

LARGER COUNCILS COMMITTEE| AGENDA

Date and time: 18 May 2023 10.00 – 12.00

Location: Zoom

Any member wishing to submit an apology for this meeting please contact NALC at NALCcommittees@nalc.gov.uk.

(Please note there will be a short ten-minute comfort break at 11.00)

1. Apologies (10.00)

2. Minutes of previous meeting – 28 February 2023 (10.00 – 10.05)

2.1 To approve minutes of the meeting of Larger Councils Committee held on 28 February 2023 and to note any matters arising not covered elsewhere on the agenda – appendix 2.1

3. Local council elections 2023 - updates (10.05 – 10.15)

3.1 To receive general updates from committee members on outcomes and experiences for their larger councils from the local council elections on 4 May 2023 – particularly regarding levels of independent candidates, cross-party coalitions, numbers of contested elections and related issues.

3.2 To receive an update on handling of committee vacancy created by Cllr Matthew Hulbert who stood down as a local councillor and as a committee member on 4 May 2023.

4. Planning for in person committee meeting on 25 July 2023 (10.15 – 10.25)

4.1 To plan the structure of the agenda for the in-person committee meeting on 25 July 2023 at the CCLA London offices (this will not be streamed on Zoom, is likely to be between 11.00 and 15.00 and will need optimal attendance from LCC members, please).

5. Member services update (10.25 – 10.45)

5.1 To receive a verbal update from the head of member services on the latest outcomes from the civility and respect project.

5.2 To discuss service needs of larger councils on procurement matters with Steve Parkinson, of the Parkinson Partnership LLP.

6. Government Anti-Social Behaviour Action Plan (10.45 – 11.00)

6.1 To discuss and receive feedback from committee members on the government's Anti-Social Behaviour Action Plan and its implications for larger councils (in particular regarding fixed penalty notices and fines).

Coffee and rest break – 11:00 – 11:10

7. Policy consultations update (11:10 – 11:15)

7.1 To gather verbal feedback from the committee with regard to the government's live consultation on the [Infrastructure Levy](#) – appendix 7.1.

8. Dependants' Carers' Allowance (11:15 – 11:25)

8.1 Following the committee stage amendment during the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill in the Lords in April 2023, we will discuss and secure feedback from committee members on estimated overall councillor numbers of their larger councils and likely costs of providing the dependants' carers' allowance to such councillors, to strengthen the lobbying case for this campaign.

9. Neighbourhood governance review (11.25 – 11.30)

9.1 To sketch out what the committee wants to see coming out of the government's delayed neighbourhood governance review cited in the Levelling Up the United Kingdom White Paper (February, 2022).

10. Sharing good practice (11.30 – 11:40)

10.1 Update on NALC good practice visit to Newport Pagnell Town Council on 27/28 June 2023 – appendix 10.1.

10.2 Star Council Awards 2023 – request to promote awards to all larger councils in your areas and make at least one nomination by 28 July 2023.

11. Martyn's Law (formerly known as the Protect Duty) – (11.40 – 11.50)

11.1 To discuss the potential implications of [Martyn's Law](#) (formerly known as the Protect Duty) for larger councils responsible for organising events and public gatherings in open spaces, and the associated risk assessment needs involved in the prevention of terrorist attacks.

12. NALC National Networks (11.50 – Noon)

12.1 To receive an update on the NALC National Networks for Super Councils, Coastal Communities and Climate Emergency – appendices 12.1 and 12.2

13. Date and time of next committee meeting (12.00)

Tuesday 25 July 2023 at 11.00, CCLA offices, 1 Angel Ln, London, EC4R 3AB (in person only, no Zoom stream).

© NALC 2023

Appendix 2.1

LARGER COUNCILS COMMITTEE | DRAFT MINUTES

Meeting of the Larger Councils Committee on 28 February 2023 at 10.00 taking place by Zoom.

Present (online):

Councillors Pat Ansell, Phil Barnett, Mike Drew (NALC vice-chair, member services), Paul Harvey (committee chair), Richard Parry and Peter Quinn; and directly elected clerks, Jane Biscombe (for part), Carl Hearn and Shar Roselman.

Staff present: Chris Borg (policy manager) and Justin Griggs (head of policy and communications).

1. Apologies

Resolved: That apologies be noted from Mark Smith and Cllr Peter Astell (committee vice chair).

2. Minutes of previous meeting – 18 October 2022

Resolved: That the minutes from the 18 October 2022 committee session be noted.

3. Mandatory training

The policy manager provided a brief verbal update that the Policy Committee had agreed to review its training policy for councillors which currently stated that training should be strongly encouraged and not made mandatory. The policy manager had attended all committee and network sessions this cycle to draw down the views of each forum as to whether training should be made mandatory for all councillors or not. There was a brief debate and then a vote took place during which it was agreed that training should not be made mandatory for all councillors. Further sub-questions were asked and answers logged which would be fed back to the Policy Committee in due course.

Resolved: That training should be strongly encouraged for all councillors, that county associations should be encouraged to roll out training for all newly elected councillors, that training checklists should be factored into the Annual Governance and Accountability Return (AGAR) and to the Local Council Award Scheme as appropriate, but that training be mandatory for all councillors on standards of behaviour, good governance and best practice.

4. National Agreement on Salaries and Conditions of Service of Local Council Clerks in England and Wales

There was a discussion on the National Agreement on Salaries and Conditions of Service of Local Council Clerks in England and Wales during which the point was made that the minimum pay scale for the highest and lowest scale of clerks should be increased as the current agreement was not fit for purpose. An example was provided of a clerk's job for a very large council with a population of over 50,000 people where the salary was completely inadequate.

Securing an agreement for all 10,000 local councils to use was considered very difficult. Clerks are paid too little on smaller councils. Job evaluations need to be effective and fair.

Resolved: That the National Agreement on Salaries and Conditions of Service of Local Council Clerks in England and Wales be referred to the next meetings of the Smaller Councils Committee and Management Board for discussion.

5. Civility and respect project

Linda Larter, the chief executive of Sevenoaks Town Council provided a very thorough presentation on the civility and respect project. The project factored in a sliding scale of 5 types of local council based on need. Training, support and intervention were factored in. The scale runs from stable to critical impact. The project aims to keep councils at a stable level. There are also 6 workstreams. Not all clerks are trained. Interventions where needed should be at an early stage. Monitoring Officers have also said they need resilience training too. Lack of trust is a big issue.

Some councils involve the clerk being central to activity far more than others. 1021 councils so far have signed the civility pledge. Local councillors are encouraged to continue to engage with training with good governance arrangements in place for all local councils being the aim of the project.

Resolved: To thank Linda Larter for her excellent presentation, to welcome the fact that 1021 local councils have signed the civility pledge and for all committee members to encourage their own larger councils to engage with the project. There was then a ten-minute comfort break between 11:05 a.m. and 11:15 a.m.

6. Leader and Cabinet model of governance

The policy manager introduced an item on the leader model of governance following a query from Hebden Royd Town Council in Yorkshire. The council had asked for updates on what the larger councils of committee members had for

governance models on their councils. The committee chair started a round robin update of committee members whose feedback was as below:

- Yate Town Council – has a leader, but also a civic Mayor.
- Chippenham Town Council is thought to have excellent and very clear standing orders regarding its governance arrangements.
- Weymouth Town Council is a new larger council so does not have the longevity issue of the longest serving councillor becoming mayor. The council has a leader and the council is not an advocate of the cabinet structure.
- Newbury Town Council has a party grouping system where the council leader is also the leader of the largest party. A committee structure is also run there, where the Mayor runs full council meetings.
- Woughton Community Council have a Mayoral Ambassador and a chair of council, where the longest serving member becomes chair.

The discussion continued and it was confirmed that NALC's position was to lobby for the position of leader on local councils which wanted a leader, to not be unlawful. It was agreed there was a need for legal clarity.

Resolved: That the written report be noted and that the feedback on governance models be relayed to Hebden Royd Town Council.

7. Sharing good practice

7.1 Update on NALC good practice visit to Newport Pagnell Town Council on 27/28 June 2023

The policy manager provided a brief update on progress with organisation of the [good practice visit to Newport Pagnell Town Council on 27-28 June 2023](#). There were currently low numbers of bookings to the event which had taken much work for officers at NALC and Newport Pagnell Town Council to organise since May 2022. This was considered to be part of a wider trend of falling delegate numbers to NALC's physical events due to train strikes, COVID-19 and the sector preference for online events indicated by NALC survey results over the last 3 years. Committee members were encouraged to book onto the event and to promote the event to all local councils in their areas. Depending on outcomes of NALC engagement with the host hotel, the event would either have to be cancelled or delivered as a one-off with fewer delegate numbers. The event model was not considered to be sustainable beyond 2023.

Resolved: That committee members be encouraged to book on to the good practice visit 2023 to Newport Pagnell Town Council and to promote it to all local

councils in their areas and that the event either be cancelled outright or delivered as a one-off with fewer delegates for 2023 only.

7.2 Weymouth Town Council hosted study visit for Northamptonshire councils

The policy manager confirmed (in the absence of the clerk to Weymouth Town Council who had had to leave the meeting due to a prior engagement) that Weymouth Town Council had recently hosted a good practice visit of three larger councils from Northamptonshire which had gone very well.

Resolved: That the verbal update be noted.

8. Provisional local government finance settlement 2023-24

8.1 The policy manager confirmed that NALC had recently responded to the government's technical consultation on the provisional local government finance settlement 2023-24. NALC had welcomed the fact that the government would be again exempting all local councils from referenda on excessive council tax increases, but argued for a permanent or multi-year exemption in future.

Resolved: That the report be noted.

9. NALC National Networks

9.1 The policy manager provided a short verbal update on the recent meetings of the Climate Emergency Network and the Super Councils Network sessions he had chaired, summarising outcomes. The two most readily available notes from sessions had been included in the committee papers.

Resolved: That the verbal update be noted.

10. LGA associate membership

10.1 The policy manager provided a short report on the latest state of play with LGA associate membership for the 2022-23 and 2023-24 financial years. Five Super Councils had taken this membership out in 2022-23. Seven Super Councils were taking it out in 2023-24.

Resolved: That the report be noted.

11. Date and time of next meeting

10:00 a.m. – Noon, 18 May 2023 by Zoom.

Appendix 7.1

29 MARCH 2023

PC1-23 | INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY

Summary

The Infrastructure Levy is a reform to the existing system of developer contributions – Section 106 planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy – in England. The Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) have issued a consultation to inform the design of the Levy and of regulations that will set out its operation in detail.

The main consultation document can be downloaded [here](#). The consultation closes at DLUHC on 9 June 2023.

Context

The consultation seeks insight on:

- technical aspects of the design of the Infrastructure Levy.
- the preparation and content of regulations.

NALC will be responding to this consultation as many local councils will have an interest in feeding in their own views on the existing system of developer contributions and how they relate to proposals for the new Infrastructure Levy.

NALC's current policy positions

NALC will be arguing very strongly that it is right that local councils will receive the 25% neighbourhood share of the Infrastructure Levy. This will ensure communities benefit from development and local councils can invest in local infrastructure and other priorities. It will be important for local councils to have full flexibility in how the levy is used. However, the reported flat share of 25% does not provide an uplift or added incentive for communities that have a made neighbourhood plan in place, which is the presently the case where the Community Infrastructure Levy is charged.

Consultation Questions

The main consultation questions NALC will be responding to in this consultation are as below and NALC seeks the views of county associations and member councils in response to these questions to help inform its own submission to DLUHC:

Chapter 1: Fundamental design choices

Question 1: Do you agree that the existing CIL definition of ‘development’ should be maintained under the Infrastructure Levy, with the following excluded from the definition:

- developments of less than 100 square metres (unless this consists of one or more dwellings and does not meet the self-build criteria) - Yes/No/Unsure
- Buildings which people do not normally go into - Yes/No/Unsure
- Buildings into which peoples go only intermittently for the purpose of inspecting or maintaining fixed plant or machinery - Yes/No/Unsure
- Structures which are not buildings, such as pylons and wind turbines. Yes/No/Unsure

Question 2: Do you agree that developers should continue to provide certain kinds of infrastructure, including infrastructure that is incorporated into the design of the site, outside of the Infrastructure Levy? [Yes/No/Unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 3: What should be the approach for setting the distinction between integral and Levy-funded infrastructure? [see para 1.28 for options a), b), or c) or a combination of these]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer, using case study examples if possible.

Question 4: Do you agree that local authorities should have the flexibility to use some of their levy funding for non-infrastructure items such as service provision? [Yes/No/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 5: Should local authorities be expected to prioritise infrastructure and affordable housing needs before using the Levy to pay for non-infrastructure items such as local services? [Yes/No/Unsure]. Should expectations be set through regulations or policy? Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 6: Are there other non-infrastructure items not mentioned in this document that this element of the Levy funds could be spent on? [Yes/No/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 7: Do you have a favoured approach for setting the ‘infrastructure in-kind’ threshold? [high threshold/medium threshold/low threshold/local authority discretion/none of the above]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer, using case study examples if possible.

Question 8: Is there anything else you feel the government should consider in defining the use of s106 within the three routeways, including the role of delivery agreements to secure matters that cannot be secured via a planning condition? Please provide a free text response to explain your answer.

Chapter 2: Levy rates and minimum thresholds

Question 9: Do you agree that the Levy should capture value uplift associated with permitted development rights that create new dwellings? [Yes/No/Unsure]. Are there some types of permitted development where no Levy should be charged? [Yes/No/Unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 10: Do you have views on the proposal to bring schemes brought forward through permitted development rights within scope of the Levy? Do you have views on an appropriate value threshold for qualifying permitted development? Do you have views on an appropriate Levy rate 'ceiling' for such sites, and how that might be decided?

Question 11: Is there is a case for additional offsets from the Levy, beyond those identified in the paragraphs above to facilitate marginal brownfield development coming forward? [Yes/No/Unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary, using case studies if possible.

Question 12: The government wants the Infrastructure Levy to collect more than the existing system, whilst minimising the impact on viability. How strongly do you agree that the following components of Levy design will help achieve these aims?

- Charging the Levy on final sale GDV of a scheme [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure]
- The use of different Levy rates and minimum thresholds on different development uses and typologies [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure]
- Ability for local authorities to set 'stepped' Levy rates [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure]
- Separate Levy rates for thresholds for existing floorspace that is subject to change of use, and floorspace that is demolished and replaced [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure]

Question 13: Please provide a free text response to explain your answers above where necessary.

Chapter 3: Charging and paying the Levy

Question 14: Do you agree that the process outlined in Table 3 is an effective way of calculating and paying the levy? [Yes/No/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 15: Is there an alternative payment mechanism that would be more suitable for the Infrastructure Levy? [Yes/No/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 18: To what extent do you agree that a local authority should be able to require that payment of the Levy (or a proportion of the Levy liability) is made prior to site completion? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure]. Please explain your answer.

Question 19: Are there circumstances when a local authority should be able to require an early payment of the Levy or a proportion of the Levy? Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Chapter 4: Delivering infrastructure

Question 21: To what extent do you agree that the borrowing against Infrastructure Levy proceeds will be sufficient to ensure the timely delivery of infrastructure? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 22: To what extent do you agree that the government should look to go further, and enable specified upfront payments for items of infrastructure to be a condition for the granting of planning permission? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 23: Are there other mechanisms for ensuring infrastructure is delivered in a timely fashion that the government should consider for the new Infrastructure Levy? [Yes/No/Unsure] Please provide free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 24: To what extent do you agree that the strategic spending plan included in the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy will provide transparency and certainty on how the Levy will be spent? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 25: In the context of a streamlined document, what information do you

consider is required for a local authority to identify infrastructure needs?

Question 26: Do you agree that views of the local community should be integrated into the drafting of an Infrastructure Delivery Strategy?
[Yes/No/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 27: Do you agree that a spending plan in the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy should include:

- Identification of general integral infrastructure requirements
- Identification of infrastructure/types of infrastructure that are to be funded by the Levy - Prioritisation of infrastructure and how the Levy will be spent
- Approach to affordable housing including right to require proportion and tenure mix
- Approach to any discretionary elements for the neighbourhood share
- Proportion for administration
- The anticipated borrowing that will be required to deliver infrastructure
- Other - please explain your answer
- All of the above

Question 28: How can we make sure that infrastructure providers such as county councils can effectively influence the identification of Levy priorities?

- Guidance to local authorities on which infrastructure providers need to be consulted, how to engage and when
- Support to county councils on working collaboratively with the local authority as to what can be funded through the Levy
- Use of other evidence documents when preparing the Infrastructure Delivery Strategy, such as Local Transport Plans and Local Education Strategies
- Guidance to local authorities on prioritisation of funding
- Implementation of statutory timescales for infrastructure providers to respond to local authority requests
- Other - please explain your answer

Question 29: To what extent do you agree that it is possible to identify infrastructure requirements at the local plan stage? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Chapter 5: Delivering affordable housing

Question 30: To what extent do you agree that the 'right to require' will reduce the risk that affordable housing contributions are negotiated down on viability grounds? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 31: To what extent do you agree that local authorities should charge a highly discounted/zero-rated Infrastructure Levy rate on high percentage/100% affordable housing schemes? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary

Question 32: How much infrastructure is normally delivered alongside registered provider-led schemes in the existing system? Please provide examples.

Question 33: As per paragraph 5.13, do you think that an upper limit of where the 'right to require' could be set should be introduced by the government? [Yes/No/unsure] Alternatively, do you think where the 'right to require' is set should be left to the discretion of the local authority? [Yes/No/unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Chapter 6: Other areas

Question 34: Are you content that the Neighbourhood Share should be retained under the Infrastructure Levy? [Yes/No/Unsure?]

Question 35: In calculating the value of the Neighbourhood Share, do you think this should A) reflect the amount secured under CIL in parished areas (noting this will be a smaller proportion of total revenues), B) be higher than this equivalent amount C) be lower than this equivalent amount D) Other (please specify) or E) unsure. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary

Question 36: The government is interested in views on arrangements for spending the neighbourhood share in unparished areas. What other bodies do you think could be in receipt of a Neighbourhood Share in such areas?

Question 37: Should the administrative portion for the new Levy A) reflect the 5% level which exists under CIL B) be higher than this equivalent amount, C) be lower than this equivalent amount, D) Other, (please specify), or E) unsure. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 38: Applicants can apply for mandatory or discretionary relief for social housing under CIL. Question 31 seeks views on exempting affordable housing from the Levy. This question seeks views on retaining other countrywide exemptions. How strongly do you agree the following should be retained:

- residential annexes and extensions; [Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly

Disagree]

- self-build housing; [Strongly Agree/Agree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree]

If you strongly agree/agree, should there be any further criteria that are applied to these exemptions, for example in relation to the size of the development?

Question 39: Do you consider there are other circumstances where relief from the Levy or reduced Levy rates should apply, such as for the provision of sustainable technologies? [Yes/No/Unsure]. Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 40: To what extent do you agree with our proposed approach to small sites? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Question 41: What risks will this approach pose, if any, to SME housebuilders, or to the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas? Please provide a free text response using case study examples where appropriate.

Question 42: Are there any other forms of infrastructure that should be exempted from the Levy through regulations?

Question 43: Do you agree that these enforcement mechanisms will be sufficient to secure Levy payments? [Strongly Agree/Agree/Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary.

Chapter 7: Introducing the Levy

Question 44: Do you agree that the proposed 'test and learn' approach to transitioning to the new Infrastructure Levy will help deliver an effective system? [Strongly Agree/Agree/ Neutral/Disagree/Strongly Disagree/Unsure] Please provide a free text response to explain your answer where necessary

Your evidence

Please email your responses to this consultation to chris.borg@nalc.gov.uk by 17.00 on 19 May 2023. County associations are asked to forward this briefing onto all member councils in their area.

© NALC 2023

Appendix 10.1

NALC study visit – Newport Pagnell Town Council

27-28 June 2023

Devolved leisure services theme

1. Summary

This is a short update report on organisation of the NALC Good Practice Visit 2023 to Newport Pagnell Town Council on 27-28 June 2023 (devolved leisure services theme).

2. Context

In May 2022 the committee requested that NALC seek to organise a good practice visit (the first since 2019) to Newport Pagnell in 2023 on a theme of devolved leisure services. Thanks to the constant help of the clerk of Newport Pagnell Town Council (a member of this committee) and the receptionist / administrator at NALC this visit has become viable despite several challenges over the last 11 months.

At the time of writing there are 3 members of NALC staff attending the visit, 11 booked delegates and two representatives from the Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes Association of Local Councils. The event has almost sold out but will likely sell out by the end of May 2023. Various representatives from Newport Pagnell Town Council will be attending the visit over the two days including the town clerk and mayor.

Delegate bookings for this event as pre-2019 have almost all come from Super and larger councils, something we need to factor in if these visits are organised from 2024. The below two points need to be borne in mind by the committee when these visits are organised:

- they take a huge amount of officer time (host council and NALC), to organise.
- as pre-2019, these visits are hard to sell as their themes are very niche within the sector.

If these visits continue from the 2024-25 financial year onwards they would be the only in person (paying delegate) events being planned for the next couple of years by NALC, due to the huge transition to online events as a legacy of the pandemic.

3. Resolution

That the committee note the report and agree a recommendation as to whether good practice visits continue from the 2024-25 financial year onwards.

Contact officer: Chris Borg, policy manager e. chris.borg@nalc.gov.uk T. 07714 771049

Appendix 12.1

Note from Climate Emergency National Network Session – 14 February 2023

To: Climate Emergency Network

To: 109

Dear Colleagues.

I hope you are well. Please the below note from the NALC National Network: Climate Emergency session yesterday.

Introduction:

- Chris Borg welcomed members.

Data sharing:

- Farhana Miah of NALC gave an update on data sharing. As the network gets larger, NALC needs consent to share personal details with other members.
- Please contact Farhana to say whether you're happy to have your data shared amongst the network (Farhana.Miah@nalc.gov.uk).

Chris introduced guest speaker Paul Behrens.

Dr Paul Behrens (University of Leiden) talk (slides will be circulated when they are received by NALC):

- As a society we overestimate our resilience and underestimate the rate of change (gave the ex. of pine forests in Canada and the spread of wildfires further North).
- Tipping elements are at risk, 1 change creates a domino effect that worsens another change.
- Tap into what makes people care about climate change: not everyone will be dead for example when the worse hits us can be a good way to force people to care.
- Each year on average will be worse than the last one.
- Top tip for raising awareness: centre your comms and policy pushes around summer as that's when people feel the drastic effect of change most acutely (ex. 40C summer days in London last year).
- Myth that people are overwhelmed with climate news – if we look at the breakdown of news stories, people are not hearing about it.
- Renewables are cheaper, making electrification easier through wind and solar.
- Indeed, we could save trillions of pounds by pushing to achieve net zero earlier.

- Important to be honest – climate change is not a positive thing and it is fine to alarm people to push them to change.

Q&A for Dr Paul Behrens:

- Members brought up the role of lab grown food (making vegan/vegetarian diets more accessible), the importance of not underestimating the lobbying power of fossil fuel companies (Paul pointed out that carbon power is locked in through the social infrastructure).

Mandatory training update:

- Policy Committee is trying to gain an oversight of networks' views on NALC adopting the position of mandatory training being necessary for local (parish and town) councils.
- Should training be mandatory for councillors? Network said yes.
- If so, why? All training should be encouraged. Councillors have statutory duties and should know what they are and how to deliver on them.
- How can this be achieved? Members brought up the issue of enforceability and resistance to change.

Chris gave an update on NALC's NPPF draft response (summary attached).

Open Forum:

- Andrew Maliphant gave an update on his work with the net zero forum on which he represents NALC. If anybody wants something to go to that forum please share it with Andrew (a.maliphant@btinternet.com). Forum has decided to settle on a place-based approach as best. Next forum meeting is on 24th of February.
- Members raised:
 - o Community energy schemes and the importance of learning from each other.
 - o Importance to press government to defer more powers down to the parish level rather than just principal authorities.
 - o The challenge for parish councils is how to develop relationships with activist groups and the community power sector.
 - o The potential for someone to work alongside Andrew on the forum?

Post-meeting extra open forum session:

- Importance of having these long open forum sessions to better network. Need to learn from other places so these less formal meetings are very important for establishing relationships.

- Discussion of NPPF and how funds go to district authority. Need for application for funds to be straightforward and easy so that smaller as well as larger councils can access.

Andrew's summary of community climate change projects is attached – please send comments direct to Andrew at a.maliphan@btinternet.com.

Next meeting is in May.

Contact officer: Chris Borg, policy manager e. chris.borg@nalc.gov.uk T. 07714 771049

Appendix 12.2

Note from Super Councils Network Session – 23 February 2023

To: Super Councils

To: 109

Dear Colleagues.

I hope you are well.

Please see the below note and attachment from the Super Councils Network session on 23 February 2023:

Data sharing:

- Farhana Miah of NALC gave an update on data sharing. As the network gets larger, NALC needs consent to share personal details with other members.
- Please contact Farhana to say whether you're happy to have your data shared amongst the network – Farhana.Miah@nalc.gov.uk.

Item 1: Councillor training

- Policy Committee is trying to gain an oversight of networks' views on NALC adopting the position of mandatory training being necessary for parish/town councils.
- Should training be mandatory for councillors? Network overall agreed that yes, it should.
- Why should training be mandatory?
 - o Candidates should undergo training before being able to stand in elections. Would have to amend electoral timetable to reflect this.
 - o One member highlighted that members of their council had to undergo training to sit on a board or a committee. Was a struggle at first but when it becomes an expectation, things go much more smoothly.
 - o Quality of training is key.
 - o Other sectors have to undergo training, why not councillors?
 - o Possibility to rely on bulk online training which might reduce cost for some councils as well.
 - o What outcomes does NALC hope to achieve? Training doesn't always lead to change in behaviour.
- How can mandatory training be achieved?
 - o Could the fact that councillors who don't undertake training be barred from being councillors be one sanction?
 - o Need more weight behind a breach of code of conduct. Officers need more protection.

- Possibility to mirror a driving test whereby councillors have to score a certain mark to pass.
- Highlighted that mandatory training unlikely to be imposed by government on a local level as that could imply that they might one day also be subjected to the training too.

Item 2: Markets

- Update from Chris on an email and survey received from the National Association of British Markets (summary attached).
- Members highlighted that as independent shop owners shut down their permanent stores, they moved towards having a stall in the market for example (contradicting the data collected from the survey so far)
- Finding it hard to bring new traders in.

Item 3: Study tour to Newport Pagnell

- Chris provided an update on the study tour event organised by NALC. Please [book on soon](#) if you wish to attend.

General discussion:

- Brief update on the state of Levelling Up amendments in the House of Lords particularly on remote meetings.

Contact officer: Chris Borg, policy manager e. chris.borg@nalc.gov.uk T. 07714 771049