

Council

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

on

Tuesday, 26 January 2016

19:30

Agenda

Page nos

1 Lord Mayor's announcements

2 Declarations of interest

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

3 Questions from the public

4 Petitions

5 Minutes

7 - 36

Purpose - to agree the minutes of the meeting held on 24
November 2015.

6 Questions to cabinet members / committee chairs

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

7 Council tax reduction scheme 2016-17

37 - 46

Purpose - To consider a council tax reduction scheme for
2016 - 17 and to propose that council tax discounts and
exemptions are not amended.

8 Motion - Housing and planning bill

Proposed by Councillor Harris and seconded by Councillor Woollard

Council **RESOLVES** to write to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to voice its strong objection to the following provisions in the Housing and Planning Bill that will have serious implications for our council tenants and the ability of the city council to meet the housing needs of Norwich:

1) The proposed end of secure tenancies and replacement with fixed term tenancies of between 2 and 5 years

2) Mandatory Rents for 'high-income' social tenants ('Pay to Stay'). Affecting any household with an income of more than £30,000 (outside of London), this will require those households to pay up to full market rents. This extra charge to be paid as weekly contribution to central government (Chapter 4 of the Bill)

9 Motion - Human rights act

Proposed by Councillor Waters and seconded by Councillor Manning

The Human Rights Act was introduced by the labour government in 1998 – however, it received widespread cross-party support.

Council **RESOLVES** :-

1) to reaffirm its commitment to the Human Rights Act 1998

2) ,if there are proposals to erode the act in any way, to ask cabinet to work with organisations and individuals who support the provisions enshrined within it, to lobby to retain the Human Rights Act 1998 in its present form.

10 Motion - Freedom of Information Act

Proposed by Councillor Wright and seconded by Councillor Ackroyd

Many believe The Freedom of Information Act is a vital tool for building trust and maintaining transparency of public

bodies. In its 2012 review, the Justice Committee concluded that Freedom of Information provides “a significant enhancement of our democracy”.

A Freedom of Information Commission has been established. Its panel of members include some who have publicly stated their reservations with Freedom of Information. The commission’s Terms of Reference and its public call for evidence focused mainly on measures that would restrict Freedom of Information.

Council **RESOLVES** to:

1) support the principle and practice of Freedom of Information and transparent governance

2) believe that Freedom of Information has delivered many improvements at local and national level over the 11 years it has been in effect

3) ask the leader of the council to write to the Prime Minister and local MPs, asking them to:-

a) protect the Freedom of Information Act from any attempt to restrict its function,

b) recognise that imposing charges for requests and fees of up to £600 for appeals, would also significantly undermine citizens’ right to know.

11 Motion - Improving urban biodiversity

Proposed by Councillor Carlo and seconded by Councillor Price

A study has found that a rapid decline in biodiversity threatens UK ecosystems vital for food production and human well-being.

Urban green infrastructure that fosters biodiversity has other benefits including reducing flood risk.

The Greater Norwich Growth Board’s Green Infrastructure Strategy includes the aim of maximising “opportunities to enhance green infrastructure to meet the needs of people and biodiversity”.

While much important conservation work takes place in established habitats in Norwich, many believe biodiversity in managing the public realm is equally vital.

Council **RESOLVES** to:

1) ask cabinet to ensure that biodiversity is consistently addressed in Norwich City Council maintenance programmes and contract specifications relating to open spaces, parks, cemeteries, street trees, verges and allotments and in new landscaping proposals for the public realm.

2) ask Cabinet to include the following in the draft Corporate Plan for 2015 - 2020 :-

a) Under the heading *A safe, clean and low carbon city*, include the sixth bullet point from the previous plan, adding “including biodiversity” so that it would read as follows:

“To mitigate and reduce the impact of climate change wherever possible and protect and enhance the local environment **including biodiversity**.”

b) Under the heading *A prosperous and vibrant city*, include the third bullet point from the previous plan, adding: “and its green heritage”, so that it would read as follows:

“To maintain the historic character of the city **and its green heritage** through effective planning and conservation management.”

3) **give consideration, when the 2016/17 budget is decided, to reducing the grass cutting budget** and spending the money saved on setting up a scheme for managing some intensively managed grass areas under conservation cuts as proposed in point 2.26 of the Environment Strategy for 2015/16.



Anton Bull
Executive head of business relationship management and democracy

For further information please contact:

Andy Emms, democratic services manager
t: (01603) 212459
e: andyemms@norwich.gov.uk

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

Date of publication: **Monday, 18 January 2016**

Information for members of the public

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

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



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



COUNCIL

7.30pm – 9.55pm

24 November 2015

Present: Councillor Arthur (Lord Mayor), Councillors Blunt, Bogelein, Bradford, Bremner, Brociek-Coulton, Button, Carlo, Coleshill, Driver, Grahame, Harris, Haynes, Henderson, Herries, Howard, Jackson, Jones, Kendrick, Lubbock, Manning, Maxwell, Neale, Packer, Peek, Price, Raby, Ryan, Sands(M), Sands(S), Schmierer, Stonard, Waters, Woollard and Wright

Apologies: Beryl Blower (Sheriff), Councillors Ackroyd, Thomas (VA) and Thomas (VI)

1. LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Lord Mayor said that since the last meeting her engagements had been ones of commemoration, celebration and enjoying the talents of young people.

The Royal Anglian 'Vikings' Regiment had exercised its right of the freedom of the city by marching with bayonets fixed. She had enjoyed meeting the soldiers, many of whom had served in Afghanistan and other parts of the world.

She had attended commemorations at the war memorial on Remembrance Sunday and again on 11 November. A large number of people came to pay their own tribute on both occasions.

The engagements involving young people included a celebration of the work of the YMCA which has helped to turn around the lives of many young people; presenting prizes to schools and pre-schools who had won Norwich In Bloom prizes; visiting the Assist Trust Café at the Norman Centre which helped teach young people life skills through work experience and enjoying the musical talent at a recent Norfolk County Youth Orchestra event.

She had enjoyed a pleasant afternoon at the Norwich Beer Festival where she was able to meet a number of local brewers and the volunteers who made the festival possible.

She had opened the new Asda store which is invigorating the area by creating 130 new jobs.

Finally, it had been good to be part of the candle lit procession and other activities which heralded the switching on of the Christmas lights, another example of a first class event organised by the council's events team.

The Lord Mayor said that at the last meeting she had mentioned some awards and that we would hear more about them at tonight's meeting. At the invitation of the Lord Mayor, Councillor Brociek-Coulton updated council on the following prizes achieved by Norwich In Bloom.

Britain in Bloom

Norwich - Silver Gilt
Mancroft Ward - Silver
Reg and Jo Chiddick - Community
Champions

Anglia in Bloom

Norwich - Gold winners and category winner
Mancroft Ward - Silver Gilt and Category Winner
Sewell Ward - Silver Gilt award
St Stephens Churchyard - Gold award
Stepping Stones group - Special needs award
Edith Cavell Academy - Grow your own award

At the invitation of the chair, Councillor Waters then commented on the Norfolk Arts Awards which had been presented to the Events Team for the excellent work it had done to attract, support and facilitate the Radio 1 Big Weekend. This award was special because it was awarded by peers in the events industry.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

Dr Stephen Musk asked the cabinet member for housing and wellbeing:-

"Mental health accounts for approximately 23% of need in the NHS, yet attracts on average only 10% of NHS funding. Norwich CCG allocates slightly above the average at around 13.5% but this is still woefully short compared to the levels of need.

Despite public proclamations by various government ministers of this and the previous coalition government that mental health is a priority and that there must be 'parity of esteem' between mental and physical health, funding for mental health services has in fact been cut over the last five years, with disastrous consequences here in Norwich and Norfolk. If mental health services were funded in the same way that the acute hospitals like the Norfolk and Norwich hospital are, our local NHS mental health service would have an additional £30 million per year in its budget.

Norfolk and Suffolk NHS foundation trust became the first mental health trust to be placed in special measures in February of this year. Cuts to these services include the closure of the homeless mental health team and assertive outreach team, which supported some of the most vulnerable people in our city. It is possible that this, coupled with cuts in welfare support, has simply pushed need on to other parts of the system.

With this in mind, what has been the impact of cuts to mental health services on the services you provide and people who use those services?"

Councillor Harris, cabinet member for housing and wellbeing's response:

"Thank you Dr Musk for taking the time to attend the council meeting this evening and ask this thoughtful and important question.

Firstly, you are right to identify that mental health services have been cut significantly since 2010. This has led to experienced, dedicated staff being lost, the capacity of those remaining services reduced and appalling, enormous uncertainty for clients and their families.

It is also important to state again forcibly that this is the consequence of deliberate political choice, not chance.

Put simply, it is the consequence of the Lib Dem and Tory Coalition cutting the funding, opening up the NHS to competition and privatisation through the appalling Health and Social Care Act 2012 and the deliberate running down of services. It is not the fault of the nurses, social workers and other clinicians who work tirelessly to support their patients.

I am rather tired of listening to Lib Dem Norman Lamb MP berate mental health services in Norfolk and Suffolk without for one second having the decency to acknowledge his active and complicit part in the government of the last 5 years and the consequence of all of the funding decisions and budget cuts made.

If politics is about choices, we are now surely living in a world with the consequence of this all around us.

Over recent years, many city council services have increasingly dealt with complex and challenging mental health issues on a regular basis, issues for which there isn't always adequate support. Much of the evidence for this is anecdotal as we don't routinely record whether our customers have mental health issues, unless it is relevant for example to our equality duty or to the service provision.

However we know that around 50% of our current active cases in the ABATE team (who deal with anti-social behaviour) features individuals with mental health issues, whether as victim, witness or perpetrator. There are, no doubt, others who have issues which either haven't been disclosed, or aren't immediately apparent. The November 2014 rough sleeper count showed an increase in the number of people having to sleep rough through having been excluded from services because their needs were too high and complex. Since 2013, whilst numbers of single people assessed as homeless whose primary issue is mental health has not increased; the proportion assessed with a dual diagnosis (broadly mental health and substance misuse issues) has increased. Again this indicates that the complexity of cases has increased, requiring greater resource to support. Our environmental protection team also report that they have twice as many current cases of hoarding and self-neglect (which often reflect underlying mental health issues) as they did this time last year

and that cases are more complex. They also find it harder to refer onward to ongoing appropriate mental health support for these cases due to reductions in those services.

It is difficult to ascertain the exact cause of this increase and therefore ascribe it to specific cuts, as there are wider drivers of mental health issues, including economic uncertainty, socio-economic inequality and changes to substance misuse patterns, such as the advent of legal highs. It may also be that wider reductions in services that could have played a preventative role (such as legal aid for debt and benefits issues) will have played as significant role as reductions in clinical services.

However, we are aware that in the past, specialist services such as mental health rough sleeper teams would have been able to assess individuals and support them into appropriate services in a timely fashion; the absence of such provision certainly seems to coincide with the advent of a more crisis-driven response to needs. This often means an escalation and increase in incidents requiring city council services (as well as those of criminal justice and other service providers) before individuals can access appropriate mental health services.

Lastly, I hope this reply is useful in outlining the impact of the cuts upon Norwich City Council with regards to mental health. I can assure you that we will do all we can to continue to work with partners, advocate for fair funding and make the case for mental health services in Norwich."

4. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

5. MINUTES

RESOLVED, unanimously, to approve the minutes of the meeting held on 29 September 2015.

6. QUESTIONS TO CABINET MEMBERS/COMMITTEE CHAIRS

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

QUESTION 1 Councillor Grahame to the leader of the council on the Syrian refugee motion from the previous council meeting.

QUESTION 2 Councillor Schmierer to the cabinet member for resources and income generation on setting an unbalanced budget.

- QUESTION 3** Councillor Jones to the cabinet member for housing and wellbeing on communal balconies and landings.
- QUESTION 4** Councillor Bogelein to the cabinet member for environment and sustainable development on a composting facility for biodegradable nappies.
- QUESTION 5** Councillor Price to the cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety on the late night economy.
- QUESTION 6** Councillor Henderson to the cabinet member for environment and sustainable development on air quality at Thorpe Ridge.
- QUESTION 7** Councillor Carlo to the cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety on the tree planting budget.
- QUESTION 8** Councillor Howard to the cabinet member for housing and wellbeing on the Let NCC scheme.
- QUESTION 9** Councillor Ryan to the cabinet member for resources and income generation on the development of the new council website.
- QUESTION 10** Councillor Button to the cabinet member for resources and income generation on the River Wensum strategy.
- QUESTION 11** Councillor Sands(M) to the leader of the council on Living Wage Week.
- QUESTION 12** Councillor Brociek-Coulton to the cabinet member for environment and sustainable development on the homelessness strategy.
- QUESTION 13** Councillor Manning to the cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety on the reducing inequalities action plan.
- QUESTION 14** Councillor Woollard to the cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety on 'Get Involved Week'.
- QUESTION 15** Councillor Coleshill to the cabinet member for parks, markets and open spaces on the provision market consultation.

- QUESTION 16** Councillor Wright to the cabinet member for environment and sustainable development on not-for-profit power companies.
- QUESTION 17** Councillor Ackroyd to the cabinet member for environment and sustainable development on parking permits for carers.
- QUESTION 18** Councillor Lubbock to the cabinet member for housing and wellbeing on allowing elderly tenants to replace baths with shower cubicles.

(Details of the questions and replies, together with any supplementary questions and replies, are attached as Appendix A to these minutes.)

7. GREATER NORWICH GROWTH PROGRAMME

Councillor Waters moved and Councillor Bremner seconded that the recommendations in the annexed report be endorsed.

RESOLVED, with 21 voting in favour, 8 against and 5 abstentions, to endorse -

- 1) the projects recommended for inclusion in the 2016-7 Greater Norwich annual growth programme and commit £2.52 million from the pooled infrastructure investment fund towards these projects;
- 2) in principle projects (brought forward in the 2016-7 business plans) for inclusion in the 2017-8 growth programme and commit in principle £1.025 million from the pooled infrastructure investment fund towards these projects;
- 3) the inclusion of the city council projects in the draft 2016-7 capital programme.

8. MOTION – TRADE UNION BILL

Councillor Grahame moved and Councillor Waters seconded the motion as set out in the agenda.

RESOLVED, unanimously, that –

“The government’s trade union bill would affect this council’s relationship with our trade unions and with our workforce as a whole.

Payroll administration and membership dues and facility time – as negotiated with our trade unions – suits our needs and supports our staff.

New rules restricting strikes and pickets remove unions' ability to protest against changes that will affect them. The 40% mandate required far exceeds the mandate of this government to make such a law which will impact on many people's lives.

Council **RESOLVES:-**

- 1) to lobby government to enable facility time and payroll deductions for trade union membership to continue;
- 2) to write to the Secretary of State and the Prime Minister stating its opposition to the unnecessary, anti-democratic and bureaucratic trade union bill;
- 3) if the bill becomes law, to –
 - (a) ask cabinet to seek to continue its own locally agreed industrial relation strategy and take every measure possible to maintain its autonomy with regard to facility time and the continuing use of check-off;
 - (b) call on Norfolk Constabulary not to prioritise investigating people for infringement of new laws such as those on picketing.

9. MOTION – FOOD POVERTY AND FOOD WASTE

Councillor Howard moved and Councillor Price seconded the motion as set out on the agenda.

Councillor Herries moved and Councillor Driver seconded the following amendment:-

“To amend resolution (ii) by:-

Inserting after “ask cabinet to”...”continue to build on the good work in the reducing inequalities action plan, which is tackling the root causes of food poverty and social inclusion in our city, including to consider:-...

And adding the suffix “ing” to the first word in points (a) – (g)”

With 19 voting in favour, 15 against and no abstentions, the amendment was carried and became part of the substantive motion.

RESOLVED, unanimously –

“In Norwich more than 7,000 children live in food poverty. Across the UK it is estimated that 180,000 of unsold food from supermarkets went to waste in 2014.

The effects of childhood malnutrition can last a lifetime and put increased pressure on public services with significant cost to the taxpayer.

Council **RESOLVES** to:-

- 1) commend the work of the dedicated volunteers in Norwich who feed hundreds of people each week;
- 2) ask cabinet to continue to build on the good work in the reducing inequalities action plan, which is tackling the root causes of food poverty and social inclusion in our city, including to consider:-
 - (a) raising awareness of the work of food re-distribution organisations and the challenges they face through articles in Citizen magazine;
 - (b) learning from other successful food re-distribution partnerships; for example those supported by Lambeth and Bristol councils;
 - (c) working in partnership with local organisations who have joined forces under the umbrella organisation Norwich food hub to tackle the joint problems of increased food poverty and the wasting of surplus food across the city, in order to understand the many challenges they face and help them best achieve their objectives;
 - (d) helping to build dialogue between the city's large retailers and the new hub, to ensure the most effective re-distribution of surplus food;
 - (e) working with Norfolk County Council, the clinical commissioning group and other public bodies to find premises and funding to help local people who want to re-distribute surplus food to those in need;
 - (f) working with Norfolk County Council to encourage all food retailers to sign up to a re-distribution scheme in their area;
 - (g) lobbying DEFRA to introduce penalties for large retailers deliberately spoiling or wasting surplus food and to end the retail practice of rejecting food on purely cosmetic grounds.

With two hours having passed since the start of the meeting, the Lord Mayor asked if any of the remaining items could be taken as unopposed business.

The Lord Mayor said that if members were happy to deal with item 12, the motion on equality for mental health, it would be on the basis that the amendment which had been moved in advance by Councillor Kendrick and had been circulated, was accepted by all members. If any member objected that item would have to be dealt with in the normal way.

10. MOTION – HOUSING

RESOLVED, unopposed -

“The YMCA report entitled “uncertain futures” says the budget proposal to cut housing benefits for 18-21 year olds could leave thousands of vulnerable young people homeless. Young people are amongst the millions on low incomes – including many in work – relying on housing benefit to secure accommodation who will be severely impacted by proposals to cut benefits.

Other proposals to extend “right to buy” to housing association homes will undermine the finances of associations; affect their ability to build genuinely affordable housing while councils are forced to sell “high value” properties to fund the “right to buy” extension, further depleting the supply of affordable housing.

Council **RESOLVES** to write to the Secretary of State for communities and local government to:-

1) highlight its opposition to:-

- (a) housing benefit cuts which will punish those in housing need;
- (b) a depletion of the stock of social housing through the extension of the “right to buy” and the forced sale of council housing;

2) ask for:-

- (a) a massive increase in the supply of housing – including council housing – with proper security of tenure and genuinely affordable rents through a public sector house building programme, including empowering and resourcing local authorities to build housing directly;
- (b) regulation of private rented sector housing to improve its security and quality and review whether locally-led controls on private sector rent could deliver benefits for local housing markets and reduce expenditure on housing benefit.

11. MOTION – CLIMATE CHANGE AND FOSSIL FUEL

RESOLVED, unopposed, that:-

“The risk to both the planet and Norwich from climate change as a result of burning fossil fuels is very real. Ending Norwich City Council’s financial links to the fossil fuel industry would help it realise the goals outlined in its own ‘environmental strategy’.

Norwich City Council contributes to the Norfolk Pension Fund which has £65,575,000.00 directly invested in fossil fuel-based companies. The council therefore contributes to supporting the fossil fuel industry.

Most fossil fuel companies have shown considerable decreases in share price, eg BHP. Billiton has fallen by over 35% in the last year.

Council, therefore, **RESOLVES** to:-

1) ask cabinet to:-

- (a) consider how best an ethical investment policy, which would include not investing in fossil fuel based companies, might be achieved and make appropriate recommendations to council for inclusion in the treasury management strategy;
- (b) engage with local businesses, community groups and other relevant organisations, including Fossil Free Norfolk and Transition Norwich, to explore the potential for supporting a more widespread move to a fossil fuel free future;
- (c) call on the Norfolk Pension Fund to consider an ethical investment policy and a rapid divestment from fossil fuel based companies;

2) write to relevant ministers urging them to:-

- (a) reverse policies that harm the fight against climate change (such as recent changes to feed-In Tariffs and other subsidies for green energy, changes to planning policy and cuts to green deal finance);
- (b) support the principals of fossil fuel divestment and stop subsidies to the fossil fuel industry, and advocate for all countries to commit to this during the COP21 global climate change negotiations later this year in Paris.

12. MOTION – EQUALITY FOR MENTAL HEALTH

RESOLVED, unopposed, that:-

“Mental health services are often referred to as the “Cinderella service” and still suffer severe inequality compared with those for physical health.

People with mental ill health often do not have equal access to treatment and services with 75% of people experiencing mental ill health not accessing any treatment at all.

The recent open letter from Norman Lamb MP, Alistair Campbell and Andrew Mitchell, along with leaders from the business, faith, culture and sport communities, called on government to end the historic injustices in mental health and to consider the need for additional investment in mental health services.

Council **RESOLVES** to:-

- 1) call on the government to:-
 - (a) formally welcome the calls from this cross party and cross society campaign and commit to take action to address inequalities in mental health services that exist despite the previous coalition government's commitment to put mental health treatment on a par with physical health (mental health trusts in England have seen their budgets fall by more than 8% in real terms, equivalent to almost £600 million and spending on children's mental health services in England has fallen by more than 6% in real terms, equivalent to nearly £50 million, since 2010);
 - (b) commit to additional, dedicated funding for mental health services in the 2015 spending review;
- 2) ask cabinet to ensure mental health and wellbeing receive the same billing and priority as physical health in the work the council does, recognising that positive steps have already been taken in this area.

13. RUSSELL O'KEEFE

At the invitation of the Lord Mayor, the leader of the council informed members that Russell O'Keefe, executive head of strategy, people and neighbourhoods would be leaving the council to take up the post of corporate director at Windsor and Maidenhead Council.

He said that Russell had provided exceptional service to the council on a range of issues including the council's case for unitary status; the drug and alcohol strategy; choice based lettings and the council's transformation programme. He said that members would be sorry to see him go but he was sure that all would wish him well for the future.

Members showed their appreciation in the usual way.

LORD MAYOR

Question 1

Councillor Grahame to ask the leader of the council:

“Please will the leader publish the letter to the Government from the three group leaders on the European refugee crisis, which council agreed at its last meeting? Earlier this month, the United Nations special representative for international migration, Peter Sutherland, said Britain will be adopting a morally unacceptable position if it turns its back on the refugee crisis in Europe. This city has a good record of responding to previous refugee crises with humanity, and has indicated its will to do so again with this current crisis. As a harsh winter sets in in Europe, and while acknowledging the security issues after Paris of which refugees are often the first victims, please can the leader say what further urgent pressure, the council as a whole (i.e. cross-party), could put on the Government to provide genuine assistance to the refugees currently suffering across Europe?”

Councillor Waters, leader of the council’s response:

“Thank you for your question. I must admit to being a little surprised by a public question which would have been better discussed informally. At the last leaders meeting with councillors Haynes and Wright I did raise the need to get a draft prepared and volunteered to do that once I had received relevant extracts from the speeches of councillors Lucy Howard and James Wright. I stand to be corrected but I have not yet received that information. I guess it is the downside of writing a letter by committee. I have not felt able to progress this until I have that information - since all three group leaders need to be satisfied with the contents before signing the letter to Prime Minister and Norwich MPs.

Another reason that has to be factored in to the timing of our letter has also emerged - the fact that Norfolk County Council, as the lead authority dealing with the Home Office over the Syrian re-settlement programme, has yet to receive an actual offer from Government (funding, I suspect, remains a sticking point). Until that is resolved the city council - which has clearly expressed its wish to welcome Syrian Refugees to the city - cannot set in train its own approval process. We hope for a speedy conclusion to these negotiations and I look forward to receiving the necessary information from colleagues to prepare a draft letter to Government.”

In reply to a supplementary question from **Councillor Grahame**, **Councillor Waters** said the council would welcome any refugees allocated to it by Norfolk County Council, which was the responsible authority. The council was working closely with Norfolk County Council and emphasised that sustainable funding over a five year period was required. The council would be willing to do everything it could to support the county council by taking its full quota of refugees when called upon.

Question 2

Councillor Schmierer to ask the cabinet member for resources and income generation:

“Does the cabinet member for resources and income generation think it is ever acceptable to put forward or even threaten to put forward an unbalanced budget - something which is especially pertinent given the scale of cuts that are set to fall on local authorities like Norwich?”

Councillor Stonard, cabinet member for resources and income generation’s response:

“Local authorities are required to set a balanced budget. The process for calculating the council’s budget requirement and the council tax are set out in chapter three of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

Section 114 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 requires the section 151 officer to make a report to all the council’s members and to its external auditor, in consultation with the monitoring officer and the head of paid service, if it appears that the expenditure of the council incurred (including expenditure it proposes to incur) in a financial year is likely to exceed the resources available to it to meet that expenditure. Serious consequences could follow making such a report.

Under the Local Government Act 2003 section 25, there is a statutory duty on the s151 officer to report to the council, at the time the budget is considered and the council tax set, on the robustness of the budget estimates and the adequacy of proposed financial reserves. Under the same section of the legislation, the council must have regard to this report when making decisions about the budget.

The Secretary of State has reserved powers to specify in regulations a statutory minimum level of reserves that will be used if authorities fail to remedy deficiencies or run down reserves against the advice of the s151 officer.

So, in answer to the question, it is never acceptable to put forward an unbalanced budget.”

Councillor Schmierer asked, as a supplementary question, if the council was ruling out setting an unbalanced budget then how did it intend to deal with difficult decisions in the future other than by building more new car parks. **Councillor Stonard** reiterated that it would be reckless to set an unbalanced budget which would lead to Tory ministers taking over and setting the council’s budgets for it. The council is working hard to identify increased efficiencies and to more savings without affecting frontline services and ultimately council would need to choose its priorities in a way that enabled it to continue to look after the most vulnerable people in the city.

Question 3

Councillor Jones to ask the cabinet member for housing and wellbeing:

“The council has a policy of forcing pot plants and similar items to be removed from communal balconies and landings even when they are not in the way and are not a fire hazard. Could this policy be reconsidered?”

Councillor Harris, cabinet member for housing and wellbeing’s response:

“In light of serious fires resulting in deaths of tenants and fire fighters in other parts of the country, we worked very closely with Norfolk Fire Service to come up with an updated communal areas procedure, informed by consultation, which has been designed to keep people safe, allow the Fire Brigade access in the event of an emergency, whilst balancing the practical needs of the people who live there. The council’s cabinet approved this updated communal area inspections procedure in December 2014.

We want to encourage sensible use of communal spaces wherever possible, but we also have a statutory responsibility. The Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 requires us to carry out fire risk assessments and to maintain communal space as means of escape in the event of a fire. Our duty is to ensure that escape routes are not obstructed. We are required to keep stairways/steps, corridors and all exit routes clear of obstructions, trip hazards and combustible materials.

The communal areas inspection procedure is designed to encourage tenants and residents to create welcome environments in communal areas but in way that does not create risks and hazards for others.

The procedure and its implementation will be reviewed in the next six months, once the full roll out of the procedure is completed.”

Councillor Jones said that blanket rules seemed to be applied and asked, as a supplementary question, if this could be investigated as part of the review.

Councillor Harris reiterated that the policy was set in discussion with the tenants’ panel and also the fire service. The council’s responsibility was to protect people.

Question 4

Councillor Bogelein to ask the cabinet member for environment and sustainable development safety:

“Anyone who has raised a baby will be stunned at how much waste a little one produces purely through nappies. With an average of 8 nappies a day, the bin fills quickly. A large number of mothers want to do the best for their baby and the environment and thus choose biodegradable nappies and wipes. I have met many of them and the demand is growing, despite the higher costs. The problem is: in Norwich we have currently no composting facility for biodegradable nappies. When calling the council I was advised to dispose of them in general waste. This defies the

whole environmental benefits of biodegradable nappies, as they cannot biodegrade in a landfill.

100% biodegradable nappies and wipes offer high quality composting material and are much better for the environment when composted. Will Norwich City Council look into establishing a composting facility for biodegradable nappies and therefore not only be at the forefront of this growing practise but also be able to harness the benefits of making use of biodegradable material?"

Councillor Bremner, cabinet member for environment and sustainable development's response:

"At present there are no plans for the council to establish a compostable facility for biodegradable nappies. Options for waste treatment facilities are being discussed through the Norfolk Waste Partnership. The partnership is investigating the most cost effective ways for the tax payer of delivering such facilities for the whole of Norfolk. I will ensure the issue of biodegradable nappies is included in the discussions."

Councillor Bogein asked a supplementary question: if the minutes of the meetings discussing this could be circulated. **Councillor Bremner** said that he couldn't promise that as the meetings may not be public meetings but he would investigate the possibility.

Question 5

Councillor Price to ask the cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety:

"Will the cabinet member consider revisiting the decision to make a single late night activity zone on Prince of Wales Road and conduct a public consultation on situating a second zone away from the city centre and residents on an industrial or commercial estate for example that can be policed efficiently? A focus for the results of any consultation should take into account the existing costs to the council, Police and NHS whether or not these costs have yet been established."

Councillor Driver, cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety's response:

"The council recognises that the issues involved with the night time economy in Norwich are complex and need to be managed carefully and responsibly. This involves taking a co-ordinated approach to managing the activities through a dedicated licensing forum, involving close co-operation between the council's planning, licensing and environmental health officers, pub and club operators, representatives of the local community and the police to ensure the proper regulation and enforcement of the sector.

Our *Local plan* which was adopted by council in 2014 identifies two late night economy zones rather than one. One is centred on Prince of Wales Road, the other is on Riverside. The associated policy (DM23) seeks to enhance the vibrancy of the

city centre and local and district centres and cater for increased demands for leisure and hospitality uses. It seeks to concentrate late night entertainment within the two specified areas whilst aiming to reduce conflicts by restricting noise sensitive uses in these areas where possible.

In March 2014, cabinet adopted a 12 point plan to further improve management of the night time economy and to help mitigate the effects of the night time economy on residents, businesses and visitors within the city centre.

This 12 point plan has taken such steps as to restrict traffic movement in the surrounding residential streets and promote other traffic improvement plans; increase CCTV coverage; install a new gate to prevent anti-social behaviour in a particular alleyway; work with night time economy operators; develop the new Rose Lane car park plan to make toilet provision more widely available; instigate various designated driver and reducing the strength of alcohol campaigns, and has seen the introduction of the Safe Haven project. Much of this work is complete, although some is ongoing. The feedback on actions taken so far has indicated a positive improvement for the residents surrounding the existing late night activity area.

In June of this year the council also adopted a cumulative impact policy which applies to a single defined area of the city centre and will assist in ensuring that licensing decisions take into account the fullest possible range of considerations. The policy applies across a significant part of the city centre including both of the two defined late night economy areas in the *Local plan*.

Late night uses contribute significantly to the economy of the city and are a feature of all vibrant major urban centres. We will continue to work closely with all interested parties to find the best way of maximizing benefits and managing the impacts of the night time economy. However, we are not intending to conduct any review of our *Local plan* policy in the near future and I am not at all convinced that seeking to create a new zone for late night activities remote from the city centre on an industrial or commercial estate would be a popular, practicable or deliverable option to pursue”

Councillor Price said that since the road closures around Prince of Wales Road, anti-social behaviour had moved to adjacent alleyways. He asked, as a supplementary question, if the council would be willing to investigate a ‘gating’ order. **Councillor Driver** said that as Councillor Price was aware that at recent a public meeting he had indicated he would be happy to have discussions with the residents and the police on this matter, he was surprised that Councillor Price felt the need to ask the question.

Question 6

Councillor Henderson to ask the cabinet member for environment and sustainable development:

“The council has recently approved an *Air quality action plan* at cabinet. With the building of Generation Park, residents in the area are concerned about potential impacts on air quality in the area surrounding it. Will the cabinet member consider monitoring air quality at Thorpe Ridge*?”

Councillor Bremner, cabinet member for environment and sustainable development's response:

"We are well aware from the many representations received on the planning application for Generation Park that its potential impact on air quality, which was highlighted in the Environmental Statement accompanying the application, is a cause for concern among local residents. As you may be aware, to ensure this matter was fully and properly considered as part of the planning application, the council has commissioned its own independent expert advice on air quality to assist it in determining the application. This has led to further information being requested from the applicant which is currently outstanding.

At this stage it would be premature to be specific about how air quality will be monitored in one particular area of the city going forward. The planning application has yet to be determined so at this stage we do not know whether it will be approved or refused. Possible measures to monitor and mitigate any air quality impacts will need to be considered through the planning application process and, if approved, any permission may well have conditions attached related to air quality.

Furthermore, in addition to securing planning permission, if the Generation Park proposal is to become operational it would also need an environmental permit from the Environment Agency. If such a permit is issued this is likely to require monitoring at source."

Councillor Henderson asked, as a supplementary question, if it would be possible to have a one off baseline air quality assessment for the area. **Councillor Bremner** said that he would ask the officers to look into this.

Question 7

Councillor Carlo to ask the cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety:

"For this financial year, Norwich City Council agreed to use £50,000 of Community Infrastructure Levy to re-plant and maintain some of the city's 2,000 street trees removed since 2011. This appears to be a one-off payment with no plans in place to support re-planting in future years. Trees are essential for supporting people's quality of life and biodiversity, improving air quality, flood protection and cooling the city as global temperatures rise. Will the portfolio holder consider reinstating the annual tree budget for re-planting the city's stock of street trees outside of conservation areas?"

Councillor Driver, cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety's response:

"The council did increase the budget for tree planting this year by £16,000 allowing 102 trees to be planted on our streets. In view of the continued pressure on council's finances, there are no immediate plans to raise the tree planting budget still further. The commitment to review the level of funding in the future when funding is more readily available remains, as does the commitment to identify other sources of

funding as demonstrated by the use of the Community Infrastructure Levy to plant a further 99 trees across the city.”

Councillor Carlo asked, as a supplementary question, if the cabinet member could give us assurance that the council will continue to draw on community infrastructure levy funds to replace lost trees. **Councillor Driver** said he would look into this. He said the city was always looking for new ways to access funds. It did a very good job with trees and was one of the best cities for trees in Britain.

Question 8

Councillor Howard to ask the cabinet member for housing and wellbeing:

“Tenants renting through Let NCC are sometimes vulnerable people unable to bid for council properties. Does the cabinet member for housing feel that council policy is being applied consistently by housing officers when dealing with tenants living in damp, mouldy properties, and have officers received sufficient training to allow them to make accurate judgements regarding mould caused by 'tenant lifestyle' and damp caused by underlying issues the landlord or council has responsibility for?”

Councillor Harris, cabinet member for housing and wellbeing’s response:

“Let NCC is a valuable and innovative scheme to assist vulnerable clients who may otherwise not be eligible for social housing in Norwich into accommodation leased by the council. Typical clients will include those that have previously been unable to maintain tenancies and those who do not qualify for other housing options because of their previous behaviour, so this can often be a challenging client base with a poor history of tenancy management.

Since its launch in 2007 the Let NCC scheme has assisted over 1000 such clients into accommodation, demonstrating its immense value to the council in making such a contribution to our work preventing homelessness in the city.

As part of their property management remit, Let NCC officers are required to have a good all round knowledge of all aspects of housing, including being able to identify disrepair issues. As such, officers are required to attend HHSRS (Housing Health and Safety Rating System) training. This nationally recognised training gives a good overall knowledge of repair issues, housing conditions and hazard awareness but, as you would expect, this would not be to the same level as a specialist surveyor. As such, where appropriate, specialist advice is sought for more complex issues and once identified; officers will work with the landlord to ensure that any underlying repair issues are resolved.

The cause of damp issues is often not straightforward to identify and we have found that, as in the council’s own stock, the lifestyle of the occupants can often play a significant contributing factor. As such, the council places great emphasis on educating tenants with advice and information as to possible causes of damp and condensation in the home, particularly where lifestyle can be such a contributory factor.”

Councillor Howard asked, as a supplementary question, if housing officers taught tenants to use damp-eaters and to tell the difference between rising damp and that caused by drying clothes etc. **Councillor Harris** said she would ask officers about such training and emphasised that if councillors had any examples of tenants who were having difficulty they should refer them on to officers.

Question 9

Councillor Ryan to ask the cabinet member for resources and income generation:

“Can the cabinet member for resources and income generation give his views on the new council website due to be launched next year and the additional advantages it should provide for users?”

Councillor Stonard, cabinet member for resources and income generation’s response:

“The new website is due to go live towards the end of January. The main benefit will be the advanced technology that sits behind it, allowing it to be fully responsive. This means we will soon have a website that provides maximum optimal viewing and an interactive experience across a wide range of devices from desktop computers to mobile phones and tablets – all of which will benefit from easy reading and navigation.

Users will be able to access content with the minimum of resizing, panning and scrolling when searching for what’s needed. Additional functionality includes a customer portal for secure access to individual information including online account balances, an improved intelligent search facility, greater functionality on forms with the ability to make payments and send attachments and integrated mapping functions all of which will improve the customer experience and provide a cleaner, clearer and fresher experience.

This is an important step forward for the council for two key reasons:

- Responsive web design is becoming increasingly important due to the upward spiral of mobile traffic across internet usage as a whole.
- Having a website with content that’s easy to read and delivers what visitors need quickly and efficiently has an important link with our work and support around digital inclusion.

With council budgets increasingly under pressure, having a fully responsive website means, in a cost-effective way, we can help to deliver what more and more of our customers want – round-the-clock and easy access to the council services they want, on any device.”

Question 10

Councillor Button to ask the cabinet member for resources and income generation:

“Following an excellent response to the consultation on improving the River Wensum, can the cabinet member for resources and income generation comment on the next steps for developing a strategy and action plan to promote this treasured resource?”

Councillor Stonard, cabinet member for resources and income generation’s response:

“There was indeed an excellent response to the River Wensum Strategy public consultation in summer 2015, which generated over 800 responses from over 160 individuals and organisations with an interest in the river. The report on the consultation, published in the autumn, summarised a wide range of issues and potential opportunities identified by consultees. These include many leisure related issues and opportunities related to improved boating infrastructure, improved access, better signage, and opportunities for enhancement for specific sites, as well as opportunities for enhanced biodiversity, and green infrastructure enhancements.

The River Wensum Strategy Partnership is led by the city council, working with the Broads Authority, Norfolk County Council, the Environment Agency, and the Wensum River Parkway Partnership (also representing the Norwich Society and Norwich HEART). The Partnership is currently developing the strategy, taking into consideration the large number of consultation responses, along with input from partner organisations, and also addressing the complex nature of partners’ roles and responsibilities for the river which can be a challenge to management of the river corridor and delivering change.

These roles and responsibilities include the city council’s role as landowner of the river bed and local planning authority and the Broads Authority’s role as navigation authority and local planning authority for the tidal reaches of the river. The Environment Agency also has responsibilities for the non-tidal reaches of the river upstream of New Mills, and Norfolk County Council has responsibility for a range of functions including delivery of green infrastructure within the Greater Norwich Growth Board (GNGB) area.

Partners are working together with a shared vision for the future of the river corridor to ensure that the emerging strategy delivers real benefits for all by increasing access to and greater use of this important asset.

Given the complexity of responsibilities, many of the emerging proposals inevitably require discussion and coordination between the partner organisations in their various capacities, and with relevant stakeholders as appropriate. As the intention is to produce a strategy that is focussed and deliverable, the process of developing

proposals also includes investigation of feasibility and of funding sources where relevant.

Once complete, the draft strategy will be subject to a further public consultation in 2016 to give the public and stakeholders an opportunity to comment on its proposals. Following this consultation, a final version of the strategy will provide a framework for delivery and will support funding applications for specific improvement projects.”

Question 11

Councillor Sands (M) to ask the leader of the council:

“Can the leader give his opinion on the success of the recent Living Wage Week closely supported by this council? How does he envisage the Living Wage campaign locally developing for the future?”

Councillor Waters, leader of the council’s response:

“My thanks to Councillor Sands for his question.

There can be no more important an issue than the campaign for a Living Wage. Low pay and insecure employment is sadly a characteristic of the Norwich economy. In the city, more than one in four employees earns less than £7 per hour. It is also a national problem, with the number of low paid workers across Britain hitting a record high last month of over five million. So ‘Living Wage Week’ which took place in the first week in November is an important date in the Norwich calendar of events. The council working alongside ‘Living Wage Norwich’, Aviva, trades unions, local churches, voluntary sector and advice organisations and a growing number of living wage employers, ran events through the week and raised the profile of this most urgent of issues. The living wage is calculated according to the basic cost of living in the UK. The current living wage is £8.25p an hour. The ambition is to end low pay and make Norwich a ‘Living Wage City’. Working with our partners ‘Living Wage Norwich’ - and in particular its chair, Tony Gammage - we have seen significant progress, with businesses signing up to pay a living wage or committing to work towards becoming living wage compliant.

The campaigning work needs to be sustained - not least with the threat of cuts in the income of low paid workers (working tax credits) and what amounts to a charter for bad employers with the Conservative Government's attempt to emasculate the employment rights of all workers in the form of the Trade Union Bill currently making its way through Parliament.”

Question 12

Councillor Brociek-Coulton to ask the cabinet member for environment and sustainable development:

“In England 112,330 households applied to their local authority for homelessness assistance in 2014/15, a 26 per cent rise since 2009/10. Given these shocking figures can the cabinet member for environment and sustainable development give

his opinion on the new Greater Norwich Homelessness Strategy and its role in tackling homelessness within Norwich?"

Councillor Bremner, cabinet member for environment and sustainable development's response:

"Homes in England are becoming less affordable and harder to find. As a result, homelessness in all its forms, whether rough-sleeping, sofa-surfing or living in overcrowded or unsuitable accommodation, is increasing.

Norwich, however, has a good track record in preventing homelessness: We offer temporary accommodation for people in immediate housing need and provide advice and support for households who face losing their homes. We fund outreach services to rough-sleepers, work closely with local hostel providers and prevent private tenants from being forced out of their homes due to poor conditions. We also offer good quality, affordable and secure council homes to over 15,000 households in Norwich.

Last year we helped 627 households faced with immediate homelessness to remain in their accommodation or to find a suitable alternative.

The Greater Norwich Homelessness Strategy sets out clearly how we will continue tackle this hugely important issue over the next five years. Our main focus, as with our previous strategies, will be on prevention and our main priorities will be:

- Targeting our resources at those people who are most at risk of homelessness - it is always better to stop people becoming homeless in the first place;
- Helping people find affordable, safe, good quality housing;
- Working in a co-ordinated way with partners – for example working with services involved with mental health and substance misuse since poor health can lead to homelessness or can keep someone homeless for longer;
- Helping people develop independent living skills to reduce the risk of them becoming homeless in the future - The council has an excellent track record of setting up services like Norwich LEAP that tackles the links between homelessness, education and work.

This strategy will ensure that, at a time of increasing pressure both on public resources and individual households, we will continue to offer a coherent and effective approach to tackling this growing problem. "

Question 13

Councillor Manning to ask the cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety:

“The new *Reducing inequalities action plan* offers opportunities to use limited resource to tackle inequality with an additional specific focus upon Lakenham. Can the cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety give his comments on the anticipated improvements aimed in the action plan for this community?”

Councillor Driver, cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety’s response:

“Inequalities within Norwich are both stark and deeply ingrained. This action plan will not deliver a quick fix and neither will it fully mitigate the impacts of changes to welfare and those of low incomes. What it does seek to do is support households both in and out of work to tackle some areas of their lives over which the council and its partners can help them have a positive impact.

For example the council will proactively encourage residents to claim benefits to which they are entitled but have not yet taken up, especially around tax credits. This should increase income in people’s pockets which is a core strand of the council’s financial inclusion activity.

The council will support people into skills and jobs as best we can with limited resources by, for example, offering and signposting to support into jobs through our digital inclusion activity. The council will also support as best we can people into accessing lower fuel prices and insulating their homes.

Through recent work, it is clear that there is considerable activity run by the voluntary and community sector, which we are looking to join up with.

The city also has considerable assets including physical assets such as parks, open spaces and community centres as well as activity run by residents themselves.

If all of these can be harnessed and focussed, they can help make a difference and reduce the inequality and hardship that some of our residents face.

Many changes will take a long time to have a positive impact. In the short term though the council would want to see more people in work, maximising their income, reducing their households costs and making best use of opportunities to improve their health and wellbeing through partners in the public, private and voluntary sector.”

Councillor Manning asked, as a supplementary question, if the cabinet member would join him in thanking officers for the excellent work they were doing.

Councillor Driver said he was happy to do so.

Question 14

Councillor Woollard to ask the cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety:

“Can the cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety comment on the recent ‘Get Involved Week’ which sought to link community groups operating in Norwich with volunteers and interested residents? Given the vast cuts to local government funding how will the council continue to harness and support volunteers who wish to become active in their communities?”

Councillor Driver, cabinet member for neighbourhoods and community safety’s response:

“Norwich has a long history of active communities and the aim of ‘Get Involved Week’ was to showcase and encourage volunteering and active participation across the city.

Community groups were invited to run activities and show case the huge range and level of voluntary activity that takes place in the city that residents could attend and find out more.

85 confirmed activities were offered from 42 different groups therefore as a first attempt at the council promoting voluntary activity this was a remarkable achievement. 40% of these groups had not had extensive contact with the council before.

Feedback from groups hosting events was also very positive with 94% indicating that it had raised their profile.

Norwich has always had a strong community sector and the week of events provided another example of people’s willingness to get involved and make a difference to their communities and where they live.

Members will know that the council has to make significant savings by 2020 to 2021 and a very different approach is required with the council’s operating model being revised to reflect the role of the council in terms of influencing others and working better with partners, residents and the voluntary and community sector.

The council is therefore developing a programme of community enabling to encourage self-sufficiency and self-service and achieve better coordination with the voluntary and community sector.

In order for the council to deliver such a programme in Norwich, visits were made to a number of other councils including Lambeth which like Norwich is a co-operative council.

A number of these council’s run ‘love where you live’ initiatives and a ‘love where you live’ programme is planned for Norwich.

This will set out to encourage residents to take greater ownership of the areas where they live; rely less on the council to deliver services allowing the council to focus on those most in need.

The programme will include a number of elements which have been successful elsewhere in the country:

Street champions

The council will enlist, train and support a network of street champions to help facilitate community enabling within their local street or neighbourhood, building self-sufficiency and resilience.

The street champions would be responsible for facilitating and organising community activities specific to their street or neighbourhood, which addresses local challenges, help adopt open and public space to build social capital and realise community benefits. For example, a litter picking event or organising a street party, where different people of the community come together, helping to establish new relationships and build community ties.

Running parallel will be a programme of education.

‘Do the right thing’ will encourage positive behaviours such as helping an elderly neighbour, encouraging re-cycling, reporting issues online or litter picking.

‘Not on our streets’ will seek to challenge and address the all too common ‘enviro-crimes’ such as littering, fly-tipping and dog fouling that costs the council many thousands of pounds a year to clear and clean up.

The details of these programmes are being finalised for launching early next year.

If the interest and enthusiasm seen in Norwich during ‘Get involved week’ and over many, many years can be developed and encouraged further, the city can look forward to communities playing a greater role in their neighbourhoods and making a difference where they live.”

Question 15

Councillor Coleshill to ask the cabinet member for parks, markets and open spaces:

“Can the cabinet member for parks, markets and open spaces give his opinion on the early results of the recent Norwich Market consultation?”

Councillor Kendrick, cabinet member for parks, markets and open spaces response:

“The response to the Norwich Market survey has been very pleasing indeed.

We received 866 online survey responses and a further 115 completed paper copies on the market giving us a grand total of 981 responses.

This means it was one of the most successful survey responses for Norwich City Council in recent years. We rarely break through the ceiling of 500 responses so 981 really is phenomenal. According to a popular survey statistics site, we actually only need 384 responses to claim we are representative of the Norwich population, so again 981 is fantastic.

The survey was widely circulated and available online and in paper format on the market itself so I'm happy that a wide range of people were given an ample opportunity to respond and give us their thoughts.

Ninety three per cent of respondents said they thought the market was an important part of the city and 91 per cent said they did browse or shop on the market. We had a whole range of comments telling us that "we [should] not lose the market", "it's famous", "it's historically important" and is "integral to the city's character".

The survey has given us a useful profile of the people who shop on the market. 42 per cent of shoppers were aged 45-64; the split between men and women was broadly equal and most people (46 per cent) spent between £5 and £10 per visit.

We also gathered a whole range of suggested improvements. Fifty eight percent of people said the layout was confusing and nearly the same number said the range of products needed to be wider.

The fresh and pre-packed food and hot food stalls were by far the most popular stalls according to respondents.

And many people commented that they wanted more varied and interesting street food and more seating on the market and would love to see it opened up a bit with a central square or something similar.

So all in all I am very pleased and I feel we have some really useful data which can inform decisions we make about the market in the future."

Question 16

Councillor Wright to ask the cabinet member for environment and sustainable development:

"Nottingham City Council has recently launched Robin Hood Energy, a not-for-profit power firm. This differs from a switch and save scheme in so far as the council would be buying gas and electricity from the market and then reselling.

As well as offering lower tariffs than the 'big six', there is potential for any surplus to be retained by the council as part of an income generation strategy. Has the cabinet member any plans to explore this opportunity?"

Councillor Bremner, cabinet member for environment and sustainable development's response:

"Thank you for this timely question. Considering the recent weather, I am sure that many residents will be thinking of switching their provider to save some money on their fuel bills.

Norwich City Council regularly compares the offers from its 'Switch and Save' programme to other providers. In this respect the findings showed that the Switch and Save tariff was cheaper by £146 per year. (Based on Ofgem average consumption data for dual fuel)

In addition to this, by looking at comparison sites and comparing the new Robin Hood Energy tariff, Prime Energy V2. It appears that two more, big six companies are also cheaper than Robin Hood Energy: Npower with their Online Price Fix Dec 2016, which is £47.16 cheaper and Scottish Power Online Fixed Price 2016, which is £40.72 cheaper.

Therefore it appears that whilst the not-for-profit model can provide good offers to citizens, these offers are not as good as the market leading deals created via collective switching schemes or deals offered via some of the big six.

Therefore our analysis concludes that a not-for-profit power firm would not generate much income as its primary purpose is to provide savings to its customers.

In comparison our 'Switch and Save' model creates a small income via referral fees which come from the new supplier. Therefore, enabling the authority to assist the very vulnerable, via our affordable warmth activities, whilst not affecting the offer made.

The seventh tranche of the Norwich Big 'Switch and Save' will be launched on 1 December."

Councillor Wright said he did not believe it was a 'binary choice' and asked, as a supplementary question, if the cabinet member was willing to consider a not-for-profit firm again in more detail specifically taking into account the Nottingham tariff. **Councillor Bremner** said that the aim of switch and save was to break the monopoly of the big six and to keep in the forefront of people's minds the opportunities to be gained from switching. It had brought forward significant reductions for many people. He was happy to meet Councillor Wright and to explore this in more detail.

Question 17

Councillor Ackroyd to ask the cabinet member for environment and sustainable development:

"Along with other councillors, I recently received a letter from a local care provider setting out concerns over the changes to the parking permit charges. The author of the letter suggests that their overall costs will increase by £6,700 per year as a result of these changes.

We know that carers provide a vital service on behalf of society in challenging financial circumstances. Will the cabinet member responsible reconsider the position as regards permits for care providers and carers?"

Councillor Bremner, cabinet member for environment and sustainable development's response:

"The council has recently increased the cost of permits to statutory and other service providers. A variety of evidence has shown such permits being used for non-operational reasons, thereby using up scarce parking otherwise intended for local residents and their visitors. The number in circulation exceeded likely operational needs whereas they were also very cheap compared to the price of other permits such as say residential permits.

I am aware that the price increase has created a problem for carers – whose number has grown greatly since the permit review commenced.

Officers have therefore recently met the county council, who commission carer services, to discuss the matter with it. Members will be aware that on-street permit parking is a service provided by the council ultimately on behalf of the county council as highway authority. In view of this, a mechanism has been agreed whereby the county council would become responsible for the provision of carer permits, ensuring that the number in circulation is kept within reasonable operational requirements and so as to control inappropriate use. The county council is currently investigating the number of permits that will be reasonably required by the care agencies to carry out their duties, and will be liaising directly with our business support team to arrange for these permits to be issued. Once they have been issued, they will be distributed and managed by the county council.

We will be in a position to issue the permits as soon as we have received confirmation of the number required from the county council."

Question 18

Councillor Lubbock to ask the cabinet member for housing and wellbeing:

"I have in my ward tenants who have lived in their council house for over 50 years. They regard their house as their home, where they brought up their family and where they have their friends. They do not wish to move at this stage in their lives to a one bedroomed sheltered housing bungalow or to a downstairs one bedroomed flat. They are in their seventies and are enjoying reasonable health. They would really like to have their bath replaced by a shower. Is this really too much to ask?

Apparently it is. "Baths will be replaced with baths when upgrades are done unless the tenants are disabled" is what they have been told in a letter from the council. So regardless of whether the tenants use the bath or not they will get a new one and no chance of a shower cubicle. Is this helping the tenants to stay healthy and independent longer in their own home?

Why is it that good tenants who have paid rent for 50 years are denied the opportunity to live independent lives, with easy washing facilities with a shower, saving water, saving money on heating the water and saving the NHS money because they are less likely to have falls using a shower than a bath? Why cannot we give those tenants who want a shower, a shower cubicle instead of a bath which they do not use?"

Councillor Harris, cabinet member for housing and wellbeing's response:

"The council wants tenants, and their immediate household, to live independently in their homes for as long as possible and to help tenants achieve better housing and living conditions. In addition our aim is to ensure that the best use of existing adapted council properties, whilst offering a value for money service.

During the council's upgrade programme standard replacements to bathroom fittings in homes classed as general needs will include a new bath, where there is one currently and an over bath shower. Where tenants have asked for an independent shower, subject to the tenants approval, their case would be referred for an occupational therapist assessment. This would be to ensure that the tenant could discuss their overall needs; given there may be other issues to consider. Showers and others changes may then be made to the property.

If the council were to install shower cubicles, replacing baths, as part of the standard upgrade programme there would be an additional cost to the council in fitting these. These will vary from home to home dependant on the current bathroom design and would reduce the number of improvements we could make to other properties.

In addition, many of our homes are suitable for family living and therefore a bath with an over bath shower provides flexible use for a range of family member's needs. If shower cubicles are fitted without careful consideration there will be additional costs to removing these to meet future tenant needs as many people prefer the flexibility of a bath and over bath shower.

It is important for the council to consider all these factors, managing our homes carefully to ensure it makes best use of its financial resources whilst meeting the needs of its current and future tenants

Due to the complexities of this issue, we are currently commencing a full review of the current policy, including the cost implications of taking a different approach in the future."

Councillor Lubbock said that it was clear that the current policy was biased towards future tenants. She asked, as a supplementary question, who would be involved in the review. **Councillor Harris** said that the new neighbourhood housing manager will lead on this.

Report to	Council	Item
	26 January 2016	
Report of	Executive head of business relationship management and democracy	7
Subject	Council tax reduction scheme 2016-17	

Purpose

To consider a council tax reduction scheme (CTRS) for 2016 - 17 and to propose that council tax discounts and exemptions are not amended.

Recommendation

To approve the council tax reduction scheme 2016-17 by continuing with the council's 2015/16 scheme with a number of modifications:

- a) The applicable amounts shall be uprated by the composite council tax percentage. Including in the scheme the principle of the uprating rather than the actual figure;
- b) The applicable amounts uprating shall exclude sums for Family Premium. Which shall be retained for old and new claimants but the value shall not change from 2015-16;
- c) The applicable amounts uprating shall also exclude the element for Employment Support Allowance (ESA) which shall be retained but mirror the DWP uprating/freeze;
- d) The 6 months backdating for CTRS shall be retained.

Corporate and service priorities

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

Financial implications

The proposed changes to the council tax reduction scheme will result in additional cost to the council of around £64k, which will be covered by the increased income due to rise in council tax.

Ward/s: All wards

Cabinet member: Councillor Thomas - Fairness and equality

Contact officers

Anton Bull, executive head of business relationship and democracy 01603 212326

Tracy Woods, business relationship and procurement manager 01603 212140

Background documents

None

Report

Introduction

1. In April 2013 the government abolished the previous national council tax benefit scheme which helped those people with no or low income to pay their council tax. The government set the rules regarding who can claim and how much benefit they would receive. Previously the government funded 100% of the council tax benefit scheme.
2. To replace council tax benefit the government told local councils to come up with their own locally run scheme called the council tax reduction scheme. As part of this the government reduced the amount of funding it provided to councils for this by 10%. In Norwich this was a reduction of about £1.5 million per year. However, the government also said that pensioner households could not lose any of their council tax benefit.
3. On 29 January 2013 council considered options for the council's first council tax reduction scheme and opted for no changes to the then existing scheme for council tax benefit. This meant adopting the "default regulations" [The Council Tax Reduction Schemes (Default Scheme) (England) Regulations 2012]
4. Further, on 29 January 2013 council approved raising income through changing council tax discounts and exemptions.
5. On 28 January 2014 and 27 January 2015 the council considered and resolved to make further amendments, following consultation.

Consultation process for 2016 - 17 Council tax reduction scheme

6. Schedule 1A to the Local Government Finance Act 1992 states:
 - (1) For each financial year, each billing authority must consider whether to revise its scheme or to replace it with another scheme; and
 - (2) the authority must make any revision to its scheme, or any replacement scheme, no later than 31 January in the financial year preceding that for which the revision or replacement scheme is to have effect.
7. The council consulted with the other precepting authorities, the office of the Police and Crime Commissioner and Norfolk County Council. No adverse comments have been received.
8. The council has also consulted through the wider consultation on the development of the council's budget for 2016-17. The following questions were asked in section C and responses received:

QC1a: Do you agree the council should continue to increase 'applicable amounts' for the CTRS to protect claimants? - Yes 55.6 % No 44.4 %;

QC1b: If so, should we increase these 'applicable amounts' by any percentage increase in council tax for the year? – Yes 63.7 % No 36.3 %;

QC2: Do you agree we should retain this 'family premium' in the 'applicable amounts' for CTRS for both new and old claimants to protect claimants? – Yes 52.8 % No 47.2%;

QC3: Do you agree we should continue to backdate CTRS for six months to protect claimants? – Yes 46.5 % No 53.5%;

9. The budget consultation for 2016-17 concluded on 8 January 2016 full comments and analysis for the consultation was not available at the time of writing this report. However, from the raw data as above there is support for the proposed changes in respect of the uprating and marginally against the proposal to back date.

Proposals for 2016-17 Council tax reduction scheme

10. In the government's summer budget of 2015 it proposed several changes to housing benefit, three of which become effective from April 2016:

- a) Housing benefit uprating of applicable amounts for working-age claimants frozen for four years from April 2016;
- b) family premium to be removed from new housing benefit claims from May 2016; and
- c) backdating for housing benefit to be limited to a maximum of one month.

11. Norwich City Council proposes not to mirror these changes in the CTRS.

12. As the Government shall not be providing future uprating figures for the applicable amounts Norwich City Council is proposing to uprate by the same amount as any increase in council tax (the composite rate of any rise in the city council, county council and office of the police and crime commissioner.) This would mean that working age claimants would not be adversely affected.

13. Norwich City Council is also proposing to maintain the family premium for new claimants of CTRS and continuing to backdate council tax reduction for up to six months.

14. The overall cost of this would be covered by the increase in council tax but would reduce the amount collected. The actual amount would depend on the rate of increase (if any) for each of the precepting authorities. In the 25 November 2015 Spending Review, it was announced local authorities responsible for adult social care "will be given an additional 2% flexibility on their current council tax referendum threshold (which is 2%) to be used entirely for adult social care. By way of estimate, if the city council, county council and office of the police and crime commissioner all increased council tax by 1.95% and the county council increased by the additional 2% for social care the total increase in cost would be approximately £461k (approx. £333k of this cost would fall to the county council). If nobody increased council tax there would be no additional cost. However it should be noted that with a composite increase in council tax of 3.39% (as detailed above), more council tax payers may become in need of CTRS – should 100 more band D equivalents require CTRS this create an additional cost of £165k (£119k would fall to the county council).

15. Therefore the proposal for the 2016-17 council tax reduction scheme is to continue with the council's 2015-16 scheme with the following modifications:

- a) The applicable amounts shall be uprated by the composite council tax percentage. Including in the scheme the principle of the uprating;
- b) The applicable amounts uprating shall exclude sums for Family Premium. Which shall be retained for old and new claimants but the value shall not change from 2015-16;
- c) The applicable amounts uprating shall also exclude the element for Employment Support Allowance (ESA) which shall be retained but mirror the DWP uprating/freeze;
- d) The 6 months backdating for CTRS shall be retained.

Proposal for 2016-17 council tax discounts and exemptions

16. There are no proposed adjustments to existing discounts and exemptions.

Implementation of the scheme

17. The scheme has to be agreed by 31 January 2016 but Council Tax will be set by precepting authorities in February 2016. The S151 officer will therefore populate the scheme with the actual figures once the council tax has been set.

Integrated impact assessment



NORWICH
City Council

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

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

Report author to complete

Committee:	Council
Committee date:	26 January 2016
Head of service:	Anton Bull
Report subject:	Council tax reduction scheme 2016-17
Date assessed:	
Description:	

	Impact			
Economic (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Finance (value for money)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Add commentary
Other departments and services e.g. office facilities, customer contact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ICT services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Economic development	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Financial inclusion	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The report recommends continuing with the council tax reduction scheme adopted for 2015/16 with amendments. Positive impact for claimants however, negative financial impact for all council tax payers due to negative financial consequences.
Social (please add an 'x' as appropriate)	Neutral	Positive	Negative	Comments
Safeguarding children and adults	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<u>S17 crime and disorder act 1998</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Human Rights Act 1998	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Health and well being	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

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

Recommendations from impact assessment
Positive
Negative
Neutral
Issues

