

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

held at the Council House, Nottingham,

on Monday 13 December 2010 at 2.00 pm

ATTENDANCES

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

45 URGENT ITEM OF BUSINESS

The Lord Mayor informed Council that, although not included in the agenda, a report of the Portfolio Holder for Employment and Skills on the proposed changes to education support for young people would be considered as a matter of urgency in accordance with Section 100(B)(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972, in view of the detrimental impact the changes would have on students in Nottingham and on the local economy, and the need for this Council's concern to be heard within the national debate on this subject. Councillor Mellen confirmed that, if the additional report was considered by the meeting, he would withdraw his motion.

Council was also informed that it was proposed that 5 external representatives speak on the urgent report.

The introduction of the external speakers was debated and put to the vote and carried.

RESOLVED

- (1) that with a majority agreement, 5 external representatives be permitted to speak on the urgent report;**
- (2) that it be noted that Councillor Mellen had withdrawn his motion.**

Councillors Akhtar, Benson, Clarke-Smith, Culley, Davie, Foster, Long, Marshall, Morley, Oldham, Price, Spencer and Sutton requested that their vote against the external speakers being introduced be recorded.

46 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Bryan, MacLennan and Heppell.

47 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Gibson declared a personal interest in agenda item 9, Review of the Statement of Licensing Policy, as he was a Council appointed member of the Highbank and Clifton Community Centres which both had bars, which did not preclude him from speaking or voting.

Councillor Arnold declared a personal interest in agenda item 3(c), questions to Councillors relating to Building Schools for the Future Programme, as she had a child affected by the decision on the Programme, which did not preclude her from speaking or voting.

48 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS FROM CITIZENS

Questions from citizens

The following question from a citizen was received:

Higher Education fee increases

The following question was asked by Ms Tayamina Aston to the Portfolio Holder for Employment and Skills:

I am a student at Nottingham Trent University. In April of this year, Nick Clegg stated in his Manifesto that he would keep his promise and oppose these rises. However, as usual, these seem to be empty and broken promises. Does the Portfolio Holder agree that the Lib Dems have broken their promise?

Now I understand that these increases may not affect me, but it will definitely affect the next generation. I am 18 years of age and I have a reasonably large family. What is more, my mother is disabled and my father is her legal carer and we mainly live off benefits. Therefore, without the opportunity for funding, I would not have had the opportunity or chance to go to university. Does the Portfolio Holder agree that young people from poorer families would be put off by these increases? This is the same for my younger sister who is in her final year at secondary school and wishes to go to college and university. She is the main reason I am writing to you. I don't believe that people like me and my sister should have to pay for the Government's mistakes. Does the Portfolio Holder also agree that these Conservative Ministers must have no idea of the impact of their decision on Nottingham's young people?

In addition, the more fees that are increased the less students will want to go to university and as unemployment rates are soaring, poverty in this City and country will increase every year, instead of getting rid of it. Also who can decide exactly how much education should cost? Does the Portfolio Holder agree that young people and old gaining knowledge through education, is a value for the whole of society and that this

massive increase in fees passes the entire cost of university to students. Basically stating that there is no benefit to society of me and others like me being highly educated.

So this is what they want? To make the rich richer and the poor poorer. When will they realise that there are other ways and ways that don't make things 100 times worse than they are already?

Councillor Ahmed replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor. This question was asked of the Leader, but since it's my brief, I will respond.

It is clear from Ms Aston's question, just how strongly she feels about this issue. I share this strength of feeling as do hundreds of thousands of others, a few of whom will be joining us later to discuss a report on this matter. Without pre-empting the discussion later, I do feel that it is important to address this question.

The Council will be aware that last Thursday the Bill to introduce this ill thought out tripling of tuition fees passed through the key stage in the House of Commons by a majority of 21, with many Liberal Democrats, including their 2 ex-Party Leaders and 6 Tory MPs voting against the measures, but more breaking their pre-election promise to oppose any rise in the fees. This was a sad day for young people in Britain and in Nottingham. The figures are stark, fees of £6,000 leaving an approximate post university debt of £30,000, with fees of £9,000 upping this to £38,000. This is an extraordinary burden for any young person to consider taking on. I agree wholeheartedly with Ms Aston that this will obviously discourage young people from poorer backgrounds going to university. I also share Ms Aston's fear that the Government is imposing this without understanding the serious impact this will have on Nottingham's people. This is a Government that preaches localism, but practices anything but. There is no consideration from the Government of what skills and jobs people in Nottingham need and, more importantly, no plan on how to achieve it. Increases in fees combined with other cuts in the benefit system, including the withdrawal of the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) are especially going to hit people on low income and disadvantaged communities hard.

Ms Aston I read you a quote from a newspaper, none other than the Daily Mail, which comments 'we worry that graduates will have to start

paying money back at about the time they are buying their first house and starting a family, crippling them financially, just when they try to become fully fledged members of society'.

We have two world class universities in Nottingham, but Councillors will know just how good our Universities are, what they may not know is that the progression into higher education by Nottingham students has been increased by 37% over the last 9 years. This has included progression from young people in our most deprived areas. Does anyone in this Chamber really believe that hiking up fees, not to improve educational standards, but instead to pay for Government cuts in funding, allied to EMA will build on this success? I certainly don't. This new system will be up and running by 2012, which means that Ms Aston's sister will be one of the first to be affected. I dearly hope that these fees will not put her off university. I hope more that by then the Government have seen sense and withdrawn this extraordinarily short sighted move. Nottingham needs young people like Ms Aston's sister to go to University and become Nottingham's doctors, teachers, police, accountants, lawyers, architects and much, much more. Thank you Lord Mayor.

Petitions from Councillors on behalf of citizens

(a) Councillor Collins - Heating card top up machine

Councillor Collins submitted a petition to the Lord Mayor on behalf of 300 people, requesting the installation of a heating card top up machine at the Robin Hood Chase Post Office in St Ann's.

(b) Councillor Akhtar - Conduit Close and Healey Close residential parking scheme

Councillor Akhtar submitted a petition to the Lord Mayor on behalf of over 40 residents of Healey Close and Conduit Close in the Meadows, requesting the introduction of a residential parking scheme.

(c) Councillor Long - Beech Avenue and Gladstone Street speed bumps

Councillor Long submitted a petition to the Lord Mayor, from residents around Gladstone Street and Beech Avenue, Forest Fields, requesting that the speed bumps in the area be replaced with smoother, less angular, speed bumps

49 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the last meeting held on 11 October 2010, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed and signed by the Lord Mayor.

50 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

The Chief Executive reported the following communications:

East Midlands in Bloom

The Meadows Library Garden had been awarded East Midlands in Bloom Award in partnership with the Royal Horticultural Society.

Nottingham City Council supported the residents in Strelley and Bilborough to enter the Urban category in this year's East Midlands in Bloom and they received a silver award and were overall winners in the Urban Communities category. Local volunteers from Strelley, Hilary Wheat and Susan Ward-Rice, attended the East Midlands in Bloom Awards presentation on Wednesday 14 September in Northampton to receive the award.

Towle Memorial Garden also received a judges award, which was rarely given, for the work done by four generations of the Roper family, encouraging comments from the judges about the standard of the entry were also received.

Institute of Sport and Recreation Management

John Wileman, Head of Sport and Leisure completed his year as President of the Institute of Sport and Recreation Management and received his past President badge at the Conference this year. Holding this post positioned Nottingham and Nottingham City Council on the national landscape for sport over the last 12 months.

Woman of Influence Award

Many congratulations to Councillor Sue Johnson who received a Woman of Influence Award at the annual Women of Influence fundraising lunch. The Women of Influence Awards were originally aimed at volunteers, but organiser Carol Parkinson was so impressed by Councillor Johnson's

work, she added an extra award for her work as Director of Prostitution Outreach Workers.

Councillor Development Charter

On 10 November Nottingham City Council became the first City Council in the East Midlands to achieve the Councillor Development Charter. The Charter recognised the Council's commitment to Councillor Development across the Council from officers and Councillors from all parties.

Honorary Alderman Angela Pink

Honorary Alderman Angela Pink passed away on 21 October 2010.

Angela Pink was elected in May 1976 and served as a Councillor until 1991. She was the fourth generation of her family to be involved in local politics. She lived in The Park and was local ward Councillor for the area.

She was married to her husband, Ian, for 33 years and had 2 children.

The Council stood in silence as a tribute to her memory.

51 QUESTIONS

Dunkirk Fire Station closure – impact on response times

Councillor Price asked the following question of the Chair of the Fire Authority:

Does the Chair of the Fire Authority understand the anger and the disappointment felt by Clifton and Wilford Area Committee when it was reported at a recent meeting that response times on average were 90 seconds slower than before the Dunkirk Fire Station was closed, being a direct contradiction of what Clifton and Wilford residents and Councillors were told by the Fire Authority before the closure?

Can he assure me that any current rationalisation of services would include response times and that these are honestly reported to local residents and their democratically elected representatives?

Councillor Pulk replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Price for his question.

I'll start with a bit of background information. As Chair of the Fire Authority, I've been made aware of the concerns of the Clifton and Wilford Area Committee, following receipt of a copy of a letter from the Chair of Clifton and Wilford Committee, Councillor Malcolm, to the Chief Fire Officer last week. The Chief Fire Officer has informed me he will be forwarding a detailed response to Councillor Malcolm, in his capacity of Chair of the Committee, this week. The Chief Fire Officer has also informed me that visits were made by Officers, including himself, in his previous role as Assistant Chief Fire Officer, to inform and update the Clifton and Wilford Committee, following their request, regarding the merger of the former Dunkirk and Beeston Fire Stations. This was at the invitation of the former Vice-Chair of the Fire Authority, Councillor Charlesworth, who was, at that time, also a member of the Clifton and Wilford Committee. During his visit, the then Assistant Chief Fire Officer, clarified the issue of attendance times and assures me that he did, in fact, acknowledge that there may be an increase in attendance times on some occasions. However, this would be mitigated by more positive action in encouraging the installation of smoke detectors and increasing activity in the carrying out of home safety checks by operational crews from the new Highfields and West Bridgford Stations. I am unaware that any information given by the Fire Authority, or by officers of the Fire Service has been misleading.

In respect of attendance times, each Fire Authority have, since 2003, been responsible for setting their own standards in line with their individual Integrated Risk Management Plan. The Integrated Risk Management Plan is an ongoing process and is subject to wide consultation, all members of the City Council will have had and will continue to be consulted, and have the opportunity to input into this process. The standards set out in the Integrated Risk Management Plan for Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue, is to attend 90% of all incidents within a 10 minute envelope, criteria which the Service not only achieves, but exceeds, the current level of attendance is 92% within that time. I do not have the specific details regarding Clifton/Wilford in isolation, as your question was only received on Friday. However, I am more than willing to provide a written answer, or come back to Council with detailed information regarding incident type, trends, attendance times and impact of Fire Service activities within the Clifton/Wilford area. I would hope this

would allay the concerns of the Committee and City Councillors that they have been placed at greater risk, or misled from the previous decisions around the merger of Dunkirk and Beeston Fire Stations.

In respect of your point regarding future rationalisation of the Service, I can confirm that the Chief Fire Officer and his team are currently concluding a comprehensive review of our cover throughout the City and County. The finding of this review will be formally presented to the Fire Authority in late February 2011 and if approved by the Fire Authority, the recommendation will be subject to a comprehensive period of consultation, before reporting back again to the Authority in June 2011. No decision will be made until then, although, if approved for consultation in February, the report will lay out clear and comprehensive options for further service delivery. I personally, and I am sure the Chief Fire Officer, would be pleased to present these options to the City Council and discuss any implications are part of the consultation. We will also ensure that the Clifton and Wilford Area Committee are specifically invited to respond.

Thank you Lord Mayor.

Science Cities – GCSE results

Councillor Morley asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services:

Given that Nottingham is justly proud of being one of only six Science Cities in the UK, are our GCSE results in science subjects enabling our young people to take advantage of the wonderful opportunities already within our city?

Councillor Mellen replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Morley for her question.

National Indicator 84 measures the proportion of pupils achieving 2 or more A*-C grades in Science GCSEs or equivalent.

Latest figures published for the 2009 GCSE outcomes show that 49.8% of pupils in Nottingham achieved that measure. This was above the mean of statistical neighbour authorities which was 47.0%, in line with

the mean of all 6 Science Cities (49.9%), but below the national average of 53.7%.

From 2006 to 2009 the Nottingham outcomes at this measure rose by 22.2 percentage points from 27.6% to 49.8%, an increase from 752 to 1,388 pupils. This was the highest percentage point increase in any of the Science Cities. The average 4 year increase across all Science Cities was 14.6 percentage points.

Indicative data for this year from the National Consortium for Examination Results show that outcomes have continued to rise, with over 55% of Nottingham school and academy pupils achieving 2 or more A*-C grades in Science GCSE or equivalent. So although we are not complacent and better grades are looked for on a year to year basis, there is evidence that improvements are taking place in Science results and that this will enable more young people in Nottingham to access the opportunities that Science City provides.

Individual Ward Budgets

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

The rationale for giving Councillors individual budgets for their wards was so that they can respond to meet local needs in a timely manner. This is not facilitated by the current single gateway process. Can the Portfolio Holder explain why it is easier and quicker for Council to spend £50,000 than it is for a Councillor to release £500 for community groups or local causes?

Councillor Urquhart replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Spencer for his question.

Although in a matter of not very many minutes from now, we anticipate the Tory and Liberal Democrat Government information on reducing the money that comes into our City by millions of pounds, that will impact on all of our spending, whether through Council decision, Executive Board or Portfolio decision, and potentially the levels of money the Councillors can allocate within their wards and is also likely to impact on voluntary and community groups and also on the day of the Localism Bill, perhaps

I should not be surprised Councillor Spencer, that you are concerned with the local rather than the impact that your Government is having on our City. I am sure Councillor Spencer would agree with me, that even spending small amounts of public money, we do have to make sure we have a process in place to ensure accountability and we have made the process as streamlined as possible, and we do review it regularly. Unfortunately, as Councillor Spencer, in his question, has not provided me with a specific example, my response will need to be general.

The single gateway process is the one that is used for Area Committee grants and ward Councillor budget allocations to voluntary and community groups. This process does require community groups to complete a short, single page application form and for those groups who have not been funded since 2008, they do also need to supply supporting documents, such as a constitution, annual accounts and an equal opportunities statement and if they have expenditure for one item over £250, they do have to break down the costs and evidence that value, because that is required by the Council's financial regulations. A recent review of grant applications received by the single gateway did find that waiting for groups to supply such information was a major cause of delays in the grant making process. Groups do often complete the short application form, but often don't attach the other documents that I have just mentioned. To address this the officer working most closely with the group, and in the case of ward Councillors budgets, this is usually the Neighbourhood Action Officer, ought to be working to check that the groups understand what is needed and, if necessary, to assist them in collecting that information. Once all the information is received, the assessment is completed, then the delegated decision form is completed and signed, and this ought to be within 48 hours. Instructions should then be issued to the payments section and most ward Councillor allocations should be treated as urgent, meaning that they should be taking about 4 days to be received into the group's bank account.

An officer from the single gateway is available to talk to ward Councillors about the process and I understand that Councillors who have taken up this offer have found that it has been beneficial to both them and groups who they represent.

But of course, that's the process that has been set in place, but I suspect Councillor Spencer that you do have a specific example of an organisation where this process has not proceeded smoothly, and things don't always go as they should. I suspect you will tell me about the

specific example in a supplementary question and I am quite happy to take on that case and find out why the system didn't work as it should for that application, and of course, to take action to further improve our system, if necessary. Had difficulties such as these been brought to me before now, I would have already taken that action and could have done something before now, but of course that would have solved the problem, rather than raising some publicity.

National Apprenticeship Scheme

Councillor Culley asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Employment and Skills:

Will the Portfolio Holder join me in welcoming the 75,000 new adult apprenticeships announced in the spending review, and in particular the National Apprenticeship Service's 100 in 100 Apprenticeship Scheme, that will be led in Nottingham by the Chamber of Commerce and the Evening Post?

Councillor Ahmed replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Culley for her question.

We are pleased that the Nottingham Post and Nottingham Chamber of Commerce have joined forces to find 100 apprenticeships within 100 days.

I understand that the opportunities will be open to everyone, of any age and that the Evening Post, the Chamber, and the National Apprenticeship Service, are asking Nottinghamshire businesses to take on an apprentice.

I understand that the campaign, 100-in-100, will launch on 11 January 2011, in an event staged at the East Midlands Conference Centre.

Businesses will be invited to attend and asked to pledge to take on apprentices, while the Chamber and National Apprenticeship Service will explain how the scheme works.

However, it should also be understood that the introduction of Apprenticeships comes by the current Government at the cost of a

significant loss in the number of Train to Gain places. This was announced by the Government in the Comprehensive Spending Review.

Train to Gain was a flagship scheme introduced by the previous Labour Government, to equip employees with level 2 skills. Providers based in Nottingham delivering this scheme were paid £11.5m in 2009/10 to deliver qualifications to over 14,000 employees.

Nationally Train to Gain was a £1.4 billion a year programme. In 2009, 1.2 million people accessed the programme at a unit cost of £970. A success rate of 71% for more than 1 million learners. Whilst there was some criticism on the programme, overall it improved the quality and quantity of training and was accessed by hard to reach segments of employees. The £250 million Apprenticeship Scheme will be implemented by 2014/15, but a measured reduction in the Train to Gain programme would seriously damage Nottingham and the UK's skills base and industry's competitiveness. While large companies can meet their employees training needs, it is small employers who will suffer most. The reduced tariff to Skills for Life programme are also going to hit low paid workers and employers, when we all know that 1 in 5 people have a very low level of literacy and numeracy.

The positive news regarding the 100 apprenticeships to be offered in Nottingham by the Chamber of Commerce therefore has to be placed in the context of this loss of far greater numbers of training opportunities for our citizens. Personally, I am a very keen supporter of apprenticeship frameworks and we will proactively and pragmatically engage with the Government's apprenticeship programme and ensure that residents of Nottingham benefit from it. Nottingham City Council is one of the lead Authorities in the Country to set up a 200 place apprenticeship scheme for residents of Nottingham during the last year.

Thank you.

Nottingham's Grant Settlement

Councillor Williams asked the following question of the Deputy Leader:

Could the Deputy Leader explain when we can expect an announcement on Nottingham's grant settlement and why there has been a delay?

Councillor Chapman replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Williams for his question.

A statement on the provisional 2011-12 and 2012-13 Local Government Finance Settlement will be made to the House of Commons today at around 3.30pm.

Once the Secretary of State has made the announcement DCLG will release summary information for each Local Authority through their website.

Detailed information on the content of the settlement for Nottingham will then be released over the following few hours. We will be able, therefore, to announce to the meeting, what the broad settlement is, we hope.

Although there has been no confirmation from the Government of the reason for the delay in the release of the settlement details, a number of potential causes have been raised by reliable commentators, Civil Servants, who for some reason, it seems, seem very woolly to talk and I can't think why.

These include:

- the initial modelling of the grant settlement indicated an unforeseen and untenable level of grant reduction for Shire districts. This issue can only have been resolved by redistributing grant from other categories of Councils, which may mean Unitaries and Metropolitans and may have an implication for us;
- a similar issue for Police Authorities. Again, it is suggested that the Government's initial modelling showed a grant reduction that could not be delivered, so they're fiddling around with the Police settlement;
- there has been widespread opposition to the way the grant reductions have been front-loaded. Again, this is from Conservative Councils, because they don't listen to us. This is widely viewed to be unnecessary and damaging. The question is – has the Secretary of State got any room for manoeuvre or is he locked in to this profile of cuts? We know that he has been back to the Treasury asking for more money. We also are told that he has received a cold response.

So, in reality, the reason for the delay is likely to be a combination of these issues and we still don't know what sort of settlement we are going to get, because of this confusion. But some of the confusion also can be attributed to the style of the Secretary of State, who does tend to leap before he looks, and then, whilst in mid air, tries to step back. As a consequence, we end up with confusion and chaos, but we will see. But this is not the real point, the real point is that in a couple of hours' time we will know the grant level. Now we have been told variously, by Mr Cameron and Mr Osbourne and Mr Clegg, that we are all in it together, that is Mr Osbourne. We are also told that the Government will not cut the deficit in a way that hurts those who most need help, and that is Mr Cameron. We will rebalance the economy towards to areas that most need it, and that is Mr Clegg. Now unless there has been a conversion of damascene proportions, we know that in this settlement, Nottingham and its people will suffer disproportionately. There is a chance, a strong chance, we will lose up to £60 million pounds worth of Government grants, which is enormous. And it will hit the worst off, in the worst off areas. So as a consequence, we will not, therefore, be all in it together, those who are most in need will suffer and it is likely to be the young and the old and the worst off. And other areas in the South and the Shires are likely to do better so the economy will not be rebalanced. It was interesting, when I was in London, on his initial announcement, the Evening Standard said 'London gets away with it' I remember picking up the newspaper and seeing that headline, London gets off lightly, I think it was something of that sort. So there we have 3 broken promises to add to the ones we are going to be discussing later on this afternoon. We will do our best in this Council to alleviate the impact. We will do our best to make what is very unfair, as fair as possible, but it is going to be extremely hard and I do recall members of the Opposition saying that if it disproportionately hurts this City, then they would be willing to go down to lobby with us, to the Government, to put our case and I am still going to hold them to that.

Building Schools for the Future

Councillor Arnold asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services:

Could the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services update the meeting on Building Schools for the Future in Nottingham?

Councillor Mellen replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Arnold for her question.

As has been previously reported at Council, the Building Schools for the Future programme has had a significant effect on the standard of school buildings in Nottingham. New schools have been built at Bigwood and Oakfield College, and Hadden Park School has been completely renovated. These are in addition to the Academy schemes at Bulwell and Bilborough, the new Southwark Primary and the New Nottingham Academy in Mapperley and Bakersfield currently under construction. The only BSF school currently under construction is the Rosehill Special School in St Ann's, due to be completed in the spring or summer of next year. In addition there are currently 5 BSF schemes that are detailed as 'unaffected' following the Ministerial announcement on the 5 July this year. These schemes are part of the original Wave 2 and the indicative funding is as follows:

- Ellis Guilford School and Sports College approximately £11.9m;
- Bluecoat School and Technology College (Margaret Glen Bott site only, the money for the Aspley Lane site having been cancelled) approximately £10.6m;
- Farnborough School and Technology College approximately £17.2m;
- Nethergate Special School approximately £3.2m and;
- Woodlands Special School approximately £1.2m.

Since the Ministerial announcement by Mr Gove when these schemes were in the category of 'unaffected', there has been a change of heart. The Secretary of State announced on The World at One on BBC Radio 4 on the 24 October that these schemes, previously announced as 'unaffected' now required a 40% reduction. A reduction that cannot possibly be achieved by efficiencies or minor savings, but a reduction in funding that would have significantly affected what would be able to be achieved within the financial envelope. However, in accordance with Mr Gove's consistent line of inconsistency, a further change has occurred, and following the Comprehensive Spending Review in October 2010 the BSF Team at the City Council has been asked to review the schemes above with a view to making some savings (but 40% was not mentioned in this request). So the City Council has submitted its saving proposals to the Partnership for Schools earlier this month, as requested, and a decision on them as to whether they are acceptable is expected to be

given by the Secretary of State for Education by 20 December 2010 we are told. Although who knows when the announcement will be made and what it will say.

Meanwhile, these 5 school communities who have done a huge amount of work in participating in planning and design consultation, and where there is a huge sense of anticipation of what this much needed funding will achieve, wait to see what will happen. Although Rosehill Special School is the only scheme currently in construction, Ellis Guilford School is currently in the planning application stage and, subject to response on savings mentioned previously, construction will hopefully start on this scheme early next year. A final business case for the Ellis Guilford scheme is due to be presented to the Executive Board on 21 December, however the funding amount is yet to be confirmed by the Secretary of State.

In October this year the Council lodged papers in the Leeds Administrative Court requesting permission to apply for a Judicial Review of the Secretary of State for Education's decision of 5 July to stop the funding for Top Valley and Trinity Schools. This has previously been reported and debated at Council. I am pleased to report today however, that following a judge's ruling at the end of November, we have been granted permission to proceed to the next stage. After reviewing the papers submitted by the Council, the Honourable Justice Langstaff has stated that the claim raises arguable issues which merit a full hearing. The case is listed for the week commencing 24 January at a hearing which could last 5 days. The hearing will consider similar challenges made by Luton, Waltham Forest and Kent, all of whom have been given leave to seek Judicial Review.

Sports Development Partnership funding – impact on childhood obesity

Councillor Edwards asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services:

What is the likely impact of the withdrawal of external funding for Sports Development Partnerships for Nottingham? What impacts will such changes have on the Portfolio Holder's ambition for reducing childhood obesity?

Councillor Mellen responded as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Edwards for his question.

The Government announced cuts amounting to half a million pounds to the school sports partnerships in Nottingham in the Comprehensive Spending Review in November.

This money, for Nottingham's two School Sports Partnerships, has provided children in City schools with enhanced opportunities in sport and physical activity for the past decade, with the aim of providing at least three hours of sport every week as well as an additional two hours of sport in their communities.

Although this has not been achieved consistently across the City, since Schools Sports Partnerships were established thousands more young people have taken part in sports activities as part of the school curriculum, lunchtime and after-school sport and through competitions, coaching and sports leadership development. Many have gone on to join community sports clubs as local links have been developed and opened up.

The competition programme within the Nottingham City School Sports Partnership is the largest in the county, providing for twenty different sports at secondary level, with most of these having a two-tier competitive system; elite and development. This is in addition to the many opportunities in competitive and development formats at primary school, where the primary competition offer also has a variety of opportunities from festivals to central venue leagues, again many of which are aligned to the National Competition Pathway.

The Competition Manager assists in aligning these sports on the National Competition Pathway which starts with family, school participation, and progresses through to county, regional and national competition.

The partnerships have supplemented the strong existing infrastructure in Nottingham in a small number of high profile sports such as football, basketball and cricket by making other sports such as dance, cheerleading and boccia (for young people with special needs) all more accessible.

In addition, 2500 hours of dedicated sports-led coaching took place in 2010/2011. Feedback from teachers and pupils shows that this had a significant effect on staff teaching. Secondary schools involved in the partnership entered on average 35 teams each into the Schools Partnerships competitions calendar in 2009/2010. This programme annually provided over 500 year 10 and 11 pupils with training and deployment in sports leadership, preparing them for the world of work. Through this work, as well as the promotion of schools undertaking a greater number of hours per week offering PE, the partnerships have also helped to tackle Nottingham's serious obesity levels amongst young people.

By cutting the funding for the partnerships, the fear is that the coherence and pressure that has been established to promote physical activity amongst young people across the City will be lost. Obesity is a serious issue for young people in Nottingham, and although there are eating disorders amongst a small proportion, this issue has been addressed under the wider heading of healthy weight; this must not disguise the very real problem of children being overweight and this having a real impact on their life chances. Obesity rates in the UK have more than doubled in the last 20 years. In England almost two thirds of the adult population is overweight or obese. In Nottingham City over one third of children aged 10-11 and nearly 63% of adults are overweight or obese. Trends in childhood obesity are of particular concern. Obesity has been rising rapidly in children in England over the last 25 years. The proportion of children classified as obese has nearly doubled for 4-5 year olds, and has increased more than three-fold for children aged 10-11 years over that time.

Thankfully this increase may be starting to level off as the rate of increase for child obesity has slowed compared to the increase observed between 1995 and 2004, but there is no room for complacency. Although Nottingham's children have similar levels of obesity to the England average at age 4-5, levels are 11% higher than England's average by 10-11. Amongst 10-11 year olds one fifth of children measured were obese and over one third were overweight. This is on a par with obesity levels in 10-11 year olds in similar areas.

Causes of childhood and adult obesity are complex and cannot just be put down to a lack of physical activity. The increase in availability of fast food and food high in sugar and fat together with a strong link between adults who are overweight and their children is also having an issue in

this area which are also contributory factors. But it is common sense that a tendency towards a more sedentary lifestyle has increased the chances of being overweight, in these circumstances ceasing the funding for something which set a good record of getting children more active, equipped teachers to teach and coach a variety of sports and physical activities, and linked Nottingham's youngsters to clubs where they might pursue sport outside school, is at best short sighted and at worst dangerous given the effect that obesity can have on health. We do take some comfort from Mr Gove being corrected by his boss Mr Cameron and then the Culture Secretary now promising a rethink on spending in this area. The rethink follows a growing backlash against plans to end the £162 million in direct funding from the last government sports and PE strategy. More than 70 top athletes including Denise Lewis, Olympic heptathlon champion, and world diving champion Tom Daley wrote to Mr Cameron saying that the policy was ill-conceived and risked efforts to deliver a genuine legacy from the Olympics in terms of encouraging sports participation. A review of this area is promised, and awaited here with expectation at the City Council. In the meanwhile, we await news of announcements as to how school sports and physical activity in Nottingham will be funded and encouraged in the future. This is an area where we cannot afford to get it wrong.

Police Commissioners

Councillor Hartshorne asked the following question of the Leader:

What is the Leader's view about the value of Police Commissioners?

Councillor Collins answered as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Hartshorne for his question.

Directly elected Police Commissioners are at best an expensive irrelevance, and at worst a potential threat to the progress we've been able to make over the last few years in reducing crime in Nottingham. At a time when the £208 million budget for Nottinghamshire Police is facing around £40 million in cuts from this Liberal Democrat and Conservative government, to introduce a new system of governance for the police force which will cost £130 million to set up, £78 million extra per year to run, and that will pay a salary of up to £122,000 per year to a directly elected Police Commissioner is nothing short of criminal. Since the extra

costs will have to be found from a declining national police budget, the proposal is very likely to mean fewer police officers. As for the proposal itself, it seems strange to think that one commissioner can understand the varied and diverse policing needs of communities across the county better than an authority made up of a number of members drawn from those communities and bringing with them a range of relevant backgrounds and experiences. Add to that the concerns of Chief Constables about the lack of clarity over the role of Commissioners, the risk of maverick candidates standing and getting elected, the BNP's declared intention to target elections to these posts, and the cost of the election itself, and it's clear how poorly thought out and ill-conceived this policy is.

52 ORDER OF BUSINESS

RESOLVED that the order of business be varied to consider the urgent report of the Portfolio Holder for Employment and Skills on changes to education support for young people, and then continue with items of business as detailed on the agenda.

53 URGENT ITEM - CHANGES TO EDUCATION SUPPORT FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

The report of the Portfolio Holder for Employment and Skills, as circulated prior to the meeting, was submitted.

External representatives spoke on the report, as follows:

- Alastair Leverton, representing NCN High Pavement Campus;
- Phoebe Benta, also representing NCN High Pavement Campus;
- Phil Docherty, representing Trent University;
- Will Vickers, representing the University of Nottingham;
- Tom Bonner, representing the Open University.

The speakers were thanked by the Lord Mayor for their contributions.

Moved by Councillor Morley by way of an amendment and seconded by Councillor Price:

In recommendation 2.1 delete 'highlighting the negative impact that the changes to EMA and HE tuition fees will have on young people in

Nottingham. This representation should request that measure should be introduced to mitigate the damage that the changes will bring to Nottingham’.

and insert:

‘to ensure that:

- (i) changes to the HE tuition fees are reviewed in three years to assess whether there is a detrimental impact on the participation rates of the poorest students;
- (ii) a replacement for the EMA ensures that Nottingham’s FE colleges and other providers have access to significant hardship funds in order to maintain increased participation rates of 16-18 year olds’

After discussion the amendment was put to the vote and was not carried. Councillors Akhtar, Foster, Long, Marshall, Oldham and Sutton requested that their vote against the amendment be recorded.

RESOLVED on the motion of Councillor Ahmed, seconded by Councillor Edwards:

- (1) Nottingham City Council makes representations to the coalition government highlighting the negative impact that the changes to EMA and HE tuition fees would have on young people in Nottingham. This representation should request that measures should be introduced to mitigate the damage that these changes would bring to Nottingham;**
- (2) the Council also makes representation to the coalition government regarding the changes to Connexions. This representation should request that the powers and funding for NEET (not in education, employment or training) prevention work be retained within local authorities and that the proposed all age careers service contain high quality impartial careers advice for young people in schools.**

Councillors Akhtar, Foster, Long, Marshall, Oldham and Sutton requested that their vote in support of the report be recorded.

54 SECOND ST ANN'S AND SNEINTON DESIGNATED PUBLIC PLACE ORDER

The joint report of the Portfolio Holders for Community Safety and Partnerships and Transport and Area Working, as set out on pages 322 to 332 of the agenda, was submitted.

RESOLVED that on the motion of Councillor Urquhart, seconded by Councillor Collins:

- (1) the map showing the area proposed to be covered by the Order be noted;**
- (2) the timetable and procedures for making the Order, as detailed in Appendices 2 and 3 to the report, be noted;**
- (3) the publication of the draft Order for public consultation for the second St Ann's and Sneinton Designated Public Place Order be approved.**

55 TREASURY MANAGEMENT – 2010/11 STRATEGY CHANGES

The report of the Deputy Leader, as set out on pages 333 to 341 of the agenda, was submitted.

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

- (1) the proposals relating to the inclusion of the European Investment Bank as a non-specified investment counterparty for 2010/11 be approved;**
- (2) the revised list of eligible counterparties for investment, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report, be approved;**
- (3) the revised schedule of Prudential Indicators for 2010/11, as detailed in Appendix 2 to the report, be approved.**

56 REVIEW OF STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY

The report of the Portfolio Holder for Environment and Climate Change, as set out on pages 342 to 344 of the agenda, was submitted.

RESOLVED that on the motion of Councillor Collins, seconded by Councillor Cresswell, adopt the Statement of Licensing Policy be adopted, to take effect from 7 January 2011.

The meeting concluded at 7.10 pm

Council question requiring a written response

The following response was circulated to all City Councillors on 22 December 2010:

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

Could the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Area Working please inform Council what she will be doing about parking in city council car parks in Bulwell Town Centre?

Councillor Urquhart replied as follows:

Nottingham City Council has car parks on Gilead Street, Duke Street (West and East) and Holborn Place in Bulwell Town Centre. These car parks are free to encourage people to shop in Bulwell, but parking surveys show that the majority of the spaces are used by car owners who are parking there early in the morning and using the car parks all day thereby limiting the spaces available for shoppers to park for short stays. Clearly this acts as a deterrent to visiting Bulwell to shop and as a result people may choose to shop elsewhere and not in Bulwell.

The introduction of parking controls and a small parking fee was proposed to help people to use the local shops and businesses more easily by discouraging commuters and encouraging shorter stay car parking. The proposed charge would be during the daytime only, on Monday to Saturday, 8am to 6pm, with the first hour of parking free of charge on Mondays to Fridays and the first two hours free on Saturdays, the busiest trading day.

The proposed charges are set out in the table below.

Monday to Friday

0 -1 Hours	Free
1 – 2 Hours	£1.00
2 – 3 Hours	£2.00
3 – 4 Hours	£4.00
4+ Hours	£6.00
Blue Badge Holders	Free for first 4 hours

	+ 1 – 2 hours £1.00 + 2 – 3 hours £2.00 + 3 – 4 hours £4.00 + 4 hours £4.00
Motorbikes	Free of charge.

Saturday

0 -2 Hours	Free
2 – 3 Hours	£2.00
3 – 4 Hours	£4.00
4+ Hours	£6.00
Blue Badge Holders	Free for first 4 hours + 1 – 2 hours £1.00 + 2 – 3 hours £2.00 + 3 – 4 hours £4.00 + 4 hours £4.00
Motorbikes	Free of charge.

Sundays and Bank Holidays 08.00 – 18.00

No Charges

The free parking concession would be with the stipulation that there could not be a return to park at any of the authority's car parks in the district within an hour of taking the first 1 or 2 hours free as appropriate.

Blue Badge holders, upon displaying valid badge and clock, will receive three hours free parking. Thereafter they revert to the charging schedule about with the first subsequent hour free etc.

Proposals were also made to enable those businesses that felt they needed all day parking to be able to purchase permits at reasonable rates. Additionally arrangements for Market Traders to park all day for very reasonable cost were put forward.

There has been extensive consultation on the proposals. This includes 2,000 letters being sent out to the public on 31 August 2010. In each case, comments and/or objections were asked to be received in writing within 28 days from the date of the letter. The proposals were then formally advertised on the 28 October 2010 by erecting Notices within the affected car-parks, by advertising its proposals in the Nottingham Post, and by placing a copy of the Order on deposit at the Nottingham

Central Library. Again, comments and/or objections were asked to be received in writing within 28 days from the date on the Notices.

At the end of these two consultation periods a total of 31 responses had been received. These were presented to me as the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Area Working, to make a decision on the proposals. The decision I have decided to make is to defer the introduction of the charges pending further consideration of developments in the area which might affect the proposals, such as the new Tesco store opening.

Following consideration of relevant factors the options for my decision as the Portfolio Holder are as follows:

- proceed with the original proposals;
- amend the proposals in light of developments which have fundamentally affected the original rationale for them;
- continue to defer the introduction of the proposal while keeping it under review;
- not implement the proposal.