

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CABINET ON 16 MARCH 2021 TO COUNCIL ON 8 APRIL 2021

CAB245 DRAFT STANDING ORDER 11.2A - REFERRAL BACK TO CABINET FROM COUNCIL

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

Cabinet was reminded that at the 14 January 2021 Council meeting it was agreed to refer back to Cabinet for further consideration the Cabinet Members recommendation to introduce a new SO 11.2A, as set out below:

“Draft amendment to Standing Order 11.2 referred back to Cabinet for further consideration and final decision by Council.

11.2A The procedure for putting questions under Standing Order 11.2.1 shall be as follows:

11.2A.1 The period of time for putting questions and receiving responses shall not exceed 30 minutes for all Cabinet Members, excluding the Leader.

11.2A.2 The period of time for putting questions and receiving responses to the Leader shall not exceed 15 minutes.

11.2A.3 The order of putting questions shall commence with one Member from the largest opposition group, proceeding in descending order to the smallest opposition group, followed by a Member from the ruling group. This order shall repeat until the time for questions has elapsed or there are no more questions to be put.”

In proposing the following for inclusion as the standing order, Councillor Long confirmed he had spoken to group leaders about them. Councillor Nockolds seconded the proposals.

Standing Order 11.2a

1. That the total time given for questions to Cabinet members except the leader be 50 minutes, and 15 minutes of the Leader.
2. That no question and answer exceed 10 minutes
3. There is no right to a supplementary question
4. That the cabinet members reports be presented “en bloc” and questions asked as follows with that order to be rotated at each meeting:

Major opposition group
2nd opposition group
Non aligned councillors
Administration group

5. That the suggestion be put to the chairs of panels, that to further facilitate the scrutiny of cabinet, panels consider having on their agendas a time limited question and answer session of cabinet members as appropriate to the work of the panel.

Cabinet discussed the proposals and the suggestion that the Panels have a question and answer session for Cabinet members was welcomed.

Under standing order 34 Councillor Rust asked that where questions were put to Cabinet members in advance they were responded to.

Under standing order 34 Councillor Morley felt Cabinet member questions at Panels would be a positive step with possibly longer than the 10minutes suggested, and the timeframe proposed for council was fair but preferred opposition questions only. He suggested that Chairs should be from opposition groups. Councillor Long confirmed the timeframes would be for a Panel to decide.

Under standing order 34 Councillor Dickinson stated that as Chair of Audit Committee she would also welcome a cabinet member question and answer session at her Committee.

Under standing order 34 Councillor Parish indicated he did not have an issue with the timings for questions except he felt the 10 minutes for each question was too long. He indicated he had encouraged members of his Group to submit questions in advance and asked for Cabinet Members to respond to them.

It was confirmed that the review of standing orders would be carried out in due course as required.

Under standing order 34 Councillor Ryves hoped to receive written answers from Cabinet members, and suggested question for Panels be put in advance in writing.

Councillor Long commented that who and how long questions were held would be up to the panel in accordance with the appropriateness of their agenda. He hoped long questions would be dealt with outside of meetings.

RECOMMENDED: That the following be recommended to Council and incorporated into standing orders in the appropriate way:

Standing Order 11.2a

6. That the total time given for questions to Cabinet members except the leader be 50minutes, and 15 minutes of the Leader.
7. That no question and answer exceed 10 minutes
8. There is no right to a supplementary question
9. That the cabinet members reports be presented "en bloc" and questions asked as follows with that order to be rotated at each meeting:

Major opposition group

2nd opposition group
Non aligned councillors
Administration group

10. That the suggestion be put to the chairs of panels, that to further facilitate the scrutiny of cabinet, panels consider having on their agendas a time limited question and answer session of cabinet members as appropriate to the work of the panel.

CAB247 **SALTERS ROAD, KING'S LYNN**

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

Councillor Long left the meeting during consideration of this item.

Cabinet decided that the item would be taken in public session. The report reminded Members that on 18th September 2018 it recommended to Council, that the Council enter into a contract with Homes England to accept their accelerated funding offer to bring this site forward. The contract with Homes England was agreed on the basis that this development should be taken forward as part of the Major Housing contract with Lovell Partnerships Limited, to facilitate the acceleration of the development.

The report updated Members on the progress made, together with how it was hoped that this scheme would be delivered in partnership with Freebridge Community Housing.

Under standing order 34 Councillor Rust welcomed the social rentable and shared ownership houses in an area in need of it, but was sad to lose the open space.

Under standing order 34 Councillor Morley asked whether the water authority would carry out any work required in the area, and whether there had been sufficient scrutiny as a large number of the Regeneration and Development Members did not participate due to being Planning Committee members.

Members were reminded that comments could be made on all planning applications.

Under standing order 34 Councillor Parish commented that the discussions had not been in public, he felt there should be a better airing of the issue.

Under standing order 34 Councillor Ryves felt the debate should have been public. He sought legal advice for members to prevent pre determination. He asked what would happen if the contract with Freebridge didn't go ahead.

In debating the item, Cabinet commented that members of the Panel not on Planning Committee could have commented on the item. It was also agreed that "subject to planning permission being granted" be added to the recommendation.

RECOMMENDED: 1) That the Council enters a contract with Lovell Partnerships Ltd under the Major Housing Contract to deliver this project subject to planning permission being granted.

2) That the Council agrees to sell all properties to Freebridge Community Housing (FCH) as laid out in this report.

3) That if terms cannot be agreed with FCH the scheme is delivered as set out in paragraph 2.4 of the report.

Reason for Decision

1. To develop this site using the Major Housing contract with Lovell Partnerships Limited.
2. To allow the scheme to be developed using traditional methods.

CAB248 SOUTHEND ROAD, HUNSTANTON

[Click here to view the recording of this item on You Tube](#)

The item was taken in public. Cabinet was reminded that on 18th September 2018 it recommended to Council, that the Council enter into a contract with Homes England to accept their accelerated funding offer to bring this site forward. The contract with Homes England was agreed on the basis that this development should be taken forward as part of the Major Housing contract with Lovell Partnerships Limited, to facilitate the acceleration of the development.

The report updated Members on the progress made, explained why the application was previously refused at Planning Committee on 7th December 2020 and sought approval to sign contracts with Lovell if planning permission was granted, when re-presented to Planning Committee.

In discussing the report it was agreed that recommendation 2 in the report be deleted, and “subject to planning permission being received” be added to recommendation 1.

Under standing order 34 Councillor Morley, supported the housing for Hunstanton but sought clarification on the legal position for members on the Regeneration and Development Panel and Planning Committee.

The Chair reminded members that the Planning Committee received training on all such issues.

By way of clarification, the Monitoring officer confirmed she could provide further advice for members, but confirmed that the regulatory decision of the Planning Committee could be different to that of the Council.

Under standing order 34 Councillor Parish commented that the arrangements to sell the properties to local people were not practical in the long term.

Under standing order 34 Councillor Ryves commented on the layout of the parking areas referred to in the report and their optimum use and values.

The Chair reminded Members that the car parks were not always full except on bank holidays etc.

In debating the item Cabinet supported the ability of local people to purchase the properties, confirmed the Council’s right of appeal, and the improvement the

development would bring to that area of the town, in accordance with the Regeneration Masterplan.

RECOMMENDED: That the Council enters a contract with Lovell Partnerships Ltd under the Major Housing Contract to deliver this project subject to planning permission being granted.

Reason for Decision

- 1) To develop this site using the Major Housing contract with Lovell Partnerships Limited.
- 2) To allow the scheme to be developed using traditional methods.
- 3) To include the tenure mix shown in section 2.4 of this report.