

## **NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL**

### **WEST AREA COMMITTEE**

#### **MINUTES**

of meeting held on **15 JULY 2009** at the

Council House from 5.34 pm to 7.35 pm

|                      |              |
|----------------------|--------------|
| Councillor Wood      | (Chair)      |
| Councillor James     | (Vice-Chair) |
| Councillor Chapman   |              |
| Councillor Cresswell |              |
| Councillor Foster    |              |
| Councillor Long      |              |
| Councillor Unczur    |              |
| Councillor Watson    |              |

indicates present at meeting

#### **Also in attendance**

|                  |   |           |
|------------------|---|-----------|
| Mr R Hamilton    | ) | Bidwells  |
| Mr L Broom-Lynne | ) |           |
| Mr V King        | ) | Catch 22  |
| Mr L Walker      | ) |           |
| Mr J Hose        | - | S.M.A.R.T |

#### **City Council Officers**

|                  |   |                              |
|------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Mr A Miller      | ) | Community and Culture        |
| Mr A Mohammed    | ) |                              |
| Mr N Holroyde    | ) |                              |
| Mr A Houldsworth | ) | Environment and Regeneration |
| Mr R Percival    | ) |                              |
| Ms L Raynor      | ) |                              |
| Miss L Wilson    | - | Resources                    |

**Please note: except where otherwise indicated, all items discussed at the meeting were the subject of a report which had been circulated beforehand.**

**12 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Unczur (on other Council business), Councillor Watson, Stuart Edwards, Andrew Hore, Jenny Knight and Alison and Clive Thorpe.

**13 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

At the time of consideration, Councillors Foster and Wood declared personal interests in item 9 (minute 20), Land Registry, Chalfont Drive, Bilborough – Consultation, as they were members of the Development Control Committee, which did not preclude them from speaking.

**14 MINUTES**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the last meeting held on 13 May 2009, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

**15 SPENDING PROFILE 2009-2010**

(Acting Director of Local Communities)

Members commented that, as all of the Incidental Budget for 2008/09 had not been needed, the additional £9,000 proposed to be put into that budget for 2009/10 should be redistributed evenly between ward councillors.

**RESOLVED**

- (1) that it be noted that each member had been allocated an individual ward member budget allocation of £10,000, which would be divided between an Area Allocation Budget and individual Ward Support Budgets;**
- (2) that it be noted that Aspley had received an additional £21,000 and Bilborough £15,000 based on being in the top 5% deprived wards in the indices of deprivation;**
- (3) that the amounts allocated from last year's budget across the three wards, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report, be noted;**
- (4) that the activities totalling £24,500, as detailed in Appendix 2 to the report, to be supported from the uncommitted balances from the 2008/09 budget, be approved;**
- (5) that it be noted that the £26,428 that remained unspent from the 2008/09 budget would be added to the £116,000 balance for 2009/10;**
- (6) that the total amount available for West Area for 2009/10 of £142,428, be distributed across the budgets as detailed in Appendix 3 to the report, with the exception of the £9,000 for the Incidental Budget**

**ACTION**

which would be redistributed evenly between the ward councillors;

- (7) that the following funding requests, as detailed in Appendix 4 to the report, be approved and met from Councillor Cresswell's budget:

| <b><u>Project</u></b>   | <b><u>Amount</u></b> |
|---|----------------------|
| Seagrave Court Patio Area and Garden – money towards materials for the residents to do the work themselves; | £500                 |
| Moorgreen Resource Centre Summer Fun Day on 5 September 2009 and a day trip to Twin Lakes during the summer | £500                 |

- (8) that the decisions regarding funding from the Community Influence and Engagement Budget within the Area Allocation Budget be delegated to the Area Manager, or in their absence, the Acting Director of Local Communities, and that any such decisions be reported to the next available Area Committee.

#### **16 AREA CAPITAL RESOURCES**

(Director of Environment and Regeneration)

The Area Manager informed the Committee that future reports would detail where suggestions had come from and the Committee would be responsible for approving projects.

Members commented that although there was a lot of consultation it needed to be improved to include feedback so that the decision making was transparent.

#### **RESOLVED**

- (1) that the committed works, as detailed in Appendices 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) to the report, be approved;
- (2) that the proposals and associated cost estimates, as detailed in Appendices 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) to the report, for inclusion in the future programme, be approved;
- (3) that the remaining funds in each ward, as detailed in Appendices 1(a), 1(b) and 1(c) to the report, be noted.

#### **17 CATCH 22 YOUTH INCLUSION PROJECT**

(Director of Targeted Services for Children and Young People)

In addition to the report, representatives from Catch 22 presented members with the following information:

- Catch 22 was a national charity that worked with young people who found themselves in difficult situations. Whatever the reason for their

**ACTION**

situation Catch 22 helped them. Work was done with their families and communities wherever and whenever the young person most needed it including in schools, on the streets, in the home, at community centres, shopping centres, in police stations and in custody;

- as young people became more positive, productive and independent the whole community benefited;
- the Nottingham Prevention Programme (NPP) consisted of a number of Youth Inclusion Projects (YIPs) and alternative education deliverers working across areas of the City;
- there was currently a senior YIP based in Melbourne Park in Aspley with a case load of 42 young people aged between 13 and 16, 30 of which were identified through the YIP ID process and the remainder through the common assessment framework multi-agency process. Three project staff were employed to work with the young people and interventions were delivered according to each young person's needs;
- the breakdown of offences for the young people involved in the YIP were as follows:
  - other/unspecified sexual offences (attempted);
  - theft from a motor vehicle (attempted);
  - assault on a police officer (common assault);
  - attempted rape;
  - breach of conditions of bail;
  - burglary in a dwelling (x7);
  - common assault (x3);
  - criminal damage (x4);
  - grievous bodily harm;
  - handling stolen goods (x3);
  - intent to steal;
  - intentional harassment, alarm or distress;
  - other criminal damage under £2,000 (x2);
  - other/unspecified sexual offences (x 4);
  - possession of an offensive weapon;
  - possession of class c drugs;
  - robbery (x2);
  - public order offenses;
  - theft from a shop or stall;
  - undertaking or assisting in the retention, removal, disposal or realisation of stolen goods;
- from October 2008 to March 2009 the Aspley senior YIP identified 43 young people aged 13 to 16 and 100% of the engaged young people were deemed as medium/high risk;

**ACTION**

- the current YIP targets were as follows:

|   | Target (%) | Met (%) |
|---|------------|---------|
| To work with those identified young people who were targeted to become core group members | 75         | 70      |
| To ensure that the core group were receiving appropriate educational provision            | 90         | 57      |
| To ensure that the engaged core group had exit strategies                                 | 90         | 69      |
| To engage parents of the core group in activities   | 20         | 23      |
| To reduce substantive offending outcomes  | 70         | 61      |

Members commented that the figures were honest and the transparency was welcomed but the figures needed to improve so that the targets were reached.

**RESOLVED that a progress report be submitted to the Committee for consideration in 12 months.**

#### **18 USING THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES ACT**

(Corporate Directors of Community and Culture and Environment and Regeneration)

Members made the following comments:

- the recommendations focused on physical issues with the environment and did not seem to address issues such as unemployment;
- there had been no opportunity for members to consult with tenants and residents on the recommendations and consultation was paramount;
- the questionnaire should be sent to the Area Manager for circulation to tenants and residents;
- the full report should also be emailed to members so they had a full understanding of the recommendations and how they had been arrived at.

Members discussed each recommendation and made the following comments:

- the actions on littering from vehicles and fly posting were supported but they would be difficult to enforce;
- 'grotty' houses and the action proposed was supported but it was important for Nottingham City Homes to bring their housing stock up

**ACTION**

to standard;

- the licensing of private landlords would be difficult and it was unclear as to why it was felt necessary;
- the action against repeat offenders was covered more by criminal law rather than civil, but if it could be enforced it would be supported;
- Licensing Panels had recently imposed conditions on two off licences to mark alcohol containers with the shop name, which were going through the appeal process at the Magistrates Court. Members felt that this recommendation should be dependent on the outcome of the appeals;
- the action on noise nuisance was welcomed but there could be issues with practicality;
- the proposed action regarding domestic abuse was complex and contentious and should be dealt with by the Police;
- action against those who left their bins on the street after they had been emptied was welcomed but the recommendation needed to be more detailed and flexible as the storage of 2 or 3 bins needed to be considered and action should only be taken against persistent offenders;
- the recommendation on property management was supported, but again, it was important to ensure that Nottingham City Homes housing stock was up to standard;
- it was felt that public safety zones would be difficult and could create division as it could appear that some areas were more important than others. There would need to be clear criteria as to how they were allocated.

**RESOLVED**

- (1) that the report be noted;**
- (2) that the Area Committee views, as detailed above, be fed into the proposals to Government;**
- (3) that the Head of Environmental Health email the detailed report on the proposals to councillors and the questionnaire to the Area Manager;** **Lorraine Raynor**
- (4) that, once the questionnaire was received, the Area Manager circulate it to the Chairs of Tenants and Residents Associations in the area to involve them in the consultation.** **Asif Mohammed**

**ACTION**

**19 NOTTINGHAM CITY CORE STRATEGY – ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION**

(Director of Planning and Transport)

Members made the following comments:

- the Committee should have been seeking the views of tenants and residents so should have been involved earlier in the consultation process;
- the area was part of the neighbourhood transformation process and the Committee and tenants and residents were clear on what they wanted for the area and this needed to be taken into account;
- additional development should be inward looking to ensure that it integrated with existing housing rather than becoming a separate community.

**RESOLVED that the publication of the Issues and Options Consultation be noted.**

**20 LAND REGISTRY, CHALFONT DRIVE, BILBOROUGH - CONSULTATION**

(Director of Planning and Transport)

Although Councillors Foster and Wood remained in the room for consideration of this item they did not participate in the discussion so as not to fetter their discretion when it was put before the Development Control Committee for decision.

Members made the following comments:

- the need for five bedroom houses was queried as they could be bought by private landlords to create student accommodation;
- some residents with rear gardens backing on to the development were concerned about roads and open spaces being created and the lack of security this could create;
- the proposal for a mix of on-street and garage parking was welcomed as was the mix of fencing, railings and walls to define boundaries;
- it was important to ensure that the bedrooms and living spaces were adequate in order to attract families to the area;
- the development of the footpaths needed to be monitored to ensure that they were overlooked and would not create areas for people to congregate or 'escape routes';

**ACTION**

- there needed to be a management agreement needed to be put in place to ensure that the open green spaces were properly maintained.

**RESOLVED** that the report be noted and the views of the Committee, as expressed above, be included in the report to the Development Control Committee.

**Rob  
Percival**