



**Council**

**19:35 to 22:30**

**30 November 2021**

Present: Councillors Maguire (Lord Mayor), Ackroyd, Button, Bogelein, Brociek- Coulton, Carlo, Champion, Davis, Driver, Everett, , Fulton-McAlister (M), Galvin, Giles, Grahame, Hampton, Harris, Haynes, Huntley, Jones, Kendrick, Lubbock, Manning, Oliver, Osborn, Packer, Peek, Price, Sands (M), Schmierer, Stonard, Stutely, Waters, Wright and Youssef

Apologies: Councillors Everett, Fulton-McAlister (E) Maxwell, Sands (S), Thomas (Va) and Thomas (Vi)

**1. Lord Mayor's Announcements**

The Lord Mayor explained the procedures for this informal meeting of the council that was being held remotely on public health grounds. Members would discuss the items on the agenda and then a vote taken. The votes cast would be ratified and used to inform decisions made at an in person meeting of a quorum of members of the council to be held on 1 December 2021.

The Lord Mayors invited group leaders to pay tribute to former councillor Adrian Holmes who had recently passed away. Members gave a round of applause in recognition of his achievements.

**2. Declarations of interests**

Councillors Waters, Harris, Oliver, Brociek-Coulton, Kendrick, Driver, Peek and Button declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 6 on the agenda, and motion 10e as council tenants.

Councillor Bogelein declared a pecuniary interest in motion 10b and would withdraw from the meeting for the discussion and vote on the item.

**3. Public questions/petitions**

The Lord Mayor announced that two public questions and two petitions had been received.

The first public question was from Mr Peter Cutting.

Mr Cutting asked the cabinet member for health and wellbeing the following question:

“Norwich City Council repeatedly removed material objecting to the tennis court construction in Heigham Park.

The opinion of a UEA Law Professor (UK Government advisor on Human Rights):

‘The legal position is quite clear. A council is under enforceable duties - contained in s.6 of the Human Rights Act 1998 - not to take a decision or perform any action that breaches someone else's rights - and here, it is your group's rights to freedom of expression under Article 10 of the ECHR/HRA. That this is political expression enhances your position.

The fact that a council has the power - and I've seen correspondence from Councillor Packer to take action 'against' political speech under a different statute does not absolve it of its duties under the HRA, and under s.6 of that Act.’

How does the council justify removing its citizens rights to freedom of expression?”

Councillor Packer, the cabinet member for health and wellbeing gave the following response:

“The council supports residents rights to freedom of expression and our decisions in relation to the improvement of tennis facilities in Heigham Park have been debated on numerous occasions.

With regards to the banners and posters that were placed on the perimeter fence of Heigham Park, the council sought its own legal advice. This was clear that that council had the right to remove these posters from its own property. Several weeks later there has been no legal challenge to the actions taken.

I can see little to be gained from debating the removal of posters any further and it is simply false to suggest freedom of expression has been curtailed.

I am greatly looking forward to the opening of the new courts in coming weeks.”

(By way of a supplementary question, Mr Cutting referred to two complaints he had submitted and asked why there had been no response to these. Councillor Packer replied that he would need to look into this matter and would respond to Mr Cutting personally.)

The second public question was from Ms Katie Ward.

Ms Ward asked the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods the following question:

“It is appreciated that the council is acting regarding the increasing incidents of spiking in the city. Whilst creating awareness surrounding the incidents is essential to deterrence, the increasingly violent and subversive means employed by those looking to assault women – most recently the use of injections – completely disempowers individuals from ensuring their own safety. Therefore, it is vital that increasing awareness is coupled with increasing action by the police – it is essential that where incidents occur, they are met with prosecution and conviction. The motion presented here states that the council are working closely with the police force to ensure that the hot spots in the city are monitored, but as a woman I want to query whether the council will be closely monitoring the successful arrests and convictions for these violent acts against women to ensure that police response is adequate, and the perpetrators are removed from our streets?”

Councillor Jones cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods gave the following response:

“The increase in incidents of spiking is very worrying. The city must remain a safe, welcoming place for all to enjoy any time of the day and night.

The council is working closely with Norfolk Constabulary and other night-time economy stakeholders to tackle this issue. The Constabulary take the lead in investigating criminal matters, but where the council can support police investigations, we will, to ensure a successful prosecution.

If there are issues with the management of a particular licensed premises, enforcement powers are available to the council and other responsible authorities. We would not hesitate to act where we believe this would assist in keeping women safe.

Through close joint working on initiatives such as the community safety partnership we will do all we can to ensure that women’s safety at night continues to be monitored and support the constabulary to address this serious matter.”

(In response to a supplementary question, Councillor Jones said that it was clear that there was only so much the Police could achieve around prosecutions, and this was a wider issue for the criminal justice system and the government. The system needed to be properly resourced and the council would continue to work with partners and stakeholder using the powers available, to protect its citizens.)

#### **4. Minutes**

**RESOLVED** to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 28 and 29 September 2021.

## 5. Questions to Cabinet Members/Committee Chairs

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

The questions are summarised as follows:

- Question 1:** Councillor Champion to the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion on a net zero plan.
- Question 2:** Councillor Price to the cabinet member for inclusive and sustainable growth on local nature recovery strategies.
- Question 3:** Councillor Galvin to the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion on a climate change communication strategy.
- Question 4:** Councillor Haynes to the cabinet member for environmental services on fly tipping.
- Question 5:** Councillor Bogelein to the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods on Temporary Event Notices.
- Question 6:** Councillor Youssef to the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods on drink spiking in Norwich.
- Question 7:** Councillor Carlo to the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion on air pollution monitoring.
- Question 8:** Councillor Schmierer to the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods on a buy-to-let policy.
- Question 9:** Councillor Grahame to the cabinet member for environmental services on dog fouling.
- Question 10:** Councillor Osborn to the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing on housing compliance.
- Question 11:** Councillor Peek to the cabinet member for health and wellbeing on trees in West Earham woods.
- Question 12:** Councillor Button to the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing on grounds maintenance.
- Question 13:** Councillor Mike Sands to the leader of the council on Remembrance Sunday.
- Question 14:** Councillor Driver to the deputy leader and cabinet member for social housing on the Webster Court development.
- Question 15:** Councillor Giles to the leader of the council on the Norwich Living Wage campaign.

- Question 16:** Councillor Everett to the leader of the council on the Digi-tech factory.
- Question 17:** Councillor Manning to the cabinet member for health and wellbeing on the Lakenham Recreation Ground tennis courts.
- Question 18:** Councillor Matthew Fulton-McAlister to the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion on COP26.
- Question 19:** Councillor Lubbock to the cabinet member for inclusive and sustainable growth on parking enforcement.
- Question 20:** Councillor Bogelein to the chair of the scrutiny committee on resources for scrutiny.
- Question 21:** Councillor Haynes to the chair of scrutiny on training on the constitution.
- Question 22:** Councillor Osborn to the cabinet member for environmental services on the delivery of communal bins.

(Details of the questions and responses were available on the council's website prior to the meeting and attached to these minutes at Appendix A, together with a minute of any supplementary questions and responses.)

## **6. Health and safety compliance in council homes**

(Councillors Waters, Harris, Oliver, Brociek-Coulton, Kendrick, Driver, Peek and Button had declared a non-pecuniary interest in this item).

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

Following debate it was,

**RESOLVED**, with seven abstentions and twenty three voting in favour, to:

- 1) Approve that the HRA capital programme is adjusted by £1m in 2021/22 and £1m in 2022/23 to support delivery of capital upgrade works relating to the Compliance Improvement Plan as set out in paragraph 48 of the 12 November cabinet report; and
- 2) note that quarterly progress reports against the Compliance Improvement Plan will be presented to cabinet.

## 7. Licensing Act 2003 – Statement of Licensing Policy

Councillor Jones moved and Councillor Stutely seconded the recommendations as set out in the report.

Following debate it was,

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to adopt the Statement of Licensing Policy.

## 8. Polling district and polling places review 2021

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

Following debate it was,

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to approve:-

- 1) the polling scheme as recommended by the polling district and place working;  
and
- 2) the polling district boundaries changes in Crome, Mancroft and University wards

## 9. Constitutional amendments

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

The Lord Mayor explained that as he had received a request for the votes to be taken in parts, with recommendation 1(a) taken first, then recommendations 1(b) and 2 would be taken together.

Following debate it was,

**RESOLVED**, with thirteen voting against and twenty one voting in favour to adopt the proposed changes to the Questions by Councillor Procedure in the Procedure Rules by amending paragraph 51 so that questions at Council may only be asked to the Leader or Cabinet members.

It was then,

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to:

- 1) (b) amend paragraph 56 to read:

“Written replies will be given to questions by the relevant Cabinet member or committee chair or their nominee but shall not be the subject of any further debate. *Answers should provide a full response to questions in a succinct way.* If the reply cannot be given at the council meeting, a written answer will be provided to the questioner within 10 working days of the meeting.”

- 2) Adopt the proposed changes to the Motions on Notice Procedure in the Procedure Rules as suggested in Appendix 1

## 10. Motions

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

(With two hours having passed since the beginning of the meeting, the Lord Mayor asked if the remaining business could be taken as unopposed. Councillor Waters opposed item 10(e) and Councillor Jones opposed item 10(f).)

### 10 (a) Motion: Veterans

(Proposer Councillor Mike Sands, seconder Councillor Davis. Unopposed business)

"This council supports our Armed Forces, forces families and veterans living in city. We are proud that British Forces are respected worldwide for their professionalism and excellence. Over the last year our Armed Forces have shown just how indispensable they are to the Nation's security, from recently airlifting British nationals out of Afghanistan to driving NHS ambulances and delivering vital fuel. Just as our Armed Forces work to keep us all safe and our country secure, so we must do all we can to support them both in our city and beyond.

Council **RESOLVES** to:

- 1) note that;
  - a) The Armed Forces Bill, which will soon return to the Commons from the Lords, provides an important opportunity to tangibly improve the lives of our service personnel, veterans, and their families. The current Armed Forces Covenant is not currently enshrined in law allowing for wide variations in its interpretation at local level. When this is combined with years of government austerity it results in many local authorities being forced to concentrate ever more on their basic, statutory services.
  - b) That following their service, commonwealth veterans can be left with steep financial costs to remain in the UK. Whilst their applications are ongoing, commonwealth veterans are unable to seek employment or claim social security, with many facing NHS bills of tens of thousands of pounds for life saving treatment following service that placed their own lives at risk for the benefit of us all.
- 2) ask the Leader to write to: -
  - a) The Minister of State for Immigration, The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Defence People and Veterans, and our two local MPs to pledge support for the incredible service of men and women from the Commonwealth and Nepal who have served and do serve in the UK Armed Forces, and the unconscionable way so many of them and their families are being treated. In particular we agree with veterans who believe their right to stay in the UK

should be awarded automatically on account of their service and note that the recent government public consultation was insufficient in scope; with the only proposal being to offer a visa fee waiver after 12 years' service – an unduly high threshold that will alleviate costs for only a fraction of service personnel. Council believes that only meaningful reform will deliver justice, and that means introducing a free and equitable route to citizenship that incorporates families, and – as we as a nation do not know how many have been affected by this injustice – believe that the government should establish a dedicated unit to assist veterans, similar to the Windrush Taskforce.

- b) The minister of state for immigration and minister for veterans to pledge our support for all commonwealth veterans who have served a minimum of 4 years to be granted automatic and free of charge right to remain in the UK and that any veteran who completes 12 years of service to be automatically given British Citizenship without charge.
  - c) The defence secretary to request that a £35m fund to support British veterans and Afghan interpreters is delivered (through funding recovered from cancelled MoD interpreter contracts) for grants to charities and Local Authorities in England to provide mental health support services for veterans and support for those Afghan nationals who have relocated to the UK through the ARAP scheme.
- 3) develop, working with the veteran's champion and cabinet member for social inclusion an enhanced Norwich Armed Forces Community Covenant, to complement the Armed Forces Covenant. "

### **10(b) Motion: Local energy business campaign**

(Proposer Councillor Hampton, seconder Councillor Stutely. Unopposed business)

The following amendment was received from Councillor Osborn:-

Inserting the words "**to become a licensed supplier**" after "**running costs**" in resolution 2a).

Inserting the words "**and the risks of traded power market volatility**" after "**local customers**" in resolution 2a).

Replacing the word "**impossible**" with the words "**very difficult**" in resolution 2a).

Removing the word "**financial**" in resolution 2b).

Inserting the words "**and recognising the benefit their investments would bring locally**" after "**electricity supplier's operation**" in resolution 2b).

Inserting the words "**also support emissions reduction locally**" after "**if they wished, and**" in resolution 2b).



Inserting the words “**go towards creating a resilient, smart local energy system, benefitting energy security**” after “**local services and facilities,**” in resolution 2c).

Inserting the words “**used**” before the words “**to reduce local**” in resolution 2c).

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

Norwich City Council **RESOLVES** to; -

- 1) Acknowledge the efforts that this Council has made to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote renewable energy including such programmes as ROAR power, COSY City, Solar Together and Big Switch and Save in recent years.
- 2) Further recognise:
  - a) that very large financial setup and running costs to become a licensed supplier involved in selling locally generated renewable electricity to local customers and the risks of traded power market volatility result in it being very difficult for local renewable electricity generators to do so,
  - b) that making these costs proportionate to the scale of a renewable electricity supplier’s operation and recognising the benefit their investments would bring locally would create significant opportunities for local companies and community groups to be providers of locally generated renewable electricity directly to local people, businesses, and organisations, if they wished, and also support emissions reduction locally and
  - c) that revenues received by such local companies or community groups that chose to become local renewable electricity providers could be used to help improve the local economy, local services and facilities, go towards creating a resilient, smart local energy system, benefitting energy security and used to reduce local greenhouse gas emissions;
  - d) Notes that the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee, as a result of its 2021 Technological Innovations and Climate Change inquiry, recommended that a Right to Local Supply for local energy suppliers be established to address this;
  - e) Accordingly resolves to support the Local Electricity Bill, currently supported by a cross-party group of 266 MPs and which, if made law, would establish a Right to Local Supply which would promote local renewable electricity supply by making the setup and running costs of selling renewable electricity to local customers proportionate to the size of the supply company; and
- 3) Further resolves to
  - a) inform the local media of this decision,
  - b) write to local MPs, asking them to support the Bill, and

- c) write to the organisers of the campaign for the Bill, Power for People, (at Camden Collective, 5-7 Buck Street, London NW1 8NJ or [info@powerforpeople.org.uk](mailto:info@powerforpeople.org.uk)) expressing its support.

### **10(c) Motion: Fireworks**

(Proposer Councillor Stutely, seconder Councillor Button. Unopposed business)

**RESOLVED** that:

This Council **RESOLVES** to:

- a) call on the relevant licensing authorities to require all public firework displays within the city boundaries to be advertised in advance of the event, allowing residents to take precautions for their animals and vulnerable people.
- b) actively promote a public awareness campaign about the impact of fireworks on animal welfare and vulnerable people – including the precautions that can be taken to mitigate risks.
- c) write to the UK Government urging them to introduce legislation to limit the maximum noise level of fireworks to 90dB for those sold to the public for private displays; and
- d) encourage local suppliers of fireworks to stock ‘quieter’ fireworks for public display.”

### **10(d) Motion: Anti-social behaviour and residents’ feeling of safety**

(Proposer Councillor Bogelein, seconder Councillor Osborn. Unopposed business)

The following amendment from Councillor Jones was received:

Inserting the words “**the government and other statutory agencies**” after “**to lobby**” in resolution 2a).

Replacing the words “**for and implementing**” with the words “**to implement**” in resolution 2a).

Inserting the words “**as planned**” after “**introducing**” and the words “**through the developing community safety strategy**” after “**feelings of safety**” in resolution 2b).

Replacing the words “**bringing forward the underspend of the estate aesthetics programme in the coming financial year**” with the words “**giving consideration to taking forward any underspend of the estate aesthetics programme at the end of the financial year**” in resolution 2c).

Replacing the words “**looking at**” with the words “**continuing to look at**” in resolution 2d).

Replacing the words “**using**” with the words “**continuing to work with the police and supporting the use of**” in resolution 2d).

Inserting the words “**giving consideration to, through the review of the HRA Business Plan,**” before the word “**providing**” in resolution 2f).

Replacing the word “**increasing**” with the words “**continuing, increasing and developing**” in resolution 2g).

Inserting the words “**including as part of the Safer Neighbourhood Initiative**” after “**together with officers**” in resolution 2g).

Inserting the words “**alongside those existing**” after the words “**producing a strategy**” in resolution 2i).

So that the revised motion becomes:-

“The level of anti-social behaviour recorded in Norwich varies greatly in different parts of the city. The percentage of residents who feel safe in their communities also varies and it is largely the case that council tenants feel less safe than residents in other forms of housing.

**RESOLVED** that:

1) Council notes:

- a) Residents’ feelings of safety and anti-social behaviour can be linked to the state of cleanliness and upkeep of an area.
- b) Anti-social behaviour is the one category that has been marked as red on the council’s risk register since the introduction of the new risk register.
- c) The council has recently changed its approach to responding to anti-social behaviour in order to improve the experience of those who report anti-social behaviour to the council.

2) Council resolves to ask cabinet to consider:

- a) continuing to lobby the government and other statutory agencies to implement measures which address the structural drivers behind anti-social behaviour;
- b) introducing, as planned, a separate theme in the covid recovery plan to look at actions that reduce anti-social behaviour and increase feelings of safety, through the developing community safety strategy;
- c) giving consideration to taking forward any underspend of the estate aesthetics programme at the end of the financial year to address issues

of cleanliness and upkeep on council estates, which can influence anti-social behaviour and feelings of safety;

- d) continuing to opportunities to increase CCTV coverage, where the evidence indicates a demand and to increase the monitoring of CCTV in line with requests from the public, councillors and the police;
- e) continuing to work with the police and supporting use of partial premises closure orders for public spaces such as staircases which suffer from frequent use of drug dealing and drug use;
- f) giving consideration to, through the review of the HRA Business Plan, providing the budget to increase the number of safer neighbourhood coordinators;
- g) continuing, increasing and developing resident engagement around anti-social behaviour through regular resident audits together with officers;
- h) communicating with residents the option of a community trigger as a way to escalate situations around anti-social behaviour, where action by the council and partner agencies has not resulted in any improvement;
- i) producing a strategy, alongside those existing, for designing out crime in council-owned parks and public spaces.”

### **10(e) Motion: Housing safety compliance**

Councillor Lubbock moved and Councillor Ackroyd seconded the motion.

“In October 2021 the council wrote to 17,000 tenants and leaseholders to inform them of its failure to carry out legal safety checks on properties that it has responsibility for.

The verdict of the Regulator for Social Housing (RSH) is that 'Norwich City Council has failed to meet statutory health and safety requirements in relation to fire, electrical and water safety....and as a consequence there was the potential for serious detriment to tenants.'

New governance arrangements, comprehensive plans and proposals are being developed to return NCC homes to full compliance, including the creating of a Health and Safety Compliance Board to oversee the process of implementing a 'Compliance Improvement Plan'.

Council **RESOLVES** to increase the membership of the Health and Safety Compliance Board to include members who are external to the administration in order to improve scrutiny, openness and transparency. This increase will include representatives of tenants and leaseholders - the voice of those who receive the services - and members of the opposition parties, for at least 2 years or the duration of the Health and Safety Compliance Board.”

With twelve voting in favour and eighteen voting against, the motion was lost.

(As three hours had passed since the beginning of the meeting, the Lord Mayor took vote on continuing with the meeting.

With one vote in favour of continuing, the meeting was closed.

The remaining agenda item, motion 10 (f) on drink spiking, would be heard at the next meeting of full council).

The meeting was closed.

LORD MAYOR



**NORWICH**  
City Council

**Council**  
**30 November 2021**  
**Questions to cabinet members or chairs of committees**

**Question 1**

**Councillor Champion to ask the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion the following question:**

“I’m glad the council has reaffirmed its commitment to UK100. I understand that this means the council has ‘set ambitious Net Zero targets for greenhouse emissions of 2030 for council operations and 2045 for areawide emissions at the latest’. Therefore, will the council publish a clear plan showing how these targets will be reached?”

**Councillor Hampton, the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion’s response:**

“The council was one of the first to benchmark its carbon footprint in 2007, and has reduced its emissions by 71.1 % since then through a series of ambitious Carbon Management Programmes. Work is underway on our next carbon management programme to take us to our 2030 target and will cover scope 1-3 emissions sources.

Developing a plan for the city will fall within the scope of the independent Norwich Climate Commission, with City Vision partners working towards the commission’s recommendations as appropriate. However, it is already clear that to achieve Net Zero by 2045 national policy, funding and regulatory frameworks must be revised and co-ordinated to enable a faster transition to a low carbon society. Regretfully presently the UK Net Zero target year is 2050.”

(By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Champion said that membership of UK100 meant that the council could be involved in various green campaigns and asked for details of which campaigns had been supported by the council. Councillor Hampton replied that it was early days of the council’s membership and she hoped to learn from its experience and be involved in future campaigns.)

**Question 2**

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

“I understand that Local Nature Recovery Strategies will map the most valuable existing habitat for nature and map specific proposals for improving habitat for wildlife. We must protect and improve these habitats and their natural states, such as being dark at night. Will the cabinet member agree to work with volunteers from Norwich Greener Spaces, who have been mapping wildlife in Norwich, to identify, protect and enhance very local biodiversity corridors, as well as other local groups that have produced similar data?”

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

“Nature Recovery Networks (NRN) are a commitment in the government’s 25 Year Environment Plan and are also established by the Environment Act 2021 which recently received Royal Assent. A key part of delivery of the NRN at a local level will be the use of mapping and data to develop Local Nature Recovery Strategies (LNRS). The details of what LNRS must do or contain are not yet known and the government is yet to publish guidance and best practice advice to aid in their production. But I would certainly hope that locally the scope for utilising the vast amount of expertise and goodwill that exists within the voluntary sector is maximised.”

(As Councillor Price’s supplementary question on audits and targets around biodiversity was not part of Councillor Stonard’s portfolio, the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion said that she would contact Councillor Price directly with the information.)

### Question 3

#### **Councillor Galvin to ask the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion the following question:**

“I was pleased to see the council tweet during COP26. However, these tweets focused on personal actions and ignored: the crisis; the need for system change; the relevance of COP26 and how residents can engage to make real change, putting pressure on decision makers at a high level. The council suggested personal actions to help reduce emissions including things like recycling. Recycling is important, but research suggests that focusing on environmental behaviours that don't significantly contribute to tackling climate change, while being important for other reasons, risks negative spill over, rebound effects and a false impression of the scale of the problem. A councillor enquiry response told me the council does not have a climate change communication strategy. Will the cabinet member commit to developing a climate change communication strategy which makes sure that messaging is in line with the extensive research on climate messaging?”

#### **Councillor Hampton, the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion's response:**

“I am glad you agree on the importance of communicating to citizens on climate change. If you would like to share the research you mentioned, our environmental and communications teams would be happy to review it.

The council's Environmental Strategy 2020 – 2025 includes information on how the council will engage and communicate, including that the council will:

- carry out a range of work to engage and communicate with residents, voluntary and community organisations, businesses, academic institutions and other statutory bodies on the progression of the environmental strategy.
- utilise the latest research and approaches in community engagement and environmental psychology to inform communications activity
- evaluate the response and outcomes accordingly.

As set out in the update report to cabinet in October, the council is taking stock of environmental response and will consider any communication aspects as part of that work.”

(In response to Councillor Galvin's supplementary question, Councillor Hampton said that although output on the council's Twitter account was limited, other press releases were published during COP26 promoting outcomes and system change.)



#### **Question 4**

**Councillor Haynes to ask the cabinet member for environmental services the following question:**

“I am very concerned that insufficient action has been taken by cabinet in the past to deter fly tippers. As it's inefficient for the council to ignore residents' reports of people illegally dumping waste and, recognising that the council could usefully issue fixed penalty notices or seek to educate the perpetrators, will the current cabinet member commit to taking some action to deter fly-tipping in the city?”

**Councillor Oliver, the cabinet member for environmental services' response:**

“The council is aware of the impact that fly tipping is having on our neighbourhoods. A Task and Finish Group has been established by the council's scrutiny committee to examine this problem and propose solutions to address it.

The Task and Finish Group is awaiting a report and recommendations from officers and will be reporting its conclusions to the scrutiny committee in due course. We will consider further possible actions when the report is produced.”

(By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Haynes asked what the reasoning was for asking residents to report flytipping when the information did not seem to be being made use of. Councillor Oliver replied that there was an ongoing Task and Finish group with an officer report on this anticipated. Recommendations from the group would be considered by cabinet).

## Question 5

### **Councillor Bogelein to ask the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods the following question:**

“In recent weeks, temporary event notices have been granted for a number of locations throughout the city, some of them in residential areas. These licences were for alcohol and music entertainment until 2am. While I fully understand the legislation behind TENs and that only the police or public protection can object, I was surprised that public protection did not anticipate problems with licences until 2am in residential areas, especially after the numerous problems we have had with these licences in the city centre. Other temporary licences in the past have been restricted to an earlier time to prevent the negative effect on neighbours. Can the cabinet member explain how they are planning to strengthen the scrutiny by the public protection team of these TENs licences, so the action is not only reactive in terms of working with organisers once problems arise, but proactively anticipating amenity issues?”

### **Councillor Jones, the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods' response:**

“Norwich City Council receives approximately 30 temporary event notices (TENs) every month. The system of TENs is intended as a light touch process under the Licensing Act 2003, and many operators successfully undertake activities without causing significant disturbance to surrounding properties.

Following a recent peer review of the licensing service, consideration is being given to resourcing and operating procedures of the entire service. This review will consider the approach to TENs as well as the resourcing of the public protection team.”

(In response to a supplementary question, Councillor Jones said that the peer review was around service structure and she would follow up with more detail around this once it was known.)

## Question 6

### **Councillor Youssef to ask the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods the following question:**

“I understand that the Night-time Economy Adviser working for Bristol City Council has developed a guide for venues on how to respond to suspected drink spiking. People are encouraged to report spiking, venues are encouraged to support police investigations, and hundreds of testing kits are being rolled out to bars, pubs and clubs. Given recently-reported incidents of spiking in Norwich, what plans are there for this council to take similar action to discourage the spiking of drinks, or needle spiking in the city?”

### **Councillor Jones, the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods’ response:**

“There has been an increase in reports of spiking across the country and the city over the past few months. Norfolk Constabulary are the lead agency on the prevention of crime and are working closely with venues on how to respond to suspected spiking incidents. This work is being carried out in conjunction with the Late-Night Norwich forum which includes night-time economy businesses, security staff, support services such as the SOS Bus, the Police and city council officers.

Norfolk Constabulary are carrying out investigations and are closely monitoring patterns of reported incidents. The advice being provided to premises in safeguarding victims is to encourage reporting of incidents, use of lidded vessels for drinks, advice on searching customers and support to obtain evidence. The police will act against individuals as necessary and if issues are found with the management of particular premises, then there are powers for enforcement against licensed premises.”

(In response to councillor Youssef’s supplementary question on what Norwich City Council was doing to prevent this issue, Councillor Jones said that a multiagency approach was needed and the council was looking at how to work with partners and stakeholders to make best use of the powers it had.)

## Question 7

### **Councillor Carlo to ask the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion the following question:**

“The draft Transport for Norwich Strategy says in some locations outside the City Centre Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) such as “Wroxham Road/ Ring Road, Sprowston and Reepham Road, Hellesdon”, nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>x</sub>) levels are near to where an AQMA would have to be considered. Poor air quality there has not been picked up by monitoring stations at Castle Meadow and Lakenfields. New WHO guidelines recommend halving the annual average exposure to PM<sub>2.5</sub> and cutting by three quarters the annual average limit for NO<sub>x</sub>. In view of this new information, will the city council install additional air pollution monitoring equipment across the whole city in particular along primary routes and outside schools?”

### **Councillor Hampton, the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion’s response:**

“We work with Norfolk County to tackle air pollution arising from traffic. The locations that Councillor Carlo quotes from the Transport Strategy are in Broadland District. Within the city council’s area our monitoring is concentrated on the city centre Air Quality Management Area supported by the background monitoring stations. In addition, diffusion tubes have been installed outside the AQMA where traffic congestion or planned development coincides with residential areas where housing is close to the carriageway. These locations are kept under review and most recently resulted in tubes being installed on Bracondale, Hall Road, Heigham Street and St Stephens Road. We need to be mindful of the cost of the equipment and staff time when locating monitoring equipment. We will also be supporting the county’s work on School Streets by monitoring the air quality improvement that we expect to result from traffic restrictions in the vicinity of the selected schools.”

(By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Carlo asked if the cabinet member agreed that a general road traffic reduction scheme was needed across Greater Norwich to improve air quality. Councillor Hampton replied that it would be an aspiration but would need work from other colleagues.)

## Question 8

### **Councillor Schmierer to ask the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods the following question:**

“Major new housebuilding initiatives at Anglia Square and Norwich East will see thousands of new properties built in the city. Does the cabinet member agree that the council should look to follow the example set by other European cities, most notably Amsterdam or Berlin in tackling the rise of build/buy-to-let property magnates? Amsterdam was the first city to take advantage of a law introduced by the Dutch government last month, ruling that anyone who buys a home under €512,000 must live in it for at least four years, with the hope that the move will open up the housing market to more domestic buyers and owner occupiers. Only newly-purchased properties, not apartments which are already being rented out, will be affected. Such a policy could have similar benefits for the people of Norwich who, through no fault of their own, are struggling to get onto the property ladder.”

### **Councillor Jones, the cabinet member for safer, stronger neighbourhoods’ response:**

“There is much the UK can learn from continental Europe about how it plans for development and manages its housing stock, often delivering better quality homes at more affordable prices to residents across a range of tenures. Whereas here the cost of decent quality homes for owner occupation and private rented accommodation is unaffordable to many. I doubt whether the UK government would introduce the legislation similar to that used in Amsterdam. However, if they did, I would be happy to consider using these powers, although do note that the buy-to-let market does currently meet a housing need. I would want to sure that it did not negatively impact on availability of private rented accommodation, raising prices if supply did not meet demand. At present I believe our focus must be on improved protection for private renters, both in terms of quality and safety of accommodation and security of tenure.”

(In response to Councillor Schmeierer’s supplementary question around what the city council was doing to stop citizens being priced out of buying homes, Councillor Jones said that she would need to find out more information and asked Councillor Schmierer to contact her directly.)

## Question 9

### **Councillor Grahame to ask the cabinet member for environmental services the following question:**

“Dog fouling is frequently a problem on The Green on St Leonard’s Road. I understand that this is within the area of a dog fouling PSPO. It would be helpful if a sign were put up to discourage owners from letting their dogs foul on the grass. It would also be helpful if negligent dog owners received fixed penalty notices, in accordance with the PSPO. Will the council take either of these actions to help residents take care of their shared space?”

### **Councillor Oliver, the cabinet member for environmental services’ response:**

“The Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) for dog fouling In Norwich was implemented in May of this year. Effective signage is being finalised to raise awareness of the PSPO and the fines payable for failing to follow its directions. We are also developing an enforcement approach that will support the objectives of the PSPO, and this approach will include identifying and targeting areas that are most affected by inconsiderate dog owners allowing their dogs to foul.”

(In response to Councillor Grahame’s supplementary question, Councillor Oliver said that there was not a date for review of the enforcement policy but dog owners needed to be made aware of their responsibilities. Signage on penalties for dog fouling had been requested for The Green on St Leonard’s Road).

**Question 10**

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

“In June, full council passed a motion on reducing harmful advertising in Norwich. In October, a planning application was submitted for 9 illuminated advertising hoardings on Heigham Street that could impact on the quality of life for residents nearby, yet the planning portal did not allow the public to submit comments on the application. More recently plans have been submitted for 3-metre high "BT Street Hubs" that would mean large, brightly-lit digital advertising screens being erected in various locations in the city. Can the cabinet member tell me whether, following the motion in June, the council is intending to review planning policy in order to address concerns about the harmful impact of illuminated advertising and to ensure that residents are able to present their views?”

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

“The council motion of June concerned the subject of advertising and locations near schools.

It remains the council's intention to review planning policies as per the resolution, i.e., to ensure that, where possible, adverts are not sited near schools. This will be done through a review of all development management policies, which will start next year.

In the meantime, the council will continue to apply its existing policies to assess advert applications. These do allow for the impact on residents' amenity through issues such as illumination to be considered”

(By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Osborn asked for a date of the review of the planning policies. Councillor Stonard said that there was not a date for the review as yet but there were mechanisms for members of the public to respond to consultations, including those around brightly lit advertising hoardings.)

## Question 11

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

“I was of course concerned to hear of our housing compliance issues and there are many councillors that are naturally invested in the issues as council tenants themselves. We rightly self-reported ourselves to the social housing regulator. Can the cabinet member for social housing tell me what has been put in place to drive the necessary improvement plan through?”

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

“We have developed a comprehensive compliance improvement plan and supporting the plan will be a risk register, trackers, and a performance dashboard. Actions will be agreed and allocated for ownership by a new compliance team working with colleagues from asset management. The compliance team will be led by a new head of asset management and a new senior compliance and building safety officer.

A Health and Safety Compliance Board, comprising of members of the administration and senior officers will have oversight of, and drive delivery of the compliance improvement plan.

The regulator has confirmed it has the level of assurance needed in the plans we have put in place to not take statutory enforcement action. We will report progress to the Regulator monthly and to cabinet quarterly.

Our aim is to work with the Regulator of Social Housing to return to a fully compliant position within 12 – 18 months.”

(Councillor Peek had no supplementary question)



## Question 12

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

“West Earham wood remains a beautiful asset nestling between the wards in this city. In recent years I have been deeply impressed by the work of the Friends of West Earham Wood group and the efforts of the council to support them. With new S106 money identified for it, can the cabinet member for health and wellbeing comment on the number of new trees this funding will deliver for this valued green space?”

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

“Bunkers Hill is one of many areas of woodland managed by the council. Recent works have been informed by an ecological survey and are aimed at increasing its biodiversity.

The woodland has thinned, removing approximately 70 sycamores which have a low biodiversity value. 900 trees (sweet chestnut, oak, beech, hornbeam) were planted to improve the woodland structure and biodiversity. Planting of a further 2,000 trees (Hazel, hawthorn, blackthorn, spindle, holly) has started around the woodland edge.

The Friends of West Earham Woods and the Trust for Conservation volunteers have played an important role in improving the woodland, giving more than 793 hours of their time. I would like to take this opportunity to thank them for.”

(Councillor Button had no supplementary question)

### **Question 13**

**Councillor Mike Sands to ask the leader of the council the following question:**

“I note that some veterans were displeased with the lack of a formal parade at Remembrance Day this year due to the Covid-19 restrictions and safety measures which the council had agreed to earlier in the year. I have seen certain comments indicating that this is due to the council not caring about veterans or the importance of remembrance. Can the leader confirm, once again, that this is not the case and that any restrictions permitting, a full remembrance service and parade will be organised next year?”

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

“As you say in your own motion later on the agenda, “this council supports our Armed Forces, forces families and veterans living in city”. I was saddened to hear that some people felt the decision not to organise a parade was due to lack of care. To the contrary, the decision to hold a smaller, dignified wreath laying ceremony and Cathedral Service was made in the best interests of protecting public health. The news of a new, possibly more virulent, strain of COVID, requiring a return to the public health precautions, like wearing face masks, reminds us that the pandemic is not over.

On the basis that COVID is under control, it is our intention to organise a full remembrance service and parade next year.”

(Councillor Mike Sands had no supplementary question)

## Question 14

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

“Tackling homelessness through building safe, secure housing and support has been a cornerstone ambition of this administration for generations. I am aware that the cabinet member visited the development of new homes at Webster Court which seem a great example of how the council are looking at ambitious and creative ways of commissioning housing development projects. Can the cabinet member for social housing comment on progress with the scheme and the difference it will make?”

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

“I can confirm that the six flats will be complete and ready before Christmas. People have already been identified with personalised packages of support to help them transition and settle into their new homes. This housing will change people’s lives by giving them somewhere safe, secure, and warm with the support they need to live independently.

The modular scheme is a brilliant example of off-site constructed homes that can be constructed and delivered on-site at pace to help solve our pressing need for affordable housing quickly. These homes could not have been delivered without the strong partnerships we have fostered with Broadland Housing Association and the local voluntary sector. We are grateful for the support of our partners to make this happen.”

(In response to Councillor Driver’s supplementary question, Councillor Harris said that she would be joining Councillor Driver on a visit to the site which would be her second visit.)

## Question 15

### **Councillor Giles to ask the leader of the council the following question:**

“Many constituents in my ward of Crome do not earn the real Living Wage and live with the associated poverty and pressures which come with this. As a proud Living Wage council can the leader comment on the success of the Norwich Living Wage campaign during this month and the differences it has delivered to raising pay in our city since starting?”

### **Councillor Waters, the leaders’s response:**

“I’m pleased to say that the campaign for a ‘Real’ Living Wage, calculated each year on the cost of living, is going from strength to strength.

There are now 53 accredited living wage employers in Norwich; 16 accredited in 2021 (the largest annual increase to date). This covers 7,368 employees, including 802 uplifted to the living wage when their employer accredited (66 of these from the 16 new accreditations this year).

We have greatly benefited from the support and expertise of the Living Wage Foundation. Work started earlier this year on Norwich becoming accredited as a Living Wage City. A steering group has been formed to draw up an action plan to significantly grow the number of employers paying the Living Wage.

Our submission will be made to the Living Wage Foundation in May 2022. Our ambition is to make the real living wage the expected norm in Norwich.”

(By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Giles asked what value would be brought to the city by acquiring a Living Wage Place designation. Councillor Waters replied that there would be structural changes around insecure employment and shortcomings with the national minimum wage, and employment opportunities would be generated around the city.)

## Question 16

### **Councillor Everett to ask the leader of the council the following question:**

“The lack of good quality, well paid jobs remain a problem for many constituents in my ward, so I was particularly pleased to see the opening, which the Leader attended, of the new Digi-Tech factory thanks partly to this council winning Town Fund investment towards it. Can the leader comment on the opportunities this investment might offer this city?”

### **Councillor Waters, the leader’s response:**

“I was massively impressed by the new Digi-Tech factory when I attended its opening. It is an inspiring building and the facilities it offers should equip the young people of the Norwich with the skills they require to thrive in the modern labour market.

It is, we believe, the first completed towns fund project in the country and is the first of eight projects set out in our investment plan which is designed not only to support skills development but also to drive regeneration and development, providing new business locations and promoting better use of underused sites. Time doesn’t allow me to list all that this may achieve but I look forward to attending several further opening events in the coming years.”

(As Councillor Everett had given apologies for the meeting, there was no supplementary question.)

## Question 17

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

“Representing Lakenham Ward I was pleased to visit the two newly refurbished tennis courts at Lakenham Recreation Ground. The new courts which are hard surfaced and floodlit, make them accessible throughout the year and for all weather conditions. I know from talking to my constituents that they will be much used and valued by the community. Can the cabinet member for health and wellbeing comment on the investment made and difference this will deliver for east Norwich and our wider city?”

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

“I am pleased that we have been able to build further on the success of Norwich Parks Tennis since its inception at Eaton Park in 2012, expanding the benefits to residents at Waterloo Park, Harford Park and now this current phase delivering quality facilities at Lakenham Recreation Ground and Heigham Park. The city’s residents will benefit from the provision high quality facilities, available all year round, for extended hours, at cost to users of £35 per household per year which represents excellent value for money. Norwich Park Tennis will not only deliver for existing players but aims to be a catalyst for getting more people active and making tennis accessible for all. As you point out the new courts at Lakenham are well place to serve existing residents and also future residents of East Norwich”

(Councillor Manning had no supplementary question)

## Question 18

**Councillor Matthew Fulton-McAlister to ask the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion the following question:**

“Now that COP26 has finished can the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion give her comments on whether the actions agreed at the conference go far enough?”

**Councillor Hampton, the cabinet member for climate change and digital inclusion’s response:**

“COP26 was largely a disappointment. It delivered modest progress – at absolute best – when what we need is a transformational leap. It falls short of delivering the practical measures urgently required to limit warming to 1.5C, with analysis of the pledges to come out of Glasgow having shown we’re on track to hit a disastrous 2.4C. There remains a dangerous level of ambiguity on countries’ responsibilities to align their targets to 1.5C, and the watering down of commitments to keep fossil fuels in the ground is unacceptable. Norwich will continue to show local leadership in tackling the climate crisis. But COP has once again demonstrated that the government is failing to match our ambition - and failing to treat this like the emergency it is.”

(Councillor Matthew Fulton-McAlister had no supplementary question)

**Question 19**

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

“Has there been a policy change in the way the city council’s civil enforcement officers have been deployed?”

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

“The council’s Civil Parking Enforcement staff provide parking enforcement on behalf of the Norfolk Parking Partnership. Our Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs) are required to enforce parking regulations fairly, lawfully and without discrimination. They are deployed to ensure that enforcement is proportionate to the problems caused by the parking.

There has been no change in policy with regards to the way in which these officers have been deployed, although a recent increase in staff turnover resulted in a temporary reduction in the number of officers available to carry out enforcement duties. We have recently recruited four new CEOs, and are reviewing the service to ensure that it continues to meet our residents’ needs”

(In response to Councillor Lubbock’s supplementary question, Councillor Stonard said that the review of the service would consider the deployment of CEOs and would take into consideration the issue of illegal parking outside schools.)



## Question 20

### **Councillor Bogelein to ask the chair of scrutiny committee the following question:**

“The scrutiny committee has the crucial function, in this council, of ensuring that checks and balances are in place and that cabinet decisions, as well as the work of the council, can be adequately scrutinised. Part of this overview and scrutiny should be carried out by vital task and finish groups which can help inform council policy going forward and scrutinise areas that are of particular importance to residents and members. In your opinion, as chair of scrutiny, does the scrutiny committee receive the resources it requires to carry out adequate scrutiny, in order to support the council in improving services for residents?”

### **Councillor Wright, the chair of scrutiny’s response:**

“Thank you for highlighting the important work we, as a scrutiny committee undertake. There are a number of examples of excellent working between council officers and the committee, such as our last meeting exploring the council’s work on social inclusion.

In principle, the committee is supported by a lead executive director, head of legal and procurement, the democratic and electoral services manager, democratic services team leader and the scrutiny officer as well as officers from the service areas we are scrutinising.

I am aware that there have been some recent challenges in officer and member working in relation to the select committee dealing with the issue of communal bins and fly tipping. I have been assured by officers that they are very happy to work with myself and members of the select committee to understand what went wrong and how we might be able to work more effectively in future.”

(In response to Councillor Bogelein’s supplementary question, Councillor Wright said that the chair of the task and finish group was keen for it to consider information from experts as well as lived experience of local residents and he was confident that there were the resources available to do so.)

## Question 21

**Councillor Haynes to ask the chair of scrutiny committee the following question:**

“A discussion at the end of the scrutiny committee meeting on 18th November demonstrated that members of the committee did not have a clear understanding of how the council’s constitution applies to the scrutiny committee and the setting of the scrutiny work programme. Members were unaware that TOPIC forms and recommendations from the scrutiny committee to cabinet were included in the phrase, ‘motion or amendment in similar terms to, or which has the same effect as, one that has been rejected at a meeting of council’ at point 101 of part three in the council’s constitution. Would the chair of scrutiny support training for councillors so that they can understand such meanings?”

**Councillor Wright, the chair of scrutiny’s response:**

“There will, in any constitution, be areas where interpretations will need to be made and I am sure the Monitoring Officer and Councillor Kendrick, chair of the constitution working party, will be happy to listen if members feel that the constitution, which went through a thorough review this year can be improved to assist clarification. If members feel that training would assist their understanding, then I am happy to add my support for it, and would be happy to add this to the annual training for scrutiny committee members.”

(By way of a supplementary question, Councillor Haynes asked is training could be made available to all members and not just the scrutiny committee. Councillor Wright said that he would support this and suggestions for training would be made through the Councillors development group.)

## Question 22

**Councillor Osborn to ask the cabinet member for environmental services the following question:**

“On 26 July, I reported a missing communal blue bin in West Pottergate and was assured it would be replaced. It took until 9 November and several follow-ups from me until the bin was finally replaced. This is not the first time there have been delays in delivery of communal bins - for example, there have been delays in fulfilling a request for additional recycling bins at Blazer Court and at Leather House on St George's Street (which are not council-owned). Can the cabinet member tell me what action she is taking to ensure that the contractors are held to account for delivering bins on time and to the right location?”

**Councillor Oliver, the cabinet member for environmental services' response:**

“As part of our ongoing contract management arrangements, the Council has regular oversight meetings with our waste collection contractor. Issues such as those raised by Councillor Osborn are highlighted, and remedies sought. Where a remedial action has not been carried out, then this would be escalated both within the council and contractor  
With regards to the specific issue at West Pottergate, the delay was caused by the lack of availability of bins from our supplier, which has since been addressed.”

(In response to a supplementary question, Councillor Oliver said that she appreciated ward councillors bringing issues to the council's attention so that future recurrences could be avoided.)



**Council**

**14:00 to 14:10**

**1 December 2021**

**Present:** Councillors Maguire (Lord Mayor), Davis, Galvin, Giles, Grahame, Harris, Hampton, Huntley, Kendrick, Maxwell, Osborn, Schmierer, and Waters

**Apologies:** Councillors Ackroyd, Bogelein, Button, Brociek-Coulton, Champion, Carlo, Driver, Everett, Fulton-McAlister (M) , Fulton-McAlister (E), Haynes, Jones, Lubbock, Manning, Oliver, Packer, Peek, Price, Sands (M), Sands (S), Stonard, Stutely, Thomas (Va), Thomas (Vi) Wright and Youssef.

**1. Lord Mayor's Announcement**

The Lord Mayor explained the procedures for this formal meeting of the council, convened to confirm the votes cast at the informal meeting of the council on 30 November 2021; and confirmed that the meeting was quorate.

**2. Public questions / petitions**

Public questions and petitions had been heard at the informal meeting on 30 November 2021.

**3. Declarations of interests**

Councillors Waters, Harris and Kendrick, declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 5 (below) on the agenda, and motion 9e (below) as council tenants.

**4. Minutes**

**RESOLVED** to approve the accuracy of the minutes of the meetings held on 28 and 29 September 2021.

**5. Health and safety compliance in council homes**

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to

- 1) Approve that the HRA capital programme is adjusted by £1m in 2021/22 and £1m in 2022/23 to support delivery of capital upgrade works relating to the Compliance Improvement Plan as set out in paragraph 48 of the 12 November cabinet report; and

- 2) note that quarterly progress reports against the Compliance Improvement Plan will be presented to cabinet.

## 6. Licensing Act 2003 – Statement of Licensing Policy

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to adopt the Statement of Licensing Policy.

## 7. Polling district and polling places review 2021

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to approve:-

- 1) the polling scheme as recommended by the polling district and place working;  
and
- 2) the polling district boundaries changes in Crome, Mancroft and University wards

## 8. Constitutional amendments

The Lord Mayor explained that as he had received a request for the votes to be taken in parts, with recommendation 1(a) taken first, then recommendations 1(b) and 2 would be taken together.

**RESOLVED**, with 4 voting against and 9 voting in favour to adopt the proposed changes to the Questions by Councillor Procedure in the Procedure Rules by amending paragraph 51 so that questions at Council may only be asked to the Leader or Cabinet members.

It was then,

**RESOLVED**, unanimously, to:

- 1) (b) amend paragraph 56 to read:

“Written replies will be given to questions by the relevant Cabinet member or committee chair or their nominee but shall not be the subject of any further debate. *Answers should provide a full response to questions in a succinct way.* If the reply cannot be given at the council meeting, a written answer will be provided to the questioner within 10 working days of the meeting.”

- 2) Adopt the proposed changes to the Motions on Notice Procedure in the Procedure Rules as suggested in Appendix 1

## 9. Motions

(Notice of the following motions, 9(a) to 9(f), below, as set out on the agenda, had been received in accordance with the council’s constitution.)

(With two hours having passed since the beginning of the meeting, the Lord Mayor asked if the remaining business could be taken as unopposed. Councillor Waters opposed item 9(e) and Councillor Jones opposed item 9(f).)

## **9 (a) Motion: Veterans**

(Proposer Councillor Mike Sands, seconder Councillor Davis. Unopposed business)

“This council supports our Armed Forces, forces families and veterans living in city. We are proud that British Forces are respected worldwide for their professionalism and excellence. Over the last year our Armed Forces have shown just how indispensable they are to the Nation’s security, from recently airlifting British nationals out of Afghanistan to driving NHS ambulances and delivering vital fuel. Just as our Armed Forces work to keep us all safe and our country secure, so we must do all we can to support them both in our city and beyond.

Council **RESOLVES** to:

- 1) note that;
  - a) The Armed Forces Bill, which will soon return to the Commons from the Lords, provides an important opportunity to tangibly improve the lives of our service personnel, veterans, and their families. The current Armed Forces Covenant is not currently enshrined in law allowing for wide variations in its interpretation at local level. When this is combined with years of government austerity it results in many local authorities being forced to concentrate ever more on their basic, statutory services.
  - b) That following their service, commonwealth veterans can be left with steep financial costs to remain in the UK. Whilst their applications are ongoing, commonwealth veterans are unable to seek employment or claim social security, with many facing NHS bills of tens of thousands of pounds for life saving treatment following service that placed their own lives at risk for the benefit of us all.
- 2) ask the Leader to write to: -
  - a) The Minister of State for Immigration, The Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Defence People and Veterans, and our two local MPs to pledge support for the incredible service of men and women from the Commonwealth and Nepal who have served and do serve in the UK Armed Forces, and the unconscionable way so many of them and their families are being treated. In particular we agree with veterans who believe their right to stay in the UK should be awarded automatically on account of their service and note that the recent government public consultation was insufficient in scope; with the only proposal being to offer a visa fee waiver after 12 years’ service – an unduly high threshold that will alleviate costs for only a fraction of service personnel. Council believes that only meaningful reform will deliver justice, and that means introducing a free and equitable route to citizenship that incorporates families, and – as we as nation do not know how many have been affected by

this injustice – believe that the government should establish a dedicated unit to assist veterans, similar to the Windrush Taskforce.

- b) The minister of state for immigration and minister for veterans to pledge our support for all commonwealth veterans who have served a minimum of 4 years to be granted automatic and free of charge right to remain in the UK and that any veteran who completes 12 years of service to be automatically given British Citizenship without charge.
  - c) The defence secretary to request that a £35m fund to support British veterans and Afghan interpreters is delivered (through funding recovered from cancelled MoD interpreter contracts) for grants to charities and Local Authorities in England to provide mental health support services for veterans and support for those Afghan nationals who have relocated to the UK through the ARAP scheme.
- 3) develop, working with the veteran’s champion and cabinet member for social inclusion an enhanced Norwich Armed Forces Community Covenant, to complement the Armed Forces Covenant. “

#### **9(b) Motion: Local energy business campaign**

(Proposer Councillor Hampton, seconder Councillor Stutely. Unopposed business)

The following amendment was received from Councillor Osborn:-

Inserting the words “**to become a licensed supplier**” after “**running costs**” in resolution 2a).

Inserting the words “**and the risks of traded power market volatility**” after “**local customers**” in resolution 2a).

Replacing the word “**impossible**” with the words “**very difficult**” in resolution 2a).

Removing the word “**financial**” in resolution 2b).

Inserting the words “**and recognising the benefit their investments would bring locally**” after “**electricity supplier’s operation**” in resolution 2b).

Inserting the words “**also support emissions reduction locally**” after “**if they wished, and**” in resolution 2b).

Inserting the words “**go towards creating a resilient, smart local energy system, benefitting energy security**” after “**local services and facilities,**” in resolution 2c).

Inserting the words “**used**” before the words “**to reduce local**” in resolution 2c).

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

Norwich City Council **RESOLVES** to; -

- 1) Acknowledge the efforts that this Council has made to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and promote renewable energy including such programmes as ROAR power, COSY City, Solar Together and Big Switch and Save in recent years.
- 2) Further recognise:
  - a) that very large financial setup and running costs to become a licensed supplier involved in selling locally generated renewable electricity to local customers and the risks of traded power market volatility result in it being very difficult for local renewable electricity generators to do so,
  - b) that making these costs proportionate to the scale of a renewable electricity supplier's operation and recognising the benefit their investments would bring locally would create significant opportunities for local companies and community groups to be providers of locally generated renewable electricity directly to local people, businesses, and organisations, if they wished, and also support emissions reduction locally and
  - c) that revenues received by such local companies or community groups that chose to become local renewable electricity providers could be used to help improve the local economy, local services and facilities, go towards creating a resilient, smart local energy system, benefitting energy security and used to reduce local greenhouse gas emissions;
  - d) Notes that the House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee, as a result of its 2021 Technological Innovations and Climate Change inquiry, recommended that a Right to Local Supply for local energy suppliers be established to address this;
  - e) Accordingly resolves to support the Local Electricity Bill, currently supported by a cross-party group of 266 MPs and which, if made law, would establish a Right to Local Supply which would promote local renewable electricity supply by making the setup and running costs of selling renewable electricity to local customers proportionate to the size of the supply company; and
- 3) Further resolves to
  - a) inform the local media of this decision,
  - b) write to local MPs, asking them to support the Bill, and
  - c) write to the organisers of the campaign for the Bill, Power for People, (at Camden Collective, 5-7 Buck Street, London NW1 8NJ or [info@powerforpeople.org.uk](mailto:info@powerforpeople.org.uk)) expressing its support.



**9(c) Motion: Fireworks**

(Proposer Councillor Stutely, seconder Councillor Button. Unopposed business)

**RESOLVED** that:

This Council **RESOLVES** to:

- a) call on the relevant licensing authorities to require all public firework displays within the city boundaries to be advertised in advance of the event, allowing residents to take precautions for their animals and vulnerable people.
- b) actively promote a public awareness campaign about the impact of fireworks on animal welfare and vulnerable people – including the precautions that can be taken to mitigate risks.
- c) write to the UK Government urging them to introduce legislation to limit the maximum noise level of fireworks to 90dB for those sold to the public for private displays; and
- d) encourage local suppliers of fireworks to stock ‘quieter’ fireworks for public display.”

**9(d) Motion: Anti-social behaviour and residents’ feeling of safety**

(Proposer Councillor Bogelein, seconder Councillor Osborn. Unopposed business)

The following amendment from Councillor Jones was received:

Inserting the words “**the government and other statutory agencies**” after “**to lobby**” in resolution 2a).

Replacing the words “**for and implementing**” with the words “**to implement**” in resolution 2a).

Inserting the words “**as planned**” after “**introducing**” and the words “**through the developing community safety strategy**” after “**feelings of safety**” in resolution 2b).

Replacing the words “**bringing forward the underspend of the estate aesthetics programme in the coming financial year**” with the words “**giving consideration to taking forward any underspend of the estate aesthetics programme at the end of the financial year**” in resolution 2c).

Replacing the words “**looking at**” with the words “**continuing to look at**” in resolution 2d).

Replacing the words “**using**” with the words “**continuing to work with the police and supporting the use of**” in resolution 2d).

Inserting the words “**giving consideration to, through the review of the HRA Business Plan,**” before the word “**providing**” in resolution 2f).

Replacing the word “**increasing**” with the words “**continuing, increasing and developing**” in resolution 2g).

Inserting the words “**including as part of the Safer Neighbourhood Initiative**” after “**together with officers**” in resolution 2g).

Inserting the words “**alongside those existing**” after the words “**producing a strategy**” in resolution 2i).

So that the revised motion becomes:-

“The level of anti-social behaviour recorded in Norwich varies greatly in different parts of the city. The percentage of residents who feel safe in their communities also varies and it is largely the case that council tenants feel less safe than residents in other forms of housing.

**RESOLVED** that:

1) Council notes:

- a) Residents’ feelings of safety and anti-social behaviour can be linked to the state of cleanliness and upkeep of an area.
- b) Anti-social behaviour is the one category that has been marked as red on the council’s risk register since the introduction of the new risk register.
- c) The council has recently changed its approach to responding to anti-social behaviour in order to improve the experience of those who report anti-social behaviour to the council.

2) Council resolves to ask cabinet to consider:

- a) continuing to lobby the government and other statutory agencies to implement measures which address the structural drivers behind anti-social behaviour;
- b) introducing, as planned, a separate theme in the covid recovery plan to look at actions that reduce anti-social behaviour and increase feelings of safety, through the developing community safety strategy;
- c) giving consideration to taking forward any underspend of the estate aesthetics programme at the end of the financial year to address issues of cleanliness and upkeep on council estates, which can influence anti-social behaviour and feelings of safety;
- d) continuing to opportunities to increase CCTV coverage, where the evidence indicates a demand and to increase the monitoring of CCTV in line with requests from the public, councillors and the police;

- e) continuing to work with the police and supporting use of partial premises closure orders for public spaces such as staircases which suffer from frequent use of drug dealing and drug use;
- f) giving consideration to, through the review of the HRA Business Plan, providing the budget to increase the number of safer neighbourhood coordinators;
- g) continuing, increasing and developing resident engagement around anti-social behaviour through regular resident audits together with officers;
- h) communicating with residents the option of a community trigger as a way to escalate situations around anti-social behaviour, where action by the council and partner agencies has not resulted in any improvement;
- i) producing a strategy, alongside those existing, for designing out crime in council-owned parks and public spaces.”

#### **9(e) Motion: Housing safety compliance**

(Proposer Councillor Lubbock, seconder Councillor Ackroyd.)

“In October 2021 the council wrote to 17,000 tenants and leaseholders to inform them of its failure to carry out legal safety checks on properties that it has responsibility for.

The verdict of the Regulator for Social Housing (RSH) is that 'Norwich City Council has failed to meet statutory health and safety requirements in relation to fire, electrical and water safety....and as a consequence there was the potential for serious detriment to tenants.'

New governance arrangements, comprehensive plans and proposals are being developed to return NCC homes to full compliance, including the creating of a Health and Safety Compliance Board to oversee the process of implementing a 'Compliance Improvement Plan'.

Council **RESOLVES** to increase the membership of the Health and Safety Compliance Board to include members who are external to the administration in order to improve scrutiny, openness and transparency. This increase will include representatives of tenants and leaseholders - the voice of those who receive the services - and members of the opposition parties, for at least 2 years or the duration of the Health and Safety Compliance Board.”

With four voting in favour and nine voting against, the motion was lost.

(As the meeting the previous evening had last more than three hours, motion 10 (f) on the agenda would be taken at the next meeting of full council.)

The meeting was closed.

LORD MAYOR