

Unconfirmed



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Full Council** held in the Conference Room, Riverside, on **Wednesday, 24 July 2019 at 6:30 pm**

Members of the Committee present:

Councillor Melissa Allen, Councillor Paul Ashdown, Councillor Edward Back, Councillor David Beavan, Councillor Stuart Bird, Councillor Chris Blundell, Councillor Elfrede Brambley-Crawshaw, Councillor Norman Brooks, Councillor Stephen Burroughes, Councillor Peter Byatt, Councillor Jenny Ceresa, Councillor Judy Cloke, Councillor Maurice Cook, Councillor Tony Cooper, Councillor Linda Coulam, Councillor Janet Craig, Councillor Mike Deacon, Councillor Graham Elliott, Councillor John Fisher, Councillor Tony Fryatt, Councillor Steve Gallant, Councillor Andree Gee, Councillor Tony Goldson, Councillor Louise Gooch, Councillor Colin Hedgley, Councillor Ray Herring, Councillor Mark Jepson, Councillor Richard Kerry, Councillor Geoff Lynch, Councillor James Mallinder, Councillor Chris Mapey, Councillor Frank Mortimer, Councillor Trish Mortimer, Councillor Mark Newton, Councillor Keith Patience, 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 William Taylor, Councillor Ed Thompson, Councillor Caroline Topping, Councillor Steve Wiles, Councillor Kay Yule

Officers present:

Stephen Baker (Chief Executive), Andrew Jarvis (Strategic Director), Nick Khan (Strategic Director), Hilary Slater (Monitoring Officer and Head of Legal and Democratic Services), Paul Wood (Head of Economic Development and Regeneration) and Nicola Wotton (Deputy Democratic Services Manager).

Others present:

David Walker, Offshore Development Director for Scottish Power Renewables, and Philip Watkins, Director of Eastern Edge Ltd.

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J Bond, T Gandy, T Green, TJ Haworth-Culf, S Lawson and D McCallum.

2 Declarations of Interest

During the consideration of Confidential Item 14, Lowestoft Full Fibre Project, Councillor K Patience declared a Local Non Pecuniary Interest, as he was a Member of Lowestoft Town Council and he chose to leave the meeting during the discussions on this item.

3a Minutes of the Annual East Suffolk Council meeting held on 22 May 2019

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Annual East Suffolk Council meeting held on 22 May 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Monitoring Officer has recommended that the Minutes of the past and Shadow Authorities be received as good governance and for the avoidance of Minutes remaining unconfirmed.

3b Minutes of the Suffolk Coastal District Council meeting held on 28 March 2019

RESOLVED

That the Minutes from the Suffolk Coastal District Council meeting held on 28 March 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

The Monitoring Officer had recommended that the Minutes of the past and Shadow Authorities be received as good governance and for the avoidance of Minutes remaining unconfirmed.

3c Minutes of the Waveney District Council meeting held on 20 March 2019

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Waveney District Council meeting held on 20 March 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

3d Minutes of the East Suffolk Shadow Authority Meeting held on 28 February 2019

RESOLVED

That the Minutes from the East Suffolk Shadow Authority meeting held on 28 February 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4 Announcements

The Chairman of the Council:

-

The Chairman of the Council took the opportunity to inform Members about the interesting and varied number of public engagements that he and the Vice Chairman had attended, since the Annual Council meeting which was held on 22 May 2019. The list of engagements included:

Chairman's Attendance:

-

- * Southwold Civic Parade and Service
- * The Suffolk Show
- * The start of the OVO Women's Tour in Beccles
- * Felixstowe Mayor's Civic Service

- * Launch of Suffolk Day at Felixstowe Town Hall
- * National Care Homes Open Day at Harleston House, Lowestoft
- * Bangladesh Festival Launch Event in Ipswich
- * Grundisburgh Village Fete
- * Dedication of the new Lowestoft Pilot Boat
- * Felixstowe Mayor's Reception

Vice Chairman's Attendance:

-

- * The 40th Anniversary of Lowestoft Police Station
- * Southwold Hospital Project
- * Lord Kitchener's Annual General Meeting in Lowestoft
- * Lord Mayor of Great Yarmouth's Civic Service

The Leader of the Council

The Leader of the Council reported that he was pleased to announce that Councillor T Cooper, who was previously an Independent Councillor and therefore a Member of the GLI, had decided to join the Conservative Group. It was noted that the Conservatives welcomed Councillor Cooper to their Group and they very much looked forward to working with him.

The Leader reported that he had appointed 3 Assistant Cabinet Members and they were as follows:

Councillor A Cackett had been appointed as Assistant Cabinet Member for Transport; Councillor M Cook had been appointed as Assistant Cabinet Member for Finance; Councillor M Jepson had been appointed as Assistant Cabinet Member for Community Health.

The Leader then reported that, as mentioned in previous forums, the Council's vision for East Suffolk, and more specifically what the Council will be doing over the next four years, needed to be set out in a new Business Plan for East Suffolk. Historically, formulating and creating Business Plans had always been a lengthy process, sometimes taking up to a year to fully develop and to agree content and format. So, the Council was going to take a new approach using something called a Hothouse. A Hothouse creates a unique environment where people with knowledge and skills across a broad spectrum are dedicated solely to solving a given business objective, which means immediate collaboration, feedback and momentum to provide for creative solutions. All 55 Members will be invited to the Hothouse session, which will be held over a three day period at the beginning of October, at BT Adastral Park in Martlesham. Key officers would also be in attendance to provide specialist knowledge and collaboration. It was important for as many Members to attend as possible for the full three days, to fully feed in to the creation of the new Business Plan for East Suffolk Council. Members were asked to respond to the invitation as soon as possible, as numbers for the session needed to be managed. Invitations would be sent out after this meeting, to all 55 Members.

Councillor Ritchie, Cabinet Member for Planning and Coastal Management

Councillor Ritchie, Cabinet Member for Planning and Coastal Management, took the opportunity to report that the Council's Building Control Team had been successful at the recent Eastern Region Building Control Awards Ceremony. The Building Control Team had submitted 12 projects for consideration and 9 of those projects had been short listed. The Council had been highly commended for its Building Control Partnership with Ipswich Council and for one of its Commercial Building Projects in Ipswich. The Council had won the categories of Best Social Housing Project, for its St Edmunds Road development in Southwold and the Best Local Builder had been Stephen Elphick from Shadingfield.

The Chief Executive

The Chief Executive was pleased to report that the Council had appointed a new Head of Service - Emma Bloom, who would be responsible for Customer Services, Communications and Marketing. He took the opportunity to confirm that her arrival was eagerly anticipated and that we would all very much look forward to working with her in the future.

On a personal note, the Chief Executive reported that he had become a grandfather again for the third time earlier today, with the safe arrival of grandson. All those present congratulated the Chief Executive on his new arrival.

Former Suffolk Coastal District Councillor, Terry Hodgeson

The Chairman then invited Councillor M Deacon to say a few words about former Suffolk Coastal District Councillor, Terry Hodgeson, who had sadly passed away. Councillor Deacon reported that he and former Councillor Hodgeson had first been elected, together, in 1983. Since then, Terry Hodgeson had worked tirelessly for the public and had been appointed Chairman of the Policy and Resources Committee as well as Leader of the Council. He had a tenacious character and was a keen cyclist and he had helped to instigate the payments for cycles miles within the Members Allowance Scheme. He worked passionately for his constituents and he would be greatly missed. The Chairman then invited all those present to stand for a Minutes' Silence as a mark of respect for Terry Hodgeson.

5 Questions from the Public

No questions had been submitted by the electorate as provided by Council Procedure Rule 8.

The Chairman of the Council reported that he had changed the order of the agenda to allow for the Presentation on Scottish Power Renewable Energy to be received at this point in the proceedings.

6 Presentation on Scottish Power Renewable Energy

The Chairman welcomed David Walker, Offshore Development Director for Scottish Power Renewables, and Philip Watkins, Director of Eastern Edge Ltd, to the meeting and invited them to commence their presentation.

Members noted that there was a Government and National commitment to the Low Carbon agenda. The aim was for 30% of electricity to be generated by offshore wind by 2030 and for the UK to be carbon neutral by 2050. At a more local level, Suffolk County Council (SCC) has the ambition of becoming the Greenest County in the UK and had also declared a climate emergency. The offshore wind industry would therefore play a significant role in achieving these aims. The East Anglia One development was currently under construction and would be fully operational by 2020, with an expected generation of 714 MW. East Anglia One North and East Anglia Two were currently in the fourth Consultation Stage, with construction planned to commence in 2023 and they would be expected to generate 800 MW and 900 MW respectively. The East Anglia Three development had an anticipated construction commencement date of 2022 and was expected to be fully operational by 2025, which would generate 1200 MW.

The construction phase of these developments would last for approximately 10 years, providing much needed jobs in the local area. Members were pleased to note that the operations and maintenance base for the off shore wind farms would be located at Lowestoft's PowerPark, for at least 25 years. Other local businesses were also benefiting from the construction phase and these included Associated British Ports (ABP Lowestoft), Cefas, James Fisher, Stowen Group, Palmer Group and Turner ICENI. This equated to £25 million worth of contracts being awarded to suppliers across the East of England and an additional £45 million being awarded to local companies for future work. £30 million had also been spent on regenerating Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth Ports.

The development of offshore wind had also highlighted the need to develop the skills of local people, to ensure that there were sufficiently trained staff to operate and maintain the wind farms. As such, Scottish Power had been involved in a variety of initiatives to improve skills development in the local area. This included a Skills Strategy in Partnership with SCC and East Suffolk Council (ESC), Suffolk Skills Show, STEM Ambassadors engaged with schools, East Coast College Career Talks, Lowestoft Skills Academy Workshops, Cambridge Science school events, UEA Masters Scholarships, 2019 Graduate recruitment and Women in Engineering. In terms of investment, £55,000 had been spent on student places at the East of England Offshore Wind Skills Centre, over £200,000 had been spent on scholarships at the UEA and 83 STEM workshops had been delivered to 3,000 East Anglian pupils.

It was noted that there continued to be ongoing engagement throughout the development of East Anglia One North and East Anglia Two, which included regular meetings with Natural England, Historical England and the MMO, liaison with statutory bodies and a dedicated Tourism Working Group. There had also been a dedicated workshop for the Friston Community and a Community Update for Thorpeness. Various matters had been raised by the Local Planning Authorities and these had been addressed. These included additional substantial landscape planting of 24 acres within the order limits of the sub-station, changes to transport routes for large vehicles and providing additional Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) ponds over and above the design requirements to provide improvements to a historical flood issue.

Members noted that a Community Fund had been created for the communities directly affected by the development of the offshore industry, namely Leiston and Friston. The Community Fund was distinct from the Section 111 Planning Agreements and had been developed in partnership with the Suffolk (Community) Foundation and the Scottish Power Foundation (which was charity focused). There were five main principles which underpinned the Community Fund and they were: Education, Environment, Culture, Economy and Community and the lifetime of the Fund was 25 years, which mirrored the predicted life of the wind farms. The value of the fund was £2.5 million, which equated to £100,000 per year.

It was confirmed that Scottish Power Renewables wind farm projects were fully aligned with national / local strategy and planning policy and that there had been extensive stakeholder engagement, with a variety of mitigation measures undertaken to address the feedback received. The projects had also delivered significant benefits to date in respect of jobs, investments and skills and these long term benefits would be extended and enhanced should East Anglia Two and East Anglia One North be supported and consented.

Councillor Goldson queried why underground cables were not being used to take the energy from the wind farms to the onshore substation? Confirmation was provided that the cables would be underground from the wind farms to the land fall point. This would help with fishing and the environment and it was noted that there would be no restrictions regarding fishing around the turbines. The only restrictions on fishing would be during the construction phase, due to safety reasons.

Councillor Patience sought reassurance about the security of the turbines and as he was concerned that they could become a target for terrorists in the future. It was reported that the design and engineering of the turbines, particularly the bases, were meant to withstand significant forces and they were made of steel. The turbines would not be damaged by being rammed by a boat and it was noted that there was no evidence globally of wind turbines being a target for terrorism.

Councillor Lynch reported that off shore racing was popular and queried whether the turbines would hinder further racing events. It was confirmed that the turbines were an operational asset, however they would not work when there was insufficient wind and they could also be turned off when wind levels were too high or gusty, for safety reasons. Despite this, the wind turbines were anticipated to have a high output of over 50%, as the North Sea was known to have sustainable wind levels to facilitate the turbines. They should not adversely affect any future racing events.

Councillor Topping stated that she was pleased to learn that there would be 24 acres of additional planting around the sub station, however she requested that any trees planted should not have the plastic tubes surrounding their trunks, as they served no real purpose and contributed to litter and pollution over time. It was confirmed that this request would be taken forward and Mr Walker thanked Councillor Topping for her suggestion. He also reported that specialist advice would be sought about the species of trees that would be planted, to enhance and supplement the existing woodland in that area.

Councillor Smith-Lyte queried why Friston had been chosen as the location for the sub-station for the wind farm, as the area was very rural and environmentally sensitive. It was reported that the wind farm had to link up to the existing infrastructure that was already in place at Friston as it was suitable to transport the electricity generated by the wind farm. The electricity could then be fed into the national grid, which had capacity to accept this additional electricity. Unfortunately, there was no suitable infrastructure available in Lowestoft and the development of such a sub station would be prohibitively expensive. Although concerns had been raised about the Friston sub station, the site itself was located outside of the Area of Outstanding National Beauty (AONB) and significant planting would be undertaken to mitigate the visual impact.

Councillor Herring commented about the £2.5 million Community Fund which would be created and administered by the Suffolk Foundation. He queried whether the funds would be targeted on the local areas most affected by the proposals? It was reported that the cable route to Grove Wood in Friston and the surrounding area would receive some of the fund monies. It was noted that the Community Fund would also focus upon the coastal areas too, although the exact geographic extent of those coastal areas had yet to be decided.

The Chairman thanked David Walker and Philip Watkins for their lively and informative presentation and he paused the meeting momentarily to allow them to leave the meeting at this point in the proceedings.

7 Questions from Members

(a) Question from Councillor E Brambley-Crawshaw to the Cabinet Member for Transport:

- What progress is being made to install Rapid Electric Vehicle charging points in Council owned car parks and other publicly accessible locations?

Response from Councillor N Brooks, Cabinet Member for Transport:

- Like other authorities in Suffolk, East Suffolk has started some projects to test the optimum way of installing the infrastructure needed to support electric vehicles. With a likely investment requirement running to several millions of pounds, it is vital that we get the technology right before committing to a district wide roll out. However, we have been actively pursuing some pilot schemes and we are working new installation points into our new builds and redevelopments.

We have delivered an installation in Felixstowe, funded by Highways England, on a pilot basis. This is use at the Manor Road car park and has been providing us with data on take up and CO2 avoidance. As part of this programme we have selected a hardware and software provider – eVolt/ SWARCO – and early indications are that this is working well.

In terms of engaging with technology providers, we are exploring with other providers the potential to link our emerging 'cashless parking' offer to a network of charging points in car parks. Our meetings have shown us that this technology is emerging – as are usage patterns. For example, it is currently considered to be the case that people

with EVs will 'graze' on power whilst away from home and use their home chargers to fully recharge. Therefore, our hardware will have to support this type of use. In terms of installing equipment as part of redevelopments - there has been installation of charging as part of the Deben pool development, and at both Riverside and East Suffolk House. We are also exploring the viability of installing charging points as part of any new on street parking scheme. Charging points will be the default position in new developments and have been included in the business case for Bungay Pool, and in the budget.

We have recently appointed a Strategic Parking Manager, so we will be using this learning to draft a strategy for the roll out of charging points in all council run car parks. This strategy will be delivered later this year.

Supplementary Question from Councillor E Brambley-Crawshaw:

Can I seek assurances that the Council will consult widely with partners, including Town and Parish Councils, regarding the future location of these charging points?

Response from Councillor N Brooks, Cabinet Member for Transport:

- Yes, we will consult widely about this, as we want to have the best locations possible.

(b) Question from Councillor C Topping to the Cabinet Member for Customer Services & Operational Partnerships

- The former Waveney District Council requires residents to put their food and kitchen waste in the black bin and this is sent for incineration. The former Suffolk Coastal District Council allows food waste with garden and this is turned into a valuable soil conditioner. When will this disparity in service within our single Council be rectified? And can we be assured that we adopt the higher of these two standards?

Response from Councillor S Burroughes, Cabinet Member for Customer Services and Operational Partnerships

- The Government's draft waste strategy proposes that food waste will be collected at every household as part of a drive to increase recycling rates. Consultation will continue over the next twelve months. If the result of this consultation is that there is a requirement to collect food waste from every home then all Suffolk authorities will need to consider their investment plans, and the infrastructure needed to deal with food waste at a district wide scale.

In terms of current arrangements: There is a variance between the approach in the two 'old' districts. The reasons for this continuing variation is that Suffolk Coastal had a contract with a processors – Biogen – that runs until the end of May 2021. This contractual commitment means that we are not able to substantially change our current operation until then. But clearly, we need to be exploring other options as the direction of national strategy is clear.

A separate food waste collection service across the district would, it is estimated, cost the council an additional £1.8m per year. This is mainly due to additional collection costs.

Adding food waste into the green bin collection – the model in the former Suffolk Coastal district – would cost the authority in the region of an additional £400,000 per annum.

There are issues with this approach. It is possible – even likely - that the Waste Strategy may well render the ‘co-mingled’ food waste approach obsolete and require the council to collect a separate food waste stream; i.e. not mixed with garden waste. In addition, this approach does not address the 50% of households in the district that do not have a green bin. Finally, this approach requires the council to pay £42 on every ton of garden and food waste – instead of £20 per ton for single stream garden waste. Therefore, whilst this approach may seem the most straightforward, it may not be viable.

Another key issue is how we reduce food waste in the first place. East Suffolk have been involved in working with Hubbub, a national charity, to reduce food waste by improving access to information. This has included delivering the ‘Food Savvy’ programme – and innovations such as the community fridge project in Kirkley in Lowestoft, which provides access to fridges for people with surpluses rather than disposal in the black bin.

East Suffolk Council – and other local authorities – has proposed that the costs of separate food waste collections are covered by waste ‘producers’ through the extended producer responsibility component of the strategy.

As it is uncertain whether the government would introduce a policy that put additional costs on food producers, we do need to consider other ways in which the council could deliver this service, without adding to the current £5.5m cost of collecting waste materials.

We welcome discussions with town and parish councils where radical new approaches to waste collection might be supported.

Supplementary Question from Councillor C Topping:

- Can I be assured that the Council will work with the Suffolk Waste Partnership to ensure that any waste from East Suffolk, that is sent overseas for recycling, is being recycled and is not being dumped into landfill overseas?

Response from Councillor S Burroughes, Cabinet Member for Customer Services and Operational Partnerships:

- The Council is committed to reducing waste and is working closely with the Suffolk Waste Partnership to increase recycling wherever possible. We are also working to reduce the large amount of food waste that is generate, which will help the environment.

N.B. Councillor P Byatt took the opportunity to state that many companies were working hard to reduce their impact on the environment and he reported that all of the waste collected by Biffa was recycled and nothing was put into landfill.

(c) Question from Councillor L Gooch to the Cabinet Member for the Leader of the Council:

I understand that prior to the Merger, Waveney District Council offered interim payments to applicants for Universal Credit if their payments were delayed. If that is so, can the Portfolio Holder please explain for the benefit of all Councillors how that is now working as part of East Suffolk's support to struggling residents?

Response from Councillor S Gallant, Leader of the Council:

The Council continues to award the statutory two week run on of Housing Benefit when Universal Credit is claimed – the so called 'transitional payment'. This additional payment is automatically awarded by the Benefits service irrespective of when the DWP will pay Universal Credit. The Council continues to support customers to claim Universal Credit, working in partnership with the DWP Jobcentre and Citizen's Advice, who will assist customers to claim an advance payment from the DWP.

Supplementary Question from Councillor L Gooch:

There has historically been a low take up of these transitional payments. What is the Council doing to ensure that the public know that the transitional payments are available?

Response from Councillor S Gallant, Leader of the Council:

The Council signposts people to our partner organisations including the DWP, Job Centre and Citizens Advice Bureaux and we do all we can to help raise awareness of the support available. However it should be noted that not all claimants are in need of transitional payments.

(d) Question from Councillor P Byatt to the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Economic Development:

I am sure we all share the disappointing news that Lowestoft has missed out with its application to the Government's Future High Street Funds to support development in Lowestoft. This is particularly frustrating as our neighbours just up the coast were successful. Can Councillor Rivett shed any light on how this came about, given the significant needs of Lowestoft?

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

A comprehensive expression of interest was compiled by officers from a number of teams across the council. The bid clearly articulated the challenges currently facing Lowestoft town centre alongside the significant opportunities for redevelopment if funding was secured. The submission was strongly evidence based (using robust data sets covering town centre uses, vacancy rates, demographics, deprivation indices etc.) and presented a strong case for investment linked to our ambitious vision for the town

centre. Furthermore, the bid was also strongly supported by 15 local and regional partners across the private, public and voluntary sectors e.g. New Anglia LEP, Suffolk CC, ABP, CEFAS, Anglia Water, Lowestoft TC, Access Community Trust.

The Future High Street Fund was a competitive, national fund, with all high streets and town centres from across the county eligible to apply. Of the over 300 applications submitted only 51 were successful and will now progress the full business case phase. Regrettably, on this occasion Government decided not to put the Lowestoft EoI through to the next stage.

Three towns in Suffolk submitted applications (Ipswich and Haverhill in addition to Lowestoft) and none were successful whilst 2 towns in Norfolk, Great Yarmouth and Kings Lynn were successful. The next stage of the process guarantees smaller amounts of revenue funding to work up feasibility reports / business cases but does not guarantee capital funding at the end of the process.

Great Yarmouth had a town centre masterplan in place, which possibly resulted in them being further along in the process in terms of setting a vision and having projects sufficiently worked up. The initial general feedback from government said it was focussing on those places that have “shovel ready” projects where there might be opportunities to accelerate these. This was disappointing since the funding criteria did not state this and in fact stated that if successful in the EoI stage, funding would be made available to work up investment plans.

A second round of funding will be launched early 2020 and the ambition is for Lowestoft to resubmit. In the meantime, a Town Centre Officers Group is working on commissioning a town centre masterplan to ensure the town is in the best possible position for a revised bid. Regardless of the future success of any funding bids for the revitalisation of the town centre ESC is committed to an ambitious redevelopment which includes significantly broadening the offer to include more leisure, community, residential and business uses in order to maintain the relevance and increase the footfall in the high street.

Response from Councillor P Byatt:

Thank you for your thorough answer. We really need to get behind Lowestoft and highlight all of the opportunities that are available - there are many great things happening such as the Third Crossing, Tidal Barrier and the First Light Festival.

8 Petitions

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

9 Notices of Motion

The Chairman advised that two Notices of Motion had been received for this meeting and that each Notice of Motion would be considered individually. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, a Motion could only be discussed with the consent of the Council, otherwise Notices of Motion would be referred to the Cabinet or the most relevant Committee. The Chairman then handed over to the Leader of the Council to invite the Councillors who had proposed the Motions to speak to them.

(a) Councillor R Smith-Lyte has submitted the following Notice of Motion:

"This Council pledges to:

1. Declare a Climate Emergency.
2. Set up a Policy Development Panel, commencing by October 2019, to investigate ways to cut East Suffolk Councils carbon and harmful emissions on a spend to save basis, with the ambition to make East Suffolk Council (including all buildings and services) carbon neutral by 2030.
3. To work with Suffolk County Council and other partners across the county and region, including the LEP and the Public Sector Leaders towards the aspiration of making the county of Suffolk carbon neutral by 2030.
4. To work with Government to a) deliver its 25 year Environment Plan and b) increase the powers and resources available to local authorities in order to make the 2030 target easier to achieve."

Councillor Elliott, Leader of the GLI Group, stated that he wished to make a very small amendment to the Notice of Motion. The change would be to replace the words 'Policy Development Panel' with Cross-Party Task Group within the second pledge. He confirmed that this change had been requested by the Cabinet Member for the Environment and had been agreed with the Notice of Motion's proposer, Councillor Smith-Lyte.

Upon being put to the vote, the amendment was unanimously **APPROVED**.

Councillor Byatt, Leader of the Labour Group, then took the opportunity to propose a further amendment, that 'the Task Group would report back on progress at quarterly intervals'. This would ensure that Councillors were kept apprised of any developments and that progress would continue to be made.

The Chief Executive reported that there had been two amendments made to the Notice of Motion and he took the opportunity to check that Councillor Smith-Lyte was content to accept the changes. Councillor Smith-Lyte confirmed that she was satisfied with the changes and was happy for the Motion to be voted upon. The amended Notice of Motion was duly proposed and seconded and upon being put to the vote, it was

RESOLVED

That the Notice of Motion, with the two proposed amendments, be **APPROVED** and it was also **CONFIRMED** that the Motion would be debated by Full Council this evening.

Councillor Burroughes queried whether the proposed quarterly updates on progress would be brought to Full Council or the Cabinet. There followed some discussion in this respect and it was confirmed that the update reports would be brought to the Cabinet, as all Working Groups/Task Groups needed to report back to the Cabinet, in accordance with the Council's Constitution.

Councillor Smith-Lyte reported that she had submitted the Notice of Motion as there needed to be urgent action to address climate change. Advice needed to be sought on

what the Council and its residents could do to help, as excessive carbon was significantly affecting the climate and ocean density. There was plenty of evidence to show that carbon was causing the changes to the climate that were being experienced around the world. The issue of climate change was not party political and cross-party consensus was needed to decide on the best way to proceed and the measures the Council could practically take to address this issue. West Sussex Council had ventured into generating solar energy and they were able to sell their excess energy back to the national grid. This Council needed to work proactively and look at different ways that it could make a difference. The leadership of the Council should be looking at ways of future proofing against climate change and ways to reduce it and it should look to embrace the opportunities that arose as a result of this change. The Council should take the lead in the district and encourage others to look at a wide range of ways to become carbon neutral. She took the opportunity to thank Councillors for their support and she sought commitment that this matter would receive ongoing consideration in future.

Councillor Mallinder, the Cabinet Member for the Environment, thanked Councillor Smith-Lyte for submitting this Motion, which was supported by Councillors and touched everyone's lives. The Council had a responsibility to take action and could make changes in effect to food waste, rubbish collections and recycling and was ultimately responsible for the direction of the Environmental Strategy that the Council would follow. It was noted that small changes could make a significant difference and all targets set would need to be achievable in order for there to be meaningful changes. The Council was also taking part in several pilot schemes, including one in Southwold which involved reducing the number of times that grass was cut, which would assist in helping wild flowers and insects to flourish. To date, the pilot scheme had worked well and it was hoped that it would be expanded more widely in future. East Suffolk Council definitely meant business and as such it would be working closely with colleagues and partners to help improve efficiency and make the right choices for the future.

Councillor Ritchie, Cabinet Member for Planning and Coastal Management, reported that climate change had a significant impact upon his portfolio. The coastline was dynamic and continuously changing and should the sea levels rise as a result of global warming, this would have a tremendous impact upon the district. Kessingland and Benacre had a pumping station close to the sea and should that pumping station be overwhelmed by the sea, it would lead to the flooding of 100 hectares. Lake Lothing in Lowestoft was also prone to tidal surges. A tidal barrage was planned for Lowestoft, which would be able to cope with a maximum of 0.5 metre increase in sea levels. This work was essential and the government would need to assist with additional funding to assist with these important schemes.

Councillor Brambley-Crawshaw reported that urgent action was needed to help mitigate climate change. A recent report had stated that there was only 12 years in which to act to prevent devastating climate change, and the changes needed to be front loaded, so the majority of the changes needed to be made during the next 18 months. The world was facing rapid and unprecedented changes and action was required before it was too late. The Council could use its influence and collaborate with other organisations and agencies. It could also use some of the environmental toolkits which were available and which could be used as a practical guide to make real

change. This Motion was the first step on an important journey which must be taken in order to avoid unprecedented climate change.

Councillor Elliott took the opportunity to thank the Cabinet Member for the Environment for his support for the Notice of Motion and he commended the questions that he had asked at the last Cabinet meeting, regarding environmental matters. It was important that all Members of the Council worked together to tackle the underlying issues, which would cause changes to the way that we live our lives. He also thanked the Liberal Democrat Councillors for taking a step back and not seconding the Motion, although they were very supportive of it. The subject of climate change required political maturity at this time, with Councillors working for the best outcome rather than political point scoring. The Leader of the Council, in his opening speech back in May 2019 had mentioned the environment several times and had quoted David Attenborough and he had agreed with everything that was said. The planet would ultimately survive and would bounce back from the devastation of climate change, but it would not be a planet that we recognised or could continue to live with. The Leader had also mentioned a 30 year vision of East Suffolk Council in his opening speech, which would take us to almost the year 2050. What will life be like for us then? Would many of us be climate refugees if we take no action now? He reported that he was very supportive of the Motion and it was time to become part of the solution.

Councillor Bird stated that he also supported the Motion and he commented that new record temperatures or weather phenomena were now being experienced on a regular basis, which demonstrated that climate change was real. It was important not to make empty promises, and that real action was required. This would involve looking at the way that we live, how we use various electrical gadgets, how we heat and cool our homes, and the clothes we wear. Words were easy, however actions were much more difficult and it was important that Councillors took the opportunity to ask challenging questions during meetings, to ensure that reducing climate change remained a focus of the Council.

Councillor Mapey thanked Councillor Smith-Lyte for her Motion, which he agreed was extremely important. It was a momentous day, as this was the first Motion for East Suffolk Council and it was good to hear the Leader's speech being quoted by Councillor Elliott. Councillor Mapey was also a Woodbridge Town Councillor and he reported that a climate change emergency had recently been declared at that Council's last meeting. It was important for all Councils to do this and to recognise the seriousness of the situation. Councils had a duty to act to mitigate the effects of climate change. He also stated that it was important for people to reduce climate change without being required to live 'lesser lives' in order to do so. He also said that whilst there had been several mentions of reducing levels of carbon during the debate, it was actually the carbon dioxide emissions which had a negative impact on the environment and which needed to be reduced. Carbon was a different element entirely.

Councillor Byatt reported that national government had already declared a climate emergency and there was no time to waste, otherwise things could spiral out of control. He reported that other countries had taken a different approach to climate change and had already taken other steps to reduce litter, such as chewing gum and cigarette ends. Education was the key and it was important to let everyone know how important small changes could be over time. Recycling rates and the use of single use

plastics needed to increase. It was also important to plant more trees as they would use up carbon dioxide, whilst producing valuable oxygen.

Councillor Deacon reported that Felixstowe Town Council had already declared a climate emergency and several young people had helped to raise the profile of this issue, in a very eloquent way. It was important for everyone to think about what they could do to help reduce climate change.

Councillor Gallant, Leader of the Council, confirmed that it was a cross party matter and the establishment of a Task Group was the best way for the Council to achieve this. It was important to look at all possible ways of engaging with a variety of other organisations to help reduce climate change, however it should be noted that the Council could not achieve miracles and instead should lead by example and encourage others to do their best too.

Councillor Gooch stated that she endorsed all of the comments made to date. East Suffolk Council was in a unique position as it was surrounded by off shore energy. She also said that the former Waveney District Council had supported the reduction in neonicotinoids in the River Waveney. The quarterly updates on the progress of the Task Group would be welcome as it was important to maintain the profile and momentum of this. It was important for the Council to do as much as it could to help reduce climate change and pollution in general.

The Chief Executive then read out the amended Motion in full. It was then moved by Councillor Smith-Lyte, seconded by Councillor Gooch and it was

RESOLVED

"This Council pledges to:

1. Declare a Climate Emergency.
2. Set up a Cross Party Task Group, commencing by October 2019, to investigate ways to cut East Suffolk Council's carbon and harmful emissions on a spend to save basis, with ambition to make East Suffolk Council (including all buildings and services) carbon neutral by 2030. The Cross Party Task Group will report on their progress on a quarterly basis.
3. To work with Suffolk County Council and other partners across the county and region, including the LEP and the Public Sector Leaders, towards the aspiration of making the county of Suffolk carbon neutral by 2030.
4. To work with Government to a) deliver its 25 year Environmental Plan and b) increase the powers and resources available to local authorities in order to make the 2030 target easier to achieve."

The Leader then reported that Full Council would consider the second Notice of Motion.

(b) Councillor G Elliott has submitted the following Notice of Motion:

"This Council notes that:

- the former Waveney District Council had a policy of actively supporting

Fairtrade whilst the former Suffolk Coastal District Council had no such policy.

- Suffolk has eight “Fairtrade Towns”, five of which are in the East Suffolk Council area, two in the former Waveney District and three in the former Suffolk Coastal District.
- Global Fairtrade sales last year generated £142 million in Fairtrade Premium. Farmers in 73 countries have invested this money in their communities, increasing business productivity and contributing to the achievement of the global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
- Despite this positive news, exploitation remains rampant in global supply chains. More than 40 million people are trapped in modern slavery, including forced labour, and 152 million young people in child labour. Hundreds of millions more are earning less than a living income or wage.

This Council resolves to:

- Renew the commitment to Fairtrade of the former Waveney District Council and expand this to the new East Suffolk Council.
- Actively promote Fairtrade locally, through support for local groups, in the media including social media, and events, including during Fairtrade Fortnight.
- Review its procurement policy, including its catering offer, to ensure that Fairtrade produce is chosen wherever possible, and that Fair Trade considerations are included as a preference in any contracts going out to tender."

Councillor Elliott proposed the Motion and this was duly seconded by Councillor Brambley-Crawshaw.

Councillor Gallant, Leader of the Council, stated that he would like to propose an amendment to the Motion. He wished to include an additional paragraph, which would appear after the first paragraph, and to amend the final paragraph to read:

This Council, nevertheless, recognises that:

- *The Fair Trade scheme, while making a positive contribution to global wellbeing, is but part of a wider range of initiatives that all play their part in raising living standards.*
- *Overall, the dramatic global reduction in levels of absolute poverty we have seen over the last 30 years or so, and commensurate increase in living standards, has been a direct result, not of Fair Trade, but of expanding free trade, free markets and capitalism across many previously poor countries of the world.*
- *Any support for a particular scheme such as Fair Trade must be set against other, often competing local and global challenges, such as supporting local producers, reducing food miles, and improving healthy eating.*

Therefore, this Council resolves to:

- *Support food-based initiatives, including Fairtrade, that demonstrate a commitment to improving living standards and raising people out of poverty, while supporting our local economy.*
- *Promote Fairtrade as part of this wider ethical approach, including through support for local groups, in the media including social media, and events, including during Fairtrade Fortnight.*
- *Review its procurement policy, including its catering offer, to ensure that Fairtrade produce is included where possible, and that Fair Trade and other ethical*

considerations are given appropriate weighting when drawing up any contracts going out to tender.

The proposed amendment was moved by Councillor Gallant, Leader of the Council, and was seconded by Councillor Blundell.

Councillor Elliott spoke and said that he was unable to accept the proposed amendment. He felt that it took the focus away from Fair Trade, which was a worthy and ethical cause to support. Fair Trade products such as tea, coffee and chocolate were important as they were products which could not be grown in the local area due to climatic factors. Therefore Fair Trade played an important role, globally, in reducing poverty. He felt that it was not appropriate to link Fair Trade with other initiatives in this way. Councillor Elliott said that he was saddened at the amendment and he was unable to support it.

Councillor Mapey reported that he was pleased to see that the proposed amendment included the Council reviewing its procurement policy and the catering offer in its offices. He highlighted other initiatives which helped the environment and also reduced poverty, such as the Rainforest Alliance. It was important to reduce food miles and support local businesses.

Councillor Brambley-Crawshaw stated that she was saddened by the conflict which had been created by the proposed amendment. She stated that the Fair Trade Motion focused on produce which was not grown in the UK and that there was no other equivalent to Fair Trade. She was saddened that an amendment was being proposed, which changed the focus and meaning of the Motion. The Motion had been a way of continuing the good work and the decision of the former Waveney District Council, to support Fair Trade, with Lowestoft becoming the first Fair Trade town in Suffolk, as a result. Fair Trade was not just about growers selling their produce for a fair price, it was also about values, ideals and ethics. She reiterated that she was very upset that the Motion was being amended in this way.

Councillor Byatt reported that he agreed with Councillors Brambley-Crawshaw and Elliott and he echoed their sentiments. The Motion should be about Fair Trade only and he felt that the amendment was not relevant on this occasion.

Councillor Gooch reported that ethical food production in the local area was important in its own right, however, this was being confused with Fair Trade, which had unique values and ideals.

Councillor Topping stated that she agreed. The sign welcoming visitors to Lowestoft stated that it was Suffolk's First Fair Trade Town and that Fair Trade was unique. She said it would be helpful to have signs in the cafe to inform people that they were purchasing Fair Trade goods and were making a difference.

Councillor Ritchie reported that he had a family member who lived in Argentina and they had provided some different perspectives on how Fair Trade operates abroad. He reported that he had been told that Fair Trade would only help and support local farmers on their own terms. It was also suggested that Fair Trade had had a negative impact upon some smaller, independent producers. Therefore, it was important to

realise that there were positive and negative impacts to all initiatives and they needed to be carefully evaluated.

Councillor Blundell stated that Fair Trade was a means of allowing producers abroad to develop and sell their goods for a fair price, which significantly helped poorer countries. Whilst it was important to support Fair Trade, however, it was also important to be pragmatic, as not all of the funds raised were paid back to the farmers. Therefore, it was appropriate to support all initiatives which helped to support farmers, locally and abroad, and to reduce food miles and damage to the environment.

The Leader of the Council reported that he was surprised by the level of debate around the proposed amendments, which he felt had enhanced the Motion. A vote was taken on whether or not to accept the amendment. On being put to the vote it was

RESOLVED

That the amendment to the Motion be approved.

Councillor Elliott, as the proposer of the original Motion, reported that although he was disappointed that it had been amended, he still felt that it was a positive Motion and there were further discussions on to have on it, and further amendments to be made.

The Chief Executive sought advice from the Monitoring Officer at this point during the meeting, regarding further amendments and speeches. The Monitoring Officer referred to sub-paragraphs 13.6 (d) and 13.6 (e) of the Council's Constitution, and advised that the amended motion had taken the place of the original motion. It had become the substantive motion on which further amendments could be moved. So, the question was whether there were further amendments to be made to the substantive motion, and if not, it could be put to the vote.

Councillor Elliott stated that he whilst he did not agree with the amendment, he accepted that it had been approved, however, he felt that the discussions which had taken place so far, were only about the amendment, they were not about the substantive Motion and the importance of Fair Trade.

He then stated that he would like to propose a further amendment, whereby the Council 'acknowledges the great work done by the 5 Fair Trade towns in the East Suffolk District.' Confirmation was provided that he would like this amendment to be added to the last bullet point of the Motion and the amendment was duly seconded by Councillor Brambley-Crawshaw.

Councillor Goldson reported that there were many smaller villages and organisations which were working with Fair Trade and therefore, it was unfair to ignore the good work being undertaken by others. Councillor Gallant, Leader of the Council, stated that Councillor Goldson made a valid point. Councillor Elliott then **WITHDREW** his proposed amendment.

Councillor Herring then raised a point of order, as he stated that there had not been sufficient debate about the substantive Motion, and he felt that this was unfair to Councillor Elliott.

The Chief Executive reiterated the advice previously provided by the Monitoring Officer. There being no further amendments, he then read out the Motion in full prior to it being put to the vote, where it was

RESOLVED

This Council notes that:

- the former Waveney District Council had a policy of actively supporting Fairtrade whilst the former Suffolk Coastal District Council had no such policy.
- Suffolk has eight “Fairtrade Towns”, five of which are in the East Suffolk Council area, two in the former Waveney District and three in the former Suffolk Coastal District.
- Global Fairtrade sales last year generated £142 million in Fairtrade Premium. Farmers in 73 countries have invested this money in their communities, increasing business productivity and contributing to the achievement of the global Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
- Despite this positive news, exploitation remains rampant in global supply chains. More than 40 million people are trapped in modern slavery, including forced labour, and 152 million young people in child labour. Hundreds of millions more are earning less than a living income or wage.

This Council, nevertheless, recognises that:

- The Fair Trade scheme, while making a positive contribution to global wellbeing, is but part of a wider range of initiatives that all play their part in raising living standards.
- Overall, the dramatic global reduction in levels of absolute poverty we have seen over the last 30 years or so, and commensurate increase in living standards, has been a direct result, not of Fair Trade, but of expanding free trade, free markets and capitalism across many previously poor countries of the world.
- Any support for a particular scheme such as Fair Trade must be set against other, often competing local and global challenges, such as supporting local producers, reducing food miles, and improving healthy eating.

Therefore, this Council resolves to:

- Support food-based initiatives, including Fairtrade, that demonstrate a commitment to improving living standards and raising people out of poverty, while supporting our local economy.
- Promote Fairtrade as part of this wider ethical approach, including through support for local groups, in the media including social media, and events, including during Fairtrade Fortnight.
- Review its procurement policy, including its catering offer, to ensure that Fairtrade produce is included where possible, and that Fair Trade and other ethical

considerations are given appropriate weighting when drawing up any contracts going out to tender.

10 Membership of the Audit & Governance Committee, Scrutiny Committee, Licensing Committee, Appointments of Assistant Cabinet Members, Heritage Champion and Outside Bodies (Non Executive Function)

The Leader of the Council presented the report, which sought to make a number of appointments to the Council's Committees. It was noted that the Council appointed to its Committees at its Annual meeting in May each year. Members who were appointed to Council Committees were expected to have received the appropriate development / training to enable them to carry out their roles effectively on whichever body they serve.

Since the Annual Meeting, Councillor F Mortimer had advised that he was no longer able to be the Vice Chairman or a Member of the Audit & Governance Committee, with immediate effect. He then took the opportunity to propose that Councillor Back be appointed Vice Chairman of the Audit & Governance Committee, for the remainder of the Municipal Year.

It was noted that Councillor Cook had recently been appointed as the Assistant Cabinet Member for Resources, therefore he was no longer eligible to sit on the Audit & Governance Committee, which resulted in two vacancies on that Committee. It was therefore proposed that Councillor Cooper and Councillor Cloke be appointed to the Audit & Governance Committee with immediate effect.

The Leader reported that since the Annual Meeting, Councillor William Taylor had advised that he is no longer able to sit on the Scrutiny Committee and the Leader then proposed that Councillor Back be appointed to the Scrutiny Committee, for the remainder of the Municipal Year.

Additionally, Councillor Haworth-Culf and Councillor Taylor have advised that they are no longer able to sit on the Licensing Committee. The Leader then proposed that Councillor Coulam and Councillor Goldson be appointed to the Licensing Committee, for the remainder of the Municipal Year.

The Leader of the Council reported that it was his decision regarding the size and membership of the Cabinet, which was exempt from the political proportionality rules under the Local Government Act 2000. He then took the opportunity to announce that he had made 3 Assistant Cabinet Member appointments:

- Councillor Alison Cackett has been appointed Assistant Cabinet Member for Transport.
- Councillor Maurice Cook has been appointed Assistant Cabinet Member for Finance.
- Councillor Mark Jepson has been appointed Assistant Cabinet Member for Community Health.

The Leader reported that Heritage England encouraged all local authorities to appoint a Heritage Champion, in order to support the protection of the historic environment at a local level. He stated that it would be beneficial for East Suffolk Council to have a Heritage Champion and due to its significance, he took the opportunity to propose that

this role be filled by Councillor Craig Rivett, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Economic Development, as it fits well within his Portfolio.

Since the Annual Meeting on 22 May 2019, the North East Suffolk Citizens Advice Bureaux had been contacted and they have responded that they would like to have a representative from East Suffolk Council. There have been a number of nominations received for this position, therefore there will need to be a vote to fill this position. There followed some discussion in this respect, during which Councillors Beavan, Byatt, Cooper and Patience withdrew their nominations. Therefore Councillor F Mortimer was appointed to this Outside Body unopposed.

Councillor Topping sought clarification regarding the last recommendation, which granted the Leader of the Council delegated authority to make amendments to the Council's Outside Body appointments as appropriate. The Monitoring Officer reported that vacancies may arise during the year, if so the Group Leaders would discuss the matter and agree a way forward, with the delegation for the decision resting with the Leader of the Council.

The Leader moved the recommendations en bloc and this was duly seconded by Councillor Rivett and it was

RESOLVED

1. That a Councillor Cooper be appointed to the Audit & Governance Committee for the remainder of the 2019/20 municipal year with immediate effect to replace Councillor F Mortimer.
2. That a Councillor Cloke be appointed to the Audit & Governance Committee for the remainder of the 2019/20 municipal year with immediate effect to replace Councillor Cook.
3. That Councillor Back be appointed as Vice Chairman of the Audit & Governance Committee for the remainder of the 2019/20 municipal year with immediate effect.
4. That Councillor Back be appointed to the Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the 2019/20 municipal year with immediate effect to replace Councillor Taylor.
5. That Councillor Coulam be appointed to the Licensing Committee for the remainder of the 2019/20 municipal year, with immediate effect to replace Councillor Haworth-Culf.
6. That a Councillor Goldson be appointed to the Licensing Committee for the remainder of the 2019/20 municipal year, with immediate effect to replace Councillor Taylor.
7. That the Group Leaders make revisions to their appointments to the Council's Committees, as appropriate and necessary, during the year.
8. That Council notes that Councillor Cackett has been appointed as the Assistant Cabinet Member for Transport.

9. That Council notes that Councillor Jepson has been appointed as the Assistant Cabinet Member for Community Health.
10. That Council notes that Councillor Cook has been appointed as the Assistant Cabinet Member for Resources.
11. That Councillor Rivett, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Economic Development be appointed as the Council's Heritage Champion.
12. That Councillor F Mortimer be appointed as the Council's representative on the North East Suffolk Citizens' Advice Bureaux, for the remainder of the 2019/20 Municipal year.
13. That the Leader of the Council be granted Delegated Authority in order to make revisions to the appointments on the Council's Outside Bodies (Non Executive Function) as required, in consultation with the other Group Leaders, when appropriate.

11 Appointments to Working Groups

The Leader of the Council reported that the Council appoints to a number of Working Groups each year, as part of its corporate governance framework, in support of the democratic process and decision-making arrangements. The Councillors appointed to the Working Groups work to help address local issues and to achieve sustainable solutions, which helps to deliver a strong and sustainable local economy and improves the quality of life for everyone living and working in the District. The proposed Council Working Groups for 2019 / 20 are:

- 1 The Local Plan Working Group
- 2 The Housing Benefits and Tenant Services Consultation Group
- 3 The Member Development Steering Group
- 4 The Lowestoft Transport and Infrastructure Prospectus Steering Group

The Working Groups each have clear terms of reference outlining their roles, responsibilities and reporting mechanisms, thereby increasing openness and transparency and making the best use of resources. This information was contained within Appendix A and where specific post holder nominations were required, these were also outlined in Appendix A. It was noted that the Membership of the Member Development Steering Group and the Lowestoft Transport and Infrastructure Prospectus Steering Group had already been provided by the Group Leaders and was included within Appendix A to the report.

With regard to the Local Plan Working Group, the Leader suggested that the vacancies for 2 Planning Committee Members should be delegated to the Planning Committee North and Planning Committee South to decide, with each Committee filling one vacancy. There remained 3 vacancies for Other Members and the Leader sought nominations for those vacancies. There were 4 nominations received - Councillors Deacon, Elliott, Pitchers and Yule. Following a vote, it was confirmed that Councillors Deacon, Elliott and Pitchers would fill the 3 vacancies. It was confirmed that other

Members could attend the Local Plan Working Group Meetings by invitation, if they were interested.

In respect of the Housing Benefits and Tenant Services Consultation Group, it was confirmed that there was one vacancy for a Member of the Scrutiny Committee. The Leader of the Council suggested that this vacancy should be delegated to the Scrutiny Committee to fill. There were also vacancies for 4 other Members and the Leader sought nominations for those vacancies. There were 5 nominations received - Councillors Beavan, Jepson, Mapey, Patience and Robinson. Following a vote, it was confirmed that Councillors Jepson, Mapey, Patience and Robinson would fill the 4 vacancies.

RESOLVED

1. That the membership of the Member Development Steering Group and the Lowestoft Transport and Infrastructure Prospectus Steering Group for the 2019/20 Municipal Year be appointed, as supplied by Group Leaders.
2. That the membership of the Local Plan Working Group and the Housing Benefits and Tenant Services Consultation Group for the 2019/20 Municipal year be appointed, as supplied by the Group Leaders and the outstanding vacancies be filled as follows:
 - Local Plan Working Group - that the vacancies for 2 Planning Committee Members be delegated to the Planning Committee North and Planning Committee South to decide, with each Committee filling one vacancy and that Councillors Deacon, Elliott and Pitchers would fill the remaining 3 vacancies.
 - Housing Benefits and Tenant Services Consultation Group - that the vacancy for a Scrutiny Committee member should be delegated to the Scrutiny Committee to fill and that Councillors Jepson, Mapey, Patience and Robinson would fill the remaining 4 vacancies.
3. That the Leader be granted Delegated Authority to make any necessary changes to the membership of the Working Groups for the remainder of the 2019/20 Municipal Year, in consultation with the other Group Leaders.

12 Cabinet Members Report and Outside Bodies Representatives Report to Council

The Leader of the Council reported that he had given the Cabinet Members the opportunity to provide Members with an update on their areas of responsibility and a number of updates were contained in the report for this evening. The Cabinet Members did not have any additional information to provide at the meeting and there were no questions from Members. It was confirmed that there were no Outside Body Representatives Reports to Council for this meeting.

RESOLVED

That the report be received.

13 Exempt/Confidential Items

RESOLVED

That, under Section 100(a)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the public be excluded from the Meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

N.B. The Chairman took the opportunity to adjourn the meeting from 9.10 pm to 9.20 pm to allow Members to consider two additional documents that had just been tabled and circulated in relation to the Lowestoft Full Fibre report. The documents were an Addendum and a Business Case. Members read through the documents during this interval and the meeting reconvened at 9.20 pm.

N.B. Councillor K Patience declared a Local Non Pecuniary Interest during the consideration of Item 14 - Lowestoft Full Fibre, as he was a Lowestoft Town Councillor and the matter under consideration would include CCTV. He then chose to leave the meeting at 9.35 pm, during the consideration of this item, and he took no part in the debate or voting thereon.

14 Lowestoft Full Fibre Project

- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

The meeting concluded at 9:45 pm

.....
Chairman