

**Norfolk County Council**  
**Minutes of the Extraordinary General Meeting Held at 2pm on**  
**Monday 7 June 2021**

<b>Present:</b>		
	<b>ADAMS</b> Timothy	<b>KIRK</b> Julian
	<b>ADAMS</b> Tony	<b>LONG</b> Brian
	<b>ANNISON</b> Carl	<b>MACKIE</b> Ian
	<b>AQUARONE</b> Steffan	<b>MASON BILLIG</b> Kay
	<b>ASKEW</b> Stephen	<b>MAXFIELD</b> Ed
	<b>BAMBRIDGE</b> Lesley	<b>MORIARTY</b> Jim
	<b>BENSLY</b> James	<b>MORPHEW</b> Steve
	<b>BILLS</b> David	<b>OLIVER</b> Judy
	<b>BIRMINGHAM</b> Alison	<b>OSBORN</b> Jamie
	<b>BLUNDELL</b> Sharon	<b>PECK</b> Greg
	<b>BORRETT</b> Bill	<b>PENFOLD</b> Saul
	<b>BOWES</b> Claire	<b>PLANT</b> Graham
	<b>CARPENTER</b> Graham	<b>PRICE</b> Ben
	<b>CARPENTER</b> Penny (Chair)	<b>PRICE</b> Richard
	<b>CLANCY</b> Stuart	<b>PROCTOR</b> Andrew
	<b>COLMAN</b> Ed	<b>RICHMOND</b> Will
	<b>CORLETT</b> Emma	<b>REILLY</b> Mathew
	<b>DAUBNEY</b> Nick	<b>RILEY</b> Steve
	<b>DAWSON</b> Christopher	<b>ROPER</b> Dan
	<b>DEWSBURY</b> Margaret	<b>RUMSBY</b> Chrissie
	<b>DOLBY</b> Michael	<b>SANDS</b> Mike
	<b>DUFFIN</b> Barry	<b>SAVAGE</b> Robert
	<b>DUIGAN</b> Phillip	<b>SMITH</b> Carl
	<b>EAGLE</b> Fabian	<b>SMITH-CLARE</b> Mike
	<b>ELMER</b> Daniel	<b>STOREY</b> Martin
	<b>FISHER</b> John	<b>THOMAS</b> Alison
	<b>FITZPATRICK</b> Tom	<b>THOMPSON</b> Vic
	<b>GURNEY</b> Shelagh	<b>VARDY</b> Eric
	<b>HEMPSALL</b> Lana	<b>VINCENT</b> Karen
	<b>HORSBRUGH</b> Michael Chenery of	<b>WALKER</b> Colleen
	<b>JAMIESON</b> Andrew	<b>WARD</b> John
	<b>JERMY</b> Terry	<b>WATKINS</b> Brian
	<b>JONES</b> Brenda	<b>WEBB</b> Maxine
	<b>KEMP</b> Alexandra	<b>WHITE</b> Tony
	<b>KIDDIE</b> Keith	<b>WHYMARK</b> Fran
		<b>WILBY</b> Martin

**Present: 71**

## **1 Apologies**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Ed Connolly, Cllr Stuart Dark, Cllr Nigel Dixon, Cllr Andy Grant, Cllr Jane James, Cllr Mark Kiddle-Morris, Cllr Graham Middleton, , Cllr Paul Neale, Cllr Rhodri Olliver, Cllr Lucy Shires and Cllr Barry Stone.

## **2 Chair's Announcements**

- 2.1 There were no chair announcements.

## **3 Declarations of Interest**

- 3.1 Cllr John Fisher declared an "other interest" as he was a member of Norfolk Wildlife Trust and Friends of the Earth who had lobbied on the Western Link Road item.
- 3.2 Cllr Ben Price declared an "other interest" as he had donated money in support of "Stop the Western Link" crowd funding.

## **4 Any items of business which the Chair decides should be considered as a matter of urgency**

- 4.1 There were no items of urgent business

## **5 Norwich Western Link -Referral of Cabinet decision to Award £100m+ Contract**

- 5.1 In her opening remarks the Chair pointed out that there were two recommendations in the Council report.
- 5.2 The Chair said that the first recommendation related to the decision which Cabinet had made that morning in respect of the Norwich Western Link, to which Councillors had a link in the executive summary of the Council report. The Constitution required that a decision which committed the Council to spend more than £100m must be referred to Full Council, and that was why this meeting was called and why this matter was put before the Council at this time. The Constitution required only that the matter was "referred" to Full Council, but the Cabinet was also asking that Council endorses its decision. The Chair reminded Councillors that the decision was and remained an executive decision, and if Council agreed to endorse Cabinet's decision that did not mean that the decisions made by Cabinet this morning became a decision of Full Council.
- 5.3 The Chair said that the second recommendation was in respect of the forward capital programme. In order for the scheme to proceed, the conclusion of the procurement process needed to be reflected in the forward capital programme.
- 5.4 The Chair said that she would call on the Leader of the Council to introduce the report and to formally move the recommendations contained therein and then call on Group Leaders to speak to the recommendations and propose any amendments.

- 5.5 The Leader in formally moving the recommendations contained in the report (seconded by Cllr Wilby) summarised the reasons why the Cabinet had reached its decisions and asked Full Council to endorse those decisions.
- 5.6 The Leader said that the building of the Norwich Western Link would support the Council's commitment to reduce carbon emissions, it would improve road networks and supply chain connectivity across the whole county, reduce congestion delay, take traffic away from the city and rural roads, support local communities, unlock sustainable development where people wanted to live and work and speed up attendance times for blue light services across Norfolk. There would also be biodiversity net gains for all applicable wildlife habitats from a scheme aimed at enhancing and protecting the local and built environment including the creation of new woodland. Where there were environmental concerns, these would be addressed with the contractor design team and assessed as part of the environmental impact element of the planning application.
- 5.7 The Leader also said that the outline business case for the project was based on more detailed and robust estimates than was the case in the past. The project would bring into Norfolk nearly £170 million of investment which was a massive leverage on the local contribution of nearly £30 million and a sign of the government's confidence in Norfolk.
- 5.8 In seconding the motion in support of the recommendations Cllr Wilby said that local communities, district councils, emergency services, local employers and MPs had expressed strong support for the project. The case to be put to the Department for Transport for this vital piece of infrastructure for Norfolk would show a significant reduction in carbon emissions from vehicles over the 60-year appraisal period. There would also be improvements in existing wildlife habitats and the creation of new ones across a wide geographical area to the west of Norwich beneficial to a wide range of wildlife including bats, birds, amphibians and pollinators. Guidance would be sought from environmental bodies to develop and design mitigation measures as part of the planning application process. There would also be complementary sustainable transport measures put in place in support of walking, cycling and the use of public transport. The new road would improve road safety with 515 fewer accidents involving a motor vehicle over the 60 years period and an average reduction of nine accidents a year. There would also be £315 million worth of travel time benefits over six years. The concerns expressed at a local liaison meeting held last week about the impact on protected species of bats would be addressed as part of the environmental impact assessment which would be submitted with the planning application.
- 5.9 **The substantial motion on the table was:**
- 1. To endorse the decision taken by Cabinet to refer its decision made on 7 June 2021 to Full Council as required by the Council's Financial Regulations set out in its Constitution at App 15 para 3.6.1.**
  - 2. To agree to include £186.836m in the forward capital programme, funded from £167.605m of DfT Grant and £19.231m local**

**contribution, underwritten by the County Council which would be funded through additional prudential borrowing.**

**5.9 Cllr Morpew, seconded by Cllr Watkins, moved the following amendment:**

**‘Add new recommendation 3**

**3. a) To defer consideration to Full Council on 19 July and**

**b) refer the Cabinet recommendations to the Scrutiny Committee to review**

**c) request Scrutiny Committee to report back to the Council meeting on 19 July with any comments they feel help Council in considering the recommendations from Cabinet.’**

**5.10** Cllr Morpew said that the amendment made no value judgement on this huge project which had generated a lot of public interest. There would be significant risks along the way for this project as technical studies were commissioned, and the evidence was tested and scrutinised. The amendment provided an opportunity for Councillors to better understand and test the implications and details of the two stages of this project in advance of the next meeting of Council in July 2021. Cllr Morpew added that there should also be a scrutiny role for the Corporate Select Committee and the Infrastructure and Development Select Committee given the breadth of the topic and the need to allow the Scrutiny Committee time to also consider other important issues.

**5.11** Cllr Watkins said that the decisions taken by the Council today would have widespread environmental implications for the whole of Norfolk and define the Council at a time when there was a growing threat from climate change to our future way of life. The decisions to be taken on the Norwich Western Link were being rushed through when clearly so many important questions remained unanswered. There was very good evidence to question the Council's ability to deliver this project in accordance with its stated objectives and to do so within the stated cost parameters. The Administration would do well to remember the harsh bitter lessons that should have been learned from the incinerator issue just a few short years ago when it refused to listen to voices of reason and common sense preferring instead to carry on with a project that was doomed to failure and for which the Council paid a very high financial price. Proper scrutiny was needed of the outline business case even at this late stage before a final decision was reached.

**5.12** As proposer of the original motion, Cllr Proctor said that he did not accept the amendment.

**5.13** Following debate and upon it being put to a recorded vote (Appendix A), with 23 votes in favour, 45 votes against and 3 abstentions, the amendment was **LOST**.

**5.14 Cllr Osbourn, seconded by Cllr Price, moved the following amendment:**

**5.15 To ask Cabinet to reconsider its decision with the following information publicly supplied:**

**1. The calculations used to quantify the projected carbon impacts of the project, including carbon from construction and land use**

change.

2. Detailed evidence for the claims regarding traffic flows related to the scheme and changes since the 2015 NATS modelling on which the SOBC was based.
3. Evidence of legal advice sought by the council regarding the carbon implications of the scheme, their mitigation and legal risks associated with the scheme's carbon impacts.
4. Evidence of how carbon emissions and biodiversity loss are to be considered within the risk register.
5. Scientific evidence of the efficacy of "green bridges".
6. Evidence of how ancient and veteran trees could be included in Biodiversity Net Gain calculations.
7. Detailed evidence of how the contractors selected to input into and deliver the scheme have been assessed for their environmental management.
8. A Habitats Regulation Assessment, and evidence of legal advice sought by the council regarding how the River Wensum SAC status has changed since 2005.
9. Evidence of how the findings of the contractors' report into high level of barbastelle bat presence and activity on or close to the proposed route of the road have been considered.
10. Detailed evidence of the impact of the construction period on biodiversity.
11. An Equalities Impact Assessment for the scheme.
12. Detailed evidence of the financial risks of proceeding with the scheme in the face of likely legal challenges and delays.

- 5.16 In moving the amendment Cllr Osborn said that it drew attention to just some of the information that the Council should examine before it reached a decision on this matter. Evidence was required to show how building the Western Link Road would reduce carbon emissions and impact on traffic flows. Evidence was also needed to test the contradictory assumptions about how biodiversity mitigation would work. These assumptions were not backed up in the report with links to hard evidence. Before reaching a decision of this magnitude Councillors should wait to see the written answers to the many detailed and important questions that were asked of the Leader at this morning's meeting of Cabinet and look to examine the detailed workings behind the evidence. Comparisons should also be made with scientific evidence that could be obtained from the UEA that showed Norfolk's above average carbon emissions were due to the dominance of car transport as more new roads were built, for example, in broadland where there had been a large spike in carbon emissions following the opening of the Broadland Northway. The Council could open itself to serious financial and legal challenges which significantly raised the cost of the project and important questions about the future status of the River Wensum.
- 5.17 As proposer of the original motion, Cllr Proctor said that he did not accept the amendment.
- 5.18 Cllr Ben Price in seconding the amendment, said that today's Cabinet decisions had lacked an evidence-based approach and had pushed back responsibility onto the contractor whose sole interest would be to deliver the project. This

undermined an earlier commitment to this Council made in April 2019 that because of the serious impacts of climate change globally and the need for urgent action in Norfolk the Council's environment policy from November 2019 would adopt an evidence-based approach to climate change. The legal and financial implications of the project needed more careful assessment. The Western Link Road was not supported by Norwich City Council.

- 5.19 Following debate and upon it being put to a recorded vote (Appendix B), with 23 votes in favour, 47 votes against and 1 abstention, the amendment was **LOST**.
- 5.20 The substantive motion was then debated and, following a summing up by the Leader of the Council, the matter was put to a recorded vote (Appendix C). **With 50 votes in favour, 20 votes against and 1 abstention, the motion was CARRIED and Council RESOLVED to:**
- 1. To endorse the decision taken by Cabinet to refer its decision made on 7 June 2021 to Full Council as required by the Council's Financial Regulations set out in its Constitution at App 15 para 3.6.1.**
  - 2 To agree to include £186.836m in the forward capital programme, funded from £167.605m of DfT Grant and £19.231m local contribution, underwritten by the County Council which would be funded through additional prudential borrowing.**
- 5.21 The Chair then ended by thanking everyone who had attended the meeting.

The meeting ended at 4.50 pm.

## Chairman



If you need this document in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact Customer Services on 0344 800 8020 or 18001 0344 800 8020 (textphone) and we will do our best to help.

# Norfolk County Council

Date: 7 June 2021

## ITEM NUMBER 5: RECORDED VOTE A (Amendment by Cllr Morphey seconded by Cllr Watkins)

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
<b>ADAMS</b> Timothy	x			<b>LONG</b> Brian		x	
<b>ADAMS</b> Tony		x		<b>MACKIE</b> Ian		x	
<b>ANNISON</b> Carl		x		<b>MASON BILLIG</b> Kay		x	
<b>AQUARONE</b> Steffan	x			<b>MAXFIELD</b> Ed	x		
<b>ASKEW</b> Stephen		x		<b>MORIARTY</b> Jim	x		
<b>BAMBRIDGE</b> Lesley		x		<b>MORPHEW</b> Steve	x		
<b>BENSLY</b> James		x		<b>OLIVER</b> Judy		x	
<b>BILLS</b> David		x		<b>OSBORN</b> Jamie	x		
<b>BIRMINGHAM</b> Alison	x			<b>PECK</b> Greg		x	
<b>BLUNDELL</b> Sharon	x			<b>PENFOLD</b> Saul	x		
<b>BORRETT</b> Bill		x		<b>PLANT</b> Graham		x	
<b>BOWES</b> Claire		x		<b>PRICE</b> Ben	x		
<b>CARPENTER</b> Graham		x		<b>PRICE</b> Richard		x	
<b>CARPENTER</b> Penny			x	<b>PROCTOR</b> Andrew		x	
<b>CLANCY</b> Stuart		x		<b>RICHMOND</b> Will		x	
<b>COLMAN</b> Ed		x		<b>Reilly</b> Matthew	x		
<b>CORLETT</b> Emma	x			<b>RILEY</b> Steve	x		
<b>DALBY</b> Michael		x		<b>ROPER</b> Dan	x		
<b>DAUBNEY</b> Nick		x		<b>RUMSBY</b> Chrissie	x		
<b>DAWSON</b> Christopher		x		<b>SANDS</b> Mike	x		
<b>DEWSBURY</b> Margaret		x		<b>SAVAGE</b> Robert		x	
<b>DUFFIN</b> Barry		x		<b>SMITH</b> Carl		x	
<b>DUIGAN</b> Phillip		x		<b>SMITH-CLARE</b> Mike	x		
<b>EAGLE</b> Fabian		x		<b>STOREY</b> Martin		x	
<b>ELMER</b> Daniel		x		<b>THOMAS</b> Alison		x	
<b>FISHER</b> John		x		<b>THOMPSON</b> Vic		x	
<b>FITZPATRICK</b> Tom		x		<b>VARDY</b> Eric		x	
<b>GURNEY</b> Shelagh		x		<b>VINCENT</b> Karen			x
<b>HEMPSALL</b> Lana		x		<b>WALKER</b> Colleen	x		
<b>HORSBRUGH</b> Michael Chenery of		x		<b>WARD</b> John		x	
<b>JAMIESON</b> Andrew		x		<b>WATKINS</b> Brian	x		
<b>JERMY</b> Terry	x			<b>WEBB</b> Maxine	x		
<b>JONES</b> Brenda	x			<b>WHITE</b> Tony		x	
<b>KEMP</b> Alexandra	x			<b>WHYMARK</b> Fran		x	
<b>KIDDIE</b> Keith			x	<b>WILBY</b> Martin		x	
<b>KIRK</b> Julian		x					

<b>For</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Against</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>Abstentions</b>	<b>3</b>

# Norfolk County Council

Date: 7 June 2021

## ITEM NUMBER 5: RECORDED VOTE B (Amendment by Cllr Osborn seconded by Cllr Ben Price)

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
<b>ADAMS</b> Timothy	x			<b>LONG</b> Brian		x	
<b>ADAMS</b> Tony		x		<b>MACKIE</b> Ian		x	
<b>ANNISON</b> Carl		x		<b>MASON BILLIG</b> Kay		x	
<b>AQUARONE</b> Steffan	x			<b>MAXFIELD</b> Ed	x		
<b>ASKEW</b> Stephen		x		<b>MORIARTY</b> Jim	x		
<b>BAMBRIDGE</b> Lesley		x		<b>MORPHEW</b> Steve	x		
<b>BENSLY</b> James		x		<b>OLIVER</b> Judy		x	
<b>BILLS</b> David		x		<b>OSBORN</b> Jamie	x		
<b>BIRMINGHAM</b> Alison	x			<b>PECK</b> Greg		x	
<b>BLUNDELL</b> Sharon	x			<b>PENFOLD</b> Saul	x		
<b>BORRETT</b> Bill		x		<b>PLANT</b> Graham		x	
<b>BOWES</b> Claire		x		<b>PRICE</b> Ben	x		
<b>CARPENTER</b> Graham		x		<b>PRICE</b> Richard		x	
<b>CARPENTER</b> Penny			x	<b>PROCTOR</b> Andrew		x	
<b>CLANCY</b> Stuart		x		<b>RICHMOND</b> Will		x	
<b>COLMAN</b> Ed		x		<b>Reilly</b> Matthew	x		
<b>CORLETT</b> Emma	x			<b>RILEY</b> Steve	x		
<b>DALBY</b> Michael		x		<b>ROPER</b> Dan	x		
<b>DAUBNEY</b> Nick		x		<b>RUMSBY</b> Chrissie	x		
<b>DAWSON</b> Christopher		x		<b>SANDS</b> Mike	x		
<b>DEWSBURY</b> Margaret		x		<b>SAVAGE</b> Robert		x	
<b>DUFFIN</b> Barry		x		<b>SMITH</b> Carl		x	
<b>DUIGAN</b> Phillip		x		<b>SMITH-CLARE</b> Mike	x		
<b>EAGLE</b> Fabian		x		<b>STOREY</b> Martin		x	
<b>ELMER</b> Daniel		x		<b>THOMAS</b> Alison		x	
<b>FISHER</b> John		x		<b>THOMPSON</b> Vic		x	
<b>FITZPATRICK</b> Tom		x		<b>VARDY</b> Eric		x	
<b>GURNEY</b> Shelagh		x		<b>VINCENT</b> Karen		x	
<b>HEMPSALL</b> Lana		x		<b>WALKER</b> Colleen	x		
<b>HORSBRUGH</b> Michael Chenery of		x		<b>WARD</b> John		x	
<b>JAMIESON</b> Andrew		x		<b>WATKINS</b> Brian	x		
<b>JERMY</b> Terry	x			<b>WEBB</b> Maxine	x		
<b>JONES</b> Brenda	x			<b>WHITE</b> Tony		x	
<b>KEMP</b> Alexandra	x			<b>WHYMARK</b> Fran		x	
<b>KIDDIE</b> Keith		x		<b>WILBY</b> Martin		x	
<b>KIRK</b> Julian		x					

<b>For</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Against</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Abstentions</b>	<b>1</b>



# Norfolk County Council

Date: 7 June 2021

## ITEM NUMBER 5: RECORDED VOTE C (the substantive motion)

	For	Against	Abstain		For	Against	Abstain
<b>ADAMS</b> Timothy		x		<b>LONG</b> Brian	x		
<b>ADAMS</b> Tony	x	x		<b>MACKIE</b> Ian	x		
<b>ANNISON</b> Carl	x	x		<b>MASON BILLIG</b> Kay	x		
<b>AQUARONE</b> Steffan		x		<b>MAXFIELD</b> Ed		x	
<b>ASKEW</b> Stephen	x			<b>MORIARTY</b> Jim		x	
<b>BAMBRIDGE</b> Lesley	x			<b>MORPHEW</b> Steve		x	
<b>BENSLY</b> James	x			<b>OLIVER</b> Judy	x		
<b>BILLS</b> David	x			<b>OSBORN</b> Jamie		x	
<b>BIRMINGHAM</b> Alison		x		<b>PECK</b> Greg	x		
<b>BLUNDELL</b> Sharon	x			<b>PENFOLD</b> Saul		x	
<b>BORRETT</b> Bill	x			<b>PLANT</b> Graham	x		
<b>BOWES</b> Claire	x			<b>PRICE</b> Ben		x	
<b>CARPENTER</b> Graham	x			<b>PRICE</b> Richard	x		
<b>CARPENTER</b> Penny			x	<b>PROCTOR</b> Andrew	x		
<b>CLANCY</b> Stuart	x			<b>RICHMOND</b> Will	x		
<b>COLMAN</b> Ed	x			<b>Reilly</b> Matthew		x	
<b>CORLETT</b> Emma		x		<b>RILEY</b> Steve	x		
<b>DALBY</b> Michael	x			<b>ROPER</b> Dan	x		
<b>DAUBNEY</b> Nick	x			<b>RUMSBY</b> Chrissie		x	
<b>DAWSON</b> Christopher	x			<b>SANDS</b> Mike		x	
<b>DEWSBURY</b> Margaret	x			<b>SAVAGE</b> Robert	x		
<b>DUFFIN</b> Barry	x			<b>SMITH</b> Carl	x		
<b>DUIGAN</b> Phillip	x			<b>SMITH-CLARE</b> Mike		x	
<b>EAGLE</b> Fabian	x			<b>STOREY</b> Martin	x		
<b>ELMER</b> Daniel	x			<b>THOMAS</b> Alison	x		
<b>FISHER</b> John	x			<b>THOMPSON</b> Vic	x		
<b>FITZPATRICK</b> Tom	x			<b>VARDY</b> Eric	x		
<b>GURNEY</b> Shelagh	x			<b>VINCENT</b> Karen	x		
<b>HEMPSALL</b> Lana	x			<b>WALKER</b> Colleen		x	
<b>HORSBRUGH</b> Michael Chenery of	x			<b>WARD</b> John	x		
<b>JAMIESON</b> Andrew	x			<b>WATKINS</b> Brian		x	
<b>JERMY</b> Terry		x		<b>WEBB</b> Maxine		x	
<b>JONES</b> Brenda		x		<b>WHITE</b> Tony	x		
<b>KEMP</b> Alexandra		x		<b>WHYMARK</b> Fran	x		
<b>KIDDIE</b> Keith	x			<b>WILBY</b> Martin	x		
<b>KIRK</b> Julian	x						

<b>For</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Against</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Abstentions</b>	<b>1</b>