

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

held at the Council House, Nottingham,

on Monday 10 December 2012 at 2.00 pm

ATTENDANCES

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

52 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Arnold, Johnson and Longford.

53 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

Councillor Grocock declared an interest in agenda item 10 – Review of the Nottingham City Council Statement of Gambling Policy, as a Council appointed Director of Nottingham Racecourse Limited, which did not preclude him from speaking or voting.

Councillor Wood declared an interest in agenda item 10 – Review of the Nottingham City Council Statement of Gambling Policy, as a Council appointed Director of Nottingham Racecourse Limited, which did not preclude him from speaking or voting.

Councillor Hartshorne declared an interest in agenda item 10 – Review of the Nottingham City Council Statement of Gambling Policy, as a Council appointed Director of Nottingham Racecourse Limited, which did not preclude him from speaking or voting.

Councillor Bryan declared an interest in agenda item 10 – Review of the Nottingham City Council Statement of Gambling Policy, as a Council appointed Director of Nottingham Racecourse Limited, which did not preclude her from speaking or voting.

54 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS FROM CITIZENS

Questions from citizens

The following question from a citizen was received:

Sunday on-street parking charges

The following question was asked by Rami Seth to the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation:

I think the parking charges made for side-road parking on a Sunday afternoon are unreasonable. Last Sunday I parked my car in East Circus Street and attended a charity lunch. I read the instructions on the meter for Sunday parking and got the impression that £1 would be sufficient. I

was wrong as, on return, I noticed a sticker of penalty charge. There were plenty of spaces for cars and all the businesses were closed except restaurants. There was no question of traffic congestion, resident parking, narrow road or demand for parking spaces.

I would like to know how the Council can justify parking charges without deterring customers from using central restaurants? How can you justify penalty charges on top, for parking where the road can be deserted on a Sunday afternoon?

Such unreasonable by-laws will not gain popularity or respect for the Councillors from the citizens of Nottingham.

Councillor Urquhart replied as follows:

Thank you, Lord Mayor, and thank you Mr Seth for this question.

Nottingham City Council, as Councillors and members of the public will be aware, introduced parking charges on Sundays and in the evenings in November 2011 and gave a commitment from the outset of those charges that they would be kept under review, to ensure that they continue to encourage turnover in use of spaces, and complemented other City transport strategies. Key to this review was the need to be flexible in the use of parking provision.

In May 2012 the Nottingham Retail and Leisure Business Improvement Districts (BIDs) commissioned an independent study of parking for the City Centre. This report provided a basis for discussion and it was agreed to continue to work with the BID and other stakeholders to develop a working partnership that actively promoted the City Centre retail and leisure sectors and develop the parking offer, both on and off street, for all users. As part of this engagement, it was agreed to move forward with changes to the on-street parking charges, namely the removal of maximum stay limits and simplifying the current charging. Dropping the maximum waiting period is designed to encourage visitors to stay longer in the City Centre, using price to enable turnover of spaces. A very full City-wide consultation took place and the new simpler tariffs, with no maximum stay, were introduced on 5 November 2012. Nottingham, of course, always seeks to be bolder and go further and so, now, we are the only city without maximum stay limits for our on-street parking.

The new charges have been the subject of much discussion with the, now merged, retail and leisure Nottingham Business Improvement Districts, the BID, and have their backing.

Parking on-street on a Sunday now costs £1 for up to 2 hours, and a further £1 for the next 2 hours, and so on, in Zone 1 and £1 all day, 8am to 8pm, in Zones 2 and 3 on Sundays. The parking ticket in particular question on this occasion was issued, in this instance, because the customer overstayed passed the time he had purchased. East Circus Street is in Zone 1, and so it would have been open to the customer to purchase a longer duration there.

So how have, overall, the changes gone and have they put people off or encouraged people in to our City Centre? Since 5 November 2012 we have been monitoring the usage of the on-street bays and we have seen an increase in the number of transactions, and the average spend during the week and weekends, showing that the changes are having the desired effect of encouraging more people to use those spaces and to dwell longer in the City Centre, as the BID organisations felt was appropriate. Analysis of footfall, which we always do every week of every year, also shows us that the parking charges have not had an adverse effect on footfall levels. Over the last few weeks footfall has been higher than for the previous two years, and has shown no signs of declining. Sunday, in particular, also has a significant number of visitors to the City Centre and, looking back over the last few weeks, the proportion of visitors who come on a Sunday has been increasing over the last few weeks, as you probably might expect in the run up to Christmas, so going from 9% in the back end of October to 12% share at the end of November.

Nottingham has a great deal to offer visitors and shoppers this year. There are a great range of parking offers in our off-street car parks, the new simpler tariffs on-street and, of course, great deals on our award winning public transport network. You can travel on the Bus Operator of the Year as a family for only £4 all day at weekends and in the evenings and, of course, there's the new £2 return fare for those making only short journeys in and out of the City Centre. Analysis of bus, and overall public transport use, shows that this is still growing too. So, overall, whether by car or public transport, more people are coming in to our City Centre now than has been the case in previous years.

So, in conclusion, our new, more flexible on-street charges have been broadly welcomed. It is still important that visitors and users of those bays do look at the machines to work out how much they need to pay and, on Sunday, if you are in Zone 1, the heart of our City Centre, the cost is £1 for 2 hours and a further £1 for the next 2 hours and so on, still another very good deal, even for a whole 6 hour shopping day, at £3 for that whole period of time. This information is displayed on all the parking meters, we do welcome feedback on their clarity and, of course, we are already working on the next print version of those inserts to the meters to make them even clearer for all to understand the simple message that the answer is £1, now how long do you want to stay?

Petitions from Councillors on behalf of citizens

Councillor Piper submitted a petition on behalf of 62 signatories regarding providing single persons' accommodation on the Lenton Flats site.

55 MINUTES

RESOLVED that, subject to the inclusion of the Conservatives vote against the cancellation of the October 2012 meeting (minute 50) the minutes of the last meeting held on 10 September 2012, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed and signed by the Lord Mayor.

56 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS

The Acting Deputy Chief Executive reported the following communications:

Local Government Chronicle Awards

The Council had been short-listed for 2 Local Government Chronicle Awards, these were:

- (1) on "innovation" for its work developing small group homes for Children in Care in Residential Services. Our entry was one of 8 short-listed, out of 44 submissions, so it was a terrific achievement to get this far; and

- (2) the Energy Efficiency Award. We were one of 6 entries short-listed out of a total of 24 in this category. Affordable energy and improved energy efficiency were at the heart of Nottingham's strategic planning and service delivery. Making Nottingham the Energy City was our aim.

We were achieving this by increasing our energy self sufficiency, reducing energy wastage in homes and many Council-owned premises, providing free day time energy, encouraging tariff switching and introducing the cheaper Nottingham Energy Tariff, and we were promoting behavioural change so that residents used their energy carefully.

Nottingham was ambitious about becoming the UK's Energy City and proud of the steps taken so far to improve energy efficiency in our own premises, businesses and City households.

The next stage for both awards was to present and answer questions from the panel of judges on 25 January 2013. The final decisions would be announced on 13 March 2013.

UK Bus Awards

The City Council and local bus providers Nottingham City Transport and Trent Barton came out top in several categories at this year's UK Bus Awards on 20 November. Nottingham City Council brought home the award for Local Authority Project of the Year, for the Statutory Quality Partnership Scheme.

Nottingham City Transport took home the coveted Top City Operator and UK Bus Operator of the Year titles.

Trent Barton came out on top in four categories winning The Young Manager of the Year; Top National Bus Driver; Marketing Excellence Award for MANGO and Making Buses a Better Choice Awards. It was a strong category for Nottingham, with Nottingham City Transport coming runner up for social media and technology.

57 QUESTIONS

Nottingham Jobs Fund performance

Councillor Molife asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Jobs, Skills and Business:

Could the Portfolio Holder for Jobs, Skills and Business give his thoughts on the recently published figures for the government's flagship work programme and contrast its performance to that of the Nottingham Jobs Fund and the former Labour government's Future Jobs Fund?

Councillor McDonald replied as follows:

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

I am very pleased to talk about this issue, an issue on which, whilst the Government is floundering, this Council is delivering.

I'm sure all members in this Chamber will be aware of the Government's Work Programme, the Work Programme is the Conservative led Government's flagship work programme introduced by the Government in June 2011, at a cost of £435 million. In introducing the Work Programme the Government stated its aim of improving upon previous work programmes, programmes the Department of Work and Pensions called fragmented, over specified and lacking proper incentives. The Work Programme, we were told, would address these weaknesses by giving clear incentives, allowing providers greater freedom to operate, and focusing upon long term results. So far, so good. Yet concerns were raised from a number of quarters about the Work Programme from the very beginning; in particular, because its payment by results structure made it very difficult for providers to deliver the scheme and, because of the mandatory nature of the compliance it required, heavily penalised individuals. In short, the Work Programme was felt to be unfair on the unemployed who are penalised for failing to meet stringent criteria to try and find a job, when often there is no job there, and unfair on providers who get little or nothing until they find their client that elusive job, and these concerns have been borne out.

For months now rumours have circulated about providers going bust and individuals having benefits removed because they could not make

meetings, about which they were never notified. The situation is actually worse than that; as is so often with this Government, unfairness has been matched with incompetence. The Work Programme was introduced very quickly, replacing all other work programmes within a year, there was no testing, no piloting, indeed, in May 2011, the Commons Public Accounts Committee reported that the speed with which the Work Programme was introduced threw up risks that have to be addressed. Major projects of this nature need to be thoroughly planned. In this case, the programme was not piloted, the design and development phases overlapped and the business case was devised after the decision to go ahead was taken. The programme was launched before the IT system designed to support it was operational, so far, so bad then, and worse than that, so far, so unfair, and so far, so incompetent, but we were assured that the Work Programme is on track, it will deliver, it will get people into jobs.

I don't imagine many members in this Chamber will be surprised to hear that, the week before last, the first report on the Work Programme was released and has shown that the Work Programme is an unmitigated disaster. Only 3.5% of unemployed people referred through the programme have found a job. That actually shrinks to 2.3% over the first full year, 2.3%! None of the 18 national contractors of the programme have met their target, not one.

So, how does that compare with the Future Jobs Fund first of all, the other scheme referenced by Councillor Molife and, of course, the major work programme introduced by the last Labour government. Well last week, the Government also produced a report on the success of the Future Jobs Fund, that report found that society gained £7,750 per participant through wages, increased tax receipts, reduced benefit payments, participants gained £4,000 on average, and employers also gained, with the cost to the Exchequer just £3,100 per job. Two years after the start of their time with the fund former job seekers were 16% less likely to be in receipt of welfare, they were 27% more likely to be in unsubsidised employment than if they had not participated.

Lord Mayor, the position could not be more stark, whilst the last Labour government ran a work scheme that got people in to work, created a net benefit for the economy and benefited employers, this Conservative led Government scheme isn't working, it isn't targeting the unemployed and it's wasting hundreds of millions in untargeted incentives and IT costs. That stark contrast was actually very predictable, Lord Mayor, and that's

why this Labour Council introduced the Nottingham Jobs Fund when the Government cancelled its Future Jobs Fund. The Nottingham Jobs Fund was a, initially, £1.5 million, now £3 million, incentive scheme to get 400 people in to work by 2014 and how is it doing? Well, it has already placed 119 people in to work, with another 44 in the pipeline; it's, therefore, on track to deliver ahead of target and ahead of time. Not only that, and this is the key statistic, but over 90% of the young people it has placed in to work have stayed in work at the end of their placement, 90%! Let's contrast those two numbers – the Work Programme 3.5%, the Nottingham Jobs Fund over 90%. The Nottingham Jobs Fund is not only getting our young people in to work, it is keeping them there and we, of course, recognise that the Nottingham Jobs Fund cannot deliver on its own, that's why we've started the Employer Hub which is placing hundreds of people in to work; that's why last week we launched the Apprenticeship Hub which aims to create 1,000 new apprentices in Nottingham over the next 3 years. It's also why we have completely restructured our economic strategy through the Growth Plan and the City Deal because we recognise that active labour market policies are not enough, they must go in hand with growth, confidence and the stimulation of demand. So what's the effect? Well, business start ups are up 45% this year, unemployment is down in Nottingham by 7.6% in the last 6 months, faster than any other core city, youth unemployment is down by 7.3%, faster than any other core city. When unemployment went up nationally last month as the Olympic affect faded, it continued going down in Nottingham. The work we are doing on our economy is creating confidence and it's creating jobs. Now, we know the road is not easy, whilst this Government continues to ignore the need to stimulate growth, to hammer the public sector with austerity measures and to slash welfare support, it will be very difficult to keep unemployment going down, but I think what these statistics show is that when it comes to putting our citizens in to work, this Government is failing, this Council is succeeding.

Good and outstanding primary schools

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

How likely are parents to send their children to a good or outstanding primary school in Nottingham?

Councillor Mellen replied as follows:

Thank you, Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Ali for his question and take this opportunity to thank him and many other members around the Chamber for their work as school Governors, supporting many of our schools to be good or outstanding.

The most recent report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Education, Children's Services and Skills has identified Nottingham as a place where 71% of children have the chance of attending a good or outstanding primary school. This ranks the City's schools on a par with Nottinghamshire, and well above those in Derby and Derbyshire, Leicester and Leicestershire, and Lincolnshire.

In terms of the proportion of primary schools which are good or outstanding, 65.8% of primary schools in the City are rated as either good or outstanding, this ranks us as 97th out of 152 authorities. Whilst this is slightly below the national average of 68.7%, it is broadly in line with the proportion of good or outstanding schools in core cities and our statistical neighbours. The proportion of pupils in top graded schools is higher because many of our larger schools are performing well.

The relatively strong performance of our schools in Ofsted inspections is down to some very hard work by the Heads and staff in our schools, the children and young people, combined with support from their parents and, of course, from the governing bodies.

As a Council we have managed to retain a small but very effective school improvement team. We have intervened robustly to support where standards were low and showing little improvement. This team not only discharges the Council's statutory responsibility for securing standards, it tried to spot the signs of developing issues and offer timely support.

The City Council also recognises the importance of partnerships between schools where there can be peer to peer support, and between the local authority and other agencies, such as the National College from whom we can broker additional resource.

Whilst the Council remains of the opinion that pupils are well served in schools which are supported by the community of local authority schools, we have also been willing to work constructively with those schools that have chosen to become academies. Where academisation has been forced on our schools, we have ensured that sponsors share our ambition and our determination to retain locally driven improvement in

our schools. It is worth noting that the Chief Inspector, in his report, which mentioned the number of outstanding and good schools, emphasised the continuing responsibility of local authorities to ensure good outcomes for pupils in all schools in their area, whether they're academies or not.

Whilst this is an encouraging picture it is based on a percentage of the relatively small number of schools in the City and, as such, may fluctuate widely as a result of a small number of inspections each year. What will not fluctuate is this City's absolute determination to ensure that all its young people have the opportunity to attend a good or outstanding school, and that improvement in the educational outcomes and skills of our young people is at the centre of the drive to develop Nottingham as a world class city.

Bulwell Hall Estate insulation works

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

Could the Portfolio Holder for Energy and Sustainability please tell the Council what has been happening on the Bulwell Hall estate?

Councillor Clark replied as follows:

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

I am sure that most members here cannot fail to have noticed the level of construction activity on Bulwell Hall Estate in the last few weeks, since the start of October. What members perhaps haven't appreciated is that, for the last three weeks, there have been over 200 people working on site.

As the Ward Councillors know, but I now have the opportunity to tell Full Council, the properties on Bulwell Hall are single brick skin with no cavity, so cavity wall insulation is not an option.

Bulwell Hall has seen the roll out of solid wall insulation. Partners Nottingham City Homes, Nottingham Energy Partnership, Nottingham City Council and E.ON have worked together on this whole estate approach. The estate has been divided into two phases for the purpose of project management. Remember, this scheme, funded in full by E.ON,

is for both Nottingham City Homes properties and private properties, and Bulwell Hall has about equal numbers of each. So far, take up has been over 90%.

What are we doing? First, massively effective thermal insulation is attached to the outside wall, then a surface is placed over it to restore a good look to the house.

Why does our approach work? It has been resource intensive, but there is now a buzz about the place; neighbours have been encouraging neighbours to take up the scheme. This has worked far better than tackling particular housing types across the whole City at once, as we are doing with 'No Fines' properties.

At the first open day on the estate, designs had already been drawn up showing how each different type of block would look. These looked great on paper and look even greater in real life now the scaffolding is coming off as properties are signed off. These designs had been given careful consideration by planners and I cannot emphasise enough how a co-ordinated design looks so much better than if Nottingham City Homes had a different look from the privates, and if private differed from private.

Without the momentum created by the scheme for Nottingham City Homes tenants, nowhere near as many private properties would have been completed, and this is where successive Governments have failed with energy schemes, there are some appalling energy inefficient homes in the private sector.

Why are we doing it? The energy companies have obligations to spend money on keeping people's energy bills down, and they cannot achieve this spend through cavity wall and loft insulation alone, and the benefits could not be better described than by the resident interviewed by the BBC on Friday. Firstly, she has been able to turn her thermostat down by 4 degrees, as she was always struggling to keep the place warm. Secondly, her daughter's bedroom was always damp and felt cold; her daughter has asthma and her use of her inhaler has significantly dropped. So, in a nutshell, she has taken a comfort gain, a saving and a health boost all in one go.

Where can we improve? Well, whilst we regularly see vans from firms like Hilton and Waller, so we know local jobs are being created. Had we had more time to plan the project, we clearly could have delivered more

local jobs. But, the good news is that Nottingham City Homes has 7,000 further solid wall properties that are yet to have solid wall insulation, and the private sector will probably have at least four times that number, so the Bulwell Hall model should be looked at seriously by Government as a national approach.

Autumn Statement

Councillor Jones asked the following question of the Deputy Leader:

Could the Deputy Leader comment on how the Autumn Statement will affect working families in Nottingham?

Councillor Chapman replied as follows:

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

Well, it's all going wrong, isn't it? The Chancellor's deficit targets are being missed, the stimulus that they've started as a 'plan b', which they won't admit, is not actually taking effect, hardly any of the capital has been announced over the last few years has actually gone in to the system yet. Growth is down and there is risk of a triple dip recession and, finally, talking about triples, the AAA rating looks as though it's going and that was the hallmark of the Government.

Now it's forgivable that an economic philosophy, and the policy which goes with it, can go wrong. Nobody's perfect. We may disagree, we may say "we told you so", and a lot of us have been telling you so almost from day one, but if it's a genuinely held view, you can at least respect it. What is not forgivable is if that policy, in going wrong, makes the poorest in society pay for it. What is also not forgivable is pretending that the poor are not paying, and telling us that we're all in it together when the opposite is the case. The budget took £3.8 billion away from the benefits system, it took less than £1 billion from the well off, mainly in the form of reduced allowance for pension contributions. So, for every pound taken off the better off, four is being taken away from the poor.

I want to make 4 points. First, there are people who are fiddling the benefits system and genuinely not unemployed, I reported one this morning. Also, I agree with the Government, I agreed with the last government, this Council agrees with both governments that one of the

best things that can happen to a person is to get in to work; otherwise we would not have all the effort this Council is putting in to the work programme.

Second, however, there are many who are genuinely unemployed and looking for jobs and cannot get jobs because, mathematically, there are not the jobs to absorb all the economically active people in the City or, in fact, in the nation. Nor are they in the right places so, as a consequence we are beating up people for not being in work when there are not the jobs for them to go in to, and these are often people who are genuinely looking.

Third, many of the people most suffering are already in work. 60% of people who are losing benefits are already in work. So it's not the people behind the curtains in bed in the morning that are suffering as much as the people going off to work that are suffering, and the myth that the Chancellor tried to put about is totally untrue and it is a calumny on those people in work in low paid jobs.

Finally, those who are not in work are also suffering. There are many of them disabled who cannot reasonably work or, indeed, the children of the working poor and the unemployed, who people seem to forget in all this.

So a whole range of people who are innocent are being swept up in a tsunami of changes aimed at a minority of people whom the Tories wish to punish. Their only sin is not to have been born into a wealthier household, and this is not all being in it together, it is punitive action against the poor for being poor. In Nottingham 23,000 people in work will lose out, for a working family claiming the average £8,600 in Working and Child Tax Credit this could equate to a loss of £146 per year. Government spin tells that this will be offset by increasing the tax threshold, yet the increase is worth, effectively, £47 a year, so you're talking about a loss of £100. There are 23,000 working families in Nottingham, of these, the chances are that there will be 3,200 who are likely to be earning below that threshold so will not benefit at all, they will be earning below the £9,000+ threshold at which tax is raised, therefore they will not benefit, so it's the poorest that will have to take the full brunt of that average £146 a year loss.

So much for the Liberal Democrat wheeze of taking people out of tax at the same time, of course, they are forcing them in to Council Tax, at the same time as taking people out of tax, they are also taking people like

me out of tax, they are increasing the tax allowance for people like Alan Sugar. It is not an effective way of dealing with it, yet we are told of this measure as helping the poor, it actually helps middle income as much as, and it even helps millionaires, that system.

As for the unemployed themselves, for an individual claiming Job Seekers Allowance (JSA) at £71 a week, there is likely to be annual loss of £63. Individuals in 10,800 families claiming Child Tax Credit may also see relative losses, so a huge number of people, most of whom are working, are going to be losing money as a consequence. Then there is a plethora of additional changes, including the local housing allowance. But the final inconsistency is the view that somehow all this will help the economy. It will do the opposite. It will take money out of the Nottingham economy, plus, if you add the further £3.7 million cut that this Council will have to make as a result of the budget, you take all the cuts that are in train, the £158 per person that this City has lost, compared with the £7 per person that people in Dorset have lost, you are talking about tens of millions of pounds of demand taken out of this economy, and with every pound of demand you lose the opportunity for jobs, so it's a downward spiral, instead of creating an upward spiral they are creating a downward spiral. They are making a bad situation worse, it is economic illiteracy.

But, I will leave with a picture of the lady I visited yesterday – a single mother with a child with disability. She spends the time when he is not at school caring for him, when he is at school she spends her time caring for her elderly parents. She's in a 3 bedroom house, the house has no carpets on either floor or stairs, I went in. One thing it was, it was adequately heated and insulated, partly because of our schemes. She was allocated this house in a 'hard to let' area where there are few 2 bedroom houses, so she is not responsible for living in a 3 bedroom house and under occupying, yet she will lose £11 a week in bedroom tax. She will soon have to pay a contribution to the Council Tax. She's on JSA and will now lose income on that benefit and her heating bills are soaring. So can someone, particularly the opposition, tell me how it is fair, or how on earth it is going to benefit society or the economy, to take money away from this woman and her child? Or is she just another one of George Osborne's scroungers?

Robin Hood Festival of Running

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

Would the Portfolio Holder agree that, in view of the motion passed by Council at the September meeting of this year which acknowledged the need to 'Inspire a Generation' and provide a lasting legacy following the very successful Olympic and Paralympic Games held in London in the summer, it is of paramount importance that the Robin Hood Festival of Running is quickly reinstated to include a full marathon, as soon as tram works allow, by facilitating the necessary road closures and bus diversions, without cost to the organisers, thus allowing a fully-viable event and a return to Nottingham's pre-eminence by ensuring we stage one the finest annual running events in the country, along with the further economic benefits to the city that ensue?

Councillor Trimble replied as follows:

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

This Labour Council can be rightly proud of its investment in sport and leisure. Over recent years we have invested £32 million in a leisure transformation programme, with further very significant investment in Harvey Hadden, including a new 50 metre pool, which will probably take us up to in excess of £45 million worth of investment in our leisure centres.

We have also hosted major sporting events in the City this year, such as stage 2 of the Tour of Britain, and the 3 day Cycle Live event. In terms of running, we have the Robin Hood event and the Race for Life every year. We were the very first local authority to introduce Park Run in one of our parks, with around 200 runners every week in Colwick Park, and we're already planning a new park venue for another Park Run event in the spring of next year.

This Council started the Robin Hood marathon in 1981 and ran it for 20 years. In 2001 the event was taken over by Sweatshop and run on a commercial basis. This year it was run as a half marathon and a mini marathon with around 9,500 participants, however, whilst we understand and respect the reasons why they did not include the full marathon this year, we are very keen to see the reintroduction of the full marathon next year, or as soon as possible if the tram route is an issue.

Council officers have already met the organisers to explore options on this; we do though have to remember that Sweatshop is a commercial organisation. It would be foolish of us to promise to deficit fund a

commercial organisation. The likely outcome of this would be to have absolutely no control on the costs whatsoever, which would not be good for anybody. Lord Mayor, do we want to see the reintroduction of the full marathon? The answer is a categorical yes. Will we put unnecessary barriers in the way of the organisers? The answer is no. Will we have constructive discussions with the organisers? The answer is yes, but we will not negotiate in public. Ultimately though, the answer as to whether or not the full marathon is reintroduced is in the hands of the race organisers.

Five term school year

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

While we are pleased that the Portfolio Holder has had the good sense to listen to the teachers who have opposed his Five Term School Year plans, now that he has backed down, why not go all the way and scrap the plans to change school terms and instead work with the County to come up with a cross-boundary solution that would be of real benefit to children, families and teachers?

Councillor Mellen replied as follows:

Thank you, Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Morley for her question. It's great to have some tidings of comfort and joy from your benches at this time of year.

The Executive Board of the Council made the decision to implement the Nottingham Model of term and holiday dates at the Executive Board in November. You would know that if you attended the Executive Board, but you decline your opportunity to do so.

This decision was made following two extensive consultations with parents, governors and members of staff working in schools, including teachers. This decision was made taking in to account all the views put forward to us, alongside the research which presents a strong case in favour of a shorter summer break. Clearly, this was a different decision to the original proposal. We have been clear from the start that our aims were to reduce the length of the summer holiday, create more consistent terms lengths and to reduce the financial burden experienced by some of our families during the long summer holiday and, although the five term

year was our starting point on this journey, we have developed an alternative in conjunction with our stakeholders, and in direct response to feedback gathered during these consultations. We believe that this will give significant advantages to the children living in our City communities.

Of course, Councillor Morley is wrong when she says that the change has been made in response to the views of teachers, sadly, the main teacher unions have not been prepared to suggest any alternatives to the holiday patterns which have been in place for over 100 years, and based on harvest patterns. No, it's been the City's governors association, CONGA, and the unions representing the Head Teachers and our large number of support staff that have realised that their own working arrangements, whilst important, must be balanced with the prime purpose of our schools, and that is to meet the educational needs of our City children, and to ensure that they maximise their achievement. So, if Councillor Morley is accusing me of listening to staff working in our schools day in, day out, then yes, I plead guilty. If she is accusing me of taking seriously the views of school governors who give many voluntary hours leading our schools and giving critical friendship to Head Teachers, then yes, I've done that. And if we're being accused here of putting the needs of children first, children many of whom do not have the summer experience of long holidays and expensive day trips, but spend the holidays mainly on the streets where they live, then yes, this is what this Labour Council has done and I'm afraid I don't apologise for that in the slightest.

In response to the part of your question about delaying implementation to work with the County Council on an alternative, this avenue has already been explored and, I'm afraid, it was Councillor Morley's colleagues in charge of the Tory County Council who were keen first of all to add alternative holiday plans to their consultation, but then at the last minute didn't include any significant changes, in what was a pretty meaningless consultation. We have delayed implementing a new term and holiday pattern for a year already to give the County Council the opportunity to review their own terms and holiday dates and, whilst we would be keen to resume talks on changes to the holiday patterns with a future Labour County Council administration, which we hope will come very soon, this has already been a long process which parents, carers, governors and school staff are keen to be resolved and this pattern needs to be implemented so that Nottingham children can start benefiting from the changes.

Parking charges for school based staff

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

Would the Portfolio Holder consider the anomaly that school teachers and support staff can be charged differing amounts for parking at school, depending upon which type of school they attend? Whilst this Council has imposed a standard £288 Workplace Parking Levy on Academies and Voluntary Aided Schools for each registered parking place, it offers differential charges to LEA Schools based upon 0.6% of salary levels.

The Council Tax payer is thereby subsidising these school parking places.

Why cannot the other schools be treated in the same manner, when the system is demonstrably iniquitous?

Councillor Urquhart replied as follows:

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

As with Councillor Mellen, it wouldn't quite be Council without a question about this and, in fact, wouldn't quite be Council without me having to, once again, explain the difference between the Workplace Parking Levy, a charge on all employers who provide more than 10 workplace parking places, and Nottingham City Council's Workplace Parking Charge, that's the system we, as an effected employer, have put in place. It does surprise me today though, that I am going to have to explain the coalition's education policy to you.

The coalition is pursuing policies that remove more and more of our schools from the supposedly authoritarian control of the local authority, and it's freeing them to be independent, either as academies or free schools, and do you know what, one consequence of this is that, of course, those schools are no longer associated with the Council and, therefore, have to make their own arrangements and independent decisions about the Workplace Parking Levy. They don't have the ability to be a part of the Council's Workplace Parking Charge because they are no longer a part of the Council.

So, once again, and I hope that this time you manage to retain the information, the Workplace Parking Levy and the Council's Workplace Parking Charge are totally separate schemes.

Workplace Parking Levy is a charge on all employers within the City Council's boundary and it was introduced, of course, to tackle the problem of congestion and provide funding for NET Phase 2, those two tram lines that we're building, the redevelopment of the Railway Station, and it supports the Link Bus service, as well as acting as an incentive for employers to manage, and potentially reduce, their own workplace parking. Workplace Parking Levy has brought over £½ billion of investment to our City, has already created over 100 jobs, and is set to create thousands more. It has led to over £10 million worth of contracts for local firms supplying those projects. Without the Workplace Parking Levy none of that infrastructure investment would have happened.

All employers within the Nottingham City Council administrative boundary must hold a Workplace Parking Levy licence for their workplace parking spaces, and employers who provide 11 or more spaces are liable to pay a charge. Nottingham City Council, as an employer, is responsible for licensing and paying the Workplace Parking Levy charge for all its premises where it provides workplace parking, including our community schools. The Council has led by example and has been proactive in introducing its own parking management scheme, the Workplace Parking Charge. That scheme requires all colleagues, including schools who are community schools, who wish to park at those premises, to pay a charge for this parking, and that income is then used to offset our Workplace Parking Levy liability, and, yes, this scheme has two levels of charge, an inner-City and outer-City rate, and it is also proportionate to salary. So, as far as community schools are concerned, you are correct, that would be 0.6% of salary level, but, of course, academies and voluntary aided schools are separate employers to the City Council and it is, therefore, their responsibility to apply for their own Workplace Parking Levy licence and pay any associated charges. It is the choice of those employers whether or not to introduce travel planning or parking management schemes, they can choose how they pass on that charge, or don't, that's their freedom, in line with the current Government's thinking. Of course, as part of the operation of the Workplace Parking Levy, the Council does provide business support to all employers who are liable for the Workplace Parking Levy to assist them to manage their parking and, of course, that's open to schools, such as academies and voluntary aided schools, that are outside local authority control.

So I'm not sure, Councillor Steel, if you would rather that all schools came back in to the family of the Council. That way, of course, they could all participate in the Council's Workplace Parking Charge scheme. Perhaps, if Mr Gove is in listening mood, you could talk to him about whether he would support a Conservative group seeking to take all schools back in to local authority control. I wonder.

So, Workplace Parking Levy, that's the charge we make to all employers. Workplace Parking Charge is our decision for Nottingham City Council parking. Schools outside local authority control have their own decisions to make.

Garden waste collection end date

Councillor Morley asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Area Working, Cleansing and Community Safety:

Would the Portfolio Holder accept that the cut off date of November 2nd for Garden Waste Collections, when this year the trees were still laden with leaves, does not make sense to residents? Will the Portfolio Holder agree that a more flexible approach, taking the timing of leaf fall into consideration, would be a common sense way of avoiding this next year?

Councillor Norris replied as follows:

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

Two years ago members in this Chamber took the decision, we must remember it was part of what was then a historically difficult budget process, which is probably even harder now. But the decision was taken to reduce the collection regime of our garden waste service, such that garden waste was collected 7 months of the year, rather than 12 months of the year.

In line with the common sense approach that Councillor Morley's asking us to take, we did this using a sensible, evidence based model. We took data for the period 2008 to 2011 to determine what would be the most efficient use of our resources to collect garden waste, and what we found was that during the period November to March, the period we eventually chose to suspend collection, only 16% of waste was historically collected, but that that period of time took up 40% of our total annual cost

for providing this service. For November, in specific that I believe she is referring to, on average the month of November only yielded just under 5.5% of the total garden waste collected during the 12 month regime. So we took the sensible decision, I believe, that these 5 months were clearly the sensible ones to cease the service in order to get the saving in order that we could afford the services, many of which we have spoken about today.

But what we do know, and Councillor Morley is right to advocate common sense ways of looking at the problems in the City, we know that for some of our residents, this has proven awkward, so we've applied common sense, as far as possible, to mitigate the impact. In areas of the City where there are a large number of trees, the local cleansing teams work closely with residents to collect leaves which drop post October, so that if it's hotspots, such as gully pots, don't get blocked up causing other service disruptions, or other more personalised, depending on the nature of the house, issues that can arise to try and head them off, and it is worth noting that, as part of that, in November alone last year 500 tonnes of leaves were delivered for composting, so we're out there trying to provide common sense solutions to these issues. But, similarly, as Councillors in Wollaton will know very well from our budget consultation a year ago, the refuse collection crews will also take bagged leaves as side waste in addition to the normal residual waste, again, common sense. It feels like, to me, that we do operate a common sense system and we build into that local flexibility to make sure that where people need additional support for leaf removal we can provide it. I think that's a common sense approach to cushioning the impact of this change.

What this doesn't mean though, is that I think that this is a desirable change to have made. It wasn't made because we felt it would improve the service, far from it. It was a result of funding reductions from the Government which have totalled £75 million since 2010, that we know this year, as Dave Trimble said, we're going to have anticipated reductions of £23 million, and a further £17 million next year. So these are the choices that we have to make to get a balanced budget, so I'm going to finish answering the question with a question of my own.

Councillor Morley's asked me whether changes to garden waste collection make sense to local residents. I think they do, given the parameters. My question to her is whether she felt that the people of Nottingham would think that the Government cuts that are costing each of them £160 per head between 2010 to 2014, and the people of Dorset

just £2.70 a head, whether this makes sense to local residents? I think not.

58 DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER THE URGENCY PROCEDURE

The report of the Leader, as set out on pages 215 to 218 of the agenda, was submitted.

RESOLVED that, on the motion of Councillor Collins, seconded by Councillor Chapman, the urgent decisions taken, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report, be noted.

59 AMENDMENTS TO DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND SCHEME OF DELEGATION

The report of the Leader, as set out on pages 219 to 231 of the agenda, was submitted.

Moved by Councillor Morley by way of an amendment and seconded by Councillor Culley that an additional recommendation be added:

“The Council agrees to consult on the introduction of speaking rights for members of the public at Planning Committee meetings at the earliest possible opportunity”

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

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

- (1) the changes to the Constitution, as set out in paragraphs 5.3 to 5.11 of the report, be approved;**
- (2) the change of name from Development Control Committee to Planning Committee be approved.**

60 TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY 2012/13 – REVISED INVESTMENT STRATEGY

The report of the Deputy Leader, as set out on pages 232 to 238 of the agenda, was submitted.

RESOLVED that, on the motion of Councillor Chapman, seconded by Councillor K Williams, the action of the Section 151 Officer in authorising the changes to the 2012/13 investment strategy, as detailed in paragraph 6.4 of the report, be approved.

61 REVIEW OF NOTTINGHAM CITY COUNCIL STATEMENT OF GAMBLING POLICY

The report of the Portfolio Holder for Area Working, Cleansing and Community Safety, as set out on pages 239 to 243 of the agenda, was submitted.

RESOLVED that, on the motion of Councillor Norris, seconded by Councillor Grocock:

- (1) having had regard to the recommendation of the Executive Board of 20 November 2012, and to the principles/matters identified in both the Introduction and Appendix 2 of the draft Policy, the previous “No Casino” resolution be renewed pursuant to Section 166 of the Act so, that with effect from 31 January 2013, no casino licences would be issued within the administrative area of the City of Nottingham;**
- (2) Nottingham City Safeguarding Children Board continue to be designated for Nottingham City Council as the appropriate body to advise it on the protection of children from harm;**
- (3) having had regard to the recommendation of the Executive Board of 20 November 2012, the Statement of Gambling Policy be adopted;**
- (4) the Corporate Director for Communities be authorised to comply with the relevant statutory requirements in respect of the advertisement and publication of the Statement.**

62 NOTTINGHAMSHIRE AND NOTTINGHAM WASTE CORE STRATEGY – SUBMISSION TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE

The report of the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation, as set out on pages 244 to 250 of the agenda, was submitted.

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

- (1) the submission of the draft Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Core Strategy, along with the Schedule of Changes, and accompanying submission documents, as set out at paragraph 5.7 of the report, to the Secretary of State for independent examination be approved;**
- (2) the Corporate Director for Development be granted delegated authority to agree any necessary amendments to the submission Waste Core Strategy during the independent examination process.**

Mr Curryer, Acting Deputy Chief Executive, left the Chamber prior to consideration of the next item.

63 APPOINTMENT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE/HEAD OF PAID SERVICE

The report of the Chair of the Appointments and Conditions of Service Committee, as circulated in advance of the meeting, was submitted.

RESOLVED that, on the motion of Councillor Neal, seconded by Councillor Collins, the Appointments and Conditions of Service Committee recommendation be accepted and the post of Chief Executive/Head of Paid Service be offered to Ian Martin Curryer at an annual salary of £160,000 and on other terms and conditions approved by the Committee.

Mr Curryer returned to the Chamber.

64 MOTION IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR NORRIS

Moved by Councillor Norris, seconded by Councillor Dewinton:

“The City Council knows that domestic violence can destroy lives and tear apart families. Rather than allowing domestic violence to continue behind closed doors, the Council is committed to supporting the Man Enough campaign which calls on individuals to sign up to the international pledge “not to commit, condone or remain silent about domestic violence against women and girls”.

This Council notes:

- The successful effort of the Nottingham Post to raise awareness of this issue
- That nearly as many men in Nottinghamshire have signed up to the pledge than the rest of the country put together

This Council will:

- Protect spending for Domestic Violence services
- Lobby the Police and Crime Commissioner to maintain funding currently provided through the Community Safety Grant
- Lobby the government to ensure that other local authorities do not substitute good practices in certain cities for the provision of their own domestic violence services. Such practice would put additional pressure on services in Nottingham and prevent proper support for victims
- Lobby the government to retain and develop the Violence Against Women and Girls (VAWG) strategy”

RESOLVED that the motion be carried.

65 MOTION IN THE NAME OF COUNCILLOR STEEL

Moved by Councillor Steel, seconded by Councillor Culley:

“Nottingham City Council supports the general proposals of the Castle Working Group and commits to significantly improving the visitor experience at Nottingham Castle

The Council acknowledges the cultural and economic importance of the Nottingham Castle and Robin Hood legend to the City in terms of reputation and tourism, and resolves to seek every opportunity to:

- improve visitor experience by fully exploiting these assets:
- establish a widespread international recognition of the City’s unique attributes;

- provide ease of access to, and maximise the potential for the magnificent views of, the Castle and Rock from across the City.”

RESOLVED that the motion be carried.

66 EXECUTIVE BOARD CITY CENTRE COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

RESOLVED that the addition of Councillors Collins and Chapman to the membership of the Executive Board City Centre Committee be noted.

67 ADDITIONAL MEETING

RESOLVED that an additional meeting of Council be held on 28 January 2013.

The meeting concluded at 6.10 pm