

Unconfirmed



Minutes of the Meeting of the **Full Council** held in the Deben Conference Room, East Suffolk House, Melton on **Wednesday 25 September 2019 at 6:30 pm**

Members of the Committee present:

Councillor Melissa Allen, Councillor Paul Ashdown, Councillor Stuart Bird, Councillor Chris Blundell, Councillor Jocelyn Bond, Councillor Elfrede Brambley-Crawshaw, Councillor Stephen Burroughes, Councillor Peter Byatt, Councillor Alison Cackett, Councillor Jenny Ceresa, Councillor Judy Cloke, Councillor Maurice Cook, Councillor Linda Coulam, Councillor Mike Deacon, Councillor Graham Elliott, Councillor John Fisher, Councillor Tony Fryatt, Councillor Steve Gallant, Councillor Tess Gandy, Councillor Andree Gee, Councillor Tony Goldson, Councillor Louise Gooch, Councillor Tracey Green, Councillor Colin Hedgley, Councillor Ray Herring, Councillor Mark Jepson, Councillor Richard Kerry, Councillor Stuart Lawson, Councillor Geoff Lynch, Councillor James Mallinder, Councillor Chris Mapey, Councillor Debbie McCallum, Councillor Frank Mortimer, Councillor Trish Mortimer, Councillor Mark Newton, Councillor Malcolm Pitchers, Councillor Carol Poulter, Councillor David Ritchie, Councillor Craig Rivett, Councillor Keith Robinson, Councillor Mary Rudd, Councillor Letitia Smith, Councillor Rachel Smith-Lyte, Councillor Ed Thompson, Councillor Caroline Topping, Councillor Steve Wiles

Officers present:

Katherine Abbott (Democratic Services Officer), Stephen Baker (Chief Executive), Phil Gore (Head of Environmental Services & Port Health), Andy Jarvis (Strategic Director), Nick Khan (Strategic Director), Nicole Rickard (Head of Communities), Philip Ridley (Head of Planning & Coastal Management), Hilary Slater (Monitoring Officer and Head of Legal & Democratic Services).

Others present:

Mr Jim Crawford, Strategic Director, EDF Energy, Mr Richard Bull, Head of Transport Planning (Sizewell C), EDF Energy, and Mr Tom McGarry, Head of Communications, EDF Energy.

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for Absence were received from Councillor Edward Back, Councillor David Beavan, Councillor Norman Brooks, Councillor Tony Cooper, Councillor Janet Craig, Councillor T-J Haworth-Culf, Councillor Keith Patience, Councillor William Taylor and Councillor Kay Yule.

2 Declarations of Interest

There were no Declarations of Interest.

3 Minutes

With reference to item 9, Notices of Motion, of the Minutes of the Meeting held on 24 July 2019, Councillor Graham Elliott referred to the second Motion regarding the expansion of a commitment to Fairtrade by East Suffolk Council and to the minuted point of order made by Councillor Herring regarding there having been "insufficient debate" on the substantive Motion. Councillor Elliott considered there to have been no debate on the substantive Motion and proposed that this to be so recorded in the Minutes. The proposal was seconded and by majority vote it was

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 24 July 2019, subject to the amendment of item 9 regarding the debate of the second Motion, be confirmed as a correct record.

4 Announcements

Council received the following announcements:

The Chairman of the Council, Councillor Colin Hedgley, announced that four past Councillors of the previous Suffolk Coastal and Waveney District Councils had passed away in recent months - Dennis Gooch, Les Binns, Simon Wood and Jim Bidwell. At the invitation of the Chairman, tributes were paid to each of the deceased Councillors by Councillor Mark Newton (Dennis Gooch), Councillor Stuart Bird (Les Binns), Councillor Judy Cloke (Simon Wood) and Councillor Stephen Burroughes (Jim Bidwell). At the conclusion of the four tributes, Full Council stood for a minute's silence as a mark of respect.

The Chairman of the Council announced the public engagements which he and/or the Vice Chairman, Councillor Keith Robinson, had attended since the last meeting of Council in July. These included:

- Launch of #MakeShipHappen campaign to raise funds to build a full size replica of the Sutton Hoo ship
- Operation Camouflage at Rock Barracks
- The Mayor of Beccles Civic Reception
- Speech Day at Woodbridge School
- Battle of Britain Commemorative Events and Thanksgiving Services
- Opening of Leiston Leisure Centre

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Steve Gallant, announced that Wednesday 2 October would be the start of the Council's Hothouse event at BT (Adastral Park) and to which many Councillors had confirmed their attendance. The Leader of the Council thanked those Councillors who had been able to commit to the three day event which, he said, would be a fantastic and unique opportunity to contribute to the development of the Council's new Strategic Plan setting the aims and objectives for East Suffolk for the coming four years. The Leader of the Council continued that, although the event would be intense, it promised to be a worthwhile experience for Councillors to work more closely with Officers to explore the type of organisation the Council wanted to be. He concluded by saying he was very much looking forward to what promised to be a productive and creative three days.

There were no announcements by other Cabinet Members or the Chief Executive Officer.

5 Questions from the Public

No questions from the electorate, as provided for by Council Procedure Rule 8, had been received.

6 Presentation on Sizewell C

Council received a presentation by Mr Jim Crawford, Sizewell C Project Development Director and Mr Richard Bull, Head of Transport Planning for Sizewell C, both of EDF Energy. The presentation included:

- Sizewell Cs positive contribution to UK energy policy: Safely and reliably meeting future energy demand and diversifying risk; low costs and risks for customers on a total system cost basis; high value infrastructure projects provide construction jobs, up-skilling and economic stimulus; and, meeting carbon emission reduction targets and mitigating risks
- Future power demand forecast to increase due to the electrification of heat and transport. This will have to be met by low carbon power
- EDF advocated a diverse generation mix to meet the UKs power sector objectives: nuclear complementary to renewables
- Sizewell C would replicate the design of Hinkley Point C with some site-specific additions
- Sizewell C could be built with greater cost certainty due to the replication of Hinkley Point Cs design, dovetailing construction on the two sites, leverage Tier 1 contractor experience, and the transition of key skills
- Replication of design would have economic benefits (25,000 job opportunities, 1000 apprentices/40% female, 2/3 of construction spend would be in the UK, education investment, the creation and growth of local businesses) and construction benefits (design cost savings, lower development costs, no design or quantity risks, learning in the supply chain, lower qualification costs)
- Sizewell C and its prime contractors were confident that a cost reduction of 20% (£4bn) could be achieved against the expected cost of Hinkley Point C
- Regulated Asset Base model could reduce financing costs : for partnership between consumers, policy makers and developers; operates under a Regulator; opportunity to attract a wide range of investors; opportunities to maximise savings
- Government had recently launched a consultation on financing for new nuclear projects reflecting the key role new nuclear has in future UK energy policy
- Decommissioning would take around 20 years but was a relatively straightforward process
- Socio-economic benefits at Hinkley Point C would be repeated and increased at Sizewell
- Freight management strategy options: Rail-led, integrated and road-led
- Key steps up to the submission of the Application outlined
- Key steps following the submission of the Application outlined

The Chairman invited questions.

Councillor P Byatt asked if EDF Energy was confident that it would be able to locate and employ the size of workforce and variety of skills required to complete the project on time and to budget. Mr Crawford replied that the project offered significant job opportunities for local people and added that discussions with further education providers were also underway regarding the training opportunities that would also be available.

Councillor G Elliott queried Mr Crawford's statement, during his presentation, that Greenpeace "supported nuclear power": Mr Crawford clarified that Greenpeace had recognised nuclear power generated low levels of carbon.

Councillor C Rivett referred to discussions with Network Rail and asked about the potential risks or consequences if delivery of this option were to be delayed. Council was briefly updated on EDF Energy's discussions with Network Rail around freight management. Councillor C Mapey asked about EDF Energy's contingency plans if a rail solution was not possible. Mr Bull referred to the integrated approach which would focus on delivery via the branch line; he added that the infrastructure would be provided by EDF Energy, subject to National Rail's agreement. He continued to state that EDF Energy was confident that the phased implementation of a range of mitigating measures, including key road schemes, would be successful.

Councillor M Deacon asked why a marine-led solution to freight delivery was not being pursued. Mr Crawford acknowledged that this was the most desirable solution however, the impact on the marine environment of the construction phases meant it was not feasible and so had been withdrawn as an option.

Councillor D McCallum noted that the presentation had stated some 64% of construction value would go to UK business and asked about the remaining 36%. Mr Crawford said the manufacturers of key nuclear components were located in France and that, at the moment, there was no such production in the UK.

There being no further questions, the Chairman thanked Mr Crawford for his informative presentation.

7 Questions from Members

The following Questions had been submitted by Members as provided for by Council Procedure Rule 9. The written response to each Question, below, was provided at the meeting.

(a) Question from Councillor M Deacon to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member with responsibility for Economic Development:

-
"Councillor Byatt and I recently met with a senior ABP representative and were given a full briefing about the contribution ABP makes to Lowestoft Port and the surrounding area. Will the Deputy Leader extend an invitation to ABP Port Management to address Full Council about their operations and share their vision for the future part they can play in local economic development?"

Response from Councillor C Rivett, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Economic Development:

"ESC has been working closely with ABP in relation to their port operations at Lowestoft for many years now. The role of the port in the Lowestoft economy cannot be underestimated and our ongoing work has been focussed on how we can assist the growth of the port's operations and, in particular, the close relationship they have with the offshore energy sector.

The Economic Development team have been working closely with Scottish Power Renewables, Petersons, James Fisher Marine Services and Cauldwell Marine – all recent inward investments to the port and surrounding areas to determine how we (and our partners such as the LEP) can help maintain and grow their business operations. Furthermore, as part of the Renaissance in East Anglia Fishing (REAF) Group, ESC are working alongside ABP to determine what opportunities BREXIT and the UK's withdrawal from the Common Fisheries Policy can present to our local fishing sector and what investment, particularly in the port, will need to be made to exploit these potential growth opportunities.

The Council is also working very closely with ABP regarding the Lowestoft Flood Risk Management Project and is in close contact regarding the Third Crossing Project. It is therefore very clear that ESC views ABP as a key partner in supporting economic growth in Lowestoft and indeed the port is at the centre of the Central Lowestoft Regeneration Area.

ABP have also recently consulted on a masterplan for Lowestoft Port and ESC provided a supportive and comprehensive response to their plans to develop the port. Again, our response was based on how the port's operation can support the town's economic growth and our role in enabling this.

This demonstrates that ESC and ABP have a long history of collaborative working across a number of areas. I am therefore very happy to extend an invite to ABP to attend Full Council so they can provide further details on their growth plans for Lowestoft port and how this will benefit the wider Lowestoft economy."

Councillor Deacon thanked the Deputy Leader for his response and said he was delighted that ABP would be invited to attend a future meeting of the Full Council. Councillor Deacon asked, as a supplemental question, if the Council was aware of ABPs concerns regarding the siting of the third crossing.

Councillor Rivett replied that ABP had fully stated its concerns within a masterplan for Lowestoft Port and that the Council had provided a constructive response to the consultation on that masterplan. He added that the Council would continue to work proactively with ABP to ensure a harmonious resolution to the siting of the crossing.

(b) Question from Councillor T Gandy to the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Community Health:

“Given the serious implications for public safety, how satisfied were you with the emergency evacuation procedures in place for the recent emergency in Normanhurst Close, and what lessons may have been learned for any future incidents requiring evacuation of residents and others?”

Response from Councillor M Rudd, Cabinet Member for Community Health

“Evacuation in Suffolk is led by Suffolk Constabulary and is only undertaken as a last resort in response to an emergency. The roles and responsibilities for each multi-agency partner are defined in the Suffolk Resilience Forum Guide to Evacuation and Shelter in Suffolk that is available on the Suffolk Resilience website.

East Suffolk Council supported a police-led emergency evacuation of over 100 properties on Sunday 28 July 2019 after dangerous chemicals were discovered in Normanhurst Close, Lowestoft. The Local Authority, supported by the Suffolk Joint Emergency Planning Unit and Sentinel Leisure Trust, established a Rest Centre for 37 evacuees at Water Lane Leisure Centre, dispatched a Liaison Officer to the incident to liaise with the Emergency Services and ran an ad hoc Emergency Control Centre to co-ordinate the support. In the following week, teams within the Housing Service supported two tenants who were unable to return to their properties due to the on-going complex police investigation.

The key lessons for the Local Authority were considered at the quarterly Emergency Preparedness Forum on 21 August 2019. A multi-agency de-brief for all the Category 1 responders, including the police and Local Authority, was held on 23 September 2019.”

Councillor Gandy thanked the Cabinet Member for her response and, as a supplemental question, asked for clarification on the state of the two properties the two residents had been moved to. The response to this question was not available at the meeting but was subsequently provided to all Councillors.

(c) Question from Councillor P Byatt to the Leader of the Council:

“Following the previous disappointment in July with the Future High Streets Funds, does the recent announcement about our success with the New Towns Fund mean that plans for the Heritage Action Zone can be incorporated into this funding stream?”

Response from Councillor S Gallant, Leader of the Council

“The outcome of East Suffolk Council’s bid to the Future High Streets fund was very disappointing especially given the substantial work Officers from across the Council had contributed to the bid and the widespread support it received locally, regionally and nationally. The key lesson learnt from this experience is that the towns that were successful had a masterplan in place for their town centres. As a result of this ESC are now currently developing such a masterplan for Lowestoft’s town centre which will support a further bid for round 2 of the Future High Streets Fund and a bid into the recently announced Towns Funds that Lowestoft was invited to bid for. A crucial element in the production of an effective masterplan will be engaging with key stakeholders such as Lowestoft Town Council during its development.

The Towns Fund invites us to bid for up to £25m for Lowestoft (not restricted to the town centre) for progress regeneration and development projects. The Government expects communities, businesses and local leaders to join forces to draw up ambitious plans to transform their town's economic growth prospects with a focus on improved transport, boosting productivity, broadband connectivity, skills and culture. However, we still await detailed criteria from the Government so we know exactly what we can bid for.

The development of the town centre masterplan will provide a comprehensive approach to repurposing the town centre and guide future development and inward investment opportunities. Furthermore, it will include the HAZ area and will provide the basis for our bid to the Towns Fund and the second round of the Future High Street Fund. The North Lowestoft Heritage Action Zone is and will continue to play a vital role in the future regeneration of Lowestoft. The HAZ will help shape regeneration proposals within that area, complementing other key areas within the town (including the town centre and south seafront). This will allow ESC to seek further external grant funding, from a variety of sources, including the Towns Fund. The HAZ will also allow us to bring key partners to the table to ensure that initiatives are supported by a wide range of partners / community."

Councillor Byatt thanked the Leader for his response and, as a supplemental comment, suggested that, in addition to the Council's existing Heritage Champion, the Leader consider appointing an Assistant Heritage Champion. He added that, in comparison to the current "febrile" national political atmosphere, it was additionally important for the Council to be seen as a constant that continued to work with enthusiasm for and on behalf of its local communities, town and parish councils. The Leader of the Council stated that the Council would continue to work closely with all three tiers of local government and he was very pleased that Lowestoft Town Council was keen to work with the Council to develop the masterplan for the town centre.

8 Petitions

No petitions, as provided for by Council Procedure Rule 10, had been received.

9 Notices of Motion

No Notices of Motion, as provided for by Council Procedure Rule 11, had been received.

10 Political Balance of East Suffolk Council

Council received report **ES/0150** by the Leader of the Council. The report referred to the overall political composition of the Council to be reflected in the appointment of Councillors to seats on Committees and Sub-Committees, in accordance with the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990. The proportional allocation of seats had been reviewed following the announcement at the 24 July 2019 meeting of Full Council that former Independent Councillor T Cooper had moved to the Conservative Group; the implications for proportionate representation on the various Committees for the remainder of the Municipal Year to ensure decision-making continued to be undertaken democratically had been considered. The report provided the updated political balance of the Council and the composition of the Committees

and stated that Councillor Cooper had retained his seat on Planning Committee South, as a Conservative Councillor.

There being no questions or matters raised for debate, the Chairman moved to the recommendations which were proposed, seconded and by unanimous vote it was

RESOLVED

1. That the updated political balance of the Council and the composition of the Committees be noted; and
2. That the retention of his seat on Planning Committee South by Councillor T Cooper, as a Conservative Councillor, be noted.

11 Establishment of Community Partnerships

Council received report **ES/0156** by the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Customers, Communities and Leisure. The report provided an explanation of the purpose, structure, governance and funding of the Community Partnerships and sought approval of their establishment and associated funding.

The Leader of the Council introduced a detailed presentation in support of the report. The Leader of the Council said the proposed eight Community Partnerships would provide an innovative opportunity to connect with local communities across the District. An initial programme of eight workshops were planned between the end of October and the end of November; these would focus on data in the form of statistical facts and figures as well as insight in the form of local people's knowledge. The first round of Community Partnership meetings would commence between January and March 2020 and all District Councillors would be core members of their Community Partnership. Other key partners participating in the Community Partnerships would include the County Council, Suffolk Constabulary, Clinical Commissioning Groups, the Youth Voice, businesses, the voluntary sector, and community and social enterprise organisations. The Leader of the Council continued to state that the meetings of the Community Partnerships would focus on the development of solutions to the priorities agreed at the earlier workshops as well as to "live" issues which communities and their representatives identified. Each Community Partnership would have a budget of £10,000 in 2019/20, with a further £25,000 per year for three years. In addition, there would be strategic funding of £150,000 available in 2019/20 with a further £300,000 per year for three years. Each of the Community Partnerships would have a Chairman who would meet key strategic partners, including the Suffolk Constabulary, Clinical Commissioning Groups and the County Council, at quarterly meetings of the Community Partnership Board.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the Head of Communities provided the remainder of the presentation. This included:

- An example of the introductory information which would be provided to each Workshop
- A example of a Community Partnership 'area' profile including population key facts e.g. most over-represented and under-represented age groups, largest and smallest age groups, the number of people aged under 16, over 64 and over 85.

- Key facts on deprivation in the area e.g. the numbers affected by income deprivation, the percentage of people of working age affected by employment deprivation, the numbers of children and older people affected by income deprivation
- Using the DCLGs Index of Multiple Deprivation data to provide a comparison of the most deprived areas and the least deprived
- The highest and lowest life expectancy statistics by Ward (as at 2018)
- The prevalence of dementia and depression in the Community Partnership area
- The percentage of primary school children measured as overweight or obese according to the National Child Measurement Programme
- The percentage of adults who complete more than two hours exercise per week and the percentage of adults who do not exercise
- The number of children in care whose home is in the Community Partnership and the number of children in care placements in the area
- Data maps to indicate disability and social isolation
- Percentage of adults in receipt of Universal Credit

The Chairman invited questions.

Councillor T Goldson welcomed the proposed Community Partnerships which, he said, provided a real opportunity to make a positive difference; he asked if it was intended that there be cross-over and flexibility with County Councillors' divisional boundaries. The Leader of the Council replied that the Community Partnerships would work with a number of organisations and, unfortunately, the boundaries of these would not all be co-terminous with the Community Partnerships. He added that it was important for the County Councillors to play an integral part but this would mean that some may need to participate in more than one Community Partnership although most Councillors had a clear partnership within which most of their parishes fitted; he added that opportunities for neighbouring Community Partnership to work jointly on the same priorities would be sought to ensure economies of scale and a sensible, flexible approach.

Councillor L Gooch said the proposals would be a marvellous opportunity to improve lives and thanked the Leader and the Head of Communities for the detailed work so far; she asked why the budget for each Community Partnership had been set at the same amount when the make-up of each would differ considerably. The Leader of the Council said the rurality of some locations brought differing dimensions and challenges to the delivery of services but these were, obviously, as important as those within a more urban location, and, therefore, all the Community Partnerships would receive the same amount. Councillor Gooch agreed this was a logical approach but suggested that funding allocations should be reviewed in a year or so. The Leader of the Council said that Full Council could seek to recommend such a review if it so wished.

Councillor C Topping asked if the data to be provided to each of the Workshops would include traffic and parking matters. The Leader of the Council said the presentation had provided an example of the data that could be provided but, he said, the volume of data needed to be considered with care as it was important for the Community Partnerships to be able to focus on priorities. The Leader stressed the importance of

ensuring that any data which was reviewed by the Community Partnerships had been validated.

In response to a question from Councillor S Bird about how voting mechanisms for conflicting priorities were intended to work, the Leader of the Council replied that there would need to be a flexible approach and a willingness to compromise when agreeing priorities would be needed.

Councillor T Green also welcomed the proposed Community Partnerships and asked if the County Council's social care and early intervention teams could be involved in the Community Partnerships. Councillor Green also referred to the previous *Hidden Needs* document and asked that this be made available to newly elected Councillors. She also asked how the impact of the Community Partnerships would be reviewed and how their success would be measured. The Leader of the Council agreed that the *Hidden Needs* document was a key source of information for all Councillors and available on-line. He added that the Community Partnerships would go through a process of continuous review to ascertain how they were working and developing, albeit at different rates and in different ways.

Councillor P Byatt welcomed the involvement of all Councillors in the Partnerships. He asked that the participation of young people be encouraged and also that there be a sharing mechanism for issues being addressed by Community Partnerships to indicate common priorities and related solutions. Councillor Byatt hoped the formation of the Community Partnerships would be celebrated. The Leader of the Council agreed that it would be essential to share best practice and opportunities between the Community Partnerships. He added that the Strategic Board which included the eight Chairs would provide an opportunity for the sharing of information.

Councillor M Jepson welcomed the opportunity for all participants to come together, regardless of political persuasion, and asked that the forums be well-promoted. The Leader of the Council replied that a communication strategy would be put in place.

The Chairman invited debate.

Councillor C Blundell said he had a number of reservations about practical aspects of the Community Partnerships, these included the election of a Chair for each of the Community Partnerships and he was concerned that District Councillors on each Partnership might be undermined or "swamped" by the other participating bodies. Councillor Blundell said demands would be diverse and there would be the potential for conflict, therefore, he said it would be important for all participants to have an equal voice. The Leader of the Council confirmed that each Chair would be a Councillor and referred to the governance arrangements detailed within the report.

Councillor T Goldson said it would be important for the Chair of each Community Partnership to set realistic parameters and to provide good leadership to enhance the success of the Partnerships; he commended the proposals.

The Chairman moved to the recommendations which were proposed, seconded and by unanimous vote it was

RESOLVED

1. That the establishment of eight Community Partnerships, one for each of the areas shown on the map at Appendix A to ES/0156, be approved;
2. That the proposed purpose, remit, governance, structure and funding for Community Partnerships in East Suffolk, as set out in ES/0156, be endorsed;
3. That the proposed budget for the Community Partnerships, as set out in the table at paragraph 6.7 of ES/0156, be approved;
4. That all that can be done to ensure the success of the East Suffolk Partnerships be agreed; and
5. That a review in three years of the establishment, workings and success of the Community Partnerships be agreed.

12 Update of the Anglia Revenues Partnership Agreement

The Chairman advised Council that this report had been withdrawn. The reason for this was that the Joint Anglia Revenue Partnership (ARP) Committee, when it met on 17 September 2019, had been inquorate. Therefore, that Committee had not been able to formally approve the new Constitution as required before the individual partner Councils could be asked to also consider it for approval. The Chairman further advised that the ARP Committee next met in December and so this item would be deferred to the January 2020 meeting of East Suffolk's Full Council.

13 East Suffolk Food and Health and Safety Service Plan 2019/20

Council received report **ES/0151** by the Cabinet Member for Community Health. The report provided the Council's Service Plan for 2019/20 in the format prescribed by the Food Standards Agency in its Framework Agreement on Local Authority Law Enforcement and as also required by the Health and Safety Executive in the National Local Authority Enforcement Code. The 2018/19 Service Plan was required to be submitted for member review to identify performance against the agreed targets, any variance from the Plan and any areas for improvement in the service. Similarly, the draft 2019/20 Service Plan was required to be submitted for member consideration and approval.

In presenting the report, the Cabinet Member drew Council's attention to the key achievements delivered in 2018/19 and as set out in more detail in paragraphs 7.2, 13.2 and 19.2 of the Plan and also to the areas for service improvement as set out in more detail in paragraphs 8, 14 and 20 of the Plan.

The Chairman invited questions.

Councillor T Goldson, with reference to the table at paragraph 2.6 of the report, and the statistic that 97% of food hygiene interventions had been achieved, asked that future reports provide numbers of tasks completed as well as percentage performance against the target so it could be more easily understood. This was agreed.

There being no further questions or matters raised for debate, the Chairman moved to the recommendations which were proposed, seconded and by unanimous vote it was

RESOLVED

1. That performance against the Food and Health and Safety Service Plan 2018/19 be noted; and
2. That the Food and Health and Safety Service Plan for 2019/20 be adopted.

14 Cabinet Members' Report and Outside Bodies Representatives' Report to Council

Council received report **ES/0152** by the Leader of the Council. The report provided individual Cabinet Members' reports as well as reports by Outside Bodies representatives.

The Chairman stated that the written reports would be taken as read and invited questions on their contents.

Councillor R Herring, with reference to the report by the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Communities, Leisure & Tourism, asked a question related to the Period Poverty initiative and previous contributions to its funding by a number of Councillors through their 2018/19 Enabling Communities Budgets. Councillor Herring said he had made such a contribution and had received a commitment that a proportion of that funding would be utilised by the initiative within his own Ward. However, he considered that funds had been predominantly used within urban areas and GP practices in rural areas did not appear to have been advised of the initiative and so had not requested one of the boxes of sanitary products. Councillor Herring also stated that he had been informed that Rendlesham Youth Club had requested a box, but this had not been received. He asked if the initiative could be more widely promoted and for it to better recognise that the same difficulties from period poverty were experienced in rural areas. He asked the Cabinet Member to review the individual contributions from Enabling Communities Budgets, the previous commitments given to facilitate the initiative within the Wards of those contributing Councillors and to address any areas where provision could be improved. The Cabinet Member thanked Councillor Herring for his question and undertook to review the issue, as requested. The Cabinet Member also asked all Councillors to let her know if there were host locations within their Wards for the boxes.

Councillor C Topping asked the Cabinet Member for Housing, with specific reference to the earlier presentation on Community Partnerships and the example of data and statistics that would be provided, asked if the quoted number of houses in poor condition included any Council houses. The Cabinet Member thanked Councillor Topping for her question. The Cabinet Member said Council houses were maintained to a very high standard and investment in housing stock continued to deliver re-wiring, new heating, replacement roofs, kitchens and bathrooms etc. However, the Cabinet Member undertook to check the quoted figure and to provide an answer outside of the meeting.

Councillor P Byatt asked the Cabinet Member for Planning and Coastal Management if he could raise the collapsing of the Pakefield Cliffs with the County Council. The Cabinet Member responded that this was not the direct responsibility of the coastal management team, but reassured Council that there was close working with all partners in this regard.

Councillor C Mapey asked the Leader of the Council (in the absence of the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Transport) for an update on civil parking enforcement. The Leader of the Council referred to issues with the Traffic Regulation Order and discussions with the Highways Department of the County Council and the Department of Transport. It was suggested that the Council's Car Parking Manager would be able to assist the Councillor with additional detail.

Councillor T Gandy advised the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Customer Services and Operational Partnerships that she was aware of a number of complaints from residents related to the length of time taken to speak with the Council's Council Tax team to seek advice. The Cabinet Member thanked Councillor Gandy for her question. He said that unfortunately he did not have the relevant statistical data with him, but would look into this matter outside of the meeting.

The meeting concluded at 9:20 pm.

.....
Chairman