

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

**Minutes from the Meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 28th November, 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, R Blunt, F Bone, C Bower, 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, A Lawrence, B Lawton, B Long, J Lowe, C Manning, G Middleton, J Moriarty, C Morley, S Nash, E Nockolds, T Parish, S Patel, J Ratcliffe, C Rose, J Rust, C Sampson, S Sandell, S Squire, M Storey, A Tyler, D Tyler, D Whitby and M Wilkinson

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors P Beal, J Bhondi, A Bubb, A Bullen and A Ryves

C:46 **PRAYERS**

Prayers were led by Rev Canon Ling

C:47 **MINUTES**

RESOLVED: The Minutes of the meeting held on 17 October 2019 were approved as a correct record, subject to the minute C45i considering CAB53 Boal Quay Gallery proposal reflecting the fact that the Regeneration and Development Panel proposals moved by Councillor Moriarty as an amendment were accepted, voted on and agreed.

C:48 **DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

None

C:49 **MAYOR'S COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

None

C:50 **URGENT BUSINESS**

None

C:51 **PETITIONS AND PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

The Mayor invited public questioners to come forward under standing order 9.

1) **Robert Raab:**

“Why was Hardings Way Road in King’s Lynn changed from an All Types of Transport Road to a Bus and Cycle Road only?”

Councillor Blunt gave the following response:

When Hardings Way was opened, Norfolk County Council traffic order (TRO) for the use of Hardings Way was for buses, cycles and emergency vehicles.

By way of supplementary Mr Raab asked why the Council wanted to change it back to pollute the area.

Councillor Blunt reiterated that it had never been changed, it was the same traffic order as originally opened with.

2) **Daphne Sampson – KClimate Concern**

Back at the April Council meeting George Gawlinski asked, on behalf of King’s Lynn Climate Concern, if the council would set up a local climate change partnership, a forum of people from across our community, including business, environmental organisations and councillors, to work together in seeking solutions to the ever rising greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere. We pointed out that this partnership was one of the two main ‘asks’ of the excellent Tomorrow’s Norfolk Today’s Challenge signed by the borough council ten years ago. The answer from Councillor Devereux was that the Environment Agency was looking into something similar as part of their planning and that the council was in communication on this. We continued to press for this when we were invited to the Local Plan Task Group in August.

What progress has there been?

Councillor Devereux gave the following response:

“Thank You for your Question. Yes, back in April The Environment Agency was in the process of consulting on their draft Flooding and Coastal Erosion and Risk Management Strategy up to the year 2100. A very important document for us in West Norfolk. A key objective was “Between now and 2050 the nation will be resilient to future flood and coastal risks. Over the next year the Environment Agency will work with partners to explore and develop the concept of standards for flood and coastal resilience”. The strategy attracted a significant national response from across England and is now being consolidated with further work across DEFRA.

However, through my role with the Environment Agency I am involved in one such collaborative activity. The Stakeholder Technical review of the “Future of the Fens” with the EA partners including County Councils, Borough & District Councils, Internal Drainage Boards, Anglian Water and other technical Authorities such as Utility companies and Highway Authorities. This is a long-term activity which will take several years to define the range of available

options and perhaps decades for implementation at considerable cost. This is an undertaking that must involve all stakeholders across Government, Industry, Commerce and Community from the highest levels –so partnership working will become essential for its success and our long-term survival.

Specifically on Climate Change mitigation, as you will see from my report later in the proceedings, we are working the Eastern and Great Ouse Regional Flood and Coastal Committees to understand the science, uncertainty and potential mitigation measures that might be taken on a Regional basis. I also attended the Norfolk Coastal Futures initiative with other Councils, National England, the Environment Agency and NGOs such as The RSPB , Norfolk Wildlife Trust, The Holkham Estate and the Norfolk Coast Partnership to share thoughts and experiences to inform development of potential strategies and actions.

This was followed up with the Norfolk Coast Partnership Members Forum last week where we all shared our plans and directions of travel. As a council, our Officers are developing a network of contacts and other resources that can assist in quantifying our approach and strategy including the UEA, Norfolk County Council and the New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership. At the local level we have also committed to consulting with communities as our plans and policies firm up. As we see through the media, this is a rapidly evolving matter with new policies, strategies and targets appearing almost on a daily basis, so it is vital we work closely with others engaged in similar work to make the best use of the resources available to us.”

By way of supplementary Ms Sampson asked that in view of the County Council aim to be carbon neutral by 2030, in what ways was the Borough Council taking a leadership role in sharing ideas, which the KLLimate group would welcome. She invited Councillor Devereux to a tree planting event on 2 March.

In response Councillor Devereux referred to the new environmental policy adopted by the County Council. The Borough’s officer team were setting out working arrangements with the County Council to address to work together to prevent duplication. He accepted the invitation to the tree planting event.

3) **Chris Rose**

Residents of Upwell/Outwell & Emneth have previously had unfettered access to the household waste/recycling site in Wisbech. However, recently Cambridgeshire County Council have revised their policy and are now clearly stating that residents of Norfolk County Council are not permitted to use the site. A number of us have corresponded with both county councils and our local MP however Cambridgeshire are adamant that under current arrangements we cannot use the site. The nearest full time site for us is now in Kings Lynn, using this site adds approximately 30 miles to the round trip and between an estimated 6 - 9 kgs of CO2 for each trip.

Can the Borough Council help to find a solution to the problem of access to a nearby recycling/household waste facilities which minimises the impact on the environment?

Councillor Devereux gave the following response

“Thank you for your question, I have no doubt that many other people in the western part of our Borough are also asking the same thing: why they can no longer make full use of the Household Waste Recycling Facility at Wisbech? My simple answer to you is “I will continue to try to help!”

However, as I'm sure you know, this is not a trivial task! So, for the benefit of others some important facts:-

- Household Waste Recycling Sites are generally provided under the Environmental Protection Act 1990
- They are provided by the Waste Disposal Authority, a County Council/Unitary Authority (not a District or Borough Council)
- They are provided for the residents of that County/Authority
- The Wisbech site is in Cambridgeshire (not Norfolk)

Cambridgeshire have up until recently allowed uncontrolled disposal of household waste to those living in the area. This has clearly been beneficial to our locals and many others who live nearer to sites provided by Cambridgeshire, rather than Norfolk. The issue however, is not just confined to people in Norfolk, it is happening all around their boundaries with other Counties. So, Cambridgeshire have been picking up the cost for the waste taken to their sites from their neighbouring County users.

Cambridgeshire County Council have decided to change matters and introduced a permit scheme and that has disadvantaged our Norfolk residents. We fully understand that access to the nearest, local service is a benefit, compared to the access to the same service provided by Norfolk County Council at King's Lynn or Crimplesham. It is also true that this council, like yourself, has no influence on the decisions made by Cambridgeshire. The decision that they have made is lawful and one which is not unique across the country.

The matter was raised during my last meeting with Norfolk Waste Partnership, when County Officers said that they did not favour the Cambridgeshire approach and had suggested instead either reciprocal arrangements, or, evidenced recharge of costs, but without success. I understand that the matter had been escalated through channels to central Government, who acknowledge that whilst there is a duty to cooperate, the decision ultimately lies with Cambridgeshire.

I suspect that in the short-term, the provision of a new Recycling facility on the Norfolk side is likely to be economically and environmentally 'unaffordable' to NCC. It could happen perhaps as part of a potential plant rationalisation consideration over the long-term.

So, for now, I intend to use the recent adoption of the new Norfolk County Council Environment Policy to provide further leverage through the NWP to seek a new cooperative arrangement to mitigate the increased carbon footprint consequent on the Cambridgeshire decision for the mutual benefit of all our communities.”

By way of supplementary Mr Rose welcomed partnership working and suggested that the local residents be involved in looking for solutions.

Councillor Devereux explained that the relationship was to be addressed through the Waste Board which he would raise it through, but as a county function it would be for them to decide if they would accept direct petitions.

4) Andrew Nixon on behalf of the Eastern Counties section of the Showmen's Guild.

Members of the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk. While it was agreed that in regards to the right to hold a fair after the tragic accident in 2012 it was established that the Showmen's Guild would work with the elected Task Group to review all aspects of the future operations and arrangements to enable the Mart to take place, and that a fair, just and proportionate agreement be made to the mixture of measures to ensure the Mart would be sustainable for the future. We have been trying to draw your attention over the last eight months to the fact that the current terms of this agreement has included a number of human oversights and procedural anomalies that we would like recognised and corrected. This primarily being the fact that 2020, being a leap year, causes the agreed three weekends to fall correctly within the agreed terms just mentioned; in lieu of our agreement to forgo the Monday and Tuesday.

We feel all our attempts over these last eight months to draw your attention and illicit a timely response to these oversights and anomalies have been ignored. It is our belief that in you being a public authority whose primary duty is to be fair, equal and non discriminatory are denying us a fair, just and proportionate claim to our rights to pursue both our cultural rights set out in this agreement and diminishing the right to pursue our cultural way of life for such an important and significant fair within our community. Therefore our question is, for what reasons are you refusing to recognise and correct this human oversight contained within this agreement?

Councillor Nockolds gave the following response:

“Good evening Mr Nixon, thank you for your question. I have always supported the Showmans Guild and have attended the Mart since 1960.

You rightly claim that ourselves and the Showmans Guild attended several Task Group meetings together with local businesses and residents including the local bus company.

The recommendations of the Task Group were supported by our Review Panel. On 11th June 2014 the recommendation from Cabinet to the Council was to accept the rolling 6 year agreement between the Showman's Guild and the Borough Council. This was agreed and we have both been working within that programme.

At a meeting between the Showman's Guild and ourselves, in November 2017 to discuss contractual agreements for 2018, your solicitor confirmed that the Showman's Guild wished to secure a 5year rolling agreement, once the Safeguarding Policy, Event Management plan and the provision of a pedestrian Crossing Point issues were addressed.

Finally it was agreed that the number of operational days for the period of 2018 to 2022 be included in the rolling 5 year agreement, which is on the same basis as the 2014 agreement which went through Full Council.

This evening you state that you feel we have ignored you during the last 8 months. As I understand it we have been corresponding with you, via letters, one of which took you no less than 8 weeks to reply to.

Unfortunately you held a meeting in Yaxley in late July which we could not attend.

A letter of explanation was given, with the reasons that we were evaluating the implications of your request due to your oversight.

A meeting was held with yourselves on 10th September 2019, at which 2 ongoing projects were explained following the contractual closure.

An overview of the proposed works to the Corn Exchange during and after the Mart which potentially included a road closure.

As stated in our letter to the solicitor dated 30th October 2019, we are unable to vary from the contract for the 2020 Mart. We have reviewed the notes of our meeting with the Guild Solicitor during the drafting of the contract and they show that the dates were scrutinized as part of the meeting before the Agreement was signed.

It is unfortunate that this anomaly was not recognized at the time. We have worked in good faith in planning other projects.

As you have been informed we have 2 projects on-going which currently rely upon the availability of the TMP in the week immediately following the closure date of the Mart 2020.

This significant project is the substantial works to the Corn Exchange where it is envisaged that part of the new roof structure will be built in the TMP prior to being craned into place.

We want to work with you and offer assistance.

In our letter to you dated 30th October we have asked what your specific situation is regarding what appears to be a spare week within the Showman's Guild calendar.

We are offering an alternative location in the Borough as well as giving you the choice of arriving earlier than the contract date you have signed, we have yet to receive a reply from you.

By way of supplementary, Mr Nixon asked that the issue was as a result of the leap year and the agreement there was a shortfall of 6 days not covered by the current agreement which had allowed the Borough schedule works at the Corn Exchange. He asked if there was no change to the agreement who would shoulder the loss of earning. He that the Borough had known about the issue in February 2019, and the decision on the Corn Exchange was not made until June 2019.

Councillor Mrs Nockolds responded that the tenders for the Corn Exchange work were already out at that time. She reminded them to contact the Borough regarding the offer made and if there were any problems with this.

C:52

DETERMINATION OF COUNCIL TAX DISCOUNTS RELATING TO SECOND HOMES AND EMPTY DWELLINGS FOR 2020/2021

RESOLVED: That under Section 11A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as enacted by Section 75 of the Local Government Act 2003, Section 11B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as enacted by Section 11 and Section 12 of the Local Government Finance Act 2012 and in accordance with the provisions of the Council Tax (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings) (England) Regulations 2003, the Council Tax (Prescribed Classes of Dwellings) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 and the Rating (Property in Common Occupation) and Council Tax (Empty Dwellings) Act 2018 the Council determines:

1. That the council tax discount for Second Homes defined as being within Class A of the Regulations be set at 0% for 2020/2021;
2. That the council tax discount for Second Homes as defined by Class B of the Regulations be set at 0% for 2020/2021;
3. That the council tax discount for Empty / Unfurnished dwellings defined as being within Class C of the Regulations be set at 0% for 2020/2021;
4. That the council tax discount for Uninhabitable dwellings defined as being within Class D of the Regulations be set at the following for 2020/2021:
 - a. 25% for 12 months starting on the day the dwelling becomes uninhabitable; then
 - b. 0% once the 12 month period has expired;
5. That the Levy rate for Long Term Empty Dwellings as defined in the Regulations be set as follows for 2020/2021:
 - a. 100% for properties empty between two and five years, and
 - b. 200% for properties empty longer than five years;
6. That any period of occupation of less than six weeks shall be disregarded when calculating the maximum period of a reduction or the start date of the Levy;
7. That delegated authority be given for individual applications under s13a Local Government Finance Act 1992 to be determined by the Revenues and Benefits Manager in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Resources and Performance and the relevant Ward Member/s.
8. In accordance with Section 11A(6) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as enacted by Section 75 of the Local Government Act 2003 and the Local Government Finance Act 2012, these determinations shall be published in at least one newspaper circulating in West

Norfolk before the end of the period of 21 days beginning with the date of the determinations.

C:53 **CABINET MEMBERS REPORTS**

i **Business Development - Councillor G Middleton**

Councillor Middleton presented his report. In response to a question from Councillor Kemp on what he could suggest to encourage the raising of wages in the area, Councillor Middleton suggested it was a matter to raise with the new MP when elected to raise the minimum wage, as apart from this and ensuring they remained within legal frameworks, what firms paid their employees was the decision of the firms themselves. He reminded Members of the economic development work being done by the council.

Following a question from Councillor Squires on a Sunday Times article on unemployment hotspots which featured King's Lynn and what was being done to stop the unemployment increase, Councillor Middleton referred to the bids made under the Future High Streets fund to assist with the town centres. He disputed the figures quoted and encouraged people to come to King's Lynn and see what was on offer.

Councillor Rust asked what was being done to ensure the Future High Streets Fund would incorporate the views of the public. Councillor Middleton responded that the deadline had been changed to the end of January for draft submissions with final submissions in April and that the Vision Kings Lynn brand and Love West Norfolk and social media were being used to spread information.

ii **Commercial Services - Councillor P Kunes**

Councillor Kunes presented his report. He informed members that the tap in and out facility at the multi storey car park was now working well.

iii **Development - Councillor R Blunt**

Councillor Blunt presented his report. A question was raised by Councillor Kemp on the consideration by the Corporate Performance Panel (CPP) of the call in on the County Council Waste and Minerals strategy comments asking why the issue of fracking and incineration had not been included in the response. Councillor Blunt indicated that he would update his decision in accordance with the recommendations from CPP as a matter of urgency as he didn't want to jeopardise the comments made to remove Shouldham from the document. He also agreed to incorporate some wording on fracking and incineration.

In response to a question from Councillor Rust on what steps were being taken to analyse and change planning income forecasts for the following year. Councillor Blunt explained that they were regularly analysed, and it was not planned to amend the figures a small number of large applications would cover the shortfall. He confirmed there was no impact of not changing the figures.

iv Environment - Councillor I Devereux

Councillor Devereux presented his report. He undertook to forward to Councillor de Whalley a copy of a presentation he had recently attended on Local Decisions around climate change.

Following a question from Councillor Squires, Councillor Devereux confirmed that the Council had adopted a ban on the release of balloons and Chinese lanterns on its land some time ago.

Councillor Devereux undertook to organise a briefing for Councillors on sea level rises and mitigation being undertaken when requested by Councillor Squires.

In response to a comment from Councillor Kemp that building plots in the flood plain should be removed from the plan as they weren't appropriate for older or disabled people, Councillor Devereux reminded Members that flood risk assessments would have to be carried out on all plots and the levels would have to be revised according to the levels at any time. Councillor Blunt also responded that the Local Plan Task Group was considering sites, and all issues would have to be considered.

Following a question from Councillor Mrs Collop about the emptying of very full bins and the jamming of items in the bottom of the bin, Councillor Devereux explained that the lorries did shake the bin on emptying, but encouraged householders to clean their bins.

Councillor Jones asked whether the IPCC reports sea level were threats to coast and whether the current strategies were sufficient to safeguard towns and villages. Councillor Devereux commented that there was little doubt that there would be evolution to what was currently used. He concurred that he wanted to know the Environment Agency sea level rise predictions in the borough's area.

In response to a question from Councillor Parish as to the remit of permits to extract water and the environmental impact on chalk streams, Councillor Devereux informed members that the Council had recently joined the Water Resources East Group which examined the use of the water resources in the area. He acknowledged the importance of chalk streams to the local flora and fauna.

In response to Councillor A Tyler asking what arrangements were being put in place to inform households of what to put in the recycling bins, Councillor Devereux said he expected the information to be on the Christmas delivery leaflets as it had been in previous years.

Following a question from Councillor Rust whether the remediation work to Heacham beach wasn't taking place due to lack of funding, Councillor Devereux confirmed that the shingle bank work was paid for by the Environment Agency and the Community Interest Company, however the amount of shingle needed to be recycled was less than expected, the annual recycling works would be completed as usual in February/March next year.

Councillor Rust asked whether having attended the flood workshop Councillor Devereux had a greater understanding of the climate emergency and the

need to declare. She also asked the views of the owners of new builds at Snettisham on this. Councillor Devereux referred to the presentation he had attended and again undertook to provide this for members. He indicated that the people purchasing the new properties at Snettisham knew the risks of what they were purchasing.

In response to a question from Councillor Moriarty about the joint waste collection procurement and the portfolio holders involvement in the process, Councillor Devereux confirmed he was regularly briefed at portfolio meetings with officers. He deferred any comment on this until the special Cabinet meeting on Friday 6 December, and confirmed he was not involved in the detailed contractual arrangements as this was carried out by a panel of professional officers.

In response to a question from Councillor Dark as to how the preparatory work on the Climate Change item containing relevant information was progressing. Councillor Devereux confirmed he had that day received a draft of the report which would go to the January Cabinet meeting.

v **Housing - Councillor A Lawrence**

Councillor Lawrence presented his report and in response to questions from Councillor J Collop regarding the length of time applicants remained on the Home Choice register as the numbers were so high, explained that people came on and off the register all the time. As there were 43 properties available in the previous period, 43 people had been removed from the register, they had been replaced by new applicants.

In response to a question from Councillor J Collop asking if he agreed that the night shelter and its volunteers were a worthy cause and its volunteers were to be commended. Councillor Lawrence commended the night shelter, Churches Together and all the volunteers who gave up their time to assist. He thanked all those involved.

Councillor Bone made comments on the need to provide more social housing as well as trying to get people into private rented. Councillor Lawrence confirmed that the Council was trying to assist with the social housing situation, and also assisted tenants with deposits etc.

Councillor Joyce drew Council's attention to the fact that Home Choice provided an update to a system previously that was open to abuse.

In response to a question from Councillor Howman regarding the numbers of empty homes, Councillor Lawrence reminded members he had undertaken to provide it quarterly or half yearly.

Councillor Rust asked how many private renters made homeless were on the Home Choice list. Councillor Lawrence undertook to investigate.

vi **Project Delivery - Councillor P Gidney**

Councillor Gidney presented his report, he confirmed to Councillor Moriarty that the web site referred to in his report should be ready for the next meeting.

In response to a question from Councillor Kemp on whether the town's library was being decommissioned and moved elsewhere and whether the Borough would resist this, Councillor Gidney reminded Members that this was a County Council building and function.

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

Councillor Nockolds presented her report, and responded to Councillor Squire's question regarding the number of new members signed up for the Alive West Norfolk, confirming that the numbers of new member contracts were 947.

In response to Councillor Rust's question on what analysis was given to the contractor selection for the cinema works, Councillor Nockolds confirmed that interviews and tender evaluation was carried out, the project manager lived locally.

Councillor Kemp asked what the situation was regarding Fairstead surgery as the CCG had postponed their meeting to take a decision on it, Councillor Mrs Nockolds confirmed that the CCG would call a meeting after the election.

In response to a further question from Councillor Kemp regarding the pop in centre facing closure Councillor Mrs Nockolds confirmed that the Lily Co-ordinator had made contact with the group, offering help with funding, but had received no reply. In order to assist the Council would need to know the financial situation.

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

Councillor Long presented his report. He informed Members that he had attended the Leeway event relating to raising awareness of domestic violence which was at the Town Hall and moving around the county as part of the campaign.

With regard to the Sunday Times report referred to earlier in the meeting, Councillor J Collop asked what the Council were doing to assist. Councillor Long responded by stating that the unemployment rates in King's Lynn were below the East of England average. He believed they had factored in job losses from CITB. The Council were working hard to assist in identifying potential jobs for those made redundant. The situation was changing, there were businesses taking on more staff, he encouraged members to concentrate on the positive opportunities and not on the negative. He referred to the presentation members had received earlier which showed unemployment was low.

Councillor Morley asked that the Leaders report contain more financial information, key data, productivity and asset utilisation. He also asked how many jobs had been relocated from CITB. Councillor Long directed Members to the monthly Monitoring report which was issued to all councillors. He undertook to check the number of jobs relocated from CITB.

Councillor Rust asked how many of the jobs in the area were full time or other contracts. Councillor Long referred Members to the presentation received as part of their briefing.

C:54 **MEMBERS QUESTION TIME**

None

C:55 **RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COUNCIL BODIES**

i **Cabinet: 12 November 2019**

Councillor Long proposed the recommendations from Cabinet with the amended policy in CAB66. This was seconded by Councillor Nockolds.

CAB65: Corporate Complaints Policy

CAB66: Revised Unreasonable Complaints (revised policy)

RESOLVED: That the recommendations from the meeting on 12 November 2019 be agreed.

C:56 **APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES TO INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARDS**

RESOLVED: 1) That Council delegates authority to officers to seek nominations for vacant positions on Internal Drainage Boards from group leaders and thereafter ballot members for their votes to be returned within a set time scale.

2) That this approach be endorsed for future appointments to IDBs.

C:57 **NOTICES OF MOTION**

1) Notice of Motion (7/19)

Councillor J Rust proposed the Notice of Motion, this was seconded by Councillor Jones.

“Council are asked that the Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk

(i) recognises that councils can play a central role in creating sustainable communities, particularly through the provision of locally generated renewable electricity;

(ii) further recognises

- that very large financial setup and running costs involved in selling locally generated renewable electricity to local customers result in it being impossible for local renewable electricity generators to do so,
- that making these financial costs proportionate to the scale of a renewable electricity supplier's operation would create significant opportunities for councils to be providers of locally generated

renewable electricity directly to local people, businesses and organisations, and

- that revenues received by councils that became local renewable electricity providers could be used to help fund local greenhouse gas emissions reduction measures and to help improve local services and facilities;

(iii) accordingly resolves to support the Local Electricity Bill, currently supported by a cross-party group of 115 MPs, and which, if made law, would make the setup and running costs of selling renewable electricity to local customers proportionate by establishing a Right to Local Supply; and

(iv) further resolves to

- inform the local media of this decision,
- write to local MPs, asking them to support the Bill, and
- write to the organisers of the campaign for the Bill, Power for People, (at 8 Delancey Passage, Camden, London NW1 7NN or info@powerforpeople.org.uk) expressing its support.”

Councillor Long urged Councillors not to support the motion which was submitted by a lobby group. He considered the Motion premature, and did not agree that the majority of the population welcomed on shore wind farms as opposed to off shore.

Councillor A Tyler expressed his support for the proposal. Councillor Joyce considered the pros and cons of the argument but supported it in principle.

Councillor Dark spoke against the motion due to the number of disadvantages such as unpredictable speeds, variable directions not most efficient use of the turbines, noise and the danger to birds, less efficient than off shore turbines. He acknowledged the need to move to cleaner energy but could make things worse.

Councillor Parish drew attention to the Government statement that there would not be more on shore wind turbines due to the impact on people and bird life. The off shore option was more efficient.

Councillor Ayres drew attention to the large campaign in his ward against a wind turbine, and the fact that Scotland required a turbine to be 1.5Km away from a property.

In summing up, Councillor Rust thanked members for the feedback but urged members not to dismiss because it had been put forward by a lobby group. She considered that many of the community would benefit from this energy sold to them.

On being put to the vote the motion was lost.

RESOLVED: That the Motion is lost.

2) Notice of Motion (8/19)

Councillor J Rust proposed the Motion, seconded by Councillor Howman.

“Our council resurrected the Freedom of the Borough award in 2003 after a long period of absence. The criteria for the nomination of the award only state that the nominee must have given outstanding service to the borough. The leader of the council has previously stated that “they” have set the bar high. Based on those who have been awarded the freedom compared to those who have been nominated and not granted it, that bar could be deemed to have been set at a measure invisible to most and arbitrary at best. This motion sets to change that and instead, provide clearer guidelines on what could be considered to fulfil the criteria.

This council is asked to adopt the following criteria when awarding this honour.

The conferment of the Honorary Freedom of the Borough is a mark of distinction upon the person or persons whom the council wishes to honour. The freedom itself carries no privilege and is purely an honour, reflecting the eminence of the person on whom it is conferred or as recognition of significant and/or valuable services rendered to the borough by that person. It is normally an honour bestowed on those of note who have lived or worked in the borough and who are proud to be a part of the history of that borough through that freedom. It should not be awarded to serving councillors.

What criteria should be used to award this status?

The principle is that these awards should be made on merit, defined as:

- Achievement
- Exceptional Service

Awards should not be given merely for a job well done or because someone has reached a particular level. They should be awarded because an individual has gone over and above what is expected or what has previously been seen as the standard, being seen to have demonstrated “Service Above Self” and to stand above others in what has been achieved before.

To be considered for the award a nominee should meet at least two of the following criteria:

1. Delivered in a way that has brought distinction to borough life and enhanced the reputation of the borough in the area or activity concerned
2. Contributed in a way to improve the lives of those less able to help themselves
3. Demonstrated innovation and entrepreneurship which is delivering discernible benefits to the area or activity concerned.

For candidates to be considered they must be able to demonstrate a strong and continuing connection with, and commitment to, the borough or to have made a major contribution to national life and, in doing so, have enhanced the reputation of the borough.

People from all walks of life and all sections of society who have made a difference to the community and the borough are eligible to be nominated, provided that, at the time of nomination, they are living in the borough.

It could be include the following

- Artistic and cultural endeavours
- Business, economic growth and prosperity

- Charitable work
- Improvement to built and natural environment
- Religious and spiritual life
- Sports activities
- Civic service

Nominations for persons or organisations to be granted the Freedom of the Borough may be made by any resident of the borough who are on the electoral roll. Each nomination must be supported by at least 5 referees to testify to the nominee's worthiness, two of whom at least should be currently resident citizens of the Borough.

A form shall be drafted which enables the nominating person to set out clearly the necessary details for the award and should include the following

Nominees details – information about the person being nominated . Surname, forename, nickname, Title Address, Telephone Number, Email address

The recommendation – the details of how the nominees has made a significant contribution in their area of activity – giving as much detail as possible

What role they have excelled in?

How have they demonstrated service worthy of recognition?

How has the nominee contribution impacted on their particular field, locality, group or the community at large?

Over what time period did the nominee make their contribution or major commitment?

What makes this person stand out from others doing similar work?

Background Info

Full details of post(s) held by nominee, paid or voluntary, which support or are relevant to your nomination. Start and end dates, or if they're still involved.

Letters of support – one letter of support may be submitted. Confidentiality must be maintained and details of the nomination must not be discussed with any others persons or with the nominee.

Details of the person making the nomination

Surname

Forename

Address

Telephone Number

Email address

Relationship to nominee

Signature

Date

Confidentiality statement"

Under standing order 14.6 the Leader proposed that the item be referred to Corporate Performance Panel on the basis that the Council chamber was not the right place to develop new policy. This was seconded by Councillor Mrs Nockolds. Councillor Dark as Chair of the Panel confirmed he would be happy to consider the item.

On being put to the vote the proposal was agreed.

RESOLVED: That the Motion be referred to Corporate Performance Panel.

3) Notice of Motion 9/19

Councillor S Squires proposed the Motion, drawing attention to the importance of trees in the Borough's performance against climate change. She reminded Members of the County Council and North Norfolk District Council's decisions on tree planting. Councillor Squires offered Councillors a young native sapling to plant either in their gardens or in an area within their wards.

"Council notes that the annual report on carbon emission from the Department for Business Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) reports that the per capita impact for the King's Lynn & West Norfolk area was 8 tonnes per capita, well above the Norfolk average of 5.7 tonnes and the UK average of 5.4 tonnes.

This council acknowledges that trees are a vital resource in helping to combat climate change and for carbon sequestration.

Therefore this council agrees to plant the equivalent of one tree for every Resident in the Borough, spread over a period of 4 years, creating community woodlands, which will not only reduce our carbon impact but will benefit wildlife and provide valuable green space to improve the lives of West Norfolk residents in years to come."

This was seconded by Councillor de Whalley who drew attention to the fact that trees were the most socially acceptable means of carbon reduction in the fight against climate change.

In debating the item Councillor Devereux proposed the following amendment to the Motion:

To replace the third paragraph by:

"This council acknowledges a recent decision by Norfolk County Council in planting a net gain of 1 million trees over the next 5 years across the County.

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council therefore endeavours to:

- 1) Commit full support to NCC in delivering its objective
- 2) Urge cabinet to incorporate its own tree planting plan within its ongoing climate change proposals"

He drew attention to the Council's tree strategy and the work going on to plant trees and work being done with schools and as part of planning applications to encourage tree planting. He reminded members that as part of the CIL arrangements where parishes were awarded CIL finances they could spend the money on planting trees.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Middleton who encouraged members to vote for the amendment whereby cabinet members could work with officers to deliver.

Councillor Squires asked if the Tree Strategy could be re-visited as it concentrated on King's Lynn and the parks. Councillor Long drew attention to the fact that the Environment and Community Panel could request it to be looked at.

Councillor Moriarty sought reassurance that the matter would be treated urgently, in which case he would support it.

Councillor Squires accepted the amendment.

On debating the substantive motion Councillor Moriarty drew attention to the window for planting trees until March, and the fact there were organisations willing to offer saplings and land to plant them on.

It was confirmed it would be treated as urgent. The part time nature of the Tree officer was drawn to members attention. Councillor Squires informed Members that the County Council had offered help if any was needed on the tree advice front.

RESOLVED: That the motion, amended as follows, be agreed.

“Council notes that the annual report on carbon emission from the Department for Business Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS) reports that the per capita impact for the King's Lynn & West Norfolk area was 8 tonnes per capita, well above the Norfolk average of 5.7 tonnes and the UK average of 5.4 tonnes.

This council acknowledges that trees are a vital resource in helping to combat climate change and for carbon sequestration.

This council acknowledges a recent decision by Norfolk County Council in planting a net gain of 1 million trees over the next 5 years across the County.

King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council therefore endeavours to:

- 1) Commit full support to NCC in delivering its objective
- 2) Urge cabinet to incorporate its own tree planting plan within its ongoing climate change proposals”

4) Notice of Motion 10/19

Councillor T Parish proposed the following Notice of Motion stating that written minutes didn't reflect the flavour of the meeting, and when challenged it relied on the memories of councillors.

‘This Council requires all dialogue within Full Council and that of Panels, Committees, and Task Groups to be recorded digitally as soon as possible.

The digital recordings to be made available to all who would normally have access to written minutes. In addition, the minutes of Council and the other bodies must not be signed off until any queries have been addressed, with reference to the recording, should that prove necessary.

Digital recording should at least reduce and, hopefully, remove members' concerns that some matters pertinent to themselves or to the party or group they belong to, are not lost within the difficult task of balancing the length of written minutes with the need to keep them succinct.'

In seconding the Motion, Councillor Moriarty proposed that under standing order 14.6 the item be referred to Cabinet. This was seconded by Councillor Parish.

Councillor Long disagreed with the proposal to refer to Cabinet. Councillor Joyce stated he felt it should be considered. By way of clarification, Councillor Parish confirmed he meant sound recording. Councillor Rust supported the proposal as she had asked for minutes to be amended and they had previously been sent out unamended. Councillor Lawton agreed with the proposal. Councillor Kemp agreed with the proposal and felt that it should be live streamed.

Councillor Mrs Nockolds drew attention to the fact that Cabinet did not do policy development.

Councillor Dark explained that the dynamics of whether it would work would be the Panel.

As a point of order Councillor Long explained that if the proposal had been to refer the Motion to Corporate Performance Panel he would have supported it.

In dealing with the proposal to refer to Cabinet, Councillor Moriarty accepted the suggestion that the Motion be referred to Corporate Performance Panel.

On being put to the vote, this was carried.

RESOLVED: That the Motion be referred to Corporate Performance Panel for consideration.

The meeting closed at 9.15 pm