

Minutes of the Council meeting held at Riverside, Canning Road, Lowestoft on **Wednesday, 22 July 2015 at 6.30 pm.**

| |
|----------|
| 3 |
|----------|

Members present:

B Provan (Chairman), S Allen, S Ardley, P Ashdown, S Barker, M Barnard, M Bee, N Brooks, A Cackett, G Catchpole, J Ceresa, M Cherry, Y Cherry, J Craig, G Elliott, J Ford, T Gandy, T Goldson, L Gooch, I Graham, K Grant, A Green, J Groom, L Harris-Logan, M Ladd, C Law, P Light, S Logan, F Mortimer, T Mortimer, J Murray, L Nicholls, M Parsons, K Patience, M Pitchers, C Punt, D Ritchie, M Rudd, J Smith, L Smith, C Topping, N Webb and S Webb

Officers present:

S Baker (Chief Executive), J Green (Planning Officer), I Johns (Planning Officer), D Reed (Planning Policy and Delivery Manager), H Slater (Monitoring Officer), and N Wotton (Senior Democratic Services Officer)

The Chairman welcomed those present to the first Full Council meeting to be held at the new Riverside Offices in Canning Road, Lowestoft. The room layout for the meeting was under review and any feedback received would be used to inform any future arrangements. The first meeting of the Full Council in the new building was then photographed for posterity.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors E Back, R Neil, T Reynolds, K Springall and S Woods.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 20 May 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications from the Chairman on this occasion.

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE / LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

There were no announcements on this occasion.

6. NOTICES OF MOTION

No Notices of Motion had been received.

7. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

With the agreement of the Council, the Chairman changed the order of business to enable the reports to be considered prior to receiving Questions from Members.

8. PETITIONS

No Petitions had been received.

9. QUESTIONS FROM THE ELECTORATE

No Questions from the Electorate had been received.

10. GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY ADOPTION

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Planning & Coastal Management presented the report, which sought approval of the Green Infrastructure Strategy, which concerned the distribution of green spaces and the connectivity between them in the District.

Members were advised that the Green Infrastructure Strategy had been prepared to highlight the gaps in the existing network of green spaces and to identify opportunities to improve the quality, value and connections between them. The Strategy also set out an approach to protect and improve existing green spaces, provide appropriate types of green space and related facilities where required when opportunities present themselves and improve the quality of wildlife habitats in the District.

It was reported that the Green Infrastructure had been considered by the Local Plan Working Group and significant public consultation had taken place to inform the development of the strategy. The strategy would also inform the decision making process with regards to the allocation of Community Infrastructure Levy monies and be used to support Neighbourhood Plans.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Planning & Coastal Management confirmed that the Green Infrastructure Strategy was a living document and an additional recommendation was subsequently proposed and seconded:

That delegated authority be given to the Cabinet Member for Planning & Coastal Management, in conjunction with the Head of Planning, to make updates that do not affect the overall strategy, as and when necessary.

Those present took the opportunity to thank the Officers involved in the development of the Green Infrastructure Strategy and commended the training sessions and consultation work undertaken in this respect.

Members were reassured that they would be kept apprised of any changes made to the Strategy under the proposed delegated powers and a list of changes would be circulated on a regular basis, as appropriate.

In response to a comment from a Member, it was confirmed that the Strategy was a very detailed and lengthy document. As such it would be kept updated and available to view on the Council's website and a copy would be available in the Members Room. A hard copy of the document would be available to Town and Parish Councils upon request. It was also suggested that a copy could be made available in the local library for public reference.

RESOLVED

1. That the Green Infrastructure Strategy be adopted.
2. That the Green Infrastructure Strategy and the statement summarising the main issues raised during the consultation and how those issues have been addressed in the Strategy be published and made available.

3. That delegated authority be given to the Cabinet Member for Planning & Coastal Management, in conjunction with the Head of Planning, to make updates that do not affect the overall strategy, as and when necessary.

11. EAST SUFFOLK REPORT

The Leader of the Council presented a report which sought approval of the East Suffolk Report, which highlighted the key activities and developments that had been achieved during the 2014/15 financial year. It was noted that this was the first Joint Report for East Suffolk, which reflected the shared services partnership between Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Councils.

Members were advised that the report was divided into 7 sections, which reflected the key interdependent and overlapping themes, which represent the Councils' critical success factors and address the issues that matter to communities. It was noted that the publication would be an excellent marketing tool for the two councils and would be a critical mechanism for further engagement with residents, businesses, partners and stakeholders.

It was noted that a corresponding communication strategy had been developed to ensure that the East Suffolk Report was appropriately distributed. Reassurance was provided that the Report had been produced by the Councils' Communications Team, at no additional cost to the authorities.

In response to a comment from a Member, it was noted that the document had been printed within the meeting papers in black and white in order to save on printing costs. The document was also available to view in colour on the Council's website and hard copies would be available on request.

Clarification was provided that the £25 million funding for the Lowestoft Flood Protection Scheme had been secured and the project was in its final design phase. As soon as the plan was finalised, it would be sent to the Environment Agency.

With regard to recycling rates, a Member queried whether it was anticipated that recycling rates would fall, given that charging for garden waste was to be introduced in the future. There was some discussion in this respect and it was reported that it was anticipated that recycling rates would remain unchanged, however measures would be put in place to raise public awareness and encourage more recycling.

A Member raised concerns about Lowestoft Station, as the building looked very run down. The station was created by Sir Morton Peto and was one of the oldest railways stations in England. There followed some discussion in this respect and it was noted that the Council was working with Lowestoft Vision to find the best ways to use the £10,000 grant which had recently been awarded by the Heritage Lottery Fund.

In response to a query from a Member, it was confirmed that the siting of any new CCTV cameras would be carefully planned and any over hanging vegetation which obscured the view would be trimmed, as appropriate. It was noted that additional CCTV cameras would be installed along the promenade of Lowestoft Seafront in the near future.

RESOLVED

1. That the East Suffolk Report be received and noted.
2. That delegated authority be given to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make any necessary changes to the style, layout and photographs of the East Suffolk Report, as required.

12. APPOINTMENT AND DISMISSAL OF STATUTORY OFFICERS

The Leader of the Council presented the report, which advised that the Council was required to revise its Constitution and adopt new mandatory Standing Orders for the appointment of the Head of Paid Service (Chief Executive) and for the dismissal process for the Head of Paid Service, the Chief Finance Officer (s151 Officer) and the Monitoring Officer.

It was reported that just prior to the General and Local Elections in 2015, the Council had received a letter from the Department of Communities and Local Government (CLG) which announced the making of the 2015 Regulations. They required the Council to amend the Council's Employment Procedure Rules no later than the first ordinary meeting of the Council falling after 11 May 2015.

It was noted that where the Council was considering the dismissal of the Head of Paid Service, Chief Finance Officer or Monitoring Officer, they were now required to invite Independent Persons to be part of the dismissal advisory panel. Any decision made by the joint appointments committee or dismissal advisory panel would need to be ratified by Full Council. There was no right of appeal with regards to this process, except via Judicial Review.

Members were advised that the 2015 Regulations had attracted some adverse comments from professional bodies and it was not at present clear how the new processes would work in practice. There was also no guidance in respect of statutory officers who were employed by two or more authorities.

A Member queried whether the new Regulations would lead to potential law suits in future. It was reported that there was always the potential for legal action in relation to employment matters and any dispute would lead to costs being incurred. It was noted that the previous processes were bureaucratic and time consuming, however it would be impossible to predict whether the new processes would be an improvement.

A Member requested assurances that the new Regulations would not lead to confidentiality or compromise agreements being used in the future. It was reported that it was not possible to give such an assurance. Each case was unique and such agreements would be used if they were in the best interests of the Council.

RESOLVED

1. That the Council's Constitution be revised in accordance with the 2015 Regulations, with regard to the appointment and dismissal of Statutory Officers, with immediate effect.
2. That delegated authority be given to the Monitoring Officer to make the consequential changes to the Constitution.

13. SECTION BY SECTION REVIEW OF THE CONSTITUTION – LICENSING AND NOTICES OF MOTION

The Leader of the Council presented the report which sought approval to amend the Constitution in respect of a recommendation from the Licensing Committee and the Audit & Governance Committee.

It was reported that at the Full Council meeting on 25 February 2015, a Notice of Motion was referred to the Audit & Governance Committee for consideration:

'With reference to Section 12.4 of the Constitution, this Council recommends to the Audit & Governance Committee that where a motion affecting Council responsibilities or which affects the district, is properly proposed and seconded by two councillors, it shall be debated forthwith, without the need for a prior majority vote taken in order to discuss such a motion.'

This was discussed by the Audit & Governance Committee at its meeting on 22 June 2015. After detailed discussions and debate, the Committee felt that, rather than make a recommendation on whether or not to change the Constitution, it might be prudent to ask the Conservative and Labour Group Leaders to discuss the issue and explore whether an alternative solution could be found and to set any ground rules for future Notices of Motion.

With regards to Licensing, in 2005, in preparation for the commencement of the Licensing Act 2003, a hearing procedure was adopted in line with the published Licensing Act Regulations. This is in Part 5 of the Constitution – Protocol for Councillors and Officers Dealing with Licensing Matters.

Over the years, it had become apparent that each scenario presented to the Licensing Sub-Committee for determination required a bespoke order of procedure. To this end, at its meeting on 17 June 2015, the Licensing Committee approved a suite of documents to prescribe the hearing procedure to be followed during the most commonly heard applications. It also approved a guidance document for external parties attending licensing hearings.

The Committee was advised that it was not appropriate to retain the existing Licensing Protocol in the Council's Constitution and had recommended that the Protocol for Members and Officers Dealing with Licensing Matters contained at Part 5 of the Constitution be removed.

RESOLVED

1. That no change be made to the procedure rule concerning discussion of Motions at Paragraph 12.4 of Part 3 of the Council's Constitution at this point.
2. That the Leaders of the Conservative and Labour Groups discuss the issue of consideration of formal Notices of Motion and explore whether an alternative solution can be found to the concerns of Members which led to the Notice of Motion being put to Full Council, and to set any ground rules for the submission of future Notices of Motion, including ensuring that the appearance of party politics is not allowed to inhibit debate in Full Council meetings.
3. That the existing Protocol for Members and Officers Dealing with Licensing Matters contained at Part 5 be removed from Waveney District Council's Constitution.

14. REPRESENTATION ON THE OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The Leader of the Council presented the report, which sought to replace Councillor Grant with Councillor Brooks on the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the 2015/16 municipal year.

Members were advised that Full Council had approved the Councillor appointments to Committees at the Annual Council meeting on 20 May 2015. Since that meeting, Councillor Grant had asked to stand down as a Member of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee. In order to maintain the political proportionality, an alternative Conservative Councillor needed to be sought to serve on this Committee. Consultation had taken place with the Leader of the Council regarding the proposed membership of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

RESOLVED

That Councillor N Brooks replace Councillor K Grant as one of the Conservative Councillors on the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the 2015/16 municipal year.

15. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES FOR 2015/16 (NON EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS)

The Leader of the Council presented the report, which sought to appoint a Non Executive Member to the Waveney Norse Governance Board. It was noted that the Council had approved Councillor representation on Outside Bodies, where the role related to a Non-Executive function carried out by the local authority, at the Annual Council meeting on 20 May 2015.

The Cabinet, at its meeting on 24 June 2015, considered representation on Outside Bodies where the role related to an Executive function of the local authority and where the relevant Cabinet Member was the most appropriate representative. At that meeting, Councillor Ardley, as the Cabinet Member for Operational Partnerships & Lowestoft Rising, was appointed to the Waveney Norse Partnership Board. Since that time, an additional Non Executive Member vacancy had been created on the Waveney Norse Governance Board. It was suggested that it would be appropriate if representation on this Outside Body came from a Member of the Labour Opposition Group. Appointment to this Outside Body would enhance the Council’s representative and community leadership role, whilst allowing the appropriate monitoring of performance / budgets in line with best practice. Consultation had taken place with Councillor Barker, the Labour Group Leader, seeking a nomination for the additional position.

Members were pleased to note that the additional Non Executive Member vacancy had been created and the feedback received about similar positions on other Outside Bodies had been extremely positive.

RESOLVED

That Councillor I Graham of the Labour Group be appointed as an additional Waveney District Council representative on the Waveney Norse Governance Board for the 2015/16 municipal year.

16. MEMBER QUESTIONS

- (a) Question from Councillor P Light to the Cabinet Member for Economic Development, Tourism & Rural Affairs

Accepting that a new river crossing will not be in the immediate future, would Waveney District Council actively investigate, promote and support temporary alternatives to improve the present traffic flows?

Response from Councillor M Ladd

The Lowestoft Transport & Infrastructure Prospectus (LTIP) outlines a large number of potential projects that aim to improve traffic flows in the town. These projects span over a 15 year programme broken down into the short (1-5 years), medium (5-10 years) and long term (10 years plus).

Successes have already been realised through the completion of the Northern Spine Road, Bus/Rail Interchange, Commercial Road Junction Improvements and Upgrades to the UTMC. In conjunction, significant progress was being made in the flood protection project with a substantial amount of funding committed to delivering a scheme which will protect the town centre, residents and key development sites from future flooding.

To build on these successes, LTIP Partners have been supporting an initiative undertaken by Highways England to reduce traffic congestion in Lowestoft. AECOM consultants had been commissioned to assess 13 key junctions around the town and prepare recommendations for HE’s consideration. These recommendations would be focussed purely on improving traffic flows in the town and could be delivered in the short term.

Supplementary Question from Councillor P Light

There is a lack of information about when the bridge is going to be raised in Lowestoft, which causes traffic congestion. Could we work with local radio stations

or the Lowestoft Journal to provide advanced information of when the bridge is going to be raised?

Response from Councillor M Ladd

We could look into trying to provide more information and improve communication. However, the State of Suffolk Report advised that there had been an increase of 60,000 vehicles in Suffolk over the past 10 years, therefore we need to look at alternative methods of travel and take a radical approach, as traffic congestion can only increase in the future.

(b) Question from Councillor G Elliott to the Leader of the Council

Waveney has two Fairtrade Towns, namely Lowestoft and Beccles and these two towns proudly display entry signs proclaiming this status. The Fairtrade Town status of Beccles relies upon a commitment from Beccles Town Council but in the absence of a Town Council in Lowestoft this commitment has to come from Waveney District Council. In August 2004 this Council unanimously passed a resolution promoting Fairtrade.

Can the Leader of the Council please explain what measures are being taken to ensure the continuation of Lowestoft's status as a Fairtrade Town and to ensure we uphold our own commitment to promoting Fairtrade?

Response from Councillor C Law

I would like to thank Councillor Elliott for his question about Fairtrade. It was in fact introduced in 2004 into Lowestoft by the Conservative administration. We have actively promoted and supported the use of Fairtrade products throughout the town and made sure it was standard issue within the council.

Cllr Topping, as Mayor of Beccles, championed the use of Fairtrade products thus ensuring Fairtrade was adopted and promoted within the Town of Beccles.

Unfortunately as the District Council for the whole of Waveney, it has not been possible for the Council to take the Fairtrade lead for Lowestoft in the same way that the Town Council obviously has for Beccles. This may be another argument for the need to create a Town Council for Lowestoft, but that debate is for another day. In the meantime, we will continue to promote and support the use of Fairtrade products not only in Lowestoft but throughout Waveney.

Supplementary Question from Councillor G Elliott

Can we ensure that all tea and coffee purchased for the new Riverside Building is Fairtrade and can we promote its use by having signage around the building?

Response from Councillor C Law

We are very supportive of the use of Fairtrade products but we do need to use up any non Fairtrade products in circulation first. As the Riverside building is shared with Suffolk County Council we also need to consider their views and encourage them to use Fairtrade produce. We can install some signage and encourage the use of Fairtrade throughout the building.

(c) Question from Councillor G Elliott to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Planning & Coastal Management

On 15 October 2014 the Development Control Committee approved the extensive redevelopment of the Brooke Peninsula. This scheme is part of wider redevelopment which will include a pedestrian and cycle bridge across Lake Lothing from the new riverside development to Normanston Park. Prior to the planning meeting on 15

October 2014, I received categoric assurances from the Head of Planning that the delivery of this pedestrian and cycle bridge would be a high priority for this Council. Can the Cabinet Member for Planning please explain what has been done since 15 October to progress the delivery of this bridge?

Response from Councillor D Ritchie

Councillor Elliot may be aware that the planning application for Brooke peninsula has yet to be approved. Discussions have been ongoing to ensure that the Section 106 agreement, which includes significant financial contributions towards the pedestrian and cycle-bridge, together with the provision of a landing site on the south side of Lake Lothing, is watertight. The pedestrian and cycle bridge at Brooke Peninsula is a corporate priority of this Council and Suffolk County Council. It is identified as a priority in the Council's Lowestoft Lake Lothing and Outer Harbour Area Action Plan and Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood Development Brief which both received unanimous approval at Full Council. It is also identified in the Lowestoft Transport and Infrastructure Prospectus and in Suffolk County Council's Local Transport Plan.

Progress to date has been limited, as without a planning consent on the Brooke Peninsula, there is little hope of the project being delivered. However, in light of the fact that the consent is likely to be issued soon, scoping work has begun and a paper on how the project can be driven forward will be tabled at September's Lowestoft Transport and Infrastructure Prospectus Working Group meeting. The project will be considered as a two phased process, with the first phase securing a new crossing over the railway line to facilitate the landing point on the north side of Lake Lothing. The recommendation to LTIP will be to work with Sustrans to drive the project forward.

There was no Supplementary Question on this occasion.

(d) Question from Councillor L Gooch to the Leader of the Council

Would the Leader of the Council please provide an update on the current plans for the future of the Lowestoft Town Hall Building?

Response from Councillor Law

Having considered the interest expressed for the Town Hall site, the Town Hall Project Group is confident a suitable project partner can be identified to work with the Council. The interested parties appear to demonstrate a clear understanding of the Council's objectives for the site, particularly in relation to the long term viability of the Town Hall building, and a willingness to work with the Council to deliver a sustainable development. The group considers the proposals presented have merit and await a formal proposal exploring the concepts presented in more detail. A full appraisal is expected to be completed during this month and once we have all the details available we will release them in the public domain, prior to any formal decision being taken. The details of the interested parties at this stage remain commercially sensitive, to ensure that the Council can achieve the best possible outcome for the community, including providing value for money.

Supplementary Question from Councillor L Gooch

Can the suggested uses for the Town Hall which were submitted during the public consultation process be released to the public? Can we also ensure that we support the businesses in the North of the Town?

Response from Councillor C Law

We are working hard to ensure that the businesses in North Lowestoft are supported and we want to stimulate the economy in that area. The vast majority of uses for the Town Hall which were suggested by the public were not supported by any sort of

business case or financial plan, therefore they were not deemed to be financially viable, so were not given any further consideration.

(e) Question from Councillor M Cherry to the Cabinet Member for Operational Partnerships & Lowestoft Rising

Could Councillor Stephen Ardley confirm that Waveney District Council are not intending to charge £50.00 per year for the collection of green waste or introducing another bin (Brown) so as to save the authority money?

Response from Councillor S Ardley

Thank you for your question, I refer Cllr Cherry and this Council to the report to Cabinet last week and the briefing sent to all Members regarding this matter. Members will clearly be able to see the options and proposals that needed to be considered. A £50 annual charge was not one of them.

Supplementary Question from Councillor M Cherry

Will the Cabinet extend the current food only and glass collection services, which are on trial in several areas in the District?

Response from Councillor S Ardley

We are going to review the different trials and services which are being provided. I can confirm that food waste should not be put into the Green Bin in future but we will have a comprehensive publicity and education programme prior to any changes being implemented. There will be an annual charge of £42 per year for Green Bin collections in future and it would not be compulsory to have your Green Bin emptied by the Council. Since the Cabinet made its decision regarding charging for garden waste to be collected, there has been a lot of discussion on social media, the majority of which was factually incorrect. We will bring more information to a future Council meeting to ensure that all Councillors are aware of the proposed changes and why they are being introduced. As a Council, we will encourage composting and provide more information about what can and cannot be recycled.

(f) Question from Councillor S Logan to the Leader of the Council

After the clear and firm commitment given several times by our Prime Minister in May and June 2015 to deliver the Third Crossing by 2020, and recognising that whilst the project is a Highways issue under the jurisdiction of Suffolk County Council, the commitment was clearly given to Waveney Constituency, and not Suffolk County. I therefore ask, can this administration ensure the immediate and urgent production of a detailed programme working back from 2020, to show all deadlines necessary, from consideration and appointment of the project professional team, through to completion, in order that progress can be clearly tracked, to ensure delivery, as promised, by 2020?

Response from Councillor Law

The Lowestoft Transport & Infrastructure Prospectus (LTIP) Steering Group has instructed a Third Crossing Sub Group be set up, which will be dedicated to facilitate and co-ordinate the completion of the £2m feasibility study and subsequent delivery. This sub group contains key partners such as NALEP, Highways England, Port Authority, Network Rail, Business Representatives and SCC as the responsible authority. A programme of works is being produced to deliver the feasibility study. Once completed and a viable option has been approved, an overall programme will be produced to assist the delivery of a Third Crossing by 2020.

Supplementary Question from Councillor S Logan

Can we have a design competition for the new bridge, to ensure that we get the best possible design for Lowestoft?

Response from Councillor C Law

We are working to extremely tight timescales and we need to have the plans in place to ensure that the bridge is included within next year's Government Budget. The competition for the design of the bridge would take far too long. Please be assured that we will have the best possible engineers working on the project and they will consider all the options available.

(g) Question from Councillor J Murray to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Planning & Coastal Management

Can the Cabinet Member for Planning and Coastal Management explain what plans have been made to manage road congestion in and around Oulton Broad in the light of proposed and planned housing developments such as Woods Meadow, Brooke Peninsular, the Sanyo site and the Western end of Lake Lothing?

Response from Councillor Ritchie

As with all development proposals, the transport impacts are thoroughly assessed by the local planning authority. Where impacts are identified, mitigation measures are required. Turning to each of the examples mentioned:

- Woods Meadow - This was approved in August 2013 and construction has recently begun on site. The development was subject to full transport assessment. To mitigate the identified impacts the section 106 agreement for the site requires:
 - New bus service paid for by a £350,000 contribution by the developer
 - A contribution of £500,000 towards strategic transport improvements which are yet to be defined, and a further £1,000,000 contribution if an assessment conducted after the completion of the 400th dwelling shows that further mitigation is required.
- Brooke Peninsula - This application has yet to be approved, although Members resolved to grant permission in October 2014. This site is allocated in the Area Action Plan, which was subject to numerous detailed transport assessments and scrutinised by an Independent Examiner. A Transport Assessment also accompanied the application. To help mitigate the impact on the network, the Section 106 agreement for the site will require:
 - Provision of land for a pedestrian and cycle bridge over Lake Lothing
 - A financial contribution towards the pedestrian and cycle bridge
 - A new bus service paid for by the developer
 - A travel plan
 - A contribution towards a car share scheme
- The Sanyo site is also allocated in the Area Action Plan and the planning application includes a Transport Assessment. The site will also contribute towards the pedestrian and cycle bridge and be subject to a Travel Plan.
- The Western End of Lake Lothing is a small development of only up to 57 houses. The transport assessment for the 44 unit development on the site which was permitted earlier this year stated that the traffic generation for the development would be lower than current uses. It should be noted that the same could be true for Sanyo and Brooke Peninsula if they were used to their full potential or industrial uses.

In addition to these measures the Council is promoting a number of other transport measures through the Lowestoft Transport and Infrastructure Prospectus. These include working with Network Rail to reduce waiting times at the level crossing in Oulton Broad, improvements to other pinch points, and other traffic management measures. All of these will help manage road congestion through Oulton Broad.

Supplementary Question from Councillor J Murray

I am concerned that when Woods Meadow gets developed, the area will become even more of a rat run than it is today. There are no footpaths and I have safety concerns, as it was not designed to cope with industrial traffic.

Response from Councillor D Ritchie

I am not directly involved with this application, however there is the potential for £1 million from the developer after the 400th dwelling has been built, if mitigation is required to assist with traffic issues. I will ask the Planning Officers to contact you to discuss this.

(h) Question from Councillor S Barker to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Planning & Coastal Management

Can the Cabinet Member for Planning and Coastal Management give a date for the installation of Waveney District Council signs informing members of the public of the access points to seafront and beach facilities including businesses during the current promenade and beach works? (The engineering works are being undertaken along the seafront from Children`s Corner to Claremont Pier).

Response from Councillor Ritchie

Following consultation with businesses it was agreed to provide the following signage which has been erected.

- A large project information and background board mounted at the old Lifeguard shelter.
- 4 Project Information update boards – refreshed every 2 weeks.
- Numerous signs fixed onto the site fencing, directing visitors approaching from the Royal Green car park to both Royal Plain facilities and the Blue Flag beach to the south. These signs were agreed with the Lowestoft Tourism Group before they were erected. Note that additional signs of this type were added in early July to cover the extended temporary site fencing from Parade Road South to the Claremont pier. They also include two signs showing the direction and distance to the Blue Flag Beach/beach entrance south of the Claremont. The first of these is at the South Pier end and the next at the Old Life Guard station.
- 2 large signs with text and maps on the Royal Green with a wealth of information, including directions to the Blue Flag beach and other tourism facilities.
- Leaflets with a map are also available at the Tourist Information Centre, and at all the B&Bs in the area. The map covers a larger area this year and shows the full extent of the beach and facilities down to Pakefield, rather than focussing on the Royal Plain/Green areas, following consultation with the businesses.

Supplementary Question from Councillor S Barker

I am still concerned that there are not enough signs to direct tourists towards the access to our award winning beach. There are some small signs but if there are a lot of pedestrians on the promenade, a significant amount of which is cordoned off, they may not see them.

Response from Councillor D Ritchie

May I suggest that you contact Samantha Jones from Economic Development, so that you can discuss possible signage in detail. It should be noted that local businesses stated that they did not wish to have too much signage directly in front of

the beach. Many people are actually treating the works to the beach as a tourist attraction in their own right – tourists are really interested in watching the delivery of the rocks onto the beach.

(i) Question from Councillor S Barker to the Cabinet Member for Community Health & Safety

Is the Cabinet Member for Community Health & Safety (which includes NHS provision) sure that the number of in patient beds available in the Gt. Yarmouth & Waveney CCG area will be sufficient to meet the demands of an increase in residents aged 75 and over by 2025 if there is a reduction in community hospitals such as those currently in Southwold, Halesworth, Beccles, Northgate Hospital (Gt. Yarmouth) and All Hallows Hospital in Ditchingham?

Response from Councillor Rudd

I have spoken to my colleagues in NHS Great Yarmouth and Waveney CCG and they have assured me that their capacity plans have been developed using the evidence that they have from their successful pilot in Lowestoft.

For the past year, an out of hospital model has been working in Lowestoft following the closure of Lowestoft Hospital and the 17 GP beds there. The evidence from the first 12 months of the pilot shows us that in that time the out of hospital team have managed to keep 352 patients out of an acute hospital. The team also works with only five beds with care, which are only at capacity during peak winter periods, showing how effective this new way of working is at keeping people supported appropriately in their own homes.

The current consultation is looking at rolling out this out of hospital model across the whole CCG area and in order to do so the GP beds at Southwold, Patrick Stead, Northgate and All Hallows Hospital in Ditchingham would then close.

Until the consultation has been completed, and a decision made by the CCGs Governing Body after hearing the views of the public the implementation of the proposed new service will not take place. At this stage the detail of exactly how many beds with care will be needed for each area is still to be determined. This will be agreed with local clinicians, including GPs, and decisions will be based on the level of services that they feel are needed in their locality. During the consultation it has become clear that there is an expectation in the Halesworth area that due to the rurality it would be better to have more beds with care available to local patients.

Implementation of the new service model will be closely monitored, reviewed and refined by the commissioner, in partnership with local clinicians and GPs, ensuring beds with care are providing enough capacity, alongside capacity to support people at home, will be a critical part of review.

Supplementary Question from Councillor S Barker

I have attended several of these consultation evenings and the key concern is about the arrangements which will be put in place during the transition period. There has also been no definite number provided about the beds which are actually required. How can we be considering closing our hospitals and care beds when we don't know how many we actually need? We need to have security.

Response from Councillor M Rudd

I will go back to the CCG for more information and provide this outside of the meeting.

The meeting was concluded at 8.00 pm

Chairman