

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

held at the Council Chamber - at the Council House

on 12 September 2016 from 14.00 - 17.25

ATTENDANCES:

✓ Councillor Mohammed Saghir (Lord Mayor)	
<hr/>	
✓ 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 Chris Gibson	✓ Councillor Wendy Smith
✓ Councillor Brian Grocock	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

33 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Alex Ball	-	work commitments
Councillor Mohammed Ibrahim	-	personal reasons
Councillor Sue Johnson	-	personal reasons
Councillor Gul Khan	-	personal reasons
Councillor Neghat Khan	-	personal reasons
Councillor Ginny Klein	-	personal reasons
Councillor Brian Parbutt	-	unwell
Councillor David Smith	-	unwell
Councillor Chris Tansley	-	work commitments
Councillor Marcia Watson	-	unwell
Councillor Mick Wildgust	-	unwell

34 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

None.

35 QUESTIONS FROM CITIZENS

None.

36 PETITIONS FROM COUNCILLORS ON BEHALF OF CITIZENS

Councillor Andrew Rule submitted two petitions on behalf of citizens:

- 1) To actively lobby Trent Barton to reinstate stops at Silverdale and Wilford for the Skylink Express Bus Service;
- 2) to actively lobby Nottingham Express Transit and the Tramlink Nottingham Consortium to install a tram stop at Silverdale, in addition to including construction of a tram stop at Silverdale as an objective within the City Council's transport plan.

37 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING OF COUNCIL AND THE LAST EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 11 JULY 2016

The minutes of the previous Council and Extraordinary Council meetings on 11 July were agreed and signed as a true record by the Lord Mayor.

38 TO RECEIVE OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND/OR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Deputy Chief Executive reported that at the annual Association of Public Service Excellence (APSE) awards event last week, Nottingham City Council was awarded Council of the Year, and is the only authority to have won this award twice. The Council also won an award for the best public/private working initiative for the "Field of Dreams" project, which replaced the derelict sports pavilion on Victoria Embankment. This was the service's fifth win in as many years. Nottingham City

Council had a record year at the APSE awards, with a total of 10 nominations and 7 finalists.

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

None.

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

Councillor Andrew Rule asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Business, Growth and Transport:

I welcome the recent changes to the city council's parking permit policy, which will allow residents in areas that wouldn't previously qualify for a parking permit scheme to acquire one, however, will he consider making a provision, in the cost of the permit or in the proceeds from enforcement, to reimburse the Area Capital Fund for those wards that implement schemes under the policy, for the costs incurred in implementing schemes?

Councillor Nick McDonald replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Rule for his question. The answer is no, and a colleague of mine noted that the Conservatives do seem to have something of an inconsistent position with regards to the Area Capital Fund, but actually can I thank Councillor Rule for his question and may I say it's nice to get a question from an opposition member that is an attempt at a genuine debate about a genuine policy issue.

I can confirm that the current policy regarding residents' parking schemes is to allow such schemes where the following criteria apply:

- there are fewer than 50% of properties that have off-street parking facilities;
- the parking problems occur during the day and are created by non-residents;
- the amount of on-street parking available to residents is inadequate for the number of properties in the area.

The schemes are funded through the Area Capital programme, subject to the approval of local councillors, and this requires a Traffic Regulation Order, and that is not going to change. What I do recognise is that there needs to be greater flexibility, and that is why we've made the change that we've made to the policy, particularly where there are specific considerations. I've had that discussion with a number of Labour members, and I'm happy to have that discussion with Councillor Rule.

What I would also say is that we need to achieve financial balance. We need to have a policy that is clear and applicable within a sensible financial envelope. We cannot fund these schemes everywhere, so that means we have to apply sensible criteria, but what I will also say is that I've asked officers to develop options that will allow residents' parking schemes to be considered in these circumstances, for example

where regular events could lead to parking problems. As a result, a number of schemes are being progressed to trial arrangements.

As regards to costs themselves, the cost of the permits has been set to reflect the cost of issuing permits, and if this is set at a level to meet or contribute to the cost of implementation, this would mean there would have to be a significant increase in permit costs, which is clearly not something that we want to see. So, as with all things, there is an ideal scenario, and there is a reality of how we implement and how we fund the implementation of these schemes; they cannot always be the same. For greater flexibility, whilst having clear rules and a cost that is sufficient, but no more than sufficient, are for me the guiding principles here. As we review the impact of the trial schemes we've been looking at over recent months, I will ensure that those principles are adhered to.

Councillor Jim Armstrong asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture:

Could the Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Culture explain what he believes the impact on tourism will be of moving the taxi rank away from the main entrance of the train station, given that Nottingham is now one of the only cities where there is not a taxi rank directly outside the main entrance to the train station?

Councillor Dave Trimble replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and could I thank Councillor Armstrong for his question. I have been to many train and bus stations in my time, and I have to say that there are plenty of train and bus stations with taxi ranks not directly outside the main entrance of a station. Perhaps Councillor Armstrong drives far too many places; perhaps he should start using the train?

My recent experiences are: I've been to Liverpool Lime Street, which has a taxi rank at the side of it. It works absolutely fine. I've been to Manchester Oxford Road recently, that has one at the front, but because of the lack of space and the amount of people coming off the train, it's really really difficult to get a taxi. So there are different factors really on how it works. They include the size, the length, the width, the number of platforms, the design and the accessibility within the station itself, being every bit as important as the street and the public realm outside.

Now, in Nottingham the road layout and the public realm has only just been completed, so it's absolutely far too early to say what, if any, impact there could be.

Councillor Georgina Culley asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Business, Growth and Transport:

What are the costs of implementing extra measures to safeguard residential properties from the results of displaced parking?

Councillor Nick McDonald replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and thanks to Councillor Culley for her question. As Councillor Culley will no doubt already be aware, part of the implementation of residents' parking schemes and the consultation process involved in their introduction is consideration of potential displacement on residential parking. It is considered in every case. Where displacement could transfer to adjacent residential streets, options to include these streets would be routinely included in the proposals. If residents feel those restrictions are not appropriate as part of the scheme, but it is still considered that this will be a risk, then it is possible to include these streets in the scheme.

As all Councillors know, when they look at these issues, the issue of displacement is often the key question with any scheme of this nature. Residents tend to support restrictions where they have current parking problems, unsurprisingly. Those restrictions, if introduced, often do make displacement to adjacent streets likely, and where there's not a current problem, often residents won't support restrictions at that time, but may change their view later down the line. This is why we need to take a strategic approach to each scheme; it is why we need to think about these things carefully, it is why we need a dynamic approach in every case.

Now Councillor Culley asks about the costs. Of course, this is an impossible question to answer. Costs of the scheme to protect any surrounding area from displacement are dependent on the nature and extent of the areas affected, and the scale of the problems generating the issues. Therefore there is no figure that can be placed on this, a large scheme would be more expensive to implement than a smaller scheme, and also to police.

As Councillor Culley is aware, we do our very best to ensure, and I believe we have been successful in ensuring, that we maintain a good on-street presence in our neighbourhoods, and we enforce Traffic Regulation Orders across the city. But of course, it does get more difficult every year to do that, as her party in government continues to slash our budgets year on year.

Councillor Andrew Rule asked the following question of the Deputy Leader:

Could the Deputy Leader explain why supplementary questions and their answers are not fully recorded in the minutes of full council meetings, and does he not agree that by doing this it would only serve to increase the transparency of proceedings in this chamber?

Councillor Graham Chapman replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Rule for his question. There is no legislative or constitutional requirement to record responses to questions, or supplementary questions asked at Council. At Nottingham City Council, we choose to record a verbatim response to the initial question, which I think is sensible. Many other Councils do not. Some record a summary of the answer provided, and some

merely present to the meeting the suggested written response with no question or supplementary question even asked at the meeting.

I'll give you some examples. In Birmingham, minutes do not record questions or answers. In Bristol, questions are not asked at Council, but at a pre-meeting, where verbatim responses are not recorded, rather there is a summary. In Cardiff supplementary answers are recorded, so you'd get what you want in Cardiff! In Glasgow no responses to any questions are recorded in the minutes. In Leeds, the entire meeting, God help them, is transcribed verbatim, including notes indicating when the chamber has applauded, by an external court transcriber, well I would suggest to the Leader of Leeds that there might be a bit of a saving there for next year! In Liverpool, no supplementary questions appear to be asked. In Manchester, no responses to any questions are recorded. In Newcastle, answers to supplementary questions are recorded in summary style. In Sheffield, no supplementary questions appear to be asked. On that basis, that Nottingham are recording the answers to the main question is very transparent, and in my view there is no real case for extending it.

But my real answer, however, is to do with cost benefit. And we all know that Councillor Rule likes cost benefit. Recording questions is an arduous and painstaking exercise, and it would probably take an estimated 3 or even 4 extra days of officer time to unpick it. It already takes 2 days to do the normal responses, where much of the answer is written. If Councillor Rule had 3 days per meeting, 18 days per year, of middle cost officer time at his disposal, at a time of fairly savage cuts to the council's budget, would he really want those 18 days to be taken away from people, for example dealing with child mental health, or probably at the rate of pay that is given to the Committee Section, 36 days of people tending to the elderly out of hospital? Because that is the game the government has forced upon us. It's a zero sum game. You spend 36 days on recording answers to supplementaries; it's taken away from somewhere else in the system. And I genuinely don't think he would want that to happen. But I'll do a deal with him: if he can persuade his government to give us the same preferential treatment that they've dished out to places like Surrey, to Kent, to Buckinghamshire, to Rutland, to many Tory shires last year in the supplementary grant, then we might have a little latitude to record the supplementary questions.

The bill would be £2,000,000.00. So I'm setting you a target: you get that £2,000,000.00 from your government which is Nottingham's fair share, and we will be only too delighted to record supplementaries to your questions. In fact, we will get them embossed in gold. Thank you.

Councillor Anne Peach asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Energy and Sustainability:

Would the Portfolio Holder for Energy and Sustainability explain why our approach in Nottingham has resulted in successfully meeting our climate change targets 4 years early, in comparison to the weak performance of the Conservative government, which has recently abolished the Department of Energy and Climate Change?

Councillor Alan Clark replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and I thank Councillor Peach for her question. We are very proud to have reached our climate change targets four years early. This has been achieved through a number of ambitious programmes the council has taken forward to drive up low carbon energy generation, drive down energy usage, and tackle fuel poverty. This included the external wall insulation programmes, which have seen Nottingham City Homes and Nottingham City Council work together to clad around 5,000 homes across the city and across tenures.

Our efforts to fit solar panels have reached over 4,000 homes. The council's own energy efficiency projects have cut our energy usage very significantly through measures such as LED lighting, and we continue to expand the district heating network into new developments like BioCity and the fire station.

We don't want to stop there. We're already working with both universities on innovative projects around the city involving new ways to save, generate and store energy, with the communities we serve.

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

Could the Deputy Leader comment on the fact that the Parliamentary Boundary Review will be based on the electoral register prior to the substantial interest in registration stimulated by the EU Referendum?

Councillor Graham Chapman replied as follows:

Yes I'd be delighted to respond, thank you for the question and thank you Lord Mayor. The Parliamentary Boundary Review will be published for consultation this autumn, based on the Electoral register published on 1 December 2015. Now remember that date, 2015, 1 December, I'll be referring to it later. You would have expected the criteria to have been based on what was the most effective way of representing the democratic rights of a given population, and respecting the integrity of an area. That's what you would have expected from the oldest democracy in the world, and from the mother of all parliaments. Is that what we're going to get? It most definitely is not.

There has been a crude dictat in the Redistribution Act. The starting point for the whole exercise has not been what is best for the electorate; it has been the number of constituencies, and the reduction of the number of constituencies to 600. 600, I'll remind any statistician, is an arbitrary figure. Just because it's got some noughts on, doesn't mean it is set in stone. It is an arbitrary figure, and it's no less arbitrary than 601, or 633, or any other figure. The other point that's been specified is that there should only be a 5% variation between constituencies, which is equally arbitrary. It means that at a time when constituency work is going up, the number of MPs is going down. The reasoning is, we are told, that it saves £12,000,000.00. But this from a government which has created, does anybody know how many Lords the last government has created? I think the figure is 240, it has created 240 Lords, but it tells us it needs to reduce 50 MPs in order to save money. I'd suggest that it's spent that money already.

A further expectation would have been that the key issue would be the population represented. But no, it is the number of electors, not the number of people that is the starting point. And we all know that in cities there are more under 18s, there is immigration which is a large part of an MP's job, there are unregistered people because it's become harder to register. And no MP is going to refuse to deal with a person because they are children or because the issue involves children, or they are not on the register, or they are an immigrant. The criteria will not be for an MP, "are you on the Electoral register in my constituency?" It will be "do you live in my constituency?" and the result will be that places like Nottingham will suffer in terms of representation.

You would also expect that the commission would want to use the most accurate figures available. But again, this is not happening. It is basing its judgements on the Electoral register published on 1 December 2015, which is already outdated. It has however, been our position in this council for some time, to question using 1 December each year, never mind 2015, as a basis. It has also been a concern of ours that since the introduction of the Individual Electoral register, the electorate in Nottingham and across the country has dropped significantly, especially at the point of publication on 1 December each year. So not only are the criteria not based on the population, it is on a more and more artificial basis of people on the register. There is a bigger and bigger gap growing between population and people on the register.

The main reason for this additional requirement, and why it has become more problematic getting people on the register, is that they are now expected to fill in their national insurance, which takes time for verification, which often means that by 1 December date there is slippage, and therefore the register for 1 December is that much more inaccurate. This has caused an additional problem for us in Nottingham, particularly in places where there is a student population, as students also have to go through this process. Students do not arrive at their term time address until September or October, and this gives them little time to register. It is also now their individual decision whether to register, and we all know about students, for their first term time address or not. Previously universities were able to provide us with a list of all students, who are then automatically registered to vote. So there is a further distortion for any place with students.

If we want a far more accurate measure, therefore, we should be using the register of the electorate from before an election. What happens is, the most accurate register is always prior to an election. And I'll give you examples. From 1 December 2014 there were 181,000 people on the register. By the time of the parliamentary election in 2015 that had gone up to 195,000; that's a 14,000 increase because of a parliamentary election. I will also give you the example of the EU referendum. There were 187,000, but at the EU referendum there were 195,000; that's an increase of 8,000 people. So there is no excuse for not using the most accurate figures, which relate to the pre-election process rather than 1 December each year.

But we all know that this is not the aim. The aim is to skew the system in favour of those non-urban areas which most favour the Conservatives. Hence the arbitrary reduction in seats, hence the criteria of electors and not population, hence Individual Electoral Registration, hence maintaining the date of 1 December for the cut-off

period, hence ignoring the additional 2,000,000 people who registered up to 16 June 2016 for the referendum.

As a result of all this, Nottingham, and indeed other cities, are likely to get a raw deal. If based on 187,000 electors and not 195,000 as after the referendum, and with only a 5% variation rather than a 10% as recommended by the Parliamentary Commission, then the city will end up with at least 1 MP, if not all 3, covering different local government boundaries. They will be covering far more than their fair share of people as opposed to constituents, with workloads far greater than their rural equivalents. It will be a dog's breakfast, and the sole beneficiary will be the Conservative party. As Councillor Collins said, it is gerrymandering on quite a shameless level. So much for the oldest democracy in the world, and so much for the mother of parliaments. Thank you.

Councillor Rosemary Healy asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Education, Employment and Skills:

Does the Portfolio Holder agree with the Chief Inspector of Schools that a government reintroduction of grammar schools would be "an entirely retrograde step"?

Councillor Sam Webster replied as follows:

Yes Lord Mayor, thank you. Thank you Councillor Healy for providing me with this opportunity to declare myself on this occasion to be in complete agreement with Sir Michael Wilshaw, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools. Indeed, he is correct, Theresa May's proposed re-introduction of grammar schools, and therefore secondary moderns, is a retrograde step. I'm opposed to expansion of existing grammar schools, opposed to the opening of new grammar schools, and fundamentally opposed to the re-introduction of an outdated education system that segregates and divides children. The evidence couldn't be clearer: grammar schools do not improve social mobility; in fact the evidence shows the opposite. They stigmatise children, they create a 2 tier education system, and they truly are a symbol of social division.

In my view, the aim must always be to offer the very best education to every child; that's what parents expect, and that's what children deserve. So it's only common sense that we should be working to deliver the highest standards of education, nationally and locally, for all children. And that's why there's been widespread dismay and disappointment at the Prime Minister's announcement that she intends to bring back a grammar and secondary modern education system. But as well as a chorus of criticism from education experts, I'm heartened to see cross-party opposition to the proposal.

This Labour group is opposed, as is the Labour party nationally. My party has committed to fight these proposals every step of the way. The Tory chair of the Education Select Committee, Neil Carmichael MP, is opposed. The former Secretary of State for Education, Nicky Morgan, is opposed. The chair of the government's own Social Mobility Commission is opposed, and judging by the half-hearted manner in

which she responded to questions about grammar schools in the House of Commons last week, the comprehensive school educated Secretary of State for Education, Justine Greening, doesn't seem too convinced herself. So the new PM has no mandate for this crazy policy, but she does have lots of opposition.

I think Sir Michael's choice of the word "retrograde" was particularly significant, because the proposal to re-introduce grammar schools appears, to anybody who has a genuine concern for seeing educational attainment improve for all children and young people, to be a dangerous exercise in nostalgia. I'd suggest it's a desperate attempt to pursue a retro-vision of education, based not upon evidence, but the comforting glow of an imagined past. A bit like the EU referendum debate, the grammar schools debate will be filled with anecdotes and rose-tinted nostalgia, but those things should have no part to play in determining the futures of our children and young people.

There is lots of evidence available on this subject, and the Prime Minister should use it. Given the obsession with school structures that has been at the heart of education policy since the Tories took control back in 2010, it is sadly no surprise that the new Prime Minister should grasp this idea as the centrepiece of her thoroughly disheartening contribution to the education debate. Sadly, in doing so, she's ignoring the truly important issues that need to be tackled. So for her benefit, before we introduce even more structural change, how about her government deals with the problems of recruiting and retaining high quality teachers, or how it might reverse the year-on-year reduction in real term funding to schools, or dealing with the ongoing failure to provide a coherent vision and strategy for vocational education, one that might focus on the skills our young people need to enter the workforce and begin closing our nation's shameful productivity gap? This is a productivity gap that we know affects Nottingham, its residents, and its businesses.

I can't see how the re-introduction of grammar schools will make any positive difference to this set of issues; in fact, I can only see it having a completely negative impact on all 3. In terms of recruiting teachers, the likely effect would be the creaming off to grammar schools of the best teachers, when it's clear that the best teachers need to be working in those schools that provide the greatest challenge in terms of the social deprivation of its pupils and attainment outcomes. We know from the massive financial waste of the free school programme that a major structural change brings with it the redeployment of precious resources from schools with the greatest need, to those that best fit the ideological vision of those in power. In the case of free schools, we saw Michael Gove dipping his hand into the budget for those children with special needs to fund his ideological folly. What educational needs will be sacrificed to fund Theresa May's grammar school vanity project? And in terms of equipping our children with the right skills for the future, how would a focus and targeting of resources on a narrow, largely academic curriculum, benefit the country?

The fundamental problem with allowing selective education is that it creates a binary system, and inevitable a grammar school has a negative impact on the outcomes of those children who are unable to access it. By taking the brightest children into one school, the results of all those non-selective schools that surround it are depressed. So we see in Kent, an area that has retained a full grammar school system, that overall only 27% of pupils receiving free school meals gained 5 good GCSEs including English and Maths, compared to the national average of 33%, and in

London, which has virtually no grammar schools, 45%. The evidence is there: where a grammar school system is in place, poorer children receive lower results. It does not help poorer children, it hinders them, and it holds them back. An education system that will advantages the 20% who will benefit at the expense of the 80% who don't, surely has no place in a modern country that aspires to be, in Mrs May's own words, a country where everyone has a fair chance to go as far as their talent and their hard work will allow.

But my concern is not simply about party political dogma or ideology. It is a view shared by politicians of all hues, who see that there is a real danger in talking about increasing social mobility, whilst introducing policies that have the completely opposite impact. Let's not pretend, however, that the current education system delivers for every child, because it doesn't. There is still far too much inequality in our schools, there is still too much left to luck, background, or parental investment, and far too many children get left behind. We know this in Nottingham; too many children in our city do not achieve to their full potential, and the government must accept responsibility for a lack of progress on this issue nationally.

It is important that we put forward alternatives if we're going to criticise, because things do need to change. Selection is not the change we need. Division is not the change we need. High standards for a few, whilst others suffer second rate education standards, is not the change we need. So what would I like to see? What is our alternative? The best teachers in the most challenging schools. More high quality, well-trained, qualified teachers. A more individualised approach where the potential of every child is unlocked. More high quality technical and vocational education in schools. More exposure to careers education, employability and employer interactions, and a move away from the damaging government obsession with school structures. An understanding that a good school with good teachers, good facilities, good leadership and good governance can deliver for children regardless of whether it says academy, free, community or grammar over the door. A good school is a good school.

Bringing back a system that allows the many to fail so that a few can do well is indeed retrograde. It is the wrong choice, possibly driven by the wrong motive, and I hope the proposal is scrapped. Thank you.

41 DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER URGENCY PROCEDURES

The Leader submitted a report on decisions taken under urgency procedures, as set out on pages 23 to 28 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to note the urgent decisions taken, as follows:

1) urgent decisions (exempt from call-in);

<u>Decision reference number</u>	<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of decision</u>	<u>Reasons for urgency</u>
2519	29/06/16	Island Site - consultancy fees to support CPO business case	£190,000	To bring forward development of the site

<u>Decision reference number</u>	<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of decision</u>	<u>Reasons for urgency</u>
2520	30/06/16	Lease of Land at Hoewood Road, Bulwell, Nottingham	Nil	There is a need for the lease to be entered in to as soon as possible and it was agreed that the call-in period could be waived in this instance to facilitate this.
2534	21/07/16	Procuring four videos to promote the Midlands Engine	up to £60,000	The videos (which aren't being funded by the council) are required by the Midlands Engine urgently
2535*	21/07/16	Broadmarsh Shopping Centre Redevelopment - approval of further development funding	Exempt	To enable works to take place within the tight timescales
2552	02/08/16	Property Investment Acquisition	£2,443,980	A delay in this decision would prejudice the Council's interests in making the purchase
2553	02/08/16	Property Investment Acquisition - Nottingham	Exempt	Call-in would delay the exchange of contracts
2554	02/08/16	Property Investment Acquisition - Birmingham	£4,634,925	Time constraints that call-in may provide
2567	18/08/16	Homecare price increase 2016/17	Exempt	Urgent need to implement the decision
2580	26/08/16	Funding of legal support in relation to employment matters	Exempt	Urgent decision required for funding to be pursued

2) key decisions (taken under special urgency procedures)

<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of decision</u>	<u>Decision Taker</u>	<u>Reasons for special urgency</u>
22/07/2016	Broadmarsh Shopping Centre Redevelopment - Approval of further development funding	Exempt	Leader of the Council	The decision is urgent and the business cannot be deferred to enable the detailed design work to continue and adhere to the timescale for development.

26/07/2016	Commercial Opportunity for Trading Operations	£1.587m revenue expenditure over 5 years	Leader of the Council	The decision is urgent and cannot be deferred because should Nottingham City Council be successful in its tender, it would need to sign and enter into a contract.
------------	---	--	-----------------------	--

42 AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Leader presented a report on amendments to the Constitution, as set out on pages 29 to 42 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to:

- 1) **note the addition of the designation of Assets of Community Value to the responsibilities of the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing 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 paragraphs 5.4 and appendix one of the report;**
- 4) **agree the revisions to the terms of reference for the Health and Wellbeing Board Commissioning Sub-Committee outlined in paragraph 5.5 of the report;**
- 5) **agree the revised terms of reference for the Health and Wellbeing Board as outlined at appendix two of the report;**
- 6) **approve the amendments of the Constitution required by the above changes.**

43 MOTION

Moved by Councillor Wendy Smith, seconded by Councillor Steve Battlemuch:

“This Council calls upon the Government to make fair transitional state pension arrangements for all women born on or after 6th April 1951, who have unfairly borne the burden of the increase to the State Pension Age with lack of appropriate notification.

This Council notes the damage caused to the lives of these approximate 11,900 women across Nottingham who were born between 1951 and 1959 and face a changed future as a consequence”

Councillor Georgina Culley proposed an amendment. Upon taking advice, the Lord Mayor ruled the amendment to be not in order, as it effectively negated the operative part of the motion.

RESOLVED to carry the motion.

44 MOTION

Moved by Councillor Jackie Morris, seconded by Council Leslie Ayoola:

“This Council notes that Female Genital Mutilation represents a risk to physical health, mental health and quality of life for young women across the whole of the United Kingdom. It is believed over 60,000 people are at risk of this abuse in this country alone.

The City Council stands against Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) and resolves to:

- Make Nottingham a “Zero Tolerance” City in respect to Female Genital Mutilation.
- Work to end the procedure within the city by working closely with survivors, affected communities and other agencies with a responsibility to safeguard and protect.
- Provide training for staff to help spot the signs associated with Female Genital Mutilation.
- Work closely with grassroot organisations, survivors and communities to prevent children being removed from the city to experience Female Genital Mutilation.
- Help support potential survivors of Female Genital Mutilation to say no and raise awareness amongst their peers and communities.
- Help with raising awareness and keep the subject on the agenda while showcasing the successes of Nottingham.
- Support the establishment of a referral pathway for the City”

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Jim Armstrong, seconded by Councillor Andrew Rule:

In the opening paragraph, replace “This Council notes that Female Genital Mutilation” with “This Council is appalled at the latest figures available for newly recorded cases of Female Genital Mutilation (‘FGM’) in Nottingham, which stood at around 80 between April 2015 and March 2016. The Council considers this to be far too high, especially given that FGM is under-reported and often only discovered when women are in maternity care. This Council believes that all action should be taken to prevent this practice, which...”

In the second paragraph, delete “(FGM)”

In the second bullet point, delete “work to”

In the third bullet point, replace “provide training for” with “train”

In the fifth bullet point, delete “help”

In the sixth bullet point, replace “help with raising awareness” with “raise awareness of FGM”

Councillors voted on the proposed amendment.

RESOLVED to reject the proposed amendment.

Councillors then voted on the original motion.

RESOLVED to carry the original motion.

45 MOTION

Moved by Councillor Andrew Rule, seconded by Councillor Jon Collins:

“Nottingham City Council recognises the achievements of Team GB during the Rio 2016 Olympic Games, and takes particular pride in the 2 gold medals that the county of Nottinghamshire itself delivered during the most successful Games for British athletes ever, which saw Team GB finish second in the medal table.

The Council also proudly acknowledges the achievements of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire’s Paralympians.

The Council also acknowledges the foresight of Sir John Major’s government in setting up the National Lottery in 1994, and the role played by the National Lottery in funding sports development in the UK ever since.

This Council pledges to continue to do its part to ensure that the children of Nottingham have the opportunity to participate in sport and go on to represent Great Britain in the future, by promoting sport in schools and supporting the volunteer organisations in local communities. The Council supports the Conservative Government’s ‘Sporting Future’ strategy, published in December 2015, to encourage more participation in sport across the board, with a particular focus on raising engagement levels amongst sections within the community with lower participation rates. Prime Minister Theresa May’s commitment to continue to encourage increased participation in sport is therefore welcomed by the Council”

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Dave Trimble, seconded by Councillor Alan Clark:

At the end of the third paragraph, replace “.” with “, as well as the partnership work with Sport England”

In the fourth paragraph, after “this Council”, insert “, having successfully developed the Ice Arena, Harvey Hadden Sports Village and the Tennis Centre as well as other community venues”

In the fourth paragraph, replace “Prime Minister Theresa May’s commitment to continue to encourage increased participation in sport” with “The commitment of the Council to ‘Make Nottingham the fastest growing city for disability sports participation in England””

At the end of the fourth paragraph, delete “by the Council”.

Councillors voted on the proposed amendment.

RESOLVED to accept the proposed amendment.

The new motion therefore read:

“Nottingham City Council recognises the achievements of Team GB during the Rio 2016 Olympic Games, and takes particular pride in the 2 gold medals that the county of Nottinghamshire itself delivered during the most successful Games for British athletes ever, which saw Team GB finish second in the medal table.

The Council also proudly acknowledges the achievements of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire’s Paralympians.

The Council also acknowledges the foresight of Sir John Major’s government in setting up the National Lottery in 1994, and the role played by the National Lottery in funding sports development in the UK ever since., as well as the partnership work with Sport England.

This Council pledges to continue to do its part to ensure that the children of Nottingham have the opportunity to participate in sport and go on to represent Great Britain in the future, by promoting sport in schools and supporting the volunteer organisations in local communities. The Council supports the Conservative Government’s ‘Sporting Future’ strategy, published in December 2015, to encourage more participation in sport across the board, with a particular focus on raising engagement levels amongst sections within the community with lower participation rates. The commitment of the Council to ‘Make Nottingham the fastest growing city for disability sport participation in England’ is therefore welcomed”

The following amendment was proposed by Councillor Andrew Rule, seconded by Councillor Dave Trimble:

At the end of the fourth paragraph, replace “The commitment of the Council to ‘Make Nottingham the fastest growing city for disability sports participation in England’ is therefore welcomed” with “As part of its commitment to ‘Make Nottingham the fastest growing city for disability sports participation in England’ the Council recognises:

- **The importance of hosting sporting events in raising participation levels; and further resolves to;**
- **Place Nottingham’s sporting facilities at the forefront of the development of sports for people with disabilities;**
- **And ambitiously set itself the objective of holding as many international disability sporting events as possible by 2024.”**

Councillors voted on the proposed amendment.

RESOLVED to accept the proposed amendment.

The new motion therefore read:

“Nottingham City Council recognises the achievements of Team GB during the Rio 2016 Olympic Games, and takes particular pride in the 2 gold medals that the county of Nottinghamshire itself delivered during the most successful Games for British athletes ever, which saw Team GB finish second in the medal table.

The Council also proudly acknowledges the achievements of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire’s Paralympians.

The Council also acknowledges the foresight of Sir John Major’s government in setting up the National Lottery in 1994, and the role played by the National Lottery in funding sports development in the UK ever since., as well as the partnership work with Sport England.

This Council pledges to continue to do its part to ensure that the children of Nottingham have the opportunity to participate in sport and go on to represent Great Britain in the future, by promoting sport in schools and supporting the volunteer organisations in local communities. The Council supports the Conservative Government’s ‘Sporting Future’ strategy, published in December 2015, to encourage more participation in sport across the board, with a particular focus on raising engagement levels amongst sections within the community with lower participation rates. As part of its commitment to ‘Make Nottingham the fastest growing city for disability sports participation in England’ the Council recognises:

- The importance of hosting sporting events in raising participation levels; and further resolves to;
- Place Nottingham’s sporting facilities at the forefront of the development of sports for people with disabilities;
- And ambitiously set itself the objective of holding as many international disability sporting events as possible by 2024.”

Councillors voted on the amended motion.

RESOLVED to carry the motion.