

BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK**COUNCIL****Minutes from the Meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 17th November, 2016 at 6.30 pm in the Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn****PRESENT:** Councillor D Whitby (Chairman)

Councillors B Anota, B Ayres, Miss L Bambridge, P Beal, A Beales, R Bird, R Blunt, Mrs C Bower, A Bubb, Mrs J Collingham, J Collop, Mrs S Collop, C J Crofts, N Daubney, I Devereux, Mrs S Fraser, P Gidney, R Groom, G Hipperson, P Hodson, M Hopkins, M Chenery of Horsbrugh, Lord Howard, M Howland, H Humphrey, C Joyce, P Kunes, A Lawrence, B Long, C Manning, G McGuinness, Mrs K Mellish, G Middleton, J Moriarty, A Morrison, Mrs E Nockolds, T Parish, M Peake, D Pope, P Rochford, C Sampson, Miss S Sandell, M Shorting, T Smith, Mrs V Spikings, Mrs S Squire, M Storey, A Tyler, D Tyler, G Wareham, Mrs E Watson, Mrs J Westrop, A White, Mrs M Wilkinson, T Wing-Pentelow, Mrs A Wright and Mrs S Young

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs S Buck, I Gourlay and Councillor Tim Tilbrook

C:47 PRAYERS

Prayers were said by Father Ling.

C:48 MINUTES

RESOLVED: The Minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 29 September 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

C:49 COUNCILLOR TERRY PARISH - HEACHAM WARD

The Mayor welcomed Councillor Terry Parish recently elected to the Heacham Ward to his first meeting of the Council.

C:50 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

There were no interests to declare.

C:51 EAST ANGLIAN DEVOLUTION - NORFOLK AND SUFFOLK

Councillor Long introduced the report on Norfolk and Suffolk Devolution which was being considered by all the Norfolk and Suffolk Authorities who had opted in June to continue to the consultation stage of the Devolution proposal. He drew attention to the information which had been received, the consultations undertaken and to the insistence of Government that the Combined Authority would have to have an elected Mayor. He acknowledged that for some it was too high a price to pay and that it was not an easy decision to have to take, but no-one could know what the future would bring or if there would be any further offer for Norfolk at a later date if this Deal was

rejected. He reminded Council that his Group would have a free vote on this issue.

In order that the debate could take place he proposed the following recommendations, and at the same time asked for a recorded vote on the decision. This was supported by the required number of Members.

- 1 That, on the basis of the earlier Governance Review (*Appendix B to the 30th June Council papers*), Equalities Impact Assessment (EqIA) and the results of the consultation, the Authority continues to conclude that the establishment of a Mayoral Combined Authority for Norfolk and Suffolk is the option which most fully permits the effective discharge of the functions that Government is prepared to devolve to this area.
- 2 That the Council authorises the Chief Executive to consent to the Council being included in an Order that will be laid before Parliament by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to create the Norfolk and Suffolk Combined Authority, such Order to:
 - a) establish a Norfolk and Suffolk Combined Authority and specify the high level constitutional arrangements;
 - b) confer functions on the Norfolk and Suffolk Combined Authority; and
 - c) specify those functions exercisable by the Mayor.
- 3 In the event that any minor drafting changes are required to reflect legislative requirements and the contents of the Deal Agreement, authority is delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader and agreement with the other Chief Executives/Managing Directors of the Constituent Councils across Norfolk and Suffolk to make the necessary changes to the Order.
- 4 That further reports are presented to the Authority, as appropriate, as the Devolution process progresses.

Councillor Bird spoke against the recommendations stating that the incentives were not good enough value and the timeframes were unrealistic. He stated that neither he nor his constituents supported the issue of an Elected Mayor, which he considered would end up being a Suffolk representative with a layer of bureaucracy which would be additional cost to the tax payer. He drew attention to the potential benefit of the Ely North Junction but did not consider that a Suffolk Mayor would see it as priority.

Councillor J Collop concurred with the comments made and confirmed that his Group also had a free vote on the issue. He commented that it was an important decision for the area, but had not been happy about the proposals to date, particularly the Elected Mayor, and the associated costs.

Councillor Sampson drew attention to the potential housing pot available with the deal which meant he was not able to vote against the deal. He also spoke in support of the works to the Ely North Junction and reminded Members that Suffolk also needed improvements to it. He acknowledged he did not support the elected Mayor but considered that the good points outweighed the bad.

Councillor Devereux spoke in support of the proposal drawing attention to the commitment to improve housing and infrastructure etc which the Government had failed to do, but with the finance available locally he considered it could be delivered. He drew attention to the support from businesses, and commented that change was inevitable but the Council could position itself well for the future.

Councillor Mrs Wilkinson spoke against the proposal, she considered that the housing would be built around Norwich rather than King's Lynn, she drew attention to the use of existing senior staff and asked if there was capacity for this, and the potential revision clause after 5 years.

Councillor McGuinness expressed concern about rushing into a devolved authority, and the level of response to the consultation. He considered that when the money from the Government dried up it would be the new Authority which would bear the blame instead of the Government.

Councillor Lord Howard urged Members to retain the integrity of the Borough as he considered the Borough would lose its powers and the Combined Authority would gain powers such as being able to raise Business Rates and decide on CIL usage. He questioned whether any priorities would be centred on King's Lynn and stated that he felt the additional money was not there.

Councillor Wareham in speaking against the proposal commented that he felt the Authority had been there before with the unitary proposals which had been fought against.

Councillor A Tyler drew attention to the fact that experienced politicians were against the proposals which he felt suggested smoke and mirrors.

Councillor Morrison spoke against the additional bureaucracy and costs, he considered it was handing over powers to the Mayor and was not in the interests of the Borough as the Mayor would have Suffolk's interests at heart. He considered that it was his duty to listen to his voters, to take a longer term view and ensure the small print was read and overall he considered that the disadvantages outweighed the advantages.

Councillor Joyce expressed concern about the ability to veto executive powers, and the Mayor's ability to borrow. If it was approved, he considered that all areas of Norfolk should have a vote in Mayoral

elections. In relation to the housing requirement he considered that if housing associations could borrow long term they would be able to build without Government money.

Councillor Mrs Wright expressed concern about an elected Mayor presiding over such a large area, and the fact the area was not like a city. She considered that King's Lynn would not be in the forefront of the Mayor's mind.

Councillor Lawrence commented that there were strong voices for and against the proposal, and the housing associations were not concerned about the consequences of the additional money. He had taken the soundings of his constituents who had told him they were not in favour, and he was voting against the proposal.

Councillor Smith spoke against the proposal which he considered was not democratic and there was no electoral mandate for it. He felt Norfolk did not need to be attached to Suffolk and was confident there would be a better deal for Norfolk if willing to fight for it. He stated his view that young people would leave the area if it was agreed because it wouldn't give growth for this area.

Councillor Daubney referred to the strong arguments on both sides but stated that he would vote in favour of it. He commented that if there was a unitary Council for Norfolk it would be disastrous for West Norfolk and drew attention to the fact that the old Development Agencies that distributed funding for the area gave West Norfolk the least funding, whereas the LEP s had awarded funding for the area. He spoke of his wish for the area to have better infrastructure, skills and salaries, which could be achieved by encouraging companies to move to the area. He re asserted that the area wanted the money, but not from Whitehall who may or may not award it in this part of the country, but from a body where the Council had a place in influencing where it was spent and acknowledged that the Deal could be bigger, but the Council needed to be part of it to be able to access it.

Councillor Squires in speaking for the proposal encouraged Members to take the opportunity in order to encourage jobs to the area which had high deprivation and low youth ambition, and so provide careers for young people, her parishes had indicated that they wanted better infrastructure and homes and an improved rail service.

Councillor Beales drew attention to some of the concerns about an elected Mayor, and reminded Members that the person would be elected locally who would have to help this Borough as it would the others, the elected Leaders of the Councils would also have votes in the Combined Authority and the Parliamentary Order was designed for the funding to be fair across the County. He acknowledged that the funding was not new money, but was that which would otherwise be spent by Government Departments anywhere across the country, not

just within the two counties. Members were reminded that the new Authority would have access to all publically owned land with the involvement of the Borough's Leader. Councillor Beales reminded Members that the Secretary of State had indicated that if the Deal fell then the money would go to other areas which were committed to Devolution, and drew attention to the comments made by other Norfolk Councils that if the Deal fell they would make a Unitary Council bid.

Councillor Hipperson asked that if the money was there why weren't the Government giving it to the Councils anyway.

Councillor Gidney asked why some of the money slipped from HS2 could not be moved for the Ely Junction. Whilst still weighing up his decision he considered it was another layer of bureaucracy

Councillor Storey stated that he had consulted his constituents on the proposals and as he was acting on the comments he had received he would not be supporting the proposal.

In summing up, Councillor Long acknowledged that there was not an easy answer for all, he commented on a number of the points raised including the fact that he was not in support of an elected Mayor, but was conscious that there was no guarantee that there would be another deal to be had in the future.

On being put to the vote, a recorded vote was held as follows:

For	Against	Abstain
B Ayres	B Anota	
A Beales	L Bambridge	
R Blunt	R Beal	
C Crofts	R Bird	
N Daubney	C Bower	
I Devereux	A Bubb	
H Humphrey	M Chenery of Horsbrugh	
P Kunes	J Collingham	
B Long	J Collop	
E Nockolds	S Collop	
C Sampson	S Fraser	
S Squire	P Gidney	
J Westrop	R Groom	
T Wing-Pentelow	G Hipperson	
	P Hodson	
	M Hopkins	
	G Howard	
	M Howland	
	C Joyce	
	A Lawrence	
	G McGuinness	

	C Manning	
	K Mellish	
	G Middleton	
	J Moriarty	
	A Morrison	
	T Parish	
	M Peake	
	D Pope	
	P Rochford	
	S Sandell	
	M Shorting	
	T Smith	
	V Spikings	
	M Storey	
	A Tyler	
	D Tyler	
	G Wareham	
	E Watson	
	D Whitby	
	A White	
	M Wilkinson	
	A Wright	
	S Young	
14	44	0

RESOLVED: That the Devolution proposal is lost and the Norfolk and Suffolk Devolution deal should be rejected.

C:52 **URGENT BUSINESS**

None

C:53 **PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

The Mayor invited the following members of the public to come forward to ask their questions of Council:

1) Joanne Rust

“King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council has a representative who sits on the County's Health Scrutiny Committee. What representations has she made in respect of the STP to ensure that our area receives its fair share of health funding and services to meet the needs of the population. In particular to keep open the Fermoy Unit? “

Councillor Mrs Nockolds gave the following response:

“The Sustainability Transformation Plan, STP, for Norfolk and Waveney was presented to the Health & Wellbeing Board as a complete plan on 18th October and submitted to NHS England on the 21st October.

At the moment I do not know the outcome although I have a meeting of the H&WB Board on the 23rd November.

The County's Health Scrutiny Committee does not have a role in drawing up the STP. I am sure the Chairman and Committee will arrange a meeting to scrutinise the STP. I am aware that this Committee has scrutinized Mental Health issues including the care and support given.

STP's are place based, system wide plans for health and social care and covers integration with local authority services including prevention and social care. The Plan covers the period Oct 2016 to March 2021.

The focus of the Plan is addressing 3 national challenges.

1. Inequalities in health
2. Ensuring quality & performance of health & social care systems
3. Ensuring a financially sustainable health & social care systems

To improve the governance of the STP, the Executive Board (by which District Councils and Norfolk Healthwatch are represented) have been given the responsibility of ensuring the STP programme structure is being delivered on time.

Within the programme structure a specific Mental Health work programme will be developed across the breadth of the STP.

A Clinical Reference group has also been established involving NHS Trust Medical Directors & CCGs Chairman to ensure that local clinical leaders are engaged in the STP process.

Within the coming months the STP will have to be shared with residents of Norfolk and Waveney and engage with organisations and professionals to shape the plan and develop the change.

Norfolk County Council have in place a Communication workstream programme for residents.

The programme will outline how health and social care services in Norfolk and Waveney will change as well as how the organisations will work together during the next 5 years.

The Local Transformation Plan, LTP, was recently refreshed and agreed at the HWB in July to improve mental health outcomes for children and young people and is a high priority. An extensive redesign of the entire system will be undertaken over the next 2 years to maximise the opportunities for integrated pathways of care. The 5 CCG's in Norfolk & Waveney have committed to spend an extra £1.9m of funding to deliver the priorities set out in the LTP for instance,

increase support for children & young people affected by domestic abuse, those with eating disorders and more support to schools.

A new Drop-In clinic for young people has recently been funded which operates twice each month in our Borough.

The Borough Councils Strategy Group, which involves, WNCCG, QE hospital, Freebridge, DWP, Police, Fire service, Probation Service, Library Service and ourselves, have agreed that mental health is one of the top key issues for our area and are meeting later this month. CEO of WN MIND will be in attendance. The meeting will discuss how as partners we can join up some of our services and ensure mental health issues are incorporated in the strategy.

The WN Partnership Improving Attainment Steering Group have also identified mental health as a key factor which impacts on children's educational attainment. The Group have made some provision within the improving Attainment budget to fund and provide training to teachers about Mental Health issues affecting young people. 2 successful training sessions have been delivered this month. These sessions have been attended by teachers from both Primary and High schools.

Further training is planned as the Partnership want to ensure the opportunity is available for as many schools as possible.

I personally will, along with my colleagues, try to achieve the best possible outcomes for our residents within a budget giving best value in a planned and caring way.”

By way of supplementary, Mrs Rust asked whether Borough Councillors refuse to support the STP which should be subject to wide consultation.

Councillor Mrs Nockolds responded that she wouldn't vote against it but would continue to work in partnership across local authority borders.

2) Michael Coote

“I want to question why the agreed method and procedures have not been carried out as per the minutes of the Major Housing Consultative Group and why there has been no meetings arranged other than those as listed below.

A Major Housing Consultative Group has also been established made up of local stakeholders, meetings took place as listed below.

These minutes are available on the web site:

Meetings:

1. 24 March 2015.
2. 06 July 2015.
3. 29th March 2016
4. this is long overdue

I have asked several times when is the date of this long overdue meeting? When might this happen? I thought that these meetings would take place every 3 to 4 months a year, perhaps I misunderstood, but with such long gaps between meetings, one wonders if "direct public input is no longer welcome"?"

Councillor Beales responded:

"As you know there is a dedicated web page for the Major Housing Scheme signposted from the home page of the Council's website. The consultation page to which you refer reads as follows

A Major Housing Consultative Group has also been established made up of local stakeholders. The Minutes for the first three meetings are available at the bottom of the page.

Further meetings will take place to coincide with each planning application, with sub groups meeting if necessary to discuss different issues. All interested parties will be kept up to date with all the issues being considered and will have the opportunity to express their views and provide input using their specialist knowledge and expertise to help shape housing development in these areas.

Further public consultations will be publicised as planning applications for each stage of the Major Housing Project are prepared. I hope this reassures you that the meetings will take place as described and that input remains as important as ever."

By way of supplementary, Mr Coote asked:

"expressing concern about the withdrawal of the provision of bungalows from local developments he said I find this unacceptable as there is no reason why mitigation could not allow for dormer type bungalows which allowed refuge in the event of flooding. It appears that the need to provide suitable accommodation for elderly and infirm is being avoided. I consider that the Council's flood risk design does not make proper provision to accommodate the elderly and infirm with mobility problems, how does the Council propose to remedy this situation?"

In response Councillor Beales explained that the draft application contained bungalows, but the Environment Agency turned the proposal down on flood risk and their advice was unequivocal, so there was nothing the Council could do in this situation.

C:54

MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor informed Council that he had send birthday wishes to the Prince of Wales.

C:55 **CABINET MEMBERS REPORTS****i** **Culture Heritage and Health - Councillor Mrs E Nockolds**

Councillor Mrs Nockolds presented her report. She responded to questions on grass cutting in King's Lynn and that the Festival was committed to continuing putting on high quality performances.

ii **Development - Councillor R Blunt**

Councillor Blunt moved his report. He responded to questions on the Local Plan and undertook to have a discussion with Councillor J Collop on unadopted estate roads.

iii **Housing and Community - Councillor A Lawrence**

Councillor Lawrence presented his report. He responded to a question on the provision of new homes which were equipped for the disabled, and the opening times of the Gaywood public toilets.

iv **Human Resources, Facilities and Shared Services - Councillor Mrs K Mellish**

Councillor Mrs Mellish presented her report. There were no questions.

v **Performance Councillor N J Daubney**

Councillor Daubney presented his report. There were no questions.

vi **Deputy Leader and Regeneration and Industrial Assets - Councillor A Beales**

Councillor Beales presented his report. He responded to a question on the attendance of the Waterfront Consultants at residents meetings in the area.

vii **Leader and Environment - Councillor B Long**

Councillor Long presented his report. There were no questions.

C:56 **MEMBERS QUESTION TIME**

None.

C:57 **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COUNCIL BODIES**

i **Cabinet: 25 October 2016**

Councillor Long, seconded by Councillor Beales proposed the recommendations from the Cabinet Meeting on 25 October 2016 below:

CAB80: Changes to arrangements for appointment of External Auditors

CAB81: Terms of Reference of the King's Lynn Area Consultative Committee – Parish Partnership Programme

CAB82: NORA Enterprise Zone – Discretionary Business Rates Discount

CAB84: Refuse and Recycling Contract Arrangements

CAB86: Asset Management – Housing Development Sites – Options

At the request of Councillor J Collop the following resolution was passed:

Exclusion of the Press and Public

RESOLVED: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for item of business CAB85 below on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

Councillor Collop sought clarification as whether the cost implications of the proposals under CAB85: King's Court Office Accommodation. It was explained that the minor details of costings were not available but the move would bring the Town Hall into greater use.

RESOLVED: That the recommendations from 25 October 2016 Cabinet be approved.

C:58 **REVIEW OF PROPORTIONALITY**

RESOLVED: That proportionality be amended by the change of 2 seats, one from both the Licensing & Appeals Board and Licensing Committee moving from Conservative to Independent and the appropriate membership sought.

C:59 **NOTICE OF MOTION**

The Mayor invited Councillor Long to propose his Notice of Motion (3/16).

Councillor B Long proposed the Motion:

That this Council supports and adopts the Motor Neurone Disease Charter which includes the following aims:

1. The right to an early diagnosis and information.
2. The right to access quality care and treatments.
3. The right to be treated as individuals and with dignity and respect.
4. The right to maximise their quality of life.
5. Carers of people with MND have the right to be valued, respected, listened to and well-supported.

The Motion was seconded by Councillor A Beales with amendments to read:

That this Council supports the Motor Neurone Disease Charter because what is required from councils such as ours is clearly outlined in a specially written Guide for Councillors and there is little doubt that the Council can do what is required without undue impact on financial and other resources. Before such other worthy causes are supported, the Council should be similarly aware of the nature of the assistance required and the possible financial and resource impact.

RESOLVED: That the Motion, as amended be agreed.

The meeting closed at 8.34 pm