

**BOROUGH COUNCIL OF KING'S LYNN & WEST NORFOLK****COUNCIL**

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 17th October, 2019 at 6.30 pm in the Assembly Room - Town Hall, Saturday Market Place, King's Lynn PE30 5DQ**

**PRESENT:** Councillor G Hipperson (Chair)  
Councillors B Ayres, Miss L Bambridge, P Beal, J Bhondi, F Bone, C Bower, A Bubb, A Bullen, Mrs J Collingham, J Collop, S Collop, C J Crofts, S Dark, M de Whalley, I Devereux, A Dickinson, P Gidney, A Holmes, Lord Howard, M Howland, G Howman, C Hudson, H Humphrey, B Jones, C Joyce, A Kemp, J Kirk, P Kunes, B Lawton, B Long, J Lowe, C Manning, G Middleton, J Moriarty, C Morley, S Nash, E Nockolds, T Parish, S Patel, D Pope, J Ratcliffe, C Rose, J Rust, A Ryves, C Sampson, S Sandell, S Squire, M Storey, D Tyler, D Whitby and M Wilkinson

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors R Blunt, A Lawrence and A Tyler

C:35 **PRAYERS**

Prayers were led by Rev Canon Ling

C:36 **MINUTES**

Councillor Nash called into question the content of the minutes and that the specific ruling of the Monitoring Officer to his query was not included in them.

**RESOLVED:** The Minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2019 were approved as a correct record.

C:37 **DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

None

C:38 **MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None

C:39 **URGENT BUSINESS**

None

**C:40**     **PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Under standing order 9 the Mayor invited the following public questioners to pose their questions.

**1)     Question from Brenda Kent**

"In the light of recent flood warnings, a tide higher than predicted and rising sea levels, what plans do you have in place to protect residents, land and dwellings in those local areas that are perilously close to sea level given that your 2008 strategy document will now be, at the very least, in the most urgent need of updating?"

Councillor Devereux gave the following response:

I understand the thrust of your point, but, I must first correct your second proposition. The basic magnitude and timing of our 'tides' are a matter of predictable scientific expression: this is what enables the publication of nationally available tide tables. However, individual local tidal water levels are subject to the additional variable effects of wind direction and magnitude as well as local air pressure and other weather trends over short timescales. It is these factors that are analysed, tracked and assessed by the Environment Agency in real time, with data from the Met Office, to provide overarching estimates of increased risk of higher water levels that might over-top the flood defences; these risks inform multi-agency decision making on specific flood alerts, warnings and exceptionally, precautionary evacuation notices, as recently experienced at Hunstanton. On this latest occasion, the combined additional effect of the weather was less than originally forecast for the time of the highest tide, because the wind dropped. As a consequence, the forecast flood levels did not occur: but, the warning actions were prudent in the light of the weather forecasts at the time.

As to the other points, I presume that your reference to a 2008 document is the high level, Environment Agency "Shoreline Management Plan" for our part of the Wash. This document informed the basic decision making for the Wash East Coast Management Strategy. This led initially to the Shingle Bank Flood Defence recycling process plan at Snettisham and then, more recently drafting of the Hunstanton Coastal Management Plan. This latest detailed local plan takes a 75+ year view of coastal change, including the estimates of sea level rise and their effect on tidal flood levels, to identify the engineering works needed to defend Hunstanton, including increased height of 'sea-walls'. This was subject to extensive consultation with the community and national agencies over recent years.

All Shoreline Management Plans across England are currently going through their 10 year review cycle by the Environment Agency. As it happens, our Borough Council Team is scheduled to be reviewing ours with the EA during November.

By way of supplementary Mrs Kent asked to what degree the council had a sense of urgency about the impending climate chaos and what steps would be taken to prevent damage.

Councillor Devereux confirmed that the council was committed to doing an assessment of the carbon footprint and its work was underway. An officer working group had been established and additional staff recruited to undertake the additional work required.

**2) Question by Dr Charlie Gardner  
To be read by Lee Stevens**

Thank you, Mr Mayor and borough councillors, for all your efforts, over the months and years, to ensure that West Norfolk remains a thriving and happy place for its residents. Thank you too, Mr Mayor, for the opportunity to address you on this hugely important evening. I apologise for not being here in person - yesterday I was in Cardiff speaking to the National Assembly for Wales, whose members are taking their collective responsibilities in this time of climate and ecological emergency very seriously, and tomorrow I will be at University of Kent, teaching tomorrow's leaders about these same emergencies. Unfortunately, I have not been able to return home to King's Lynn in between.

Tonight is a momentous occasion. Less than three weeks ago, parts of Hunstanton, Heacham and Snettisham were evacuated due to the risk of dangerous flooding, reminding us of the acute danger we face as one of the country's most vulnerable communities to the impacts of climate breakdown. And over the last 10 days, tens of thousands of people (including myself and many others from West Norfolk), have been sacrificing their time, and in many cases their liberty, to fight for our collective survival on the streets of London and capital cities around the world. And just last week a report was published stating that the costs of climate breakdown are 'potentially infinite', and include a possibility of human extinction. In case you are wondering, it was published by those notorious ecowarriors the IMF. So the timing of tonight's vote could not be more pertinent, or historical.

Council members have said, in our meetings and in the press, that you don't want gesture politics. On that we can all agree. To indulge in gesture politics at a time like this would be to fiddle while Rome burns. It would be a dereliction of your duty not only as councillors, but as proud residents of West Norfolk. The *only* alternative to gesture politics is to pass a strong declaration, as Councillor de Whalley has proposed, and to back it up with the necessary drive and commitment. Because to do otherwise, and vote against this action, would be to vote for climate breakdown. It would be a vote for the flooding of West Norfolk, a vote for food insecurity and hunger, and a vote against your children and grandchildren. It would be a vote that West Norfolk would never forgive you for, and one that will be remembered when the next floods hit.

The last time I spoke at a full council meeting was in early August, when I was invited to speak in support of a climate emergency motion proposed by the Conservative portfolio holder for economic development in Tunbridge Wells Town Council. Tunbridge Wells is not a coastal town, and so is much less threatened than West Norfolk. Their council is strongly conservative, and the motion proposed was stronger than that proposed by Councillor de Whalley. Yet it was passed unanimously with just a single abstention. The councillors of Tunbridge Wells are not alone - over half the local authorities in the UK, including our neighbours in North Norfolk, have declared a Climate Emergency, as have others in over 20 countries. The cities of New York, Paris, Sydney and Ottawa have declared Climate Emergencies. So has the UK Parliament, and those of the Republic of Ireland, France and Canada. Governments around the world, from local to national levels, are starting to show the leadership, vision and courage to take the necessary first step to saving our only home.

So my question to you is straightforward. If all these authorities around the world have the confidence, courage and vision to take the necessary actions for the people they represent, what makes King's Lynn and West Norfolk so different?

Councillor Devereux gave the following response:

Thank You, Mr Stevens, for your input.

Mr Mayor, I will try to keep my response within the bounds of the Nolan Principles, but I'm afraid that this so called question just confirms to me the arrogant self-seeking nature of Extinction Rebellion.

I refuse to acknowledge their patronising approach and their flagrant disregard of our laws and Institutions of Government, in pursuit of their clearly stated political objectives: their intention to overthrow our well-established local and national government processes, and for them to be replaced by their ideas of "Peoples' Assemblies". What nonsense

We in this Borough do not need telling that Climate Change is happening....we live the implications every day! But, together with Regional and National Authorities we have implemented robust actions to protect our communities. There is no doubt that much needs to be done to continue these arrangements into the future and we will continue to pursue them vigorously. It is sad that XR has no viable, practical solutions.

We must have top down constructive strategies and plans to overcome the adversity of changes to our climate and weather, whilst maintaining economic and political stability: Global policies must be agreed by International Governments to find the robust technical paths to enable the world to progress towards a better future. XR's aspirations are narrow, manipulative and driven by their partisan, anti-establishment

view of the world. Their way would deny humankind of the essentials of life today, including pharmaceuticals, health care, food, potable water, communications, transport and security, amongst many other essentials valued by individual cultures.... In a word: "Disaster".

It is a matter of great concern to me that so many Global and National Leaders pay lip-service to acceptance of XR pressures, then fail to address the international requirements for all of our futures, thereby providing XR the publicity on which they thrive.

Mr Mayor, We will continue to do what can be done, and that which we can do... within the Authority of this Council: to best serve the people and communities we have been democratically elected to represent.

We will not dance to the tune of unelected, anarchistic and disruptive objectors!

By way of supplementary Mr Stevens made a statement.

### **3) Question from M J Ray**

How many times more important to this council is cutting traffic jam length than cutting air pollution; and how many times more important is cutting traffic jam length than increasing walking and cycling levels?

Councillor Long responded confirming that both were considered equally important, and once traffic jams were sorted, other options such as walking and cycling became better with less fumes etc.

By way of supplementary Mr Ray asked what the council would do to prioritise measures that did both, and asked if the Council would meet with WN Bug to discuss what could be achieved.

Councillor Long explained that the King's Lynn Transport Plan document was still in draft, but there were various options to consider. He confirmed that the County Council was the lead on the matter, but the Borough had agreed to part fund the process. He confirmed that the cabinet member would meet with the Group.

### **4) Question from Hazel Fredericks**

With regard to action on the Climate Change issue, does the council accept that it ought to do more than simply take responsibility for reducing its own Corporate greenhouse gas emissions, welcome though that would be.

Who does the council see as having the responsibility for overseeing population-wide greenhouse gas emission reductions throughout our area of West Norfolk and what plans are currently in place to effect our fair share of cuts to meet our part of the 2015 Paris Agreement?

Councillor Devereux gave the following response:

“Mr Mayor, On the first part, I would refer the questioner to my earlier response to Mr Stevens, specifically, “We will continue to do what can be done, and that which we can do... within the Authority of this Council: to best serve the people and communities we have been democratically elected to represent!”.

As to the second part: the simple answer is everyone is responsible for their actions! I am sure we will all want to comply with the Law of the Land as it develops.”

By way of supplementary Mrs Fredericks made a statement.

C:41 **REVIEW OF PROPORTIONALITY**

**RESOLVED:** That proportionality be amended by the change of seats as follows:

Conservatives gain 2 seats on: 1 on Licensing and Appeals Board and 1 on Licensing Committee.

Independent lose 2 seats on: 1 on Licensing and Appeals Board and 1 on Licensing Committee.

C:42 **CABINET MEMBERS REPORTS**

i **Business Development - Councillor G Middleton**

Councillor Middleton presented his report. There were no questions.

ii **Commercial Services - Councillor P Kunes**

Councillor Kunes presented his report. There were no questions.

iii **Development - Councillor R Blunt**

Councillor Blunt was not present at the meeting, members were invited to email any questions.

iv **Environment - Councillor I Devereux**

Councillor Devereux presented his report. There were no questions.

v **Housing - Councillor A Lawrence**

Councillor Lawrence was not present at the meeting, members were invited to email any questions.

vi **Project Delivery - Councillor P Gidney**

Councillor Gidney presented his report. There were no questions.

vii **Deputy Leader and Culture, Heritage and Health - Councillor Mrs E Nockolds**

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

viii **Leader and Resources - Councillor B Long**

Councillor Long presented his report. There were no questions.

C:43 **MEMBERS QUESTION TIME**

There were no questions.

C:44 **NOTICES OF MOTION**

The following Notices of Motion were considered:

**(3/19), submitted by Councillor J Moriarty:**

Councillor Moriarty proposed the following motion, seconded by Councillor Parish.

“In 2018 this Council introduced a new system for sifting planning applications. Said scheme was subsequently reviewed in early 2019.

On both occasions the council breached its own Scheme of Community Involvement (SCI) by failing to consult key partners in the planning process, namely Parish Councils.

It is agreed there will now be a consultation exercise with Parish Councils, said exercise to be overseen by an appropriate panel or body of elected councillors.”

In proposing the Motion Councillor Moriarty explained that it was not about whether it was a good idea or if it worked or saved money, but about the fact that key partners were not consulted when it was brought in and the panel was not told the detail of comments from parishes. He made referent to the SCI which described how the Council would engage with key partners including parishes, he considered that the argument not to consult on the process was difficult to sustain and the Council should show how it wanted to treat parishes.

Councillor Long reminded members that the SCI came into effect for major consultations, whereas the sifting panel was an internal working

arrangement and did not affect how the parishes were consulted on planning applications or whether their comments were taken into account in deciding on applications. He referred to a parish council training session on planning which was recently run where no-one made any comments on the sifting panel. The parishes still had their 21 days to comment on applications, and those were taken into account.

Councillor Howman in supporting the Motion proposed an amendment that the Kings Lynn Area Consultative Panel (KLACC) be included in the consultation process as Kings Lynn was unparished. Councillor Jones seconded the amendment.

Councillor Holmes commented that he understood it was a trial, so should therefore be reviewed.

Councillor Rust in supporting the motion as amended considered it would go a long way to ensure local people were kept informed.

Councillor Joyce stated that if something was being changed to a great extent it should be consulted on. He referred to the planning application at Knights Hill which he considered would have had objections.

Councillor Dark commented that he had a degree of sympathy for the motion, but it was an existing policy. He suggested that the Corporate Performance Panel was the correct route to review policies.

Councillor Long reminded members that the KLACC members were members of Council and so had the full ability to comment on the process as it came through the panels. KLACC had the opportunity to comment on any planning applications for the unparished area. He reiterated that it was an internal process, not one that required and SCI consultation process.

In summing up on the amendment, Councillor Moriarty reminded members that he was talking about consulting on the Sifting Panel process.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

In debating the substantive Motion Councillor Parish reminded members of the process prior to the Sifting Panel whereby parish comments contrary to the officer recommendations would automatically add the item to the Planning Committee agenda. The process was now that the parish had to go to a ward member to call the item in to committee.

In summing up Councillor Moriarty pointed out that he believed parishes had been affected by it. He stated that he would encourage it to be reviewed by the Corporate Performance Panel. Councillor



Moriarty, with the required number of supporters requested a recorded vote on the decision.

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
P Beal	B Ayres	
J Bhondi	L Bambridge	
F Bone	C Bower	
A Bullen	A Bubb	
J Collop	J Collingham	
S Collop	C Crofts	
A Holmes	S Dark	
G Howman	I Devereux	
C Hudson	A Dickinson	
B Jones	P Gidney	
C Joyce	G Hipperson	
A Kemp	G Howard	
B Lawton	M Howland	
J Moriarty	H Humphrey	
C Morley	J Kirk	
S Nash	P Kunes	
T Parish	B Long	
D Pope	J Lowe	
J Ratcliff	C Manning	
C Rose	G Middleton	
J Rust	E Nockolds	
A Ryves	S Patel	
S Squire	C Sampson	
M de Whalley	S Sandell	
M Wilkinson	M Storey	
	D Tyler	
	D Whitby	
<b>25</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>0</b>

The vote on the motion was lost and the motion fell.

**Resolved:** That the Motion falls.

**(4/19), submitted by Councillor A Kemp:**

Councillor Kemp proposed the Motion, seconded by Councillor Bone. Councillor Kemp proposed her motion referring to the content of her Motion.

**“Lynn Transport Plan and Hardings Way Bus Lane**

A large number of Constituents across the Borough, including South Lynn and the Friars, and from the Walpoles to North Runcton and Setchey, are now aware of the harm, distress and adverse impact on disabled residents, people in mobility scooters, families with children

and prams, retired residents, those less able to walk and children walking to school, in the South Lynn community, the Friars and other parts of the Borough, for whom Hardings Way is the only safe route into town, if Council goes ahead with its plan to run a road through the Buggy Pavement & Safe Route to School, and allow traffic, HGV's and two other roads across the Wisbech Road part of Hardings Way Bus Lane; and want to avoid the detrimental impacts.

In 2009, a bid for £5.3m funding from the Community Infrastructure Fund (CIF 2) to implement a package of transportation improvements in King's Lynn, was approved at the Borough's Cabinet.

This included a public transport road link across the waterfront area from Wisbech Road to Boal Quay.

This public transport link was Hardings Way.

The purpose of Hardings Way was to speed up buses through the bus lane and reduce congestion, air pollution and emissions from buses from London Road, from the town centre and from the gyratory.

Members - and the local community - were advised that it was envisaged that the road would never be a through traffic route, with the exception of buses.

The Transport Statement said that " the route would initially be used by 13 buses per hour, off peak, in each direction throughout the day, rising to an anticipated 15 per hour from 2016 and 17 per hour from 2021. During peak hours, initial estimates are that 22 services per hour will use the route (0800 to 0900 and 1700 to 1800 Monday to Friday) It is likely that by 2021 the weekday am/pm peak could be up to a maximum of 26 per hour in each direction. There would be significantly less bus movements in all off peak periods".

The Development Control Board said:

"The provision of the bus route is expected to reduce bus journey times, equating to a time saving of 4 minutes for AM peak inbound journeys and 3 minutes for PM peak outbound journeys.

In addition to extended scheduled journey times currently experienced at peak periods, extended layover times between journeys are planned throughout the day to provide a robust schedule that enables services to recover from unpredictable operational delays".

### **Lynn Transport Strategy**

Hardings Way will underpin the success of the West Lynn Park and Ride, under consideration in the Lynn Transport Plan. Shuttle buses, using Hardings Way as the fast route to town, will encourage drivers to leave their cars outside the town, avoid the town centre queues and reduce congestion and emissions.

Hardings Way Bus Lane has a strategic role to play in further reducing traffic entering Lynn. The aspiration must be to increase the flow of buses and make Lynn a carbon neutral town.

### **Planning Application September 2017**

However, by a planning application of Sept 2017, the Borough granted itself planning permission that would place general traffic and maximum HGV's on a fifth of Hardings Way, build three access stub roads for 50 houses on Hardings Way South and move the bus lane north 15m north; and instructed Norfolk County Council to amend the two Traffic Orders that banned general traffic on Hardings Way.

There was no highways impact assessment.

The County Council has destroyed the road specification for Hardings Way and it is uncertain if it was built to withstand maximum weight vehicles that the traffic orders would permit.

The Traffic Orders allows general traffic and maximum weight HGV's on the first 125m of the bus lane, even though the feeder road, Wisbech Road, has a 7.5 tonne weight limit.

The Equality Impact Assessment said that disabled people would suffer a significant detriment.

The access for the private firm placing maximum HGV's on the bus lane, and the other two accesses, would be paid for by the Borough Council.

There have been 1,400 online and written objections to general traffic on any part of Hardings Way.

There is a 38 degrees petition.

123 written objections to the Traffic Orders were sent to Norfolk County Council.

### **Flood Risk**

The Hardings Way South area was flooded in the Great Flood of '53, in the floods of '78 and Hardings Way was flooded during the storm surge

Tidal Hazard Mapping for the River Great Ouse shows the site is located in a high flood risk area, where the mapping identifies inundation to depths of up to 2m in a flooding event, over the development's lifetime. The Local Plan Task Group is being approached over concerns regarding the suitability, sustainability and safety of Hardings Way South as a location for people's homes.

## **Disability and Protected Groups**

This Council has just appointed a new Disability Champion for the Borough, and is committed to understanding, listening and improving life for disabled residents.

The western pavement along Hardings Way South is a key walking route into town for disabled people including buggy users, for families with prams and young children, and for the whole community. It encourages people to leave their cars at home and walk into town.

Hardings Way is the only safe route into town.

Implementation of the planning permission would allow an unsignalled crossing in the wide western pavement, and introduce points of conflict with cars, parked cars and HGV's in turning manoeuvres, putting disabled buggy users, cyclists and other vulnerable users at risk.

It would affect safety and independent use of the road for those less able to walk.

People in Buggies do not feel safe using London Road unaided to get into the town centre, as it has sloping pavements with an uneven surface and several road accesses that are not safe to cross, as they are not traffic lit and have inadequate drop kerbs.

Hardings Way Buggy Lane in contrast, has a wide smooth pavement on a flat surface that is easy for buggies to negotiate.

People with disabilities want to lead fulfilling lives and get to town under their own steam.

The implementation of the traffic orders would affect the independence and safety of disabled residents and the attractiveness of cycling into town. People would be deterred from getting into town under the own steam.

Hardings Way links into National Cycle Lane 1.

Hardings Way South is also used by parents to teach children to cycle.

Hardings Way South is part of the safe route to school for children at Whitefriars Primary.

The former Head of Whitefriars School was promised by the County Council in 2009 that general traffic would never be allowed on the Bus Lane, because of concerns about pollution near the adjacent school playground.

Hardings Way was built on waste ground that was the traditional walking route into town for residents and plays an important role in

healthy lifestyles and improving public health outcomes in the deprived area of South Lynn.

In view of the disruption to the efficient working of the bus lane and to Lynn's Transport Strategy, the high flood risk to building in Hardings Way South, and the impact on older and disabled residents and young families if the Traffic Orders and planning permission were implemented, and in view for the strategic imperative to reduce traffic from entering the historic town centre:

Council urges Cabinet, in the strongest terms, to review all work planned to be done on or around Hardings Way, under (but not limited to) Planning Permission 17/01008/F, in the hope that they will not move the bus lane north, or introduce any new roads across it, and not allow any additional types of traffic onto it, or diminish any of its current features which enable pedestrians, prams and buggies to use it unhindered by traffic; in order to prevent the detrimental impacts."

Under standing order 14.6 Councillor Long proposed the matter be referred to Cabinet, pointing out that that the Motion referred to Cabinet consideration. This was seconded by Councillor Nockolds.

Councillor Kemp asked for a debate on the motion and a recorded vote on the item.

Council was advised that the vote should be taken on the 14.6 referral without debate. Councillor Moriarty questioned this advice and referred to standing order 14.8, to which Council was advised that once a vote was taken on 14.6, then 14.8 could be moved and then voted upon.

The proposal from Councillor Long to refer the motion to Cabinet under standing order 14.6 was put to the vote and carried.

Councillor Long then proposed that under standing order 14.8 the considerations from Cabinet come back to Council for decision. On being put to the vote, this was agreed.

**Resolved:** That the Motion 4/19 be referred to Cabinet for consideration and back to Council for final decision.

**(5/19), Submitted by Councillor M de Whalley**

Councillor de Whalley proposed the Notice of Motion, seconded by Councillor Moriarty. In proposing the Motion Councillor de Whalley set out the details and reasoning behind the motion, also reminding members that the Council could influence areas outside its own responsibility. He referred to the potential costs of the climate emergency for the area particularly when west Norfolk was a low lying area.

1. This council recognises that:
  - a. Local Government exists to ensure the wellbeing of its population through its statutory and moral authority across a wide range of economic and social aspects of local life.
  - b. The human influence on the climate system is unequivocal, and recent man-made emissions of greenhouse gases are the highest in history.
  - c. Recent climate changes have had widespread impacts on human and natural systems. This and other factors have led to a crisis in ecology and biodiversity.
  - d. West Norfolk is already at a high and increasing risk of the effects of climate change which endangers the population. This council has the legal and moral responsibility to act both across its own corporate activities and those wider economic and social issues over which it has regulatory control and influence.
  - e. The 2015 Paris Agreement, which the UK has ratified, sets a temperature target of limiting global heating well below 2°C with efforts to achieve 1.5°C.
  - f. “For King's Lynn and West Norfolk to make its fair contribution to delivering the Paris Agreement's commitment to staying ‘well below 2°C and pursuing 1.5°C’ global temperature rise, then an immediate and rapid programme of decarbonisation is needed.”\*
  - g. The 2018 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report showed that “impacts are much greater if 1.5°C is exceeded.”
  - h. The social and economic costs of delayed action far outweigh those of rapid mitigation and adaptation to the 1.5°C target.
  
2. For the above reasons the Borough Council of King’s Lynn and West Norfolk declares a climate and biodiversity emergency and commits to the following actions:
  - a. Ensure that every decision made by this council takes into consideration the impact on climate change and biodiversity as the top priority.
  - b. Achieve carbon neutrality by 2030, or earlier, across the Borough Council’s own corporate activities.
  - c. Use all Council regulatory means (such as local plan, transport, regeneration etc.) to ensure that the relevant aspects of life across West Norfolk become net zero carbon by 2030, or earlier, across the population to meet

the Borough Council's fair share of the UK commitment to the Paris Agreement temperature target.\*

- d. Not to exceed a Borough population-wide all-time "energy only" budget of 8 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> (or equivalent) emissions, as calculated recently to meet the Paris Agreement temperature target.
- e. Prepare a report, within six-months of this motion, outlining how West Norfolk can sufficiently reduce carbon emissions through energy and other Council strategies, plans and contracts to ensure the above commitments are met.
- f. Include a full carbon footprint for the Borough with future trajectories.
- g. The above report will be overseen by the formation of a Climate Change and Biodiversity task group which will report to the appropriate Council body.
- h. Review and performance monitoring of climate change strategy will take place every six months.
- i. Establish a West Norfolk Climate Change Partnership with key stakeholders & Government departments to develop new strategic and policy approaches.
- j. Invite contributions and instigate a wide-ranging programme of community engagement and awareness within the next six months.
- k. Lobby Westminster to deliver the legislation and resources necessary for the required changes.
- l. Provide adequate staff, time and leadership to effect the above.

\* Tyndall Centre, Manchester, "Setting Climate Commitments for King's Lynn and West Norfolk", October 2019.

In seconding the Motion, Councillor Moriarty drew attention to the LGA's recent motion declaring a climate emergency offering support to local authorities declaring the same. He considered that with the county's low lying coastline we should be at the fore front with the LGA with the support of other councils.

He referred to the need to ensure that local responses and data sets were tailored locally.

Councillor Moriarty moved an amendment to the motion – to delete section 1 b: The human influence on the climate system is unequivocal, and recent man-made emissions of greenhouse gases are the highest in history. This was seconded by Councillor Rust.

Under standing order 14.6, Councillor Long wished to move referral of the motion to Cabinet for consideration, the amendment had to be debated first.

In debating the amendment Councillor Joyce urged council to agree that the earth was warming and it was getting out of control and it needed to be brought back. He said it was about things that would make a difference, for example supporting local services and a park and ride for the town. Councillor Joyce was reminded that the debate was on the amendment.

Councillor Squire referred to the little enthusiasm to declare anything, she referred to sea levels, weather patterns and glaciers, she urged councillors to be part of the solution not the problem. Councillor Squire was reminded that the debate was on the amendment.

Councillor Kemp stated that human influence was unequivocal, the ice levels of 250 years ago were no longer there. The Borough area was responsible for high levels of CO2 from gas turbines in the area.

Councillor Parish spoke in support of the amendment. He wanted to debate the motion at the meeting.

Councillor Rust agreed that the Council should take a lead as the LGA suggested, stating that it couldn't be ignored, and that the point that 12 years didn't constitute a climate emergency was small minded when it was important to ensure West Norfolk didn't flood.

Councillor de Whalley apologised for the comments made in public questions and applauded the Extinction Rebellion. He considered that 12 years was a climate emergency.

The amendment was put to the vote and carried.

The substantive Motion was now on the table.

Councillor Long, under standing order 14.6 moved the motion be referred to Cabinet for consideration. He explained that there was already a statement position on this issue with reports being prepared, and that he agreed with a large part of the motion but needed more information. This was seconded by Councillor Middleton.

Councillor Moriarty with the required number of supporters requested a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was held on the substantive. Immediately following the initial calling of names Councillors Mrs Wilkinson and Howland declared that they had called the wrong vote. Upon discussion those votes were amended. Councillor Moriarty called the figures into question and objections were raised on the amending of the votes.



Following discussions with the Mayor, as it was an important decision for the Council to take, for Councillors to have confidence that their vote, as published, was their vote as intended and for the avoidance of all doubt, Council was invited to re take the vote.

There was some disagreement on the decision taken with comments that it would stifle any debate, to which it was also commented that it was to be proposed to bring it back to Council, and that it would set a precedent. It was noted that this would not set a precedent, and each instance would have to be considered on its merits.

This vote was as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
B Ayres	P Beal	G Hipperson
L Bambridge	J Bhondi	
C Bower	F Bone	
A Bubb	A Bullen	
J Collingham	J Collop	
C Crofts	S Collop	
S Dark	A Holmes	
I Devereux	G Howman	
A Dickinson	C Hudson	
P Gidney	B Jones	
G Howard	C Joyce	
M Howland	A Kemp	
H Humphrey	B Lawton	
J Kirk	J Moriarty	
P Kunes	C Morley	
B Long	S Nash	
J Lowe	T Parish	
C Manning	D Pope	
G Middleton	J Ratcliff	
E Nockolds	C Rose	
S Patel	J Rust	
C Sampson	A Ryves	
S Sandell	S Squire	
M Storey	M de Whalley	
D Tyler	M Wilkinson	
D Whitby		
<b>26</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>1</b>

The vote was carried to refer the matter to Cabinet for consideration.

Under standing order 14.8 Councillor Long moved that the matter be brought back to Council for consideration. This was agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That the Motion, as amended be referred to Cabinet for consideration, with the recommendations to be brought back to Council for decision.

**6/19 Submitted by Councillor F Bone**

Councillor Bone proposed the following Notice of Motion, seconded by Councillor Joyce. In proposing his Motion Councillor Bone explained that he felt there was no financial reason to change Hardings Way and he considered that the Council should not subsidise private house buyers. He felt that changes would make the friars area as congested as London Road, He asked if due diligence had been carried out and called for a report to come to Cabinet and Council.

In seconding the Motion Councillor Joyce invited Councillor Long to accept the Motion and bring it back to Council. He referred to the need for more bus only lanes to encourage people to leave their cars which would help the environment and climate emergency.

“This Council notes:-

Hardings Way in South Lynn was built as part of a £5.3 million Government funded scheme to allow the NORA development to proceed and to help reduce pollution on London Road

When planning permission was granted, in 2009, it was for public transport, and not general traffic. Prohibition Orders were put in place to prohibit traffic entering Hardings Way from Wisbech Road.

A senior highways engineer of Norfolk Highways Authority who advised the Norfolk Casualty Reduction Partnership Board on highways safety issues wrote to state that Hardings Way was only for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport and was not safe for any other use.

Therefore, this Council calls on the Cabinet to bring a report to this Council detailing all aspects of Hardings Way to include, but not exclusively, implications of a nature that cover:

Legal  
Financial  
Social  
Environmental  
Highways Safety  
Highways Impact Assessment

This Council instructs the Chief Executive to write informing Norfolk County Council that this Council will not fund any and all work carried out in association with Hardings Way until this Council has considered the report from Cabinet.”

Under standing order 14.6, Councillor Long moved that the Motion be referred to Cabinet as per the sentiment in the Motion. He reminded

members that the Kings Lynn Area Transport Plan was not yet finalised.

The motion to refer to Cabinet was put to the vote. This vote was carried.

Under standing order 14.8 Councillor Long proposed it be referred back to Council for decision. This was agreed.

**RESOLVED:** That the Motion be referred to Cabinet for consideration, with the recommendations to be brought back to Council for decision.

C:45

### **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COUNCIL BODIES**

i

#### **Cabinet: 24 September 2019**

As members had indicated a wish to debate the Cabinet recommendations from 24 September 2019, the reports on which were exempt, the Mayor agreed to move consideration of the item to the end of the meeting. A vote was taken on whether to exclude the press and public. The vote was carried.

#### **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 the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 and 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Act.

At 20.41 Council adjourned for 5 minutes.

Councillor Long, seconded by Councillor Nockolds proposed the following recommendations, the reports for which were exempt.

#### **CAB53: Boal Quay – Gallery Proposal**

In debating the recommendations for the above item, Councillor Moriarty considered that the recommendations of the Regeneration and Environment Panel had not been taken into account, particularly the comment regarding the reference to seeking guarantees of the funding and the quality of the displays etc. Councillor Long confirmed that the sentiments of the Panel had been accepted by cabinet at the time.

Councillor Joyce commented that there were other things that could be done with Boal Quay to protect Hardings Way. He called into question the proposed financial and transfer arrangements.

Councillor Ryves drew attention to the loss of revenue from car parking in the area with the proposed development and questioned the

projected visitor numbers for the centre. He considered it would be too good to be true.

Councillor Kemp questioned: whether due diligence had been carried out, the loss of revenue, the high number of staff due to work there and the re-alignment of Hardings Way, and what artefacts would be held in the building.

Councillor Collingham expressed dismay that some councillors did not want the opportunity for the enhancement of that part of the town.

Councillor Rust denied that opposition members did not want to see arts development, but questioned the contents of the proposal and whether it would come to fruition.

Councillor Dark drew attention to sweeping statements being made, and reminded members of the opportunity going forward.

Councillor Gidney assured members that due diligence would be carried out, and that the proposal was not something that could be ignored particularly when it fitted in with the cultural direction it was taking. He assured members that if there was a problem it would be flagged by officers.

Councillor J Collop asked for information and updates to be forthcoming to members on the progress with the project.

Councillor de Whalley suggested that the proposal should be turned down.

Councillor Mrs Nockolds reminded members that the waterfront development had remained static for a number of years, the economic assessment said it would bring visitors to the area.

**On being put to the vote the recommendation was carried.** Councillor Joyce requested his vote against to be recorded.

**CAB54: Nar Ouse Enterprise Zone Implementation and Delivery was agreed.**

#### **CAB55: Heritage Action Zone – Chapel Street**

Councillor Rust disagreed with the proposals in CAB55 due to the loss of car parking spaces. She did not object to development generally, but to the venue proposed.

Councillor Long explained that the car parking situation was one of the biggest issues Cabinet had with the proposals, but Historic England were supportive of the proposals. He gave reassurance that the car parking strategy for the town was being examined looking to make provision for growth in the future.

Councillor Jones drew attention to the problems found by North Lynn residents where cars were parked in the area to prevent the payment of parking fees.

Councillor Joyce commented that he could be persuaded if there was a park and ride in the town, but the proposals would move cars from the existing car park to others which meant he was against the proposal.

Councillor Kemp stated that the Kings Lynn Transport Strategy needed to be considered, she felt that buses stopped coming into town too early, the rise in use of the industrial estates on the edges of the town rather than the town centre didn't help small businesses. She felt that Cabinet should re-consider the proposal.

Councillor Gidney assured members that the car park situation was under consideration.

Councillor Kunes reminded Members that the multi storey car park was very rarely full. He also made reference to plans for the development of a further car park. He confirmed the number of spaces was around 100.

Councillor Squires commented that the types of properties being built did not assist the homeless.

**On being put to the vote the recommendation was agreed.**

**RESOLVED:** That the recommendations from the Cabinet meeting on 24 September 2019 be approved.

**The meeting closed at 9.24 pm**