



## COUNCIL

### Minutes of a meeting of the Council of Broadland District Council, held on Thursday 31 March 2022 at 7pm at the Council Offices

**Members Present:** Councillors: A D Adams, S C Beadle, D J Britcher, P E Bulman, S J Catchpole, B Cook, J K Copplesstone, A D Crotch, J Davis, J J Emsell, J F Fisher, R R Foulger, N J Harpley, S I Holland, N C Karimi-Ghovanlou, K S Kelly, E C Laming, S Lawn, J Leggett, K G Leggett, T M Mancini-Boyle, G Peck, R E Potter, S M Prutton, S Riley, D Roper, D M Thomas, K A Vincent, S A Vincent, J M Ward, F Whymark

**Officers in Attendance:** The Managing Director, the Director of Place, the Director of Resources, the Director of People & Communities, the Chief of Staff (Monitoring Officer), the Assistant Director Finance (Section 151 Officer) and the Committee Officers (DM/LA).

#### 100 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Member	Minute No & Heading	Nature of Interest
Cllr Roper	114 - Motions	Other Interest – Norfolk County Council Councillor and member of their Pensions Committee.

#### 101 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors S M Clancy, S C Gurney, D Harrison, L H Hemsall, D King, K E Lawrence, I J Mackie, I N Moncur, M L Murrell, J A Neesam, G K Nurden, N C Shaw, L A Starling, J L Thomas.

#### 102 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 February 2022 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**103 MATTERS ARISING**

A member made reference to the email circulated by the Managing Director incorporating the response from Anglian Water to the Council's request for more information about discharge into rivers. The member expressed concern about continued discharge rates and sought assurance that the Council would endeavour to ensure the discharge ceased. The Leader of the Council responded that it was not within the control of the Council to ensure that the issue ceased but that every effort would be made to bring pressure on Anglian Water to address the unacceptable levels of discharge into waterways in the district. The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Excellence added that the response from Anglian Water would be considered at a forthcoming meeting of the Environmental Excellence Policy Development Panel. Whilst the Council was powerless to stop the discharges, it did have a role to play in raising public awareness. The member welcomed the actions being taken and suggested that the planning decision making process was also an area where the Council could bring about a positive influence.

**104 ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Members noted the civic engagements undertaken by the Chairman of the Council since the last meeting. The Chairman drew attention in particular to his attendance at the launch of the Newmedica Eye Health Clinic at the Broadland Business Park. He commended this new facility in the Broadland area and the positive impact it would have on reducing waiting times for eye treatment. He had also been honoured to support Ukraine by flying the colours of the Country's national flag. The Chairman also drew attention to the joint Broadland and South Norfolk Business Awards which had been an extremely successful event celebrating local businesses. He had been particularly impressed that so many young people were associated with winning businesses and was pleased the Council could contribute to encouraging young entrepreneurs.

The Leader of the Council reported on the Council's preparations for receiving Ukrainian refugees and that much work was ongoing in partnership with agencies in Norfolk to make the process as smooth as possible. He went on to make reference to County Deals and progress of the Government's levelling up white paper and reminded members that Norfolk was one of the nine areas identified for a potential deal. The next phase involved a meeting of all Norfolk Council leaders/chairmen to gain an understanding of what a deal might look like.

The Portfolio Holder for Finance updated members on implementation of the Government's energy bills rebate scheme. There had been an increase in the number of resident paying their council tax by direct debit with 83% of residents signed up. The energy bill rebate would be paid directly to direct debit payers in April. Options for paying residents not using direct debit were being explored. The Portfolio Holder also drew attention to the free workshops being held across the two councils at Sprowston Manor and Hethel Engineering, to support small and medium enterprises with procurement of council services. She also

commented that the Community Lottery was approaching its first anniversary and that free social media training sessions were being organised for interested local good causes.

The Portfolio Holder for Economic Development reported that building work on the Food Innovation Centre was progressing well with the topping out ceremony held recently. A number of businesses had expressed interest in the facility.

The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Excellence reminded members that the new waste contract started the following week. The contract would include the collection of new items such as small electronic items and textiles. She also advised that biodegradable bin liners would now be used for food waste collection. Leaflets about the new service had been left for residents with their recycling bins.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Wellbeing referred to ongoing work by the Communities team to distribute grants from the Government's Household Support Fund to vulnerable households. Fuel poverty was a very real issue at the present time and would have an impact on many households. He made reference to the important role of local charities and invited members to inform the Communities team of any small local charities within their parishes which might be a useful source of support to vulnerable households approaching the Council.

### **105 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC**

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

### **106 PUBLIC SPEAKING**

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

### **107 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

The minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 8 March 2022 were received.

### **108 CABINET**

#### **21 December 2021**

The Leader reported that the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 21 December 2021 were received at the last meeting. The following matters were however deferred for consideration at this meeting:

**Minute no 228 - Street Naming & Numbering Policy & Introduction of Charges**

The Portfolio Holder for Planning advised members that the proposals for updating the policy for street naming and numbering functions and introducing charges for the service had been considered by the Place Shaping Policy Development Panel who had supported the proposals and by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee who had also supported the proposal except for those relating to the charge for changing the name of an existing property. The Portfolio Holder went on to give an example of the level of income which could potentially be generated based on current levels of activity. A workload of 170 street naming and numbering activities would have generated circa £34k income towards administrative costs. The charges would offset costs of the service and would be reviewed annually. With regard to the concerns raised about charging for renaming an existing property, she did not feel this was unreasonable as it was a choice of the homeowner to rename and did not justify it being a free service.

A member commented that, whilst they supported the proposals in principle to charge for these services to offset administrative fees, they felt the charges for small scale developments and for large developments were not equitable and penalised small developers.

It was then proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote,

**RESOLVED**

1. To agree the introduction of charges from 1 April 2022 as set out in Appendix 1; (attached at appendix 1 to the signed copy of these minutes)
2. To agree the adoption of the Street Naming and Numbering Policy as set out in Appendix 3 with effect from 1 April 2022. (updated policy attached at appendix 2 to the signed copy of these minutes)

**Minute no 229 – S106 Agreements Monitoring Fees**

The Portfolio Holder for Planning advised members that the proposal to introduce charges for monitoring S106 agreements reflected changes enacted by the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations which came into force in September 2019 and would align with current government guidance. The Council was actively monitoring 43 agreements which incorporated 137 obligations and over 600 triggers. Based on this level of activity, income of circa £41k would have been generated to offset against costs of administering the work.

In supporting the proposals, a member commented that they hoped some long running outstanding non-compliance issues could be progressed.

A concern was raised that, whilst the principle of charging for this work could be supported, the charges proposed affecting small developments was not equitable to the proposed charges associated with large developments and that these needed adjusting to ensure support was given to local, smaller companies.

It was then proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote,

### **RESOLVED**

To agree that the monitoring fees for section 106 agreements, as set out in Appendix 1, are adopted from 1 April 2022 (copy attached at appendix 3 to the signed copy of these minutes).

### **15 March 2022**

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 15 March 2022 were received. The following matters were considered by Council:

#### **Minute no 257 – Delivery Plan 2022-2024**

The Leader drew attention to the Delivery Plan which set out the actions and projects to be undertaken to meet the priority ambitions of the Strategic Plan. The vision was to work together to create the best place for all residents and businesses now and into the future.

In response to a question about the timetable for the review of the Environmental Strategy, the Portfolio Holder for Environmental Excellence commented that the Strategy was due for review as much had moved forward since it had been prepared. She anticipated the review would be undertaken within the next 10 months but that further details would be shared once these had been finalised.

In response to a question relating to the customer satisfaction measures and metrics, the Portfolio Holder for Transformation and Organisational Development advised that this matter was scheduled to be considered by the Service and Improvement Committee at its forthcoming meeting.

It was then proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote,

### **RESOLVED:**

To approve the adoption of the Delivery Plan for 2022-24.

**Minute no 260 - Approval of Extension to Belaugh Conservation Area and Adoption of Conservation Area Appraisal**

The Portfolio Holder for Planning invited Council to approve and adopt the Belaugh Conservation Area Appraisal and the extension of the Conservation Area boundary.

The Conservation Area had last been re-appraised in 2011 when it had been recommended that the area should be extended to include the property Piper's Haigh, which fell within the Broadland District Council area. Although approved by the Broads Authority, the additional extended area had not been adopted by the Council at this time, so the boundary remained legally the same. The Broads Authority had conducted a re-appraisal in 2021 and it had been concluded that a single change to the boundary, as initially recommended in 2011, should again be proposed.

It was then proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote,

**RESOLVED**

1. To approve the adoption of the proposed extension of the boundary of Belaugh Conservation Area to include Piper's Haigh and its curtilage; and
2. To approve and adopt the conservation area appraisal for Belaugh Conservation Area.

**Minute no: 261 - Community Infrastructure Fund Application – Brundall Parish Council**

The Portfolio Holder for Economic Development invited Council to approve the offer of a loan to Brundall Parish Council to part fund the new Brundall Sports hub using the Community Infrastructure Loan facility.

To facilitate the loan, the earmarked reserve of the Community Infrastructure Fund would need to be increased by £150,000. It was proposed to make this increase permanent to cover existing commitments and the proposed loan to Brundall Parish Council. This would result in the Community Infrastructure Fund increasing to a total value of £650,000.

Members welcomed the report and commented this was exactly what the Community Infrastructure Fund was established for and it would enable the local community to push ahead with a much needed facility ahead of finalisation of approved development.

It was then proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote,

**RESOLVED**

To allocate an additional earmarked reserve of £150,000, to permanently increase the Community Infrastructure Fund loan facility to cover the existing commitments, plus the proposed loan to Brundall Parish Council. This will result in the Community Infrastructure Fund increasing to a total value of £650,000.

**109 PLANNING COMMITTEE**

The decisions of the Planning Committee meeting held on 23 February 2022 were received.

**110 PAY POLICY STATEMENT**

Members considered the report seeking approval of the Pay Policy Statement for 2022/23 in accordance with the requirements of Section 38 of the Localism Act introduced in 2012.

The Portfolio Holder for Transformation and Organisational Development highlighted the scope of the statement regarding remuneration of officers. He drew attention to an error in the heading “No: of Employees” on page 81 of the report and that this should be “Salary Scale”.

It was then proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote,

**RESOLVED**

To approve the content of Broadland District Council's 2022/23 Pay Policy Statement in advance of its publication on the Council's website.

**111 SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS 2022-2023**

Members considered the schedule of meeting for 2022-2023.

A member raised a concern about recent low attendance by members at some meetings and if this was allied to any issues regarding the timing of meetings. The Leader responded that, whilst it was disappointing when members were unable to attend meetings, there was a range of different reasons as to why attendance was not always possible; the timing of meetings had not been linked to difficulties in attending. One of the current main causes of absence was COVID.

In response to a suggestion that the Council needed to lobby the government to amend the legislation to allow for virtual meetings, the Leader assured members that efforts to lobby the government via local MPs and via the District Council network were ongoing.

In response to a question as to why there was no date in the schedule for a meeting of the Standards Committee, mindful of the new model councillor code

of conduct, the Monitoring Officer advised members that officers were currently working through the new model and a meeting of the Standards Committee would be arranged in due course.

It was then proposed, seconded and on being put to the vote,

**RESOLVED**

To approve the schedule of meetings for May 2022 – May 2023.

**112 OUTSIDE ORGANISATIONS**

Members received and noted the feedback from a member appointed to represent the Council on Outside Organisations. The Leader thanked the member for their update report and encouraged all members of outside bodies to submit feedback reports.

**113 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS**

The following questions had been received in accordance with Procedural Rule 12.4:

**Question from Cllr Laming**

In the BDC and SNC Joint Greenhouse Gas Report 2018/19 (published January 2022) there is a suggestion in Section 12 that local authorities could establish a carbon offset fund for financial contributions from developers when 100% reduction in CO2 emissions cannot be achieved on site. Would BDC consider setting this up as a priority?

**Response from Cllr Lawn**

Where local authorities require the development of new homes to be zero carbon, a combination of minimising on-site carbon emissions and offsetting emissions could be applied. In situations where 100% reduction in carbon emissions could not be achieved on-site, councils could establish a Carbon Offset Fund for financial contributions from developers. Investments in the fund could then be used elsewhere within the local area to achieve carbon savings.

The example used in section 12 related to the London Mayoral area and where local plan policies already existed requiring this standard. In the Greater London Area's Supplementary Planning Guidance, the price of carbon offsets for their Carbon Offset Fund was £60 per tonne, which was paid by the developers, per year, for 30 years.

At present there was no requirement under existing planning policies or those proposed within the Greater Norwich Local Plan to require a developer to achieve this level of carbon offset. This did not mean that the Council would not



look to consider this in the next iteration of the local plan process. The best way to achieve improved carbon performance and energy efficiency was still likely to be via Building Regulations, and government was currently in the process of bringing into effect the Future Homes and Buildings Standard, which was intended to require new build homes to be future-proofed with low carbon heating and world-leading levels of energy efficiency. As such, the Portfolio Holder stated she would not propose at this time that this be given priority in the planning process where there would be no certainty that it could be enforced and secured under existing and proposed local plan policies.

Without a planning policy, the Council would not be able to secure a financial contribution via a S106 and, even if it could, it would need to identify how it would be spent. The forthcoming GNLP was not proposing a zero-carbon policy and at this late stage it would not be possible to re-word the policy, so at present the Council did not have the mechanism to secure a fund via S106's.

### **Supplementary Question from Cllr Laming**

Cllr Laming agreed the best way forward in reducing carbon emissions was to look at Building Regulations but said it was rare to achieve carbon zero in development without some offset measures. The Council's Environmental Strategy noted that the implementation of carbon offset measures was one of the targets for implementation of the policy. This aligned with her proposal. The Council was a member of the Greater Norwich Development Partnership and she was inviting the Council to push this forward – other councils in the UK were already pursuing this.

### **Response from the Leader on behalf of Cllr Lawn**

The Leader stated that at the current time the Council did not have a policy which could be enforced to secure contributions from developers so the first course of action would be to secure the necessary policy. The current local plan was going through its examination stage and once adopted would provide the policies for the Council to work with. This document did not include such a policy. The Council therefore needed to look at the next version of the local plan and build the relevant policies into the next local plan. The expectation was that the next local plan would need to be completed relatively quickly; this could be within approximately 5 years following the completion of the current plan, although this was still to be finalised as the government was yet to put in place the legislation to support such a policy.

### **Question from Cllr C Karimi-Ghovanlou**

With people all over the country looking forward to celebrating the Queen's Platinum Jubilee in June; I'm sure you will all agree a once in a lifetime event, it was disappointing to hear that there "was not the political will" from Broadland to provide small grants towards Parish /Town community events of £200 / £300

respectively, in line with some other District Councils such as South Norfolk, West Norfolk and Breckland. As a councillor, I am not aware that this decision was discussed or minuted at any meeting, so could I please ask who made the decision to rule out the provision of grants for this historical event?

### **Response from Cllr Mancini-Boyle**

Broadland District Council appointed a member-led working party to coordinate the celebrations for the Queen's Platinum Jubilee in 2022. An officer working group existed from across the One Team to fulfil the plans set out by the working party.

At the time of planning the Council's own celebrations, Broadland District Council was aware that Town and Parish Councils were already forging ahead with their own local arrangements for the Jubilee and that they had funds assigned to deliver them. Broadland Council therefore took the decision to have a free event which would be open for all residents to apply to attend at Blickling Hall. This event was intended to be an opportunity to showcase one of the district's attractions and bring together people from different locations to celebrate together in an iconic setting.

In addition to this event, the Council would be delivering a number of other celebrations. On 2 June, a small civic ceremony will be held at Thorpe Lodge where the Chairman will raise the Jubilee Union Flag and officially begin the District's celebrations. During the summer, residents and visitors would be invited to look out for bespoke Corgi sculptures. The Pembrokeshire Welsh Corgi's, beloved by HM the Queen, would be decorated by local artists and put in key locations around Broadland. Also over the summer holidays, families and individuals would be invited to take part in a Jubilee Treasure Hunt. Participants would visit sites across the district to solve clues and uncover hidden mysteries and explore what Broadland had to offer.

### **Supplementary Question from Cllr C Karimi-Ghovanlou**

Cllr Karimi-Ghovanlou stated that it would have been preferable for all councillors to be consulted. Many parish councils wanted to celebrate. Would the Leader email all parishes to see if they support the allocation of grants?

### **Response from the Leader**

The Leader responded that it was not his intention to email all parishes. The decision to proceed in the current way had already been taken and the time to set aside monies for grants would have been as part of the budget setting process in February – no budget was now available to do this.

## 114 MOTIONS

Council considered the following motions in accordance with Procedural Rule 13:

**Motion – Norwich Western Link**

In the absence of the proposer of the motion, Cllr Clancy, due to COVID, the motion was instead proposed by Cllr Peck, seconded by Cllr Bulman.

“Broadland District Council reasserts its full support for the construction of the Norwich Western Link dual carriageway which will deliver the following benefits to the whole of Norfolk, specifically the Norwich Western Fringe parishes, and reduce through traffic in Norwich:

- Lead to a reduction in CO2 and other greenhouse gas emissions from vehicles.
- Boost Norfolk’s economy and support its businesses.
- Improve road safety.
- Take traffic off unsuitable roads.
- Create new habitats and improve existing ones.

This Council therefore resolves to request the Leader of Broadland District Council to write to the Leader of Norfolk County Council reaffirming its fullest support for the Norwich Western Link.”

In proposing the motion, Cllr Peck indicated he wished to make an amendment to the wording of the final paragraph of the motion as follows:

- To add the words “***Whilst we await further details of the detailed route and design of the road and will comment on these in due course,***” before the words “this Council therefore resolves to request the Leader .....”
- To add the words “***principle of the***” before the words “Norwich Western Link.”

Cllr Peck stated that the Council had in the past given its support to the Norwich Western Link. The County Council had now submitted its business case to the Department of Transport for consideration by the Secretary of State and those in opposition to the proposed link were publically expressing their objections. It was therefore an appropriate time for those supporting the Norwich Western Link to make their views known. Cllr Peck went on to state that residents living in villages located to the western end of the Broadland Northway were suffering with traffic congestion and gridlock and high levels of traffic pollution. This pollution was far greater than that which would be generated by a small extension to the Broadland Northway to create the Norwich Western Link. A similar motion considered by South Norfolk Council had recently received cross party support and he urged members to support the amended motion.

Members then voted on the amendment and, with a majority of members in favour, the amendment was carried and became the substantive Motion.

The substantive motion, as follows, was then considered by Council:

***“Whilst we await further details of the detailed route and design of the road and will comment on these in due course,*** this Council therefore resolves to request the Leader of Broadland District Council to write to the Leader of Norfolk County Council reaffirming its fullest support for the **principle of the** Norwich Western Link.”

Cllr Davis expressed his concern that the motion was premature. The proposal was one of a series of projects having impact on the Broadland district and the County. The Local Transport Plan (4) was a part plan which contained illustrative proposals including the Norwich Western Link which were to be reviewed alongside, and as part of, consideration of the implementation plan, including a carbon assessment and an evaluation in the light of requirements of the government transport decarbonisation plan and net zero strategy which were all out for consultation. So effectively the implementation plan was the subject of consultation and the motion was being proposed during a period of consultation from 21 March to 2 May. With the LTP (4) being subject to consultation, the only relevant exiting Plan was the LTP (3) which did not feature the Western Link. Details of the road were not available, indeed the County Council had indicated a new alignment might be necessary, and once determined would be subject to a planning application. If adopted, the motion would tie the Council to support of a theoretical proposal ahead of any firm planning details.

He therefore proposed a further amendment as follows:

“Noting the following:

- the NWL does not have support from either the Norfolk Local Transport Plan 4 Strategy (adopted in Nov 2021, and the GNLP (as submitted to the recent examination by the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) (which includes Broadland District Council);
- the LTP4 Implementation Plan is currently out for consultation;
- the NWL does not feature in the existing local transport plan (LTP3);
- clearly evidenced quantifiable figures have not been made available for the impact of the road on achieving national commitments from transport emissions to net zero by 2050;
- the motion cannot take into account the current realignment and redesign of the proposed NWL as this is ongoing;

then any support for this road expressed by this council can only be conditional subject to clarification of the above, and the views of Broadland constituents expressed through a future consultation.”

The further amendment was seconded by Cllr Laming.

A question was raised as to whether the further amendment negated the substantive motion and the Monitoring Officer ruled that this was not the case

and the further amendment could be considered. In response to a question as to how the amendment would sit with the wording of the motion, the Monitoring Officer explained that the amendment would be added to the end of the motion.

On a point of clarification relating to reference to the matter being the subject of a consultation, Cllr Peck stated that the Secretary of State was considering the funding situation and the matter was not a public consultation.

The Leader stated that the further amendment to make the motion conditional did not serve any purpose. The motion identified five key benefits that would be achieved and which it was expected would be delivered. Other members also expressed their opposition to the further amendment.

Members then voted on the further amendment by Cllr Davis and, with a majority voting against, the amendment was lost.

Members then returned to discussing the substantive motion.

Cllr Laming stated that road transport produced 20% of UK greenhouse gas emissions, according to the ONS. Carbon emissions were produced by construction activities and travelling traffic. In 2019 traffic was Broadland's highest emitting sector and the district already had higher emissions than many other local authorities and emissions had risen since 2013. The rise was steeper following the opening of the NDR. A climate change risk assessment produced earlier in the year from the Climate Change Committee had identified that the UK was not doing enough to address climate change and that this needed to be taken into account in all decision making. The Greater Norwich Local plan topic paper on addressing climate change produced earlier in the year identified that car use needed to be reduced and alternative transport needed to be promoted. The Department of Transport had contacted all local authorities suggesting it would not support major new road projects that increased carbon emissions or did not have a focus on active travel. The Welsh government had already stopped building new roads. The LTP (4) implementation plan had not been adopted yet and the Council should not be supporting a project in its design phase. Cllr Laming stated there had to be a point at which things were done differently, to stop building new roads and to use the existing transport system for low carbon transport by promoting active travel and increasing the rail network. She stated she would not be supporting the motion.

A number of members expressed their strong support for the motion and for the Norwich Western Link. The original intention had always been to see the completion of the Broadland Northway by the addition of the western link and there had been disappointment this could not be achieved at the time of construction of the Broadland Northway. The desire to see the completed link was stronger than ever. Several members gave examples of parishes suffering with problems caused by heavy goods vehicles and high volumes of traffic travelling on narrow village roads. The provision of the link would help reduce the carbon footprint by providing a defined, free flowing route avoiding lengthy and unsuitable alternatives, some of which suffered flooding in the river valley. The western area of the district was disadvantaged economically and socially without

the western link. Rail options did not offer a viable alternative. There were health concerns regarding the pollution caused by slow moving/static, congested traffic in the more urban areas and provision of the western link would help reduce condensed emissions. It was suggested that the issue to be addressed was emissions from transport and the technology of the transport using the roads and how these were fuelled.

Cllr Davis stated he believed the problem to be one of too much traffic. More roads created more traffic. There was a need to be realistic, to see the future and to change habits and behaviours and planning processes. Without this it would not be possible to get to net zero carbon emissions. It was essential to change the way things were being done. He stated there was a lack of evidence to support the assertions made in the motion.

In seconding the motion, Cllr Bulman urged members to support the motion. Residents in the villages around the western end of the NDR were in support of the completion of the route to relieve pressure on the road network around the villages.

On being put to the vote, with a majority voting in favour, 4 members voting against, 2 abstentions, the substantive motion was carried.

It was, therefore

### **RESOLVED**

Whilst we await further details of the detailed route and design of the road and will comment on these in due course, this Council therefore resolves to request the Leader of Broadland District Council to write to the Leader of Norfolk County Council reaffirming its fullest support for the principle of the Norwich Western Link.

### **Motion – Broadland District Council Stands with Ukraine**

Proposer – Cllr S Vincent    Seconded – Cllr S Holland  
Supported by – Cllr N Harpley and Cllr J Davis

“This Council and its members of all political parties, join all residents and communities across Broadland in condemning Vladimir Putin’s unprovoked and brutal war on Ukraine and recognises the need to support the Ukrainian people and their communities affected by this terrible onslaught.

This Council therefore resolves to:

1. Work in partnership with all councils across Norfolk help make preparations for refugee accommodation in our county.

2. Work with local schools and colleges to help provide children and young people displaced by the war with access to the educational facilities they need.
3. Recognise and value the experience and expertise of local agencies and organisations and work with them as they help to provide resources and assistance to Ukrainian refugees as they arrive.
4. Promote and support other organisations, such as the Red Cross and UNICEF, working on the ground in Ukraine to provide humanitarian aid.

The Council understands the need to ensure the interests of the Russian regime and its supporters, whether political or financial are not promoted in our area and confirms its support for:

1. The disinvesting of the Norfolk County Council pension fund in Russian investments.
2. The need to seek alternatives at the earliest opportunity where existing contracts are reliant on Russian suppliers including the energy supplier *Total* who have confirmed they will not be cutting ties with Russian suppliers.
3. Support and encourage the government to impose the strictest possible sanctions on the Russian regime and to continue to monitor and remove the ability of those with ties to Putin's regime to continue financial operations in the UK.

In the face of an autocratic Russian regime carrying out a despicable and unprovoked war on the democratic country of Ukraine and its peoples, all political parties in Broadland unite in condemning those actions and in confirming the basic human rights of all peoples to self-determination and democratic governance as outlined at the United Nations."

Cllr Vincent proposed the cross party motion stating that the Council was proud to see the Ukrainian flag flying at Thorpe Lodge to show solidarity with Ukraine. The Council wanted to send a message of support to Ukraine at this horrific time for them. The Council strongly condemned the brutal and unprovoked war on Ukraine and recognised the need to support the Ukrainian people. The Council stood ready to help refugees where ever it could working with the UK Government to support the settlement programme. The motion set out what was being done and what would continue to be done working in partnership with other councils and agencies across Norfolk. Work would continue to help those wanting to make financial contributions to support the work of agencies, including the Red Cross, providing humanitarian aid. The Council also sought to ensure the interests of the Russian regime and its supporters were not promoted in the Broadland area. The Council encouraged the Government to provide the most severe sanctions possible. Russia's despicable and unprovoked war on democratic Ukraine and its people was condemned by all political parties serving Broadland and they applauded the Ukrainian people who against all odds and with amazing tenacity and resolve were continuing to resist.

The Leader of the Labour Group expressed her Group's support for the motion. Focussing on the refugee crisis and potential anti refugee sentiments, she invited the Council to lead by example and for members to help ensure that within their communities, refugees arriving from the most horrific of circumstance were treated with dignity and respect.

The Leader of the Green Group echoed the comments made supporting the motion. The Ukrainian crisis highlighted the refugee crisis ongoing throughout the world and that this was also a time to remember all refugees and continue to offer support.

A number of members spoke in favour of the motion and applauded the cross party support for the motion. A member stated that the invasion had analogies with the Second World War and was illegal. The atrocities being committed needed to be dealt with and more should be done by the West. Members were advised that the Housing and Communities teams were working hard with the County Council to support Ukrainians entering the UK but also to support host families, to check suitability and to manage their long-term commitment to host refugees. There would be no quick fix – this was a long term commitment to provide holistic support. A Ukrainian member of staff had been appointed which would be an immense support to existing staff some of whom also spoke Ukrainian. With regard to the Homes for Ukrainians scheme, a member urged the Council to do all it could to press for support to be given to help match Ukrainian refugees with host families. The member commended the online briefing session for those looking to host Ukrainian refugees and hoped these would continue.

In seconding the motion, the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group welcomed the cross party support for the motion. She was horrified by the unprovoked attack on Ukraine. She welcomed the work being done to help refugees and host families. She stated there was a need to uphold democracy and send a strong message of support to Ukraine and the wider world about the democratic rights of everyone and the right of self-government.

Members then voted on the motion and it was unanimously

**RESOLVED** that the motion as set out above be supported.



**115 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**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.

**116 CABINET**

The exempt minutes of the Cabinet meeting on 15 March 2022 were received.

---

Chairman

(Meeting closed at 9:05 pm)