

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

held at the Council House, Nottingham,

on Monday 12 September 2011 at 2.00 pm

ATTENDANCES

✓	Councillor Wildgust		Lord Mayor
✓	Councillor Ali	✓	Councillor McDonald
✓	Councillor Arnold	✓	Councillor Malcolm
✓	Councillor Aslam	✓	Councillor McCulloch
✓	Councillor Ball	✓	Councillor Mellen
✓	Councillor Bryan	✓	Councillor Molife
✓	Councillor Campbell	✓	Councillor Morley
✓	Councillor Chapman	✓	Councillor Morris
	Councillor Choudhry	✓	Councillor Neal
✓	Councillor Clark	✓	Councillor Norris
✓	Councillor Collins	✓	Councillor Ottewell
	Councillor Cresswell	✓	Councillor Packer
✓	Councillor Culley	✓	Councillor Parbutt
✓	Councillor Dewinton	✓	Councillor Parton
✓	Councillor Fox	✓	Councillor Piper
✓	Councillor Gibson	✓	Councillor Saghir
✓	Councillor Grocock	✓	Councillor Smith
✓	Councillor Hartshorne	✓	Councillor Spencer
✓	Councillor Healy	✓	Councillor Steel
✓	Councillor Heaton	✓	Councillor Trimble
✓	Councillor Ibrahim	✓	Councillor Unczur
	Councillor Jeffery	✓	Councillor Urquhart
✓	Councillor Jenkins		Councillor Watson
✓	Councillor Johnson	✓	Councillor K Williams
✓	Councillor Jones	✓	Councillor S Williams
✓	Councillor Khan	✓	Councillor Wood
	Councillor Klein		
✓	Councillor Liversidge		
✓	Councillor Longford		

40 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Cresswell and Watson and Councillor Klein (on other Council business).

41 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

No declarations of interests were made.

42 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS FROM CITIZENS

Questions from citizens

No questions from citizens were received.

Petitions from Councillors on behalf of citizens

Councillor Saghir submitted a petition to the Lord Mayor on behalf of 209 residents living in the vicinity of 6 Trentham Gardens, Aspley, objecting to the property being used as a residential care home for young people aged 10-17 years old.

43 MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 11 July 2011, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed and signed by the Lord Mayor.

44 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

The Chief Executive reported the following communications:

Association of Public Service Excellence (APSE) Awards

Nottingham City Council won the APSE Award for Best Street Cleansing and Street Cleaning at a ceremony that took place on Thursday 8 September. The Council was also short listed in the categories of Best Employment and Equality Initiative and Best Parks, Grounds and Horticultural Service. A big well done to all colleagues in those service

areas. The services make a positive difference locally but it was always great to have good work recognised nationally too.

Nominations in the three categories meant that the Council was also nominated as a finalist for the APSE Council of the Year Award.

Former County Councillor Fred Riddell, Councillor Ian MacLennan and Honorary Alderman Reverend John Pennington.

Former County Councillor Fred Riddell, Councillor Ian MacLennan and Honorary Alderman Reverend John Pennington had all passed away recently.

County Councillor Fred Riddell

Former County Councillor Fred Riddell died on Thursday 8 September 2011. His immense contribution to public life in both Nottinghamshire and Nottingham, particularly in the field of education, was well known to everyone in the Chamber.

Councillor Ian MacLennan

Councillor MacLennan was elected to represent the Bridge ward in 1983. He represented the area until 2000 and was re-elected in 2007.

He chaired the Council's Leisure Services Committee for a decade from 1989 and was an active member of the Environment and Development Control committees.

He died on 22 August 2011 and leaves behind his wife Sue, and four sons Callum, Alasdair, Keir and Rory.

Honorary Alderman Reverend John Pennington

Honorary Alderman Reverend John Pennington was elected to represent the Bestwood Park ward from 1976 to 1983 and was Sheriff in 1982/83. He became Honorary Alderman on 8 May 2006.

He died on 25 August 2011 and leaves behind his wife Jean, four children Stephen, Philip, Andrew and Janet, and seven grandchildren.

The funerals of Councillor MacLennan and Honorary Alderman Reverend John Pennington were held at St Mary's Church on Thursday 8 September 2011.

Councillor Morley spoke about former County Councillor Fred Riddell.

Councillors Culley and Trimble spoke about Councillor Ian MacLennan. Councillor Hartshorne spoke about Honorary Alderman Reverend John Pennington.

The Council stood in silence in tribute to their memories.

45 QUESTIONS

Disturbances and rioting

Councillor Culley asked the following question of the Chair of the Police Authority:

Would the Chairman of the Police Authority and Leader of the Council accept the thanks and appreciation of the Conservative Councillors, on behalf of Nottinghamshire Police force, for their excellent work during the last month's outbreak of rioting and criminality?

Would he also convey our thanks to City Council staff, such as those from our Community Safety and Emergency Planning teams, for the vital role they also played in restoring order and keeping our city safe?

Councillor Collins replied as follows:

Thank you, Lord Mayor, can I thank Councillor Culley for her question, and of course I am happy to pass on her comments and thanks both to the Police and to Council Officers for their efforts. I am sure that her and her colleagues will also want to take the opportunity to underline that message by supporting the motion in my name later on today's agenda.

CCTV surveillance of disturbances

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

Would the Leader of the Council please outline the benefits of the CCTV surveillance in managing the recent disturbances in Nottingham?

Councillor Collins replied as follows:

Thank you, Lord Mayor, can I thank Councillor Morris for her question.

CCTV was used extensively during the disturbances in Nottingham between the 8 and 10 of August, with nearly 54 hours of footage and 15 incidents of disorder recorded for examination by the Police. The footage has been used to identify individuals involved in the disturbances and to provide evidence of criminal activity for use in court.

During the disturbances CCTV was used to monitor activity and the movements of groups of people round the City centre, with a view to preventing looting and other criminal activity. Contact between the Police and the Council's CCTV control room was maintained in the first instance through the airwave radio system that Community Protection staff share with the force in Nottinghamshire, and subsequently with Police Officers based in the control room to direct PSU activity and deployment.

Overall, the use of CCTV was central to the efforts of the authorities in preventing the scale of violence and criminal activity seen in other major cities developing in Nottingham. It is for this reason, and because of its effectiveness in addressing and deterring crime and anti-social behaviour, that this Council over the years has invested heavily in its deployment. It, therefore, has to be a concern that the current Government seems determined to potentially undermine the effectiveness of CCTV by introducing restrictions on its use, together with a whole new regulatory system complete with a new Security Camera Commissioner who will, as the Deputy Prime Minister put it, "put the brakes on the surveillance state".

In Nottingham CCTV has been used to protect the public and to deter and detect crime and anti-social behaviour. The recent disturbances underline how good it can be in doing just that. The Conservatives and Liberal Democrats will be doing the City a major disservice if, for ideological reasons, they change the law to make it more difficult to use, and less effective in situations like that experienced in Nottingham on the 8, 9 and 10 of August.

Building Schools for the Future

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

Would the Portfolio Holder inform Council of how much the Tory led Government's axing of the Building Schools for the Future Programme for schools such as Top Valley and Trinity is set to cost the City Council

even with Gove's promise of contractual liabilities covered and legal fees returned?

Councillor Mellen replied as follows:

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

Councillor Jenkins is right to ask this question as he is aware we are bitterly disappointed to learn that the Secretary of State is minded not to fund any of Nottingham's BSF Wave 5 projects which were the subject of a judicial review earlier this year. We are pleased, however, that the Council's bold approach has ensured that money already spent on the cancelled projects will be recovered, unlike those authorities who chose not to challenge the decision. The Council has also reached an agreement to claim back legal costs.

The Secretary of State has not yet reached a final decision in respect of how much the axing of this programme will cost the City Council. Therefore officers have not yet held discussions with DfE officials to establish which elements of the costs "contractual liabilities" will cover. I am not yet able to clarify the final cost to the City Council and when these negotiations have concluded and contractual liabilities clarified I will be able to provide a full response at that point.

I can say that, prior to a final decision being made, the City Council has provided further representations to Mr Gove in respect of the funding for these schools in Wave 5, including the £33 million previously agreed for Trinity and Top Valley Schools.

We continue to do our duty to Nottingham's schools, children, and the communities they serve to ensure that we maximise the benefits they can achieve.

Council Tax Benefits

Councillor Fox asked the following question of the Deputy Leader of the Council:

Would the Deputy Leader inform Council on the impact on Nottingham of the proposed devolution of Council Tax benefits to the City Council by national Government?

Councillor Chapman replied as follows:

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

In the 2010 Spending Review, Government announced it would localise support for Council Tax from 2013-14 and, at the same time, reduce expenditure on this support by 10%. On 17 February 2011, the Welfare Reform Bill was published and included provisions to abolish Council Tax benefit and pave the way for the new localised scheme. The Government has now published more detailed proposals. Consultation ends on 14 October.

The financial impact on the Council of these proposals is quite stark, with the Government not only looking to reduce the grant by 10% but also looking to protect pensioners and passing the risk on to increased claimants to the Local Authority. Initial modelling of these proposals show that we could face, in Nottingham, in the region of £5 million per annum loss of income, and we will have to reduce the level of support to people that we are serving. Moreover, we are not simply talking about a 10% cut to a large number of people in Nottingham on their Council Tax benefit. Once we've taken into account the gearing created by the exemption of pensioners, and I am not saying that pensioners should be included, but there is a gearing impact, because it means that other people will have to take greater than 10% and once we have taken into account the need for a hardship fund, and, once we have taken into account the need for a contingency, because we just do not know how the whole matter will pan out and how many people will actually access the benefit and qualify for the benefit, then the reduction could be as much as 28% for some people. This will not only hit the unemployed, it will hit many hard working families on low incomes. It is immoral reduction in the welfare system dressed up as localism, which makes it all the more reprehensible.

Government funding for work experience placements

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

Can the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services comment on the effect of the withdrawal of Government funding for work experience placements for young people?

Councillor Mellen replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Molife for his question. Funding for Local Authorities to facilitate work experience for 15 and 16 year olds was ended by the Coalition Government in April 2011.

In Nottingham the services providing brokerage and health and safety checks for schools, have been provided by Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Futures, a company owned and controlled by ourselves and the County Council. Futures also delivered the Connexions service, providing advice and support to young people, a service which has also been severely hit by the central government funding cuts.

The ending of this funding has placed greater emphasis on schools to buy in the necessary checks and brokerage required to facilitate work experience. I am sure we would all agree, we would not want to put young people in a workplace where it was not safe, where the various checks had not been put into place. Nottingham City Council has sought to protect the current arrangements by working with Futures, with schools and academies to broker cost effective arrangements for these placements. They do, however, remain expensive and, as a result, it is most likely that most schools will no longer offer work experience to all pupils as part of the curriculum.

This will be detrimental to young people and businesses alike, as the benefits of work experience include:

- providing an insight for young people into their chosen career pathway;
- opening their eyes to new possibilities and professions they had not previously considered;
- acquiring and understanding the benefits of transferable skills;
- using the work experience employers as a reference; and
- applying theory to 'real life' situations.

I would also add the kind of work readiness, skills of being prepared, of getting to work on time, are really important skills that young people learn during those week or fortnight placements that, sadly, are not going to be available to our young people in the same way as they were. The withdrawal of work experience will severely weaken the links built between schools and employers, and the removal of funding for this has already attracted criticism from both schools and also local business leaders who are wishing to engage in creating an effective future workforce.

It is a short term saving Lord Mayor, that will lead to long term loss for both the young people of this City, for its businesses, and for the economy of this country at a time when it needs all the help it can get.

Clifton Grove wind turbine development

Councillor Spencer asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation:

While I understand the need to explore and encourage the use of renewable energy, does the portfolio holder believe that the proposed Clifton Grove wind turbine development is appropriate considering its location close to residents' homes, not least those of the residents of Clifton Grove, Clifton Village and Silverdale?

Councillor Urquhart replied as follows:

Thank you, Lord Mayor, and thank you Councillor Spencer for your question.

I am very happy to say that I believe that generation of power by renewable sources, such as wind, is a positive way forward, and one that I feel we should explore. Broadly, Nottingham City Council has very clear policies that support the development of measures, such as wind generation of power, as part of a balanced CO2 reduction strategy and, of course, the Council is taking action already in terms of renewable energy production through our innovative photovoltaic programme for our housing stock, and our work on an energy park directed towards renewable energy and economic growth.

In terms of this particular scheme, which is the subject of a current planning application, it is clearly likely to have significant impacts for local residents, and, at present, no decision has been taken on the acceptability or appropriateness of that current application. Before any decision is taken the applicant will have to produce an Environmental Statement seeking to address key issues of visual, noise and pollution impacts on local residents and wider environment. Careful examination of this information will be crucial, and I would not want to come to a view on this particular scheme ahead of receiving all of that information and, of course, Development Control Committee members will need to consider all of those issues carefully, perhaps following a site visit, in

order to form their own view of the impacts and balance of argument for and against these proposals, because of course it is that Committee that will make the decision.

The applications for the turbines, one falling within Broxtowe and two within the Nottingham City area have only recently been submitted, and, given the complexity of the issues involved, it is far too early to form a definitive view about whether this particular development is likely to be acceptable or not.

So, at present, clearly there are no decisions that have been taken about it, and in terms of the impact on residential properties, there are not any defined standards or policies available from national government to show us a direction, so therefore it will be particularly important that we have regard to the most up-to-date and authoritative guidance which is out there. Current Planning Policy Statement 22, on renewable energy, would provide us with one such reference document, but even that does not specify wind turbine to residential property standards for example, it rather identifies the issues that would need to be assessed, and so the crucial information will of course be the Environmental Statements that will seek to address those key issues of visual, noise and pollution impact on local residents and the wider environment. The statements will assess landscape, visual amenity, archaeology, cultural heritage, noise, ecology, ornithology, aviation radar, geology, soils, hydrology, traffic, transportation, access, other planning policy, telecommunications, radio communications, shadow flicker, and any existing utilities issues. That Environmental Statement will be available for all to assess and comment on, and those reports will be scrutinised by the relevant stakeholders; Natural England and the Notts Wildlife Trust, for example, will assess the ecology and ornithology reports, East Midlands Airport and the Civil Aviation Authority will have to make their comments on radar reports, and the Environment Agency on hydrology and flood risk issues.

There has already been extensive pre-application consultation with the local community, and the application that the Council has received has been advertised, both by letters to properties within a kilometre radius of the application site, site notices, and adverts in the local press. So overall I think it will only be possible to reach an informed opinion on this particular proposal once all the responses to the present consultation exercise have been received and once the Environmental Statement has been thoroughly assessed by the local stakeholders and the local community.

Evening and Sunday car parking charges

Councillor Morley asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation:

Can the Portfolio Holder explain to the council the wisdom of introducing evening and Sunday parking charges to the city when times are tough enough for retailers already? Wouldn't a charging scheme that, at least, offered the first half or full hour free be more attractive to shoppers while also encouraging the desired 'churn' effect?

Councillor Urquhart replied as follows:

Thank you, Lord Mayor, and thank you, Councillor Morley, for your question.

As you are well aware, we are now consulting on proposals to extend existing on-street parking charges to Sundays and into the evenings, and, yes, 'churn' or the turnover use and re-use of on-street parking spaces is one of the aims of the proposal, by differentiating charging in outlying areas with lower rates for longer stays, whilst encouraging even greater turnover and usage of parking spaces in our most popular areas. This differential charging approach has already been introduced Monday to Saturday in order to better manage the spaces throughout the week. It is also worth pointing out, I think, in this context, that most of the City's parking is not free on Sundays or evenings at present. More than 8 out of 10 of the City's total parking stock is located within car parks, and these charge for parking at these times.

Additionally, the proposals for Sundays and in the evenings are already set at a lower level than that which currently applies during Mondays to Saturdays. This is to recognise the need to balance the introduction of such charges with levels of demand, and of course another point to make is that for very large numbers of our population who use public transport their journeys, aside perhaps from the very good value weekend grouprider ticket from Nottingham City Transport, cost the same on a Sunday as every other day of the week.

Additionally, I am sure that you are well aware that the Council faces a difficult financial settlement. A settlement that was unfair on Nottingham, and that effectively took away money from this City to enable places such

as Dorset to have a small increase in their funding. So yes, times are tough, times are tough for retail, times are very tough for this City Council, and times are very tough for citizens within our City.

So of course, as Eric Pickles has asked us to, we look at every avenue of our budget, and income generation is one of those things that we have to look to. So whilst it is not the only driver behind these proposals, the Council has to consider raising revenue, especially when by raising that revenue we also compliment other objectives such as our transport planning and parking management, through both charging and signing and lining is an essential component of managing a successful City centre. So I think that the on-street parking issue should be viewed alongside other parking facilities and other modes of transport as a contributor to a vibrant City centre. It is that vibrant mix that contributes towards a successful commercial hub in our City, and I am sure I do not really need to repeat the achievements that we have in terms of public transport, trams, trains and the bus network, as I am sure you are aware of and familiar with the services that are provided.

Nottingham is one of England's most significant core cities, and these proposals would bring Nottingham into line with other cities such as Liverpool, and, more locally, Derby, where Sunday on-street charging has been in place for some time now. So, of course, I thank you for your views, which I am sure you will also submit to the formal consultation, and I hope that, in addition to that, you will continue to join with us in lobbying your government for a fair settlement for Nottingham so that our budget position becomes flexible enough that income generation is not so crucial to our considerations, and I would also ask you what would you cut to replace this lost income?

Evening and Sunday parking charges – effects on worshippers and community groups

Question asked by Councillor Morley of the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation:

Can the Portfolio Holder explain what measures will be taken to mitigate the effect of evening and Sunday parking charges on worshippers in the city, and also to help other important community groups whose viability will be hit hard by these short sighted charges?

Councillor Urquhart replied as follows:

Thank you, Lord Mayor, and thank you, Councillor Morley.

I shan't repeat some of the information that I have given you in my answer to the previous question, as I have covered some of these issues already.

Of course I recognise that there are interest groups for whom free on-street parking provides an important method of supporting their activity, so consideration is being given to how to support groups such as churchgoers who worship in the various churches located in the City centre on Sundays. I did encourage officers to begin informal consultation with some religious groups to get views on this proposal prior to the formal consultation going out, and meetings have taken place and further meetings are being arranged. We must, of course, be sure though that we do not favour any particular interest group in detriment to other interest groups or faiths that worship or meet within the City centre on other days of the week and that currently do not receive help with respect to their parking needs.

Our departments already have considerable experience of being enabling on this type of issue, having successfully supported those who use the Islamic Centre near the City centre to worship on a Friday, and who are clearly affected by all the existing parking charging systems and restrictions, such that they have sensible arrangements in place to use our Curzon Street car park for worshippers.

Also, we already have an arrangement in place with one of the City centre churches which does not have nearby on-street parking for worshippers to use Broadmarsh car park at a special rate, and so I am confident that we can have positive discussions with faith groups who feel they are affected by this proposal and, as I said in answer to my last question, I am sure you will make these representations to the formal consultation, and I hope that you will continue to join with us in seeking a fair funding settlement for our City which recognises the levels of deprivation that we have and ensures that we are funded decently to meet the needs that we have in this City.

Library room hire charges

Councillor Culley asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Culture and Tourism:

Would the Portfolio Holder explain why we are introducing room hire charges at City Libraries for the very community groups and voluntary organisations we are supposed to be supporting during this period of economic uncertainty?

Councillor Trimble replied as follows:

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

I hope all Councillors would agree that the Library Service provides a vital front line service, placing access to facilities and community support right at the very heart of all of our communities right across the City.

Charging for room hire has been a longstanding policy throughout City Libraries, certainly since Local Government reorganisation in 1998, and probably even before.

I can confirm that, as from 1 June, some changes have been made to the libraries' room hire policy and that these changes have been made in order to simplify and provide better consistency of charges across all of our community libraries. A single rate of £8 per hour in all community libraries and £10 per hour for rooms at Central Library, with a £25 charge if we have to use a security firm to open up and lock the building out of hours. Previously a more complex range of differential charges applied at various libraries depending on the different facilities available across different libraries.

We continue not to charge for those services which provide direct support, help and advice to our citizens including welfare services, employment advice, debt advice, credit unions, Councillor and police surgeries for example.

The core library offer remains free and libraries do provide direct support to a very diverse range of groups, clubs and individuals. The revised charges are not aimed to reduce access or support to those valued user groups but do simplify and provide a more consistent charging policy across the City.

Lord Mayor, Dunkirk and Lenton and Bridge Labour parties use the Meadows Library, and we pay for the out of hours security service at £25, and I know that because I regularly dip into my pocket to contribute

to that. I am really grateful to Councillor Culley for pointing out to me that this has not been applied consistently. This leaves me with two questions to ask my officers. Firstly, why have some libraries been charging, and at least one library not been charging? And secondly, why are libraries in our most deprived areas charging, and at least one library in what is probably the most affluent area of the City not been charging? Because that is not a practice that I, or any of my group, support.

I would, though, have more sympathy for Councillor Culley's question if I was not hearing it from someone whose party has destroyed much of our budget, taking £62 million from Nottingham people. A party that has hit poor urban areas far, far harder than rich rural Tory areas. A party that took away the Future Jobs Fund, Area Based Grants, new schools for Nottingham kids, EMA, Working Neighbourhoods Fund, and destroyed the budgets of voluntary groups right up and down this country, especially in the areas that need them more. The party that talked about creating "Easy Jet" Councils, where you get the basic minimum and everything else you pay for as an add-on and would you believe it, Councillor Culley has supported most of that, but then again Councillor Culley has never had to make a decision on this Council, let alone had to make a difficult decision, but this is not about that. In short, these charges have been there all along, Wollaton Library did not have a community group two and a half years ago until we invested in it, and when we invested in it two and a half, three years ago, we created a meeting and community room. What did not happen is that relevant charges were not applied at that point, and they damn well should have been.

46 UPDATED CONSTITUTION AND FINANCIAL REGULATIONS

The joint report of the Leader and Deputy Leader, as set out on pages 99 to 143 of the agenda, was submitted.

Two amendments to the report were announced at the meeting – the increase of the number of Councillor questions permitted from 3 to 4, and the inclusion of time limits on initial responses to Councillor questions of ten minutes, and responses to supplementary questions of five minutes.

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

- (1) the revised Standing Orders, including the amendments detailed above, be agreed;**
- (2) the revised Financial Regulations, including Contract Procedure Rules, be agreed;**
- (3) the revised Scheme of Delegation be agreed;**
- (4) the revised key decision limits and definitions be agreed;**
- (5) the revised Constitution, as a whole, be adopted with immediate effect.**

47 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EAST MIDLANDS SHARED SERVICES (EMSS) JOINT COMMITTEE

The report of the Leader, as set out on pages 144 to 155 of the agenda, was submitted.

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

- (1) the EMSS Joint Committee be established in accordance with sections 101(5) and 102 of the Local Government Act 1972 and sections 19 and 20 of the Local Government Act 2000 (which facilitate two or more Councils establishing a joint committee for the purpose of discharging any of their functions) and all other applicable legislation;**
- (2) the functions of providing support services to the Council and Leicestershire County Council, and other external clients and partners as outlined in Appendix 1 to the report, be delegated to the EMSS Joint Committee until Council resolves otherwise;**
- (3) the membership, substitution arrangements, chairing, draft terms of reference and first meeting date for the EMSS Joint Committee, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report, be agreed.**

48 TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2011/12 STRATEGY – REVISED PRUDENTIAL INDICATORS

The report of the Deputy Leader, as set out on pages 156 to 159 of the agenda, was submitted.

RESOLVED that on the motion of Councillor Chapman, seconded by Councillor Williams, the revisions to the treasury management Prudential Indicators and limits detailed in Appendix A to the report be approved.

49 AUDIT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2010/11

The report of the Chair of the Audit Committee, as set out on pages 160 to 161 of the agenda, and the separate handout circulated with the agenda, was submitted.

RESOLVED that on the motion of Councillor Williams, seconded by Councillor Piper, the Annual Report of the Audit Committee for 2010/11 be received.

50 MOTION IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR COLLINS

Moved by Councillor Collins, seconded by Councillor Norris:

“Following on from the disturbances in Nottingham, this Council:

1. Congratulates Nottinghamshire Police, including CPOs and PCSOs, for their professional and effective response to the recent social disorder.
2. Commends the hard work of our other emergency services, especially Nottingham’s Fire Service, and of Nottingham City Council staff and partners who worked hard to engage with communities and promote diversionary activities.
3. Commends the vast majority of young people who chose not to engage in such criminal activity and who are making a valuable contribution to our community.
4. Resolves to lobby that Nottingham’s CPOs are given joint status with our PCSOs and are made eligible for the Queen’s Jubilee Medal.

5. Asks the Government to review its current policies, in particular the abolition of EMA and the Future Jobs Fund which in our view discriminates unnecessarily against young people.”

Moved by Councillor Culley by way of an amendment and seconded by Councillor Parton that:

In recommendation 4 delete “are given joint status with our PCSOs and”.

In recommendation 5 delete “Asks the Government to review its current policies, in particular the abolition of EMA and the Future Jobs Fund which in our view discriminates unnecessarily against young people.”
Insert “Congratulate the courts for taking swift action against the perpetrators”.

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

After discussion, the substantive motion was put to the vote and was carried.

RESOLVED that the substantive motion be carried.

51 MOTION IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR McDONALD

Moved by Councillor McDonald, seconded by Councillor Liversidge:

“This Council strongly supports the rights of its Citizens to receive legal advice, irrespective of their financial circumstances.

This Council also firmly supports the principle of law centres, which help ensure the most vulnerable in our society are treated fairly, and can be an effective form of early intervention, often saving public money.

The Council therefore deplores the Government’s intention to cut the legal aid budget by over £350 million, enshrined in the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Bill. The City Council believes that the Government’s reforms are unfair, ill-targeted proposals that will deny citizens of Nottingham access to justice, and are likely to result in the closure of the Nottingham Law Centre.

The City Council will therefore:

- continue to lobby Government over the Government's legal aid reforms;
- support the Justice4All campaign;
- explore the limited ways in which it can support the Nottingham Law Centre in the future;
- find ways in which this city can ensure that its most vulnerable citizens have access to legal advice."

After discussion, the motion was put to the vote and was carried.

RESOLVED that the motion be carried.

52 CHANGES TO COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS

RESOLVED that the following changes to Committee memberships be noted:

- (1) the addition of Councillor S Williams to the City Centre Area Committee;**
- (2) the addition of Councillors Choudhry and Hartshorne to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee;**
- (3) the addition of Councillor Choudhry to the Joint Health Scrutiny Committee;**
- (4) the removal of Councillor Urquhart from the Executive Board Commissioning Sub Committee.**

The meeting concluded at 5.30 pm