

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

held at the Council House, Nottingham,

on Monday 8 March 2010 at 2.00 pm

ATTENDANCES

✓ Councillor Packer	Lord Mayor
✓ Councillor Ahmed	✓ Councillor A Khan
✓ Councillor Akhtar	Councillor G Khan
✓ Councillor Arnold	✓ Councillor Klein
✓ Councillor Aslam	Councillor Lee
✓ Councillor Benson	✓ Councillor Liversidge
✓ Councillor Bryan	✓ Councillor Long
✓ Councillor Bull	✓ Councillor MacLennan
✓ Councillor Campbell	✓ Councillor Malcolm
✓ Councillor Chapman	✓ Councillor Marshall
✓ Councillor Clark	✓ Councillor Mellen
✓ Councillor Clarke-Smith	Councillor Mir
✓ Councillor Collins	✓ Councillor Morley
✓ Councillor Cresswell	✓ Councillor Munir
✓ Councillor Culley	Councillor Newton
✓ Councillor Davie	✓ Councillor Oldham
✓ Councillor Dewinton	Councillor Parbutt
Councillor Edwards	✓ Councillor Price
✓ Councillor Foster	✓ Councillor Smith
✓ Councillor Gibson	Councillor Spencer
✓ Councillor Griggs	Councillor Sutton
✓ Councillor Grocock	✓ Councillor Trimble
✓ Councillor Hartshorne	✓ Councillor Unczur
Councillor Heppell	✓ Councillor Urquhart
✓ Councillor Ibrahim	✓ Councillor Watson
✓ Councillor James	Councillor Wildgust
✓ Councillor Johnson	✓ Councillor Williams
✓ Councillor Jones	✓ Councillor Wood

68 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Edwards, Heppell, Mir, Newton, Spencer, Sutton and Wildgust.

69 HONORARY ALDERMAN MRS CROWE AND MR KEITH ALEXANDER

The Chief Executive reported the following recent deaths:-

Keith Alexander

Keith Alexander, died suddenly on 2 March 2010 at the age of 53 following the League Two football match between Notts County and Macclesfield Town at Meadow Lane.

Mr Alexander was a highly respected figure in British football and was born in Nottingham. He played as a winger for Elms Junior School football team between 1965 and 1970 and also played for Nottingham City Schools under-11s at the same time as Viv Anderson, who was the first black player in the senior England team. At a non-league level he played for several Nottinghamshire sides including Worksop, Clifton, Ilkeston Town, Kimberley Town and Alfreton Town.

The son of a miner, Mr Alexander became a professional footballer at the relatively late age of 28. But by the age of 34 he made history when, at Lincoln City, he became the first full-time black professional manager in the Football League.

His managerial career included a stint as assistant at Mansfield Town and spells as manager at Ilkeston Town, Lincoln City, where he led the club to four successive play-off campaigns, and at Peterborough. He was also Director of Football at Bury in 2007-08 before joining Macclesfield in 2008. His playing career also included international appearances for St. Lucia.

He was considered by many to have been a pioneer of the modern game.

Honorary Alderman Mrs Margaret Crowe

Honorary Alderman Margaret Bonython Crowe died on 7 March 2010.

Margaret Crowe was first elected as a member of the City Council on 6 May 1976 when she was elected to the Beechdale Ward, which she represented until May 1995. Margaret Crowe was made an Honorary Alderman at the City Council meeting on 8 January 2001.

Following her election, she served on the Appeals, Finance, Freeman's, Leisure Services, Planning, Public Services, Employment and Economic Development, Inner Area Programme and Policy and Resources Committees, and represented the Authority on a number of other internal and external bodies to which the City Council made appointments, but her chief interest lay in Leisure Services.

From 1976 to 1979, Margaret Crowe was Vice-Chair of the Leisure Services Committee and, in 1987/88, Chair of Leisure Services Committee, and Opposition Spokesperson for Leisure Services Committee from 1991 to 1995.

Councillor Culley, on behalf of the Conservative Group and Councillor Gibson, on behalf of the Labour Group, paid further tributes to the activities and personality of Honorary Alderman Mrs Crowe.

The Council stood in tribute to the memories of Keith Alexander and Honorary Alderman Margaret Crowe.

70 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

No declarations of interests were made.

71 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

The following petition was submitted:-

(a) Councillor Akhtar – Victoria Embankment Bandstand

Councillor Akhtar submitted a petition to the Lord Mayor on behalf on local residents, calling for the bandstand on Victoria Embankment to be

saved and used as a music venue. The petition contained 1,200 signatures.

(b) Public Questions

Due to the number submitted, the text of public questions considered at this meeting and the answers to them are included at Annex A to these minutes.

72 MINUTES

RESOLVED that, subject to recording the attendance of Councillor Cresswell, the minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2010, be confirmed and signed by the Lord Mayor.

73 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

The Chief Executive reported the following communications:-

Partnership Council Awards

The Central Division picked up awards in four categories from the Partnership Council. These were for Outstanding Work in the Community and Provision of High Standards of Works in the Neighbourhoods. The Partnership Council, a charity-based organisation, had worked closely with the City Council for many years. It reflected a community emphasis to provide many services to all wards from general advice to residents to work with the younger community.

Dream Scheme

Supervisors and the Central New Employment Apprenticeship Training service had won an award for their engagement and work with younger people. This promoted community involvement from all ages and provided clearance and planting schemes in some of the most deprived areas in the Division. The Dream Scheme was a privately funded arm of the Guinness Housing Trust.

74 QUESTIONS

Questions to the Nottinghamshire Police Authority.

There were no questions for either the Nottinghamshire Police Authority or the Nottinghamshire and City of Nottingham Fire and Rescue Authority.

Attitudes Towards the Privatisation of Local Authority Controlled Bus Companies

Councillor Arnold asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Area Working:

Could the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Area Working explain what the Council position is regarding the bus company in light of the privatisation of the bus company in Ipswich and the proposed privatisation in Plymouth?

Councillor Urquhart replied as follows:

Thank you Councillor Arnold for your question.

Councillors will probably be aware that back in 1986 the Transport Act deregulated the operation of bus services. Councils could keep the option to retain ownership of municipal companies, but this had to be at arms length and subject to competition law.

In Nottingham, the then Labour Council, led by Councillor Higgins, took the very brave step of retaining our ownership in the teeth of the Conservative Government's determination to regulate and privatize buses at that time. So, our bus company tenders on the same basis as all other commercial operators for contracted work and must operate on a commercially sound basis.

Since the 1980s, several municipal bus companies have been sold, but some significant ones still remain, including our own, Reading and Lothian Transport in Scotland. The City Council has consistently taken the view that a comprehensive, accessible, affordable bus network is essential on grounds of social inclusion, congestion relief and the sustainable development of our City.

We know that there is evidence from some comparable cities - I'm thinking of Bristol and Sheffield particularly, where privatization can lead to local networks being stripped down to core daytime routes, fares being higher and vehicle investment lower.

Nottingham is one of the few cities outside London which has experienced consistent passenger growth and has one of the most modern accessible fleets of buses in the country and also, as people know, a network integrated with the tram and park and ride. There remains in our City good coverage in evenings and at weekends and commuter fare levels represent good value. We have fleet investment and, clearly, the bus company being in our ownership also provides a dividend to the City Council.

So we remain of the opinion that there are significant benefits to retaining ownership of NCT and that full privatization could lead to a detrimental period of instability for passengers. We should also remember of course, that the company's commercial ethos is stimulated by the partial ownership of Transdev, who are the minority shareholder along with the City Council, and we feel that has been a helpful step, but one where we would not wish for NCT to become completely privatized.

Now, in the case of Plymouth and Ipswich, my understanding is that the main reason for their privatization was to raise funds to meet short term budgetary pressures. However, my concern would be that such a short term attitude would lead to longer term pressures, in terms of tendered bus services and concessionary fares budgets when the newly privatised companies strip back their more marginally commercial services and raise fare levels.

So, is it the case then that bus companies are at risk from Conservative Councils in particular, perhaps whose ideological commitment to privatization has long been known? Well, yes that would seem to be the case in terms of Plymouth. However, it is not only the Conservatives who would take this choice. In the case of Ipswich, privatization of the bus company had been refused several times by Ipswich when it was Labour controlled, but was agreed by a Tory and Lib Dem coalition. In Bournemouth, yellow buses were sold to Transdev, who are our partner in this City, but were sold wholly to Transdev after the Council went Liberal Democrat. There, in fact, the Conservatives opposed the sale. Eastbourne sold their buses to Stagecoach and, again, that was in

Liberal Democrat control at that point, and if you thought this was only an English issue, then Plaid Cymru in Wales, also sold their bus company.

So what I would say is that in Nottingham we recognize the value of a municipally owned bus company. We feel that that represents best value, not only financially, but also in terms of the bus services offered to our citizens, and I would say that that is a policy we would seek to retain. Nottingham's long standing opposition to selling the bus company remains the best policy, both for us financially and for our City in terms of their access to bus travel, and I don't think it's the case that any other parties would be able to say the bus company is in safe hands with them.

Concessionary bus pass benefits

Councillor Griggs asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Area Working:

Would the Portfolio Holder tell me what County Council residents can expect from their concessionary fares bus passes and others of course, and how does this compare with the benefits offered by the City scheme?

Councillor Urquhart replied as follows:

Thank you, Councillor Griggs for your question.

The County Council's concessionary scheme used to be one broadly similar to ours, indeed a local resident wrote to me only last week because it was his view that the County Council scheme was more generous than our own in the City. At the time I was able to respond that the two schemes had been broadly similar, but that perhaps he would have been right, and the County Council scheme had some elements in it that could be described as more generous than our City Scheme.

However, from 1 April 2010 the County Council will only provide the statutory minimum concessionary bus scheme comprising of free weekday travel from 9.30am to 11.00pm, and free travel at weekends. The additional benefits that were also provided will no longer be in place. So it has not taken long for travel benefits to older and disabled people to be reduced by the Conservative administration at County Hall.

The County will be continuing to fulfill its contractual obligations relating to line 1 of the tram, in which concessionary bus pass holders can get reduced and free travel on the tram. However, when the concession for phase 1 of the tram ends, we anticipate in September 2011, we understand that County residents will no longer be eligible for discounts and free travel on the tram.

So from April 2010, no more free weekday peak travel for blind people, and no more free travel passes for companions of disabled people, if those are residents in the County, and also, if you are a County resident, and you are elderly, and you like or need to go out in the morning before 7.30, you would have to pay. Or, if you like to go out in the evening, you'd need to make sure you got the 10.50 bus home, because you would have to pay after 11. If there are local community transport schemes in the County, the Dial-a-ride type service, those won't be discounted any longer.

In the City, on top of the statutory minimum scheme, the City will continue to add the following discretionary travel benefits for its residents which are:

- Free travel at all times on bus and tram for all categories of disabled City residents;
- Free companion passes for those eligible disabled residents;
- Free weekday bus travel for the elderly before 7.30am and after 11pm;
- Half fare discount on any of the Dial-a-ride type services;
- Free travel on the tram between 9.30am and 11pm on weekdays and all day at weekends.

So Councillor Griggs, in answer to your question, whilst under Labour control, the City and County schemes were broadly similar, containing a number of benefits above the national minimum to enable the elderly and the disabled to travel around, the consequences of Conservative control can now clearly be seen in reduced benefits for older people, and for disabled people, making those who are blind, elderly or disabled bear the price in terms of considerable reductions in their freedom to get about, and the Conservatives' determination at County Hall to cut spending.

Personal mentoring received by Councillor Collins

Councillor Culley asked the following question of the Leader of the Council:

Could the Leader of the Council explain the nature of the personal mentoring that he has received since 2005/06, and what value the public has received from the £111,000 spent to date?

Councillor Collins replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor. As I have previously made clear in a question to Council on this matter, I have not received any personal mentoring. I cannot therefore comment on the nature or value of something I have not had.

Riverside Care Home mismanagement

Councillor Morley asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Adult Support and Health:

Would the Portfolio Holder agree with me that users of Riverside Care Home deserve more from their Council than the mismanagement that led to the lapse of Mellors Court's registration as appropriate for people with learning disabilities, and the lack of clear consultation that led to users and their carers believing that they would be moving to refurbished or new-build accommodation, when they would not?

Councillor Campbell replied as follows:

Can I thank Councillor Morley for her question.

It is a fact that, whilst Mellors Court was under consideration, the regulators changed the room size requirements for establishments. This did now have an impact on the feasibility of NCC using Mellors Court as it made the option more expensive.

There exists a public misunderstanding that we were not able to pursue the Mellors Court option because of the licence lapse and that, had we reviewed the licence on time, we would have acquired it before the regulators changed the room size requirements. It is true that, in error, the registration for the property as an older person's establishment lapsed (a matter that was put right a few weeks' later). However, it is not true that, had we renewed this on time, that the room change requirements would not have applied to us.

Had we acquired Mellors Court for people with learning disabilities, CSCI would not register the home as appropriate for people with learning disabilities until all the building work was done. They would then inspect and agree the variation. At that point in time (i.e. on completion of the build) the rooms would all have to be the right size, otherwise change of use would not be agreed. This is why the licence lapse issue is a red herring.

With regard to the consultation, the relevant managers met with the families and carers of Riverside residents every 6 to 8 weeks from September 2006 and these meetings continue at this frequency to the present day. These meetings were set up to keep everyone informed about the alternatives being considered after the closure of Riverside and the future of Learning Disabilities Residential Services and when there was no update on Riverside, they were general information-sharing sessions. More recently they have been the forum for the formal consultation over the closure of Riverside.

At the same time, Nottingham City Council has invested in the Adult Placement Scheme (adult fostering in carers' homes). This investment is in recognition of the fact that this scheme provides more person centred long term care and short term breaks, than a residential establishment. This scheme now provides long term breaks for 37 and short term breaks for 26 citizens. This, combined with the current financial situation, means that new-build and expensive refurbishment no longer offers a value for money option.

Provisionally, alternative placements are available for all residents either in a Nottingham City Council older people's home, an Adult Placement Scheme or the independent sector. Short breaks will be provided from our other Learning Disability residential homes, for example Oakdene, at the same level as they are currently offered.

NCHA repairs at 103-109 Greencroft

Councillor Price asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Housing Delivery:

The Council must by now accept that Nottingham Community Housing Association are not going to repair the properties at 103-109 Greencroft as per their 55 year lease agreement with the Council, therefore will the Council now set a timetable for engaging in legal action to terminate the

lease with NCHA and bring these properties back under City Council control?

Councillor Liversidge replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor. These properties came to my attention at the end of last year, when I was out in the area knocking on doors actually. I asked at the time what was happening, and I was given an answer that was in accordance with the response that you got from the Property Services Department on Friday, which I think you actually got before I did. Their response was, and I'll quote exactly if I can:

“We are very concerned that the Nottingham Community Housing Association (NCHA) is not in occupation of these properties and has allowed them to become dilapidated. NCHA has been provided with a dilapidation survey setting out the works required to put the properties into good order.

However, the law in relation to such issues is complex, especially in areas involving long leases, with the consequence of reducing the Council's ability in enforcing repairing covenants under the lease. Consequently, we are actively seeking to negotiate with NCHA a surrender of the lease on suitable terms to allow the properties to be taken back into Council control.”

Now what we want to do with these properties, of course, is to take them back to use as 4 houses, for which we would need to do some work. The real issue with taking them to court is that it would be an expensive process, which might actually only achieve making them make good some of the work, so they could continue with it. We would hope not, and we would not rule that out in the future.

We're also pursuing outside the Property Services, with the Housing Strategy Department, we're pursuing the chief executive of NCHA, who has links obviously with the Strategy Department seeing as they are the largest housing association in Nottingham, with the most properties in Nottingham. If we don't get results from this, we will re-visit the legal action.

Question for Written Response

Fairham Day Centre

Councillor Clarke-Smith submitted the following question to the Portfolio Holder for Adult Support and Health for written response within five working days:

“Could the portfolio holder confirm the saving that was made by closing Fairham Day Centre, and how much the Council has spent in relocating and making alternative arrangements for residents elsewhere?”

75 EXTENSION OF COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS AND DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS

The report of the Leader of the Council as set out on pages 358 to 366 of the agenda, together with revisions to the printed schedule of meeting dates was submitted.

RESOLVED on the motion of Councillor Collins, seconded by Councillor Williams:-

- (1) the meeting of full Council scheduled for 12 April 2010 be cancelled;**
- (2) that the current membership of boards, committees and joint bodies be extended until the meeting of Council scheduled for 14 June 2010;**
- (3) the next meeting date of boards, committees and joint bodies, as detailed in the revised appendix, be agreed and current arrangements, including chairing arrangements continue until first meetings in June/July 2010;**
- (4) that the Annual Meeting proceed as scheduled on 10 May 2010, beginning at 5.00pm, for the purpose of electing the Lord Mayor and appoint the Deputy Lord Mayor and Sheriff for the ensuing year, notifying any appointment of the Lord Mayor’s Chaplain and making appointments to the Nottinghamshire and City of Nottingham Fire and Rescue Authority.**

76 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2010/11

The report of the Deputy Leader of the Council as set out on pages 366 to 369 of the agenda together with Annexe 1, circulated separately, was submitted.

RESOLVED on the motion of Councillor Chapman, seconded by Councillor Williams:-

- (1) that the 2010/11 Treasury Management Strategy document, including the strategy for debt repayment and the investment strategy, detailed in Annexe 1 to the report, be approved;**
- (2) that the Prudential Indicators and Limits from 2008/09 to 2012/13, as detailed in Appendix A within Annexe 1 to the report, be approved;**
- (3) that the revisions to Financial Regulations relating to treasury management, as set out in Appendix D within Annexe 1 to the report, be approved.**

77 NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL BUDGET 2010/11

The report of the Deputy Leader of the Council as set out on pages 370 to 377 of the agenda was submitted.

MOVED by Councillor Campbell by way of amendment and seconded by Councillor Collins:-

In recommendation 2.1 (1) add after "the revenue budget for 2010/11"

"subject to the following:-

That the proposed cost reduction in 2010/11 related to "People with LD Living in Residential Setting" (reference 114/501) is reduced by £0.115m to £0.110m and is reclassified as an Invest to Save scheme

That a sum of £0.115m from the Investment Reserve is used to support this proposal in 2010/11

That the proposed pressure for Care Package Provision (reference 114/1296) is reduced from £0.450m pa to £0.395m pa

That an investment of £0.055m pa is made for the conversion of the Laura Chambers Lodge Laundry and the provision of staff to support a drop-in service"

In recommendation 2.1 (2) add after "The capital programme for 2010/11 – 2012/13"

"subject to the following:-

That a new scheme is added for the conversion of Laura Chambers Lodge Laundry of £0.100m in 2010/11, to be funded from the capital element of the Performance Reward Grant"

And amend the following recommendations as indicated:

- In recommendation 2.1 (3) (a) substitute £993,192,276 for £993,077,276;
- In recommendation 2.1 (3) (b) substitute £720,475,636 for £720,360,636;

After discussion the amendment was put to the vote and was carried.

MOVED by Councillor Price by way of amendment and seconded by Councillor Culley:-

In recommendation 2.1 (1) add after "the revenue budget for 2010/11"

"subject to the following:-

that the proposed budgets for the following items are reduced by the indicated amount:

- discontinue the Arrow publication achieving a saving of £0.394m in 2010/11 and £0.415m in a full year
- reduce outside printing budgets by £0.300m pa
- introduce a bulk waste charge achieving an income of £0.192m pa
- discontinue the Impact publication achieving a saving of £0.052m in 2010/11 and £0.068m in a full year

- staff travel petrol allowances are reduced by £0.043m pa
- discontinue the Proud Campaign achieving a saving of £0.035m pa
- staff taxi budgets to be reduced by £0.016m pa
- reduce the European Office budget by £0.007m pa

That the proposed budgets for the following items are increased by the indicated amount:

- Invest £0.050m pa in the Service Directory
- Wilford and Beechdale Libraries £0.177m in 2010/11 and £0.127m pa
Removal of the Strategic Choice 112/419 relating to the Libraries Modernisation Programme and to enable Wilford and Beechdale Libraries to remain open.
- Summerwood Day Service budget to be increased by £0.268m pa
To increase the capacity of day services in Clifton.
- Riverside Care Home budget to be increased by £0.542m
To amend the Strategic Choice - Pressure 114/311 to enable Riverside Care Home to remain open until alternative provision is made available, pending the outcome of a review of delivery of respite care.

That a review of the following areas be undertaken

- The use of Agency Staff

In 2008/09 £13m was spent on the use of Agency staff. It is recommended that a full review of the use of Agency Staff be undertaken with the aim of achieving substantial savings in this area.

- The use of Consultants

In 2008/09 £20m was spend on the use of Consultants. It is recommended that a full review of the use of Consultants be undertaken with the aim of achieving substantial savings in this area.

That earmarked reserves be created to provide financial support for revenue spending in 2011/12 and 2012/13 from any savings from the review of Agency and Consultants costs.”

And amend the following recommendations as indicated:

- In recommendation 2.1 (3) (a) substitute £993,244,276 for £993,192,276;
- In recommendation 2.1 (3) (b) substitute £720,527,636 for £720,475,636;

After discussion the amendment was put to the vote and was not carried.

MOVED by Councillor Foster by way of amendment and seconded by Councillor Long:-

In recommendation 2.1 (1) add after “the revenue budget for 2010/11”

“subject to the following:-

That the Libraries Modernisation Programme saving (reference 112/419) is amended to reverse the decision to close Beechdale Library and the associated cost of £0.012m be found by a reduction in administrative costs elsewhere within the Library and Information Service”

After discussion the amendment was put to the vote and was not carried.

MOVED by Councillor Long by way of amendment and seconded by Councillor Foster:-

In recommendation 2.1 (1) add after “the revenue budget for 2010/11”

“subject to the following:-

that the proposed budget for Executive Assistants is discontinued with a saving of £0.017m pa

that the proposed budget for City Services in respect of Cleanest Major City is reduced by £0.900m pa (being the reversal of the £0.600m budget increase in 2009/10 and the reversal of the net £0.300m increase proposed for 2010/11)

that the proposed budget for Chief Executive Group is reduced by £0.506m pa; this to be achieved by:

- making the Arrow a more informative bi-monthly publication with a saving of £0.179m pa
- discontinuing the Proud Campaign with a further saving of £0.035m pa by increasing the proposed saving (reference 107/1047 - Various: Proud Campaign/Service Directory) to £0.060m pa
- increasing the proposed saving in the Corporate Marketing budget (reference 107/365 – Management Realignment) by £0.027m pa to £0.130m for 2010/11
- a reduction in the Corporate Communications budget of £0.077m pa
- rejecting the proposed pressure increase for Arrow (reference 107/359 – Sustaining Key Publications) with a saving of £0.038m pa

that the following proposed savings in 2010/11 are rejected:

- £0.138m in respect of Charging for the Supply of Wheeled Bins (reference 118/157)
- £0.147m in respect of Youth Activities (reference 110/506)
- £0.300m in respect of Highway Maintenance Programme (reference 102/224)
- £0.103m in respect of Business Support Fund (reference 109/295)

that the appropriate budgets are increased for the following proposed investments:

- £0.225m in respect of Occupational Therapy and Aids and Adaptations
- £0.075m in respect of 'one stop' sustainability advice provided by a Green Living Centre
- £0.100m in respect of highways tree trimming
- £0.100m in respect of other council land tree trimming
- £0.045m in respect of improved debt collection processes
- £0.040m in respect of better notification of licensing applications

that the proposed delivery of the £0.150m saving in respect of Review of Departmental Service Marketing Costs (reference 107/1087) is amended so that departments retain separate communications and marketing budgets and the move to a centralised corporate budget is rejected.

that a one-off invest to save scheme, to be funded from the Investment Reserve, of £1.000m in 2010/11 is used to fund projects to reduce energy usage and carbon emissions

that the £0.395m running costs of Victoria Leisure Centre in 2010/11 are met by a reduction in the Corporate Contingency from £2.060m to £1.665m“

In recommendation 2.1 (2) add after “The capital programme for 2010/11 – 2012/13”

“subject to the following:-

that the Victoria Leisure Centre rebuilding scheme be deleted (£4.875m in 2010/11 and £3.475m in 2011/12) and add Victoria Leisure Centre refurbishment scheme (£1.300m for condition survey work and £0.700m for additional refurbishment in 2010/11)

that new schemes are added for Purchase Equipment for Street Cleaning (£0.375m in 2010/11) and Carriageway/Footway Resurfacing (£2.500m in 2010/11 and £3.475m in 2011/12)

that a new scheme is added for Green Living Centre (£0.100m in 2010/11 to be funded from prudential borrowing)”

And amend the following recommendations as indicated:

- In recommendation 2.1 (3) (a) substitute £994,102,276 for £993,192,276;
- In recommendation 2.1 (3) (b) substitute £721,385,636 for £720,475,636;

After discussion the amendment was put to the vote and was not carried.

MOVED by Councillor Clarke-Smith by way of amendment and seconded by Councillor Price:-

In recommendation 2.1 (1) add after “the revenue budget for 2010/11”

“subject to the following:-

that the proposed budgets for the following items are reduced by the indicated amount:

- discontinue the Arrow publication achieving a saving of £0.394m in 2010/11 and £0.415m in a full year
- reduce outside printing budgets by £0.300m pa
- discontinue the Impact publication achieving a saving of £0.052m in 2010/11 and £0.068m in a full year
- staff travel petrol allowances are reduced by £0.043m pa
- discontinue the Proud Campaign achieving a saving of £0.035m pa
- staff taxi budgets to be reduced by £0.016m pa
- reduce the European Office budget by £0.007m pa

That the proposed budgets for the following items are increased by the indicated amount:

- Invest £0.050m pa in the Service Directory
- Wilford and Beechdale Libraries £0.177m in 2010/11 and £0.127m pa
Removal of the Strategic Choice 112/419 relating to the Libraries Modernisation Programme and to enable Wilford and Beechdale Libraries to remain open.
- Summerwood Day Service budget to be increased by £0.050m pa
To increase the capacity of day services in Clifton.
- Riverside Care Home budget to be increased by £0.542m
To amend the Strategic Choice - Pressure 114/311 to enable Riverside Care Home to remain open until alternative provision is made available, pending the outcome of a review of delivery of respite care.

That an earmarked reserve of £0.028m be established to fund the review of Day Care Services

And amend the following recommendations as indicated:

- In recommendation 2.1 (3) (a) substitute £993,332,276 for £993,192,276;
- In recommendation 2.1 (3) (b) substitute £720,615,636 for £720,475,636;

After discussion the amendment was put to the vote and was not carried.

RESOLVED on the motion of Councillor Campbell, seconded by Councillor Collins:-

(1) that the revenue budget for 2010/11, subject to:

the proposed cost reduction in 2010/11 related to "People with LD Living in Residential Setting" (reference 114/501) being reduced by £0.115m to £0.110m and reclassified as an Invest to Save scheme

a sum of £0.115m from the Investment Reserve being used to support this proposal in 2010/11

the proposed pressure for Care Package Provision (reference 114/1296) being reduced from £0.450m pa to £0.395m pa

an investment of £0.055m pa is made for the conversion of the Laura Chambers Lodge Laundry and the provision of staff to support a drop-in service

and including the following elements, be approved:-

- (a) the recommendations of the Chief Finance Officer in respect of the robustness of the estimates made for the purpose of the budget calculations and the adequacy of reserves;**
 - (b) the delegation of authority to the Deputy Chief Executive/Corporate Director for Resources in consultation with the Deputy Leader to finalise the Medium Term Financial Plan for publication;**
 - (c) the delegation of authority to the appropriate Directors to implement Strategic Choices proposals after undertaking the appropriate consultation;**
 - (d) the allocation of the Working Neighbourhoods Fund element of the Area Based Grant for 2010/11 and 2011/12 and that the impact of the remaining elements of the Area Based Grant as reported to Executive Board on 16 February 2010;**
- (2) that the capital programme for 2010/11 – 2012/13, subject to the following:**
- a new scheme being added for the conversion of Laura Chambers Lodge Laundry of £0.100m in 2010/11, to be funded from the capital element of the Performance Reward Grant**

and including the following elements, be approved;

- (a) delegated approval for future arrangements to manage the Greater Nottingham Transport Partnership initiative to the Corporate Director for Development in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Area Working and the Deputy Chief Executive/Corporate Director for Resources;**
 - (b) establishment of a capital allowance to avoid pooling of receipts generated from Housing Revenue Account land and building sales to be used to fund affordable housing and regeneration schemes.**
- (3) a net budget requirement of £272,716,640, including the calculations required by Section 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (“the Act”), be approved, as set out below:**
- (a) £993,192,276 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2) (a) to (e) of the Act;**
 - (b) £720,475,636 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3) (a) to (c) of the Act;**
 - (c) £272,716,640 being the amount by which the aggregate at (3)(a) above exceeds the aggregate at (3)(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year;**
 - (d) £172,345,328 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its General Fund in respect of the estimated formula grant, reduced by the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year to or from its Collection Fund;**

- (4) a City Council Band D basic amount of council tax for 2010/11 of £1,332.28 being the amount at (3)(c) above less the amount at 2.1(3)(d) above, all divided by the amount at (7)(c) below, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year (as set out in section 5 of the report);**
- (5) the setting of the amounts of council tax for 2010/11 at the levels described in section 5 of the report;**
- (6) the making of the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2010/11 in the terms of the previously adopted scheme;**
- (7) that the following be noted:**
 - (a) a Nottinghamshire and City of Nottingham Fire and Rescue Authority precept at Band D for 2010/11 of £69.69;**
 - (b) a Nottinghamshire Police Authority precept at Band D for 2010/11 of £160.11;**
 - (c) in January 2010, the City Council calculated the amount of 75,338 as its council tax base for the year 2010/11 in accordance with regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992 made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;**
 - (d) the introduction of a council tax reduction of £20 in 2010/11 to elderly residents, for one year only, who are not in receipt of Council Tax Benefit.**

The meeting concluded at 8.00 pm

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Question Submitted by Mr N Turner

“With regard to the proposed closure of Beechdale Library, why has the recent housing development plans for the Chalfont Drive Government Offices been overlooked? Surely, the building of several hundred new houses in the library's local area has considerable potential to increase the usage of Beechdale Library, thus rendering the case for the closure flawed and misleading.”

Response by Councillor Trimble

Thank you Lord Mayor and can I thank Mr Turner for his question.

The development plans for Chalfont Drive have not been overlooked; The Land Registry offices currently located on this site will not be vacated until 2015. And any further development would take further time beyond that to complete.

The size of Beechdale Library still remains an issue; it will still be difficult to provide a full range of library services from it because of the size. Both Aspley and Strelley libraries are within a mile of the proposed new development and both offer a full library service. Lord Mayor, on that basis, I don't accept that the case for closure is flawed and misleading.

Question Submitted by Mr R Ventrella-Hudson

“Why are there no speed or red light cameras at the junction of Eton Grove and Wollaton Road, at night it is like a race track, should also be a 7.5 ton weight limit. I have worked in London for the last three years, and they have stopped HGV'S in residential areas.

Why do large HGV vehicle have to gain access to the crown island shops via Eton Grove when school children use these roads for access to school, I am worried that the numerous times the trucks mount the kerb to get around the corner, that one day a child will be there. Trucks that need to go along Wollaton Road should have a permit. Keep them on the main arteries. If you need any help give me a call.”

Response by Councillor Urquhart

Thank you to Mr Ventrella-Hudson for raising this issue, which is in respect to the junction of Eton Grove and Wollaton Road.

In terms of introducing speed or red light cameras in Nottingham City or in the County, all of these are operated by a partnership including the police and road safety teams from both the City's highway authority and the County's highway authority. To ensure that the resources we have are effectively targeted to locations with the highest need the partnership has agreed a criteria based on recent road injury data which must be met before any safety camera enforcement can be considered.

Those criteria were the ones originally set by the Department for Transport and the partnership agreed to continue assessing things based on those same criteria. Recent data shows that at this particular location, over the last three years, there have only been two collisions both of which resulted in slight injuries and as such that level of accident would not lead this particular junction to be at the top of our list for meeting the criteria for red light enforcement activity.

Historically, looking back further than the last 3 years, levels of incidence at this junction have never met the criteria, and therefore we have to prioritise our and implement schemes where the casualties were occurring.

Mr Ventrella-Hudson also asks about HGV's and their access to that area. There are a number of businesses, including the community centre and health centre, that do require deliveries and those can involve the use of HGV's. To get to the point of access for the majority of the businesses access is only available from Harrow Road and therefore, via Eton Grove. There is no evidence that these vehicles are using this area inappropriately, only that they are accessing businesses in that area.

With regards to Wollaton Road, Mr Ventrella-Hudson suggests that any trucks that need to go along Wollaton Road should have a permit, Wollaton Road does serve a considerable portion of the City, and is considered as being an important arterial route which is necessary to move the traffic, including HGV's, through the area. So we wouldn't look to restrict HGV's in that area because that is encouraged to be used by HGV's rather than using the rather less appropriate Wollaton Vale.

Questions Submitted regarding Closure of Radford Unity Complex

Public Question: 3
Submitted by: Ms B Kaur

“Will the Council consider selling the RUC to the user groups or a consortium of them so that it can be retained for community use?”

Public Question: 4
Submitted by: Ms B Kaur

“No Equality Impact Assessment, No due diligence on the Inner Area Programme Grant conditions that the facility had benefited from No legal advice on the status of the groups? And not even taking the compact document into consideration? Given that the RUC had been a home to Community groups for nearly 20 yrs is it not unreasonable to evict them at such short notice without any compensation or transitional funding for at least a year?”

Public Question: 5
Submitted by: Mr R Singh

“If the groups are not able to find a new home by 31st March 2010, will the Council be locking them out?”

Public Question: 6
Submitted by: Ms C Kaur

“What legal powers are being used to evict the groups from RUC on a 3 month notice?”

Public Question: 7
Submitted by: Ms U Bhanot

“Dear Mr Collins I am a student and service user (including my family) at Radford Unity Complex- SCYS-Nottingham Teaching College. I would like to ask the question: There are very experienced Charities and community groups based at RUC who are willing to take on the management of the facility along the lines similar to what happens at Community Centres. Indeed there was an agreement for them to do so in 2000. This way the group could have brought in external funding and the Council would have made immediate saving on the rates. The revenue

expenditure would have been converted in to a tapered grant funding. The Council has repeatedly refused to consider this option. Exactly why is the Council treating the BME group's consortium in this disrespectful and discriminatory way?"

Public Question: 8
Submitted by: Ms S Hussain

"Dear Mr Collins I am a student and service user (including my family) at Radford Unity Complex- SCYS-Nottingham Teaching College. I would like to ask the question: Is the council aware that the help being offered to the group at RUC amount to: 1, Being told to sort yourself out? 2, Here are lists of properties for rent and sale. 3, Apply for a relocation grant of 3k if you have any hardship? Why are we not provided with the right level of support? Is it because we are BME organisations which are not a priority for the council?"

Public Question: 9
Submitted by: Mr P Johnson

"Dear Mr Collins I am a student and service user (including my family) at Radford Unity Complex- SCYS-Nottingham Teaching College. I would like to ask the question: All the evidence is that it can take 6 - 12 months to secure revenue funding to cover such as rent, hire charges, insurance, utilities, tel etc. It is also likely that this funding can only be secured from multiple sources. This fact can be independently verified from the Rowntree Foundation, Lottery or CVS. How does the council expect for the Community group to be able to cover these costs with a 3 month notice?"

Public Question: 10
Submitted by: Ms M Fury

"Dear Mr Collins I am a volunteer and service user (including my friends) at Radford Unity Complex- SCYS-Nottingham Teaching College. I would like to ask the question: Over the years the council has overseen demise of a number of prominent BME voluntary organisations and decommissioned very successful Libra(TRY) and Pehchan (SANMGAM) Projects and dispersed the resources elsewhere. Eviction of the BME groups from RUC on a 3 month notice without any revenue funding is a sure way of ensuring demise. Why does the Council want to shut them down?"

Public Question: 11
Submitted by: Mr S Ahmed

“Dear Mr Collins I am a volunteer and service user (including my family) at Radford Unity Complex- SCYS-Nottingham Teaching College. I would like to ask the question the council has agreed a Compact with the Voluntary sector yet at no point were the NCVS or the Community groups based at RUC consulted about the disposal of this valuable local hub of community activity. What is the rational for this?”

Response by Councillor Collins

Thank you Lord Mayor, and first can I thank all of those who have taken the time to submit and ask questions.

Radford Unity Complex is an old school building built in 1884. It is currently occupied by Council staff from Community & Leisure departments and by 6 community groups. All the running costs of the site are borne by the Council.

It costs a lot to run and is in a very poor state of repair. The building condition survey identifies that over £300k of investment is needed to bring it up to a reasonable standard, and furthermore, the site is not compliant with current standards under the Disability Discrimination Act. Finally, as part of the workplace strategy, Council staff currently occupying the building will be moved to Loxley House or to neighbourhood hubs in the not too distant future.

The Council has been talking to all groups since September 2009, when they were informed about a review of accommodation. All groups were encouraged to provide as much information on their organisation as possible to ensure that the review could be done thoroughly. Evidence about this communication between the Council and the Community Groups was recently presented to the Call-In sub-committee meeting held last Thursday the 4th of March.

On the basis of the findings of the review a decision was taken to close the Radford Unity Complex and support the relocation of the community groups and staff. An Equality Impact Assessment was carried out which highlighted no significant issues. This has now been shared with the

community groups. Groups were informed as soon as possible and work commenced immediately to help them with relocation.

Efforts have been made and support continues to be offered to all the organisations by both Council officers and other voluntary sector organisations like Nottingham Council for Voluntary Services. Council grant funding has been put aside to support groups with removal costs and rent at new premises. Nottingham CVS are advising groups on how to secure long term funding. Two groups have already agreed to move to alternative premises and their accommodation costs will be met by the Council.

The Council will not consider an asset transfer to one or a consortium of groups who occupy the building. Not only would it break with the best practice principles outlined in the Quirk Review on Community Asset Transfer, but also it would be wrong to sell the building in the condition that it is, needing the investment it does to groups that are already financially stretched.

A question has been raised regarding conditions attached to an Inner Area Programme Grant which was made in the 1980's for improvements to the complex. The Council is investigating this point. However, as the grant was made over 20 years ago the Council doesn't expect there will be any problem in obtaining a dispensation for any outstanding conditions.

Lord Mayor, today we present our budget to the full council. It's a budget that has been undertaken under unprecedented pressure both in terms of reduced revenues and increasing financial obligations. We have, like all councils up and down the country, been forced to make tough choices. We can no longer justify keeping open the Radford Unity Complex given its high running costs and the costs of completing the dilapidations and DDA works.

This decision has been through a full budget process, has been subject to consultation and an unprecedented call in by Overview & Scrutiny sub-committee and the decision is now made. The job for the Council is to focus time and resources on helping to find accommodation for the tenants that have not found alternative accommodation thus far.