

Unconfirmed



Minutes of a Meeting of the **Cabinet** held via Conference Room, Riverside, on **Tuesday, 2 November 2021 at 6.30pm**

Members of the Cabinet present:

Councillor Norman Brooks, Councillor Stephen Burroughes, Councillor Maurice Cook, Councillor Steve Gallant, Councillor Richard Kerry, Councillor David Ritchie, Councillor Craig Rivett, Councillor Mary Rudd, Councillor Letitia Smith

Other Members present:

Councillor Paul Ashdown, Councillor Edward Back, Councillor Peter Byatt, Councillor Alison Cackett, Councillor Tony Cooper, Councillor Linda Coulam, Councillor Mike Deacon, Councillor Mark Jepson, Councillor Caroline Topping

Officers present:

Stephen Baker (Chief Executive), Kerry Blair (Head of Operations), Guy Butler (Programme Manager (Towns Fund Bid)), Sarah Davis (Democratic Services Officer), Andy Jarvis (Strategic Director), Nick Khan (Strategic Director), Bridget Law (Programme Manager), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Officer), Sue Meeken (Labour Political Group Support Officer), Brian Mew (Chief Finance Officer & Section 151 Officer), Adam Nicholls (Principal Planner (Policy and Delivery)), Agnes Ogundiran (Conservative Political Group Support Officer), Desi Reed (Planning Policy and Delivery Manager), Nicole Rickard (Head of Communities), Lorraine Rogers (Deputy Chief Finance Officer), Ryan Taylor (Development Officer), Heather Tucker (Head of Housing)

1 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor James Mallinder.

2 Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were made.

3 Announcements

Councillor Craig Rivett - Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member with responsibility for Economic Development

Councillor Rivett advised of a recent visit to Lowestoft by a delegation from Historic England, as part of its regional tour. Councillor Rivett thanked everyone involved in promoting the activity in the town and the Council's future plans to Historic England, noting that the delegation was given a tour of Lowestoft on one of its historic buses.

Councillor Mary Rudd - Cabinet Member with responsibility for Community Health

Councillor Rudd advised that given the high rate of COVID-19 cases in Suffolk it was now an enhanced response area and would be supported by the government to prevent the NHS becoming overwhelmed; this would include surge testing, on-site school testing, communications, and a push on vaccine rollout. Councillor Rudd confirmed this was in effect from 1 November 2021 for a period of five weeks.

Councillor Letitia Smith - Cabinet Member with responsibility for Communities, Leisure and Tourism

Councillor Smith thanked the Members who took place in the health checks undertaken earlier in the day at Riverside. Councillor Smith noted that this service would be offered out to all Members and officers of the Council and the checks would highlight any medical issues or anything that becomes apparent as part of the checks and would be confidential.

Councillor Norman Brooks - Cabinet Member with responsibility for Transport

Councillor Brooks confirmed that the Council had written to all towns and parishes to ascertain their Christmas Lights switch-on dates in order to be able to offer free parking from 4pm that day; a number of towns and parishes had responded and free parking in those areas had been granted. Councillor Brooks noted that the Council would be providing free parking at various sites on 18 December 2021 from 12pm to 6pm, when restrictions end, and notices would be sent to the relevant towns and parishes, along with display literature to promote this offer in their areas.

4a Minutes - September 2021

On the proposition of Councillor Gallant, seconded by Councillor Rivett it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 7 September 2021 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4b Minutes - October 2021

On the proposition of Councillor Gallant, seconded by Councillor Rivett it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 October 2021 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5 East Suffolk Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule – Consultation Version

The Cabinet received report **ES/0935** of both Councillor David Ritchie, the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Coastal Management and Councillor Maurice Cook, the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Resources, which sought authorisation to consult on the draft East Suffolk Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule, alongside the draft CIL Instalment Policy, and then, after having considered representations, to submit the Charging Schedule for independent examination.

The report was introduced by Councillor Ritchie, who explained that the Council currently had two existing CIL Charging Schedules, one adopted by the former Waveney District Council in 2013 and another adopted by the former Suffolk Coastal District Council in 2015. Councillor Ritchie confirmed that the charging schedules had been updated annually, with construction industry inflation, but did not reflect the recently adopted Waveney and Suffolk Coastal Local Plans. Councillor Ritchie added that it was also desirable to have a single Charging Schedule for East Suffolk.

Councillor Ritchie noted that the Council had been advised by its viability consultants, Aspinall Verdi, when creating the draft Charging Schedule and had taken all the necessary elements into account when doing so. Councillor Ritchie explained that there were many sites within the district which would also be required to deliver infrastructure through Section 106 agreements in addition to paying CIL. Aspinall Verdi had completed viability assessments on a range of development types and the information and recommendations in the report highlighted that not all development types could viably support CIL charge.

Councillor Ritchie noted that when determining CIL rates a buffer needed to be included to allow for negative viability changes such as a drop in house prices and/or a rise in construction material costs, with the national buffer averages typically being about 30% upwards. Councillor Ritchie cited the recent rise in construction materials costs and noted that a bigger buffer than normal was recommended by Aspinall Verdi and would be necessary, particularly for strategic sites.

The Cabinet was advised that it had been concluded that Lowestoft and parts of Oulton Broad could not viably support CIL on residential developments, but the rest of the district could support residential CIL at a variety of different rates. Councillor Ritchie noted that strategic sites across the district, considered individually, would generate CIL at a range of rates per square metre. It had also been concluded and recommended by Aspinall Verdi that CIL could not viably be applied to holiday accommodation, all types of specialist retirement accommodation and employment space such as offices and industrial buildings, as well as 'comparison' shops (such as clothes and furniture shops); Councillor Ritchie highlighted that some 'convenience' retail employment sites (food and drink shops) were recommended for CIL at £70 per square metre.

Councillor Ritchie explained that Planning officers had liaised with Aspinall Verdi throughout the process and that a robust draft Charging Schedule had been created. The Cabinet was made aware that representatives from Aspinall Verdi had also given presentations at meetings of the Local Plan Working Group. Councillor Ritchie considered that the recommendations struck the correct balance between

charging the maximum level of CIL without threatening the viability of sites as a whole in the district.

Councillor Ritchie outlined that the next stage was to open a consultation on the draft Charging Schedule for six weeks, which was intended to run from 11 November 2021 to 23 December 2021. Councillor Ritchie was of the view that, notwithstanding that the proposed rates were considered appropriate, the Council would very likely receive responses from developers that the proposed CIL rates were too high, particularly citing the recent increase in construction costs.

Councillor Ritchie assured the Cabinet that all representations received during the consultation will be carefully considered prior to the draft Charging Schedule being submitted for independent examination in early 2022, with or without modifications. Councillor Ritchie highlighted that the recommendations also sought to delegate authority to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, in consultation with Councillor Ritchie, to make minor changes to the consultation in order to allow a smooth process. Councillor Ritchie thanked the Planners for their hard work on the report and the work on the draft Charging Schedule.

The Leader invited comments and questions from the Cabinet.

Councillor Rivett thanked Councillor Ritchie and the officers for the report; he highlighted the disparity between the proposed CIL rates for the North Lowestoft Garden Neighbourhood, Carlton Colville and the Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood and queried why this was, given the relative proximity of the sites. Councillor Ritchie noted that each site was considered independently and although some notional values were similar across all three sites other values, such as size, the proposed number and density of dwellings and the number of affordable homes required all differed and this resulted in different CIL rates for each site.

Councillor Rivett asked why the development profit levels for the sites appeared similar when the CIL rates were so different. Councillor Ritchie explained that the predicted profit on each site was based on the number of houses on a site, noting that the CIL rate for each site took into account multiple factors when estimating the buffer required to ensure a site's viability.

In response to a further question from Councillor Rivett on costs specific to the Beccles and Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood site, Councillor Ritchie advised that the relevant policy in the Waveney Local Plan required that a cycle path be included on the boundary with Ellough Road. Councillor Ritchie stated that consultation responses on other sites would likely provide a more up-to-date picture on their specific infrastructure requirements, which would be carefully considered and could result in refinements being made to the draft Charging Schedule if judged appropriate.

Councillor Brooks said that he could not support the paper; he supported the principle of CIL but was concerned at the varying rates across sites in the north of the district, citing the increase in both the price of and demand for housing in the Beccles and Worlingham area since 2013. Councillor Brooks considered that the CIL rates proposed for the North Lowestoft Garden Neighbourhood, Carlton Colville and the Beccles and

Worlingham Garden Neighbourhood equated to a reduction in real terms and saw no reason why the three sites were proposed for different CIL rates.

Councillor Ritchie acknowledged the rise in house prices and said that once adopted, the CIL Charging Schedule would be reviewed on a regular basis. Councillor Ritchie reiterated that each strategic site had been considered independently and that the different housing requirements on each strategic site had resulted in differing CIL rates for each site. Councillor Ritchie highlighted the rate of CIL that was paid to towns and parishes, 15% or 25% if a Neighbourhood Plan was in place and reiterated his earlier comments about strategic sites having Section 106 requirements in addition to CIL requirements. Councillor Ritchie considered that a robust process had been followed to create the draft Charging Schedule which provided the best possible proposals and welcomed Councillor Brooks' participation in the consultation and examination process.

Councillor Brooks noted that at the last meeting of the Local Plan Working Group officers had offered to speak to town and parish representatives and asked if this offer remained in place. Councillor Ritchie highlighted that officers regularly engaged with town and parish representatives and referenced two workshops held in spring 2021, which Councillor Ritchie had considered to be successful.

Councillor Kerry referred to neighbouring sites in his Ward which had not been defined as a strategic site and therefore had differing proposed CIL rates and queried the rationale behind this decision. Councillor Ritchie invited the Principal Planner to address this question.

The Principal Planner noted that the formation of a CIL Charging Schedule was not an exact science and was reliant on professional judgement and opinion, particularly when allocating strategic and non-strategic sites, this process being based on a variety of factors including scale. The Principal Planner noted that the Felixstowe and Trimleys area was a complex one given the number of allocated sites in the area and stated that officers had been working with Suffolk County Council to ensure that infrastructure was, and would be, delivered in a timely way. The Principal Planner considered that the CIL rates proposed were appropriate and would maximise CIL generation whilst recognising uncertainty on sites and giving a degree of flexibility to ensure they remain viable.

The Principal Planner explained that allocated sites were considered separately along with their policy requirements in the Local Plans and highlighted that in the example given by Councillor Kerry, a primary school was required on one site which reduced the number of dwellings on the site overall. The Principal Planner appreciated that a single rate for a wider area would be simpler but stated that there was a need to ensure that all sites had the required infrastructure to meet the totality of the needs of the wider area.

Councillor Ritchie asked the Principal Planner if the proposed CIL rates threatened the viability of sites. The Principal Planner said that they did not and considered that the buffers built into the CIL rates meant that allocated sites should be delivered viably with all policy requirements met.

Councillor Gallant queried if the consultation would result in any changes to the draft Charging Schedule prior to its examination. The Principal Planner said that, pending Cabinet approval, there would be a six-week period of consultation following which all consultation responses would be carefully considered by officers; officers would then need to reach a decision on whether, in light of these consultation responses and associated evidence, modifications to the draft Charging Schedule needed to be made before it is submitted for examination.

The Principal Planner confirmed it was not uncommon for modifications to be made following a period of consultation and if any more significant changes were required a full consultation period would be required for the revised document. The Principal Planner advised that if minor changes were made then the document would be submitted for examination, but with a four-week period for consultees to comment on the changes to the Examiner. All consultation information would be considered by the Examiner.

Councillor Ritchie emphasised that consultations were always taken very seriously by the Council and every response would be analysed and the outcomes of this shared with the Local Plan Working Group.

The Leader invited comments and questions from Ward Members.

Councillor Ashdown pointed out that Members had been encouraged to promote creating Neighbourhood Plans to towns and parishes in their Wards, due to the higher rate of CIL that towns and parishes with such a plan receive. Councillor Ashdown noted that one area in his Ward was proposed to have a zero rate for CIL and said this would not be well received.

Councillor Ritchie sympathised with Councillor Ashdown's concerns and considered that the government had not recognised there would be a need to set a zero rate for CIL in some areas. Councillor Ritchie reiterated that the analysis had shown that Lowestoft and parts of Oulton Broad would have to be zero rated for CIL.

Councillor Deacon congratulated officers for producing a detailed and well-crafted report; he sought additional information on the response to the initial consultation and the impact of the Lowestoft Flood Barrier on calculations and queried the mention of the now defunct Ipswich Northern Route.

Councillor Ritchie stated that a large database of consultees, including statutory consultees and all towns and parishes, had been contacted for the initial consultation. Councillor Ritchie predicted that the response to the next consultation would be significantly higher.

The Principal Planner confirmed to Councillor Deacon that current land values had been used when calculating the CIL rates proposed. The Principal Planner acknowledged that the completion of the Lowestoft Flood Barrier would have a positive impact on land values in the Lowestoft area but said it would be difficult to predict exactly what this would be and noted that there would still be a legacy of low land values in the area, particularly in central Lowestoft.

The Principal Planner noted that the reference to the Ipswich Northern Route had been made prior to the shelving of the project and reflected the situation at the time of drafting rather than the current situation.

Councillor Topping was of the view that residents in Beccles would be disappointed with the proposed CIL rates for the area and asked for clarity on the Section 106 agreement requirements on allocated sites in relation to CIL. Councillor Ritchie confirmed that CIL rates would be payable in addition to required Section 106 payments.

In response to a further question from Councillor Topping, the Principal Planner confirmed that different CIL rates may sometimes be applied on a site depending on the timing of phases of development being brought forward, and the current CIL rate for the area, but that the situation could be complicated.

Councillor Byatt echoed the thanks to the officers for producing a substantial document; he expressed his disappointment that the Kirkley Waterfront site would not be liable for CIL and sought an update in future about the significant brownfield sites in the area. Councillor Byatt also asked about the impact of the potential Sizewell C development on European protected sites and the figure of 10 dwellings being the minimum on a development to ensure higher energy standards.

Councillor Ritchie acknowledged the Kirkley would be a difficult area to develop but considered that land prices would increase following the completion of the Lowestoft Flood Barrier. Councillor Ritchie noted, however, that the current situation resulted in CIL not being viable for the area at present. With regard to Sizewell C, Councillor Ritchie was unable to predict what the impact of that development would be should it go ahead.

The Principal Planner highlighted that 10 dwellings was the common threshold in national planning policy for higher energy standards; he said that officers sought high standards of sustainability at all levels of development but considered that the minimum level would not overburden smaller developments.

Councillors Rivett and Ritchie noted that the proposed consultation would allow all responders to be able to make representations to the Examiner. Councillor Gallant said it was important to acknowledge that the Cabinet was being asked to approve moving to the next consultation stage and was not approving the final draft CIL rates.

On the proposition of Councillor Ritchie, seconded by Councillor Cook it was by a majority vote

RESOLVED

1. That the Draft Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Charging Schedule, including the Draft East Suffolk CIL Instalment Policy, be approved for six weeks' consultation.
2. That the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Coastal Management, be

authorised to make any presentational, typographical and/or other minor (non-material) amendments prior to consultation.

3. That the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Coastal Management, be authorised to consider the representations made to the consultation, to make any relevant modifications, and then submit the draft CIL Charging Schedule (and supporting documents) for examination by an independent Examiner.

4. That the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Coastal Management, be authorised to agree any further work and/or appropriate changes to the draft CIL Charging Schedule (and Instalment Policy) during the examination as the need may arise.

6 Half Year Financial Performance 2021/22

The Cabinet received report **ES/0932** of Councillor Maurice Cook, the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Resources, which provided an overview of the Council's projected financial performance for the financial year 2021/22 in respect of the General Fund, Reserves, Housing Revenue Account (HRA), the Capital Programme, and the Collection Fund. Specific coverage of the financial implications of the COVID-19 pandemic during 2021/22 was also included in the report.

Councillor Cook introduced the report and noted that the outturn position on General Fund was anticipated to be an underspend of around £60,000; there had been some loss of income as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic but there had also been savings on staff travel costs. Councillor Cook highlighted that a predicted loss of Planning income had not manifested and there had not been as significant an impact from the end of the government's furlough scheme. There had also been income increases as a result of business park development. Councillor Cook confirmed that the Council's outturn position would continue to be updated ahead of the production of the Council's Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS).

Councillor Cook stated that other areas of impact had been considered when forecasting a position on the Council's earmarked reserves; it was considered that the balance of these reserves would remain steady at £28,000,000 but this did not take into account any use of reserves to bridge any future budget gap.

The Cabinet was advised that the HRA was estimated to have a surplus of £310,000 at year end due to delays in housing projects and a shift towards maintenance. Councillor Cook said that the Council's Capital Programme had been similarly impacted and a further update would be provided to the Cabinet at its meeting in December 2021.

Councillor Cook noted that since the production and publication of the report, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given his Autumn Budget statement and invited Mr Brian Mew, the Council's Chief Finance Officer and Section 151 Officer, to give a brief presentation.

Mr Mew gave an overview of the Chancellor's Autumn Budget statement, made on 27 October 2021, and considered the impact on the local government settlement to be the biggest influence on the Council's MTFs. Mr Mew highlighted information related to the overall position of local government funding, business rates (including the fairer funding review), and other grant income streams.

The Leader invited questions and comments from the Cabinet and highlighted both the financial and environmental savings from reduced travel during the pandemic, as well as the forecasted significant challenges for capital projects.

Councillor Rivett thanked Councillor Cook and Mr Mew for their hard work and noted that the Council's investments were providing income which allowed the Council to do its great work in East Suffolk.

Councillor Gallant queried the impact of rising material costs on the capital programme; Councillor Cook said there had been some indication of this impact already and hoped to have a clearer indication by the next Cabinet meeting in December 2021.

The Leader invited questions and comments from Ward Members.

Councillor Byatt thanks officers for a comprehensive report; he sought further information on the projected increase in the Council Tax base, a definition on what was considered to be 'sufficient' housing stock and the cost of retrofitting the Council's existing housing stock.

Councillor Cook stated that he expected to have a more accurate projection of the Council Tax base increase at December's Cabinet meeting, when he would be able to provide a further update on the Council's capital projects. Councillor Cook highlighted that current projections suggested an additional £500,000 at current Council Tax rates.

Councillor Cook deferred to Councillor Kerry on the questions relating to the Council's housing stock. Councillor Kerry noted the current figure for the cost of retrofitting the existing housing stock did not take into account the cost of making the housing stock carbon neutral and this impact was currently being evaluated.

Councillor Kerry invited Ms Heather Tucker, the Council's Head of Housing, to address the Cabinet on the question of sufficient housing stock. Ms Tucker stated that her team was working hard to review the impact of the pandemic on bringing forward new housing development for the Council's housing stock; she was confident that the Council would be able to deliver its timetabled development.

At this point, Mr Mew added that the word 'sufficient' in the report had possibly been misused and there had been no intention in this context to imply that any particular level of housing was necessarily "sufficient".

On the proposition of Councillor Cook, seconded by Councillor Gallant it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

1. That the Council's financial position for the first half of 2021/22 together with projections of the full year outturn, reserve balances, and capital spend be noted.
2. That the areas of financial risk identified be noted, the impact of which will be reflected in the Medium-Term Financial Strategy due to be considered by the Cabinet in December 2021.
3. That the additional financial commitments approved in the first half of the year and their impact on the General Fund and reserve levels be noted.

7 Funding for Rural Youth Provision

The Cabinet received report **ES/0931** of Councillor Letitia Smith, the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Communities, Leisure and Tourism, which sought growth funding to pilot a project to enable the development of sustainable youth provision in rural communities in East Suffolk.

Councillor Smith introduced the report and highlighted that the project would focus on the four most rural Community Partnership areas:

- Beccles, Bungay, Halesworth and villages
- Carlton Colville, Kessingland, Southwold and villages
- Framlingham, Wickham Market and villages
- Melton, Woodbridge and Deben Peninsula

Councillor Smith stated that although the Council was already supporting projects in those areas, it could and should do more to support young people, who had been significantly impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Councillor Smith noted that supporting young people had been identified as a key priority by the Community Partnership Board's COVID recovery task and finish group.

Councillor Smith set out the details of the project, as contained within the report, and how it was modelled to the needs of each Community Partnership area. Councillor Smith confirmed that the total cost for the project was £101,560, which would include a small grants fund. Councillor Smith considered the project to be an innovative model which it was hoped could be rolled out across the rest of the district in time.

The Leader invited questions and comments from Cabinet Members; he thanked Councillor Smith and officers for their hard work and sought clarity on the cost of the project as the report stated the figure required was £101,650. Ms Nicole Rickard, the Council's Head of Communities, was able to confirm this was a typographical error in the report and the total sum required was £101,560.

Councillor Cook noted that the funding allocated by the Suffolk Public Sector Leaders (SPSL) group would come from the Council's reserves and urged a note of caution if the project was to be extended, as the reserves needed to be maintained to offer central support.

Councillor Gallant clarified that the funding allocated by the SPSL group was from a collective pot of business rates income that had been held by the group and returned to its contributing councils; Councillor Gallant said he had been clear he wished for these funds to be earmarked in the Council's reserves to deliver on community priorities and that the money had been ringfenced for this purpose. Councillor Gallant reiterated that the funding was Council money that had been held by the SPSL group.

It was confirmed that the proposed project would be in addition to existing youth services in the district and not a replacement for those projects.

The Leader invited questions and comments from Ward Members.

Councillor Topping asked if cross-generational work would be included in the project and sought confirmation if the target range would include working with SEND young people up to the age of 25. Ms Rickard was able to advise that there would be some flexibility on the age range supported by the group but if specific projects emerged to support SEND young people alternate funding sources, such as the Enabling Communities budgets and other community grant schemes, could be considered.

Councillor Gallant confirmed to Councillor Byatt that the funding requested was not in addition to the money returned to the Council by the SPSL group and that the funding received from the group had been held in a pooled reserve of business rates income and when returned had been ringfenced to deliver on the Council's community priorities.

On the proposition of Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Rudd it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That an additional £101,650 for a two-year Rural Youth Support project, to be delivered by Community Action Suffolk, to work alongside communities in the four most rural Community Partnership areas to develop additional youth work provision, be approved.

8 Exempt/Confidential Items

Councillor Gallant reported that, in exceptional circumstances, the Council may, by law, exclude members of the public from all, or part of, an executive decision-making meeting. The Council should, unless there are urgent circumstances, give notice of its intention to do so via the Forward Plan, which is updated and published on its website 28 clear days prior to the meeting. There were various reasons that the Council, on occasions, has to do this and examples were because a report contained information relating to an individual, information relating to the financial or business affairs of a particular person, or information relating to any consultations or negotiations.

Councillor Gallant advised that Cabinet would be considering two substantive exempt matters which were outlined in agenda items 10 and 11 on the published agenda; firstly East Point Pavilion Construction Contract Update which asked Cabinet to consider giving approval for the budget for capital expenditure for East Point Pavilion

to be increased to ensure East Suffolk Council can award a contract to a successful tender bid to complete the redevelopment programme for the asset. The proposal had the potential to attract local businesses to tender for the construction works and for local people to be employed to deliver the construction contract. On completion, the venture would seek to create a new and exciting food hub and events space that aims to attract food traders to occupy the kiosks within the Pavilion as well as artists, entertainers, comedians, DJs, and bands to feature as part of the events programme. An improved amenity, leisure, food and beverage and evening economy offer alongside improved marketing and promotions were key elements of securing a larger tourist audience. Developments like East Point Pavilion would play a role in this, working in partnership with First Light Festival CIC to create a destination food and events hub.

Secondly, Housing Development – Meadow Gardens, Beccles, Councillor Gallant stated that this report sought approval for appropriation of land from the General Fund to the Housing Revenue Account and the associated development costs to provide a level access new build dwelling. The project described within the report was not only providing a new level access home but also aiding research into the exploration of innovative solutions to low carbon construction. The project was being undertaken as a direct response to the Council's strategic ambitions to provide good quality affordable homes whilst also actively looking to address the issue of more sustainable construction methods. The Council's housing stock was the third largest producer of CO2 accounting for 15% of the Council's total emissions (in the year 2020/21). This project would enable the Council to work in collaboration to explore alternative development methods to standard brick and block and provide an additional unit of level access accommodation.

On the proposition of Councillor Gallant, seconded by Councillor Rivett it was by a unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) the public be excluded from the meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

9a Exempt Minutes - September 2021

- Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).
- Information relating to any consultations or negotiations, or contemplated consultations or negotiations, in connection with any labour relations matter arising between the authority or a Minister of the Crown and employees of, or office holders under, the authority.

9b Exempt Minutes - October 2021

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

10 East Point Pavilion Construction Contract Update

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

11 Housing Development - Meadow Gardens, Beccles

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

The meeting concluded at 8.54pm

.....
Chairman