

Minutes of a meeting of the **Council** held at Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Thorpe St Andrew, Norwich on **Thursday 20 February 2020** at **7.00pm** when there were present:

Mrs K A Vincent – Chairman

Mr A D Adams	Ms S I Holland	Mr S Riley
Mr N J Brennan	Mrs N C Karimi-Ghovanlou	Mr D Roper
Mr D J Britcher	Mr K S Kelly	Mr N C Shaw
Mr P E Bulman	Mr D King	Mr M D Snowling
Ms S J Catchpole	Miss S Lawn	Mrs L A Starling
Mr S M Clancy	Dr K E Lawrence	Mr D M Thomas
Mr A D Crotch	Mrs J Leggett	Miss J L Thomas
Mr J J Emsell	Mr K G Leggett	Mr S A Vincent
Mr J F Fisher	Mrs T M Mancini-Boyle	Mr S C Walker
Mr R R Foulger	Mr M L Murrell	Mr J M Ward
Ms R M Grattan	Mr G K Nurden	Mr F Whymark
Mr D Harrison	Mr G Peck	
Mrs L H Hempsall	Mrs S M Prutton	

Also in attendance were the Director of Resources, the Assistant Director Governance & Business Support (Monitoring Officer), the Assistant Director Finance & Chief Financial Officer (Section 151 Officer) and the Committee Officer (DM).

106 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER PROCEDURAL RULE NO 8

Member/ Officer	Minute No & Heading	Nature of Interest
The Chairman on behalf of all Members	108 - Review of the Broadland Scheme of Members' Allowances	Pecuniary Interest - In accordance with the Constitution, Part 4 Rules of Procedure, Section 8 – Interests to be declared at meetings – the Monitoring Officer granted a dispensation to all Members of the Council to enable discussion and voting on this item.

107 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Mr S C Beadle, Mrs J K Copplestone, Mrs B Cook, Mrs S C Gurney, Ms N J Harpley, Mr I J Mackie, Ms J A Neesam and Ms C E Ryman-Tubb.

108 REVIEW OF THE BROADLAND SCHEME OF MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Mr P Franzen, Chairman of the Broadland Independent Remuneration Panel. Mr Franzen explained that the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) had been convened in October 2019 to undertake an exercise to find a solution to the current remuneration scheme in Broadland. It had become apparent early in the process that there was insufficient data available to undertake a full review and, in view of the short timeframe given to the Panel to report on its findings, it had been agreed to progress with an interim review of basic and special responsibility allowances (SRAs) pending a more detailed review which could be undertaken in conjunction with South Norfolk's scheme which was due for review by May 2020. The Panel had been ready to report its findings by the December 2019 deadline but this had been deferred because of the Parliamentary Election held that month. The review had concluded that there was little rationale and methodology to the current allowance scheme and how the levels of allowances had been determined. The existing allowances had therefore been reviewed against comparable local authorities and it was clear the Broadland allowances had fallen considerably behind the levels of other Norfolk authorities and an increase of circa 30% was needed to bring these in line. The Panel was conscious of the potential public perception associated with such an increase but felt this should not colour the integrity of the Panel's findings. Mr Franzen went on to state that he had been involved in work to review allowances at the County Council and South Norfolk Council and that the ideal model used to determine SRAs should have a clear methodology, for example, be based on a percentage of the allowance paid to the Leader, and should be mindful of government guidance that SRAs should be limited in number and should only be awarded to roles with significant extra responsibility. The Panel's findings had been shared with the current Administration who had raised a number of potential changes but the Panel had not received any evidence to support the suggestions.

The following questions were then put to Mr Franzen:

1. *Overall scheme and Methodology – mindful of the changing times for Councillors which was far more demanding than ever before, with more and more being expected at a local level - the IRP were seeking to establish the principles of the Members' Allowance scheme and that it should be inclusive, based on fairness, simple to understand and operate and transparent (clear who is getting what). Why were members not asked to complete the questionnaire which would have provided the IRP with data and information?*

The six week time frame given to complete the interim review had not given sufficient time to gather this data. Similar data gathered in the past had not assisted with previous reviews. The detailed review could allow for this data to be collected if required.

2. *Chairman's allowance - while it was recognised that it was an honour to hold the role of Chairman of the Council, there does need to be consideration of the huge amount of time and energy that goes into making the role a success and promoting Broadland. The report states that the current allowance for the Chairman is "relatively low compared to some others in Norfolk". Indeed it is the lowest across Norfolk by some margin. The IRP's recommendation of increasing the Chairman's allowance to £1,967 would still leave it as the lowest, by some margin, compared to other Norfolk councils and the resolution to this was to consider an 'honorarium' to "top-up" the allowance. Is there a reason an amount was not recommended? Would setting the level around the 'Norfolk average' be an appropriate approach to take?*

The Panel did not have sufficient evidence to demonstrate significant extra responsibility as required by government guidance. The amount of time spent on the role and the "civic" element of the role alone did not satisfy this. An amount of honorarium was not proposed as the Panel did not have sufficient information to fully understand the role and make an informed judgement on an appropriate level and it would have been inappropriate to settle for a Norfolk average. The Panel was however mindful that the current allowance had fallen significantly behind and had endeavoured to find a quick fix.

3. *Leader's allowance - the recommendation was to increase the Leader's allowance by 31.06% but immediately reduce it – the real rise is 14.67%. This is considerably below the average of other Norfolk councils. Why was this figure picked as it is not even the same as the South Norfolk allowance?*

The Panel had attempted to increase transparency by splitting the allowance to reflect the roles of Leader of the Council and Leader of the majority group and increasing the allowance in line with the recommended increase in the basic allowance to provide some rationale for the allowance. The South Norfolk allowance had not been used as a benchmark; instead data had been used from other comparable councils. It was acknowledged that the allowance was still low compared to other Norfolk councils.

4. *Leader of the main opposition group allowance - the Panel has recommended the basic allowance be increased as it "gives parity with South Norfolk" but this is not the case with the role of Leader of the main opposition group. Why is a reduction in the current allowance being recommended which is significantly lower than SNC?*

Why does the Panel acknowledge the role of the Leader of the main opposition group in relation to a manager of the group but not as the shadow Leader?

Further work was needed at the next review to examine the allowances at South Norfolk to ensure they were at an appropriate level and whilst they had been used to give the desired parity across both councils where appropriate, not all the figures could be supported at this time.

The Panel had not been able to engage with the Leader of the Opposition as part of the review so could not take their views into account and had no information before them in relation to this. The Leader of the Opposition referred to a breakdown in communication on this matter and stated that he would welcome the opportunity to engage with the Panel for the next detailed review.

5. *Basic allowance – why was the suggested increase still considerably below the average of other Norfolk councils? Whilst it was accepted that the level gave “parity with South Norfolk” what was to say their allowance was set at the appropriate level – the IRP recommendation would still leave the basic allowance significantly below the average of the other Norfolk councils?*

The current allowance was the lowest in the County and the recommended increase had been derived not by applying a percentage increase but by endeavouring to place Broadland in the appropriate quartile in the County and to have parity with the South Norfolk allowance. The Norfolk average was skewed as a result of a higher allowance paid in some other councils.

6. *Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny allowance - the Panel has recommended the basic allowance be increased as it “gives parity with South Norfolk” but this is not the case with the role of Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny - why is a much lower SRA being recommended?*

Further work was needed at the next review to examine the allowances at South Norfolk to ensure they were at an appropriate level and, whilst they had been used to give the desired parity across both councils where appropriate, not all the figures could be supported at this time.

7. *Outside organisations – why was there no SRA for Members appointed to outside organisations?*

This was a matter which would be included in the full review mindful of the need to have regard to the government guidance requiring significant extra responsibility to justify a SRA.

With regard to the changes proposed to the overall scheme, a concern was expressed about the recommended increases stating that Members had accepted the levels of allowances when elected to their roles and these

should not be reviewed until the end of the current term of office. It was also suggested that the time was not right to be supporting the increases proposed pending the more detailed review in conjunction with South Norfolk and in the light of the haste in which the current review had been undertaken and with little supporting evidence.

The Chairman thanked Mr Franzen for his work with the Panel on the interim review and Mr Franzen left the meeting. The Chairman invited Members to consider each of the recommendations in turn.

(1) Basic Allowance

Reference was made to the level to which Broadland allowances fell well below those at other Norfolk authorities and to the principles which needed to be applied in setting the appropriate allowances: inclusivity and ensuring the allowance did not exclude anyone from joining the Council as an elected Member, fairness, transparency and simplicity. The role of a councillor was becoming increasingly demanding and there was a need to ensure councillors were representative of all sectors of the community. It was proposed, seconded and, on being put the vote

RESOLVED to increase the basic allowance from £3,712 to £4,865 and to continue to link the allowance to the annual pay award for staff.

(2) Leader of the Council

It was suggested that the Panel's recommendation to split the Leader's allowance into two elements could lead to confusion and detract from the agreed principles in terms of simplicity and transparency. An amendment was proposed, duly seconded to not create two allowances but to increase the existing allowance in line with the increase for the basic allowance (31.06%) resulting in an allowance of £12,908. On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried. Members then voted on the substantive motion and it was

RESOLVED to not create two allowances but to increase the current allowance to £12,908.

(3) Chairman of the Council

Reference was made to the fact that the Broadland allowance for the Chairman of the Council was the lowest in Norfolk at £1,501 with the highest being £6,325. There was concern that the use of an honorarium to close the gap would not be transparent or practical as it would need to be reviewed each year and could reflect the person appointed and not the role. A clearer, more transparent option was needed and a recognition of the importance of the role. An amendment was proposed that the allowance for the Chairman of the Council be

set at 30% of the allowance of the Leader, resulting in an allowance of £3,872. On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried. Members then voted on the substantive motion and it was

RESOLVED to set the allowance for the Chairman of the Council at 30% of the allowance of the Leader, resulting in an allowance of £3,872.

(4) Vice-Chairman of the Council

It was suggested that it was no longer appropriate to maintain the current level of this allowance (50% of the Chairman's allowance) having regard to the requirements of the role but that an increase was appropriate. An amendment was proposed, duly seconded that the current level of the allowance be set at 25% of the new Chairman's allowance resulting in an allowance of £968 which was still below the Norfolk average. On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried. Members then voted on the substantive motion and it was

RESOLVED to set the Vice-Chairman's allowance at 25% of the new Chairman's allowance resulting in an allowance of £968.

(5) Portfolio Holders

Reference was made to the need to recognise the importance of these roles and that the recommendations of the IRP should be supported. This would see the new level still below the Norfolk average. It was proposed, seconded and, on being put to the vote,

RESOLVED to increase the allowance to Portfolio Holders from £5,628 to £6,454 (50% of the allowance of the Leader).

(6) Chairman of the Planning Committee

It was suggested that the recommendations of the IRP should be supported in relation to this allowance and it was proposed, seconded and, on being put to the vote,

RESOLVED to increase the allowance to the Chairman of the Planning Committee from £1,876 to £3,872 (30% of the allowance of the Leader).

(7) Chairman of the Audit Committee

It was suggested that the recommendations of the IRP should be supported in relation to this allowance and it was proposed, seconded and, on being put to the vote,

RESOLVED to increase the allowance to the Chairman of the Audit

Committee from £1,127 to £2,582; (20% of the allowance of the Leader).

(8) Chairman of the Licensing & Regulatory Committee

It was suggested that this allowance needed to increase to recognise the importance of the role and how far below the Norfolk average the current allowance was set. It was however felt that the Panel's proposed increase was too high and that the allowance should be aligned to that of the Chairman of the Audit Committee. An amendment was therefore proposed, duly seconded, that the current level of the allowance be set at 20% of the allowance of the Leader resulting in an allowance of £2,582. On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried. Members then voted on the substantive motion and it was

RESOLVED to set the allowance for the Chairman of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee at 20% of the Leader's allowance resulting in an allowance of £2,582.

(9) Chairman of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee

It was suggested that the recommendations of the IRP should be supported in relation to this allowance and it was proposed, seconded and, on being put to the vote,

RESOLVED to increase the allowance to the Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee from £1,127 to £3,872 (30% of the allowance of the Leader).

(10) Chairmen of the Awards Panel, Electoral Arrangements Committee and Standards Committee

It was suggested that the recommendations of the IRP should be supported in relation to these allowances and it was proposed, seconded and, on being put to the vote,

RESOLVED to not make any SRA payment in respect of these positions.

(11) Annual increases

It was suggested that the recommendations of the IRP, to continue to link SRAs to the annual pay award for staff, should be supported and it was proposed, seconded and, on being put to the vote,

RESOLVED to continue to link all SRAs to the annual pay award for staff.

(12) Majority Group Leader / Leader of the Opposition

In line with the proposals for the allowance for the Leader, this allowance needed to continue to be set as one allowance. Having regard to the need to have an effective and organised opposition and mindful of the level of allowances at other Norfolk authorities, it was suggested that the allowance for the Leader of the Opposition should be increased and should be set as a percentage of the allowance for the Leader. An amendment was therefore proposed, duly seconded, to not set a second Majority Group Leader allowance and to increase the level of the Leader of the Opposition allowance from £1,272 to £2,582 (20% of the Leader's allowance). This allowance was still lower than the Norfolk average and the methodology behind the amendment was supported. On being put to the vote the amendment was carried. Members then voted on the substantive motion and it was

RESOLVED to not set a second Majority Group Leader allowance and to increase the level of the allowance for the Leader of the Opposition from £1,272 to £2,582 (20% of the Leader's allowance).

(13) Effective date

It was suggested that the recommendation of the IRP to backdate the increases should be supported. A proposal was put forward, duly seconded, to backdate the scheme to 3 May 2019 which was the start of the current 4 year term of office of current Members. An amendment was made, duly seconded, that the amended scheme of allowances be not backdated. On being put to the vote, the amendment was lost. Members then voted on the proposal to backdate the amended scheme of allowances to 3 May 2019 and it was

RESOLVED to backdate the amended scheme of allowances to 3 May 2019.

Council was then invited to consider four further additional SRAs:

(14) Deputy Leader of the Council

To recognise the importance of this role and reflect the arrangements at other Norfolk authorities, it was proposed that a new SRA be paid to the Deputy Leader and be set at a level of 70% of the Leader's allowance. This allowance would be paid instead of the allowance for the role of Portfolio Holder. It was proposed, seconded and, on being put to the vote,

RESOLVED to provide a new allowance to the Deputy Leader of the Council to be set at 70% of the allowance of the Leader amounting to £9,035; to be paid to the post holder instead of the allowance for Portfolio Holder.

(15) Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee

To recognise the high profile and demanding work of the Committee and to reflect the position in most other Norfolk authorities, it was proposed that a new SRA be paid to the Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee to be set at 50% of the allowance for the Chairman of the Committee, the amount proposed being £1,936. It was proposed, seconded and, on being put to the vote,

RESOLVED to provide a new SRA to the Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee to be set at 50% of the allowance for the Chairman of the Committee, the amount being £1,936.

(16) Vice Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

To recognise the need to have an effective Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the role of the Vice-Chairman in this, it was proposed that a new SRA be paid to the Vice-Chairman of this Committee to be set at 50% of the allowance for the Chairman of the Committee, the amount proposed being £1,936. It was proposed, seconded and, on being put to the vote,

RESOLVED to provide a new SRA to the Vice-Chairman of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to be set at 50% of the allowance for the Chairman of the Committee, the amount being £1,936.

(17) Parish Council meetings – travel expenses

In recognition of the distances travelled by some Members in attending parish council meetings and to ensure inclusivity, it was proposed that travel to/from parish council meetings should be added to the list of approved duties for Members, giving them the option to claim these allowances if they wished. Following a request for further clarity, it was noted that eligible meetings of parish councils related to the main, regular, formally constituted parish council meetings and not to any adhoc meetings or working groups and that the travel rates would be the HMRC rates. Following a suggestion, a small amendment to the proposal was accepted that claims could not be made where the Member was a member of the parish or town council nor where a member was also able to claim an allowance by virtue of them being a member of another authority (i.e. Parish / County Council). The effective date for the new approved duty was suggested as 21 February 2020. It was proposed, duly seconded and, on being put to the vote,

RESOLVED that travel to formally constituted parish council meetings be added to the list of approved duties for the payment of travel allowance at HMRC rates effective from 21 February 2020. Claims

could not be made where the member was *a member of the parish or town council nor where a member was* also able to claim an allowance by virtue of their being a member of another authority (i.e. Parish / County Council).

[note: text underlined and in italics agreed as an amendment to the minutes at the meeting on Council on 21 May 2020.]

[Note: the meeting adjourned for a short break and resumed at 9:05pm - Mr M Snowling and Mrs L Starling left the meeting at this point.]

109 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2019 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman

110 ANNOUNCEMENTS

Members noted the civic engagements undertaken by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Council since the last meeting. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman drew attention to some of the events they had attended. Members congratulated the Chairman on raising £1500 to date from recent events including a cake sale and a gala dinner for her chosen charity. They also noted that due to a car breakdown the Vice-Chairman had been unable to attend the opening of the King's Lynn Mart as detailed in the report.

The Chairman advised Council that the AGM of the Council scheduled for 14 May 2020 would now take place on 21 May 2020.

111 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

It was noted that there had been no questions from the Public.

112 PUBLIC SPEAKING

It was noted that there had been no requests for public speaking.

113 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

The minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meetings held on 7 January 2020, 28 January 2020 and 4 February 2020 were received.

114 CABINET

The minutes of the Cabinet meetings held on 14 January 2020 and 11 February 2020 were received.

14 January 2020 - Minute no: 68 – Leisure Principles

The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Wellbeing (Mr F Whymark) advised Members that Cabinet had supported the proposed Leisure Principles as set out in the Cabinet minutes. The population was now living longer, and levels of inactivity and obesity were high. The principles would seek to ensure that every resident had accessible opportunities to engage in physical activity in their community.

Members were advised that the Council had recently been successful in securing circa £10k from the County Council's social prescribing fund. Community grants of £300 were again available until November this year for Members to allocate. Further information would be available in the next Members' Bulletin.

Members then voted on the recommendation from Cabinet and it was

RESOLVED

to adopt the following Leisure Principles:

Community Offer

1. We will work with partners to aim to ensure that there is a leisure offer appropriate and proportionate to communities across Broadland, to help as many of our population become active. In doing this, our order of priority of preference will be:
 - a) Steer the community towards existing provisions and work with partners to make sure they are accessible.
 - b) Develop capacity in the community sector to help establish self-sustaining leisure solutions.
 - c) Where there is a gap in the market, look at options to provide.
2. We will work with partners to ensure that a leisure offer is a consideration of any major development or population growth in the District.

Health and Wellbeing

1. Given the developed national evidence on the telling contribution that activity can have on various longer-term conditions and social issues, we will utilise leisure assets and expertise to help work in the following areas in line with the shared health and wellbeing priorities. This is building upon our successful Help Hub partnership and work to help develop community capacity.
 - People who are likely to or have suffered a fall as a consequence of frailty.
 - Unhealthy and inactive lifestyles in adults and children/adult obesity.
 - Those experiencing long term worklessness and NEET (not in education, employment or training).
 - Those experiencing low level mental wellbeing issues such as early onset dementia and social isolation.
 - Those living with low level chronic health conditions where increased physical activity could be beneficial
2. Activity will be targeted to areas of the District where we are aware of specific needs to ensure tailored provision to local communities, not universally.
3. Given the contribution to wider public-sector issues, we will seek to work in partnership and attract funding to help deliver in these areas, and to satisfy financial objectives for the service.

Financial

1. Any new or existing facility or activity should seek to be at least cost neutral.
2. In establishing or maintaining any facility or activity we should look to work with partners to help share the operational cost burden and risks.
3. Our leisure services should remain affordable to different members of our community, which means that some cohorts or products (see 'Health and Wellbeing') will generate less of a commercial operational yield than others.

4. In any investment we should look to better utilise existing community assets rather than develop from new.
5. Aside of investment to maintain our assets, any new non-essential (i.e. repair, replacement and maintenance) capital investment over the strategy period in leisure facilities will need to come from external sources unless there is a demonstrable ROI in excess of those typically expected via our treasury management investments (typically this is currently between two and three percent).

11 February 2020

Minute no: 78 – Capital Strategy and Capital Programme 2020/21 to 2024/25

The Portfolio Holder for Finance (Mrs T Mancini-Boyle) invited Council to support the recommendations from Cabinet relating to the five year Capital Strategy and Programme 2020/21 to 2024/25 including recommendations 1 and 2 set out in the Cabinet minutes as these were both matters which required Council resolution. The Cabinet report set out proposals to deliver the Council's vision for the district as set out in the Broadland and South Norfolk Delivery Plan, in particular the investment needed to deliver the priorities whilst also retaining the financial sustainability of the Council. The Capital Programme currently totalled £28.8m and would be financed by a mix of revenue and capital reserves, capital receipts and grants and internal/external borrowing. External borrowing would be considered if needed and was provisionally earmarked for 2021/2022 but slippage could delay this. Borrowing had been included to expand the operation of Broadland Growth Ltd with each project being subject to detailed consideration on a case by case basis.

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, which set out the requirement for a recorded vote to be taken on all budget and Council Tax setting matters, a recorded vote was taken as follows:

FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS – 32

Mr A D Adams, Mr N J Brennan, Mr P E Bulman, Mr S M Clancy, Mr A D Crotch, Mr J Emsell, Mr J F Fisher, Mr R R Foulger, Ms R M Grattan, Mrs L H Hemsall, Ms S I Holland, Mrs N C Karimi-Ghovanlou, Mr K S Kelly, Mr D King, Miss S Lawn, Dr K E Lawrence, Mrs J Leggett, Mr K G Leggett, Mrs T M Mancini-Boyle, Mr M L Murrell, Mr G K Nurden, Mr G Peck, Mrs S M Prutton, Mr S Riley, Mr D Roper, Mr N C Shaw, Miss J L Thomas, Mrs K A Vincent, Mr S A Vincent, Mr S C Walker, Mr J M Ward, Mr F Whymark

AGAINST THE RECOMMENDATIONS – 0

ABSTENTIONS - 4

Mr D J Britcher, Ms S J Catchpole, Mr D Harrison, Mr D M Thomas

RESOLVED

to

- (1) approve the Capital Programme for 2020/21-2024/25 (attached at appendix 1 to the signed copy of these minutes) and the Capital Strategy (attached at appendix 2 to the signed copy of these minutes);
- (2) approve the programme of work for 2019/20 to align key elements of ICT infrastructure and corporate systems in use across Broadland District Council and South Norfolk Council as set out in appendix 3 attached to the signed copy of these minutes.

Minute no: 79 – Revenue Budget and Council Tax 2020/21 (see Minute 117 below)

Minute no: 80 - Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2020/21

The Portfolio Holder for Finance invited Council to support the recommendations from Cabinet in relation to the Council's approach to management of its borrowing, investments, cash flow, banking, money market and capital market transaction and the effective control of the associated risks and performance. With regard to borrowing, interest rates would continue to be monitored to ensure a pragmatic approach to changing circumstances. The primary objective was still the security of the Council's cash above the liquidity of its investments. In response to a question, the Portfolio Holder drew attention to reference in the appropriate policy to the desire where possible to ensure the Council invested/borrowed ethically, although this had to be balanced with the Council's policy with regard to risk.

RESOLVED

to approve

- (1) the Treasury Management Strategy Statement;
- (2) the Treasury Management Policy Statement 2020/21 (attached at appendix 4 to the signed copy of these minutes);
- (3) the Annual Investment Strategy 2020/21 (attached at appendix 5 to the signed copy of these minutes);

- (4) the Treasury Management Practice (TMP1) Credit and Counterparty Risk Management (attached at appendix 6 to the signed copy of these minutes);
- (5) The Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation (attached at appendix 7 to the signed copy of these minutes);
- (6) The Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement (Section 8) that sets out the Council's policy on MRP;
- (7) The Prudential Indicators and Limits for the next 5 years contained within the report.

Minute no: 81 - Council Tax Reduction 2020/21

The Portfolio Holder for Finance invited Council to endorse the amendments to the scheme following the annual review and consultation, drawing attention to the proposal to adopt the introduction of a £20 per month tolerance scheme for those residents not in receipt of Housing Benefit. Those affected would be claiming universal credit and council tax assistance and the proposal would allow the Council to address issues of increasing administration and maintenance of council tax assistance where universal credit payments applied.

RESOLVED

to approve the amendments set out in appendix 8 to the signed copy of these minutes and to update the Scheme for 2020/21 accordingly.

Minute no: 82 – Greater Norwich Growth Board: Joint five-year Investment Plan

The Portfolio Holder for Planning (Mrs L Hempsall) invited Council to endorse the recommendations from Cabinet to support the five-year Infrastructure Investment Plan and approve the allocation of CIL monies to 12 specified projects.

RESOLVED

to

- (1) approve the Greater Norwich Joint Five Year Infrastructure Investment Plan 2020-2025;
- (2) approve the allocation of CIL to 12 specified projects, these projects will form the 2020/21 Annual Growth Programme; the allocation of £2M to support the Education Capital Programme within Greater Norwich; payment of the previously committed CIL funding of £561,760 to the

Hempnall Crossroad project within 2020/21; and the full reinstatement of the £2M IIF cash reserve.

Minute no: 83 – Broadland District Council and South Norfolk Council - Strategic Plan and Delivery Plan

The Leader (Mr Vincent) invited Council to support the recommendations of Cabinet to approve the adoption of the new Strategic Plan and the Interim Delivery Plan.

RESOLVED

to

- (1) approve the adoption of the Strategic Plan 2020-2024; (copy attached at appendix 9 to the signed copy of these minutes) subject to the inclusion of reference to the environment and the Environmental Strategy; and
- (2) approve the adoption of the Interim one-year Delivery Plan for 2020/21 (attached at appendix 10 to the signed copy of these minutes).

Minute no: 85 - Investment Proposition for the Food Innovation Centre see Minute no: 123 below

115 PLANNING COMMITTEE

The decisions of the Planning Committee meetings held on 18 December 2019, 8 January 2020 and 5 February 2020 were received.

116 AUDIT COMMITTEE

The minutes of the Audit Committee meeting held on 9 January 2020 were received. The Chairman of the Committee expressed the hope that the outstanding matter regarding compliance with the requirement for purchase orders to be used for all purchases would be resolved as a matter of urgency.

117 COUNCIL TAX RESOLUTION 2020/21

Members considered the report of the Assistant Director – Finance on the council tax resolution for 2020/21 together with the recommendation from the Cabinet meeting on 11 February 2020 - Minute no: 79 refers, regarding the revenue budget. The revenue budget recommended by Cabinet together with information from the various precepting bodies formed the basis of the

recommendations in the report regarding the setting of the council tax for the area for 2020/21.

An updated report had been circulated to all Members as it had been necessary to amend the report due to a rounding technicality. The figures in last year's tax resolution report resulted in the average Band D council tax (district and special expenses) for 2019/20 being calculated according to the Government's council tax return as £123.55, rather than £123.56. The aggregate expenditure figure of £44,219,055 therefore needed to be reduced by £200 in order for the equivalent number this year to be £128.55. Without this change the Government form would show an increase of £5.01, thus breaching the referendum threshold level. This did not change any of the actual amounts to be billed.

The Director of Resources drew attention to a small adjustment needed to the figure in recommendation 4 from Cabinet for the demand on the Collection Fund for general expenditure for 2020/2021 from £5,827,894 to £5,827,694 to reflect the £200 adjustment above.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance thanked Officers for their hard work putting the budget together whilst also dealing with extra work involved with collaboration with South Norfolk. The benefits from the collaboration were already beginning to be seen. Making savings through collaboration had never been the main driver, however a cost and savings tracker was being regularly reviewed and shared whenever accurate figures were known and savings were currently exceeding forecasts and were likely to be in the region of £8.6m. Caution was needed but known costs and savings had been built into the medium term financial plan.

The structures of each department had been reviewed together with the costs and savings available within. There were currently a number of staff vacancies across departments, which would not be filled unless they were identified as needed. This work had been completed without interruption to the level of services residents had come to expect from a top performing council. More savings were expected from future joint procurement with work underway on the waste collection contract – Broadland's biggest contract. Opportunities to collaborate were being sought whenever possible.

With regard to the Local Government Finance Settlement, as expected, Broadland was receiving significantly less core funding from central government than in the past. In the current year Norfolk authorities were participating in a business rates retention pilot scheme which would not continue in 2020/21 and the Government had stated there would be a business rates retention reset in 2021/2022 resulting in even more funding uncertainty. The Council had achieved housing growth well above the national average and the new homes bonus was £2.3m as a result. This was, however, for one year only and the government would be consulting on the

future of this incentive in the spring. This clearly presented a risk for Broadland and its medium-term financial plan going forward. Currently Broadland relied heavily on council tax and business rates for funding and the likely reduction in future funding and the need to finance the capital programme were the key reasons there was a reluctant recommendation to increase council tax in 2020/2021. The increase to a Band D property equated to a 3.6% rise. The medium-term financial plan showed an increase of £5 annually but this decision would be taken each year when the budget was set. It was proposed to increase most discretionary fees and charges inline with inflation in accordance with normal practice. No increase however would be applied to brown bins. The special expense recouped from Drayton, Hellesdon and Gt Witchingham relating to footway lighting was proposed to be increased by £5 to provide funds for future essential work such as column replacement.

New projects were required and the Council was now looking at a far more ambitious capital strategy and programme equating to £28.8m. This included £5m to Broadland Growth Ltd, with the potential of a further £5m in the following year. This would enable the Council to carry out its own development projects which had proven to be successful in the past. All projects would be subject to individual business cases. £1.86m had been set aside as Broadland's contribution to the Food Hub - an exciting project creating local jobs and putting Broadland on the map as one of very few food hubs across the Country, with environmental and economic benefits of manufacturing the food produced in the County instead of sending it elsewhere. European funding was required for this to go ahead and was currently being sought. A large amount had been set aside for IT as Broadland's IT was coming to the end of its useful life and there was a need to ensure this was right for Members, Officers and residents. Funds had also been earmarked for maintenance of Council assets such as Thorpe Lodge and bridges.

There would be inflationary pressures on the budget which had been included, together with pension fund and pay increases. A new PRP scheme was also being considered at present and allowed for.

With regard to borrowing, this was not currently necessary but would be considered on a case by case basis if a project came forward that proved to be beneficial and able to achieve some or all of the Council's main objectives.

This was an exciting time for the Council, which over the next few years needed to find annual savings or additional income of approximately £1.1m. New ways of working and innovative ideas would need to come forward and there was an ambition for this throughout the Council amongst Officers and Members. This would not only help to fill the funding gap but would also contribute to delivering the Council's ambitions for new and existing residents.

The proposed 2020/2021 revenue budget was a balanced one with no call on general reserves and the Portfolio Holder for Finance invited Members to support the budget in full.

A question was raised as to whether it was necessary to introduce an increase in council tax this year having regard to the Council's reserves which it was felt were at a sufficient level to support the budget without any increase in council tax and whether an increase would be more appropriate next year. Reference was also made to the earlier decision to increase Members' allowances at the same time as increasing council tax. The Portfolio Holder for Finance responded that, going forward the council was looking for a more ambitious programme which could ultimately increase revenue and that the proposed council tax increase was modest. Mindful of the number of uncertainties still facing the Council, it was prudent to make adequate provision at the present time.

Cabinet Recommendation - Minute no: 79 – Revenue Budget and Council Tax 2020/21

Members then voted on the recommendations from Cabinet (including the updated figure).

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, which set out the requirement for a recorded vote to be taken on all budget and Council Tax setting matters, a recorded vote was taken as follows:

FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS – 26

Mr A D Adams, Mr N J Brennan, Mr P E Bulman, Mr S M Clancy, Mr A D Crotch, Mr J J Emsell, Mr J F Fisher, Mr R R Foulger, Ms R Grattan, Mrs L H Hemsall, Mr K S Kelly, Mr D King, Miss S Lawn, Mrs J Leggett, Mr K G Leggett, Mrs T M Mancini-Boyle, Mr M L Murrell, Mr G K Nurden, Mr G Peck, Mrs S M Prutton, Mr N C Shaw, Miss J L Thomas, Mrs K A Vincent, Mr S A Vincent, Mr J M Ward, Mr F Whymark

AGAINST THE RECOMMENDATIONS – 9

Mr D J Britcher, Ms S J Catchpole, Mr D Harrison, Ms S I Holland, Mrs N C Karimi-Ghovanlou, Dr K E Lawrence, Mr S Riley, Mr D Roper, Mr D M Thomas

ABSTENTIONS – 1

Mr S C Walker

RESOLVED

to approve

- (1) the base budget, subject to confirmation of the finalised Local Government Finance Settlement figures which may necessitate an adjustment through the General Revenue Reserve to maintain a balanced budget. Authority to make any such change to be delegated to the Assistant Director of Finance.
- (2) the use of the earmarked reserves as set out in Appendix 11 (attached to the signed copy of these minutes).
- (3) that any surplus at the end of the 2019/20 financial year is transferred to a new earmarked reserve to help fund the future capital programme, particularly the IT and waste services investment.
- (4) that the Council's demand on the Collection Fund for 2020/21 for General Expenditure shall be £5,827,694 and for Special Expenditure shall be £141,112.
- (5) that the Band D level of Council Tax be £125.52 for General Expenditure and £3.04 for Special Expenditure.

Council Tax Resolution 2020/21

Members then voted on the recommendations contained in the updated report on the Council Tax Resolution.

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, which set out the requirement for a recorded vote to be taken on all budget and Council Tax setting matters, a recorded vote was taken as follows:

FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS – 26

Mr A D Adams, Mr N J Brennan, Mr P E Bulman, Mr S M Clancy, Mr A D Crotch, Mr J J Emsell, Mr J F Fisher, Mr R R Foulger, Ms R Grattan, Mrs L H Hempsall, Mr K S Kelly, Mr D King, Miss S Lawn, Mrs J Leggett, Mr K G Leggett, Mrs T M Mancini-Boyle, Mr M L Murrell, Mr G K Nurden, Mr G Peck, Mrs S M Prutton, Mr N C Shaw, Miss J L Thomas, Mrs K A Vincent, Mr S A Vincent, Mr J M Ward, Mr F Whymark

AGAINST THE RECOMMENDATIONS – 9

Mr D J Britcher, Ms S J Catchpole, Mr D Harrison, Ms S I Holland, Mrs N C Karimi-Ghovanlou, Dr K E Lawrence, Mr S Riley, Mr D Roper, Mr D M Thomas

ABSTENTIONS – 1

Mr S C Walker

RESOLVED

- (1) that it be noted that the following amounts for 2020/21 have been determined under delegated authority and in accordance with regulations made under the local Government Finance Act 1992:
- a) **46,430** being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as its Council Tax Base for the year.
 - b) The amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with regulation 6 of the Regulations, as the amount of its Council Tax Base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items (i.e. Parish precepts) relate, as shown in appendix 12 attached to the signed copy of these minutes.
- (2) that the Council calculates the following amounts for 2020/21 in accordance with Sections 31A, 31B and 34 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011):
- a) **£44,218,855** being the aggregate expenditure which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) (a) to (f) of the Act (including the General Fund, Special Expenses and Parish Precepts).
 - b) **£34,424,311** being the aggregate income which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) (a) to (d) of the Act.
 - c) **£9,794,544** as its council tax requirement for the year including Special Expenses and Parish Precepts being the amount by which the aggregate expenditure at 2(a) above exceeds the aggregate income at 2(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act.
 - d) **£210.95** as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year, being the council tax requirement at 2(c), divided by the Council Tax Base for the year (46,430) at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B(1) of the Act.
 - e) **£3,966,850** being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (i.e. Parish Precepts and

street lighting special expenses).

- f) **£125.52** as the basic amount of its Council Tax for dwellings in its area, excluding Special Expenses and Parish Precepts, being the amount at 2(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 2(e) above by the amount at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act.
 - g) the amounts given by adding to the amount at 2(f) above the amounts of the special items for the relevant Parish divided in each case by the Council Tax Base for the Parish at 1(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in each Parish is as set out in appendix 13 attached to the signed copy of these minutes.
 - h) the amounts given by multiplying the basic amounts for each Parish 2(g) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.
- (3) that it be noted that for the year 2020/21 the main precepting authorities have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with s40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.

Band	Norfolk County Council £	Police & Crime Commissioner £	Total Preceptors £
A	944.34	175.38	1,119.72
B	1,101.73	204.61	1,306.34
C	1,259.12	233.84	1,492.96
D	1,416.51	263.07	1,679.58
E	1,731.29	321.53	2,052.82
F	2,046.07	379.99	2,426.06
G	2,360.85	438.45	2,799.30
H	2,833.02	526.14	3,359.16

- (4) that, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts of the District's and preceptors requirements, in accordance with s30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets amounts of the council tax for the year 2020/21 for each category of dwelling as follows.

Band	District & Parishes Council Tax £	Total Preceptors £	Total 2020/21 Council Tax £
A	140.63	1,119.72	1,260.35
B	164.07	1,306.34	1,470.41
C	187.51	1,492.96	1,680.47
D	210.95	1,679.58	1,890.53
E	257.83	2,052.82	2,310.65
F	304.71	2,426.06	2,730.77
G	351.58	2,799.30	3,150.88
H	421.90	3,359.16	3,781.06

The council tax for each category of dwelling by parish is as set out in Appendix 14 attached to the signed copy of these minutes.

- (5) to determine that the Council's basic amount of Council Tax (including special expenses) for 2020/21 is not excessive, in accordance with principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, and thus there is no need to hold a Council Tax referendum.

118 MONITORING OFFICER REPORT

Members considered the report of the Monitoring Officer inviting Council to consider amending the constitution in respect of Officers who could deputise for the Monitoring Officer and the Section 151 Officer and to consider appointing Cllr Prutton to the Norfolk Against Scams Partnership and to authorise attendance at meetings as an approved duty for the purpose of payments under the Members' Allowances Scheme.

RESOLVED:

to

- (1) amend the constitution in respect of Officers who can deputise for the Monitoring Officer (the Governance Manager and the two Senior Governance Officers) and the Section 151 Officer (the Senior Finance Business Partner and the Finance Manager);
- (2) appoint Cllr Prutton to the Norfolk Against Scams Partnership and to

authorise attendance at meetings as an approved duty for the purpose of payments under the Members' Allowances Scheme.

119 OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS – FEEDBACK FROM REPRESENTATIVES

Members received and noted the feedback from Members on Outside Bodies. Cllr Prutton also reported on her attendance at a meeting of the Norfolk Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee, further details of which would be circulated to Members at the next meeting.

120 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

It was noted that there had been no Questions received in accordance with Procedural Rule 12.4.

121 MOTIONS

Members considered the following motion received in accordance with Procedural Rule 13:

Proposed by Cllr J Leggett, seconded by Cllr T Mancini-Boyle

Following concerns expressed by residents about the impact of fireworks on vulnerable people and animals, Broadland District Council resolves:

- to encourage all public firework displays within the local authority boundaries to be advertised in advance of the event, allowing residents to take precautions for their animals and vulnerable people
- to actively promote a public awareness campaign about the impact of fireworks on animal welfare and vulnerable people – including the precautions that can be taken to mitigate risks
- to write to the UK Government urging them to introduce legislation to limit the maximum noise level of fireworks to 90dB for those sold to the public for private displays
- to encourage local suppliers of fireworks to stock 'quieter' fireworks for public display

In proposing the motion, Cllr J Leggett referred to representations she had received from residents about the impact of fireworks on the wellbeing of animals and the need to raise awareness of this impact. In supporting the motion, a suggestion was made that the government be urged to improve the labelling on all fireworks to identify the noise levels and it was noted that this

was probably already in place.

A concern was raised that the real issue was in relation to the use of fireworks outside public displays and the motion would not help in this respect as it would be difficult to enforce. It was noted that the Council's role was to try and publicise the issues and not to police them. In supporting the motion, the seconder reiterated that she had received representations from the public and she wanted to see the Council encourage responsible use of fireworks.

RESOLVED

to

- (1) encourage all public firework displays within the local authority boundaries to be advertised in advance of the event, allowing residents to take precautions for their animals and vulnerable people;
- (2) actively promote a public awareness campaign about the impact of fireworks on animal welfare and vulnerable people – including the precautions that can be taken to mitigate risks;
- (3) write to the UK Government urging them to introduce legislation to limit the maximum noise level of fireworks to 90dB for those sold to the public for private displays;
- (4) encourage local suppliers of fireworks to stock 'quieter' fireworks for public display;

122 EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

RESOLVED

to exclude the Press and public from the meeting for the remaining business because otherwise, information which was exempt information by virtue of Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 would be disclosed to them.

[The press left the meeting and no members of the public remained.]

123 CABINET

11 February 2020

Minute no: 85 – Investment Proposal for the Food Innovation Centre

Members considered the recommendations from Cabinet and it was noted that recommendation (2) needed to be amended to include consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Finance as well as Economic Development.

The Leader invited Council to support the recommendations and drew attention to the benefits arising from the development including creating jobs, new businesses, increased business rate income and raising the profile of the agri-food sector at a national and international level. It was noted that a number of issues regarding risk and governance had been raised at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting when this matter had been considered and Members had been advised of the measures in place to manage these.

In response to questions, the Leader confirmed that prospective tenants of the Centre were more likely to be established and expanding businesses rather than new start up businesses and that, despite Brexit, funding was available to draw down for this project subject to a successful application.

RESOLVED

- (1) to allocate from capital reserves, the sum as set out in the report, for the delivery of the Food Innovation Centre project;
- (2) that final costings and funding agreements be signed off through delegated authority by the Director of Resources in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Economic Development and the Portfolio Holder for Finance;
- (3) to use the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) compliant Scape Procurement Framework to design and build the Food Innovation Centre giving delegated authority to the Director of Resources to initiate all pre contract work;
- (4) to continue propriety work, up to and including but not beyond the signing of the funding contracts with the Ministry for Housing Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) and other funders;
- (5) to front fund the sum, as set out in the report, for pre contract work which is not eligible under ERDF and therefore 100% at risk if ERDF funding is not secured from MHCLG.

The meeting closed at 10.30pm