



## **COUNCIL**

**19:30 to 22:20**

**29 January 2019**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There were no declarations of interest.

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

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

(No notice had been received of any petitions.)

## Question 1 – Climate Change

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Question 2 – Marlpit Community Centre

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



#### 4. Minutes

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

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

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

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

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

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

## 6. Appointment of the Electoral Registration Officer

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

Following debate, it was:

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

## 7. Interim polling district and places review 2018

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

Following debate it was:

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

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

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

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

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

## 8. Motions

### Motion – Declaring a climate emergency

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

Replacing word 'irreversible' with the word 'profound'

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

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

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

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

Councillor Maguire moved and Councillor Waters seconded the following amendment:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Council **RESOLVES** to:

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

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

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

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

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

**RESOLVED** unanimously that:-

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

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

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

Council **RESOLVES** to:

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

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

### **Motion - Trams**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**RESOLVED**, unanimously that:-

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

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

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

This Council therefore **RESOLVES** to:-

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



## **Motion – Universal Credit**

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

**RESOLVED** unanimously that:-

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

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

Council **RESOLVES** to;

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

LORD MAYOR

## Appendix A

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

#### Question 1

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Supplementary question:**

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

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

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

## **Question 2**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Supplementary question:**

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

### **Question 3**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Supplementary question:**

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

**Question 4**

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

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

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

"Thank you for your question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

They are working with families from deprived communities

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

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

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

**Supplementary question:**

There was no supplementary question.

**Question 5**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Supplementary question:**

There was no supplementary question.

**Question 6**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Supplementary question:**

There was no supplementary question.

**Question 7**

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Supplementary question:**

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

### **Question 8**

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

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

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

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

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

**Supplementary question:**

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

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

### **Question 9**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Supplementary question:**

There was no supplementary question.

**Question 10**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Supplementary question:**

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

**Question 11**

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

**Supplementary question:**

There was no supplementary question.

LORD MAYOR