

**Cabinet****17:30 to 19:20****Wednesday, 10 September 2025**

**Present:** Councillors Stonard (Leader), Hampton (Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Climate and Environment), Giles (Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services), Harper (Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects), Jones (Cabinet Member for Housing), Kidman (Cabinet Member for Culture and Wellbeing) and Councillor Padda (Cabinet Member for Equalities and Social Justice).

**Apologies:** Councillor Catt (Leader of the Green Group)

**In attendance** Councillor Galvin (Deputy Leader of the Green Group)  
Councillor Wright (Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group)

**34. Declarations of interest**

34.1 There were no declarations of interest.

**35. Public questions and Petitions**

35.1 Five public questions had been received. The first was from James Hawketts was not present the following question was read out by the Leader of the Council:

“I remember reading in the independent ombudsman report last year on housing provision that NCC wasn’t then considering the personal circumstances of tenants when prioritising repairs to their properties. May I ask whether this has now been rectified, and if so, which circumstances are considered during this prioritisation stage to ensure those more vulnerable tenants are not facing undue hardship while awaiting repairs?”

35.2 Councillor Jones responded to the question as follows:

“As part of the customer triage process for housing repairs, each call handling script is structured with a series of targeted questions designed to assess and determine the appropriate priority level for the repair request. One of these key questions prompts the call handler to consider the tenant’s vulnerability, stating: “When raising a repair, the tenant’s vulnerability needs to be taken into consideration. Refer to Norwich City Council vulnerability guidance.” This guidance supports staff in

evaluating how individual circumstances may influence the urgency of the repair, ensuring that vulnerable tenants receive a responsive and appropriate service.”

35.3 The second question was from Niah Hubbard, on behalf of ACORN Norwich, they put their question to the Cabinet Member for Housing as follows:

“What is Norwich City Council doing to improve the lives of private renters in our city, and does the council believe there is currently enough protections in place for tenants facing issues of disrepair, damp & mould, or abuse from rogue landlords?”

35.4 Councillor Jones gave the following response:

“The council is committed to delivering good quality homes for all regardless of tenure.

We have concerns about the conditions and experiences of tenants in the private rented sector in Norwich. Reform of the sector is long overdue, and while most landlords provide a good service, the private rented sector currently provides the least affordable, poorest quality and most insecure housing of all tenures.

We have taken on specialist additional staff and commissioned comprehensive stock condition and tenure Intelligence modelling of our private rented sector (PRS), with a specific focus on housing conditions and stressors. This will allow us to decide upon and target additional interventions.

We welcome the new protections currently going through parliament in the Renters' Rights Bill and the additional enforcement powers that will become available to us.

We are reviewing the structure of our Private Housing Enforcement team and looking to increase Tenant and Landlord engagement, undertaking a comprehensive review of our policies and procedures as well as ensuring we can meet the increased demands arising from the new Renters Rights Act.”

35.5 As a supplementary question Niah Hubbard asked whether the Cabinet Member would meet with ACORN Norwich to discuss the issues.

35.6 In response Councillor Jones said that she and other Cabinet members would not meet with ACORN Norwich due to its actions. The Council had affirmed its commitment to Debate not Hate, which looked at addressing the abuse and intimidation of elected officials. ACORN Norwich's actions had been harassing and intimidatory in nature and had personally targeted her which had left her fearful of leaving the house. The Council was required to act on an evidence base and consider all available information before making a decision. There were meaningful steps the Council was taking to address the issues. ACORN Norwich had had meetings with officers to discuss what the Council was doing.

35.7 The third question was from Cet Heartkin. As they were not present at the meeting the Leader read out the question as follows:

“What are council members doing to ensure accountability and transparency with their constituents? Do any of you have plans to regularly engage in constructive

dialogue with local people to ensure they have a say in decision making around key issues?”

35.8 The Leader gave the following response:

“Norwich City Council is committed to maintaining high standards of transparency and accountability. We do this in many ways, including residents’ magazines, our consultation and engagement platform, Get Talking Norwich and via the publication of key areas of information, including detailed financial information, statement of accounts, annual audit letters and corporate governance reports on our website – ensuring residents can access and scrutinise how public funds are being used.

I also know that councillors of all parties regularly engage with the communities they represent in a variety of ways, using the councillor enquiry system to ensure relevant matters can be considered by council officers.

To give some examples, over the past twelve months we have had 24 projects live on Get Talking Norwich, our consultation and engagement platform. Across all the projects, there were 35,288 people aware, 21,677 of whom were informed and 9,470 who engaged by participating in a consultation or engagement. We continue to develop Get Talking Norwich with one such example being the recently added Housing Hub which encourages engagement and information sharing amongst our tenants.

In addition to this, where opportunity allows, we seek to have constructive and meaningful dialogue across the city in person around issues which affect residents. In July we held 13 roadshows across the city to have conversations with Norwich residents in their neighbourhoods about local government reorganisation. This was alongside workshops with young people and VCSE organisations. And as part of the play strategy consultation officers were out in 16 parks across the city to talk to young people and families about what play provision is important to them over the coming years.”

35.9 The fourth question was from Lisa Brown. Lisa Brown asked the following question to the Cabinet Member for Equalities and Social Justice:

“We are all aware that we are going through a profound cost of living crisis, with the cost for food and basic goods continuing to spiral whilst wages and benefits stay the same. What is the council doing to provide support for the increasing number of local people in Norwich who have to choose between heating their homes and feeding themselves?”

35.10 Councillor Padda gave the following response:

“The council recognises the daily financial challenges people face. On that basis council continues to grant fund social welfare information, advice and advocacy services through the Financial Inclusion Consortium (FIC). The FIC provides free independent support to Norwich residents who are struggling. This could include debt, housing, legal or benefit issues, and the FIC will look to maximise income wherever possible. They may offer budgeting skills, formal debt solutions, benefit applications or benefit challenges tailored to an individual needs. In addition to this,

the council's in-house budget and money advisors support tenants who are finding it hard to manage, including those dealing with deficit budgets. The Norfolk Community Advice Network referral system also ensures that officers can get people to the support they need as quickly as possible. The Norwich Health and Wellbeing Partnership is an opportunity for council to bridge across the various organisations to build a shared understanding and unified approach to address the health and wellbeing challenges residents face as a result of hard financial times.

The Household Support Fund is designed to assist individuals and families facing financial hardship, whether or not they are receiving benefits. Support is aimed at those struggling to afford essentials such as food, utilities, or other necessary items. The current household support fund runs until the end of March 2026 and staff can refer eligible residents in need of support with food or help with heating costs into the scheme.

For those who have digital access the council's cost of living pages on our website have now been updated to show what additional support is also available. The pages are now condensed and easier to navigate.

The council has also recently launched a new Vulnerability Framework which acts as a guidance tool for officers to help them identify those who are currently vulnerable or are at risk of becoming vulnerable and how best the council can support these individuals."

35.11 As a supplementary question Lisa Brown asked whether Councillor Padda and other Cabinet members would meet with ACORN Norwich to discuss housing costs. Councillor Padda chose not to respond to the question.

35.12 The fifth question was from Izzy Jarvis. Izzy Jarvis asked the following question to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects:

"How can Norwich City Council continue to justify the continued use of bailiffs to collect on council tax debts from people who are already struggling to pay for basic goods? The use of bailiffs does nothing to stop poverty or raise funds for the council, as more money is spent on hiring out contractors than what is collected from people in debt, which also traumatises already vulnerable families by sending bailiffs to their doors. Will Norwich City Council commit to ending the use of bailiffs to collect council tax?"

35.13 Councillor Harper gave the following response:

Norwich City Council fully recognises the pressures residents are facing and the difficulties that debt can cause. Our starting point is always to support people to manage their payments and prevent debt from escalating.

Because the Council takes the issue of debt and vulnerability extremely seriously, when we appointed two new Enforcement Agents in October last year, we carefully considered how they work with vulnerable residents. We have also introduced a Corporate Debt Strategy, Policy and Vulnerability Framework, approved by Cabinet in June this year, to ensure we take a fair and supportive approach.

This includes:

- making early contact and offering flexible payment options
- using the Standard Financial Statement to assess affordability
- signposting and referring residents to trusted, independent advice services such as the Norfolk Community Advice Network (NCAN)
- offering “breathing space” and pausing recovery action where people are engaging with debt advice
- working across the Council to ensure that people with multiple debts are supported in a joined-up way
- not passing debts to enforcement agents where we know the customer is vulnerable.

Our contracted Enforcement Agents must follow strict legislation, and they use specialist teams to provide additional support when someone’s vulnerability is identified. In many cases, these debts are then returned directly to us so we can manage them more appropriately.

Enforcement Agents are only ever used as a last resort. Before that point, we will always seek to engage with residents, discuss affordable solutions, and signpost to independent advice and support agencies where this may help. In many cases, this allows us to take a different, more supportive approach.

It’s also important to note that the Council does not pay Enforcement Agents for recovering Council Tax. Any fees charged are strictly set out in national legislation.

Where someone is unwilling to pay Council Tax despite other options being offered, such as deductions from benefits or earnings - the use of Enforcement Agents may be necessary.

Our primary aim is not to punish people in hardship but to support our residents to get back on track financially, while still meeting our duty to collect income that funds essential services for Norwich.”

35.14 As a supplementary question Izzy Jarvis asked whether the Cabinet member would meet with ACORN Norwich to discuss their bailiff-free campaign.

35.15 In response Councillor Harper said that she was happy to meet with residents to have challenging conversations but reiterated that she would not meet with ACORN Norwich due to their actions that intimidated elected officials.

## **36. Questions to Cabinet Members**

36.1 There had been no questions received.

### **37. Minutes**

- 37.1 The minutes of the meeting, including the confidential minutes, held on 9 July 2025 were confirmed and signed as a true record.

### **38. Corporate Performance Report 2025-2026 – Quarter One**

- 38.1 The Leader of the Council presented the report. He highlighted that overall performance remained steady. 68% of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) were on or above target, 11% showed early warning signs and 21% had reached a level where intervention was required. The areas that required improvement included KPIs linked to processing times for new Housing Benefit claims, percentage of council housing rent collected. The KPI on average re-let times for council homes required sustained attention and mitigation actions were in place across all areas to improve performance in the coming months. There had been performance improvements in Council Tax and Business Rates collection, planning decisions remained strong with 80% of decisions upheld on appeal. The Council was conducting a review of its KPI targets and intervention thresholds to ensure these were aligned to national standards and benchmarking data. These were KPI01 – average number of days taken to process new Housing Benefit claims from point of receipt to notification of entitlement which had been adjusted from 19.5 days to 21 days to better reflect the national average processing time in England. The other was KPI09 – percentage of households owed a homelessness prevention duty (in accordance with the Homelessness Reduction Act) where the duty was ended due to suitable accommodation being secured, the target had been increased to 75% setting a higher performance standard to better reflect the proactive approach to service delivery and enabling earlier identification of performance dips.
- 38.2 The Cabinet Member for Housing commented that in relation to the void turnaround time, this was something that was being explored to ensure that the target was still realistic, especially considering the properties' condition when they were handed back. The Council would be benchmarking itself against other similar sized landlords to review this.
- 38.3 The Cabinet Member for Culture and Wellbeing said that adjustment of the target for KPI01 reflected the increasing complexity of migrating Housing Benefit claimants to Universal Credit. There was increasing amounts of data received from the Department for Work and Pensions and delays in receiving information from housing providers. She assured Cabinet that this was actively being addressed and to clear the backlog of claims.
- 38.4 As Councillor Catt had sent apologies the question on behalf of the Green Group and its response would be circulated and appended to the minutes at Appendix A.
- 38.5 The Leader of the Council moved, and the Cabinet Member for Culture and Wellbeing seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report.
- 38.6 **RESOLVED** that the Key Performance Indicators had been reviewed for the quarter.

### **39. Budget Monitoring Report 2025-2026 – Quarter One**

39.1 The Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects presented the report. The Council had a strong record of financial management, which was key to providing services to residents. The Council continued to operate within challenging financial circumstances. Both the General Fund revenue account and the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) showed forecast underspends. Prudent management of budgets continued to be emphasised. As part of the budget setting process for the following financial year more work would be done to assess forecasts.

39.2 As Councillor Catt had sent apologies the question on behalf of the Green Group and its response would be circulated and appended to the minutes at Appendix A.

39.3 The Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects moved, and the Cabinet Member for Culture and Wellbeing seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report

39.4 **RESOLVED** to:

- 1) Note the forecast £0.489million underspend on the General Fund revenue account and the £0.076million underspend on the Housing Revenue Account (HRA).
- 2) Note the forecast £6.756million underspend against the General Fund and the £1.935million underspend against the HRA capital programmes
- 3) Note the inclusion of £12.882million of unspent 2024-2025 capital budgets, carried forward into the 2025-2026 capital programme, approved under delegation by the chief finance officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects.

### **40. Good Employer Charter – response to recommendations of the Scrutiny Committee**

40.1 The Cabinet Member for Equalities and Social Justice presented the report. She was pleased to present the report for consideration by the Cabinet following recommendations made by the Scrutiny Committee, the report explored the introduction of a Good Employer Charter. The report outlined the current practice within the Council and the resource implications of implementing a charter cityside and considered the potential for the new Mayoral Combined County Authority to take this forward.

40.2 Councillor Wright asked in relation to recommendation 3 that the Scrutiny Committee recommendation did not request that the Council compels the Board of NCSL. The Cabinet Member for Equalities and Social Justice said that this was something that could be explored.

40.3As Councillor Catt had sent apologies the question on behalf of the Green Group and its response would be circulated and appended to the minutes at Appendix A.

40.4 The Cabinet Member for Equalities and Social Justice moved, and the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Climate and Environment seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report

**40.5 RESOLVED** that the following recommendations were accepted as follows:

- 1) Recommendation 1 – Cabinet response: as set out in the Scrutiny Committee report the Council had positive and regular engagement with trade unions both formally through the Joint Consultative and Negotiation Committee and informally through leadership conversations and service led engagement with local reps.
- 2) Recommendation 2 – Cabinet response: Implementation of a Good Employer Charter for the city of Norwich would require a significant amount of resource and financial contribution from the Council which was not within the Council's agreed business plan therefore this recommendation was taken forward. In other areas of England these schemes were run by Mayoral Authorities so the initiative could be promoted for the new Mayoral Combined County Authority rather than Norwich City Council. In relation to implementing the charter for Norwich City Council this was considered superfluous as the Council was already demonstrating the characteristics of a good employer
- 3) Recommendation 3 – Cabinet response: the Council could not compel Norwich City Services Limited (NCSL) to adopt a Good Employer Charter however the Executive Director of Resources would write to the Managing Director of NCSL to draw the Board's attention to the Charter.
- 4) Recommendation 4 – Cabinet response: The Council was not able to amend the contract standing orders to ask suppliers to demonstrate the characteristics of a Good Employer as the function of the contract standing orders was to ensure that the Council's procurement processes were compliant with current procurement legislation. Instead, the Council would incorporate the characteristics of a Good Employer within the next revision of the Contract Management Framework for contract managers to consider alongside other Council priorities. The requirements of a Good Employer Charter could not be used as part of the formal evaluation criteria for tenders.

#### **41. Making Norwich a Truly Accessible City: recommendations to Cabinet**

- 41.1 The Cabinet Member for Equalities and Social Justice presented the report. She thanked the Task and Finish Group for its work. The Council had committed that services it provided were inclusive and accessible. The Lord Mayor's Weekend had been awarded Bronze accreditation which highlighted events that were more inclusive. The majority of recommendations had been agreed however some had been declined due to resource constraints. The response to the recommendations had been consulted on with officers and stakeholders to ensure the viability of implementing the recommendations.
- 41.2 Councillor Galvin addressed the Cabinet as the Chair of the Task and Finish Group. She echoed the Cabinet Member's comments and thanked the officers and external contributors to the report. The Norwich Access Group had been working for a number of years to improve accessibility within the city and asked that the Cabinet apologised for the lack of action in the field. She was pleased to see that a number of the recommendations had been accepted however she was concerned that the recommendation on remuneration had not been accepted. There had been a steady



decline in the number of Disabled People's Organisation as the groups had been providing advice and support to both members and organisations for free.

- 41.3 The Cabinet Member for Equalities and Social Justice commented that she could not comment on the Council's action in the past however the Council was visibly improving its services. The reason that some recommendations were not accepted was set out in an evidence based way.
- 41.4 The Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects thanked Councillor Galvin for her tenure as Chair of the Task and Finish Group, it had been rewarding to have been involved in the process and hearing the lived experience from the community.
- 41.5 The Cabinet Member for Culture and Wellbeing commented that she was pleased that the Council had achieved Bronze accreditation for the Lord Mayor's weekend as it helped to achieve the aim of making Norwich a truly accessible city.
- 41.6As Councillor Catt had sent apologies the question on behalf of the Green Group and its response would be circulated and appended to the minutes at Appendix A
- 41.7 The Cabinet Member for Equalities and Social Justice moved, and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report

41.8 **RESOLVED** to:

- 1) Agree to accept and reject the recommendations from the Making Norwich a Truly Accessible City Task and Finish Group as endorsed by the Scrutiny Committee for the reasons set out in [Appendix 1](#) to the report.
- 2) Note the recommendations agreed and adopted by the Scrutiny Committee which would be built into its Work Programme as detailed in [Appendix 2](#) of the report.

## **42. Treasury Management Review and Outturn 2024-2025**

- 42.1 The Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects presented the report. The report detailed the Council's Treasury Management activity for 2024-2025 to the 31 March 2025. The Council's activities were compliant to the Council's agreed Treasury Management Strategy as agreed by the Full Council. The Cabinet was asked to note the report and recommend it to Full Council for approval. As part of the Treasury Management Strategy the Council had agreed to apply the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance for Capital Finance. There were no breaches to report. The Council remained significantly internally borrowed and the Council chose to invest cash balances to maximise returns. She thanked officers for their work in managing the Council's cash balances.
- 42.2 The Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects moved, and the Cabinet Member for Housing seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report
- 42.3 **RESOLVED** to note the report detailing the treasury activity for the year to 31 March 2025 and recommend it to Council for approval.

### **43. Risk Management Strategy and Policy**

43.1 The Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects presented the report. The Council was committed to effective risk management. A review had been undertaken of the strategy and policy, risks could not be eliminated. The policy and strategy highlighted a proactive approach to the management of risk and when a risk would be mitigated and managed or when it would be tolerated. The report set out the Council's risk appetite which would inform future assessment of risk. The strategy had been endorsed by the Audit Committee and a redesigned risk register template would be used for reporting from Quarter 3 of 2025-2026.

43.2 As Councillor Catt had sent apologies the question on behalf of the Green Group and its response would be circulated and appended to the minutes at Appendix A

43.3 The Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects moved, and the Cabinet Member for Housing seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report.

43.4 **RESOLVED** to adopt the policy as included in the appendix of the report.

### **44. Adoption of the Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Policy – Drivers and Operators Standards**

44.1 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services presented the report. The report summarised the changes suggested for the Hackney Carriage Drivers and Private Hire Vehicle Drivers and Operators as set out in the appendices to the report. Table one within the report highlighted the significant changes to the policy that would improve passenger safety. This included measures such as a requirement for all employees of Private Hire Vehicle Operators to have conducted DBS checks and for the maintenance of a list of employees. The Council would also conduct joint enforcement with neighbouring Councils, alignment with the higher Institute of Licensing standards for a number of requirements, a Norwich City Council penalty points scheme where points would be valid for three years, CCTV would become optional and the requirement for DVLA and DBS checks to be undertaken on a regular basis as opposed to at renewal. The policy had been considered by the Regulatory Committee who had not suggested amendments to the policy. He thanked officers for bringing the policy forward.

44.2 As Councillor Catt had sent apologies the question on behalf of the Green Group and its response would be circulated and appended to the minutes at Appendix A

44.3 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services moved, and the Cabinet Member for Equalities and Social Justice seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report

44.4 **RESOLVED** to recommend that Council adopts the revised Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Policy for Drivers and Operators Standards.

#### **45. Residential Caravan Licensing Model Standards**

- 45.1 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services presented the report. The Council owned the freehold for a Gypsy, Roma and Travellers (GRT) situated at Swanton Road. This was previously managed by Norfolk County Council and was therefore exempt from licensing. The management of the site has transferred to Broadland Housing Association, so a licence was required. Therefore the Council had drafted model standards for multiple occupancy sites and single occupancy sites. Applications would continue to be assessed on a site by site basis. Decent housing was the key to improve outcomes for the GRT community. There had been no formal responses to the consultation and the Regulatory Committee had considered the policy and made no amendments.
- 45.2 As Councillor Catt had sent apologies the question on behalf of the Green Group and its response would be circulated and appended to the minutes at Appendix A.
- 45.3 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services moved, and the Cabinet Member for Culture and Wellbeing seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report
- 45.4 **RESOLVED** to recommend that Full Council agrees the residential caravan conditions for adoption.

#### **46. Purpose-Built Student Accommodation Supplementary Planning Document**

- 46.1 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services presented the report. The report detailed a Norwich specific Purpose-Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The Council had issued an advice note in 2019 on PBSA. Since this advice note a significant amount of PBSA had been built. Policy 5 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) supports building of PBSA away from campuses subject to specific criteria having been met. The advice note was therefore out of date. The SPD updated the evidence base for developers, universities and the Council as planning authority. The evidence base demonstrated that the current stock and expected pipeline would comfortably meet the demand. While PBSA could relieve some pressure on the privately rented sector other factors influenced students' housing choices. There was no need for further PBSA beyond the current stock and expected pipeline and further PBSA could have a detrimental impact on the market. Planning applications for PBSA could still be submitted but would need to be accompanied with a statement of need and that higher education institutions would be consultees on these applications. Factors that would be considered if need had been demonstrated included location, design and other factors and developments still needed to comply with Development Management policies. 80% of respondents to the consultation agreed that the current stock and pipeline would meet demand.
- 46.2 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services moved, and the Cabinet Member for Housing seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report
- 46.3 **RESOLVED** to recommend that Full Council agree to adopt the revised Purpose-Built Student Accommodation Supplementary Planning Document.

#### **47. Review of the Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework**

- 47.1 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services presented the report. The report detailed the revised Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework (NSPF) for the Council to endorse. The document had been revised by the Norfolk Strategic Planning Forum and the Greater Norwich Growth Board, each of the local authorities would need to ratify the document. The Council had a duty to cooperate with other local authorities, and this was a key consideration when the soundness of a Local plan was assessed. The NSPF was managed by a project manager based at City Hall. The primary revisions to the document included a review of the visions and objectives, removal of irrelevant or completed objectives, information was updated to reference updated documents such as Norfolk County Council Economic Strategy, updates to the infrastructure sections and flood risk, a new section on Nutrient Neutrality had been added and the document reflected the updated methodology for calculating housing need. The new NSPF had a range of shared objectives which were detailed in the report. He thanked officers for the revised NSPF.
- 47.2 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services moved, and the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Climate and Environment seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report
- 47.3 **RESOLVED** to recommend to Full Council that it endorses the revised Norfolk Strategic Planning Framework and remains a signatory to the framework.

#### **48. Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure Strategy Supplementary Planning Document Draft**

- 48.1 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services presented the report. The report detailed a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which would be considered by Full Council before the commencement of a public consultation. The Green Infrastructure Strategy (GIS) had been adopted the previous Civic Year. The GIS detailed how green infrastructure would be prioritised, the typology of green infrastructure and the identification of green infrastructure provision. In a non-planning context the GIS was used by the Greater Norwich Growth Board to assess bids for funding. The SPD would cover the entire Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) area and would allow more planning weight to be given to the GIS as part of policies within the GNLP. The SPD should be used by developers to demonstrate how green infrastructure on sites would be connected to green corridors. The GIS and delivery plan had already been endorsed and would not be amended, however comments from the consultation would be taken forward as part of a future review of the GIS.
- 48.2 The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Climate and Environment encouraged members to look at the website of the GIS to view the story map that had been developed which detailed the sites and information within the GIS.
- 48.3 As Councillor Catt had sent apologies the question on behalf of the Green Group and its response would be circulated and appended to the minutes at Appendix A.

48.4 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services moved, and the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Climate and Environment seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report

48.5 **RESOLVED** to recommend that Full Council:

- 1) Authorises a six-week consultation of the Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure Strategy Supplementary Planning Document.
- 2) Sign off of any minor amendments to the draft SPD prior to public consultation be delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the relevant portfolio holder as appropriate.

**49. Greater Norwich Local Plan Policy 2: Sustainable Communities Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

49.1 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services presented the report. The report detailed a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) that would be considered by Full Council before a public consultation period. While all developments had to comply with Policy 2: Sustainable Communities of the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) the SPD detailed the additional information that was required of major developments when submitting a Sustainability Statement as required within the GNLP. Policy 2 detailed ten key social, economic and environmental issues that developments must address which were detailed in the report. The SPD placed an onus on applicants to demonstrate how their application was compliant with the policy. The SPD reiterated that the Council was bound by the evidenced optional higher water efficiency requirement of 110 litres per person per day as set out in the Building Regulations but made reference to the June 2025 guidance for the East of England that higher water efficiency requirements were needed and the SPD encouraged these higher standards but could not require these.

49.2As Councillor Catt had sent apologies the question on behalf of the Green Group and its response would be circulated and appended to the minutes at Appendix A.

49.3 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services moved, and the Cabinet Member for Housing seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report

49.4 **RESOLVED** to recommend that Full Council:

- 1) Agree to go out for consultation on the draft Supplementary Planning Document
- 2) Sign off any minor amendments to the draft Supplementary Planning Document prior to public consultation be delegated to the Head of Planning in consultation with the portfolio holder for planning and regulatory services as appropriate.

**50. Nutrient Mitigation Fund Loan to expedite the Norwich mitigation scheme**

50.1 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services presented the report. The report sought approval in principle for a bridging loan from the Norfolk Nutrient Mitigation Fund. This was subject to detail on confirmation on how the credits would

be financed. The Nutrient Mitigation Fund was a grant that had been awarded to Broadland District Council due to Nutrient Neutrality requirements in March 2022. The member panel of the Nutrient Mitigation Fund had approved providing a loan to Norwich City Council. The loan facility would only be drawn down if required and there was no requirement to drawdown the full amount. The borrowing would be paid by developer contributions that had a relevant section 106 agreement in place.

50.2 As Councillor Catt had sent apologies the question on behalf of the Green Group and its response would be circulated and appended to the minutes at Appendix A.

50.3 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services moved, and the Cabinet Member for Equalities and Social Justice seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report

50.4 **RESOLVED** to approve in principle the use of a £3million loan via the Nutrient Mitigation Fund to finance the Norwich Nutrient Neutrality Mitigation works, subject to confirmation from the Chief Finance Officer (s151 officer) of the optimum way to fund the capital works.

#### **51. Extension of contract with Norse Environmental Waste Services for processing recyclable material**

51.1 The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Climate and Environment presented the report. The report requested an extension of the existing contract with Norse Environmental Waste Services (NEWS) for the processing of comingled recyclable materials. There were a number of major measures introduced in the Environment Act which would reshape local waste services, including Deposit Return Scheme and a review of waste processing. The proposal within the report was to extend the contract with NEWS to 2030 to ensure financial stability and enable local processing. Within the context of Local Government Reorganisation this enabled the Council and the successor authority to agree an appropriate local arrangement. Other authorities in Norfolk would be seeking similar arrangements.

51.2 The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Climate and Environment moved, and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report

51.3 **RESOLVED** to:

- 1) Approve the extension of the Materials Recycling Facility (MRF) waste management service contract for the processing of comingled mixed recyclate (Blue Bin material) with Norse Environmental Waste Services from 30 September 2027 to 30 September 2030
- 2) Delegate authority to the Executive Director of Communities and Housing to approve variations to the contract, where such variations are required to ensure enhanced control and oversight for the permitted extension period; and respond to any uncertainty and unforeseen implications arising from changes in waste management practices and relevant legislation.

## **52. Annual complaint performance and service improvement report**

- 52.1 The Cabinet Member for Housing presented the report. This was the second year that the Council had published the report, which was required to be published by the Housing Ombudsman. It highlighted the compliance to the Code of Practice and showed improvements in the tenant satisfaction measures since the last report. The report detailed how the Council responded to complaints and she acknowledged that further improvements could be made but significant improvements had been made. The leadership team within housing were focused on service improvement including within complaint handling. There had been a 34% reduction in the number of Stage 1 complaints. The learning from complaints was being embedded to ensure that issues were not repeated. The majority of decisions reached by the Housing Ombudsman were in relation to old cases. The Council wanted to continue on its trajectory of improving its services therefore reducing the need for tenants to complaints.
- 52.2 The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Climate and Environment commented that the update was useful and clearly showed the improvements that had been made. She asked whether the cabinet member was comfortable that the self-assessment accurately reflected the performance of the Council.
- 52.3 The Cabinet Member for Housing responded and said that complaints were reviewed regularly, and dashboard of complaints was examined in real time. This included the ability to drill down to understand the complaints. This enabled her to request further briefings on these and ensured that she was able to have an overview of trends regularly and address issues in discussions with the Executive Director and Heads of Services.
- 52.4 As Councillor Catt had sent apologies the question on behalf of the Green Group and its response would be circulated and appended to the minutes at Appendix A.
- 52.5 The Cabinet Member for Housing moved, and the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Climate and Environment seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report
- 52.6 **RESOLVED** that the Complaints Performance and Service Report had been reviewed and responded to.

## **53. Delegated authority to award the Pre-Construction Service Agreement and the main design and build construction contract for 67 new homes at Mile Cross**

- 53.1 The Cabinet Member for Housing presented the report. She was pleased to bring forward a report on two contracts for the building of 67 new homes on the Mile Cross site. The enabling works on site were ongoing. The report detailed the two contracts which were for pre-construction service agreement for the necessary surveys and the contract for the main construction. The value of the contracts was up to £20million. She highlighted that the development of the site was part of the HRA and had always intended for the Council to go out to tender of the site. The progression of the site was positive as it would provide additional social housing within Norwich.

53.2 The Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects commented that the statements made by members about Lion Homes were inaccurate as the company had not collapsed and the Council had taken steps to ensure it did not collapse. She thanked the Cabinet Member and officers for progressing a complex site. She expressed disappointments that the County Council had chosen not to take forward improvements to Mile Cross Road as this would have an impact on the site. She asked for clarification from the Monitoring Officer whether it was a breach of the Code of Conduct for members to knowingly make statements that were inaccurate. In response the Monitoring Officer confirmed that members must behave with honesty and integrity, any breaches should be referred to the Monitoring Officer for consideration.

53.3 The Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services commented that it was positive that the Council was continuing to build social housing and that significant work had gone into bringing it to this stage.

53.4 The Cabinet Member for Housing referred to the campaign from the Women and Girls of the Common Lot to name streets within the development after women and hoped this could be achieved soon.

53.5 The Cabinet Member for Housing moved, and the Cabinet Member for Culture and Wellbeing seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report

53.6 **RESOLVED** to delegate authority to the Executive Director of Communities and Housing in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects the award of the contract for the main development works of the 67 new dwellings at Mile Cross former depot at a total estimated value of £20.735million (excluding VAT) and subject to due diligence being demonstrated in the following two phases:

- 1) Phase 1 for the Pre-Construction Service Agreement (PCSA) for a period of eight months.
- 2) Phase 2 for the approval of the final contract sum from the successful supplier and the award of the main contract, following the completion of the PCSA, so that the development works can commence on site for a period of two years.

#### **54. Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Capital Investment Contract**

54.1 The Cabinet Member for Housing presented the report. The report asked Cabinet to approve the award of two contracts for capital investments in the Housing Revenue Account (HRA), this was following a completion of a tender process as described in the report. Over the proceeding months several short-term contracts for HRA works to ensure continuity of works. A rigorous procurement process had been conducted which had started with an engagement process. The process demonstrated the importance of these for the HRA and the future of the Council's housing stock. This was consolidating a number of contracts that would be split into two lots, the initial contract period was five years with the option to extend for a further five years. In the context of Local Government Reorganisation the successor authority would decide on its own contracts, the length of the contracts would enable the new authority to mobilise and continue to provide services. The lots had



been divided using existing ward boundaries, roads and natural features to ensure these were a similar ratio. Longer-term contracts enabled the Council to more effectively plan work using the data from the stock condition survey.

54.2 As Councillor Catt had sent apologies the question on behalf of the Green Group and its response would be circulated and appended to the minutes at Appendix A.

54.3 The Cabinet Member for Housing moved, and the Cabinet Member for Planning and Regulatory Services seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report

54.4 **RESOLVED** to approve the awards of the two contracts to provide Capital Investment programme services under the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) a total value of £292,906,490.00 following completion of the tender process as prescribed within the report and linked exempt appendix.

Item	Action	Works programme	Value
1	Award	New contract for Capital Investment programme delivery, to CONTRACTOR A for a contract period from 15 December 2025 for TEN YEARS to 15 December 2035 North and East (Lot 1)	Up to £132,526,640.00
2	Award	New contract for Capital Investment programme delivery, to CONTRACTOR B for a contract period from 15 December 2025 for TEN YEARS to 15 December 2035 South and West (Lot 2)	Up to £160,379,850.00

## **55. Exclusion of the Public**

55.1 **RESOLVED** to exclude the press and public from the meeting during the consideration of the below items of the exempt report on the grounds that they contained exempt information as defined in the relevant paragraphs within Part 1 of Schedule 12A, as amended, of the Local Government Act 1972.

## **56. East Norwich Stakeholder Support (Para 3)**

56.1 (An exempt minute exists for this item).

56.2 The Cabinet Member for Finance and Major Projects and the Cabinet Member for Housing seconded the recommendations for the reasons set out in the report.

56.3 **RESOLVED** that the following recommendations were accepted as detailed in the report.

56.4 (An exempt minute exists for this item).

CHAIR

**,Political questions to Cabinet – Green Group**

Item	Question	Response	Response from
<b>Item 6 - Corporate Performance Report 2025-2026 – Quarter One</b>	<p>Getting homes ready for new tenants is taking longer than it should again, going up 16 days to 59 days, excluding major works - this seems to be a constant struggle for this council which we have raised many, many times to no avail - or things improve then slip again. Is it really the answer to change the target time as suggested, when well over 4,000 people are on the housing list and many more waiting besides?</p>	<p>It is important to recognise that Norwich City Council has made sustained and significant improvements in void turnaround times over recent years, despite national pressures in the social housing sector. While Q1 performance showed an increase, this is not unusual at the start of the year, when seasonal and operational factors come into play, and it remains far stronger than historic performance.</p> <p>The proposal to adjust the target is not about lowering ambition or excusing poor performance. It is about setting a benchmark that is both stretching and realistic in the current environment, in line with our peer councils. By doing so, we can ensure transparency and accountability in how we measure ourselves, while continuing to drive further improvement.</p> <p>We are absolutely clear that with more than 4,000 households on our waiting list, every day matters. That is why we have already taken steps to improve contractor performance, streamline processes, and prioritise lettings to minimise delays. Our focus is always on providing safe, good-quality homes to people who need them most as quickly as possible, and we will continue to push for better outcomes.</p>	<b>Cllr Stonard</b>
<b>Item 7: Budget Monitoring Report 2025-2026 – Quarter One</b>	<p>Recently, the administration decided to reduce the number of citizen publications to achieve savings – now we read that the reduced number of citizen publications has resulted in reduced income from advertising. Could this loss of income not have been anticipated when the decision was made to reduce the</p>	<p>The decision to reduce the number of publications was taken in order to deliver savings for the council, and that objective has been achieved through lower printing and distribution costs. While there has inevitably been some reduction in advertising income as a result, this was anticipated and is fully managed within the resources of the agreed 2025–26 budget.</p> <p>Importantly, the overall saving from the change still stands, and the council remains on track with its wider financial strategy. The priority is to make the best use of every pound of public</p>	<b>Cllr Harper</b>

Item	Question	Response	Response from
	number of publications and will the decision to reduce the number of publications be reconsidered in light of this shortfall in advertising income?	money, and the adjustment to publication frequency reflects a sensible balance between maintaining communication with residents and meeting the financial challenges we face.	
<b>Item 9: Making Norwich a Truly Accessible City: recommendations to Cabinet</b>	<p>This report into Making Norwich a Truly Accessible City was produced together with the detailed input of user groups as it was accepted that genuine stakeholder consultation from the start is vital as the voices of those with access needs are so rarely heard. The cabinet member was also invited throughout, and officers were worked with very closely on every point, so it is a disappointing to see out of 28 the recommendations, all chosen because of an identified need for real change, more than half are not being wholeheartedly accepted by cabinet, and some even rejected. This is a shame as this report was carefully crafted to make a huge difference without a huge cost. For instance, recommendation 3 was simply to look at how to support user groups, a nationally recognised approach. Given the huge amounts we continue to pay interims, running into the millions, how can we possibly justify not even examining some support for</p>	<p>Cabinet fully endorses the report's commitment to delivering accessible and inclusive services and environments for all residents, employees, and stakeholders.</p> <p>Of the 28 recommendations, Cabinet has formally accepted 14 (50%). A further 10.5 recommendations (37.5%) are already being implemented, as confirmed by the relevant Senior Responsible Officers (SROs). While delivery methods may differ from those proposed by the Working Group, the intended outcomes are aligned and verified by the SROs. Cabinet does not support duplicating work already in progress, as this would be an inefficient use of resources.</p> <p>Only 3.5 recommendations (12.5%) have been declined: 9% due to resource constraints and 3.5% (one recommendation) due to conflicts with established council policy.</p> <p>In total, 87.5% of the recommendations are either accepted or underway. <b>The assertion that “more than half are not wholeheartedly accepted by Cabinet” is therefore inaccurate. Half are newly accepted, and over a third are actively being pursued with Cabinet’s endorsement.</b></p> <p>Regarding recommendation 3, officers acknowledge that best practice supports remunerating consultees who face barriers to participation. However, implementing such a policy would require consistent remuneration across all engagement contexts – including socioeconomic disadvantage, asylum status, and other lived experiences – resulting in prohibitive costs and reduced capacity to consult widely. The Council cannot</p>	<b>Cllr Padda</b>

Item	Question	Response	Response from
	those who help us with their expertise, in line with national best practice?	<p>selectively remunerate only those in accessibility contexts without creating inequity and precedent.</p> <p>Cabinet notes that the Scrutiny Committee has established a working group on participatory democracy. Given the broad implications of remunerating lived experience participants, Cabinet invites this group to explore and propose a sustainable funding model. This will ensure a comprehensive and equitable approach, avoiding piecemeal solutions.</p>	
<b>Item 11: Risk Management Strategy and Policy</b>	Concerns have been raised in the past about the Council's approach to managing risk related to its wholly owned companies. What assurances can the Cabinet member provide that the new strategy and policy adequately manage such risks?	<p>We fully recognise the importance of strong governance and effective risk management in relation to our wholly owned companies. That is why we have commissioned a lessons learned review by the council's Head of Internal Audit, which will be reported transparently to a future meeting of the Audit Committee.</p> <p>This review will be thorough, evidence-based, and benchmarked against CIPFA's recognised best practice guide "Local Authority Owned Companies: A Good Practice Guide." This ensures that our arrangements are not only compliant but also aligned with sector-leading standards.</p> <p>The outcome will directly inform our future strategy, strengthening governance, improving oversight, and embedding lessons learned into our approach. This demonstrates our commitment to continuous improvement, accountability, and protecting the interests of both the council and the residents we serve.</p>	<b>Cllr Harper</b>
<b>Item 12: Adoption of Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicle Policy – Drivers' and Operators' Standards</b>	A repeated issue in the city has been taxi drivers coming to committee for breaches of their conditions and being seemingly unaware of the rules that they	The council absolutely recognises the importance of ensuring that all licensed drivers fully understand and comply with the conditions and standards associated with their licence. As part of ongoing service improvements within the licensing function,	<b>Cllr Giles</b>

Item	Question	Response	Response from
	<p>have agreed to and having not read the green book properly. We welcome all of the changes being made to the policy here, but enforcement is different. How will the council improve in ensuring taxi drivers actually know the rules they are signing up to, and specifically how will the council ensure that drivers already licenced know that these rules are in place and abide by them?</p>	<p>several measures are being introduced to strengthen both awareness and compliance.</p> <p>Following the recent review and update of the taxi and private hire licensing policy, a revised knowledge test will be implemented for new applicants. This updated assessment will cover key areas including an understanding of the licensing conditions, English and maths proficiency, and local geographical knowledge. The aim is to ensure that all new drivers are well-informed and suitably equipped to meet the expectations of the role from the outset.</p> <p>For existing licence holders, compliance will continue to be rigorously monitored through regular inspections and visits carried out by Licensing Enforcement Officers. These provide opportunities to not just to enforce but also to reinforce understanding, with officers able to address concerns directly with drivers.</p> <p>We are also improving communication with the licensed trade, including clearer and more accessible guidance materials. Once the new policies are adopted, we will work with the communications team to produce a streamlined, easy-to-read version of the “green book,” so that rules are transparent, consistent, and harder to ignore.</p> <p>These measures show that we are not only tightening the rules but also making sure drivers know them and abide by them – striking the right balance between fairness and enforcement.</p>	
<p><b>Item 13: Residential Caravan Licensing Model Standards</b></p>	<p>The consultation for this item received no feedback from the traveller community. Why didn't the council return to this community to ensure they were</p>	<p>As part of the council’s commitment to inclusive and equitable consultation, proactive steps were taken to engage with representatives of the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) community both prior to and during the consultation process.</p>	<p><b>Cllr Giles</b></p>

Item	Question	Response	Response from
	able to feedback into the consultation process?	<p>Before the consultation was launched, the council worked closely with the Service Manager for the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Service for Norfolk. Their expertise was instrumental in shaping the initial Equality Impact Assessment, ensuring that the specific needs and perspectives of the GRT community were considered from the outset. Following the consultation period, further input was sought from this service to review and refine the assessment, reinforcing our commitment to inclusivity and compliance with equality standards.</p> <p>In addition, the Gypsy and Traveller Communities Manager at Broadland Housing was contacted directly to provide feedback on behalf of residents at the Swanton Road caravan site. Their involvement in the pre-consultation phase helped ensure that any proposed conditions or standards would be appropriate and achievable for the site and its residents.</p> <p>While no formal responses were received during the consultation window, that does not mean the community's views were absent. Engagement took place through established representatives and service leads, and the model standards will always be tailored to specific sites before they are applied.</p> <p>In short, the council is confident that the GRT community's interests have been heard and considered, and we will continue to work with recognised representatives to ensure their voices remain central to implementation.</p>	
<b>Item 16: Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure Strategy Planning Document Draft</b>	How will the GNGIS SDP ensure that new development consistently delivers high-quality, connected green infrastructure that supports biodiversity, climate resilience, and residents' wellbeing, and how will the councils monitor delivery	The Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy is an evidence document which was developed using a significant amount of data and stakeholder engagement and was endorsed by the Greater Norwich Growth Board in March 2025. The GI Strategy provides a framework for planning and prioritising green infrastructure to support sustainable growth. It is being used to guide the provision and location of GI, to identify	<b>Cllr Giles</b>

Item	Question	Response	Response from
	against these commitments over time?	<p>deficiencies in provision, to identify opportunities for provision and to make clear the strategic GI network across Greater Norwich. It assists both in identifying GI priorities for CIL and other funding sources and in helping identify appropriate GI to serve proposed development sites.</p> <p>Policies 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 of the GNLP all contain reference to the provision of GI for new development. The SPD will support these policies specifically.</p> <p>The SPD will be consulted on shortly. It is concerned with <b>how this evidence document should be used for designing new development and for planning decision making</b>. This gives greater weight to the GI Strategy evidence in decision making and makes it clear what the Greater Norwich authorities expect applications to show.</p> <p>Comments received on the SPD text will be considered and any amendments made before bringing a final version through committees for adoption. The public will be able to see the Strategy documents in the appendices and will be able to provide general comment on these if they wish.</p> <p>Whilst changes to the strategy document itself can't be made (as it is a finalised evidence document which was subject to its own engagement exercises) any comments received on the strategy documents will be fed through to the Greater Norwich Green Infrastructure Project Team who are currently working on processes and programmes for delivering the GI Strategy.</p> <p>The implementation of GI policies will be monitored through indicator EPE7 of the Greater Norwich Local Plan's Annual Monitoring Report.</p>	
<b>Item 17: Greater Norwich Local Plan</b>	How will the Sustainable Communities SPD ensure that all	This SPD is intended to assist developers in preparing high-quality planning applications and the supporting statements	<b>Cllr Giles</b>



Item	Question	Response	Response from
<b>Policy 2: Sustainable Communities Draft Supplementary Planning Document</b>	the requirements of GNLP Policy 2 are applied consistently and effectively across all types of development, and how will the Council monitor whether developers are meeting these standards in practice?	<p>required by GNLP Policy 2 are integral to that process. The statements required by policy 2 will bring all of the information together so decision makers will be easily able to understand how a scheme complies with the ten aspects of policy. Failure to produce well written statements may delay the determination of applications and failure to comply with the various aspects of policy 2 may lead to the refusal of planning applications. Taking the time to prepare the required supporting statements however is an opportunity for a developer to showcase how their planning application is well-conceived and complies with GNLP Policy 2. Well written supporting statements may also assist in achieving a timely planning decision.</p> <p>The monitoring of policy 2 will take place as part of the Annual Monitoring Report. A number of GNLP <a href="#">monitoring indicators</a> apply to policy 2, covering housing densities, design, compliance concerning Sustainability Statements and Delivery Plans, renewable energy, flood risk and water efficiency.</p>	
<b>Item 18: Nutrient Mitigation Fund Loan to expedite the Norwich mitigation scheme</b>	Given the council's recent disastrous record with loans to developer, Lion Homes, the proposal to borrow up to £3m for the Nutrient Neutrality Mitigation scheme carries further great risk. How will the Council ensure robust financial governance — including independent scrutiny of loan drawdown, management of repayment risks linked to developer contributions, and safeguards if government policy on nutrient neutrality changes — so that public money is not exposed again to undue risk?	The government have given <i>grant</i> funding to the Norfolk authorities of just under £19 million to help unlock development stalled by Nutrient Neutrality by funding mitigation projects. It is being managed by Broadland District Council through the Nutrient Mitigation Fund (NMF) which is overseen by officer and member groups from the 5 districts impacted by Nutrient Neutrality in Norfolk. It is felt that this provides sufficiently robust financial governance. The NMF have agreed to loan Norwich up to £3m to expedite delivery of the Council's mitigation scheme. Paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 of the report set out how the loan will be drawn down and safeguards if the policy on NN changes nationally. Further, it is anticipated that we will imminently receive a significant proportion of the mitigation payment from the development at Anglia Square, circa £1.34m, which would therefore be able to be used to finance delivery of our mitigation scheme, reducing the amount of loan required.	<b>Cllr Giles</b>

Item	Question	Response	Response from
<b>Item 20: Annual complaint performance and service improvement report</b>	Community feedback on this item reflects poorly upon the council; what is the council's plan to give residents greater input in their estates?	<p>Improving the quality of our housing estates is a priority, this is reflected in the Tenant Satisfaction Measures (TSM) results and based on our own experiences as ward councillors. I have asked officers to provide me with a plan for improving estates and that will include greater input from residents. One such example is estate inspections will resume from this month, beginning with Dolphin Grove and Watson Grove. After this inspection, we'll update all residents about the schedule via Housing Hub and other means. During October we also have plans for a new engagement activity to be launched on the Housing Hub for residents regarding fly tipping and waste management issues.</p> <p>Residents feedback helps us improve and prioritise resources, and our aim is for residents to be able to track inspection results and estate improvements for their estate on the Housing Hub.</p>	<b>Cllr Jones</b>
<b>Item 21: Delegated authority to award the pre-construction service agreement and the main design and build construction contract for 67 new homes at Mile Cross</b>	What is the total length of delay to this project, due to the collapse of Lion Homes?	The question is inaccurate; Lion Homes did not collapse, the Board of Lion Homes recommended Voluntary Liquidation to the Council as Shareholder. But regardless the new homes at Mile Cross are paid for by the council from the Housing Revenue Account. The project is not and has never been a Lion Homes project.	<b>Cllr Jones</b>