decision to create two short stay spaces outside the Mitre pub and other decisions to do with on-street parking at this location were made by Norwich Highways Agency Committee (NHAC) which is a joint committee of Norfolk County Council and Norwich City Council. It is not in this council's gift therefore to amend NHAC's decision. However I will ask that your question is referred to NHAC so it can be considered when they next meet. Committee officers will let you know when the next meeting of NHAC will be.”

Mr Winterburn confirmed that he did not have a supplementary question.

Petition

The Lord Mayor said one petition had been received from Mr Clive Fudge, of the Norwich Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament.

Mr Clive Fudge introduced the following petition which had 83 signatures:

“As citizens of the city of Norwich, we (the undersigned) urge the city council to support the following statement:

“Our city is deeply concerned about the grave threat that nuclear weapons pose to communities throughout the world. We firmly believe that our residents have the right to live in a world free from this threat. Any use of nuclear weapons, whether deliberate or accidental, would have catastrophic, far-reaching and long-lasting consequences for people and the environment. Therefore, we support the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons and call on our government to join it.”

We ask the council leader to write to the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary informing them of Norwich's support for security through diplomatic means, and specifically the International Convention against Nuclear Weapons, and to continue to avoid investment in weapons of mass destruction in its treasury management, pensions and investment policies.”

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

“Thank you for your timely petition to the council raising your concerns about the threat that nuclear weapons pose to communities all over the world. I say timely because on tonight's agenda there is a cross party motion being presented to full council which has a number of resolutions attached to it. Notably, to address your areas of concern, it includes asking all party groups in this chamber to forward this decision to their national parties.

It also calls for me, as leader of the council, to write to the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary informing them of Norwich's support for national security through diplomatic means, and specifically, the International Convention against nuclear weapons.

Finally, I would add that Norwich City Council was one of the early adopters of nuclear free zones and our Lord Mayor is a ‘Mayor for peace’. I hope this gives you some comfort about our commitment over time on this vital issue and that action is being taken on this important matter.”

4. Minutes

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2019.

5. Questions to Cabinet Members/Committee Chairs

The Lord Mayor said that 17 questions had been received from members of the council to cabinet members/committee chairs for which notice had been given in accordance with the provisions of appendix 1 of the council's constitution.

The questions are summarised as follows:

Question 1	Councillor Grahame to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth about the Western Link.
Question 2	Councillor Osborn to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth about removing 'growth' from the corporate objectives.
Question 3	Councillor Bogelein to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth about resources for planning enforcement.
Question 4	Councillor Price to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth about the impact of 5G networks on health.
Question 5	Councillor Schmierer to the cabinet member for resources and about the council's Brexit preparations.
Question 6	Councillor Carlo to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth about Heigham Park tennis courts.
Question 7	Councillor Utton to the cabinet member for health and wellbeing about the parks and open spaces review.
Question 8	Councillor Maxwell to the cabinet member for health and wellbeing about Mousehold Heath.
Question 9	Councillor Button to the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment about recycling rates.
Question 10	Councillor Sands (M) to the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing about homelessness.
Question 11	Councillor Sands (S) to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth about London Street.
Question 12	Councillor Oliver to the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment about Roar Power.
Question 13	Councillor Driver to the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods about disabled facilities grants.
Question 14	Councillor Peek to the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing about the right to buy scheme.
Question 15	Councillor Stutely to the cabinet member for resources about Voter ID pilot schemes.
Question 16	Councillor Manning to the leader of the council about events in the city.
Question 17	Councillor Lubbock to the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth about the car club.

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

6. Polling Places and District Review 2019

The Lord Mayor announced that there had been amendments to the recommendations to the report, circulated at the meeting, by deleting “the Swanton Road area” from recommendation (7)(b), and inserting “from the SE3 polling district” after “Brandford Road” in recommendation (9)(b). Councillor Giles had indicated that he was willing to accept the amendments and with no member objecting these became part of the substantive motion.

Councillor Giles moved and Councillor Kendrick seconded the recommendations as set out in the document circulated at the meeting.

Following debate, it was:

RESOLVED, unanimously to agree the following:

(1) in Bowthorpe ward to:

- (a) move the boundary between BO2 and BO3 so that the Fourways Centre is placed within the BO3 polling district
- (b) Move properties 638 to 656 Dereham Road from BO2 to BO3 due to their proximity to the Fourways Centre

(2) in Catton Grove ward to:

- (a) Use The Box (Catton Grove Local) on Woodcock Road as the polling station for the CG2 polling district
- (b) Expand the CG4 polling district to include the electors living east of Weston Road (currently part of the CG2 polling district)
- (c) Move the boundary between CG4 and CG5 polling districts to the middle of St Clements Hill to ensure the number of electors within each remains within recommended levels
- (d) Make the boundary between the CG2 and CG3 polling districts along Aylsham Road by the public footpath running to Palmer Road, keeping Copenhagen Road within the CG3 polling district.
- (e) Make the boundary of the CG2 polling district between the CG2 and CG4 polling districts should be from north to south and should run down the middle of Beech Drive until it runs parallel with the north east corner of Catton Grove Primary School

(3) in Crome ward to make no changes to the current arrangements

(4) in Eaton ward to:

- (a) Reduce the number of polling districts within the Eaton ward from five to four, removing the polling district currently named EA3.

- (b) Expand the EA1 polling district to include the area north and east of Bluebell Road
 - (c) Expand the EA2 polling district southwards to cover Marston Lane
 - (d) Rename the existing EA5 and EA5A to EA3 and EA3A and expand to cover both sides of Judges Walk
 - (e) Expand EA4 to cover the area south of Newmarket Road and the area around Bluebell Road and Poplar Avenue.
- (5) In the Lakenham ward to:
- (a) use Arkwrights Social Club on Hobart Square as a polling station for the LA3, LA3A and LA3B polling districts
 - (b) move the residents on Lindley Street, Meadowbank and Stratford Drive from the LA3 polling district to the LA4 polling district
- (6) In the Mancroft ward to:
- (a) Ask the ARO to continue to look for a suitable polling station for the MA4 polling district
 - (c) Ask the ARO to continue to look for an alternative polling station for the MA3 polling district
 - (d) Split the MA2 polling district into two separate polling districts with MA2 covering the area south of St Crispins Road and a new MA5 polling district covering the area north of St Crispins Road.
- (7) In the Mile Cross ward to:
- (a) Expand the MX1 polling district to include the area around Drayton Road up to Junction Road and the area south of Drayton Road up to Mile Cross Road.
 - (b) Reduce the MX2 polling district by moving the area south of Margaret Paston Avenue and Galley Hill into the MX3 polling district
 - (c) Retain the area around the Swanton Road depot within the MX3 polling district.
 - (d) Move residents living on the western side of Mile Cross Road and north of Margaret Paston Avenue into the MX4 polling district.
 - (e) Use a temporary polling station for the MX3 polling district to be situated in the carpark at Sloughbottom Park.

(8) In the Nelson ward to:

- (a) Ask the ARO to continue to look for a suitable venue to be used as a polling station for the NE4 polling district
- (b) Move Recreation Road and the area south of The Avenues (from Recreation Road to Mill Hill Road) to the NE2 polling district
- (c) Expand the NE3 polling district to include Lincoln Street, Portland Street, Dover Street, Warwick Street, Mill Hill Road, West Parade and the south eastern part of Park Lane.
- (d) Move the residents of the north side of Earlham Road, between Edinburgh Road up to the boundary with UN5A and the South Lodge on Earlham Road from the NE1 to the NE2 polling district.

(9) In the Sewell ward to:

- (a) Move the area around Waterloo Road, Temple Road and Albany Road from the SE1 to the SE2 polling district.
- (b) Move Bell Road, the northern side of Branford Road from the SE3 polling district and the western side of Silver Road from the SE4 polling district to the SE2 polling district.
- (c) Move the boundary of the SE2 polling district to the west around Sewell Park Academy to the middle of St Clements Hill.
- (d) Include the area around Shipstone Road south to Magpie Road in the SE3 polling district.
- (e) Move residents between the southern part of Branford Road and the northern part of Beaconsfield Road to the SE4 polling district.
- (f) Use St Mary Magdalene Church on Silver Road as the polling station for the SE4 polling station.

(10) In the Thorpe Hamlet ward to make no changes to the existing arrangements;

(11) In the Town Close ward to:

- (a) move the whole of Beaumont Place from the TC1 polling district to the TC2 polling district.
- (b) Create a TC5 polling district east of the middle of the Lakenham Way footpath, including the whole of Brazen Gate, include Southwell Road, Langham Place and the eastern side of Grove Road to the north of Southwell Road.
- (c) Ask the ARO to investigate the use of a temporary polling station on Southwell Road to be used for the TC5 polling district;

(12) In the University ward to:

- (a) Rename UN1 to UN1A, UN1A to UN1, UN6 to UN6A and UN6A to UN6 to ensure a consistent approach to polling district naming across the Norwich City Council area.
- (b) Move the UEA residences on Wilberforce Road from UN6 to UN2.
- (c) Expand the UN1 polling district to include residents living at The Gardens, 530-532 Earlham Road, Earlham School House and St Anne's Vicarage.
- (d) In the Wensum ward to make no changes to the existing arrangements.

7. Treasury management full year review 2018-19

Councillor Kendrick moved the recommendations as set out in the report, seconded by Councillor Stutely.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to note the contents of the report and the treasury activity for the year ending 31 March 2019.

8. Replacement tenancy and estate management system

(Councillors Brociek-Coulton, Button, Harris, Oliver, Kendrick and Waters had declared an interest in this item.)

Councillor Kendrick moved the recommendations as set out in the report, seconded by Councillor Harris.

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve:

- (1) an increase in the Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme of £695,000 in 2019/20 and £230,000 in 2020/21 as set out in the report to fund the acquisition and implementation of new tenancy and estate management system to replace the existing Capita Housing Management (Academy) system; and
- (2) an increase in the HRA revenue budget of £10,000 for additional software licence support and maintenance costs from 2020/21.

9. Adjustment to the General Fund Capital Programme 2019-20 – Replacement Lighting at St Andrew's Multi-Storey Car Park

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

Following debate it was:

RESOLVED, unanimously, to increase the 2019-20 General Fund Capital programme by £285,000 to facilitate utilisation of the Salix Energy Efficient Loan Scheme to finance the cost of installing the new LED lighting and associated fees.

10. Motions

(Notice of the following motions 10(a) to 10(f) as set out on the agenda, had been received in accordance with Appendix 1 of the council's constitution.)

10(a) Biodiversity emergency

The Lord Mayor announced that amendments to the motion had been received from Councillor Packer which had been circulated to members at the meeting:

“Inserting “as planned” after “Updating” in resolution (2)(a)

Replacing “Clarifying the local policy to require that every new development achieves a biodiversity net gain. This could be achieved by producing” with “Working with partners on the Greater Norwich Local Plan to seek to deliver biodiversity net gain on all developments and considering the production of” in resolution (2)(b)

Inserting “Investigating,” at the start of resolution (2)(c) and replacing “by including” with “the inclusion of”

Replacing “Using” with “Continuing to use” in resolution (2)(d)

Inserting “Investigating means to secure appropriate funding” before “promoting” and replacing “Parks” with “City”, and inserting “by continuing to work closely with existing and newly formed Friends and other community groups in parks, natural areas and cemeteries to increase their involvement and to provide training to give skills and confidence to actively participate in the work on site to encourage” after “community engagement” in resolution (2)(e)

Inserting “Continuing to support additional wildlife measures across the city,” before “Including” in resolution (2)(f)

Inserting “Considering, together with the costs,” before “Conducting” in resolution (2)(g)

Replacing “Prioritising” with “Continuing to prioritise” in resolution (2)(i)

Inserting “Continuing to work with the Pesticide Action Network, to lead Norwich to becoming pesticide free, following consultation which is already underway, and” before “Including” in resolution (2)(k)”

Councillor Bogelein had indicated that she was willing to accept the amendments and with no objections from any other member, these became part of the substantive motion.

Councillor Bogelein moved and Councillor Utton seconded the motion as amended.

Following debate, it was:

RESOLVED, unanimously, that:

“A recent Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) report warns “Nature is declining globally at rates unprecedented in human history – and the rate of species extinctions is accelerating” although “it is not too late to make a difference, but only if we start now at every level from local to global.”

Biodiversity loss is alarming. Species that have evolved over millennia are being lost forever as a direct result of human activity. Locally we experience a worrying decline of bee species (1) and the hedgehog population, plus an anticipated loss of soil biodiversity. Immediate action is needed.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) Note that enhancing the local environment, including biodiversity, is part of the corporate plan priority of ‘great neighbourhoods, housing and environment’.
- (2) Ask cabinet to urgently take up local measures to prevent the loss of and to enhance biodiversity by:
 - (a) Updating, as planned, the Biodiversity Action Plan (last updated in 2002) to give a full overview of the biodiversity measures planned and taken across different teams
 - (b) Working with partners on the Greater Norwich Local Plan to seek to deliver biodiversity net gain on all developments and considering the production of a Supplementary Planning Document (see e.g. North Hampshire or Cornwall biodiversity SPD) which provides developers with detailed guidance to ensure all developments deliver a biodiversity net gain
 - (c) Investigating, following the example of Hull, the inclusion of a local policy in the local plan which requires three new trees to be planted for every new dwelling
 - (d) Continuing to use council publications to encourage the public to take biodiversity measures in their own homes, for example, in gardens, on roofs, balconies and window sills
 - (e) Investigating means to secure appropriate funding for promoting a City Biodiversity Toolkit to encourage community engagement by continuing to work closely with existing and newly formed Friends and other community groups in parks, natural areas and cemeteries to increase their involvement and to provide training to give skills and confidence to actively participate in the work on site to encourage with habitat creation such as flowering meadows for pollinating insects
 - (f) Continuing to support additional wildlife measures across the city, including additional wildlife measures in council-owned gardens and communal areas (greening, wildflower beds, small mammal holes etc.)

- (g) Considering, together with the costs, conducting biodiversity audits in our local parks and open spaces and setting measurable targets and standards for biodiversity increase in local parks and open spaces;
- (h) Identifying suitable verges and establishing a 'river of flowers' wildflower programme where appropriate (see e.g. Rotherham Council)
- (i) Continuing to prioritise biodiversity targets in the River Wensum strategy
- (j) Exploring opportunities to encourage the growth of wildflowers on brownfield sites which are waiting to be developed in line with existing evidence that brownfield sites can make an important contribution to biodiversity enhancement
- (k) Continuing to work with the Pesticide Action Network, to lead Norwich to becoming pesticide free, following consultation which is already underway, and joining the growing number of pesticide free councils across the UK (e.g. Glastonbury, Lewes, Hammersmith & Fulham), by establishing and implementing a long term plan to reduce chemical use as advised by Pesticide Action Network UK
- (l) Educating residents about the risks of pesticides (e.g. through posters at allotment sites)

10(b) Unfair evictions

(Councillors Bogelein, Giles, Grahame, Osborn, Neale, Schmierer, Thomas (Vi), Thomas (Va) and Utton had declared an interest and received a dispensation. Councillors Brociek-Coulton, Carlo, Jones, Kendrick, Oliver, Price and Waters had also declared interests.)

Councillor Jones moved and Councillor Davis seconded the motion.

Following debate, it was

RESOLVED, unanimously, that:

"Most of England's 11 million renters, including thousands in Norwich, are on tenancies with fixed terms of six months or a year; after this period has ended, landlords can evict their tenants with just two months' notice, without giving them a reason. These 'no fault evictions' were introduced under section 21 of the 1988 Housing Act; before this, renters had much greater security and it was difficult for landlords to evict tenants who paid the rent on time and looked after the property. This insecurity harms quality of life tenants with a range of documented negative side effects.

Council **RESOLVES** to:

- (1) note that:

- (a) Evictions are the number one cause of homelessness. 80% of evictions are on no-fault grounds, and 63% of private renters who were forced to move in 2016 were evicted not due to any fault of their own but because the landlord wanted to sell or use the property.
 - (b) Insecurity harms quality of life for tenants, with private renters less likely than either owners or people in council housing to say they know lots of people in their local area, but more worried that they will have to move within the next year. The threat of being evicted also gives landlords huge power over tenants, who may decide not to complain about disrepair, big rent increases or other problems in case they are kicked out.
 - (c) In Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden (among other countries), tenancies are indefinite, meaning blameless tenants cannot be evicted from their homes.
 - (d) In 2017, the Scottish government made tenancies indefinite and banned no-fault evictions under the terms of the Private Housing (Tenancies) (Scotland) Act 2016.
 - (e) A growing number of groups and individuals support abolition, including the *Times* newspaper, the London Assembly, the Resolution Foundation Age UK, Children England, Crisis, Centrepont, and over 50000 people who signed the 38 Degrees petition to abolish section 21 in a ten week period.
- (2) ask the Leader to write to the Secretary of State for Local Government to request:
- (a) The abolition of section 21 which would help to make renting more secure, improve standards, increase tenant confidence and ultimately contribute towards making renting a viable long-term alternative to home ownership or social rent for the millions who currently cannot access either.
 - (b) Since insecure tenancies make it difficult for renters to complain and organise for their rights, removing section 21 would make it easier for new renter unions like the London Renters Union and ACORN to organise and drive up standards in the private rented sector.
- (3) encourage renters across Norwich to take part in the End Unfair Evictions coalition online survey as part of the Government consultation on scrapping section 21. Including sharing support for the End Section 21 campaign on social media channels;
- (4) Ensure any changes to section 21 and section 8 cannot allow no-fault evictions through the back door.

- (5) Call on the Members of Parliament for Norwich to publicly state their support for the abolition of section 21.

(The Lord Mayor announced that two hours had passed since the commencement of the meeting. Members agreed to take agenda items 10(c) to 10(e) as unopposed business. Amendments to 10(c) Climate Strike and 10(d) Vehicle emission reduction had been received and accepted by the movers of the motions.)

10(c) Motion – Climate Strike

(This item was taken as unopposed business.)

(The motion had been proposed by Councillor Maguire and seconded Councillor Peek. Councillor Maguire had indicated that he was willing to accept the amendments, which were circulated at the meeting, from:

Councillor Matthew Fulton-McAlister as follows:

“Inserting “and also including future Trades Union Congress (TUC) endorsed actions days” after “27 September 2019” in resolution (2)(a).”

and, Councillor Bogelein as follows:

“Replacing “the action days” with “past and future action, including those” in resolution (2)(a)”

RESOLVED:

“Earlier this year Norwich City Council recognised that the world is facing the combined effects of climate, economic, and social emergencies. According to the IPCC as of 1st January 2018 the world has a remaining carbon dioxide budget of 420 gigatonnes of CO² left in our CO² budget. At current levels that budget is wiped out within 8.5 years. To play its part in reversing the climate part of the emergency Norwich City Council has recently committed to becoming Carbon Neutral as soon as possible.

Council RESOLVES to:

- (1) apply its policies within the Corporate Plan 2020-2025 and the 2040 vision regarding the current climate emergency which the world faces
- (2) Support the aims behind climate strikes led by the youth movement by
 - (a) Allowing employees the opportunity to support the action and participate in past and future action days, including those on 20 and 27 September 2019, and also including future Trades Union Congress (TUC) endorsed actions days, with the appropriate deductions from pay,
 - (b) Investigating the closure of roads in order to show solidarity with the aims of climate strikes

- (c) Signposting resources that we might offer to schools to help pupils who wish to protest

(3) Ask group leaders to write to the Secretary of State calling on them to:

- (a) investigate the implications of outsourced carbon emissions being included in the Government pledge to be carbon neutral by 2050
- (b) Look at ways that the UK might become achieve carbon neutrality earlier than 2050
- (c) Give local authorities the capacity to achieve an earlier target for carbon neutrality; and
- (d) Identify ways that carbon based energy investment might be diverted into renewable sources

10(d) Motion – Vehicle emission reduction

(Councillors Harris, Mc Cartney-Gray, Maxwell and Oliver had declared an interest in this item.)

(This item was taken as unopposed business.)

(This motion had been proposed by Councillor Wright and seconded by Councillor Lubbock. Councillor Wright had indicated that he was willing to accept the amendments from Councillor Stonard, which had been circulated in advance of the meeting:

“Inserting “Request government amend Part III of and Schedule 12 of the Transport Act 2000, as amended by Part 6 of the Local Transport Act 2008 to give second tier local authorities appropriate powers, working with the current statutory responsible organisation, to” at the start of resolution (2)(b)(i).”

RESOLVED unanimously that:

“Cites across Europe have implemented schemes to ensure that vehicles entering their city meet necessary standards in terms of emissions.

London has an Ultra Low Emission Zone (ULEZ), and in Germany, cars must display an Umweltplakette in many cities.

These schemes are in place to help reduce pollution from particulates, and whilst implementation varies from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, the principle is the same.

Council **RESOLVES** to

(1) Note that this council has already;

- (a) taken steps to enforce stationary idling of buses where drivers leave their engines running when not loading or unloading.

- (b) removed petrol and diesel vehicles from the Lord Mayor's Procession and Norwich had its first Car-free Day on 22nd September.
 - (c) made air quality a priority and key action in the Corporate Plan 2019-2022;
- (2) Ask cabinet, through its Climate Emergency and Environment Executive Panel, to:
- (a) ask the DVLA to provide a breakdown, categorised by Euro emission standard, detailing the total number of all vehicles registered in Norwich.
 - (b) consider the feasibility of introducing a scheme, similar to that in Germany, for vehicles to display a badge showing their Euro emission level following the colour standard of the German scheme, and;
 - (i) Request government amend Part III and Schedule 12 of the Transport Act 2000, as amended by Part 6 of the Local Transport Act 2008 to give second tier local authorities appropriate powers, working with the current statutory responsible organisation, to make such a scheme compulsory for all buses, coaches and taxis operating within the Norwich city boundary.
 - (ii) assess the impact of offering a discount of up to 100% for residential parking permits in Norwich where domestic vehicles in the lower emissions categories registered at that address opt to display a badge.
 - (iii) assess the impact of offering discounted parking at Norwich City Council operated car parks for vehicles in the lower emission categories.

10(e) Motion – International campaign to abolish nuclear weapons

(This item was taken as unopposed business.)

(This motion had been proposed by Councillor Grahame and seconded by Councillor Waters.)

RESOLVED,

“Nuclear weapons pose a great threat to communities throughout the world, including Norwich. Any use of nuclear weapons, whether deliberate or accidental, would have catastrophic, far-reaching and long-lasting consequences for people and the environment.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) Note that the council firmly believes that its residents have the right to live in a world free from this threat.
- (2) continue to avoid investment in weapons of mass destruction in the council's treasury management and investment policies
- (3) formally support the ICAN Cities Appeal and call on our government to join those who have signed the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons
- (4) ask all party groups in this chamber to forward this decision to their national parties; and
- (5) ask the leader of the council to write to the Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary informing them of Norwich's support for national security through diplomatic means, and specifically, the International Convention against nuclear weapons."

(The Lord Mayor closed the meeting.)

LORD MAYOR

Appendix A

Questions to Cabinet Members/Committee Chairs

Question 1

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

“The Eastern Evening News reported on 25 July, the announcement by the leader of the Labour group on Norfolk County Council that his group would campaign against the proposed Norwich Western Link on grounds that the scheme is “unaffordable and unjustifiable”. The Labour Group leader is quoted as saying that he “felt the western link had been a rushed process and more environmentally-friendly measures could be taken to address the issue of rat-running through villages west and north of Norwich.” He went on to say, ‘We support solving the problem, but we’re firmly on the side of finding a better way. There is really not enough evidence to justify spending £153m – or probably a lot more – on a road that will do considerable harm to the environment. This is an opportunity for Norfolk to lead, rather than default to old school narrow thinking and throw an expensive new road at the problem – we can do better.’ Will the cabinet member join his colleagues Clive Lewis MP and the county Labour Group in opposing the Norwich Western Link?”

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

“As I said at the council meeting in July when Councillor Carlo asked the same question following Clive Lewis MP’s announcement that he did not support the building of the Western Link, the city council’s support for the Western Link is dependent on a package of other transport investment and mitigation measures being provided. These measures will need to result in a considerable shift towards non-car modes in the urban area through increasing walking, cycling and the use of public transport as well as improving air quality and encouraging inclusive growth and economic development.

Thirty years ago the southern bypass brought benefits to the south of the city by removing through traffic including slow moving HGV’s and other vehicles. This traffic now flows freely along the A47 and mostly does not enter the city. This has been a welcome development. The opening of the Broadland North Way, as the NDR is now known, has seen similar benefits North and East of the city. Building the Western Link will lock in benefits for residents in the west of the city, but only if, and I will say it again, the new road is coupled with a package of measures that convinces people to move to more sustainable modes of transport for intra urban journeys. Evidence to date suggests that this is already happening and the current transport strategy is proving successful – Norwich is bucking several national trends; bus patronage is going up, the numbers of people cycling and walking are increasing

significantly and our retail centre is thriving. Few other cities can boast such successes.

A lot of claims are being made about the effects that the Western Link will have on the environment and climate change, much of which is based upon conjecture. I would prefer to wait until the full analysis and modelling results, of all the impacts that of the creation of the new link road will have, are published and then an informed decision can be made. If at that stage the planned mitigation measures do not offset the potential environmental harm of the road; then will be the time for the city council to reconsider its support for the Western Link. I have not seen any evidence since the July council meeting that changes what I said previously, however as I said then, if and when new evidence comes to light the Labour administration will of course consider it carefully."

Supplementary question

Councillor Grahame asked why the Labour Group at the county and the local Labour party had come to a different conclusion on the Western Link to the city council's administration. The cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth referred to the fact that the question had been asked before and reiterated his answer that the city council had supported the Western Link with conditions that needed to be in place. If this changed then the city council's administration would reconsider its position and would advise members of the council accordingly.

Question 2

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

"In June this year, the Labour chair of the 'Resources, Prosperity and Growth' committee in Brighton agreed to remove the term 'growth' from the committee's name and thus from its remit, in response to a question from a young Green councillor. In March, I attended a panel discussion about climate change with the Labour MP Clive Lewis, where he spoke explicitly about the need to look at models of "degrowth". Recognising that the planet we live on is finite, will the cabinet member ask council to replace references to "growth" in the corporate plan, with a term more inclusive of the needs of present and future generations, thereby also removing the demand for "growth" from the council's strategic objectives?"

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

"Thank you for the question. I certainly do recognise that many of the resources of the planet we live on are finite and that there is a need for fresh thinking in relation to the nature of growth and a move away from measures which regard economic growth as necessarily being a desirable thing irrespective of its impact on people or the environment. The growth in economic measures of output such as Gross Value Added or Gross Domestic Product should not be seen as signs of a successful place if these are delivered in a manner that increases the use finite resources or doesn't

address the inequalities in our society. I'm sure you will agree with me that the economic growth we have seen in the past has come at too great an environmental cost and has not sufficiently benefitted the poorest in society.

However, I would be very concerned about any attempt to amend our objectives in a way that doesn't recognise the need for Norwich to continue to grow. The population of our city is continuing to grow, both through natural growth and through patterns of migration, and I don't think we should be looking to stop either. To accommodate this increased population and address the problems of our existing population we will need more and better quality housing to be built, to increase the number and quality of jobs available in the economy and enhance the supporting infrastructure through more and better quality parks, medical centres and transport infrastructure. To fail to plan for growth in this way would not only badly let down our current and future residents. But would be likely to ultimately increase the use of finite resources and contribution to the causes of climate change through displacing growth pressures from a place such as Norwich which is capable of growing sustainably and allowing people to live with minimal environmental impact to other areas where use of resource and climate change impact are much greater.

I think our current corporate plan recognises this distinction between genuinely sustainable and inclusive growth and other forms of economic growth and reflects this in our priorities of: great neighbourhoods, housing and environment, inclusive economy and people living well. I recognise that thinking on how to decouple models of economic growth from increasing environmental impact continues to evolve but think that our current corporate plan and other associated strategies set the best framework we can have on this issue for the time being."

Supplementary question

In response to Councillor Osborn's supplementary question, the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth commented on the need to proactively plan for growth to ensure that it was sustainable and based around the urban area, as opposed to dispersed growth where there was no infrastructure to support it. He reiterated his response that he was open to new models of economic growth, but that the council's corporate plan and strategies mitigated against the impact of growth on the environment. Without these in place there would be uncontrolled growth in unsustainable locations which would result in increased carbon dioxide emissions and impact on climate change.

Question 3

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

"In recent months I have dealt with a number of pieces of casework that related to planning issues. These included determinations of planning applications as well as planning enforcement cases. In many of the responses, delays in deadlines or inaction in enforcement cases were explained by staff shortages or a lack of resources. I have requested more

information on the resources situation of the planning department and how this resource shortage is being addressed. However, I have not yet received an answer, I guess due to lack of resources. Could you please clarify the situation and explain how the council is addressing this resource and staff shortage?"

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

"Until recently the bulk of planning enforcement work was carried out by the public protection team in citywide services. Recent staff changes and competing demands upon that service have meant that their capacity to deal with planning enforcement matters has reduced. This has resulted in the informal arrangement whereby planning officers in the development management team have taken on an increasing case load of enforcement work. Enforcement work has to be managed alongside officers' normal caseload of planning applications, which puts additional pressure on them. Planning officers are also not trained in relevant legislation such as the Police and Criminal Evidence Act, which limits their ability to pursue prosecutions through the courts. In these cases the assistance of environmental health officers with the appropriate training is required. These informal arrangements need to be formalised to ensure the council possesses an effective planning enforcement service, temporary additional resources are being sought to deal with the workload and the matter is being kept under review. Performance levels should improve in the coming months."

Supplementary question

Councillor Bogelein said that whilst she was pleased additional resources had been found for the planning service and enforcement but that she considered that the "bottleneck" should have been foreseen as residents had been complaining about the service for several months. The cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth referred to his response above and added that the financial constraints the council was under placed additional pressure on services and staff. In this case the problem had been identified and would be addressed. It was a question of balancing resources. The council's MTFS indicated further pressures on the council's resources.

Question 4

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

"The cabinet member may be aware of the 5G appeal (<http://www.5gappeal.eu/>) signed by scientists and doctors who recommend a moratorium on the roll-out of 5G for telecommunication until potential hazards for human health and the environment have been fully investigated through rigorous independent scientific investigation. Does the cabinet member agree with the aims of the 5G appeal and would he join towns and cities such as Glastonbury, Brussels, Geneva and Florence in stating support of the precautionary principle in this matter and not supporting the roll-out of 5G in Norwich until it has been proven not to affect the health of residents?"

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

"I'm afraid the council does not possess the expertise or resources to reach a judgement on whether the scientific evidence available justifies a moratorium on the roll out of 5G telecommunications infrastructure. Our current policy framework is generally supportive of such infrastructure and is guided by a clear instruction from government that we cannot take potential health impacts into consideration when making regulatory decisions.

Joint Core Strategy Policy 6 recognised the general benefits of improved telecommunications links across the county and in the city in terms of accessibility to services and economic development. Local Plan policy DM10 specifically encourages, with certain caveats, the provision, upgrading and enhancement of telecommunications networks and their associated infrastructure. The council is also working with neighbouring authorities and the county council through the Norwich Strategic Planning Framework Telecommunications sub-group to ensure a co-ordinated approach to the roll-out of new technology.

However, it is worth noting that a lot of telecommunications development is carried out under permitted development powers that are set by central government. Planning applications that the council can make a decision on are therefore few and far between. The government is currently reviewing these permitted development rights to facilitate the national roll-out of the 5G network. In practice, even the limited ability the council has to influence the provision of the new infrastructure is likely to be further restricted in future."

Supplementary question

Councillor Price expressed his disappointment that the cabinet member had not given his personal view as requested and asked whether he considered that Norwich people were being treated as guinea pigs and that he wrote to the appropriate government minister calling on a halt to 5G until scientific data. The cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth reiterated his response above and said that he did not agree that Norwich people were being treated as "guinea pigs" and that he would write a letter as requested about the concerns raised. As a word of caution, he pointed out that some prominent campaigners against the roll out of 4G, 3G and 2G had later acknowledged that they had considered there had been no danger to health from increased cancer risk at the time.

Question 5

Councillor Schmierer to ask the cabinet member for resources the following question:

"This month the General Secretary of the TUC Frances O'Grady warned that the changes to the funding settlement received by local government 'leave councils far more vulnerable to the economic damage that would be caused by crashing out of the EU without a deal, and that will mean bigger funding gaps for services that families rely on.'

Last month we also heard that the government had pledged an extra £20 million for councils to ramp-up preparations for leaving the EU and instructed them to appoint a designated Brexit lead. While this sum brings the total funding allocated by the government to help local areas prepare for Brexit to £77 million to date it is still an insultingly minuscule and token amount, given the amount of disruption a no-deal Brexit will cause as outlined in the Yellowhammer report and also given the fact that the government's own Get Ready for Brexit campaign is reported to cost £100million. Could the cabinet member comment on Norwich's no-deal Brexit preparations and the impact a no deal Brexit will cause to the communities in our city?"

Councillor Kendrick, cabinet member for resource's response:

"Preparations here in Norwich and Norfolk are being co-ordinated through the local resilience forum. Each authority has been asked by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to appoint a Brexit lead officer and the director of resources has been appointed to that role. At the time of writing, there has been one national teleconference with the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government and a further one scheduled for Monday 23 September. The national assessments and focus are not on functions covered by a district council such as Norwich City Council.

Our greatest concern is not about the impact on the council but much more on the potential impact on our communities. I am concerned particularly about potential increases in food costs and the impact this would have on residents who are already struggling after the welfare cuts we have seen. The leader of the council has submitted the following question for the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government teleconference mentioned above: 'Will the Secretary of State press for an uplift or ideally the removal of the benefit cap because of the additional hardship created by anticipated increases in the cost of essential items (specifically food) as a result of a No deal Brexit? A situation already compounded by the depreciation of the £ since 2016.'

The government's own Yellowhammer document lists several severe consequences of a no deal exit from the EU on October 3 upon our food and medical supplies and also upon our economy and jobs. We shall of course work with other agencies to limit the impact wherever we can. However given the local government's limited resources and powers it is unlikely that we could remedy all but for a very small part, of the possible dire effects of a such a no deal exit from the EU at the end of next month upon the citizens of Norwich."

Supplementary question

Councillor Schmierer asked what support there was for EU nationals in the event of a no deal Brexit? The cabinet member for resources said that central government was the lead on this issue.

Question 6

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

“In September 2017 Norwich City Council closed Heigham Park’s grass tennis courts.

The planning applications committee on 8 November 2018 approved the council’s all-weather courts scheme for Heigham Park and rejected a member motion to defer the scheme for enabling the council to consider the Heigham Park Grass Courts Group’s business plan. The minutes state that one reason for rejecting a deferral was that ‘the council had already lost half of the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) grant by delaying a decision.’ The minutes report the planning officer statement that ‘a delay could mean that the [LTA] funding for the scheme was no longer available.’

However, it now transpires that the LTA withdrew its funding offer when the council dropped its first planning application for hard courts at Heigham Park in June 2017.

A council email concerning LTA funding, dated February 2019, admitted that: “There is currently no application with the LTA. As a result of the previous planning application being withdrawn. That process stopped. No further application has been lodged with the LTA at this moment in time”.

The council was therefore well aware at the time of the planning application committee in November 2018 that the LTA had withdrawn its funding offer on Heigham Park following the withdrawal in June 2017 of the first planning application for Heigham Park by the parks and open spaces team. Nonetheless, the council advised planning committee members that LTA funding for Heigham Park remained on offer. Also in the planning report, blame was placed on the Heigham Park Grass Courts Group for delaying the LTA funding, even though, behind the scenes, the LTA had withdrawn funding due to the council dropping its first application.

Can the cabinet member explain why the planning committee was led to believe that LTA funding was available for the scheme at a time when that process had stopped?”

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

“The expansion of Norwich Parks Tennis and the associated benefits to additional sites, including Heigham Park, one of the council’s main strategic parks, has not been straightforward and the project has had to adapt and change for a number of reasons including an ever changing financial climate. One thing that has not changed is this council’s commitment to deliver quality, affordable, accessible tennis to all residents, on a sustainable financial basis. The planning application submitted by the parks and open spaces manager, which came before planning committee on 8 November 2018, was based on

the most up to date information with regards to the funding situation at that moment in time.

The expansion of Norwich Parks Tennis, following the successful delivery of positive outcomes at Eaton Park, is viewed as an exemplar delivery model by the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA). The proposed expansion was discussed with the LTA at a regional development level, to develop the project prior to the first planning application being submitted in 2017. Planning permission being obtained was a pre-requisite before an application for funding could be submitted. The situation was, and always has been, that the LTA were fully behind the plan to expand the benefits of parks tennis to other parts of the city and would support a funding application being submitted. The success of the bid would always be dependent on the LTA's own internal processes it has been made clear that the delivery of the programme has been subject to successful external funding.

At the time of the first application in March 2017 the LTA's Transforming British Tennis Together (TBTT) programme offered a maximum of 50% matched funding. Therefore it was on this basis that the planning application was submitted in 2017. This application was subsequently withdrawn when queries raised during the public consultation period could not be addressed satisfactorily before the application expired.

For clarity the LTA grant programme offered 50% matched funding and therefore, the delivery of the new tennis facilities was modelled on a successful bid for 50% matched funding.

Changes at the LTA during July/August 2017 resulted in changes to the grant funding with a reduction of matched funding for successful bids from 50% to 25%. However, planning approval was still a pre-requisite to submitting a bid. Although the amount of potential LTA capital funding had been reduced the council was still committed to delivery of the benefits of the project through expanding parks tennis in other areas of the city.

Delivery budgets were revised on this basis and a revised planning application was submitted in July 2018 based on the original planning submission, which was considered on 8 November 2018.

The minute from the committee meeting which states, that *'the council had already lost half of the Lawn Tennis Association grant by delaying a decision'* which your question refers to as a reason given for rejecting a deferral was accurate, as the matched funding had been reduced from 50% to 25%. The second statement, that *'a delay could mean that funding for the scheme was no longer available'*; is also accurate as timescales relating to the expiration of funding for the programme from a S106 agreement could be put at risk, due to an inability to spend the funds within the required timeframe. The comment did not specifically refer to LTA funding as suggested. I can confirm to Councillor Carlo that on 8 November 2018 when the planning application came before committee the LTA programme still offered 25% matched funding.

More specifically members of the committee were advised that the business case and financing was not a matter for the planning committee and that members would need to determine the application on the basis of relevant development plan policy together with other material considerations.

On the 8 January 2019 the council was made aware by the LTA that the funding programme had been withdrawn nationally and there was no longer funding to bid for. However, a replacement scheme would be introduced but it was not clear when.

The LTA has never made an offer of funding. Developing the proposals, securing external funds and answering enquiries has always been based on the fact that the LTA funding was subject to a successful application.

Therefore there was no withdrawal of funding from the project by the LTA at any point.

The email response you refer to in your enquiry about LTA funding dated February 2019 is correct merely stating the current state of available external funding, namely:

- There was currently no application with the LTA;
- At that time there was no application to the LTA funding as there was no funding programme in place nationally to apply to;
- As a result of the previous planning application being withdrawn, that process stopped as a planning approval was required prior to application;
- After the withdrawal of the planning application in 2017 work focussed on securing planning approval, prior to working up any future bid;
- The impact of additional time and resources required to revise the design, complete the planning application, complete consultation prior to being considered by committee resulted in delays for the programme;
- During this period, LTA funding opportunities reduced from 50% to 25% to 0%.

Information provided to the planning applications committee was based on the facts at the time and the committee were not mislead, the advice that the business case was immaterial to the determination was accurate and members made their decision on the basis of relevant material planning considerations.”

Supplementary question

Councillor Carlo asked why the cabinet member for health and wellbeing had not answered her question and asked whether it was the case that on 8 November 2018 the council was aware that the council had not made an application to the LTA and that the LTA was not prepared to make the funding. The cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth confirmed that it was appropriate for him to answer the question as it related to the planning process which was within his portfolio. He referred to his response above and said that he was disappointed that a member would try to thwart a project that would make tennis accessible to everyone across the city and question the integrity of an officer.

Question 7

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

“In 2018, Norwich City Council commenced a review of parks and open spaces. The council appointed an external consultant who addressed a workshop for members last September. Consultation with stakeholders programmed for spring this year was postponed in the run up to the local elections. In response to a Green Party enquiry in July about progress, we were advised that the council was looking at a revised timetable for key stages. Can the cabinet member comment on the progress of this timetable and share any interim findings?”

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

“Thank you for your question.

Initial findings and comments from the very productive workshops held with stakeholders, elected members and council officers are currently being reviewed.

This involves a considerable amount of detailed work which due to competing demands on available resources has resulted in a short delay.

I hope that work will be completed in the next month and then the process for adoption and the key milestones will be finalised.

At this moment in time there are no interim findings to share.”

Supplementary question

In reply to Councillor Utton’s supplementary question, the cabinet member for health and wellbeing said that the member should appreciate the cuts to public sector funding and constraints on resources.

Question 8

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

“Representing a ward nearby the historic and beautiful Mousehold Heath I am constantly aware of how lucky we are to have such an open space which benefits our city. As protection and promotion of the heath continues to be such a priority for this council, and particularly those serving on the Mousehold Heath Conservators, can the cabinet member for health and wellbeing comment on the positive opportunities contained within the newly launched heath management plan?”

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

"Mousehold Heath is a jewel in the crown of this fine city and I would firstly like recognise the role the wonderful work the Mousehold Conservators undertake as custodians of the heath on behalf of the residents of the city; and also the work of the two Mousehold Wardens and many volunteers, individuals and groups.

The new Mousehold Heath management plan came into effect in April 2019, identifying key objectives for the work of the Mousehold Conservators over the next 10 years. The objectives are based around 8 key aspects of delivering a well maintained and welcoming open space.

The site is managed in a way which balances the informal and formal recreational needs with the management of locally and nationally important habitat and species.

There are a number of habitat and species monitoring schemes in place, on the site to monitor their status and the impact of management activities on the site. The results from these studies are positive.

A particular focus of the Conservators work is to provide opportunities for local communities to be involved in the management of the heath and attend a variety of events where residents can learn more about this important site.

In excess of 40,000 hours of volunteer time have been given to the site over the last 10 years, to help make it the wonderful place it is today

Representatives from the Conservators recently attended a symposium about urban commons in Brighton to speak about their work and the positive working relationships with the council and community that are essential when managing a site such as the heath.

The Conservators received praise for on the work achieved on Mousehold which highlighted the valuable work undertaken on a national stage. However, Mousehold is now featuring internationally.

In January 2019 one of the Mousehold Wardens, Will Stewart was invited to attend the European Ranger Conference in Portugal, representing the Countryside Management Association, Mousehold Heath and Norwich City Council. He was obviously a hit as he has now been invited to attend the World Ranger Congress in Nepal in November 2019, at no cost to the Conservators or the council.

It is clear from the new management plan that the site will continue to go from strength to strength over the next 10 years."

(Councillor Maxwell said that she did not have a supplementary question but asked the cabinet member for health and wellbeing to join her in congratulating the officers and volunteers who had contributed to the work on the heath.)

Question 9

Councillor Button to ask the cabinet member for safe and sustainable environment the following question:

“I was pleased to read in the cabinet performance report that recycling and composting rates are green for this quarter and have actually risen, against a national picture of stable or even decreasing rates. Can the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment give his opinion on whether the significant ‘Feed your Caddy’ campaign and other practical environmental steps have helped to continue to stimulate this?”

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

“There is no doubt that the programme of measures to increase the recycling of food waste in Norwich has been very successful.

During 2018 the Council worked with the Waste and Resources Action Programme (WRAP) to deliver a range of targeted food waste ‘interventions’ to increase the capture rate of food waste from the existing kerbside food waste collection service, and in so doing reduce the amount of food waste presented for collection within the residual waste stream.

Around 56,000 properties with kerbside waste and recycling collections received these interventions, which included –

- A roll of 52 PE food waste liners (the budget would not cover the cost of corn starch liners);
- A food waste information leaflet;
- No food waste please’ stickers to be placed on the lid of the refuse bin;

This was supported by a twitter campaign – ‘Feed your Caddy’ as well as media briefings and articles in the Citizen magazine and the local press. Since these measures were rolled out in May and June last year over 10,000 additional food caddies have been requested by residents and the collected tonnage of food waste remains 40% higher than before the interventions. This increase is significantly higher than what had been forecast and well above the rates achieved in other areas where WRAP has supported similar projects.

It is the case that recycling rates in Norwich are currently holding up and ‘bucking’ the national trend for reduced recycling, but this in itself is only a part of the picture. Alongside the measures for recycling the council puts a significant emphasis on measuring how much residual waste is produced in Norwich households.

The performance measure in the corporate plan is ‘Residual household waste per household’ and the stretch target for this is to achieve no more than 375 kg of residual waste for each household. Currently residents are set to achieve a mark even lower than this, with only 81 kg per household recorded for the last quarter. Whilst the annual rate will be influenced by increased waste over the festive period, this is still a very impressive ‘mid-term’

performance and indicates that this key measure for waste reduction may well be exceeded in 2019-20.

All of this is a tribute to the relentless efforts of council staff and the operatives at our collection contractor, Biffa, who are continually striving to reduce waste and increase recycling. Principally of course it's a tribute to residents who have embraced new services and have taken on-board the critical messages about waste reduction and recycling.

But despite all this, analysis shows that there are still large quantities of recycling being deposited in some domestic waste bins. So efforts will continue to support those who may not yet be fully aware of the recycling opportunities available as well as designing and implementing further schemes to build on the council's impressive performance to date."

(Councillor Button confirmed that she did not have a supplementary question.)

Question 10

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

"I read earlier in the month that the Observer newspaper analysis of government figures shows that a quarter of the more than 260,000 households in England found to be homeless or under threat of homelessness last year were in paid work at the time. Overall, councils recorded 118,700 households as homeless and a further 145,020 as being under imminent threat of homelessness in 2018-19. In-work households made up a staggering 31% of cases in South-East England and 30% in London and the East of England. Having assisted several constituents in my ward with homelessness related issues, and with the autumn fast approaching, can the cabinet member for social housing comment on the ever increasing importance and difference which our own housing service makes to providing support to people facing this awful predicament?"

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

"As you may recall, last year this council was awarded the NPSS 'gold standard' in recognition of the high quality of our housing advice and homelessness services and we continue to achieve the same level of excellence despite a challenging external environment.

Our commitment is to provide personalised solutions to each person that approaches us for help with their housing situation. The council, through its housing options service, is committed to providing an accessible, drop-in advice service so that we are able to provide specialist, one to one assistance without delay to anybody facing housing crisis.

Our approach is successful; in the last quarter 90% of households who came to us facing homelessness were prevented from becoming homeless. An

incredible success, demonstrating I think this council's commitment to providing top class services to those that are vulnerable or in need.

The prevention of homelessness; provision of high quality, personalised assistance and a broad range of housing options for those in housing need will remain priorities for this council."

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

Question 11

Councillor Sue Sands to ask the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth the following question:

"At a time when many urban city centre areas across the country are witnessing the rapid closure of shops and hollowing out of their retail offer, I was pleased to see that thanks to this Labour city council and our influence through Transport for Norwich, significant investment in London Street was approved earlier in the summer. Given this was the first street in Norwich to be pedestrianised over 50 years ago and provides an arterial route through the city centre itself, can the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth comment on the advantages and opportunities which can be delivered through this important scheme?"

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

"Not only was London Street the first in Norwich to be pedestrianised, it was actually the first in the UK; even 50 years ago Norwich was leading the way on transport issues. That has been followed up with things like introducing the first 20mph zone in England nearly 30 years ago and supporting the country's most successful car club scheme. Through initiatives in the pipeline with the Future Mobility Zone bid and the Transforming Cities bid, I am sure there will be more firsts to come.

After 50 years London Street is overdue a facelift. I am delighted that through the first tranche of transforming cities funding, we now have the opportunity to make improvements. While some changes are cosmetic most are about improving the space to allow pedestrians and cyclists to move about more freely with street furniture clustered in coherent groups, areas for tables and chairs properly defined and trees relocated for easier access for the vehicles that need to cross London Street. The paving details have been designed to be more robust and to better stand up to the wear and tear from vehicles using Bedford Street. Finally the disabled parking in the turnaround space at the end of London Street is to be moved to a dedicated disabled parking bay on Bank Plain which will be designed specifically with the needs of disabled drivers in mind.

The improvements don't stop in London Street, you all must be aware that there have been significant improvements in Rose Lane and changes are

afoot in Prince of Wales Road. Still to come are changes in Agricultural Hall Plain and Bank Plain to significantly improve pedestrian and cyclists experience of using these street and places. Taken together these schemes transform the journey from the rail station to the city centre.”

Supplementary question

In reply to Councillor Sands’ (S) supplementary question, the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth said that Norwich Cycling Campaign’s criticism of the cycle path in Prince of Wales Road, as recorded in the local press, had been made before the scheme had been completed. The decision to place the cycle path nearer the road was to prevent cyclists from being hit by car doors. The decision had been made to retain the street trees and build around them, and the tree pits would be levelled off. The scheme had undergone a thorough consultation process.

Question 12

Councillor Oliver to ask the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment the following question:

“Many constituents in my ward have contacted me to express both their interest and enthusiasm about the city council’s launch of Roar Power, a 100% renewable energy alternative to the Big 6 which continues to enhance our sustainability strategy and tackles fuel poverty. Given the recent public launch, can the cabinet member for safe and sustainable city environment comment on the next steps to develop, enhance and promote this much needed scheme?”

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

“It’s great to hear that your constituents are enthused about Roar Power and we hope they will consider becoming customers if they haven’t already. We are passionate about making Roar Power as successful as possible, to give our citizens the opportunity to protect the planet while saving money as well.

Initial reactions to the scheme have been very positive and we now need to seize the initiative and make sure that everybody across the region knows about Roar Power.

We are busy developing an ambitious multi-platform marketing strategy, and you can expect to hear lots more about Roar Power in the coming weeks and months. But we are taking the time to find out exactly what people want, and how we can deliver it to them with Roar Power. So watch this space and we will make further announcements as soon as we can.”

(Councillor Oliver confirmed that she did not have a supplementary question.)

Question 13

Councillor Driver to ask the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods the following question:

“Over the years I have assisted several constituents in applying for a Disabled Facilities Grant, through the Home Improvements Team, so that they can continue to reside and enjoy their home. My constituents have found these grants invaluable with support to provide a range of adaptations including level access showers, hand rails, stair lifts, changing lighting schemes to improve visibility around the home, to carrying out small repairs and minor jobs around the house which they cannot do. I was therefore pleased to learn that our council scheme has been recognised for the speed at which adaptations are provided and could receive a national award for this tomorrow. Whether it wins or not, can the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods comment on the importance of the scheme to city residents, positive difference made to resident’s lives together with thanking the officers involved in its continued delivery?”

Councillor Jones, cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhood’s response:

“I welcome your comments and of course would like to offer my thanks to all the officers involved in providing this invaluable service.

The work of the home improvement team is vital in providing residents with good housing and being able to live independently. These grants are provided to support independent living for the residents of Norwich which reduces the burden upon the NHS and adult social care. On average someone who has received a grant will have their long term prognosis increased to the point that they would not need to be admitted to hospital or have a long term care package by five years.

I’m pleased to be able to report that last year 48% more grants were approved than in the previous year and spend increased by 78%, all while improving our turnaround time.

For the year 2018/19 263 grants were approved amounting to £1.15m and these were delivered, on average in 109 days compared to 130 days in 2017/18, 150 days in 2016/17 and 159 days in 2015/16.

The government’s recent autumn spending review has suggested that funding for disabled facilities grants will at least be maintained at current level which will enable the council to continue to deliver this service to the residents of Norwich. Budget allocations will be confirmed early next year to enable delivery planning to be undertaken

As well as providing the statutory disabled facilities grant the home improvement team also offer grants to prevent admission to, or allow earlier discharge of people from hospital. Home improvements loans which are interest free and only repayable on the sale of a property for vulnerable people to ensure their homes are safe to live in. These additional local discretionary assistances are vital in preventing burden on the wider public purse.

The council also offer a discretionary top up that pays towards a calculated contribution for a disabled facilities grant. Last year, this enabled 65 people to receive a disabled facilities grant that perhaps wouldn't have been possible in another local authority area

I look forward to this vital and truly beneficial work continuing."

(Councillor Driver was not present.)

Question 14

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

"According to new figures released by the Local Government Association (LGA), almost five times as many council homes are being sold under Right to Buy as new homes are built. Given the devastating impact enhanced right to buy has inflicted upon our Norwich City Council housing stock, and capacity of the council to provide much needed socially affordable rented accommodation to citizens, can the cabinet member for social housing comment on its recent impact in Norwich since 2010?

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

"Thank you for your question. I agree that the enhanced right to buy has hit this council hard.

In 2012 council agreed a housing refinancing agreement with central government based upon an approved HRA business plan. In this business plan we had an assumption of selling around 40 homes each year under right to buy, with the 2 preceding years having sold 37 and 38 respectively.

Just a few months later the government introduced vastly increased discounts and shorter qualifying periods that has seen this council lose on average 146 homes each year since, having hit a peak of 187 homes sold in 2017-18. In total the council has lost 1098 homes under the RTB since 2010.

In order to try to mitigate this loss of available homes to meet housing need the council signed an agreement in 2012 to retain all of the receipts from additional RTB sales in order to provide new homes under the one for one replacement scheme and has retained over £32m of receipts since this agreement was in place.

Unfortunately the government has imposed strict restrictions around the use of these receipts, including:

- the need to spend them within 3 years or
- pay them over to government with punitive interest, and
- that they can only fund 30% of any project cost.

This council has utilised some of these receipts to develop or purchase 196 new social rented dwellings, including 93 at the award winning Goldsmith Street development and 49 on Rayne Park purchased from Norwich Regeneration Limited and the recently completed refurbishment of Bullard Road to provide 6 new family homes.

In 2015 Cabinet recognised that these restrictions meant that we wouldn't be able to fully utilise the amounts we were receiving on our own development projects and so we have also provided grant funding to local registered provider partners. To date this council has approved £9.6m worth of grants that will enable the development of 232 new affordable homes in the city to which we will have nomination rights.

The government carried out a consultation in October 2018 to consider giving local authorities some freedoms and flexibilities around spending RTB receipts including extending the period to 5 years and allowing 50% of a project cost to be funded.

In our response to the consultation we lobbied for the removal of all restrictions around the use of RTB receipts so we can get on and build the homes that the residents of Norwich need.

The outcome of this consultation remains outstanding.

If the government is serious about wanting to build 300,000 homes each year local authorities have to be part of the solution to this. It is a challenge this administration is up for!"

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

Question 15

Councillor Stutely to ask the cabinet member for resources the following question:

"An official study has concluded that more than 750 people were denied the chance to vote during May's local elections due to a trial scheme in some areas which demanded people show ID before casting a vote. Overall, the Electoral Commission study found up to 2,083 people were initially turned away for not having the necessary ID with them, and as many as 758 never returning. The Government, including the Norwich North MP responsible for this appalling scheme, has branded the pilot programmes 'another success'. Will the cabinet member for resources agree that this council was right to voice its concern against this scheme last year, will continue to refuse to partake in any future piloting of voter ID, and make every positive effort to ensure a maximum turnout in the democratic process?"

Councillor Kendrick, cabinet member for resources' response:

"There were voter ID pilots across 10 council areas in 2019. According to the [Electoral Commission research](#) on the pilots 1968 voters were asked to return with suitable ID and 740 later returned with the required identification. Identification ranged from passports and drivers licences to utility bills or ID prepared by the local Electoral Registration Officer. The largest urban authority in the pilot scheme was Derby. In Derby 514 voters were initially turned away with 256 returning later. As Labour authorities have not taken part in the pilots, we do not know what the figure would be in a large urban area like Leeds, Liverpool or Lambeth.

In Norwich rather than taking part in the Voter ID pilots, the elections team have concentrated on positively engaging with local residents and particularly those under-registered groups. For the first time this year students at the UEA will be able to register to vote automatically at the point of enrolment onto their courses. And the elections team is actively working with the UEA and NUA and the respective students unions in stressing the importance of registering to vote. This is important this year as a general election could happen at a time in the autumn when students have moved into their term time addresses. The council is also using to its own council data to contact home movers through new council tax accounts and continues to develop relationships with key groups like care homes, landlords and those residents who may need to register anonymously for safety reasons. Despite the efforts of the electoral services, a report by the [Association Of Electoral Administrators](#) stated that the government should be concentrating on updating archaic 'out of date' election law and also provide adequate funding to local authorities for the administration of elections and electoral registration rather than relying on the goodwill and long hours of those administrators.

This Conservative government is undertaking this policy of Voter ID to tackle a problem that hardly exists, there is no evidence of voter fraud expect in a tiny number of cases for which present law is more than adequate to deal with.

I believe that they are doing so by the desire to follow the strategy of voter suppression practised by the American Republican Party especially in the southern states to reduce voter turnout among ethnic minorities and poorer voters who often due to their poverty have fewer forms of ID."

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

Question 16

Councillor Manning to ask the leader of the council the following question:

"Given these generally unhappy and tumultuous political times will the leader agree and comment that the city council securing the future of this year's Big Bang and Spooky City is a positive and important success, giving everyone the access to a much needed, hopefully happy, free cultural events in our fine city?"

Councillor Waters, the leader's response:

"The city council is delighted to host Spooky City, Big Boom and the Christmas Switch On in the coming months. These events offer free family entertainment and an opportunity for people to dress up, come together and celebrate. They promise to be wonderful occasions and will bring many people in to the city centre.

On a broader point, cultural investment is the means to harness the creative potential of all communities and individuals across Norwich. There is no such thing as too much creativity! In Norwich, the link between high levels of

investment in broad-based cultural projects and local residents and visitors is striking: an overall engagement rate of nearly 50%.

After all, one expression of the exercise of democracy is that it should be fun!"

(Councillor Manning was not present.)

Question 17

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

"Norwich City Council supports the Norfolk Car Club which currently has 60 cars and vans available on the city streets.

In Eaton there is only one car available for rent within the ward boundary.

This is disappointing because more cars positioned close to where people live would encourage more use of the car club.

While there are 4 bays marked out and 3 bays in the process of designation in Eaton there is no finance available to resource cars for these bays.

Each new car club introduced will be used by 20 drivers. This means taking cars off the road and using them less, all of which is good for the environment and a more efficient use of vehicles.

Please will the portfolio holder comment on how Norwich City Council can help increase the number of car club cars in Eaton and the city as a whole?

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

"Over the years the city council has offered considerable support to the Norfolk car club and this has resulted in the Norfolk car club being the most successful not for profit car club in the UK. That support has come in a number of ways including bidding for funding, securing the necessary traffic regulation orders and marking bays. Support for the car club has also come from other sources including Department for Transport, Norfolk County Council and from new property developments.

Growth of the car club city wide, including in Eaton is currently led by the car club operator as they are best placed to determine most viable locations based on customer feedback. As you say, there are locations in Eaton where car club bays have been identified but as yet no car has been provided. It is a matter for the operator, however I am very hopeful that this will be rectified in the not too distant future.

Norfolk County Council are to submit shortly a funding bid to the Department of Transport looking for money from the Future Mobility Zone budget to significantly expand the car club in the city and to start the switch from petrol

and diesel vehicles to electric ones. As part of that Eaton Ward would see a number of new cars and bays introduced. Norwich is one of seven cities shortlisted for funding and it is expected the 3 or 4 will be successful so I am optimistic that we will get something. Even if we are not, however, we are committed to working with the car club operator to identify other potential funding sources to further expand the car club and to encourage the residents of the city to use shared transport as a viable option to individuals owning their own cars.”

Supplementary question

In reply to Councillor Lubbock’s supplementary question, the cabinet member for sustainable and inclusive growth said that whilst the Transforming Cities funding was at an early stage, there was potential to increase Car Club provision.