

Minutes of the Council meeting held at Riverside, Canning Road, Lowestoft
on **Wednesday, 23 January 2019** at **6.30 pm.**

3a

Members present:

F Mortimer (Chairman), P Ashdown, E Back, M Barnard, D Beavan, M Bee, N Brooks, P Byatt, A Cackett, G Catchpole, J Ceresa, M Cherry, Y Cherry, L Coulam, J Craig, G Elliott, J Ford, T Gandy, T Goldson, L Gooch, I Graham, A Green, M Ladd, P Light, T Mortimer, J Murray, K Patience, M Pitchers, B Provan, C Punt, C Rivett, K Robinson, M Rudd, J Smith, L Smith, C Topping, M Vigo di Gallidoro and N Webb.

Officers present:

S Baker (Chief Executive), L Chandler (Energy Projects Manager), A Jarvis (Strategic Director), N Khan (Strategic Director), H Slater (Monitoring Officer and Head of Legal & Democratic Services) and N Wotton (Democratic Services Manager).

The Chairman welcomed all those present to the meeting. He then announced that he was sad to report that Councillor John Groom has passed away suddenly on 8 January 2018. He paid tribute to Councillor Groom and then all those present took part in a minutes' silence, as a mark of respect for Councillor Groom.

The Leader of the Council reported that Councillor Groom's passing was a sad and solemn occasion. He stated that he had known Councillor Groom since 2000 and that he had epitomised 'Mr Bungay' as he had worked tirelessly to represent his town at all levels and he supported his local community wherever possible. He had been the Chairman of the Planning Committee for many years and had latterly been alternating the role of Chairman and Vice Chairman with Councillor Ashdown. Councillor Groom was a rare breed and a truly inspirational Councillor, who was well liked and respected by officers, Members and the public. He would be greatly missed.

The Leader of the Labour Group stated that Councillor Groom was very supportive, knowledgeable and fair. He had been particularly helpful with newly elected Councillors and those newly appointed to the Planning Committee.

Councillor Elliott reported that this was a significant loss for the Council and Bungay in particular. Members had a huge amount of respect for Councillor Groom and he was known for being very fair to all. He was also very kind and generous and he had ensured that the Planning Committee meetings finished in sufficient time to allow Councillor Elliott to get the train home, alternatively he had given him a lift. He would be greatly missed by all.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S Ardley, K Grant, D Ritchie, K Springall, S Webb and S Woods.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor I Graham declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in the third Notice of Motion on the agenda for this evening, as he had been affected by the installation of insulation at

his home in the Harbour Ward. He would leave the meeting during the consideration of this matter and would take no part in the discussions or voting thereon.

Councillor A Green declared a Local Non Pecuniary Interest in Member Question D, which he had submitted, regarding CCTV in Lowestoft, as he was a Lowestoft Town Councillor.

3. MINUTES

RESOLVED

- (a) That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 19 September 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.
- (b) That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 November 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4. COMMUNICATIONS

Chairman's Ball

The Chairman reported that he would be holding a Ball on Saturday, 23 March 2019 at 7.00 pm at the Ivy House Country Hotel, to commemorate the end of Waveney District Council. All Members were welcome to attend and the invitations would be sent out to Members shortly.

Cancellation of 20 February 2019 Full Council Meeting

The Chairman advised that the Full Council meeting scheduled for Wednesday, 20 February 2019 had been cancelled due to a lack of business.

Two Urgent Items of Business for this Meeting

The Chairman advised those present that he had accepted 2 urgent items of business for the meeting this evening. The reasons for accepting these items of urgent business were then explained in more detail:

- Appointment of Chief Finance Officer and Section 151 Officer - The special circumstances for considering this item as a matter of urgency were that it would be more efficient and effective for the conduct of the Council's business, if the Deputy S151 Officer could move into the role of Chief Finance Officer, with immediate effect. In addition, there was only one more scheduled meeting of the Council, before its abolition on 1 April 2019. Therefore it was appropriate and timely that the item be considered on 23 January 2019, so that the permanent role can be filled as soon as possible.
- Declaration of a Vacancy - The special circumstances for considering this item as a matter of urgency were that Section 86(1)(c) of the Local Government Act 1972 provides that where a Councillor ceases to be a Member of the authority by reason of failure to attend meetings of the authority, the authority shall, except in any cases in which a declaration has been made by the High Court, "forthwith" declare the office

to be vacant. As this was a statutory duty of the Council, it was recommended that the Council declared the vacancy, forthwith.

Change in the Order of Business

The Chairman reported that he had decided to change the order of business to allow the presentation to be received earlier during the meeting and that the Member Questions would be moved towards the end of the agenda, prior to the consideration of the confidential minutes.

5. MEMBER BRIEFING ON SIZEWELL C AND OTHER ENERGY PROJECTS BY LISA CHANDLER, ENERGY PROJECTS MANAGER

The Chairman welcomed Lisa Chandler, Energy Projects Manager, to the meeting and she gave a presentation to Members about Sizewell C and other Renewable Energy Projects. Members were advised that the slides from the presentation would be circulated to Members outside of the meeting, for information.

Members were advised that the third and final round of the public consultation was currently underway and the Application for the Development Consent Order was expected to be submitted in January 2020. It was confirmed that East Suffolk District Council would be a statutory consultee, along with Suffolk County Council.

All Members were invited to attend a Councillor Briefing on Tuesday, 29 January 2019 at 6.30pm in the Deben Conference Room at East Suffolk House by EDF Energy and Officers. All Councillors were encouraged to attend, and it was noted that the briefing would include Computer Generated Imagery to give a virtual reality tour of the development.

Members noted that the development would bring economic benefits to the area, as well as significant employment opportunities and the potential to provide a long term boost for the local area. As a result, an Accommodation Strategy had been created in order to address the housing requirements for the workers and therefore during the construction phase of the development, there would be a temporary campus for 2400 workers adjacent to the construction site, a caravan pitch for up to 600 workers on land to the east of Leiston's built development, sporting facilities would also be developed in Leiston.

A Transport Strategy had also been created to help facilitate the development and a rail terminal would be created to assist in bringing materials and equipment to the site, various road improvements would be made, direct bus routes created from the major towns to Sizewell and there would be 2 park and ride schemes to help reduce the amount of traffic going to and from the site. It was noted that the development would create a huge amount of traffic and as a result, the A12 would need to be improved in some areas, to remove current pinch-points. It had therefore been proposed to build a 2 village bypass around Stratford St Andrew and Farnham, however work was underway to campaign for a 4 village bypass and Suffolk County Council Highways Team were involved in this work. Members noted that the S106 agreement would be developed alongside the planning application, in order to mitigate the difficulties caused to the local area, wherever possible.

Members were advised that a Stage 2 response had been submitted by Waveney District Council during this stage of the consultation process and it had welcomed the potential of

the development to deliver significant local economic benefits and employment opportunities in Suffolk, during the construction and operational stages. The proposal would bring the opportunity to benefit the supply chain and provide a wide range of employment opportunities and a variety of roles, including the creation of apprenticeships and higher skilled jobs.

Members were then updated on the latest developments regarding Scottish Power Renewables. It was noted that East Anglia One North was located approximately 36 km from Lowestoft and would be generating up to 800 megawatts of power in a wind farm area of 209 square km. The final public consultation was underway and the onshore infrastructure was proposed at Friston, west of Leiston to receive the energy being generated.

East Anglia Two would be located approximately 31 km from Lowestoft and would generate up to 900 megawatts of power in a windfarm area of 255 square km. The final public consultation was also underway and the onshore infrastructure was also proposed at Friston, west of Leiston. It was reported that East Anglia Two would be visible from Southwold, as the turbines would be 300m tall. It was noted that there would be engagement with local residents regarding this development, in due course.

In respect of National Grid Ventures, it was reported that two interconnectors were being developed, which would allow energy to be exchanged with other countries. The Nautilus would connect the UK with Belgium and Eurolink would connect the UK with the Netherlands. Both proposals would require onshore infrastructure, including substations. It was noted that connection to the National Grid had been offered in the Sizewell location. It was confirmed that further public consultation and engagement would take place around Sizewell, regarding the interconnectors, in due course.

A Member queried how Brexit would affect the interconnectors, which would connect the UK with Belgium and the Netherlands. It was confirmed that the interconnectors would not be affected, as the energy exchange would still be required, regardless. It was noted that the relevant Regulations which affected energy distribution would not be affected by Brexit.

A Member commented that both Toshiba and Hitachi had recently pulled out of developing nuclear power stations in other parts of the country and he queried whether Sizewell C would ever be built. It was reported that it was now even more likely that EDF Energy would build Sizewell C, as there was significant demand for energy in the UK.

In respect of offshore energy, a Member queried whether local people would be able to benefit from the resulting job opportunities. It was confirmed that the operation and maintenance for East Anglia One would be based in Lowestoft and the area would also benefit significantly from job creation over time. However it was conceded that there would be no employment created from the interconnectors. Similarly, there would be significant construction jobs created by Sizewell C, however there would also be operational and maintenance posts which would boost the local economy in the longer term.

A Member queried why there had been no consultation events held in Lowestoft. It was reported that consultation events had been held in Lowestoft previously, however recent events took place in Ipswich and Halesworth, this time. Events would take place in a

variety of places and at different times and venues in order to attract as many interested people as possible.

A Member reported that the Suffolk Energy Coast Delivery Board, which was chaired by Therese Coffey MP, met regularly about energy matters and involved EDF and the LGA. The Board was able to provide direct feedback to central government. It was noted that they were also strongly putting the case for the 4 villages bypass, rather than the 2 villages bypass, as it would be the best result for the area. They were also requesting the upgrade of the A12, as it was key to growth in the area and would need to cope with a significant increase in traffic. The East of England was currently responsible for producing 25% of the UK's energy, therefore significant investment was required to help ensure that this was sustainable. He felt that the future was looking brighter and more hopeful.

A Member queried whether there was any way to ensure that Scottish Renewables used only local companies for the construction phase, rather than outsourcing to other national companies. It was confirmed that the use of local workers would always be encouraged, as that would minimise the impact and disruption of the development. The Head of Economic Development & Regeneration was working on a strategy to help ensure that local people were able to fill jobs that were created. It was noted that a temporary campus would be created for the 5,600 workers who would be required on site at Sizewell during the peak of the construction phase. It was confirmed that there would be an Accommodation Office to help workers find local places to stay and to try to ensure that workers did not have to travel over 90 minutes to work each day. Work would also take place to try to bring empty properties back into use and would ensure that no vulnerable people were displaced by the demand for housing created by the development.

A Member raised concerns about merchant shipping in the area and queried whether there needed to be an exclusion zone to help protect the turbines. It was reported that the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) was responsible for ensuring that shipping lanes were kept unimpeded. The land off shore was also part of the Crown Estate, so they would benefit from any rental monies generated by the turbines being located offshore.

A Member took the opportunity to comment that the costs of nuclear energy were likely to rise and that the renewable energy costs were generally reducing. They felt that nuclear energy was a backward step and was not a low carbon option.

In respect of future job opportunities, a Member queried whether they would be advertised directly by EDF or whether the recruitment would be dealt with via a local recruitment agency. It was confirmed that employment would be categorised in Tiers 1, 2, 3 and 4. It was noted that the Economic Development Team were currently working with various external organisations, including the Chamber of Commerce, in order to ascertain the qualifications that applicants would need in order to apply for the jobs which would be created, in order that the local area would be 'nuclear ready'. They would also ensure that local businesses were well represented in the supply chain.

A Member raised concerns that over the next few years, it was anticipated that there would be an increase in house building nationally, which would generate lots of employment. Should there also be employment generated by the development of Sizewell C, there may not be sufficient skills workers available in the region. Would this result in a reduction in housebuilding or would more migrant workers be required? It was confirmed that there were several significant infrastructure projects planned for the near

future, including Cross Rail, HS2 and SPR, which could lead to a displacement of workers. As a result, there were many organisations involved in the development of a Sustainability Strategy in order to mitigate this risk. The need to train up people now with the necessary skills was noted and that it was a very positive, encouraging time for this area.

The Chairman thanked Lisa Chandler for her interesting and informative report and all Members were invited to contact Lisa directly, should they have any further questions on this matter.

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

Chief Executive

There were no announcements from the Chief Executive on this occasion.

Leader of the Council

The Leader reported that at the last meeting of the Full Council in November 2018, there had been a Notice of Motion regarding the sale of the old Lowestoft Hospital Site. He confirmed that he had written to the James Paget Hospital Trust, condemning the sale of the Old Lowestoft Hospital site. He had also been in contact with Peter Aldous MP and he would be seeking an inquiry into the sale and would also be requesting a scrutiny review of the sale and that any proceeds be ring-fenced for the people of Lowestoft and Oulton Broad.

He confirmed that a copy of the letter would be circulated to all Members for information, outside of the meeting.

7. NOTICES OF MOTION

The Chairman advised that three Notices of Motion had been received for this meeting and that each Notice of Motion would be considered individually.

(a) A Notice of Motion had been received from Councillor D Beavan:

"That this Council asks the County Council and the Police and Crime Commissioner to reduce their asking price for the old Southwold Police and Fire Stations so that we can build local homes rather than holiday homes on this last significant building plot in the town."

The Leader of the Council reported that following discussions with senior officers, he would like to recommend that the Council does not discuss this Notice of Motion this evening. Instead he would like to propose that he would write to the relevant Suffolk County Council Portfolio Holder and the Police & Crime Commissioner to request that they justify the asking price for the site and to seek information on the County Council's Policy on the building of local homes and the provision of holiday homes. He reported that Waveney District Council was not able to affect the choices made by the County Council or the Police & Crime Commissioner, however requesting the justifications behind their actions would be beneficial and this course of action could be taken further, if needed.

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, it was proposed and seconded "That the Motion not be discussed immediately and that the Leader of the Council would write to the Suffolk County Council Portfolio Holder and the Police & Crime Commissioner to request the justification of the asking price and to seek further information on the County Councils Policy on the building of local homes and the provision of holiday homes". On it being put to the Vote the Motion was **CARRIED** and the Motion was therefore not discussed any further.

Councillor Beavan reported that he was pleased that the Council was genuinely going to take some action in this respect, as there was significant anger within Southwold that one of the last sites which could be used for affordable homes would produce so few.

The Leader confirmed that he would write to the Suffolk County Council Portfolio Holder and the Police & Crime Commissioner tomorrow and he would share any response received with the rest of the Council.

At this point it was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED

That the Notice of Motion would not be considered this evening and that the Leader of the Council would write to the relevant Suffolk County Council Portfolio Holder and Police & Crime Commissioner to request the justification of the asking price and to seek further information on the County Councils Policy on the building of local homes and the provision of holiday homes"

(b) A Notice of Motion had been received from Councillor M Cherry:

"This Council calls on Suffolk County Council to put an immediate suspension to all plans to change the current Record Office Service at Lowestoft, and to hold Councillor Hicks to his offer of maintaining the Service in Lowestoft if suitable premises could be found, and appropriate funding obtained to sustain the Service for the foreseeable future. This Council, will take an active part in any such search for suitable premises and funding, in co-operation with Suffolk County Council, Lowestoft Town Council and any other concerned bodies, including the Save Our Records Office Campaign. In addition, Waveney District Council will commit to ensuring that this commitment is continued after the creation of the new East Suffolk Council".

The Leader of the Council advised that he would like to move that the Notice of Motion would not be discussed this evening. He felt that the Notice of Motion was too late, as the decision to close the Lowestoft Records Office had already been taken by the County Council. The matter had also been discussed at the Suffolk County Council Scrutiny Committee meeting, to which all Waveney District Councillors had been invited to attend. The Suffolk County Council Cabinet had agreed to proceed with the decision to close the records office and had made the commitment to provide a limited service in Lowestoft, whereby the public could still access records. It was commented that although this was not ideal, the decision had already been taken.

Councillor M Cherry reported that he was disappointed with this suggestion and that he had hoped to continue to raise the profile of this cause.

Councillor Elliott stated that the Scrutiny Committee meeting had only discussed the mechanisms by which the final decision was made, the meeting had not been able to scrutinise the decision itself, which was an important clarification. The Leader responded that the whole process had been thoroughly discussed and that the Council now needed to move forward and ensure that the commitment to provide a limited service in Lowestoft would be provided as promised.

Councillor Byatt reported that this was an important issue for the town and that there has been significant discussion at the recent Scrutiny meeting. He felt that the residents of Lowestoft needed to rebuild their trust with the County Council, as their trust had been sadly broken as a result of this whole issue. Local heritage was extremely important to many residents and it was perceived that the town was being adversely affected by various losses and closures, when compared to other parts of Suffolk.

The Leader responded that the Motion, as presented, was not appropriate for debate this evening. However, it was possible that the County Council, District Council and other partner organisations could work together in order to find another vibrant location for a new facility to be provided in Lowestoft, perhaps using a current vacant building.

Councillor Byatt responded that although the residents of Lowestoft had been promised a detailed scrutiny of the decision, the meeting did not cover all of the facts and it was felt that a further scrutiny review could be beneficial in order to answer many outstanding queries and concerns. However, any genuine offer of collaborative working, in order to retain a records office service in Lowestoft would be welcomed.

At this point it was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED

That the Notice of Motion would not be considered this evening and that the Council would work with other partners and organisations to look into the possibility of continuing to provide a records office service within Lowestoft, potentially bringing a vacant property back into use.

(c) A Notice of Motion had been received from Councillor J Craig:

N.B. Having previously declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in this item, Councillor I Graham left the meeting for this item and took no part in the discussions or voting thereon.

“This Council commits to help to obtain the funds to remove completely, or rectify, all sub-standard installations arising from the sub-standard work carried out as a part of the 2012 Harbour Ward Community Energy Saving Programme (endorsed by Waveney District Council) to the qualifying standard in accordance with BBA Certificate 07/4490. The Council will also liaise with Peter Aldous MP to enlist his full help. In addition, Waveney District Council will commit to ensuring that this support is continued after the creation of the new East Suffolk Council”.

The Leader of the Council reported that the Council was aware of the concerns that some residents have regarding the standard of work undertaken as part of the Community Energy Savings Programme. The Council had been asked to obtain funding to remove or rectify the works, however the Council has no legal or contractual liability to do so. The

Council did not procure the work and had no direct involvement other than to confirm that it had been consulted by the Community Energy Savings Programme. The Council would urge against removal of the cladding without the benefit of prior specialist assessment as this may create problems in itself. It should also be borne in mind that there were many properties where residents were happy with their installation and have experienced no problems.

He reported that Peter Aldous MP had been very involved in supporting a number of the affected residents and he had offered to draft a letter to Mitie on their behalf. In addition, the Council was aware that there were homeowners up and down the country who have experienced similar problems and Peter Aldous had offered to make contact with other relevant MPs in the hope that collective action may have more of an effect. Peter remained committed to supporting the residents, although his offer of support had not yet been taken up by the residents. Likewise, the Council had carried out its own investigation and officers have offered all appropriate help and would continue to provide reasonable support if the residents decided to take legal action against the contractors. This offer of support would continue following the inception of East Suffolk Council.

The Leader of the Council advised that he would like to move that the Notice of Motion would not be discussed this evening. He reported that it would not be appropriate for the Council to comment on the work undertaken by an external company and that the matter was subject to a legal case, however he could categorically state that the Council was not financially culpable for any of the works which had been completed. He acknowledged that there were a number of dissatisfied residents, which was understandable and he had met with some of the residents before Christmas, when he had been presented with a petition. Unfortunately, there had been too few signatories for the petition to be considered at Full Council, however a response would have been provided by a Head of Service to the lead petitioner. The Leader then suggested that the matter should be referred to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for further consideration, with a particular focus upon the Council's processes and procedures for endorsing external companies, who may use sub contractors, and the processes for monitoring standards of work.

Councillor Craig reported that she would be pleased for the matter to be referred to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for further consideration, however she was saddened that the matter was not likely to be debated this evening. The Scheme had been developed to help those residents suffering from fuel poverty and the work undertaken had caused additional costs and affected residents health and quality of life. She felt that Npower should be made to pay compensation for the works undertaken and reported that other Councils had been successful in lobbying OFGEM to this end. She queried whether the Council could contact OFGEM to see if they would look into the matter for the Harbour Ward residents who had been affected. The residents had held many meetings about this and had asked Peter Aldous for support and for him to contact Npower, however they had not received a response in this respect. She stated that another meeting was being held on Friday and a further petition would be presented to Parliament in due course.

The Leader reported that he would raise this matter with Peter Aldous directly. He was pleased that there was collective action being taken, as it made for a stronger case. He felt that referring the matter to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee would assist and raise the profile of the issue and that there were lessons to be learned for the future.

Councillor Byatt reported that there was no accusation that Waveney District Council was responsible for the work, however the people affected were living in dreadful conditions, with mould, plaster falling off and cracking walls, which was affecting their health. He welcomed any assistance in raising awareness of these issues.

Councillor Elliott stated that there should be further clarification that there was no admission of responsibility by the Council, however there would be an offer of help to try to solve the problem which had been ongoing for several years. The Leader responded that care needed to be taken due to the legal case which was underway, however a full scrutiny of the situation by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee would be beneficial and any lessons learned would be taken forward to the new East Suffolk Council.

At this point it was proposed, seconded and

RESOLVED

That the Notice of Motion would not be considered this evening and that the matter would be referred to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for further consideration, with a particular focus upon the Council's processes and procedures for endorsing external companies, who may use sub-contractors and the processes for monitoring the standards of work.

N.B. Councillor I Graham returned to the meeting at this point in the proceedings.

8. MEMBER QUESTIONS

The Member Questions had been moved towards the end of the Agenda, immediately prior to the Confidential item, as advised previously, by the Chairman.

9. PETITIONS

No petitions had been received.

10. QUESTIONS FROM THE ELECTORATE

No questions had been submitted by the electorate as provided by Council Procedure Rule 10.

11. AUTHORISATION OF OFFICER TO ATTEND MAGISTRATES AND COUNTY COURT

The Leader of the Council presented the report which sought approval for Aayeesha Muzondo to be authorised to represent Waveney District Council in the County Court, under Section 60 of the County Courts Act 1984, and at the Magistrates Court in accordance with Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1972. It was noted that Miss Muzondo had recently been appointed to the post of Trainee Solicitor within Legal Services. As part of her training contract, Miss Muzondo was required to gain experience and skills necessary for practice. It would be advantageous both for the department and the trainee if she was able, as part of her training, to undertake advocacy as appropriate. Reassurance was provided that contested cases, in which it was necessary to call witnesses, cross-examine or argue points of law, were dealt with by the Council's Solicitor.

RESOLVED

That Aayeesha Muzondo be authorised to represent Waveney District Council in the County Court, under Section 60 of the County Courts Act 1984, and at the Magistrates Court in accordance with Section 223 of the Local Government Act 1972.

12. URGENT ITEM OF BUSINESS – DECLARATION OF VACANCY

The Leader of the Council presented the report which advised Members that Mr T Reynolds had ceased to be a Councillor by virtue of his absence and to formally declare a vacancy in the Harbour Ward. The special circumstances for considering this item as a matter of urgency were that Section 86(1)(c) of the Local Government Act 1972 provides that where a Councillor ceases to be a Member of the authority by reason of failure to attend meetings of the authority, the authority shall, except in any cases in which a declaration has been made by the High Court, “forthwith” declare the office to be vacant. As this was a statutory duty of the Council, it was recommended that the Council declared the vacancy, forthwith.

Members were advised that Mr Reynolds had not attended a meeting of the Council since 18 July 2018. It was noted that under Section 85 of the Local Government Act 1972, should a Councillor fail throughout a period of six consecutive months from the date of his/her last attendance to any meeting of the authority, he/she shall, unless the failure was due to some reason approved by Council before the expiry of that period, cease to be a Member of the authority. Section 86 of the Local Government Act 1972 required an authority to declare a vacancy in such circumstances, forthwith.

Members were advised that under Section 89(3) of the Local Government Act 1972, where a casual vacancy occurs within six months before the day on which the councillor whose office is vacant would regularly have retired, an election shall not be held. In this case, Waveney District Council will cease to exist on 31 March 2019 and the Shadow East Suffolk Council will be in operation until the District Council elections take place for the new East Suffolk Council on 2 May 2019. Also, The East Suffolk (Local Government Changes) Order 2018 states, at paragraph 5, that we cannot hold an election to fill a casual vacancy where that vacancy arises after 30th September 2018 and before 1st April 2019. Therefore, it would not be possible to fill the casual vacancy, once declared, however this does have an impact on the political balance of the Council, as referenced in Report REP1946, which in turn forms part of the agenda for this meeting.

Following a query from a Member, clarification was provided in relation to paragraph 3.1 of the report. It was confirmed that the High Court would only be involved in making a declaration of a vacancy, in certain legal circumstances. Confirmation was also provided that a leave of absence could be granted if a report was taken to Full Council, prior to the 6 months non attendance being reached and when the agreement of Full Council was given. It was noted that a leave of absence had been granted in the past due to ill health or for family reasons, however no such request was received from Mr Reynolds or on his behalf.

A Member commented that Mr Reynolds had not confided in any of his fellow Group Members regarding his difficult personal circumstances, as help would have been provided by his Group and also the Democratic Services Team.

RESOLVED

1. That the Council notes that Tom Reynolds has ceased to be a Member of this authority.
2. That the Council declares as vacant the office held by Tom Reynolds, as a Councillor for the Harbour Ward.
3. That the Council notes that no by-election will be held to fill the vacancy.

13. POLITICAL PROPORTIONALITY OF THE COUNCIL AND APPOINTMENTS TO COMMITTEES, WORKING GROUPS AND OUTSIDE BODIES

The Leader of the Council presented the report which presented the revised overall political balance of Waveney District Council and considered the appointments to the Council's Committees, Working Groups and Outside Bodies following recent developments. It was noted that:

- Councillor Topping had resigned from the Conservative Group and joined the Green Party on 14 November 2018.
- Councillor Light had resigned from the Conservative Group and become an Unaffiliated Independent on 26 December 2018.
- Conservative Councillor J Groom had passed away unexpectedly on 8 January 2019.
- Councillor T Reynolds had ceased to be a Councillor due to non attendance from 19 January 2019.
- Councillor J Ford had resigned from the Labour Group and joined the Conservative Party on 21 January 2019.

The Leader of the Council took the opportunity to welcome Councillor Ford to the Conservative Party and reiterated that no by-elections would be held for the two vacancies. He also reported that Councillor Rivett, Cabinet Member for Customer Services would become the Deputy Leader of the Council, with immediate effect. It was noted that he would receive a Special Responsibility Allowance for undertaking this role, which would take effect from 24 January 2019.

It was noted that all Councillors had been in receipt of a tabled document containing updated information on the Council's Committee Membership and a copy had also been published on the Council's website.

Following the recent changes, it was noted that the Overview & Scrutiny needed to gain 2 Conservative Members, following Councillors Light and Topping changing their political groups. It was therefore proposed that Councillors Ceresa and Ford would join the Committee. The Labour Group needed to lose one seat and it was confirmed that Councillor J Smith would lose his seat on the Committee. Councillor Topping would remain on the Committee as a Green Party Member.

With regard to the Planning Committee it was noted that Conservative Councillor Ceresa would lose her seat on the Committee, whilst Councillor Ford would gain her seat. Councillor J Smith would join the Planning Committee as a Member of the Labour Group. Councillor Light would join the Committee as the Unaffiliated Independent Member.

During discussions on this matter, nominations were sought for the position of Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee and it was duly proposed and seconded that Councillor N Brooks be appointed for the Conservative Party. It was then proposed and seconded by the Opposition Groups that Councillor Elliott be appointed. Upon putting the matter to the vote it was

RESOLVED

That Councillor N Brooks be appointed Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee for the remainder of the 2018/19 municipal year.

The Leader of the Labour Group made a Point of Order at this moment during the proceedings and requested further information about the numbers who voted. It was confirmed that 21 Councillors voted in favour of Councillor N Brooks and 16 Councillor voted against, whilst 16 voted in favour of Councillor G Elliott and 21 Councillors voted against.

In respect of the Licensing Committee, the Conservative Party appointed Linda Coulam to the Committee. Labour Group Councillor J Murray lost her seat and Councillor S Ardley was appointed to the Committee for the Independent Group.

In respect of the Membership of the Local Plan Working Group, it was confirmed that Councillor J Ford would join as a Conservative Member, whilst Councillor P Byatt would join as a Labour Group Member, until the end of the 2018/29 municipal year.

RESOLVED

1. That the recent changes to the Council's Political Balance be noted.
2. That the proposed changes to the Membership of the Committees, as discussed at the meeting and attached as Appendix A to the minutes be approved for the remainder of the 2018/19 municipal year.
3. That the vacancy for the position of Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee be filled by Councillor N Brooks for the remainder of the 2018/19 municipal year.
4. That the Labour Group Vacancy on the Local Plan Working Group be filled by Councillor P Byatt for the remainder of the 2018/19 municipal year.
5. That the Conservative Group Vacancy on the Local Plan Working Group be filled by Councillor J Ford for the remainder of the 2018/19 municipal year.
6. That any Councillors who gain a place on the Regulatory Committees (Planning or Licensing Committee) must attend the mandatory training, prior to attending one of their meetings.

14. URGENT ITEM OF BUSINESS – APPOINTMENT OF SECTION 151 OFFICER

The Leader of the Council presented the report which sought to appoint Mr Simon Taylor as the Chief Finance officer and Section 151 Officer, following a recent joint recruitment

process. The special circumstances for considering this item as a matter of urgency were that it would be more efficient and effective for the conduct of the Council's business, if the Deputy S151 Officer could move into the role of Chief Finance Officer, with immediate effect. In addition, there was only one more scheduled meeting of the Council, before its abolition on 1 April 2019. Therefore it was appropriate and timely that the item be considered on 23 January 2019, so that the permanent role can be filled as soon as possible.

It was noted that following Mrs Javadi's departure to Eastbourne Borough Council and Lewes District Council, the Finance Manager and Deputy S151 Officer, Mr Taylor, had been acting as the Interim Chief Finance Officer, pending a permanent appointment to the role of Chief Finance Officer.

It was noted that Suffolk Coastal District Council would be considering a report at their Full Council meeting on 24 January 2019 and it was stated that Mr Taylor would take up his permanent position with both Councils on 24 January 2019.

Those present congratulated Mr Taylor on his appointment, which was very well deserved and they wished him every success for the future.

A Member reported that they had been a Member of the Joint Appointments Committee and that Mr Taylor had been an excellent candidate, who had received cross party support from both Councils. He then queried whether there was sufficient capacity within the Finance Team, following Mr Taylor's promotion. It was confirmed that the Deputy Chief Finance Officer, Mrs Rogers, was very supportive and experienced. It was noted that Mr Taylor planned to undertake a full restructure of the Finance Team in the near future, to make sure that there were sufficient staff and experience within the team to meet all of the challenges which would be faced by the new East Suffolk Council.

RESOLVED

That Mr Simon Taylor be appointed as the officer responsible for the administration of the Council's finances under S151 of the Local Government Act 1972, with effect from 24 January 2019.

15. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

The following questions had been submitted by Members in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11:

(a) Question from Councillor P Light to the Cabinet Member for Operational Partnerships

Waveney has had a proud reputation for the excellent recycling of domestic waste. Is it possible to hear of the percentage of domestic waste that was recycled in the months of September, October, and November during 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2018-19?

Response from Councillor G Catchpole

WDC recycling percentage for Sept-Nov during years 2015 to 2019 has remained good in terms of national benchmarking (within the top 50%) however there has been an annual year on year decline since 2015, which is in line with national trends.

One of the contributory factors in the dramatic decline for 2015/16 to 2016/17 was the change to garden waste collection service in March 2016. Around 50% of households decided not to subscribe to the chargeable service, consequently significantly less tonnage collected. It should be noted that an estimated 2,000 tons of garden waste was removed from the system, due to our promotion of home composting when the Garden Waste system was launched. Some 8,000 bins were distributed at a subsidised cost.

The national recycling trend is down, with dry recycling volumes down by 2.1% from 2016 to 2017. This is due to adverse publicity relating to recycling eg plastics ending up in oceans, a volatile recycling commodity market, and lack of awareness at the national level over what can and cannot be recycled. This has possibly resulted in more recyclable material being placed in refuse destined for Energy from Waste.

The government has recently launched a new strategy for waste and recycling – called ‘Our Waste, Our resources’ which aims to deal with emerging challenges. These include changes to the way in which plastic waste is recycled by processors in Asian markets, where government policy (in China, for example) has resulted in more stringent quality standards being set for waste received from countries such as the UK. This presents a challenge for UK local authorities and their partners to increase the quality of recycled material – for example, reducing contamination. And this may require a change in collection approach in coming years.

Officers will be providing members with a detailed briefing on the new strategy and its implications for East Suffolk in the coming months. There will be significant, wide ranging changes to the way household waste is managed in future.

Supplementary Question from Councillor P Light

Why can we not aim to be in the top 10 list of Councils for recycling? A few years ago, around 2010, there was some discussion about the Council recycling glass, making it into pellets and then selling it on as a commodity for profit. Is there any way that the Council could look into this?

Response from Councillor G Catchpole

We have been waiting for the guidance to arrive from Central Government, as that will cover how we will need to deal with everything in the future and which includes glass. However we already have bottle banks across the district, which are well used, and I would not anticipate that the Council would look into recycling waste material itself. As soon as the Government Guidance has been received, officers will update Members about what the changes will mean to the Council going forwards.

(b) Question from Councillor P Light to the Leader of the Council

Since the closure of Lowestoft Town Hall in May 2015, what is the full extent of the expenditure, costs and loss of income incurred by Waveney District Council?

Response from Councillor M Bee

Since the closure of the Lowestoft Town Hall in May 2015, this Council has incurred £63.3k in costs, which are broken down as follows:

- Business Rates - £15k;
- Utilities (Gas, Electricity, Sewerage and Telecoms) - £20k;
- Pest Control and Bat Survey - £3.3k;
- Securing the Town Hall site to meeting the insurance company’s requirements for an empty site - £25k, which involved:
 - Remove all combustible contents/waste (internal & external);
 - Seal letter boxes;
 - Isolate all services (other than for fire & security);
 - Drain the water system (or maintain heating at min 5C);
 - Secure the premises – all locking devices/alarms;
 - Retain any intruder alarm system;
 - Conduct a thorough inspection of the building every 7 days;
 - Repair damage or deal with issues immediately;
 - Boarding to all vulnerable doors, windows and skylights; and
 - Create single point of access.

Supplementary Question from Councillor P Light

There was no Supplementary Question on this occasion.

(c) Question from Councillor J Murray to the Cabinet Member for Operational Partnerships

Could the Cabinet Member for Operational Partnerships inform the Chamber of the Council Procedures for dealing with, and treating, land contaminated by Japanese Knotweed, and whether these procedures are fully compliant with the National Code of Practice in protecting land and property values (in the current absence of statutory requirements) by the two industry trade bodies (PCA & INNSA).

Response from Councillor G Catchpole

The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 gave local authorities the power to intervene where acts or omissions by people are detrimental to the quality of life of others in the community and persistent. Control is achieved by means of something called a “Community Protection Notice” (CPN).

The procedure involved in serving a CPN involves Gathering evidence of the detrimental behaviour, issuing a “Community Protection Warning Letter” pointing out the effects of the behaviour and what needs to be done about it, followed (after a reasonable period) by a CPN. Anybody who fails to comply with the terms of a CPN commits a criminal offence subject to a maximum penalty of £2,500.

Breaches of CPNs may be dealt with by issuing a fixed penalty notice (£80) in lieu of prosecution. In the past 12 months we have taken steps down this route in respect two areas of land in North Lowestoft affected by Japanese knotweed. In both cases the landowner responded positively and dealt with the problem without further enforcement action becoming necessary.

If residents believe knotweed is a problem for them, they should report the details to us through the usual means where upon we will investigate and take follow-up action as necessary.

It is however, important to realise that the simple existence of knotweed on land is not sufficient grounds for us to act. We need to have evidence that it is causing detriment in some way i.e. by encroaching on somebody else's land or damaging their property. We also need to be able to show that the problem is persistent. Our contractors currently treat any incidences of Knotweed (where we are aware of it) on council land in accordance with current legislation.

Supplementary Question from Councillor J Murray

Specialist guidance states that you should not trim or mow Knotweed, as it will cause it to spread, as it is highly regenerative. On Waveney District Council land, the knotweed was sprayed once before it was trimmed and then the cuttings were just left on the ground. The neighbours saw it and helped to clear it all up. The specialist guidance states that you should spray the knotweed annually for 3 years, prior to trimming or cutting it. Can our local guidelines be amended to reflect this, so that we can be sure that good practice is followed in terms of Knotweed in future?

Response from Councillor G Catchpole

The knotweed was not cut by any of the operatives from Waveney Norse, it was cut by well meaning local residents. I do not think it would be helpful to mention the area here, I think it would be better if we were to discuss this further outside of this meeting.

(d) Question from Councillor A Green to the Leader of the Council

At the Full Council meeting on 16 November 2016, various questions were asked in regard to assets being transferred to the then proposed Lowestoft Town Council.

In particular, a response was made about the provision of CCTV and I quote: 'With regard to CCTV within Lowestoft, clarification was provided that this was funded by local businesses, in conjunction with Lowestoft Vision and was an important community safety asset.'

Would the Leader of the Council either amend or clarify this, as I would suggest it is at best a totally misleading statement, particularly to members of the public, as the CCTV provision is funded within the precept budget by the residents of Lowestoft, and whilst I welcome the funding stream mentioned in that November meeting, it contributes to less than 2% of the total cost.

Response from Councillor M Bee

Prior to the establishment of Lowestoft Town Council (LTC), CCTV costs to Waveney District Council were in the region of £292,000.

During the planning and budgeting phase for Lowestoft Town Council, this amount was built into LTC's budget and precept to fund the operation of the service going forward.

Around £3,500 was provided by local businesses and Lowestoft Vision.

It is not recorded in the minutes where the response came from in 2016, however the financial position is as set out above. CCTV is funded in large part through the precept of Lowestoft Town Council, with a small contribution to operational costs made by local businesses.

Supplementary Question from Councillor A Green

The Minutes clearly state that CCTV funding is provided by Lowestoft Vision and Local Businesses, which is very misleading.

Response from Councillor M Bee

If the Minutes were incorrect, they should have been challenged and corrected at the next meeting of the Full Council. As they were not, the Minutes currently stand as they are. £292,000 of funding was built into the budget for Lowestoft Town Council, with an additional £3,500 being provided from Lowestoft Vision and local businesses. This gives a total of £295,500. However we will investigate this matter further outside of the meeting.

(e) Question from Councillor L Gooch to the Cabinet Member for Community Health & Safety

As reported by the BBC in January 2019, children in the UK exceed the maximum recommended sugar intake for an 18 year old by the time they are 10, according to experts. This is based on their total sugar consumption from the age of two, says Public Health England (PHE). One month earlier, it was reported that children in the UK had 45,000 hospital operations on teeth in 2018.

In an effort to address this health crisis, Southwark Council has been promoting its campaign of 'Fizz Free February' to help other councils support their wider communities to safeguard their children's health. How will Waveney District Council engage with this campaign?

Response from Councillor M Rudd

Public Health at Suffolk County Council has just launched a new sugar reduction fund in conjunction with Suffolk Community Foundation.

Grants of up to £1,000 are available to support the work of voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations that are delivering work to support those who live and work in Suffolk. This particular fund is specifically open to PTAs or Friends of Schools/PRUs, or any community group such as Brownies, Scouts and youth projects, which can encourage a reduction in sugar intake and a healthier lifestyle. Priority will be given to those working in areas of high deprivation.

The fund is looking to support projects:-

- That address the Suffolk Sugar Reduction Plan, especially the last two points
- That are child or young person led
- That can show sustainability
- Where the young people are aged between the ages of 5 – 18

- That use alternative methods to promote their work

Onelife Suffolk are available to run assemblies and/or short workshops to help identify the ways of reducing sugar intake and to help kick start projects and Public Health are also running a social marketing campaign encouraging sugar swaps (similar to Changs4Life) with a Sudbury academy which Waveney and Suffolk Coastal schools can sign up to. This will be promoted in our newsletter and through social media.

Suffolk Sugar Reduction Plan

Improve knowledge and understanding of the impact of sugar on health through effective health promotion

- Deliver a social marketing campaign that asks children and young people to commit to giving up sugary drinks for 21 days in an attempt to break the habit.
- Promote Change4Life Sugar Swaps encouraging more children and their families to make four simple Sugar Swaps to tackle different ‘sugar occasions’ in the day: e.g. The Breakfast Swap: e.g. sugary cereal for plain cereal; The Drink Swap: e.g. from sugary drinks to sugar-free or no-added-sugar drinks; The After-School Swap: e.g. from muffins to fruited teacake and The Pudding Swap: e.g. from ice cream to low-fat lower-sugar yoghurt
- Support local organisations across Suffolk to become “Sugar Smart” and develop their own campaigns and initiatives to reduce sugar consumption.

Increase access to healthier options enabling a lower or reduced sugar option to be made

- Work with school meal providers to reduce the sugar content of their menus and to increase the uptake of school meals, particularly for those entitled to Free School Meals.
- Encourage organisations who provide food to children, young people and their families to provide healthier and lower sugar options e.g. school breakfast/after school clubs; PTA events.
- Increase uptake of the Eat Out Eat Well healthier food award in cafes, restaurants and other family friendly food business that promote healthier food preparation practices, including reducing sugar in food and providing healthier options for children.
- Implement a Take Out Eat Well award that rewards takeaway food businesses for reducing sugar, fat and salt content and promotes healthier choices to customers, particularly focussing on takeaways located near to schools or family-based attractions.
- Increase access to drinking water and where vending machines are in use access to healthier and lower sugar food and drink options are available.

Embed prevention messages at scale

- Increase brief intervention advice training (e.g. Making Every Contact Count) for all those working with children, young people and their families.
- Ensure healthy lifestyles advice is embedded within the educational settings to deliver key health and wellbeing prevention messages.
- Improve children’s oral health education and support health professionals to provide preventative advice.
- Work with early years services to promote healthier food and drink choices, from the point where solid foods are introduced.
- Engage with children and young people to develop their own sugar reduction campaigns and initiatives.

Supplementary Question from Councillor L Gooch

I am really pleased to see that there is such a fabulous range of projects to help improve our children's health. There are lots of free materials available to support Fizz Free February and I would recommend everyone to access them. Can I request further information on the number of dental extractions involving children for the last 4 years, in order that we can see if the figures are going up or not?

Response from Councillor M Rudd

I will see what information I can find and will circulate it outside of the meeting.

(f) Question from Councillor J Smith to the Cabinet Member for Community Health & Safety

According to the End Child Poverty coalition of charities study carried out earlier last year, nearly 30% of children within Waveney are living below the bread line. Do we expect this already negative trend to be further exacerbated by the cuts to Citizens Advice Bureau funding?

Response from Councillor M Rudd

Suffolk County Council currently provides £59,239 per annum to North East Suffolk Citizens Advice (NESCA), which covers the whole of Waveney District, and the District Council provides £78,000. NESCA has been successful in securing external funding for projects such as 'Solutions' social prescribing but the proposed reduction of more than a third in their core budget will undoubtedly have a big impact, particularly given the demographics of the local population.

Suffolk statistics show that the top five issues that Citizen Advice deal with are Benefits, Debt, Employment, Housing and Relationships - key issues in terms of quality of life for families and individuals. 38% of Citizens Advice clients are disabled or have long term health conditions and Citizens Advice emphasise their role in preventing homelessness and evictions, reducing demand on health services and enabling people to maintain and secure employment.

In Suffolk in 2017/18 Suffolk Citizens Advice secured £2.935 million in income gains and £3,657 million in debts written off. The top three debt issues are Council Tax, Debt Relief Orders and Credit, Store and Charge card debts).

In their initial response to the County Council, Citizens Advice collectively made a strong case that the proposed cut will impact on the Council's ability to meet its statutory obligations and force people back to services, such as adult social care and children's services, that are already facing significant demand pressures or, worse yet, to unscrupulous money lenders or organisations who will take a percentage of any funding secured.

Supplementary Question from Councillor J Smith

Thank you. I assume that the Citizens Advice will need to increase its resilience for the future, given that many of the queries it will be dealing with will get more complex. How can the Council be sure that there is always help available to people who need it? There has been an increase in the number of troubled families so what is the best way to tackle all this?

Response from Councillor M Rudd

We will need to see what help we can provide to the Citizens Advice. Social Prescribing will also help the situation, assisting those people with multiple needs. I will try to provide more detail outside of the meeting.

(g) Question from Councillor J Murray to the Cabinet Member for Operational Partnerships

Can the Council confirm that residents' annual parking permits are available for statutory health and care providers for an annual fee of £8.00?

Response from Councillor G Catchpole

Yes, these annual passes are still available for Health and Social Care staff through a scheme supported by Suffolk County Council

In addition, we have historically worked with a Lowestoft Town Centre NHS organisation to provide additional parking as part of this arrangement, and we are in discussions with that organisation about town centre parking arrangements.

Supplementary Question from Councillor J Murray

I am in contact with several health care workers, including health visitors, who end up spending quite a lot of money to park in our car parks around the district. Is there any way that we could help them with these additional costs, which are ultimately a financial burden for poorly paid workers?

Response from Councillor G Catchpole

We need to be fair to all people and there have been ongoing discussions about this matter for a long time. However, the new East Suffolk Council is about to be created, so now is not a good time to be looking to make significant changes. We know that we need to try and help all people who work, so in future we will try to look at different types of parking permits, which may assist workers, as you suggest.

(h) Question from Councillor J Smith to the Cabinet Member for Resources

How many residents have been referred to external enforcement agencies for non payment of all outstanding debts in the last three years?

Response

The number of Waveney residents / ratepayers sent to external enforcement agents in the last three years are as follows:-

	2016/17	2017/18	2018/19
Council Tax (including LCTRS)	306	775	1,433
NNDR	0	7	22
Housing Benefit Overpayments	0	0	0
Sundry Debts	0	0	0

Please note that if we sent two liability orders in one year, this has been counted as one as the request was for number of residents referred to external agencies.

These figures do not include Waveney residents / ratepayers that have been referred to Anglia Revenues Partnership Enforcement (ARPE) as this is judged to be an internal enforcement agency.

Supplementary Question from Councillor J Smith

Would the Council consider adopting the Council Tax Protocol created by the Citizens Advice Bureau, to try to reduce the number of people being referred to external enforcement agencies?

Response from Councillor B Provan

We would need to approach the Anglia Revenues Partnership to see what they say about it, as they operate this function on behalf of several Councils.

(i) Question from Councillor C Topping to the Cabinet Member for Operational Partnerships

Following the high tides and windy weather on 8 January 2019, and due to the tide being locked, the EA issued Flood warnings from 11am on 8th January 2019 – 11am on 9 January 2019. This included all low lying land along the Tidal Waveney and our stretch of coast. The advice from the EA is category 'Flood warning – Act.'

According to the press on the morning of 9th January 2019 'A WDC spokesman said: "Although our Operations Team were aware of the Environment Agency tidal forecasts, it was not anticipated that the water would reach some of the huts. A crane operator is now on site and once the waters recede, the huts will be returned to the promenade and an assessment will be made, with subsequent repairs made to any damage."

'Secretary of the South Lowestoft Beach Hut Association, was shocked they were even placed in such a location. He said: "It is surprising given the local knowledge that most people here have that they put them there this early in the season. "It's easy to say but it should have been foreseen. We know the high tide comes at this time of year. You know if you put them on there it's a risk."

There must have been a safer place to temporarily put the beach huts, so why were they put onto the beach at this time of year where they would be at such a high risk of damage?

Response from Councillor G Catchpole

The Asset Team and the operator of the Council's beach huts met on site to discuss the re-siting of a number of beach huts. The beach huts needed to be moved in order that the demolition contractor could start on site at Jubilee Terrace.

Sites on the promenade were considered – however there were no sites that would not have an impact on access for emergency vehicles. A decision was taken to site the huts on the beach as a temporary measure.

On the week of 7th January, the Operations Team didn't consider it necessary to move the huts because – despite the concerns of a very high tide that may have reached that section of the beach, the very high surge that was forecast over the weekend did not materialise. A decision was taken not to move the huts.

We responded promptly as soon as the problem was identified, and all beach huts were removed from the beach that afternoon and evening, and placed in alternative storage. Initial surveys suggest minimal damage and this will be made good before the season begins. All hut owners were written to prior to the move onto the beach, asking that they remove all items from their huts.

Supplementary Question from Councillor C Topping

What has this event cost the Council in terms of money and credibility? It was on the local news, all over Facebook and was mentioned on Radio Norfolk?

Response from Councillor G Catchpole

I do not know the costs involved in hiring the crane, however I can find out and circulate the information outside of the meeting.

A Member raised a point of clarification, as he felt that the costs should include the lost income from the carpark that the beach huts were placed on. The Cabinet Member for Operational Partnerships confirmed that he would find out and let Members know, however the carpark in question was underutilised at this time of year, therefore it was anticipated that the loss of revenue would be negligible.

16. EXEMPT/CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

RESOLVED

That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 1 and 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

17. CONFIDENTIAL MINUTES FROM THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 14 NOVEMBER 2018

RESOLVED

That the Confidential Minutes of the Meeting held on 14 November 2018 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The meeting concluded at 9.00 pm.

Chairman