

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

held at the Council Chamber - at the Council House

on 14 November 2016 from 14.00 - 16.40

ATTENDANCES:

✓	Councillor Mohammed Saghir (Lord Mayor)	
✓	Councillor Liaqat Ali	✓ Councillor Carole-Ann Jones
✓	Councillor Jim Armstrong	✓ Councillor Gul Nawaz Khan
✓	Councillor Cat Arnold	✓ Councillor Neghat Nawaz Khan
✓	Councillor Leslie Ayoola	✓ Councillor Ginny Klein
✓	Councillor Ilyas Aziz	✓ Councillor Dave Liversidge
✓	Councillor Alex Ball	✓ Councillor Sally Longford
✓	Councillor Steve Battlemuch	✓ Councillor Carole McCulloch
✓	Councillor Merlita Bryan	✓ Councillor Nick McDonald
	Councillor Eunice Campbell	✓ Councillor David Mellen
✓	Councillor Graham Chapman	✓ Councillor Jackie Morris
✓	Councillor Azad Choudhry	✓ Councillor Toby Neal
	Councillor Alan Clark	Councillor Alex Norris
✓	Councillor Jon Collins	✓ Councillor Brian Parbutt
✓	Councillor Josh Cook	✓ Councillor Anne Peach
	Councillor Georgina Culley	✓ Councillor Sarah Piper
✓	Councillor Michael Edwards	✓ Councillor Andrew Rule
✓	Councillor Pat Ferguson	✓ Councillor David Smith
✓	Councillor Brian Grocock	✓ Councillor Wendy Smith
✓	Councillor Chris Gibson	✓ Councillor Chris Tansley
✓	Councillor John Hartshorne	✓ Councillor Dave Trimble
	Councillor Rosemary Healy	✓ Councillor Jane Urquhart
✓	Councillor Nicola Heaton	✓ Councillor Marcia Watson
✓	Councillor Mohammed Ibrahim	✓ Councillor Sam Webster
✓	Councillor Patience Uloma Ifediora	Councillor Michael Wildgust
✓	Councillor Corall Jenkins	✓ Councillor Malcolm Wood
✓	Councillor Glyn Jenkins	✓ Councillor Linda Woodings
✓	Councillor Sue Johnson	✓ Councillor Steve Young

✓ Indicates present at meeting

46 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Eunice Campbell – personal reasons

Councillor Alan Clark – non-Council business

Councillor Georgina Culley – personal reasons

Councillor Alex Norris – personal reasons

47 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

None.

48 QUESTIONS FROM CITIZENS

Mr J.M. asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Community Services:

In light of continuing budget pressures on the City Council, does the Portfolio Holder for Community Services agree that the University of Nottingham should make a substantial financial contribution to the cost of Community Protection in dealing with noise and antisocial behaviour caused by a significant minority of students whose behaviour causes deep distress to many residents of New Lenton, The Triangle and The Park Estate?

Councillor Heaton responded as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and could I give thanks for this question.

Nottingham is one of the UK's most popular destinations for university students with two internationally renowned universities attracting over 60,000 students every year. Both of our universities are key contributors to our local economy supporting over 24,000 local jobs whilst also having an estimated annual total economic impact of over £1 billion across the city of Nottingham and the wider conurbation. Their students also have a strong positive social impact on our local communities through a number of successful volunteering initiatives.

Despite the many economic and social benefits that the universities in Nottingham bring, their close proximity to the residential areas of New Lenton, the Lenton Triangle and the Park Estate, mean that a significant proportion of student housing is situated alongside longer-term residential housing. It is acknowledged that in these areas noise nuisance and poor waste disposal practices can be a cause of tension between a small minority of students, landlords and longer-term residents and that this can have a negative impact on quality of life for everyone.

Nottingham City Council and the University of Nottingham over the last few years have formed a strong working relationship to try and alleviate some of these key issues in the areas concerned. At the start of this academic year, we undertook a series of joint enhanced engagement and education activities to remind new and existing students on the importance of keeping good relations with their neighbours. This involved increased foot patrolling in the areas by council and university staff that focussed upon pre-enforcement engagement and communicating behavioural expectations with students.

We also held a number of information stalls and door knocking activities at key locations to inform students on the importance of noise management and respecting their neighbours.

Despite this level of enhanced preventative activity there are some early indications to suggest that noise nuisance and trade waste issues have become more pronounced this academic year. Our Community Protection Service which looks to provide both a preventative and enforcement service for student-related issues has already reported an increase in the levels of enforcement action taken against students and student housing landlords.

In the academic year to date, there have already been three times as many Section 46 Notices issued by our Community Protection Officers for trade waste in the Lenton Triangle area compared to the entire previous academic year. That is 968 Section 46 Notices for this academic year compared to 357 for the entire previous 15/16 academic year.

Furthermore, our Community Protection Officers have also issued more Community Protection Notice Warnings (CPNWs) in the Park Estate for noise nuisance this academic year than compared to the entire previous academic year. Whilst further work is needed to establish the causes of these overall increases, it is apparent that the heightened levels of enforcement action in these areas is having a disproportionate impact on Community Protection resources at a time of tightened public sector funding.

Therefore, Nottingham City Council will continue to work closely with both universities on all community matters of concern. If either of our universities wish to further help us by making a voluntary financial contribution to alleviate resourcing pressures on Community Protection then we would, of course, very much welcome that decision.

49 PETITIONS FROM COUNCILLORS ON BEHALF OF CITIZENS

Councillor Gul Khan submitted a petition on behalf of 37 signatories requesting that local CPO Michael Shawkey be assigned back to the Dales Ward following his temporary reassignment to the City Centre.

50 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 September 2016 were agreed and signed as a true record by the Lord Mayor.

51 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

The Chief Executive reported the following:

Nottingham City Council's ambitious Good to Great transformation programme has won the Association of Project Management's Mike Nichols Award. This celebrates inspirational projects and programmes. Nottingham's successful bid highlighted our ethos of putting Citizens at the Heart of everything we do, creating jobs and investment in Nottingham, working in partnership and improving services, whilst investing in our workforce in the context of over £150m in funding reductions. The

judges commented afterwards that Nottingham's approach was exceptional and an example to other local authorities.

The Council's Nottingham Works Programme has been awarded winner of the ESF Equality Leader Award for a Specialist Project. The project has helped hundreds of young people in Nottingham, including some of the most vulnerable groups, with support to find training and employment. The award recognises the Council's commitment to reducing the number of workless young people in Nottingham.

David Taylor, the former Lord Mayors' Secretary, passed away on 17 October. David was Secretary at Nottingham City Council for 25 years, retiring in 1991. Over the years David organised visits for virtually every member of the Royal family, as well as overseeing the Freeman of the City Ceremony for Torvill and Dean in April 1983.

Councillor John Hartshorne spoke in tribute to David Taylor and a minute's silence was held.

52 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS - TO THE CITY COUNCIL'S LEAD COUNCILLOR ON THE NOTTINGHAMSHIRE AND CITY OF NOTTINGHAM FIRE AND RESCUE AUTHORITY

None.

53 QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS - TO A MEMBER OF EXECUTIVE BOARD, THE CHAIR OF A COMMITTEE AND THE CHAIR OF ANY OTHER CITY COUNCIL BODY

Councillor Georgina Culley submitted her apologies for the meeting and was unable to ask her question of the Portfolio Holder for Business, Growth and Transport. A written response would be provided in response to this question.

Councillor Jim Armstrong asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Business, Growth and Transport:

The Buses Bill 2016-17, sponsored by Lord Ahmad of Wimbledon was recently debated in the House of Lords on the 24th October, with an extensive discussion on Clause 21 of the Bill. Lord Ahmad said, and I quote:

'Let me at the outset answer a question that was asked of me. I have said this before and I will say it again: there are existing municipal bus companies, such as Reading Buses and Nottingham City Transport that deliver a high standard of service. They can expect to continue to do so. Their ability to do that will not be affected by this clause; nor will it prevent local authorities working in partnership with a bus company. That is an underlying thread of the Bill.'

Does the Portfolio Holder accept that Clause 21 of the Buses Bill 2016-17 will have no impact on Nottingham City Council and Nottingham City Transport's current arrangements?

Councillor Nick McDonald replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor. Yes, I think the word used by Lord Ahmad are fairly clear, however what I would say is that I'm not sure they're entirely correct. Actually, when

one reads the legislation, I think there are activities and commercial decisions which a publically owned bus company might make that could be affected by that Clause. We don't know, it's not clear, the government haven't explained it and a lot of the guidance notes I was reading this morning, do not make it clear either.

Secondly, and I'll leave it to colleagues to tell the Conservative Group why publically owned bus companies have been such a valuable asset for authorities who have had them for a number of years. I think our experience in Nottingham is having a publically owned bus company has been extremely important to the way that we run the city, to the way that we think about transport networks and the way we think about connecting our communities. That is why we don't think other councils should be prevented from owning their own bus networks. There are a number of other interesting things in the Buses Bill, it's a complicated piece of legislation and there are all sorts of things that could come from it for the future of councils and their transporting policies.

However, at a time when local authorities are being required to be more commercial by the cuts they are receiving year on year, actually, what they're saying is, 'not only are we going to require you to be more commercial, we're going to make it more difficult for you to be more commercial,' makes no sense whatsoever. Our point is not just in relation to Nottingham or Reading or other authorities who have had publically owned bus companies over the last 20 or 30 years, but actually our point is that this is a model that potentially can work very well for cities, has worked very well for Nottingham and that other cities shouldn't be stopped from following it if they choose to.

Councillor Andrew Rule asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Community Services:

Given the trend over recent years for late leaf fall will the Portfolio Holder consider reviewing collection periods for green waste with a view to starting them later so that they can continue this period in future years when they are most needed?

Councillor Nicola Heaton replied as follows:

Thank you very much Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Rule for his question. It's great to have such an imaginative question in this Chamber; he must have really stretched himself, recycling former Councillor Steel's often-asked words. I'm afraid I'm going to have to refer him to the answer I gave to Councillor Steel a number of times because my position on garden waste collections hasn't changed – except, of course, that the Conservative government has taken even more money out of our Council budget.

As I have explained previously, the decision to reduce garden waste collections' service to a seven month season, April to October inclusive, was taken by Council when setting the 2012 budget. As councillors will know, this Council has seen hundreds of millions of pounds taken out of its budget by a Conservative government and we are being forced to make several service reductions, such as this, to balance our budget. As leaders of this city, we have made choices about what to prioritise and

where we are being forced to reduce services we have tried to do it intelligently. In this case, we looked at when garden waste was most presented in deciding what service to offer residents. Historically, 82% of garden waste tonnage was collected in the months April to October and only 18% was collected between November and March. We therefore, made the painful but ultimately sensible decision not to provide this service in those months. Let me be explicit, five months of the year is 42% of a full year's costs and service and yet citizens were only putting out 18% of the year's garden waste. In the months we offer, we are collecting about 82% of the years' garden waste but only 58% of the costs of a full year's service.

I very much appreciate that residents in some parts of the city have concerns about the lengthening gardening season and it's clear to me that because of climate change our seasons are changing and there's far more variability in our weather. However, I do not believe that it is practical or affordable to extend or vary the months that we collect garden waste. I really would have to argue that bringing up this issue every autumn does amount to asking for an extension to this service. Councillor Rule does not stand here in the beginning of April asking for the beginning of collections to be delayed to compensate for collections in November. That might be because our records show that every April we collect far more garden waste than we do even in October. So, extending collections until November would likely mean even fewer residents actually using the service than compared to the numbers using it in April.

Any extension to the garden waste collection service would cost an additional £70,000 for a single extra month. In light of the massive budget cuts we're being forced to make I do not think this is something we can afford to prioritise. Let me make it clear that we do provide other options for people, if they bag leaf fall waste it will be collected in their normal waste collection. Alternatively, people can look at home composting or using the household waste recycling centre in Lenton. I would also like to remind Councillor Rule, that in our neighbouring authorities, Rushcliffe, Broxtowe and Gedling people have to pay for their garden waste bin, all year round, and that's not a choice we would make for people in Nottingham.

I think we have the right solutions for Nottingham citizens within the current budget context and in the light of the continuing attack on funding for local authorities by this Conservative government. In the circumstances, I would suggest that this Council is making intelligent and pragmatic decisions about service provision and about how to manage massive Conservative cuts. I do look forward to the Conservative Group asking the same question next year, I must warn them that they will probably receive the same answer. In March next year, we will agree a budget that will see over £25 million taken out of the Council. If Councillor Rule would like a more flexible service, with more months of operation can I suggest that he ask his government to stop implementing draconian cuts that hit cities and areas of greater deprivation hardest to reverse them? Until then, I feel that asking this question again and again, will not meet with a different answer.

Councillor Linda Woodings asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Business, Growth and Transport:

How likely is it that promises will be broken in regards to the electrification of the midland main line?

Councillor Nick McDonald replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Woodings for her question, At the Midland Mainline Electrification debate last week, the Rail Minister, Paul Maynard MP told Parliament that the Government will deliver electrification from London to Kettering and Corby by 2019 and that development work is continuing on further electrification of the route to Sheffield and Nottingham. However, he refused to be drawn on any timetable for electrification to Nottingham and Sheffield which following a previous pause which some of you might remember, was programmed for 2023.

Electrification of the Midland Mainline has strong cross-party support and it vital to the continued growth and prosperity of Nottingham and the rest of the Midlands. Although it is difficult to speculate on whether promises will be broken, a lack of commitment to the project from Westminster has been disappointing and concerning, particularly for a project that is a long standing idea, has got cross-party support and for which the economic benefits have been analysed in depth and at length and have shown themselves to be self-evident.

The electrification of the Midlands Mainline has many positives; it's a major driver of local growth, a key asset for the government's Midlands Engine initiative, it has strong support from businesses, it will reduce the operating costs of the railway as well as reducing maintenance costs. It could improve the journey experience, certainly the journey time for passengers and has significant impact for health. It also deals with what is increasingly creaking infrastructure at a time when investment for infrastructure is important to the economy as well.

There is also a strong linkage between Midland Mainline electrification and HS2 in that it unlocks the ability to run classic compatible services into Nottingham City Centre once the HS2 Eastern leg has been built. Despite all the benefits of electrification, we therefore sadly remain unconvinced by the government's commitment to fund this project, though hopeful that the commitment will ultimately be made. Once again, regions outside of London do find themselves waiting for projects to move forward whilst money always seems to be available in the south east and the next good idea in the South East always seems to attract that money ahead of the queue of cities in the regions.

Of course, we agree that infrastructure investment is important to London too, but not at the expense of the rest of the country. Too much decision making is focussed on the south east and too much decision making is made in Westminster rather than devolving both money and decision making out into the regions where it is most needed. We would therefore, welcome clarity from the government on comments made around the Midlands Mainline electrification debate, it has left a number of questions open, we're really clear about what the benefits would be here in Nottingham as they're clear in Sheffield and other places that would benefit from this improvement. It is an extremely important improvement for the growth of cities like Nottingham and we hope that the government will make a stronger and clearer commitment over the coming weeks and months.

Councillor Michael Edwards asked the following question of the Deputy Leader:

I understand that research for the film, 'I, Daniel Blake' was conducted in St Ann's and the film highlights the shortfalls of the welfare system. How fit for purpose does the Portfolio Holder think the welfare system is?

Councillor Graham Chapman replied as follows:

If you want a brief answer, it isn't, but allow me to elaborate. 'I, Daniel Blake' is about the injustices and cruelty of the benefits system, in particular the system of sanctions implemented under this and the previous coalition government. Rarely do statistics speak for themselves, but in this case they do. The latest statistics for Nottingham on sanctions since the regime was put in place in 2012, for Jobseekers Allowance there have been 34,200 referral sanctions in the city under the new JSA sanctions regime. In only 14,700 cases was there a final decision to apply to sanction, that's 43%. Of the 14,700 decisions, 5,200 went through the appeals process and of these, 3,200 decisions were overturned. In short, only 1 in 5 of all original decisions to apply sanctions were upheld and only 1 in 16 of referrals were upheld and many of those would not have been legitimate because many people would have been too demoralised to appeal – and we all know people who would not have appealed, even though they had a just case.

So, you're down to 1 in 16, and in my view it's probably 1 in 20 or 1 in 30. As for Employment Seekers Allowance the numbers are much smaller, nearly 2,000 original referrals since December 2012 and only 400 decisions were taken to impose sanctions, that's 1 in 5. Of these, 150 were overturned which means that only 1 in 8 people were actually sanctioned.

The significance of this is that the whole infrastructure has been developed, taking up the time of thousands of officials, of assessors, adjudicators, food bank volunteers and benefit advisors, to help implement and pick up the pieces of a system that is grossly inadequate and incompetent. Worst still, this has inflicted misery on whole groups of people, some mentally ill who did not deserve it. Further still, it has forced a lot of hard working civil servants against their will to become people who sanction rather than support. This too, was well illustrated by the film. Nor should anyone believe that this exercise has been driven principally by the need to save money because it has probably cost far more than it has saved. It is to do with punishment and indiscriminate punishment at that. It derives from a view that people on benefits are fundamentally 'scrounging' – that they are taking money from others. It is a tabloid view of the world which now seems to dominate certain parts.

It forgets that large numbers, like Daniel Blake, have paid into the system for many years, large numbers are children, like the children in the film who are caught up in 'punishment'. It forgets that most benefits go to people already in work but in low paid jobs, but none of that counts when you are looking for scapegoats for a crashed financial system. Actually, it is a class issue – some very well-off people caused the crash, but on the whole it has been lots of not very well-off people who have paid for the consequences. Compared with the brutality applied of the benefits sanctions

system, the approach to tax evasion, to syphoning off pension funds has been kid glove and in some cases, some people have even been awarded with honours.

Which brings me on to the phrase which encapsulated a lot of this attitude and that phrase is 'something for nothing' – how many times have we heard that phrase from the papers and from a certain Mr George Osbourne MP? This phrase means that if you are a wealthy newspaper owner living abroad and paying virtually no taxes or if you are the son of a wealthy family benefitting from inherited, unearned income and a place at a Westminster school, which you certainly didn't pay for by doing a paper round then you are a respectable member of society, even though you are getting a great deal for not a lot. If you are Wayne, living on the Aspley estate, with no chance of inheritance or any of the privileges it can buy then, somehow, you are a 'scrounger' and so are all of the other people on benefits.

That is the attitude which has driven the UK state, which I am very proud of, into punishing hundreds of thousands of decent, vulnerable and poor citizens in pursuit of a minority who are defrauding, and to concentrate on these mainly innocent people at the expense of concentrating on where the real money is, such as tax evasion from a number of large corporations and tax evasion from a number of very rich individuals, many of whom are associated with the Conservative Party. This, too, is an implicit lesson of 'I, Daniel Blake'.

Councillor Gul Khan asked the following question of the Deputy Leader:

There is a national shortfall in funding for adult care. What is the gap in Nottingham, what are the consequences and what are the solutions?

Councillor Graham Chapman replied as follows:

Thank you Councillor Khan. Since 2011, this city has lost £72 million in spending power through the loss of government grant and for other reasons. That is £583 per family and we are due to lose more next year. Since 2011, spending on Adult Care has gone from £78 million to well over £90 million due to the increase in the number of elderly and disabled people living longer.

The shortfall in the city this year is £14.5 million and next year it will probably increase again. This means two things, which other services in the city have to pay the brunt of the increased adult care costs and that the service itself is under increasing strain. We then add to that the added cost of the living wage this year to pay for care staff, both in public and private sectors. Add to that, the decreasing abilities of the NHS and GPs to cope with the elderly and their care and you end up with a crisis, not just in Nottingham but everywhere in England – there is an adult care crisis.

You also end up with a gross spectacle of elderly people being kept in expensive hospital care costing them discomfort and wasting millions of pounds worth of public money. So, it is not a funding issue, it is a competent issue. You also end up with those receiving care in their homes not being assessed regularly or receiving the appropriate care or sometimes receiving care which is rushed or inadequate. All of

this has been building up and been known about for a number of years and there is not a single member in this Chamber who did not know about it four or five years ago. All of this has been brought to the government's attention, year after year and has been met with a wall of complacency verging on negligence. Then, only this year did the penny start to drop when the government announced that councils were allowed to increase their council tax by an extra 2% to off-set the pressures. This was neither adequate or appropriate but something most councils had to do for want of an alternative. Why was it inadequate? For two reasons, firstly it was unfair. Secondly, it did not raise the income needed to fix the problem. In low income areas like Nottingham, fewer people can afford to fund their own care, the total cost of care will always be large and by forcing us to increase the council tax in an area of predominantly band A properties is the government shifting the burden to people who cannot afford to pay the cost. The poor have to pay the costs of adult care through the 2% additional levy.

Contrast this with somewhere like Richmond-on-Thames where there are a large number of G and H band properties but where the demand is lower, then the levy may have some impact. The result is, in Nottingham this levy raised about £2 million when the need was £14 million and the less well-off band A properties are paying for it on the whole. Do not think that there is not a solution, whilst this crisis was building up, this government was syphoning-off into central budgets many billions of pounds from business rates which has not been reinvested into local government. We are told we can get 100% business rates but they are top-slicing all of the business rates and putting it into a central budget – we are not getting the benefit of redistribution of business rates. This business rates surplus is expected to increase by £2.4 billion next year, we are not talking about the total surplus, which is far more, we are just talking about the increase in the totality of the surplus for next year. At the same time, if we were to use that, we could also abolish the 2% levy which is fundamentally unfair. So, we will be joining our friends in Unison and we will be writing to the Chancellor to suggest this. We will also be briefing our MPs, government has shown complacency and incompetence in this area and they have wasted NHS resources by under-funding adult social care. It is not only us, but their own Conservative MPs who recognise the problem, this is the way in which the government, if it takes this option can redeem itself, and I look forward to a cross-party approach in this Chamber to what is probably the most urgent problem facing the city at this time.

I will end by quoting the King's Fund, the independent health research agency, 'there is no more burning injustice today than the old and disabled being denied the care they need to live within independence and dignity'. There probably is, it might have been the benefits system, they are competing for being burning injustices. Now, it is the government's chance to do something about, now is the time for our Conservative colleagues in Nottingham to do something about it and I look forward to their support.

54 OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2015-16

Councillor Brian Parbutt, the Chair of Overview and Scrutiny Committee, submitted a report on the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2015-16, as set out on pages 23 to 38 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to accept the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2015-16.

55 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Leader presented a report on amendments to the Constitution, as set out on pages 39 to 46 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) Note the addition of Community Centres to the responsibilities of the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Regeneration as agreed by the Leader of the Council and outlined in paragraph 5.2 of the report;**
- (2) Note the new/revised executive delegations as agreed by the Leader of the Council outlined in paragraph 5.3 and appendix one of the report;**
- (3) Agree the new/revised non-executive delegations outlined in paragraph 5.4 and appendix one of the report;**
- (4) Approve the amendments of the Constitution required by the above changes.**

56 DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER URGENCY PROCEDURES

The Leader submitted a report on decisions taken under urgency procedures, as set out on pages 47 to 52 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to note the urgent decisions taken, as follows:

- (1) Urgent decisions (exempt from call-in);**

<u>Decision ref number</u>	<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of</u>	<u>Reasons for urgency</u>
2597	15/09/16	Financial dispensation request for urgent building works	£98,000	Imminent replacement of equipment required to ensure continued health and safety compliance.
2599	16/09/16	Supply of books and DVDs to Nottingham Library Service, including library in HMP Nottingham, over 4 years	£828,000	In order to meet the deadline for the submission urgent approval is required.
2605	28/09/16	Purchase of Sneinton Dale police station and leaseback of part to create new library and Police contact point.	Exempt	Urgent purchase in order to let the refurbishment contract.

<u>Decision ref number</u>	<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of</u>	<u>Reasons for urgency</u>
2606	28/09/16	Procurement for a Cafe/Bar & Event Catering Management Concessionaire at The Nottingham Theatre Royal and Concert Hall	Exempt	Urgent decision required in order to maximise the income to the Council.
2610	29/09/16	Purchase of Civica Software with House of Multiple Occupancy and Mobile Modules	£350,507	Urgent decision in order to benefit from discounted Civica quote.
2614	03/10/16	Commercial Opportunity for Energy Services	Exempt	In order to meet an urgent submission date.
2617	03/10/16	Unity Learning Centre - additional funding	£219,000	A delay would jeopardise an academisation decision.
2644	17/10/16	Property Investment Acquisition – Project Highland	Exempt	To allow for a timely purchase.

(2) Key decisions (taken under special urgency procedures).

<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Decision Taker</u>	<u>Reasons for special urgency</u>
28/09/16	Procurement for a Cafe/Bar & Event Catering Management Concessionaire at The Nottingham Theatre Royal and Concert Hall	Exempt	Leader of the Council	The decision was urgent in order to meet the deadline, maximise the quality of tender and increase the amount of income to the City Council.
29/09/16	Letting of Vacant Office Space at No. 1 Nottingham Science Park, Jesse Boot Way, Nottingham, NG7 2RU	Exempt	Leader of the Council	The decision was urgent because terms had been agreed between the parties which included the date on which the lease was to commence.

14/10/16	Invest in D2N2 Nottingham City as Accountable Body	£ 2,369,624	Leader of the Council	It has only recently been announced by government that ERDF bids approved before the Autumn Statement will be honoured, so there was a requirement to seek approval to the change in role to ensure approval of the bid.
----------	--	-------------	-----------------------------	--

57 MOTION

Moved by Councillor Cat Arnold, seconded by Councillor Glyn Jenkins:

“Nottingham City Council recognises and values local pharmacies as a vital primary care health service and as an integral part of the fabric of local communities throughout our city.

This City Council notes that:

- community pharmacies in Nottingham offer a range of services such as dispensing prescriptions, disposal of unwanted medicines and supporting self-care
- pharmacies play an important role in promoting wellbeing such as healthy eating, smoking cessation, exercise, flu vaccination, sexual health and more
- advice and support services are also available to care homes
- several local pharmacies have achieved Healthy Living Pharmacies (HLP) status recognising and evidencing their role in improving the health of their local population

This City Council is greatly concerned about Government imposed threats to pharmacies as a result of cuts in the budget of £170m nationally. This is a 6% cut in cash terms but could effectively mean a cut of 12% during the financial year which could potentially close up to a quarter of pharmacies with an increased focus on warehousing dispensary and online services. Service cuts in pharmacies put more residents at risk as well as putting pressure on GPs and on hospital services and therefore increasing NHS costs. A fully funded community pharmacy service is cost effective and is in the interest of patients and carers.

Nottingham City Council agrees to write to the Secretary of State for Health and NHS England detailing its concerns and demanding an immediate reversal of these proposals.

RESOLVED to carry the motion.

58 MOTION

Moved by Councillor Steve Battlemuch, seconded by Councillor Brian Parbutt:

“This council notes:

1. That the Bus Services Bill currently passing through Parliament includes Clause 21 that will effectively “prohibit a local authority from forming a company for the purposes of providing a local bus service”;
2. That the Localism Act (2011) provides general powers of competence to local authorities;
3. That municipal bus companies, such as Nottingham City Transport, provide some of the best bus services in the country and have a successful track record of increasing bus passenger numbers and providing high quality bus services;
4. That polling by We Own It found that a majority of the public (57%) oppose clause 21, whilst just 22% support it. The opposition to Clause 21 is consistent across voters from all political parties;
5. The House of Lords voted by a majority to remove Clause 21 from the Bus Services Bill.

Therefore, this council believes:

1. Clause 21 contradicts the spirit of the Localism Act 2011;
2. If there is a need and a demand from their public, then Councils should be able to provide their own bus services, such as Nottingham City Transport;
3. Consequently Clause 21 should be omitted from the Bus Services Bill.

This council resolves:

1. To write to Lord Ahmad and to call on the Department for Transport to omit Clause 21 from the final legislation;
2. To write to Lillian Greenwood, Graham Allen, Chris Leslie and other MPs whose constituencies are served by Nottingham City Transport to ask them to oppose clause 21 when the Bus Services Bill reaches the House of Commons and ask them to write to Lord Ahmad and the Department of Transport to raise concerns about Clause 21;
3. To work with any organisations such as We Own It to publicise our opposition to clause 21 in local media.”

RESOLVED to carry the motion.

59 URGENT ITEM - BOUNDARY COMMISSION PROPOSALS

The Lord Mayor agreed that this item, although not on the agenda, be considered as a matter of urgency in accordance with Section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, so that Council might consider a counter proposal for Parliamentary Constituencies in the City of Nottingham, for submission to the Boundary Commission for England, ahead of the 5 December 2016 deadline.

The Leader submitted a report, copies of which had been circulated.

RESOLVED to:

- (1) Endorse the counter proposal for submission to the Boundary Commission for England;**
- (2) Note and support the “Extending Nottingham East” option as Nottingham City Council’s counter proposal, as detailed in paragraph 6.2 and appendix 2 of the report.**